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IN PIAM MEMORIAM
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VIRI, SI QVIS ALIVS, DE HIS STUDIIS

OPTIME MERITI

HVIVS OPERIS ADIVTORIS HVMANISSIMI
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.
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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 Alexander; 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 kind. Thus Aristobulus (ap. Clem. Al. strom. i. 22; cf. Eus. praep. ev. xiii. 12) writes: κατηκολουθηκε δε καὶ τῆς Πλάτων τῆς καθ’

1 Individual cases, such as that of the Jew mentioned by Clearchus (ap. Jos. c. Ap. 1, 22), who was Ἑλληνικὸς οὗ τῆς διαλέξας μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, 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 1. 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.
The Alexandrian Greek Version.

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

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 διασπορὰ (O.L. dispersio) employed by the Greek translators in these and similar passages (cf. 2 Esdr. xi. 9, Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) tit. (codd. A* T), cxlvi. (cxlvii.) 2, Judith v. 19, Isa. xlix. 6, Jer. xiii. 14 (cod. Ν*), 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’ ἑτέρων, Eus.
2 See Tischendorf, V. T. Gr. (1879) prolegg. p. xiii. n.
* 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). 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 sense had its origin in Babylonia; there, as in Palestine, the services of the synagogue interpreter (Iq6nano) 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 Palestine 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 הָעֵמֶּד, 'exile'; see Dr Hort on 1 Pet. i. 1.
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.) foresaw\(^1\) 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 ἐνμακιὼν ἡσαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Αἰθιόπων βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὲν Ψαμμιτιχὼ). The panic which followed the murder of Gedaliah drove a host of Jewish fugitives to Egypt, where they settled at Migdol (Μάγδωλος), Tahpanhes (Ταβνάς = Δάφνη)\(^2\), Noph (Memphis), and Pathros (Παθρών)\(^3\), 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 (῾ηδὴ μὲν καὶ πρῶτερον ικανῶν εἰσεληνυθότων σὲν 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 purpose\(^4\). 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. =xliv. 1 ff. ἀπασιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν γῇ Ἀσιντου κτῆ. Many of these refugees, however, were afterwards taken prisoners by Nebuchadnezzar and transported to Babylon (Joseph, *ant*. x. 9. 7).

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. Ap. i. 22 ἐπὶ 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 Greek, he not only assigned a place in his new city to Jewish colonists, but admitted them to full citizenship.

Joseph. ant. xix. 5. 2 ἐπιγγένον ἄνεκαθεν τοὺς ἐν Ἄλεξανδρείᾳ ᾿Ιουδαίοις... ἵστα πολιτείας παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τετευχότας; c. Ap. ii. 4 οὐ γὰρ ἀπορία γε τῶν οἰκησόντων τὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς ἕντα αὐτοῦ κτισμένην Ἀλεξάνδρος τῶν ἥμετέρων τινάς ἐκεί συνήθροισεν, ἄλλα πάντας δοκιμάζων ἐπιμελῶς ἀρετῆς καὶ πίστεως τοῦτο τοῖς ἥμετέροις τὸ γέρας ἐδώκεν. B. J. ii. 18. 7 χρησάμενοι προθυμοτάτοι κατὰ τῶν Ἐλιγυπτίων ᾿Ιουδαίοι Ἀλεξάνδρος γέρας τῆς συμμαχίας ἐδώκεν τοῖς μετοικεῖοι κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εὗ ἵστο μοῖρας πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας.

Mommsen indeed (Provinces, E. T. ii. p. 162 n.) expresses a doubt whether the grant of citizenship 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 Alexander.

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.


1 Plutarch Alex. 26 ἐβούλετο πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ πολυάνθρωπον Ἑλληνίδα συνοικίας ἐπιφύσμοιν εαυτοῦ 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.
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 ó δὲ Πτολεμαίος πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς ὅρεως Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῶν περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα τῶν καὶ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαρίξειν, κατάφυσιν ἀπαντᾶς εἰς Ἀγιρπτον ἀγαγών ἐπεγυνόκει τοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων περὶ τῆς ὁρκοῦ φυλακῆς καὶ τῶν πίστεως βεβαιωτόν ὑπάρχοντα τῶν αὐτῶν τοῖς Ἑλληνίδοις ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρεια ποιῆσαι ἱσοπολίτας. οὐκ ἠλίγοι δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὴν Ἀγιρπτὸν παρεχιγραφοῦσα, τῆς τε ἀρετῆς τῶν τόπων αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πτολεμαίου φιλοτιμίας προκαλοῦμένης.

A separate quarter of the city was assigned to the colony (Strabo ap. Joseph. ant. xiv. 7. 2 τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρειας πόλεως ἀφώρισται μέγα μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ); it lay in the north-east of Alexandria, along the shore, near the royal palace. Here the Jews lived under their own ethnarch, 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.
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(Philo ad Cai. 20, in Flacc. 6). 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). 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 Greeks. 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. 9, 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 Agrippa, "was the mother city, not of a single country, but of most of the countries of the world, through the

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 Αἰδηπτίων for Αἰσιπτίων.
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 Jerusalem; 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 life. If it was not required by the State as a condition of citizenship, 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 city; 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 tongue. Any prejudice

1 See Schürer, iii. 97 ff.
2 Droysen, iii. p. 35.
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 *koiṿ* 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 *koiṿ*. 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 ‘Septuagint’, 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, op. ad Pammach.), editio LXX. (praef. in Paralip.). 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 ἐβδομῆκοντα, παρὰ ἐβδομῆκοντα, O. T. in Greek, i. p. 103, ii. p. 479), and quoted by the formula oi o' or oi oβ'. 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 'Ἀριστεάς 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 Oeconomicus περὶ τῶν ο' ἐρμηνευτῶν βιβλία δ' (Athens, 1849); a better text was given by M. Schmidt in Merx, Archiv f. wissensch. Erforschung a. A. T. i. p. 241 ff.; the latest separate edition appeared in 1900 under the title: Aristaeae 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. Rosenmuller, 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 Schürer1, 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 Philadephus, 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, 2893), and was borne by a Cyprian sculptor (see D. C. and R. B., i. 293). Wendland, however, thinks 'the island' is Pharos, as certainly in § 301. The Aristeas who wrote περὶ Ποιδαλω (Euseb. praep. ev. ix. 25) was doubtless an Alexandrian Jew who, as a Hellenist, assumed a Greek name.

2 See Ostermann, de Demetrai 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 ἀξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ βιβλιω-θήκης 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 rolls composed of skins (σῶν...ταῖς διαφόροις διφθέραις ἐν αῖς ἡ νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφία τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς 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 Heptastadion 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 Aristeas, '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


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 ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ συντηρεῖν ἄγνώς).

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

Aristobulus ap. Eus. praep. ev. xiii. 12. 2: ἢ δὲ ὅλη ἐρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέας σοῦ δὲ προγόνων [he is addressing Philometor] προσενεγκαμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων. Philo, vit. Mops. ii. 5 ff.: Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλαδέλφος ἐπικληθεὶς...ζήλον καὶ πόθον λαβὼν τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῶν εἰς Ἑλλάδα γιλτσταν τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν μεθαρμόζεσθαι διενεκέτο, καὶ πρέσβεις εὐθὺς ἐξέπεμπτε πρὸς τὸν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀρχηγεῖα.. ὃ δὲ, ὡς εἰκός, ἡσθεὶς καὶ νομίσας οὐκ ἄνευ θείας ἐπιφροσύνης περὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἐσπουδακέναι τὸν βασιλέα...ἀσμένως ἀποστέλλει...καθίσαντες δὲ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ καὶ μηδὲν παρόντος...καθάπερ ἐνθουσιώτες ἐπροφήτευον, οὐκ ἄλλα ἄλλοι, τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ πάντες ὅνωμα καὶ ῥήματα ὁστὲρ ὑποβολέως ἐκάστοις ἀοράτως ἐνηχοῦσι κτλ. Josephus, ant. i. prorom. 3: Πτολεμαῖον μὲν ὁ δεύτερος μάλιστα δὴ βασιλέως περὶ παιδείαν καὶ βιβλίων συναγωγήν σπουδάσας ἐξαίρετος ἐφιλοτιμήθη τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν διάταξιν τῆς πολιτείας εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φανήν 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. iii. 384—392. On the other hand cf. L. Cohn in Neue Jahrbiicher 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 ἀγεταῖ κατὰ τὴν Φάρου νήσου, εἰς ἦν οὔκ ᾿Ιουδαῖοι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ παμπληθεῖς ἐτεροι διαπλέουσι, τὸ τε χιῳν σεμεύνοντες εἰν φτ πρῶτον τῷ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἐξέλομψε 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.

1. 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, praep. ev. viii. 1—9, ix. 38; Cyril of Jerusalem, catech. iv. 34; Hilary, prol. ad Psalms, 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 ᾿Αρσιοθοῦλῳ διδασκάλῳ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως. See Valckenaer diatribe de Aristobulo (printed at the end of Gaisford's edition of Eus. praep. ev. iv.).
doret, praef. in Psalms; Cyril of Alexandria, adv. Julian. or. 1; Pseudo-Athanasius, synops. ser. sacr. § 77; the anonymous dialogue of Timotheus 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 shown the vestiges of the cells in which the translators had worked (αὐτός ἐν τῇ Ἁλεξανδρείᾳ γενόμενοι καὶ τὰ ἧχη τῶν οἰκίσκων ἐν τῇ Φάρῳ ἑωρακότες ἐτὶ σωζόμενα, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἑκεί ὡς τὰ πάτρια παρειληφότων ἀκηκο-ότες 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 above\(^2\). 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 Alexandriam mendacio suo extruxerit, 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 interpretum")\(^3\).

\(^1\) 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. οὕς ἑρμήνεις ἑκείνος ἄλλῃ λεισφάντας καὶ προφήτας προσαγο-ρεῦστες.

\(^3\) The story of the cells is not peculiar to Christian writers; it is echoed by the Talmud (Bab. Talm. Megillah 9a, Jerus. Talm. Meg. c. i.; cf. Sopherim, c. i.).
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). 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 remark; 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 Maccabees. 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 Aristaeae 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 Court. 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 generation. 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 Aristeas 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 Greeks.

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 books. He founded a second library at the Serapeion to receive the overflow of that which Soter had established near the Museum and the Palace. His syncretistic temperament disposed him to listen to the representatives of various creeds. A Buddhist mission from the Ganges found a welcome at his court; and the reign which produced

---

1 See the remarks of Wilcken in Philologus liii. (1894), p. 111 f., and cf. Lumbroso, p. xiii.
2 See Schürer's, iii. p. 468 f.
4 Tertullian exaggerates his literary merits (apol. 18 Ptolemaeorum eruditissimus... et omnis littaturae sagacissimus).
5 Cf. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 164 f. 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 second 1.

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. xiii. 11 of the phrase τὸν ἲστρον τῆς πρώτης by τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης. The Pharisees understood the word ἀναύριον 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 Pharisees 2. 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 draw 3.

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 ἔν

2 He also notes the rendering ἄρχων in Deut. xvii. 14—20.
3 See Expository Times, ii. pp. 209, 277 f.
The Alexandrian Greek Version.

τῇ 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.

αὐτὶ τῶν μήλων τοῦ μανδραγόρου.

ἀγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ παλαίωσι καὶ ἀφασθαί τοῦ πλάτους τοῦ μηροῦ τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

λέγειν κτηνοτρόφους αὐτοῦς εἶναι.

Genesis (LXX.).

εὑρεν μῆλα μανδραγόρων... αὐτὶ τῶν μανδραγόρων (xxx. 14 f.).

ἐπάλαεν...καὶ θυσίο τοῦ πλάτους τοῦ μηροῦ Ἰακώβ (xxxii. 25).

εἴρετε Ἀνδρέας κτηνοτρόφοι εσμέν (xlvi. 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 'negociated 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

² The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila strangely says: ἢν δὲ οὗτος ὁ Δημήτριος τῷ γένει Ἑβραῖος.
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). 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
suggestion, 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 Aristeas 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, when such Greek
equivalents as προσήλυτος, δίχον, ἀνάπαυσις, 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 Alex-
andrian, 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, Apophthegm. viii. Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς Πτολεμαῖος τῷ
βασιλεῖ παρῄνει τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτάσθαι καὶ ἀνα-
γινώσκειν.
3 Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 8 f.
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 exegesis. 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 King. 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 settlers 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 noteworthy 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 (παραγενθείς εἰς Ἀἰγυπτόν καὶ συγχρονίσας); but the clumsy Greek of the prologue, and the stiff artificiality of the book, offer a

---

1 Cf. Philo ap. Eus. ἐν εὐ. viii. 7 τῶν ἱερέων δὲ τις παρὼν, ἢ τῶν ἑράπτων εἰς, ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους αὐτῶς καὶ καθ' ἐκαστὸν ἐξηγεῖται. But εξηγεῖται 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 prol. to Sirach: οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν τὸς ἀναγινώσκοντας δὲν ἐστὶν ἑπιστήμωνας γίνεσθαι, ἀλλά καὶ τοὺς ἑκτὸς 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 (ἐφασαν...ἐρμηνευκέναι Αυσίμαχον Ἰτολεμαίου 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 ἀχιετος (Gen. xlii. 2 ff.), κονδυ (Gen. xlv. 2 ff.), ιβις (Lev. xi. 17; Deut. xiv. 16), βώσος (Exod. xxv.—xxxix. passim) and such characteristically Egyptian terms as διδραχμον, ἀληθεια (= Δημος), ἀρχιμαγερος, ἀρχιουνοχος and the like. The argument is not conclusive, since after the time of Alexander the koivq contained elements drawn from various localities. 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 name.” 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. 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 Ptolemies.

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.
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 Jerusalem, 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 Judæa 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 writers; 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 exhibentur."

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 Pentateuch. This was evident to Josephus: *ant. i. prooem. 3 οὐδὲ γὰρ πᾶσαν ἑκείνος (sc. Πτολεμαῖος ὁ δεῦτε- ρος) ἔφη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδω- σαν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἔπὶ τὴν εἴσηγησιν 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." Epiphanius goes so far as to apportion the books of the Hebrew canon among thirty-six pairs of translators. 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.). 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. 206.
3 de mens. et pond. 3 sq.
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 ἦσαν μεταχειρίζεται αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα, καὶ όταν μεταχειρίζηται εἰς ἑτέραν γλώσσαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητείαι 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 literature which had not as yet formed themselves into a complete group. The latter are doubtless the books which are known as Παλαιά or Hagiographa. Since the author of the prologue was a Palestinian Jew, we may perhaps assume that under αἱ προφητείαι 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 νόμον καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων.
clearly shewn. 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 Ἰουναίων) quotes the book of Job according to the LXX, and has been suspected of being the author of the remarkable codicil attached to it (Job xl. 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. The Psalter of the LXX. appears to be quoted in 1 Macc. vii. 17 (Ps. lxxvii. = lxxviii. 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 Jews; 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, Daniel. But, as Professor Ryle points out,

2 Ibid. 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. 1. Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Daniel, which “seem to have been among the latest books to be received into the Sacred Canon,” 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 Prophets. 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 him.”

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 lb. 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, dissertationum fasiculus, 1660; I. Voss, de LXX. interpretibus, 1661—1663; J. Morinus, Exercitationes, 1669; R. Simon, histoire critique du Vieux Testament, 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. episola, 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, Vorstudiien 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 ὀ’ ἐρμηνευτῶν, 1849; Churton, The Influence of the LXX. upon the progress of Christianity, 1861; Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 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,
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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\(^a\), 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-Wellhausen\(^6\) (1893), König (1893); and the Encyclopedias and Bible Dictionaries, especially the articles on the Septuagint in Smith's D. B. iii. (Selwyn), the Encyclopaedia Britannica\(^2\) (Wellhausen), the Real-Encyk. 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 Wetzer-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.

1. 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 ἐμειναν αἱ βιβλίοι [the translated books] καὶ παρ’ Αλγυπτίους μέχρι τοῦ δεύτερο καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίους: dial. 72 αὕτη ἡ περικοπὴ ἢ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Ἱερεμίου ἢ τι ἐστὶν ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν τοις ἀντιγράφοις τῶν ἐν συναγωγάς Ιουδαίων), Tertullian (apol. 18 "Judaei palam lectitant"), Pseudo-Justin (cohort. ad Gr. 13 τὸ δὲ παρ’ Ἰουδαίους ἢ τι καὶ νῦν τάς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ θεοσθείᾳ
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diaferoûnas σῶζεσθαι βιβλίους, θείας προοίμιας ἐργον ὑπὲρ ἤμων γέγονεν...ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς ταύτας ἀξιοῦμεν 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 ἐβδομήκοντα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτεροι παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ τῶν Ἀργυρτίων βασιλεῖ γενόμενοι μὴ εἶναι ἐν τισιν ἀληθῆ). The crucial instance was the rendering of πρός 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 text." 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 αὐτοὶ ἐξήγεσθαι πειρώνταί). Of two such fresh translations Irenaeus speaks in terms of reprehension (lib. οὐχ ὡς ἐννοὶ φασιν τῶν ἓν μεθερμηνεύειν τολμῶν τῇ γραφῇ...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 anonymous. Of the anonymous versions little remains, but Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus are represented by numerous and in some cases important fragments.

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 Ἰουδαίων ὄνοματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικῶν τῷ γένει). Aquila the translator was also of Pontus, from the famous sea-port 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... Ἐλληνα ὄντα καὶ αὐτοῦ πενθερίδην, ἀπὸ Σινόπης δὲ τῆς Πόντου ὀρμόμενον, καθίστως αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε ἐπιστατεῖν τοῖς ἔργοις κτλ....πικρανθεῖς δὲ...προσηλυτεῖαι καὶ περιτίμηται Ἰουδαῖος... καὶ ἐπιτύπωθος φιλοτιμήμασθεν ἐξειδοκεν ἑαυτὸν μαθεῖν τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεῖα. ταύτην δὲ ἀκρότατα παιδευθεὶς ἤρμικενεσθεν οὐκ ὅρθῳ λογισμῷ χρησάμενος, ἀλλ' ὅπως διαστρέψῃ τινά τῶν ῥητῶν, ἐνσκῆψας τῇ τῶν οὗ ἐρμηνείᾳ ἵνα τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς μεμαρτυρημένα ἄλλως ἐκδώσει). The same tale is told in substance by the Pseudo-Athanasi-an 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. 12f.

That Aquila was a proselyte to Judaism is attested by the Jewish tradition (Jer. Talm. Meg. i. 11, Kiddush. i. i), in which he appears as ἄρσις δ ἀποστηλωσος. After his conversion to Judaism, Aquila became a pupil of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (Meg. f. 71 e) 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 Pharisaei quorum suscepit scholam Akybas, quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autament”), 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 ἐτή κα', ὀὔτινος πός δοδεκάτῳ ἐτεὶ ἀκύλας ἐγγωρίζετο... ὅσ εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν ὁβ' ἐρμηνευτῶν ἢσ ἀκύλα τοῦ ἐρμηνευτοῦ, ἵγουν ἢσ δοδεκάτου ἐτους ἀδριανοῦ, ἐτή να' 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. 135, 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 בְּקַלְקַלְקַל, בְּקַלְקַלְקַל, בְּקַלְקַל, או בְּקַלְקַל, and in the Bab. Talmud, בְּקַלְקַל. 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 τολμῶν τὴν γραφήν...ός...'Ακύλας).

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, μὴ ἀπεθανάτῳ ἡμῖν ἡ ἡγεσία. 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. i; 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 (cf. ad African. 2 φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένον παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις...τοῦ μάλατα εἰώθαιν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἐβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ός πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιστευμένων); 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 Rabbinism as well as a bold attempt to displace the Septuagint. 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 Ἐβραίκῃ λέξει); whatever was wanting in the Hebrew text was not to be

1 Megilla i. 9: in ἡμῖν there is a play upon ἡμί (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 κεῖται παρὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους, διότι οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀκυλα). So Origen confesses¹; and Jerome, though when in a censorious mood he does not spare the proselyte (e.g. præf. 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 voluminisbus 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

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. 30 ff. (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.


**LXX. (Cod. B).**

10 Καὶ ἀπεστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑὸς Ἀδὰμ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη, εἰ ἐκποιήσει ὁ χοῦς Σαμαρείας ταῖς ἀλώτεξιν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τοῖς πεζοῖς μου. 11 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Ἰκανούσθω μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ κυρτὸς ὡς ὁ ὀρθός. 12 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, πίνων ἦν αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες βασιλεῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν σκηναῖς καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παυτῖν αὐτοῦ Οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα καὶ ἔθεντο χάρακα ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν. 13 καὶ ἦν κατὰ προφῆτας εὶς προσήλθεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει Κύριος Εἰ εὖράκας τὸν ὧχλον τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον; ἦδον ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτὸν σήμερον εἰς χειρὰς σάς, καὶ γνῶσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ Κύριος.

**Aquila.**

10 καὶ ἀπεστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑὸς Ἀδὰμ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείησάν μοι θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείησαν, εἰ ἔξαρκεσίν χοῦς Σαμαρείας τοῖς λιχάσου τοῦ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ὅς ἐν ποιήσει. 11 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Λαλήσατε Μὴ καυχᾶσθω ξωνύμενος ὡς ὁ περιλύμυνος. 12 καὶ ἐγένετο ὃς ἦκουσεν σὺν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπινυντεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐν συνκιασμοῖς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς δοῦλους αὐτοῦ Θέτε· καὶ ἐθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν. 13 καὶ ἦν ἐγὼ προφῆτης ἐς προσήγγισεν πρὸς Ἀδὰμ βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει οὐδὲς σὺν πάντα τὸν ὧχλον τὸν μέγαν τοῦτον; ἦδον ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτὸν εἰς χειρὰ σοῦ σήμερον, καὶ γνῶσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐδὲς.
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4 Regn. (2 Kings) xxiii. 21—24.

LXX. (Cod. B).

21 καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς παντὶ τῷ λαῷ λέγων Ποιήσατε πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης. 22 οὐκ ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τούτο ἀφ' ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἐκρινοῦν τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας βασιλεῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ βασιλεῶν Ἰουδαί: 23 ὁτι ἀλλ' ἦ τῷ ὀκτώκαιδεκάτῳ ἐτει τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 24 καὶ γε τοὺς θελητὰς καὶ τοὺς γνωριστὰς καὶ τὰ θεραφεῖν καὶ τὰ εἴδωλα καὶ πάντα τὰ προσοχθίσματα τὰ γεγονότα ἐν γῇ Ἰουδαί καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐξῆρεν Ἰωσείας, ἵνα στήσῃ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμον τοὺς γεγραμμένους ἐπὶ τῷ βιβλίῳ οὗ ἐδείχθη Χελκεῖας ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου.

Aquila.

21 καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τῷ λέγειν Ποιήσατε φέσα τῷ δῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς συνθήκης ταύτης. 22 οὐκ ἐπούῃθη κατὰ τὸ φέσα τούτο ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἐκριναί τὸν Ἰσραήλ καὶ πασῶν ἡμερῶν βασιλεῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ βασιλεῶν Ἰουδαί: 23 οτι ἀλλ' ἦ τῷ ὀκτώκαιδεκάτῳ ἐτει τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τούτο τῷ δῷ 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 ἄ ὀράθησαν ἐν γῇ Ἰουδαί καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπέλεξεν Ἰωσιαοῦν, ὅτις ἀναστήσῃ τὰ ἰδίματα τοῦ νόμον τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τοῦ βιβλίου [οὗ εὗρεν] Ἐλκιαοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς οἴκῳ Κυρίου.

1 The following variants in Cod. A agree with Aquila: 22 πασῶν ἡμερῶν A 23 τῷ πάσχα] τοῦτο τοῦ A

2 MS. κυ, at the end of a line: see Burkitt, p. 16.
Ps. xc. (xci.) 6b—13.

**LXX.** (Cod. B).

άπο συμπτώματος καὶ δαί-

μονίου μεσημβρινοῦ.

'πεσείται ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους σου

χιλιᾶς,

καὶ μυρίας ἐκ δεξιῶν σου,

πρὸς σὲ δὲ ὤν ἐγγείη:

πλὴν τὸις ὀφθαλμοῖς σου κατα-

νοῆσεις,

καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν ἀμαρτωλῶν

ὀψη.

ὅτι σὺ, Κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μον

τὸν ἕσκεσαι ἐθου καταφυγήν

σου.

οὗ προσελεύσεται πρὸς σὲ κακά,

καὶ μάστις ὤν ἐγγειεὶ τῷ σκη-

νώματι σου.

ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντε-

λεῖται περὶ σοῦ,

τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν ταῖς

όδοις σου.

ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσιν σε,

μὴ ποτε προσκόπησι πρὸς λίθον

τὸν πόδα σου.

ἐπὶ ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλισκοῦν

ἐπιβίση.

---

**Aquila.**

ἀπὸ δηγμοῦ δαίμ[ον ζουτος με-

σημβρίας]..

'πεσείται ἀπὸ πλαγίου σου[ν

χιλιᾶς],

καὶ μυρίας ἀπὸ δεξι[ῶν σου]:

πρὸς σὲ ὦν προσεγγ[είη]

ἐκτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς [σου ἐπι-

βλέ]ψεις,

καὶ ἀπόστων ἀσεβῶν ὀψη.

ἤτι σὺ, Ἑλλήνη, ἡ ἐλπίς μον.

ὕψωσαι ἐθῆκας οἰκητηρίον

σου.

οὗ μεταχθῆσεται πρὸς σὲ κακία,

καὶ ἀφή ὦν ἐγγίσει ἐν σκέπῃ

σου.

ὅτι ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελείται

σε,

τοῦ φυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις

όδοις σου.

ἐπὶ ταρσῶν ἀροῦσιν σε,

μήποτε προσκόπησι ἐν λίθῳ

[ποὺς σου]:

ἐπὶ λέανα[ν] καὶ ἀσπίδα πατή-

σεις.

---

1 11 ταῖς οδοῖς] pr πᾶσαις A(R)Τ

2 MS. λεενα.
Ps. xci. (xcii.) 5—10.
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LXX (Cod. B1).

5οτι εὐφρανάς με, Κύριε, εν τῷ ποιήματι σου,
καὶ εν τοῖς ἐργοῖς τῶν χειρῶν σου ἀγαλλιάσωμαι.

6ώς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἐργα σου, Κύριε,
σφόδρα ἐβαρύνθησαν οἱ δια-
λογισμοὶ σου.

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

8ἐν τῷ ἀνατείλαι τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς
ως χόρτον
καὶ διέκυψαν πάντες οἱ ἐργα-
ζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν,
ὅπως ἄν ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν εἰς
tὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.

9οὔ δὲ "Ψυστος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,
Κύριε.

10οτι ἵδιον οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἀπο-
λούνται,
καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται πάν-
tες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν
ἀνομίαν.

Aquila.

5οτι ηὐφρανάς με, ἐλθείπῃ σου,
ἐν κατέργῳ σου,
[ἐν ποιήμασι] χειρῶν σου
αινεόω.

6[ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη] ποιήματά σου,

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

8ἐν τῷ βλαστήσῃ ἀσεβεῖς ὅμοιος
χλόῃ
καὶ ἄνθησαν πάντες κατεργα-
ζόμενοι ἀνωφελές,
ἐκτριβήναι αὐτοῦ ἕως ἔτη

9καὶ οὔ "Ψυστος εἰς αἰῶνα,

10οὐδεὶς ἐχθροὶ σου, ἐλθεῖπῃ, οὐδὲ
οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἀπολοῦν-
tαι,
[σκορπὶ]σοθήσονται 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 ἐβαθυνθ. Babyaca-RT 10 pr οτι ἵδιον οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἐλθείπῃ ΚAa-RT
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. i Kings xx. 10 ὁς ἐν ποσιν μου = ἥπερ ἔστιν εἰς μου (LXX. το ἐν πεζοῖς μου); 12 θέτε καὶ ἔθηκαν = ὁτιμήσαντες τὸ χάρακα (LXX. οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα, καὶ ἔθηκαν τὸ χάρακα); 2 Kings xxiii. 21 τὸ λέγειν = ήγάλ (LXX. λέγων); 24 ἀ ὑπάρθησαν = ηγαν (LXX. τὰ γεγονότα). (2) Under certain circumstances σὺν is employed to represent the Hebrew יָשֵׁם, when it is the sign of the accusative; e.g. i Kings xx. 12 σὺν τῷ ρήμα = ἧπερ μοι, i3 σὺν πάντα τὸν ὀχλον = ὁμώς ἐδέσμευες, 2 Kings xxiii. 21 σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ (where the dat. is governed by the preceding verb), 24 σὺν τοὺς μάγους κτλ. (3) The same Hebrew words are scrupulously rendered by the same Greek, e.g. καὶ καγρε = ἀπὸ occurs thrice in one context (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19, 24); and in Ps. xcii. 8, i0 κατεργάζομενοι ἀνωφελέσ twice represents ἐργάζεσθαι. (4) The transliterations adhere with greater closeness to the Hebrew than in the LXX.3; thus ἡλίσσει becomes φέσα, ἰωσίαν ἰωσίαν, ἱερείαν ἐλκιαοῦ. (5) The Tetragrammaton is not transliterated, but written in Hebrew letters, and the characters are of the archaic type (הָיָה, not היה); cf. Orig. in Ps. ii., καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις ἐκ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἑβραίων χαρακτήρων κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, ἑβραίως ἐκ τῶν νῦν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχιστάτοις—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 ο or ο for היה4. (6) That the crudities of Aquila's

---

1 For these see Burkitt, Aquila, p. 12.
2 This singular use of σὺν 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. 105 n., and McNellle, Introd. to Ecclesiastes.
3 Aq. does not transliterate שְׁם (see Burkitt, p. 14).
4 In a few Hexaplaric MSS. (e.g. Q. 86, 88, 243mg, 264) the Greek letters ΗΙΙΠΙΙΙΙΙ 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 IIII in the text of the LXX., using it freely for κύριος, even with a preposition (אֶל). Oxyrh. Pap. 1007 (vol. vii.), late 3rd cent.,
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style are not due to an insufficient vocabulary 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 to the colloquialisms of the LXX. The following are specimens; 1 Kings xx. 10 LXX. ἐκποιήσει, Aq. ἐξαρ-κέτει; LXX. ἄλωτεξίν, Aq. λυχάσιν; 12 LXX. σκναίς, Aq. συνκιασμοῖς; 2 Kings xxiii. 21 LXX. διαθήκης, Aq. συνθήκης; 24 LXX. θεραφεῖν, Aq. μορφώματα; LXX. εἴδωλα, Aq. καθάρ-ματα; Ps. xc. 8 LXX. ἄνταπόδοσιν, Aq. ἀπότισιν; ib. 10 LXX. προσελεύσεται, Aq. μεταχθήσεται; LXX. μάστιξ, Aq. ἀφι; xci. 5 LXX. ποιήματι, Aq. κατέργη.

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, ὀπωρισμόν, στιλπνότητα for σιτων, σινων, ἔλαων in order to reflect more exactly the Hebrew יְבִי, יִשְׂרָאֵל—as though, adds Jerome humorously, we were to use in Latin fusio, pomatio, splendentia. Similarly,

has ξζ, representing doubled yod, in Gen. ii., iii. Ceriani expresses the opinion that the use of ΠΠΠΠΠ is due either to Origen or Eusebius, i.e. one of those fathers substituted ΠΠΠΠΠ for 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 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. πιττί, Field, Hexapla ad Esa. i. 2; Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, p. 1135; Driver in Studia Biblia, i. p. 12, n. 3; Z. D. M. G. (1878), 465 ff., 501, 506. Prof. Burkitt acutely points out (p. 16) that 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 (and doubtless also ΠΠΠΠΠ) was read as Κύριος, since in one place in the Aquila fragments where there was no room to write the Hebrew characters “instead of οἰκὼς 𐤀𐤀𐤀𐤀 we find οικῶ κύ." On the orthography see Burkitt, p. 15, par. 4.

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

² See Prof. Burkitt’s note (p. 26).
Aquila represented שׂעֵל by ὀστεων, and לְעִבְרִית by ἐπιστημονίζεως or ἐπιστημονοῦν, and even coined the impossible form ἀφημένος to correspond with שׂעֵל. (2) An attempt is made to represent Hebrew particles, even such as defy translation; thus n local becomes the enclitic δε (e.g. νότονδε = ἦδεν, Gen. xii. 9, Κυριηνδε = γεχρ, 2 Kings xvi. 9); and similarly prepositions are accumulated in a manner quite alien from Greek usage (e.g. εἰς ἀπὸ μακρόθεν = ἔνθελπη, 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. לְעִבְרִית is converted into τράγος ἀπολυμένος and לְעִבְרִית into σκιὰ σκιὰ; a Hebrew word is replaced by a Greek word somewhat similar in sound, e.g. for ישע (Deut. xi. 30) Aquila gives αὐλῶν, and for אָלֶיךָ (1 Sam. xv. 23) θεραπεία.

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 exegesis. 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 καὶ ἄκριβεστα nominantium." 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 critic.” 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. Theodotion. With Aquila Irenaeus couples Theodotion of Ephesus, as another Jewish proselyte who translated the Old Testament into Greek (Τεοδοτίων ἠρμῆνευσεν 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 βασι- 
λείαν τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος μετὰ τὸν προερημένον Κάμοδον Λούκιον 
Αὐρήλιον ἔτη 17', Θεοδοτίων τῆς Ποντικῆς ἀπὸ τῆς διαδοχῆς Μαρκίων 
τοῦ αἱρεσίαρχου τοῦ Σιουπίτου, μηρίων καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ αὐτοῦ αἱρέσει 
καὶ εἰς Ἰουδαίον ἄποκλινας καὶ περετμηθεὶς καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἐβραίων 
φωνήν καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεία παιδευθεῖσ, ίδιῶς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξεσθε. 
Hieron. ep. ad Augustin.: “hominis Judaei atque blasphemi”;

1 Dr Taylor, pref. to Fragments of Aquila, p. vii.
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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 Iudaeus est.”

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: τα πλεῶσα τοῖς οἴδα

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).
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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 Job, but there is no evidence that he admitted the non-canonical books in general.

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 example.


14 ἰδοὺ ἡμέρας ἔρχονται, φησὶ Κύριος, καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸν λόγον μου τὸν ἀγαθὸν ὅν ἐλάλησα ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰουδα. 15 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνατελὼν τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολὴν δικαιαν, τοιῶν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν τῇ γῇ. 16 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις σωθήσεται ἡ Ιουδαία καὶ Ἰερονατημα κατασκηνώσει πεποιθῶν καὶ τούτῳ τὸ ὄνομα διὰ καλέσει αὐτὴν Κύριος δικαιοσύνη ἐμώρη. 17 δότε τάδε λέγει Κύριος, Οὐκ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνήρ καθημενός ἐπὶ θρόνον οἴκου Ἰσραήλ. 18 καὶ τοῖς ἱερεύσι τοῖς δευταῖς οὐκ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἄνηρ ἐκ προσώπου μου, ἀναφέρων ὅλοκαυτώματα καὶ θύμων θυσίας. 19 καὶ εὐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου πρὸς Ἱερεύμων λέγων 20 Τάδε λέγει Κύριος Εἴ διασκεδάστε τὴν διαθήκην μου τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν διαθήκην μου τὴν νύκτα, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῶν' 21 καὶ γε ἡ διαθήκη μου διασκεδάστησεται μετὰ Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου, τοῦ μὴ

1 Orig. εφ. 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.
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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. 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. ἀκριβᾶσματα = Νἱηη), or a reminiscence of Aquila; on the other hand Theodotion agrees with the LXX. against Aquila in translating Νηη 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 ἀκριβᾶσματα in this sense (Jud. v. t5, 3 Regn. xi. 34, 4 Regn. xvii. t5), 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 cause. When among these we find such a word as ἔλ (which is represented by ἕλ 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 translator. Field’s judgement is here sounder than Montfaucon’s; Theodotion is not to be pronounced indoctior, or indiligentior, but only “scrupulosior quam operis sui instituto fortasse conveniret.”

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 appears, 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 current.” 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

3. Thus in Mal. l. c. he was perhaps unwilling to use θεὸς in connexion with the phrase ἐλα.”
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.”
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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 loyal 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. Burkitt9, 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 version8. 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., 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 Theodotionic reading (ἐλευθεράπευνον, LXX. ἐθεράπευνον). Barnabas (ep. iv. 5) also refers to Dan. vii., and, though his citation is too loose to be pressed, the words ἐκαταστήσασται ὁποθεθεὶς αὐτὸν are more likely to be a reminiscence of ὁπίσω αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται (Th.) than of μετὰ τούτοις 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 Theodotionic 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 νεφέλων) occurs as well as the LXX. ἐπὶ τῶν ν.; comp. Mc. xiv. 62 with Mt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64 ³.

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 ἀπηρέσιατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλεῖ ἀὐτοῦ in 1 Esdr. ii. 9 and Dan. i. 2 (lxx.)

¹ Heb. l. c. ἔφραξεν στὴματα λεβντιων (Dan. Th., ἐνέφραξεν τὰ στήματα τῶν λεβντων; LXX., στέικε μὲ ἀπὸ τῶν λεβντων).
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), I Cor. xv. 54 (Is. xxv. 8); see Schürer⁵, 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 translator. 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 remark.

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 Judaism.

Eus. H. E. vi. 17 τὸν γε μὴν ἐρμηνετῶν αὐτῶν δὴ τούτων ἱστούν Ἔβδωναιν τὸν Σύμμαχον γεγονέναι...καὶ ὑπομνήματα δὲ τοῦ Συμμάχου εἰσέπε νῦν φέρεται εἰν οἷς δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Μαθαίου ἀποτεινώμενος εὐαγγελίου τὴν δεδηλωμένην άφρεσιν κρατύνειν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ὄριγένης μετὰ καὶ ἄλλοι εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἐρμηνείων τοῦ Συμμάχου σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τινὸς εἰληφθέναι, ἡν καὶ φησὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ Συμμάχον τὰς βίβλους διαδέδωσεν. Hieron. de virr. ill. 54 “Theodotionis Hebionaei et Symmachi eiusdem dogmatis” (cf. in Hab. iii. 13); præf. in Job: “Symmachus et Theodotion Iudaizantes haeretici.” Epiph. de mens. et pond. 15 ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Σεβήρου χρόνοις Σύμμαχος τις Σαμαρείτης τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς σοφῶν μὴ τιμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου ἔδωσε...προσηλυτεῦει καὶ περιτέμεται δευτέραν περιτομήν...οὕτως τοῖνω δ Σύμμαχος πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν


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

3 The name דִּדְמוֹד 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.

S. S.
Τα ερμηνεία του Σαμαρείτα έρμηνευόμενον ερμηνεύον την τρίτην εξέδωκεν ερμηνειαν.

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. p. 212.
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.
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a verbal rendering: “non solet verborum κακοζηλιαν sed intel-
legentiae 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 con-
clusion that his purpose was polemical (πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν
παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἐρμηνεύων 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 Theo-
dotion. The following extracts will serve to illustrate this view
of his relation to his predecessors.

MALACHI II. 131.

LXX.

καὶ ταῦτα ἀ ἐμίσουν
ἐποιεῖτε ἐκαλύπτετε
dάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον Κυρίου καὶ
κλαυθμὸ καὶ στεναγμῷ
ἐκ κόπων, ἔτι ἄξιον
ἐπηθέλειν εἰς θυσίαν
ἡ λαβεῖν δεκτὸν ἐκ
tῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;

AQ.

καὶ τούτο δεύτερον
ἐποιεῖτε ἐκαλύπτετε
dακρύῳ τὸ θυσια-
στήριον
κλαυθμῷ καὶ οἴμωγῇ,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἐτὶ
nεῦσαι πρὸς τὸ δῶρον
καὶ λαβεῖν εὐδοκίαν
ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὑμῶν.

TH.

καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον
ἐποίησατε ἐκαλύπτετε
dάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον,
κλαίουσε καὶ στένουσε,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἐτὶ
προσεγγίζοντα τὸ ὀλοκαίτωμα
καὶ λαβεῖν τέλειον
ἐκ χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

SYMM.

καὶ ταῦτα δεύτερον
ἐποιεῖτε, καλύπτοντες
ἐν δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσια-
στήριον,
κλαίουσε καὶ οἴμωσσοντες,
ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἐτὶ
νεῦσατε 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.

4—2
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 ὅ τὰντα ἀνθρωπὸν ἀπαίτων δικαίωσαν, ἀκρίτως μὴ ποιήσῃς τοῦτο; Job xxvi. 14 τι δὲ ψυχήσομα τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀκούσομεν, ὅποιο βροντὴν δυναστείας ἀνυόβοι οὐδὲις ἐννοήσει; Ps. xliii. 16 ὅ δὲ ἡμέρας ἡ ἀσχημόνησις μου ἀντικρός μου, καὶ ὁ κατασχημώμος τοῦ προσώπου μου καλύπτει με. Ps. lxviii. 3 ἐβαπτίσθην εἰς ἀπεράντους καταδύσεις, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν στάσις· εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰ βάθη τῶν ὕδατων, καὶ ἰέθρον ἐπέκλυσεν με. Eccl. iv. 9 εἰσὶν ἁμείνους δύο ἐνός· ἔχουσιν γὰρ κέρδος ἀγαθόν. Isa. xxix. 4 ὅπο γῆν ἐδαφισθήσεται ἡ λαλία σου, καὶ ἐσται ὁ ἐγκαταρτιμηθὸς ἡ φωνὴ σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ λαλία σου ὀρώσεται.

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. ἄναιτις, Symm. ἄνατίως, ἄναιτις, Symm. ὀφθαλμοφανῆς, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, Symm. ἀκρογωνιαῖος); he converts into a participle the first of two finite verbs connected by a copula (Exod. v. 7 ἀπερχόμενοι καλαμάσθωσαι, 4 Regn. i. 2 σφαλέντες ἔπεσον); he has at his command a large supply of Greek particles (e.g. he renders ἢ by ἃρα, ὦντως, ὦσσος, δὴ ὅλον, μονόν, οὕτως, ἀλλ'
More interesting and important is the tendency which Symmachus manifests to soften the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament; e.g. Gen. 1:27, ἐκτισεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρως: ὁ χῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐκτισεν αὐτόν. Exod. xxiv. 10, ἐδοθεν δράματι τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ. Jud. ix. 13 τὸν οἶνον...τὴν εὐφροσύνην τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ps. xliii. 24 ἣν τί ὑπνὼν εἰ, Δέσποτα; In these and other instances Symmachus seems to shew a knowledge of current Jewish exegesis which agrees with the story of his Jewish origin or training.


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 (ζ'), and Septima (ζ') respectively. The following are the chief authorities:

Eus. H. E. vi. 16 τοσαῦτ' ἰδ' ἐκεῖγετο τῷ Ὀργόνῃ τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκρυβωμένη ἔξεται ὡς...καὶ τινας ἑτέρας παρὰ τὰς καθημαζεμένας ἐρμηνείας ἐναλλασσόντως... ἑφευρείν, ὥς οὐκ οἶδ' ὃθεν ἐκ τινων μυχῶν τὸν πάλαι λανθανοῦσας χρόνον εἰς φῶς ἀνιχνεύσας προῆγαγεν τίνος ἀρ' εἰν οὐκ εἴδως αὐτὸ τούτο μονὸν ἐπεσημάνατο

2 Reading, perhaps, ἔναλθεν εἰς ἀλήθεια; cf. Nestle, Marginalien, pp. 3, 15.
3 See D. C. B. iii. p. 20.
It appears from the statement of Eusebius ¹ 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 fermentation.³ 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 (τῶν πάλαι λανθανονότας 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 Epistles\(^1\). 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 Church\(^2\). 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 lost\(^3\).

There is no conclusive evidence to shew that any of these versions covered the whole of the Old Testament\(^4\). 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 “omnia elegantissimus...cum optimis Graecis suae aetatis scriptoribus comparandus.” Sexta also shews some command of Greek,

---

4 According to Harnack-Preuschen (i. p. 349) the opposite is implied by Eusebius’ use of ἐναλλαρροβας 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 \( \text{vol} \) renders, \( \text{Etov} \, \text{δεν} \) \( \text{καὶ} \) \( \text{ἀναιδὴ} \) \( \text{ἀντιποιηυς} \) \( \text{ἐν} \) \( \text{σκηνής} \) \( \text{καὶ} \) \( \text{λέγοντα} \) \( \text{Εἰμὶ} \, \text{ὡς} \) \( \text{αὐτόχθων} \) \( \text{περιπατῶν} \) \( \text{ἐν} \) \( \text{δικαιοσύνη} \). Jerome\(^1\) attributes both versions to 'Jewish translators,' but the Christian origin of \( \text{Sexta} \) betrays itself\(^2\) at Hab. iii. 13 \( \text{ἐξηλθες} \, \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{σώσαι} \) \( \text{τὸν} \) \( \text{λαόν} \) \( \text{σου} \) \( \text{διὰ} \) \( \text{Ἰησοῦν} \) \( \text{τὸν} \) \( \text{χριστὸν} \) \( \text{σου} \).

The Greek fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries quotes non-Septuagintal renderings from an interpreter who is styled \( \text{'Εβραῖος} \). 'Ο \( \text{Σύρος} \) is also cited, frequently as agreeing with \( \text{'Εβραῖος} \). Nothing is known of these translators (if such they were), but an elaborate discussion of all the facts may be seen in Field\(^4\).

13. The '\text{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. (\text{cod. Gr. vii.})\(^6\). 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 1875\(^6\). This translation has been made directly from the M. T., but the author appears to have occasionally availed himself of earlier Greek versions (\text{lxx.},

\(^1\) \text{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.

\(^3\) \text{leg. fors. Ἰησοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ σου.}

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

\(^5\) \text{See Eichhorn, p. 421 ff.; De Wette-Schrader, p. 122 ff.}

\(^6\) \text{Graecus Venetus Pentateuchi &c. versio Graeca. Ex unico biblioth. S. Marci Venetae codicis nunc primum uno volumine comprehensam atque apparatu critico et philologico instructam edidit O. G. Praefatus est Fr. Delitesch.}
Aq., Symm., Theod.)¹. His chief guide however appears to have been David Kimchi, whose interpretations are closely followed². That he was a Jew is clear from incidental renderings (e.g. in Exod. xxiii. 20 he translates ἡγησάθη τὸν ἓντωτήν³, sc. ἡγησάθη). From the fact of his having undertaken a Greek version Gebhardt infers that he was a proselyte to Christianity, but the argument may be used to support an opposite conclusion; as a Jew he may have been moved by a desire to place before the dominant Orthodox Church a better rendering of the Old Testament than the lxx. Delitzsch wishes to identify him with Elissaeus, a Jewish scholar at the court of Murad I., who flourished in the second half of the 14th century.

The style of this remarkable version will be best illustrated by a few specimens:

Gen. vi. 2 f.

¹ ἐβδέανται γοῦν οἱ νεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δὴ καλαὶ ἔτελουν, καὶ ἐλαβον ἑαυτοὶ γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὅν εἶλοντο. ³ ἦφη τοίνυν ὁ ἓντωτής Ὁὐ κρινεὶ πνεύμα τοῦμὸν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐς αἰῶνα, ἐφ' οἷς ἐτι πέρ ἐστι σάρξ· τελέσουσι δ' αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ἑκατον καὶ εἰκοσὶν ἐτη.

Prov. viii. 22 ff.

² ὁ ἓντωτής ἐκσήκαστο με ἄρχὴν δοῦν οἱ, πρὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἐκ τότε. ²² ἀπ' αἰῶνας κέχυμαι, ἀπὸ κρατός, ἀπὸ προλήματος γῆς. ²⁴ ἐν οὐκ ἀβύσσοις πέπλασμαι, ἐν οὐ πηγαῖς δεδοξασμένων υδάτων. ²⁵ πρὶν ὁρῇ ἐμπαγῆναι, πρὸ τῶν βουνῶν ὁδίνημα· ²⁶ ἄρτις οὐκ ἐποίησε γῆν, διόδους καὶ κεφαλὴν κόνεων τῆς οἰκουμένης.

Daniel vii. 13.

³ οὐκ ἐκύρησα ἐν ὁράσεσίν εὐφράνας, αὐτίκα τε ἐς ταῖς

¹ Gebhardt, p. lvii. ff.
² Id. p. lxii.
³ ὁ ἓντωτής, ὁ ἓντουργός, ὁ δοσωτής are his usual renderings of ἡγησάθη.
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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 κοινήν τῶν Γαλατίων 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 Pentateuche 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. Hesseling (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.

1. 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); at eighteen he was already head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. 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 τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὀμρυένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκρυβωμένη εξέτασις, ὡς καὶ τὴν Ἐβραία γλῶτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τάς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ιουδαίοις ἐμφερομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἐβραίων στοιχείων γραφᾶς κτῆμα ὅιον ποιῆσον. Hieron. de virr. ill. 54 "quis autem ignorat quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studii ut etiam Hebraeos linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret?"

The feat was perhaps without precedent, in the third century, among Christian scholars not of Jewish origin; 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 Testament. 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).

Orig. ad Afric. 5: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ φημὶ οὐχὶ δικώ τοῦ ἔρευναν καὶ τὰς κατὰ Ιουδαίον γραφὰς καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμετέρας ταῖς ἑκείνων συγκρίνειν καὶ ὅμων τὰς ἐν αὐτάς διαφορὰς, εἰ μὴ φορτικῶν γούν εἰπεὶν, ἐπὶ πολὺ τοῦτο (ὅση δύναμις) πεποιήκαμεν, γνωμάζοντες αὐτῶν τὸν νόην ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκδόσεις καὶ ταῖς διαφοράς αὐτῶν μετὰ τοῦ πόσως μᾶλλον ἀσκεῖν τὴν ἔρμηνειαν τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα... ἀσκούμεν δὲ μὴ ἄγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ’ ἑκείνοις, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίον διαλεγόμενον μὴ προσφέρωμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρητομέθεα τοῖς φερόμενοι παρ’ ἑκείνοις, εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κείται βιβλίοις. In Matt. xv. 14: τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, θεοῦ διδόντος, εὑρόμεν ἱσάσαθαι, κριτηρίω χρησάμενος ταὶς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις τῶν γάρ ἀμφιβαλλόμενον παρὰ τοῖς ο´ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν, τὴν κρίσιν ποιοῦμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων, τὸ συνάδον ἑκείνας ἐφυλάξαμεν καὶ τινα μὲν ἀβελίσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἐβραίῳ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τολμῶμεν αὐτὰ πάντῃ περιελείν, τινὰ δὲ μὲν ἀστερίσκον προσεβηκαμεν ήν δῆλον ή διδόν ἵνα μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς ο´ ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφάνους τῷ Ἐβραίῳ προσεβηκαμεν καὶ δὲ μὲν βουλόμενον προῆται αὐτὰ δὲ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον, δ´ βουλεῖται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν μὴ ποιῆσαι.

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 νομοθέτησαι τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἀποθέσαι μὲν τὰς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένας βίβλους, κολακεύειν δὲ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ πείδειν ἵνα μεταδώσων ἡμῖν τῶν καθαρῶν. In this matter it was well, he urged, to bear in mind the precept of Prov. xxi. 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. (xlvi.) i—3¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEBREW</th>
<th>HEB. TRANSLITERATED</th>
<th>AQUILA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלמעת</td>
<td>λαμανασση</td>
<td>τῷ νικοποιῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לבקיו קחר</td>
<td>[λ]αβυηκορ</td>
<td>τῶν νιῶν Κόρε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על עלמות</td>
<td>αλ·αλμωθ</td>
<td>ἐπὶ νεανιστήτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שור</td>
<td>σιρ</td>
<td>ἄσμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אלימים ונ</td>
<td>ελωειμ·λανου*</td>
<td>[ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (?)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקבמה וע</td>
<td>μασε·ουοζ</td>
<td>ἐλπὶς καὶ κράτος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abeth</td>
<td>εξρ</td>
<td>βοηθεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בצרור</td>
<td>βσαρῳ θ</td>
<td>ἐν θλίψεσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כמאת מאר</td>
<td>νεμασσ μοδ</td>
<td>εὐρέθη* σφόδρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על ב</td>
<td>αλ·χευ</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τοῦτω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לא נורא</td>
<td>λω·νιρα</td>
<td>οὗ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>บทמזר</td>
<td>βααμρ</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ארץ</td>
<td>αάρς</td>
<td>γῆν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובכמט</td>
<td>ουβαμωτ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῷ σφάλλεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חרם</td>
<td>αρμ</td>
<td>ὁρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בלב</td>
<td>βλεβ</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=fopen</td>
<td>ιαμμ</td>
<td>θαλασσῶν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In the MS. λανου appears in the third column, where it has displaced Aquila’s rendering.

* In the MS. εὑρέθης.

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.
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**Ps. xlv. (xlvi.) 1—3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmachus.</th>
<th>LXX.</th>
<th>Theodotion¹.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἑπινίκιος·</td>
<td>εἰς τὸ τέλος·</td>
<td>τῷ νικοποιῷ*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν νίων Κόρε</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν νίων* Κόρε</td>
<td>τοῖς νιῶσιν Κόρε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰωνίων</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| φόδη· | ψαλμὸς. | φόδη*.
| ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν | καταφυγῆ καὶ δύναμις, | ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν |
| πεποίθησι καὶ ἰσχύς, | βοηθὸς | καταφυγῆ καὶ δύναμις, |
| βοήθεια | ἐν θλίψεις | βοηθὸς |
| ἐν θλίψεις | ταῖς εὐρούσαις ἡμᾶς‡ | ἐν θλίψεις |
| εὐρισκόμενος σφόδρα. | σφόδρα. | εὐρέθη† σφόδρα. |

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
<td>οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
<td>οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ* συγχείχοι</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆν</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ κλίνεσθαι</td>
<td>καὶ μετατίθεσθαι</td>
<td>καὶ σαλεύσεσθαι‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅρη</td>
<td>ὅρη</td>
<td>ὅρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαλασσῶν.</td>
<td>βαλασσῶν.</td>
<td>βαλασσῶν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MS. ταῖς.

---

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 ταυτοῖς συναγάγων διελών τε πρὸς κώλου καὶ ἀντιπαραθεῖς ἀλλήλαις μετὰ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑβραίων σημειώσεως τὰ τῶν λεγομένων Ἔξαπλων ἡμῶν ἀντιγραφα καταλείποιςν, ἴδιως τὴν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδότιών ἐκδοσιν ἀμα τῆς τῶν ἐξοδομὴκοντα ἐν τοῖς Τετραπλοῖς ἐπικατασκεύασας. 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 ipsius authenticationem emendare, in quibus et ipsa Hebraea proprii sunt caracteribus verba descripta et Graecis literis tramite expressa vicino; Aquila etiam et Symmachus, LXX. quoque et Theodotio suum ordinem tenent; nonnulli vero libri et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versus 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 fond. 7: τάς γάρ ἔξις ἔρμηνειας καὶ τὴν Ἑβραίκην γραφῆν Ἑβραίκωσι στοιχείον καὶ ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς ἐν σελίδι μία συντηθεικός, ἄλλην σελίδα ἀντιπαραθεῖν δι’ Ἑλληνικῶν μὲν γραμμάτων Ἑβραίκων δὲ λέξεων πρὸς καταληψίν τῶν μη εἰδότων Ἑβραίκα στοιχεία...καὶ οὕτως τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξαπλοῖς ή ὀκταπλοῖς τάς μὲν δύο Ἑβραίκας σελίδας καὶ τάς ἔξις ἔρμηνετῶν ἐκ παραλλήλου ἀντιπαραθεῖς μεγάλην ὄφελειαν γνώσεως ἐδώκε τοῖς φιλοκάλως. Ἰδ. 19 τάς δύο Ἑβραίκας πρώτας κευμένας, μετὰ ταύτας δὲ τὴν τοῦ Ἀκύλα τεταγμένην, μεθ’ ἤν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Συμμάχου, ἐπείτα τὴν τῶν Οἰ, μεθ’ ἂς ἡ τοῦ Θεοδώτιών συντετακται, καὶ ἔξις ἡ πέμπτη τε καὶ ἐκτη".

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 κώλα 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

2 See also ib. 18 sq.; Hieron. Praef. in Paral., and in ep. ad Tit., c. iii.
3 Used here loosely as = κόμωστα, the κώλαν 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.
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... untenable hypothesis that Origen regarded the LXX. as the standard of accuracy (de mens. et pond. 19: 'Ωριγένης πυθό- μενος τὴν τῶν ὀβ’ ἐκδοσιν ἀκριβὴ έίναι μέσην ταύτην συνέθηκεν, ὅπως τάς ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐρμηνεύεις διελέγχη). 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 κάλα, 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 four. 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 'Ακύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἐκδοσιν ἄμα τῇ τῶν ὀ’ ἐν τοῖς τετραπλοῖς ἐπικατασκευάσας. Epiph. de mens. et pond. 19 τετραπλὰ γὰρ εἰσὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ ὅταν αἱ τῶν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ τῶν ὀβ’ καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος ἐρμηνεύεις συντεταγμέναι ὅσι. 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 ΧΧ and μη had each a line to itself; see Nestle in Hastings' D.B. iv. 443.

2 ἐπικατασκευάσεως is insuper vel postea concinnare (Field, prolegg. p. xii.); cf. Dio Cass. l. 23 τὰ σκάφη κατεσκεύασε...καί ἐπ’ αὐτὰ πύργους ἐπε- κατασκεύασε. 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 ἕξαπλοῦ, ἵνα καὶ παρετέθη ἀντιβλήθη 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, lxxviii. 43, cxxvi. 4, cxxvi. 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 ἐν γε μὴν τοῖς ἕξαπλοῖς τῶν Ψαλμῶν μετὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους τέσσαρας ἐκδόσεις οὓς μόνους πέμπτην ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκτην καὶ ἐβδόμην παραθείς ἐρμηνευαν). Epiphanius, on the other hand, seems to limit the Hexapla to the six columns (L. c. τῶν τεσσάρων δὲ τούτων στελίδων ταῖς δύοι ταῖς Ἐβραϊκὰς συναφθείσων ἑξαπλὰ καλεῖται. Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἣ πέμπτη καὶ ἡ ἐκτη ἐρμηνεύει συναφθώσων...δεκαπλὰ 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: μητῇρ σιων οὗ ποσότητι ἐκεῖνο εἰς τὴν τῶν ο' ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ (the Tetrapla), ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀκτασελίδῳ (the Octapla), μη τῇ σιων, ἣγου 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 eighth.

1 Field, Hexapla, ii. ad loc.; cf. Hieron. in Psalms (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 \( \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \iota \omega \phi \). 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 \( \circ = \chi \), \( \mathfrak{p} = \kappa \), and \( \mathfrak{b}, \varsigma, \varsigma' = \sigma \), and that \( \mathfrak{y} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{n} \) are without equivalent. 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 κοινὴ, or vulgata editio, as Jerome calls it), 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 (θεὸν διδόντος εὐρομέν).

Origen began by assuming (1) the purity of the Hebrew text, and (2) the corruption of the κοινὴ where it departed from the Hebrew. 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.”
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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 marks\(^1\) prefixed to the stich\(i\) 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 Hebrew\(^2\).

(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 translators\(^3\). 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, Γηρσών was substituted by Origen for Γεδσών. 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, Ἰωβ στίχοι ἀχρίς ἀστερίσκων, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἀστερίσκων Β. See Add. Notes.
222—205), and they appear to have been first employed in connexion with his great edition of Homer. 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 ἄθετωμενα ἐπὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἤγουν νενοθευμένα ἡ ὀποβεβλημένα: ὁ δὲ ἀστερίσκος...ὡς καλὸν εἰρημένων τῶν ἐπῶν. Similarly, in connexion with Platonic dicta, Diogenes Laertius (platon. iii. 657) used the obelus πρὸς τὴν ἀδέτησιν 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 authority, 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.

Epiph. de mens. et pond. 2, 3 ὁ ἀστερίσκος...σημαίνει τὸ ἐμφερόμενον ῥήμα ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ κεισθαί...οἱ δὲ οβελὸς ἐμφερούσιν παρήκαν καὶ οὐχ ἡμινευκαν...ἀβελὸς δὲ...παρετῆθη...ταῖς τῆς θείας γραφῆς λέξεσιν ταῖς παρὰ τοῖς οβελοῖς ἐμφερούσιν κειμέναις, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς περὶ Ἀκύλαν καὶ Σύμμαχον μὴ ἐμφερομέναις. Schol. ap. Tisch. not. ed. cod. Sin. p. 76 ὅσως οἱ ὀβελοὶ πρόσκεινται ρήτορις, οὔτως οὐκ ἔκειντο οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐμφερομέναις οὔτε ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς ο’· καὶ δόσως οἱ ἀστερίσκοι πρόσκεινται ρήτορις, οὔτος ἐν μὲν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐμφερομέναις ἐφέροντο, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ο’ οὐκέτι.

1 See a complete list of these in Gardthausen, Gриech. 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: οὐ δὲ ἀστερισκὸς μετὰ ὀβελοῦ, ὥσ ὀντα μὲν τὰ ἑπτά τοῦ ποιητοῦ, μὴ καλως δὲ κείμενα: schol. ap. Tisch. not. ed. Sin. I. c. φέρονται μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ο’, φέρονται δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἐβραϊκῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς, τὴν θέσιν δὲ μόνην παραλλάσσονσιν οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ τὸ Ἐβραϊκὸν παρὰ τοὺς ο’ ὁθὲν ὀβελισται ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ ἱστερισται, ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τόποις: also ap. mon. sacr. ined. iii. p. xvii. τὰ δὲ ἱστερισμένα ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ ὀβελισμένα βητὰ...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 obelus.

The form of the asterisk, obelus, and metobelus varies slightly. The first consists of the letter χ, usually surrounded by four dots (★, the χὲ περιεστηγμένον); the form ★ occurs but seldom, and only, as it seems, in the Syro-Hexaplar. The ὀβελός, ‘spit’ or ‘spear,’ is represented in Epiphanius by χ, 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

² This sometimes becomes a hook (겼).
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 Epiphaniand form, it rests. Other attempts to assign distinct values to the various forms of the obelus have been shewn by Field to be untenable. 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 (\(\checkmark\)). 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 (Ἐναγρίου σχ., one of the σχόλια εἰς τὰς παρομισ ἔδωκεν printed in the Notitia ed. cod. Sin., p. 76, from a Patmos MS.; see Robinson, Philologia, pp. xiii., xvii. ff.): εἰσιν \(^2\) ὅσα προτεταγμένον ἔχουσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς· ὅσα ὦριγένης ἐπιγραμμένον ἔχει τοῦτῳ τῷ μονοστυλλάβῳ, ὅ..ὅσα δὲ περὶ διαφωνίας ῥήτων τινῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἑδαφίῳ ἡ ἐκδόσεως ἐστὶ σχόλια, ἀπερ καὶ κάτω νευνυκιαν περεστιγμένην ἔχει προτεταγμένην, τῶν ἀντιβεβλη-κότων τὸ βιβλίον ἐστὶν· ὅσα δὲ ἀμφιβολῶς ἔξω κείμενα ῥήτα ἔξω νευνυκιαν περεστιγμένην ἔχει προτεταγμένην, διὰ τὰ σχόλια προστεθησαν κατ’ αὐτὰ τοῦ μεγάλου εἰρηκότος διδασκάλου, ἵνα μὴ δόξη κατὰ κενὸ τὸ σχόλιον φέρεσθαι, ἐν πολλοῖς μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶν ῥήτων οὖτως ἔχοντων, ἐν τούτῳ δὲ μὴ οὖτως κείμενων ἡ μὴ δόξας φερομένων, καὶ διὰ τούτῳ 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 other.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Prolegg. p. lix. sq.
\(^2\) Lietzmann proposes to read: Ἐναγρίου σχόλια εἰς ν, ὅσα...ἀριθμοῦ, ὦριγένης 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).

καὶ εὐστρεπτεῖν ἢ εὐν | το καρῳ εκεῖνῳ κ | κατελάβετο την | άσωρ | καὶ τὸν βασιλεὰ αὐτῆς | απεκτείνεν εὐν ρομ | φασι : ην δὲ ασωρ το προστέρον ἀρχουσα πασώ | τῶν βασιλείων τούτων και | απεκτείνα | παν ενπνευ * ο : εὐν | αὐτη ευν στοματι ξιφως | και | εξωλεθρευσαν : | —παντας : και ου κατελιφθη ευν αὐτη ευνπευον και | την άσωρ ευεπρησεν εν πυρι και πασας ται πόλεις των | βασιλείων * | τουτο : | και * παντας : τους βασιλείς αυτῶν ελαβεν ἢ | και | ανελείν αυτοὺς | ευν στοματι ξιφως κ | εξωλεθρευσεν αυτοὺς | ουν | τροπον συνεταξε | Μωσης ο παις κν. | ἀλλα | πασας τας πόλεις τας | κεχωματισμενας | αυτων : ουκ ενεπρησεν ἢλ πλην * την : αν οωρ | μονην : αυτην : ενεπρησεν ἢ και πάτα τα σκυλα αυτῆς * κ | τα | κτηνη : επρονομευσαν αυτοις οι νιοι ἢλ | κατα τα ρημα κν ο ευε | τειλαι το τω : αυτους | ουν | παντας εξωλεθρευσεν ευν στοματι ξιφως | εως | απωλεσεν αυτους | ουν | κατιλιπον : αυτω : | ουδε ευν ενπνευον * * *

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 Tyre. 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 διορθωτης, 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: Η.Ε. vi. 23 ταχυγράφου γάρ αὐτῷ πλεῖους ὠ ἐπτὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν παρῇσαν ὑπαγορεύοντι, χρόνοις τεταγμένοις ἀλλή- λους ἀμείβοντες, βιβλιογράφοι τε οὐχ ἦττοι ἁμα καὶ κόραις ἐπὶ τὸ καλλιγραφεῖν ἡσηκείναις: δω ἀπάντων τὴν δέουσαν τῶν ἐπιτηδεῖων ἀφθονον περιουσίαν ὁ 'Αμβρόσιος παραπόσατο. Two of these classes of workers, the βιβλιογράφοι and καλλιγράφοι (cf. Gardthausen, Gr. Palaeographie, p. 207), 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. 8 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 deposed, perhaps by Origen himself, in the library of Pamphilus. There they were studied by Jerome in the fourth century (in Psalms 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.
The Hexapla, and the Hexaplaric and other Recensions.

fuerat emendatum”; in ep. ad Tit.: “nobis curae fuit omnes veteris legis libros quos v. d. Adamantius in Hexapla diges-serat de Caesariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenti-cis 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. Ν: ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιότατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιορθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος Παμφύλου· πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιότατον βιβλίου…ὑποσημείωσις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπὲκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως: Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ ἐξαπλᾶ Ὑριγενοῦς ἵπτ 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 Ταύτα μετελήφθη ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐκδόσεις ἐξαπλῶν, καὶ διορθώθη ἀπὸ τῶν Ὑριγενοῦς αὐτοῦ τετραπλῶν ἄτινα καὶ αὐτοῦ χειρὶ διορθώτο καὶ ἐκκολογράφητο (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 Κασαρίᾳ ἀντίγραφον τῆς βιβλιωθήκης τοῦ ἀγίου Παμφύλου 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 12th8. 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 ἅφ' ὦν εὐρομεν ἐξαπλῶν, καὶ τάλων αὐτοχειρὶ Πάμφυλος καὶ Εὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο.

2 = Ηπαυλ, Gregory, p. 449, Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 183 f.

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 fo. 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 copied, 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 Palestine," writes Jerome in his preface to Chronicles, "codices legunt quos ab Origenes elaboratos Eusebii et Pamphilus vulgaverunt." Elsewhere he warns his correspondents "aliam esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebii omnesque Graeciae tractatores koujv (id est communem) appellant atque vulgatum..., aliam lxx. interpretum quae in ££απλος 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 ἐξαπλοῖς...ipsa est quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata lxx. interpretum translatio reservatur." This edition, sometimes described as τὸ Ἑὐσεβίου or τὸ Παλαιστιναῖον, or simply Ὕφελης, 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. Ν at the end of 2 Esdras says, Ἀντωνίνος ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διώρθωσα. The subscription to Esther ends Ἀντωνίνος διολογητῆς ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διορθώσατο [τὸ] τεύχος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. The scholion prefixed to Ezekiel in Q introduces the name of Eusebius, assigning him another function: Ἑὐσέβιος ἐγὼ τὰ σχόλια παρέθηκα: Πάμφιλος καὶ Ἑὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο. In its subscription to 1 Kings the Syro-Hexaplar quotes a note which runs: Ἑὐσέβιος διορθώσαμην ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἠδυνάμην. It would seem as though the work of comparing the copy with the original was committed to the otherwise unknown 2 Antoninus, whilst the more responsible task of making corrections was reserved for Pamphilus and Eusebius 3. 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 ἀντεβάλλειν and διορθῶσθαι, 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 Palestine. 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 uncial G and M, which contain only the Pentateuch and some of the historical books, and the cursive 86 and 88 (Holmes and Parson's), 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 work. 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 praef. ad Paralipp.: “Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem”; cf. adv. Rufin. ii. where the statement is repeated, and praef. 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 conspicuous person of that name is the lexicographer, and he has been identified with the reviser of the Greek Bible. 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 probably the martyr Bishop who is mentioned by Eusebius in connexion with Phileas Bishop of Thmuis, Pachymius, and Theodorus (H.E. viii. 13 Φιλέας τε καὶ Ἡρώδειος καὶ Παχύμως καὶ Θεόδωρος τῶν ἀμφί τὴν Ἀἰγύπτιον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοποι). The four names appear together again in a letter addressed to Meletius (Routh, rel. 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 φιλοσοφίαν λόγοις, ib. 10 τῶν ἐξωθην μαθημάτων ἕνεκα πολλοῦ λόγου ἅξιον...τοῦ ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλοσόφου...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 Alexandrina.”


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 Cornill 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 direction.

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

Hieron. praef. in Paralip. : "Constantinopolis usque Antiochian Luciani martyris exemplaria probat." Cf. (Ep. cvi.) ad Sunn. et Fret. 2 "[η κουή]...a plerisque nunc Λουκιανός dicitur." Ps.-Ath. syn. sacr. script. ἔβδομη πάλιν καὶ τελευταία ἐρμηνεία τοῦ ἀγίου Λουκιανὸς τοῦ μεγάλου ἀσκητοῦ καὶ μάρτυρος, ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸς ταῖς προγεγαρμέναις ἐκδόσεις καὶ τοὺς Ἐβραίους ἐντυχὼν καὶ ἐποπτέων μετ' ἀκριβείας τὰ λείποντα ἦ καὶ περιττὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ῥήματα

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

2 For the Octateuch Mr McLean (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 ἐχει τὰ ἀναλόγα βῆβλα. The Lucianic text was also known as the ἐκκλησιαστική ἐκδοσις (Oeconomus, iv. 548).
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 vivr. ill. 71). At Antioch Lucian acquired a great reputation for Biblical learning (Eus. H. E. ix. 6 τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασι συγκεκριμένοι, Suid. s.v. αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν Ἑβραίδα γλώσσαν] ὡς τὰ μάλιστα ἣν ἱκριβώκως). 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 ἔμενε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετὸς 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 θεία γράμματα καὶ τῆς Ἑβραίων ἐπεμελήθη γλώσσης, ὡς καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς Ἑβραίκαις γραφαῖς ἐπιστημονῶς ἐντυγχάνειν ἥν δὲ οὗτος τῶν μάλιστα ἐλευθερίων, προσπαθείας τε τῆς καθ’ Ἑλληνας οὐκ ἁμοιρὸς). As Pamphilus was assisted by Eusebius, as Philæas 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.

S. S.
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 ɛβδόμη ɛρµηνεία, 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 work, 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 Hexapla Field noticed that in an epistle prefixed to the Arabic Syro-Hexaplar, 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-Nehemiah 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 independently reached nearly the same result, so far as regards the historical books. He satisfied himself that codd. 19, 82, 93, 108, 118, 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.

22καὶ εἴπεν Ἡλιάς πρὸς τὸν λαὸν Ἑγὼ ὑπολέελεμαι προφήτης κυρίου, προφήτης μοιὸτατος, καὶ οἱ προφήται τοῦ Βασιλεία τετρακόσιοι καὶ πεντῆκοντα ἄνδρες, καὶ οἱ προφήται τῶν ἁλσῶν τετρακόσιοι, δότωσαν οὖν ἡμῖν δύο βῶας, καὶ ἐκελεύσωσαν έαυτοὺς τὸν ένα καὶ μελισάωσαν καὶ ἐπιβέβωσαν ἐπὶ ξύλα καὶ πῦρ μῇ ἐπιβέβωσαν· καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸν βοῶν τὸν ἁλλον, καὶ πῦρ οὐ μὴ ἐπιθώ. 24καὶ βοάτε ἐν ὄνοματι θεοῦ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἑπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὄνοματι 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.
\[\text{heou mou, kai } \varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota \alpha \delta \varepsilon \\alpha \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \kappa \alpha \kappa \alpha \upsilon \omega \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \pi \nu \iota, \omega \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma \tau \sigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \upsilon \iota. \quad \text{(1)}\]

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. Ἡλίας for Ἡλειον, the repetition of προφητής before μονάτας, the substitution of τῶν ἄλλων for τοῦ ἄλλου, of ἀπεκρίθη for ἀπεκρίθησαν, and of ἀγαθός 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. δύναται οὐν (ἡμᾶς), βοῶν (ἡμᾶς); or an adherence to an older reading which the Hexaplaric LXX. had set aside, e.g. the omission of ὃν ἐδοκεῖν αὐτῶν and ἐκ προῳδεῖν ἐως μεσημβριάς. On the other hand Lucian follows the current Hebrew in κατὰ τῶν ἐθισμῶν αὐτῶν, though he substitutes the easier ἐθισμὸς for Aquila's κρίμα, which cod. A has taken over from the Hexapla.

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

1 A Hexaplaric reading due to Aquila; see Field ad loc.
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 312. 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 ἰβδόμη (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 πίθοις. 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 οὐλοκιανσταί. Moreover, a revision which emanated from Antioch, the “ecclesiastical parent of Constantinople,” 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 Testament.

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 Unterrahmens, 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 compugnat\(^1\)). 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 \(\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\varphi\upsilon\) 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 Testament\(^2\); 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 cursive 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 tongue. 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 names. 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. liii. 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 light; 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.

1. Latin Versions from the Septuagint.

(i) 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.]
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint.


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 texts.

Genesis xlviii. 17 f.

CYPRIAN, testimonia i. 21.

ubi 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 ade capit Manasse. dixit autem Ioseph ad patrem suum Non sic, pater; hic est primitivus meus; superpone dexteram tuam super caput suum.

LYONS MS.

videns 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. dixit 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.

**Exod. xxxii. 21—24.**

**LYONS MS**

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

**WURZBURG FRAGMENTS.**

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

**MUNICH FRAGMENTS.**

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

* cod. demiserunt  † hiat cod.

**Leviticus iv. 27—29.**

**LYONS MS.**

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

**WURZBURG FRAGMENTS.**

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

* cod. delinquit  † cod. adfert
Micah v. 2.

CYPRIAN, testimonia ii. 12.
et tu, Bethlehem, domus illius Ephratha, num exigua es ut constituaris in milibus Iuda? ex te mihi procedet ut sit princeps apud Israel, et processiones eius a principio, a diebus saeculi.

WEINGARTEN FRAGMENTS.

Isaiah xxix. 11, 18.

CYPRIAN, testimonia i. 4.

WÜRZBURG FRAGMENTS.
et erunt verba haec omnia sicut verba libri huius signati, quem si dederint homini scienti litteras dicentes ex lege haec, et dicet Non possum legere, signatum est enim..."sed in illa die audient surdi sermones libri, et qui in tenebris et qui in nebula sunt; 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 Hort 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' 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.
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 class. 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 out, 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 fathers, and they often need to be supplemented from sources which were not at his command.

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

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 out 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. Berger has called attention to the prominence of Lucanian readings in certain Old Latin texts; and the fact that a Lucanian element is widely distributed in Old Latin MSS. and quotations has also been recognised by Vercellone and Ceriani. This element is found even in the African text, 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.**

1. Pentateuch.


---

1 Rules of Tyconius, p. cxvi. f.
3 Variae lectiones, ii., p. 426.
5 Burkitt, Rules of Tyconius, p. cxvii.
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint.

Containing Gen. xvi. 9—xvii. 18, xix. 5—29, xxvi. 33—xxxiii. 15, xxxvii. 7—xxxviii. 22, xlii. 36—l. 20; 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 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—xx. 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. vii. 19—x. 12, xxii. 7—xxiii. 4, xxvii. 1—31, xxx. 16—xxxii. 29.


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.


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. autehieron. vers. fragmenta Vindobonensis, 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. Dünig, 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, Septuaginiastudien, 1892.

Judith, Tobit.

Cod. Complutensis.

Cod. Goth: Legionensis.

Cod. Vatic. regin. (Bianchini, Vindiciae, p. ccc. 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.
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint.

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.).

1, 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 infr. (A. Peyron, Cic. fragm. i. 70 ff. (1824).

(See Berger, op. cit.)

ii. Poetical Books.

Psalms.

Cod. Veronensis (in Bianchini).

Cod. Sangermanensis (in Sabatier).

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

Fragments of the ωδαί edited by F. F. Fleck (Leipzig, 1837), and L. F. Hamann (Jena, 1874).

Job.


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.


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, xlvi. 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, xxxvi. 19—28, xxxviii. 8—20, xl. 3—xlii. 18, xlvi. 1—xlvi. 9, xlviii. 28—35; Dan. i. 2—ii. 9, iii. 15—(26), viii. 5—ix. 10, x. 3—xi. 4, 20—42, and Bel.


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

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.


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.


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


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.


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. Weihrich 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.

S. S.
(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 posita
tum emendaram et iuxta LXX. interpretetes, 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...renas-
centes spinas eradicem.....notet sibi unusquisque vel iacentem
lineam vel signa radiantia, id est vel obelos (-divider) vel asteriscos (★);
et ubique viderit virgulam praecedentem (-divider), ab ea usque ad
duo puncta (:) quae impressimus, sciat in LXX. translatoribus
plus haberi; ubi autem stellae (★) similitudinem perspexerit,
de Hebraeis voluminibus additum noverit aequus usque ad duo
puncta, iuxta Theodotionis dumptaxat 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.
interpretetes nostro labore dudum Roma suscipit”; 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 Vulgate.

The following specimen (Ps. lxvii.=lxviii. 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’ Psalter.

**Roman.**

12 Dominius dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; 13 rex virtutum dilecti, et speciei domus dividere spolia. 14 si dormiatis in medios cleros, penae columbae deargentatae, et posteriora dorsi eius in specie auri. [diapsalma]..... 18 currus Dei decem milium multiplex, milia laetantium. Dominus

**Gallican.**

12 Dominius dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; 13 rex virtutum *ex* dilecti: et speciei domus dividere spolia. 14 si dormiatis inter medios cleros penae columbae deargentatae et posteriora *ex* dorsi eius in pallore auri. *dia* psalma..... 18 currus Dei decem milibus multiplex, milia lae-

**Hebrew.**

12 Domine, dabis sermonem adnuntiatribus fortitudinis plurimae, 13 rex exercituum foederabuntur, foederabuntur et pulcritudo domus dividet spolia. 14 si dormiertis inter medios terminos, penae columbae deargentatae et posteriora eius in vivore auri..... 18 currus Dei innumerabiles, milia
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. 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 dunghill, and restored him to his pristine state;
the difference between the Old Latin version and the new seemed to him to be nothing short of that which separates falsehood from truth. The asterisks shewed that from 700 to 800 lines had been restored to this long mutilated book.

A few brief specimens from Lagarde’s text 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 antepositionibus lineis (÷) superflua quaeque

1 *Ad Pammach.*: "veterem editionem nostrae translationi comparat, et liquido providentiam 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 ("eligat 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 perverso sententiarum fuerat lumen ereptum suis locis restituens feci intelligi 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 assumpi...et sic confirmatus ausus fuerat lumen ereptum suis locis restituens...ubi praepostero ordine atque versus sententiarum fuerat lumen ereptum suis locis restituens feci intelligi quod latebat.”

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.


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 nititur."

The coexistence of the two versions naturally produced mixture in the MSS., 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 Judith were afterwards translated by him from the Aramaic (praeff. 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.
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 Ἀλέξανδρος... ὃς ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου, on which Blass (Acta aff. p. 201) remarks: “itaque iam tum (id quod sine testimonio suspicandum erat) in Aegyptum quoque religio permanaverat.”

² Acts ii. 9 f. ὁ Κατοικῶντες... Ἀγνύτων. Ib. vi. 9 τινὲς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης... Ἀλέξανδρῶν. Cf. Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1890—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 origin. This writing, known as Coptic—a corruption of Ἀγγέλιος—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 remarks) 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 Hort, Ciasca, and Mr A. C. Headlam: 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 modified.”

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 struggle.

1 Of the 31 letters of the Coptic alphabet only (υ, ρ, ς, χ, σ, τ) are not from the Greek. On the pre-Christian systems see Clem. strom. v. 4 οἱ παπ’ Ἀγγέλιοι παιδευμένοι πρῶτον μὲν πάντων...ἐκμανθάνουσι τὴν ἐπιστολογραφικὴν καλουμένην (the Demotic), δευτέραν δὲ τὴν λεπτικὴν...υστάτην δὲ καὶ τελευταῖαν τὴν λεπτομερείαν.

2 Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 97.

3 Intr. to N. T. in Greek, p. 85.

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


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 Bohairic, 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 Akhmimic; 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.

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.


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 omitted⁴," 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.


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.
⁵ Hyvernat, p. 71.
⁶ See the remarks of F. Robinson in Hastings' Dict. of the Bible ii. 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 speech\(^1\), 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 Ethiopian 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 Hebrew\(^2\). 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 Septuagint\(^3\). "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.


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 Greek.""

The Ethiopic version of the Old Testament contains all the books of the Alexandrian canon except i—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 M.S.S. 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. Prátorius, 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, i 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 Prophets. 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 Pro-
verbia arabice, Göttingen, 1876).

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).


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(amuel), 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: ηρμήνευται δέ ταύτα εἰς μὲν τὴν τῶν Σύρων παρ’ ὅτου δήποτε, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγνωσται μέχρι τῆς τῆμερον ὅστις ποτὲ οὕτως ἔστων. 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 Psalter." 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 inserted."

(2) The Syriac version ascribed to Paul, Bishop of Telladhe-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

---

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

The version of Paul of Tella, usually called the Syro-Hexaplar, was first made known to Europe by Andreas Masius (Andrew Du Maes, \(\text{†} 1573\)). 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 Wisdons, 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-Hexaplar\(^2\) 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; Middeldorp completed the prophetical 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 (\textit{Mon. sacr. et prof. ii.}), who has also given to the world the Milan fragments in \textit{Mon.} vol. vii.

The Hexapla, Tetrapla, and occasionally the Heptapla, are


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

S. S.
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 idiom. 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 Sinaiitica, vi. (London, 1897). 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. lxix., where many instances are produced.
2 The fragments in Studia Sinaiitica are accompanied by critical notes, the work of Dr Nestle, in which they are carefully compared with the Greek text (pp. xl.—lxxiv.).
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Oxon. ix. p. 32); in the Greater Prophets, it is in part at least Origenic (Studia Sinaitica, pp. xvi., lxxiii.); Job seems to have contained the interpolations from Theodotion which are found in the extant Greek texts of that book.

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—xi. 10, xxviii. 1—12; 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. 3, 4, xxx. 2, 6, xxxiv. 1, 11, xxxvii. 2, 18, xl. 2, 5, 7, xliii. 12—27, xlv. —xlvi., xlviii. 15 f., xliv. 1—9, liv. 2, 22, lv. 7 f., lvi. 1—7, lxiv. 2, 6, lxvii. 2, 3, 22, lxxvi. 2, 21, lxxvii. 52—65, lxxxi., lxxxii. 1—10, lxxxiv. 2, 8, lxxxv. 1, 15 f., lxxxvii. 2, 5—7, 18, lxxxix. 1—xx. 12, xcvii. 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, i. 4—9, lii. 13—liii. 12, lx. 1—22, lxi. 1—11, lxiii. 1—7; Jer. xi. 18—20.

(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,

---
3 Bickell, Conspectus ret Syr. lit., p. 9; cf. Ebedjesu in Assemani, iii. 71.
4 Field, Hexapla, ii. p. 448.
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to which two fragments printed by Ceriani\(^1\) 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.\(^3\), and the fragments of the other Greek translations. Some books of this revised version exist in MS. at London and Paris\(^3\), and a few specimens have been printed\(^4\).

(d) From Melito downwards the Greek fathers refer occasionally to the Greek renderings of an interpreter who is called \(\delta\) Σύρος. 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 Peshitta\(^6\).

**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, (*\(^3\)1888—92).


---

2 Gwynn, *D. C. B.* iii.
3 *i 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.
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 series.


6. THE GOTHIC VERSION.

About the year 350 a translation of the Bible into the Gothic tongue was made by Ulfilas (Wulfila), 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 φωνήν τὰς γραφὰς ἀπάσας πλὴν γιὰ δὴ τῶν Βασιλείων ἄτε τῶν μὲν πολέμων ἱστορίαν ἐχοῦσων, τοῦτο ἐθνὸς ὁντος 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... fragments, 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-Heyne, 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. canonicerum 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 Bibelübersetzung (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").


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 volume 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" 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 alphabet. 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.
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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 possess." But, as Lagarde has pointed out, 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 Septuagint.

The order of the books of the O.T. in Armenian MSS., as given by Conybeare (Octateuch, i—4 Regn., i—2 Paralipp., i and 2 Esdr., Esther, Judith, Tobit, i—3 Macc., Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Job, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, with Baruch and Lamentations, Daniel, Ezekiel) is on the whole consistent with the grouping found in the oldest Greek authorities, 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 Edschmiatzin 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."
5 In some MSS. Job precedes the Psalter.
6 See Part ii. c. i.
8. The Georgian Version.

The origin of this version is obscure. According to Moses of Khorens, 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 M.S., 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).


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
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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 indistinguishable." 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 Utext, 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 Utext, p. 211 ff.; the article in Ch. Quarterly Review cited above; and Th. Literaturzeitung, 1901, col. 571.

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 (1.—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 alphabet\(^1\). 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.
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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 fh m ph 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 = N, 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 φόδαι), or a particular group of books such as the Pentateuch (η πεντάτευχος3) or the Octateuch (η δεκτάτευχος = Gen. —Ruth), the Historical Books (1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Esth., Judith, Tobit), the three or five books ascribed to Solomon, the Minor Prophets (το δωδεκαπρόφητον), the Major Prophets (οι τέσσαρες), or the Prophets complete (το ἐκκαὶ δεκαπρόφητον). 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.
The 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Name of Codex</th>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Present locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.-P.</td>
<td>Lagarde.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>A Alexandrinus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>B Vaticanus</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ephraemi</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>D Cottonianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>ix—x</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>F Ambrosianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV+V</td>
<td>G Sarravianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Leyden, Paris, St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lipsiensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>L Vindobonensis</td>
<td>v—vi</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>M Coislinianus</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>N Basilianus</td>
<td>viii—ix</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>O Dublinensis</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Q Marchalianus</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Veronensis</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S=8</td>
<td>Sinaiticus</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Leipzig, St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Turicensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Londonensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>V Venetus</td>
<td>viii—ix</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>W Parisiensis</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>X Vaticanus</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Taurinensis</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z=9</td>
<td>Fragmenta Tischendorfiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>Cryptoferratensis</td>
<td>vii—ix</td>
<td>Grotta ferrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>iv—v</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>Washingtoniensis</td>
<td>v—vi</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>Petropolitanus</td>
<td>viii—ix</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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—xlv. 9 (leaf missing); Ps. xlix. 19—Ixxix. 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 ψαλμος ἰδιώγραφος (clii.) and the liturgical canticles, is preceded by the Epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, the ὑποβεβλης of Eusebius, a table, and the canons of the Morning and Evening Psalms. The books of vol. iii. are written στιχωρῶς.

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 traditio 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—1720). 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 volumes." 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 thither." 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. xlii. 19). Punctuation is limited to a single point, generally high. The abbreviations which occur are θC, kC, xC, ΠΗΡ, ΜΗΡ, γC, ΔΝΟC, ΟΥΝΟC, ΔΑ, ΙΒL, ΙΛΗΜ, ΠΝΑ, and Κ, Α, Ε, Ν, Τ, (καL, μοU, σοU, -ναι, -ραι). 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 Ραμεσσήν). 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 Proleg. 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.) 6b. 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 Bartolocci in 1669, and is still preserved at Paris in the Bibliothèque Nationale (MS. gr. supplement. 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.
3 On this work see Nestle, Septuagintast. iii. p. 13 ff.
The codex is written on the finest vellum in a singularly beautiful hand\(^1\) which "may be attributed to the fourth century," and probably to the middle of the century\(^2\), and bears a resemblance to the hand which is found in papyri of the best Roman period\(^3\). 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 diores (B\(^4\)), we may mention an early corrector denoted as B\(\text{a}\), and a late instaurator, who has gone over the whole text, spoiling its original beauty, and preserving oftentimes the corrections of B\(\text{a}\) 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 νοήσαι—ii. 8, xv. 29 κρείσσον—xvii. 1, xviii. 11 ἢ δὲ δόξα—xix. 23, xxii. 17 τὴν δὲ σὴν—xxiii. 25, xxiv. 22 ε ὦστε ἄβρωτα—56 ἡ γῆ, xxvi. 23 χείλη λεία—xxviii. 2, xxix. 48—end of book; Eccl. i. 2 μεταίωνης—14, ii. 18 ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον—end of book; Cant. i. 3—iii. 9 Σαλωμών; Job ii. 12 ῥῆζαντες—iv. 12 ἐν λόγοις σου, v. 27 σὺ δὲ γνώθι—vii. 7, x. 9—xii. 2 ἄνθρωποι, xiii. 18 οἶδα ἐγὼ—xviii. 9 παγίδες, xix. 27 ἃ ἄφθαλμος—xxii. 14 νεφέλη, xxiv. 7 γυμνοῦς πολλοὺς—xxx. 1 ἐν μέρει, xxxi. 6—xxxv. 15 ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ, xxxvii. 5—xxxviii. 17 θανάτου, xl. 20 περπήσεις—end of book; Sap. viii. 5 ἐργαζόμενος—xii. 10 τόπον μετανοίας, xiv. 19—xvii. 18 εὐμελής, xviii. 24 ἐπὶ γάρ—end of book; Sir. prol. i.—vii. 14 πρεσβυτέρων, viii. 15 αὑτὸς γάρ—xii. 17 εὐσεβέσιν, xii. 16 καὶ εἶν—xvi. 1 ἄρχη- στων, xvii. 12—xx. 5 σοφός, xxii. 12—xvii. 19, xxvii. 19—xxviii. 25 σταθμῶν, xxx. 8—xxxviii. 22 ἀυ ῳ σοι, xxx. 25—xxxi. 6, xxxii. 22 καὶ ὁ κύριος—xxxiii. 13 ἰακώβ, xxxvii. 11—xxxviii. 15, xxxix. 7—xliv. 27 ἀφικώμεθα, xlv. 24 ὃν αὐτῶ—xlvii. 23 Ροδόμη, xlviii. 11—xlix. 12 Ἡσυχίας νῦς. 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*\(^4\), Tafel 4.


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 writings\(^1\). 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 Syrian\(^2\). 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 *Palæographia Graeca*, and gave a specimen from the fragments of the N. T. (p. 213 ff.). The O. T. fragments were partly examined by Wetstein and Thilo\(^3\), 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 letters\(^4\). The writing of the O. T. differs, according to Tischendorf, from that of the N. T.; it is more delicate, some of the letters (A, Δ, B, K, Ε, Χ, Φ) assume different forms in the two portions of the codex, and there are other palæographical 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 arrangement\(^6\).

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

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

\(^1\) On palimpsest MSS. see Sir E. M. Thompson, *Greek and Latin Palæography*, p. 75 ff.

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


Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

5 εἰς τὴν γῆν—8, 9 ῥήματος—14 καμάλους, 17 καὶ εἴπεν—19 ἐως αὐτῷ, 25 αὐτῷ—27 τῆς, 30 ἀνθρώπων—33 λαλῆσαι, 36 αὐτῷ(10)—41 ἐκ τῆς, 41 ἀρκιμοῦ—46 ἀφ᾽; Num. v. 26 αὐτῆς—30 πώς; vi. 5 ἄγιος—6 τετελεσθηκία, IX κεφαλῆς—12 αἱ (20); 17 κανῶ—18 μαρτυρίου, 22, 23, 27 Κύριος, vii. 4 Μωσῆν—5 Λευιταί, 12 Ναασσάου—13 ἐν, 15 ἕνα—20 θυμίαματος, 1 Par. x. 27 τὸ πρῶτο—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. i—ii. 20; i and 4 Maccabees.

The forty-three leaves containing 1 Par. xi. 22—xix. 17, 2 Esdras ix. 9—end, Esther, Tobit i. i—ii. 2, Jer. x. 25—end, and Lam. i. 1—ii. 20 were found by Tischendorf in a wastepaper 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 (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 Sinaiaticus Petropolitanus, containing a facsimile of the St Petersburg portion of the Sinaiic 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 Porfiry in the bindings of other Sinai MSS.

This great Bible was written on leaves which originally measured 15 x 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 time; 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.
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, I Macc., and the last 4½ 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 $N^a$, $N^c_a$, $N^c_b$, $N^c_c$, $N^d$. The first symbol covers the work of the diorthotes and other nearly contemporary correctors; $N^c_a$, $c_b$, $c_c$ are three seventh century hands, of which the last appears chiefly in the Book of Job, whilst the later $N^d$ has occupied itself with retracing faded writing in the Prophets.

After 1 Chron. xix. 17 cod. $N$ (FA) passes without break to 2 Esdr. ix. 9, but the place is marked by the corrector $N^c_a$ with three crosses and the note μέχρι τοῦτον [τού] σημείου τῶν τριών σταυρῶν ἐστὶν τὸ τέλος τῶν ἐπτὰ φύλλων τῶν περιστών καὶ μὴ ὅντων τοῦ Ἐσδρα. Five of these leaves remain, and the two which preceded them probably contained 1 Chron. vi. 50—ix. 27a (H. St J. Thackeray in Hastings's 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 Sirach 1. Whether 1 Esdras formed a part of cod. $N$ is uncertain, the heading "Ἐσδρας β' does not prove this, since cod. $N$ contains 4 Maccabees under the heading Μακκαβαίων β' 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 appeared 2. The student is still under the necessity of extracting the text of $N$ 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.)


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. Völkes Israel, ii. p. 192.
3 Cf. Wetstein, N. T. i. p. 133; Lagarde, Septuagintastudien, p. 48.
V (23). **Codex Venetus.** St Mark's Library, Venice, cod. Gr. 1.

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 Venice folio measures 16½ x 11¾ inches, the Vatican at 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 size. As regards the history of the separated portions, it appears that the Vatican MS. was originally brought to Rome from Calabria by a Basilian monk; the Venice book was once the property of Cardinal Bessarion, by whom it was presented to St Mark's.

The handwriting of N and V is in the sloping uncialis 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.

1) (1). **Codex Cottonianus.** British Museum, Cotton MSS., Otho B. vi. 5—6.

A collection of fragments, the largest of which measures no more than 7 x 5½ inches, containing portions of the Book of Genesis with vestiges of pictures executed in a semi-classical style.

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.
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

No other uncial codex of the LXX., of which any portion remains, has suffered so lamentable a fate. Brought to England from Philippi\(^1\) in the reign of Henry VIII. by two Orthodox Bishops\(^2\), 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 imperfect\(^3\); 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 1837 (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—172\(^4\). As this discovery was overlooked

---

\(^1\) Still an episcopal see in the time of Le Quien; see Lightfoot, Philippian, 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 ἐστέρα καὶ ἐγένετο προί, ἡμέρα τρίτη. 14 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Γενεβήτωσαν φωστήρες ἐν τῷ στερέωματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς φαύσιν τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀρχήσωσαν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς τοῦ δια-χο[τίς]...

11. xviii. 24—26. 24 ἦν δὲ τῶν πεντῆκοντα δίκαιοι ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀπολέσας αὐτοὺς; οὐκ ἀνήσεις πάντα τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ἐνεκα τῶν πεντῆκοντα δίκαιον, ἦν δὲ τῶν αὐτῆς; 25 μηδαμός σὺν ποιήσεις ὅσ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, τοῦ ἀποκτείνα δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσέβους, καὶ ἐσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡσ ὁ ἀσέβος· μηδαμός. οἱ κρίνοις πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, οὐ ποιήσεις κρίσιν; 26 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Ἔλαν εὐρώ ἐν Σο[δόμοις]...

16. xliii. 16...θύματα καὶ έτοίμασαν· μετ’ ἐμοῦ γὰ[ρ] φάγονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑδότου ἄρτου[ς] τὴν μεσημβρίαν...

The vellum of the MS. is fine, but not so thin as in some other early uncialss. 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 uncialss 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.


The Bodleian volume contains the following fragments of Genesis: i. 1—xiv. 6, xviii. 24 δικαίων—xx. 14 καὶ ἀπέδωκεν, xxiv. 54 ἐκπεμψατε—xlii. 18 εἶπεν δὲ αἱ[τοῖς]. Another leaf, now at the Cambridge University Library, contains xlii. 18 [αἱ]τοῖς τῆ ἡμέρα—xlv. 13 τῶν ἐνα καὶ, but the verso, to which xlii. 31—xlv. 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. xlv. 13 Βενιαμίν· ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ), 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 Genesis; 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 Göttingen 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 McLean) may be found in the Classical Review for May, 1899 (vol. xiii., pp. 209—11).

The Bodleian Genesis is written in large sloping uncial 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 uncial, as well as the readiness of the scribe to pass from the uncial to the cursive script, point to a still later date. 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.


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.


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

An inscription on a blank page states that the fragments were "ex Macedonia Corcyram advecta, ibique Ill. Card. Fed. Borromei Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Fundatoris iussu empta eodemque 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., Medioli. 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 fours; three columns of writing stand on each page, and 35 lines in each column. The characters are those of cent. iv.—v.; initial letters are used, which project to half their breadth into the margin. Punctuation is frequent, and there is much variety in the use of the points; accents and breathings are freely added prima manus, a feature in which this MS. stands alone amongst early Uncials. 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 readings, notes, and scholia.

1 The fragments of Malachi and Isaiah, attributed to F in Holmes, followed by Tischendorf V. T., 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."


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. Pitaeus, Desmarez, Montfaucon, 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 1897.1

1 Fragments marked * are at Paris; that marked † is at St Petersburg.
2 Montfaucon, Pal. sacr. p. 186 f.; Tischendorf, Mon. sacr. ind. n. i. ii. prolegg. p. xviii.
The leaves measure $9\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ 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 (\(\text{\textasciiacute}\), \(\text{\textasciitilde}\), \(\pm\), and in the margin, —), the metobelus frequently occurs (\(\cdot\)'s, \(/\)\(\cdot\), \(/\)'s). 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. i—30, 40—ii. 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—xxxii. 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 stichoi is
specified \((\gamma\phi\lambda\epsilon = 3535)\); the scribe appends his name—'Ιωάν-
νοῦς Μονᾶζος Σερίος

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—xxi. 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, xlii. 21—32, xliii. 21—38, xlviii. 2—21, xlviii. 16—xliv. 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. Lambecci 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.

A MS. of the Octateuch and the Historical Books, with lacunae; the 227 remaining leaves contain Gen. i. 1—xxxiv. 2, xxxvii. 24—Num. xxxix. 23, xxxi. 4—Jos. x. 6, Jos. xxii. 34—Ruth iv. 19, i 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. Seguier, 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 sacra 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 x 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's 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*.

**Za, 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).

Za. 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.
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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).

Z4. 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.


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 cursive, is content to say "de saeculo quo exaratus fuerit nihil dicitur"; according to Coxe (Catalogus cod. 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, lxv. 20—lxviii. 3, lxviii. 26—33, cv. 43—cvi. 2) have been supplied by a later hand, which has also added the ψαλμος ἑξοραφος (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 Bianchi in his Vindiciae canonicearum 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—xliii. 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 στάσεις.

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[a].


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-
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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.


A MS. of Job with occasional lacunae; the remaining portions are i. 1—xvii. 13, xvii. 17—xxx. 9, xxx. 23—xxxi. 5, 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.


A portion of an uncial Psalter containing in 40 leaves Ps. xci. 14—cxxvi. 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—cxi. 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. 68.
⁵ Hexapla, ii. p. 2.
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Ze. 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.


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—xxxii. 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. Rocheffoucauld, 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 \(11\frac{3}{4} \times 7\) inches; the writing is in single columns of 20 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 notes\(^1\) 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 δωδεκαπρώφητον. The MS. is difficult to read, and there are many lacunae. The text, written according to Stroth\(^2\) in the ninth century, is surrounded by scholia, and prefaced by Theodoret's ἐπιθέσεις 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 published\(^3\).

\(Z^b,^c\). 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.


3 The specimens and descriptions in the Turin catalogue (p. 74 ff.) seem to shew that the headings only are written in uncials.

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 velustissima 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 uncial 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 Δαμων). 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., papy. 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., papy. cxxx.), 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. ëgyptt. Sprache, 1881 (Kenyon, op. cit., p. 131).

(8) Nine fragments of a M.S. 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.


(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, Utext, p. 74.

(13) Two palimpsest leaves of Sirach belonging to cod. 2 in the Patriarchal Library at Jerusalem: cf. Papadopulos, Ἴερος. Βιβλ., i. p. 14: τὰ ἀναπληρωτικὰ φύλλα 27 καὶ 56 εἰσὶ παλιμφήστα δὲν ἡ ἀρχικὴ γραφὴ ἀνήκει εἰς τὸν ε’ αἰῶνα...τὸ παλαιὸν δὲ αὐτὸν κείμενον ἐστὶ διόστηλον, καὶ ἐν φυλ. 56 διακρίνεται ἡ ἐπιγραφή σοφία ἰησοῦ γιοῦ σιράγ. The leaves contain Sir. prol. i—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 Heidelberg.

(15) Two leaves of a small vellum book, from the Fayûm, now Bodl. MS. Gr. bibl. e. 4 (P); the handwriting, "in small, fine uncial", 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 Ezek. 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.).

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 Septuagint.

(A) The Octateuch.

17. Genesis, cat. (x) Moscow, Syn. 5, Vlad. 28

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 Ps. v., lviii., lix., cviii., cxxvii., cxxxv., cxxxvii.—cxl. Finally, Mrs Lewis (*Exp. Times*, Nov. 1901) announces the discovery of a palimpsest from Mt Sinai containing Gen. xi. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of the Septuagint.</th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Genesis (ix)</td>
<td>[Cod. Dorothei i.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Octateuch (inc. Gen. xiii. 15)</td>
<td>Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Pentateuch (xii)</td>
<td>[Cod. Eugenii i.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Lectionary (A.D. Moscow, Syn. 31, Vlad. 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Octateuch...(xv)</td>
<td>Escurial, Y. 11. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Octateuch...(xv)</td>
<td>Zittau, A. 1. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Num. (<em>lect.</em>), (xi)</td>
<td>Escurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Fragment of lectionary</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Baron. 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Lectionary (xiii)</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Seld. 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dots in this position shew that the MS. extends beyond the Octateuch.
150  Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

59. Octateuch (xv) Glasgow, Univ. BE. 7b. 10 (formerly at C.C.C., Oxford)
60. Lectionary (xi) Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 329
62. Octateuch ... (x) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 2 Field, i. p. 5 —xi) Venice, St Mark's, O. and N.T. O. and N.T. Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 219
63. Octateuch ... (xv) Munster, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg)
64. Octateuch ... (xi) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 1 Hexaplaric. Tischendorf in L. C.-Bl, 1867 (27)
65. Octateuch ... (xi) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 40 (formerly at Venice; see H. P.) Field, i. p. 78
66. Octateuch ... (xii) Florence, Laur. Acq. 700 (49) Hesychian
67. Octateuch ... (xiv) Oxford, Univ. Coll. i.ii Lagarde's o. Horne- Hesychian
68. Octateuch ... (xiii) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 40 Field, i. p. 78 (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 748
72. Octateuch ... (xiii) Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Gr. 35 (formerly at Venice; see H. P.) Field, i. p. 78
74. Octateuch ... (xiii) Florence, Laur. Acq. 700 (49) Hesychian
75. Octateuch (a.d. 1126) Oxford, Univ. Coll. i.ii Lagarde's o. Horne- Hesychian
76. Octateuch ... (xiii) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4 Field, i. p. 78
77. Octateuch, cat. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 748
78. Gen., Ex., cat. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 383 Field, i. p. 78
80. Octateuch ... (xii) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 3 Lucianic (in part). (part), Rahlfs, Sept.-St. i. 5ff. (Lagarde's f)
82. Octateuch ... (xiii) Lisbon, Archivio da Torre da Tombo 540 &c. (formerly at Evora) Hesychian
83. Heptateuch (im- Rome, Vat. Gr. 1901 Field, i. pp. 78, 397 perf.) (x) ("praestantissimi codicis")
84. Heptateuch (im- Rome, Vat. Gr. 2058 Hesychian perf.) (xi) (formerly Basil. 97)
85. Heptateuch (im- Rome, Vat. Gr. 2058 Field, i. pp. 78, 397 perf.) (xi) ("praestantissimi codicis")
86. Gen., Ex., cat. (ix) Rome, Vat. Gr. 2058 (formerly Basil. 97)
87. Ruth... (xiii) London, B. M. Reg. Lucianic (Lagarde's m in "Lucian") i. D. 2
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

94=131
105. Exod. xiv. 6—26 &c. (xiii—xiv)
106. Octateuch...(xiv)  London, B. M. Burney
Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 187
Hesychian. O. T., N. T. (582 Greg., 451 Scr.). Lagarde, Ank. p. 27

107. Octateuch...(A.D. 1334)
108. Octateuch...(xiv)  London, B. M. Bur- 
Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 188  
Lagarde, ib.

118. Octateuch (im- 
perf.) (xiii)  Venice, St Mark's, 
6 Gr. 4
Lucianic (Lagarde's d')

121. Octateuch... (x)  Venice, St Mark's, 
Gr. 3
122. Octateuch...(xv)  Venice, St Mark's, 
Gr. 6
125. Octateuch...(xv)  Moscow, Syn. 30, 
Vlad. 3
126. Heptateuch...... cat. in Gen., Ex.  
(A.D. 1475)  Moscow, Syn. 19, 
cat. in Gen., Ex.  
Vlad. 38
127. Octateuch...(x)  Moscow, Syn. 31a, 
Vlad. 1
Field, i. p. 5. Lagarde, Ank. p. 3
128. Octateuch (xii)  Rome, Vat. Gr. 1657, 
formerly Grotta ferrata
Field, i. pp. 168, 224
129. Octateuch (xiii)
130. Octateuch (?xiii)  Rome, Vat. Gr. 1252 
Vienna, Th. Gr. 3  
(Nessel 57)
See note to 63
131. Octateuch ...... (x—xi)  Vienna, Th. Gr. 1  
(Nessel 23)
Field, i. p. 5: "in enumeratione Holmesiana [cod. 130] 
perversedesignatur 131, et vice versa,' O. and N. T.

132. Lectionary (pa-
limpsest, xi— 
xii)  Oxford, Bodl. Selden. 9
133. Excerpts from 
MSS.by I. Voss  Leyden, Univ.
134. Octateuch... (xi)  Florence, Laur. v. 1  Hesychian
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of the Septuagint.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135. Gen., Ex. i. 1— Basle, A. N. iii. 13 (Omont 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236. Jos., Jud., Ruth Rome, Vat. Gr. 331 (xii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 = 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246. Octateuch ...... Rome, Vat. Gr. 1238 (xiii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh.—Ruth (x—xi) London, B.M. Add. 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octateuch, cat. London, B.M. Add. (xii—xiii) 35123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.—Ruth, cat. Lambeth, 1214 (A.D. 1104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos.—Ruth ...... Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. cat. (xii) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octateuch ...... Paris, Arsenal 8415 Hexaplaric readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptateuch (im-perf.) (xiii) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octateuch...(xiv) Paris, Nat. Suppl. Gr. 609 Hesychian (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.—Ex. (im-perf.), ep. Arist., cat. (xv) 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Klostermann, p. 78

P. Young's copy of Cod. A

Cf. Batiffol, d'un important M.S. des Septante, in Bulletin Critique, 1889, pp. 112 ff.

Continuation of E (p. 134) with Petersburg lxii. See next page

Hexaplaric readings

Lucianic (?)
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Gen. i.—iii. (?), Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. comm. (palim.) 161
(xiii)
Gen., Ex., ep. Escurial Σ. i. 16 Hexaplaric readings
Arist., cat. (A.D. 1586)
Octateuch... (imperf.) (xi)
Octateuch, cat. Leyden, 13 (belongs to Voss collection)
(imperf.) (xi)... Gr. 361 Published by Fischer in 1767 = Lips. (H. P.)

Gen., Ex., ep. Munich, Gr. 82
Arist., cat. (xvi)
Jos.—Ruth... (x) Munich, Gr. 454 (formerly at Augsburg)
Octateuch, ep. Zurich, Bibl. de la ville, c. 11 Hexaplaric matter
Gen. iv.—v., Ex. Basle, O. ii. 17
xii. — xxviii., comm. (xii)
(? xii) 56
Gen., cat. (xvi) Rome, Barb. Gr. vi. 8
Num.—Ruth ... Rome, Vat. Gr. 332 (xiv—xv)
Hexateuch... (x) Grotta Ferrata Y. γ. 1 Continuation of E (p.
Gen.—Jos. (imperf.)... (x—xi) St Petersburg, Imp. Libr. lxii 134)
Joshua—Ruth... Athos, Ivér. 15 Hexaplaric readings
cat. (xii)
Octateuch (x) Athos, Pantocr. 24
Octateuch... (x Athos, Vatop. 511 —xi)
Octateuch ...... Athos, Vatop. 513 (A.D. 1021)
Lev.—Ruth, cat. Athos, Vatop. 515 Hexaplaric readings,
(x—xii) much faded
Ex.—Ruth ...... Athos, Vatop. 516
Pentateuch (*im-perf.*)\(^\dagger\) (A.D. 1327)
- Athos, Protat. 53

Octateuch (A.D. 1013)
- Athos, Laur. \(\gamma\). 112

Genesis, *cat.* (?xi)
- Constantinople, 224 (formerly 372)

Octateuch... *cat.*
- Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43 (xi)

Octateuch... (xiii)
- Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44
- Lucianic (?)

Octateuch, *cat.*
- Smyrna, \(\sigma\chi\alpha\lambda\eta\ \epsilon\varphi\alpha\gamma\gamma\).

Pentateuch, *cat.*
- Patmos, 216 (xi)

Num. — Ruth, *cat.* (xi)
- Patmos, 217

Heptateuch (*im-perf.*) (xiii)
- Patmos, 410

Pentateuch, *test.* (xii. *patr.* (xv)
- Patmos, 411

Octateuch... (x)
- Sinai, 1 (—xi)

Pentateuch, *cat.*
- Sinai, 2 (? x)

Octateuch... (ix)
- Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre 2

Genesis, *cat.* (xii —xiii)
- Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre 3 (xi)

Octateuch, *cat.*
- Venice, Gr. 534: see below, p. 508

---

19\(^\dagger\)... 1 Regn., 2 Esdr., Judith, Esth., 1—3 Macc., &c. (x)

29... 1—4 Regn., 1—3 Macc. (im-perf.), &c. (x)

38... 1 Regn., 2 Regn. Escurial, Y. 11. 5

44... 1 Regn., 2 Esdr., Zittau, A. r. 1

---

\(^\dagger\) 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).
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

    Esth., Judith, 4 
    Macc., Tob...

52. 1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. Acq. 
    Esth., Judith, 44 
    Macc., Tob., schol. (x)

55. 1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Regin. 
    Judith, Esth., Gr. 1 
    Macc. (xi)

56. 1—4 Regn., 1—2 Chron., 1—2 
    Macc. (xii)

58. 1—4 Regn., 1—2 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

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 
    Macc..., (xv)

70. 1—4 Regn., parts Munich, Gr. 372 (former 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)

    —(xiii)

92. 1—4 Regn. (x) Paris, Nat. Gr. 8 Field, i. p. 486
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

93...1–2 Esdr., Esth., 1–3 Macc. (xiii) London, B. M. Reg. Facsimile in Kenyon. Two texts of Esther
98. 1–4 Regn., 1–2 Escurial, Σ. 2. 19
107...1 Regn.–2 Esdr., Ferrara, Bibl. Comm.
108...1 Regn.–2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Gr. 330 Cf. Field, i. p. 702
119. 1–4 Regn., 1–2 Paris, Nat. Gr. 7
120...1 Regn.–2 Esdr., Venice, St Mark's, 1–4 Macc., Gr. 4
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. (xiv) Moscow, Syn. 19, Vlad. 38
127...1–4 Regn., 1–2 Chron. xxxvi. Moscow, Syn. 31 a, Vlad. 1
131...Historical Bks. Vienna, Th. Gr. 1 (exc. 4 Macc.) (Nessel 23)
134...1 Regn.–2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. v. 1
158. 1–4 Regn., 1–2 Basle, B. 6. 22 Wetstein, N. T. i. p. 132
236...1 Regn.–2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Gr. 331
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 cod. 16

1 Chron.—2 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 Regn. imperf.) Rome, Vat. Gr. Urb. 1

248...1—2 Esdr., Tob., Judith, Esth., &c. (xiv)

311. Historical Bks. Moscow, Syn. 341 (xi)

...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Esth., Tob.
...Judith, 1—3 Macc. (3 M. imperf.) (xii)
...1 Regn.—2 Chron. Munich, Gr. 454 (? formerly at Augsburg)
...1 Regn.—3 Regn. St. Petersburg, Imp. Libr. lxii.
...xvi. 28 (x or xi) Grotta Ferrata, A. γ. 1
...Tob., Judith, Esth., Ruth (x) (catal., 29)
...Tobit (xiv or xv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 332
...1 Esdr., Tobit Leipzig, Univ. Libr. Hexaplaric readings
... (fragments) (x or xi) Gr. 361

...Esth., Judith, Tob., 1—4 Regn. Athos, Vatop. 511
...x or xi

...Esth., Tob., Judith (A.D. 1021) Athos, Vatop. 513

...1—2 Chron. (xiv) Athos, Vatop. 516
...1—4 Regn., cat. Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43 (xi)
...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Esth., Judith, Tob. (xiii) Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44
...1—4 Regn., 1—2 Chron. (xiv) Paris, Arsenal 8415
...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., I—4 Macc., Esth., Judith, Tob. (xiv) Paris, Nat. Suppl. Gr. 609
...1—4 Regn. (xii) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.

(C) Poetical Books.

13. =I (see under Uncial MSS.)
27. Psalms i—lxx Gotha, formerly Lothringen
39. Psalms (*imperf.*) (ix) [Cod. Dorothei ii.]
43. =W (see under Uncial MSS.)
46...Prov., Eccl., Cant., Job, Sap., Sir., ῥυ-νος τῶν παρ. ῥυων (xiv)
55...Job, Psalms Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. (ix)
65. Psalms, *cant.*, Leipzig
68...Poetical Books Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 5
80. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. A
81. Psalms (xi) Oxford, Christ Ch. 2
100. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 3
101. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 20
102. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 1
103. Prov. i.—xix. Vienna, Th. Gr. 25 Klostermann, pp. 6, 18
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

104. Psalms i.-x. (xvi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 27
   (Nessel 229)
   ...Psalms (xiv) Gr. 187
109. Proverbs... (xiii) Vienna, Th. Gr. 26
110. Job, schol. (ix) Vienna, Th. Gr. 9
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 (xv) Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 6
124. Psalms, cant. Vienna, Th. Gr. 21
125...Proverbs(comm. Moscow, Syn. 30,
   Chrys.), Eccl., Cant., Sap. (xv) Vlad. 3
131...Poetical Books, Vienna, Th. Gr. 23
   &c. (?xii)
137. Job, cat. (xi—xii) Milan, Ambr. B. 73
139. Proverbs — Job, Field, ii. p. 2, and
   cat. (x) Auct. p. 5
140. Psalms Field, ii. p. 2
141. Psalms (A.D. Field, ii. p. 2
   1344)
142. Psalms, comm. Vienna, Th. Gr. 19
   (Nessel 8)
143. Psalms, provem. Vienna, Th. Gr. 19
144=131
145. Psalms, cant. (x) Velletri, Borg.
146. Psalms (x) [Cod. Fr. Xavier] In Capitular Lib.
   [Cod. Meermanni I] Toledo
   ... (xiii) 30
149. Job, Prov., Eccl., Vienna, Th. Gr. 7
   Cant., Sap., = 308*H. P. See Geb-
   Pss. Sal., comm. hardt, Die Psalmen
   (xi) Salomo's, p. 15
150. Psalms (? xiv) Ferrara, Carmelit. 3
152. Psalms (xi) (Cod. Nan. 25) Now in St Mark's
   Lib. Venice
154. Psalms, cant. (Cod. Meermanni I)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Psalms (xii—xiii)</td>
<td>(Cod. Meermanni II) Now Bodl. Misc. Gr. 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>interlin.</em></td>
<td>Basle, A. 7. 3 An uncial MS. Lagarde's D⁷⁹ (Specimen, p. 2, cf. Ank. p. 27)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Eccl., Prov. (part), Cant., <em>schol.</em> (xi)</td>
<td>Dresden, 1 Klostermann, p. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Job (xiv)</td>
<td>Dresden, 2 Field, ii. p. 2; cf. 6, 309, and Auct. 22. Cf. Klostermann, pp. 16, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Job, Prov., Eccl., Cant. (xiv)</td>
<td>Dresden, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Psalms (xii)</td>
<td>Paris, Nat. Colbert. Gr. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Psalms (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Psalms (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em> (A.D. 1283)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em> (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Psalms (imperf.) (xi—xii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Psalms (xii—xiii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em> (xii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em> (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em> (A.D. 1488)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em></td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Psalms (Latin, Arabic) (A.D. 1153)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Psalms, <em>cant.</em></td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The only Greek MS. which in Ps. xcvi (xcvi) 10 adds απο τω τύλω (sic); see below, p. 467.
177. Psalms (imperf.) Paris, Nat. Gr. 27
cant. (xiii)
(A.D. 1059)
179. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 41
(xii)
180. Psalms, cant. (xii) Paris, Nat. Gr. 42
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
(xii)
10
186 An uncial MS. Lagarde's H(p5) (Specimen, p. 3). Often agrees with 156
13 An uncial MS. Lagarde's K(p5) (Specimen, p. 3)
cant. 187
188
cant. (xiii)
193. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 21
(xii)
(xii)
(xii)
196. Psalms (inc. ii. Paris, Nat. Gr. 25
3), cant. (xii)
197. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 29
(xiv)
198. Psalms (xi) Modena, Est. 37
15
107
110
S. S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204. Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Laud.</td>
<td>C. 38</td>
<td>schol., prayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Cambridge, Gonville &amp; Caius Coll. 348</td>
<td>(xiv)</td>
<td>Facsimile in Harris, Leicester codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207. Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Tübingen, (cod. cant. Schnurrer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208. Psalms (xiv)</td>
<td>[Cod. Demetrii v.</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210. Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1542</td>
<td>(xii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211. Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1848</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1870</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. Psalms, li.—liii.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(xiii—xiv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Bologna, 720</td>
<td>(xi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Rome, Barber. 1 (Gr. 372)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Rome, Barber. 2 (Gr. 322)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227. Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228. Prov., Eccl., Cant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
&c.
250. Job (xiv) Munich, Elect. 148
251. Job, cat., Psalms Florence, Laur. v. 27
252. Job, Prov., Eccl., Cant. (ix—x) Florence, Laur. viii. 27
(xi—xiv)

255. Job (ix) Rome, Vat. Gr. 338

256. Job, schol. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 697
257. Job, comm. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 743


263. Psalms Copenhagen, Royal Lib.

265. Psalms, cant., pict. (xiv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 381
266. Psalms (imperf.) (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 2101
268. Psalms, cat. Rome, Vat. Gr. 2057


270. Psalms, cant. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1864
271. Psalms, comm. (xi) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1747


Gr. 40

Field, l.c.

Field, l.c.

Field, l.c.; cf. p. 309 and Auct. p. 2

Field, l.c.

Field, l.c. Klostermann, p. 68
Field, l.c. Klostermann, p. 11

Cf. Field, ii. p. 84 f., and Auct. p. 11

Cf. Field, ii. p. 84
274. Psalms (imperf.) comm. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Ottob. 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
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
285. Psalms, cant. Florence, Laur. v. 34
286. Psalms, comm. Florence, Laur. v. 30
287. Psalms (imperf.) comm. (xii) Florence, Laur. v. 14
288. Psalms, comm. Thdt. (xii) Florence, Laur. xi. 5
289. Psalms, comm. Euth.-Zig. Florence, Laur. ix. 2
(xiii)
291. Psalms (xi—xii) Florence, Laur. v. 39
292. Psalms, cat. (xi) Florence, Laur. vi. 3
293. Psalms, metr. Florence, Laur. v. 37
294. Psalms, lxxi. 14, paraphr. (xv) Cambridge, Emmanuel College
   —lxxxii. 7, cxxvii. 3 — cxxix. 6, cxxxv. 11 —
   cxxxvi. 1, cxxxvii. 4—cxl. 21 (?) xiii)

Lagarde calls it P in *Genesis graece*, but N (m) in the *Specimen*. Apparently a copy in a Western hand of an early cursive Psalter; see M. R. James in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 1892—3, p. 168 ff.¹

¹ Other Psalters used by Lagarde (*Specimen*, p. 3 f.) are St Gall 17 (ix) = G (m); Munich 251 = L (m); 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.
297. Prov., cat. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1802
298. Eccl., comm. (xii) [Cod. Eugenii 3]
300. Cant., comm. [Cod. Eugenii 3] (xii)
Psalms Rome, Vat. Gr. 754

(D) Prophetic Books.

26. Prophets (? xi) Rome, Vat. Gr. 556 Originally belonged to same codex as Vat. gr. 1153: see Klostermann, p. 11. Cf. 87, 97, 238
34. Dan. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 803 Lucianic (Field). Cornill’s φ
35. Dan. (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 866
36. Prophets (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 347
40. Dodecaprophets (xii) [Cod. Dorothei iii.]
41. Isa., Jer. (ix—x) [Cod. Demetrii ii.] Lucianic (Field)
42. Ezek., Dan., Min. Proph. (xi—xii) [Cod. Demetrii iii.]
46... Isa., Jer., Bar., Lam., Ep. Ezek., Dan., Minor Prophets... (xiv)
48. Prophets (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1794 Lucianic (Field), Cornill’s η. Klostermann, pp. 11, 14
49. Prophets (xi) Florence, Laur. x. 8 Hesychius, Cornill’s κ
51. Prophets (xi) Florence, Laur. xi. 4 Lucianic (Field). Cornill’s θ
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

58...Prophets (xiii) Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 10


68...Ezek., Dodecapr. (xv) Venice, St Mark’s, Gr. 5

70...Prophets (x—xi) Munich, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg)

86. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dodecapr. (?ix) Rome, Barber. v. 45

87. Prophets (?ix) Rome, Chigi 2


89. Daniel (xi) = 239

90. Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan., cat. (xi)


93...Isa. (xiv) London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2


97. Dodecapr., Isa., cat. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153

104...Isa. v.—lxii. Vienna, Th. Bib. 27 (Nessel 229)

105...Fragments of Prophets, &c. London, B. M. Bur-ney (xiii—xiv)

On the text of Daniel in this MS. see Klostermann, p. 12

Lucianic (Field). Field, ii. 907; Burkitt, Tyconius, p. cviii; Klostermann, p. 51

Hesychian. Cornill’s ψ

Field, ii. p. 939. Walton, vi. 131 f.; Klostermann, p. 50

Hesychian. Cornill’s β. For the relation of 87 to 91 and 96 see Faulhaber Die Propheten - catenen. 33, 97, 238 are copied from 87

87 in Field (ii. p. 766). O.T. in Greek (iii. p. xiii.). Cf. Klostermann, p. 31

Lucianic (Field); in Ezekiel, Hesychian acc. to Cornill: Cornill’s λ

Hesychian (Cornill). Cornill’s μ. See note on 87

Lucianic (Field)

Lucianic (Cornill)

See note on 87

See notes on 33, 87

(Nessel 229)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of the Septuagint.</th>
<th>167</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>106...</strong> Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan., Minor Prophets to Micah (xiv)</td>
<td>Ferrara, Gr. 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109</strong>... Isaiah, cat. = 302</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>114.</strong> Dodecaproph., comm. Theod. Mops...</td>
<td>Evora, Carthus. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>122...</strong> Prophets (xv)</td>
<td>Venice, St Mark’s, Gr. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>131...</strong> Prophets (? xii)</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 1 (Nessel 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>148.</strong> Daniel (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>185...</strong> Dodecaproph. (xii)</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 18 Lucianic (Cornill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>228...</strong> Prophets (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1764 Hesychian (Cornill’s φ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>229.</strong> Jer., Dan., comm. (xiv)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>230.</strong> Daniel (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>233.</strong> Prophets (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 2067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>234.</strong> Susanna</td>
<td>Moscow, Syn. 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>235.</strong> Susanna</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>238.</strong> Ezekiel, cat. (x)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153 Hesychian (Cornill). Cornill’s ς. See notes on 33, 87, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>239.</strong> Prophets (A.D. 1046) = 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>240.</strong> Dodecapr., cat.</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. vi. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>240.</strong> Dodecapr., cat.</td>
<td>(A.D. 1286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>301.</strong> Isaiah (ix)</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>302...</strong> Isaiah, cat. (xiii)</td>
<td>= 109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the second century the Greek-speaking Churches, following the example of the Hellenistic Synagogue, read the Greek Old Testament in their public assemblies.


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 uncialss, 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, *Facsimiles 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.


The following list of MSS. 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) Gr. p. 717 (207, Scr. 214)
Oxford, Christ Church, Wake 14 (xii) Gr. p. 717 (208, Scr. 215)
" Christ Church, Wake 15 (A.D. 1068) (Gen. xi. 4—9, Prov. xiii. 19—xiv. 6, Sir. xxxvii. 13—xxxviii. 6): a fragment purchased from the executors of Tischendorf
Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Add. 1879 (? xi) = Z\textsuperscript{287}, WH. 59
" Christ's College, F. i. 8 (xi) Gr. p. 714 (185, Scr. 222)
Ashburnham, 205 (xii) Gr. p. 720 (237, Scr. 237–8)
" Nat. Gr. 243 (A.D. 1133) Omont, MSS. Grècs datés, no. xlvi.

1 A few lectionaries have already been mentioned among the H.P. MSS. (37, 61, 132).
Paris, Nat. suppl. Gr. 32 (xiii)  
Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 59 (xii)  
" Vat. Gr. 168 (xiii or xiv)  
" Vat. Gr. 2012 (xv)  
" Barb. 18 (xiv)  
Grotta Ferrata, Α’ δ’ 2 (x)  
" Α’ δ’ 4 (xiii)  
" Δ’ β’ 22 (xviii)  
Venice, St Mark’s, i. 42 (xii)  
Trèves, Bibl. Cath. 143 F (x or xi)  
Athens, Nat. 86 (xiii)  
Salonica, Ελληνικού γυμνασίου iδ’ (xv or xvi)  
Cairo, Patr. Alex. 927 (xv)  
Sinai, 748 (xv or xvi)  
" 943 (A.D. 1697)  
St Saba, in tower, 16 (xii)  
Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre (xiii)  
Gr. p. 704 (84)  
Gr. p. 757 (573, Scr. 395)  
Gr. p. 786 (188, Scr. 116)  
Gr. p. 756 (556, Scr. 387)  
Gr. p. 780 (40)  
Gr. p. 748 (473, Scr. 323)  
Gr. p. 748 (475, Scr. 325)  
Gr. p. 751 (506, Scr. 358)  
Gr. p. 724 (268, Scr. 173)  
Gr. p. 713 (179)  
Gr. d. 745 (443)  
Gr. p. 771 (837)  
Gr. p. 776 (759, Scr. 140)  
Gr. p. 775 (900)  
Gr. p. 775 (908)  
Gr. p. 770 (829, Scr. 364)  
Harris, p. 13


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); Papadopulos Kerameus, Ἰεροσολωμική 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.

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: "medium 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."

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 Alcalà, and his pupil Ferdinando Núñez de Guzman (Pincianus); Diego Lopez de Zuñiga (Stunica); Juan de Vergara, Professor of Philosophy at Alcalà; 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.


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

---

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 Bibliä 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: Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη | κατὰ τοὺς ἑβάδομήκοντα | άι ἀγαθίας | ζυγτοῦ ἐκ ἀκροὺς ἄρχεται | ἐκαθορίζει | ἐκ τῶν τεσσαράκοντα | ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ | ἔριθος τοῦ μεταβολής | ἐπιστολής | ἔνθελος. The volume consists of 783 pages of text, followed by a page of addenda and corrigenda, and preceded by three (unnumbered) leaves which contain (i) 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.

(i) Sixto Quinto Pontif. Max. Antonius Carafa Cardinalis Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae Bibliothecarius

Annum agitur iam fere octavus ex quo Sanctitas vestra pro singulari suo de sacris litteris benemerendi studio auctor fuit beatae memoriae Gregorio XIII. Pont. Max. ut sacrosancta Sep-

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 rédigée 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, infinitis 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 multiplex eaque confusa veterum interpretatione fluxisse; rectissime censuit ad optimae notae exemplaria provocandum esse, ex quibus, quod fieri posset, ea quae vera et sincera esset Septuaginta Interpretum scriptura elicet. 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 expoliitionis constituendae munus cum mihi demandum esset a Gregorio XIII., cius cogitationes eo maxime spectabunt ut Christiana Religio quam latissime propagentur, operam dedi ut in celebrioribus Italiae bibliothecis optima quaeque exemplaria perquirerentur atque ex iis lectionum varietates descriptae ad me mitterentur. Quibus sane doctorum hominum quos ad id delegeram industria et judicio clarae memoriae Gulielmi Cardinalis Sirleti ( quem propter excellentem doctrinam et multiplicum 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 codicum non solum vetustate verum etiam bonitate caeteris anteire; quodque caput est, ad ipsam quam quae- bamus Septuaginta interpretationem, si non toto libro, maiori certe ex parte, quam proxime accedere. Quod mihi cum multis alis argumentis constaret, vel ipso etiam libro titulo, qui est κατά τοὺς ἐνδομήκοντα, curavi de consilio et sententia eorum quos supra nominavi, huius libri editionem ad Vaticanum exemplar emen- dandum; vel potius exemplar ipsum, quod eius valde probaretur auctoris, de verbo ad verbum repressentandum, 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 Sistine 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 Graecce, 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 Iudaes gratiam iniret aliter quam Septuaginta vertendo, subdola obscuritate involverit) iamdiu est cum a recte sentientibus, licet in hexaplis habetur, aliquibus locis non est probata. Hunc vero qui subsequuti sunt, Symmachus et Theodotio, alter Samaritanus sub L. Vero, alter Ephesius sub Imp. Commodo, uterque (quamvis et ipsi in hexaplis circumferrentur) parum fidus interpreps habitus est: Symmachus, quod Samaritanis offensus, ut placeret Iudaes, non unum sanctae scripturae locum perturbato sensu corruperit; Theodotio, quod Marcionis haereticus 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 dolis 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 Imp., 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: ἥμείς δὲ καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἐκδοσιν σεβαζόμενοι, τῇ τῶν ἐξδομήκοντα προσκείμεθα μάλιστα, ὅτι διηρημένως τὴν τῆς
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 proposita esse, deinde vero varietates tantum ex iis ad illam sub obelis et asteriscis notae essent coeptae, factum est ut vetustate notis obliteratis insincera nimis et valde sui dissimilis ad nos perveniret: quippe quae insertis ubiqui aliorum interpretationibus, aliquibus autem locis duplici atque etiam tripli eiusdem sententiae interpretatione intrusa, male praeterea a librariali accepta, sum om i d nitorem integritatemque amiserit. Hinc illae lectionum penitus inter se dissidentes varietates et, quod doctissimorum hominum ingienia mentesque diu torsi, 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 debeat 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 singulari quemad diligentiam adhibuerit, vidit primus quae ratione huic malo medendum esset; nec vidit solum, sed auctoritate etiam sua effecit ut summiss Pontifex Gregorius XIII. Graeca Septuaginta Interpretum Biblia, adhibita diligenti castigatione, in pristinum splendoren restituenda curaret. Quam rem exequandam 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 codicum omnium qui extant longe optimum esse, ac operae pretium fore si ad eius fidem nova haec editio para- retur.

Sed emendationis consilio iam explicato, ipsa quoque ratio quae in emendando adhibita est nunc erit aperienda, in primis que Vaticanus liber describendus, ad cuius praescriptum haec editio expolita est. Codex is, quantum ex forma characterum coniici potest, cum sit maioribus litteris quas vere antiquas vocant exaratus, ante millesimum ducentesimum annum, hoc est ante tempora B. Hieronymi et non infra, scriptus videtur. Ex
omnibus autem libris qui in manibus fuerunt unus hic prae aliiis, 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 Cardinale, et is quoque grandioribus litteris scriptus; alter qui ex Magna Graecia ad vectus 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 exemplariorum lectiones non exhibent ad sequentem, nisi ubi aliorum Interpretum locum aliquem afferunt, non Septuagintae. quorum editionem cum esset nova emendatione perpelienda, 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 suspicione mendi videbantur non carere. satius enim visum est locos vel aliquo modo suspectos ( nec enim fieri potest ut in quantumvis expurgato exemplarum non aliqua supersit macula) quemadmodum habentur in archetypo relinqui quam eos ex alicuius ingenio aut coniectura emendari: quod multa quae primo vel mendoza vel mutilata 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 aste riscis.

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, quod unusque arbitratu adiuvantibus libris restitui possint. Nec vero illud omissendum, quod item pertinet ad notationes; non omnia
in iis repraesentata esse quae aut ad confirmandas lectiones Vaticanas e scriptoribus vulgaris, aut ad explenda quae in Septuaginta non habentur, ex aliorum editionibus afferri potuisset, quod in communitibus 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 scholiis illas nomine, quod ipsarum certa esset auctoritas, nonnuncqua relatas) vel ad stabilirem scripturam Vaticanam et eius obscurores 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 vulgaris tamen editionibus variat in hoc quod primo habet duodecim Prophetas et hos ipsos aliter dispositos; deinde reliquis quattuor, quemadmodum vulgo editi sunt. Atque hunc ordinem verum esse intelligimus ex eo quod illum agnoscent 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 apparat sub obscura, illi paene similis quam descript sanctus Dorotheus martyris, qui vixit sub Magno Constantino.

Maccabaeorum libri absunt ab hoc exemplari, atque item liber Genesis fere totus; nam longo aequo 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 asterriscis ab Origene suppleta et distincta non sint; vel obscura et perturbata, quod cum Latina vulgaris non consentiant, et in aliquibus alii 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 kounyv, 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 reliquis 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 aequetur, probabuntur, reliquam erit ut Sixto V. Pont. Max. huius boni auctori gratias agant, et ab omnipotenti Deo publicis votis poscant,
Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Cupientes, quantum in nobis est, commissi nobis gregis saluti quacunque ratione ac via prospicere, ad pastoralem 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 potimus, 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 nonnunquam usi fuerunt, ad emendatissimorum codicum fidem exponi mandaverit; eius rei cura dilecto filio nostro Antonio Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Presbytero Cardinale Carafae, et ad id per eum delectis eruditis aliquot viris demandata, et iam expolita huiusmodi, permultis exemplaribus ex diversis Italiae bibliothecis et praecliquae 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.


The reader will not fail to note the intelligent appreciation of the LXX., and the wide outlook over the history of the Greek
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versions which are implied by these documents. 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. h).
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.):


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.

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 text, 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 | accurata 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 κοινή, 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 Breitinger (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 Canonicus. 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

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).

The great work of Holmes and Parsons has been severely criticised by later scholars, especially by Hatch and Lagarde. 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 Horeum 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. f. 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 uncialis: “eam viam ingressus sum (he writes') 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 confiderer 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 Tischendorfianarum, 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 \( N \); 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 \textit{afhmpz} (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 editions followed (vol. i., 1895, 1901; vol. ii., 1896, 1907; vol. iii., 1899, 1905). 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, 1 (Genesis only published).

1 V. T. Libr. can. praef. p. xvi.
Genesis.

P. A. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1868: *Genesis graece e fide editionis Sis tiniae adiita scripturae discrepantia e libris manu scriptis a se collatis et edd. Complutensi et Aldina accuratissime enotata.* The MSS. employed are ADEFGS, 25, 29, 31, 44, 122, 139, 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. interpretes.* A specimen had previously appeared (in 1866).

P. A. de Lagarde, 1891 (in his *Septuaginta-studien*, t. c. i.—v.). Two texts.

A. E. Brooke and N. MēLean, Cambridge, 1897: *The Book of Judges in Greek, acc. to the text of Codex Alexandrinus.*


Ruth.

Drusius, 1586, 1632.

L. Bos, Jena, 1788: *Ruth ex versione lxx. interpretem secundum exemplar Vaticanum.*

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1867: *’Pou̱th kara toûs o’.*

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*),
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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).

JOB.
Patrick Young, 1637 (in the Catena of Nicetas).
J. Terrentius, Franeker, 1663.

ESTHER.
O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1848 : Ἐφθαρ. 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.

AMOS.
Vater, Halle, 1810.

JONAH.
S. Münster, 1524, 1543.

ISAIAH.
S. Münster, 1540 (in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin).

JEREMIAH.
S. Münster, 1540.

LAMENTATIONS.
Kyper, Basle, 1552: Libri tres de re gramm. Hebr. ling. (Hebr Gr., Lat.).

1 See also Nestle in Hastings, D. B. iv. 441.
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EZEKIEL.

'Ιεζεκιήλ κατὰ τοὺς ο', Rome, 1840.

DANIEL (Theod.).

Ph. Melanchthon, 1546.
Wells, 1716.

DANIEL (lxx.).

S. de Magistris (?), Rome, 1772. Daniel secundum lxx. ex tetrapliis Origenis nunc primum editus e singuliari 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. pseudopigraphi selecti [Psalmi Salomonis, 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.


1 A fuller list is given by Nestle in Hastings, D.B. iv. 441.
2 See Nestle's art. Sirach in Hastings, iv.
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Tobit.
Reusch, Bonn, 1870: *Libellus Tobit e cod. Sinaitico.*

Baruch.
Kneucker, Leipzig, 1879.

1 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.
E. E. Geiger, Augsburg, 1871: *Der Psalter Salomos 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.

Enoch (the Greek version of).

Literature (upon the general subject of this chapter).
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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.
### Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of 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 (r) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration 1</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Vulgate Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תֵאֱוֶשֶׁת</td>
<td>B'реш</td>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תְּנֻחוֹת יַחְצֵר</td>
<td>Oゅelé σμωθ</td>
<td>Εξόδος</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵזְרֵא</td>
<td>Υυκρά</td>
<td>Λευ[ε]τικόν</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְזֵב</td>
<td>&quot;Αμμες φεκωδελμ</td>
<td>'Αριμολ</td>
<td>Numeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶלֶה אֲדַדְדֵבָרֵימ</td>
<td>Δευτερονόμιον</td>
<td>Deuteronomium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יוֹסְעֶת בֵּן נֵו</td>
<td>'Ισούς</td>
<td>Iosue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>᲋אַפַטְלֶמ</td>
<td>Κρηταί</td>
<td>Iudices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סְהַמְוָל</td>
<td>Βασιλείων {α', β'}</td>
<td>Regum {1, 2}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֹבְדִּי</td>
<td>Δαβְּד</td>
<td>{γ', δ'}</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יוֹסְיָא</td>
<td>'Ησαίας</td>
<td>Isaias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יֶרֶא</td>
<td>'Ιερεμίας</td>
<td>Jeremias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יֶרֶא</td>
<td>'Ιερεμία</td>
<td>Ezechiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יוֹסְיָא</td>
<td>'Ωσְי</td>
<td>Osee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'יוֹנָל</td>
<td>'יוֹנָל</td>
<td>Ioel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'מוֹז</td>
<td>'Αμώς</td>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'תוֹבֶא</td>
<td>'Οβδειοβ, 'Αβδ[ε]ιοβ</td>
<td>Abdias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As given by Origen ap. Eus. H. E. vi. 25.
2 I.e. μετά τὰ πέντε τῶν δανίων 'fifth of the precepts'; cf. the Mishnic title רס סיווא (Ryle, Canon of the O. T., p. 294). Jerome transliterates the initial word, vayedaḇber; cf. Epiph. (Lagarde, Symmicta ii. 178), οβαίδαβηρ, "η μετά 'Αριμολ. The book is also known as רְבִיבֵי.
3 I.e. רז יַחְצֵר (first two words of 1 Kings i.), Malachim, Jerome; διαλαξελμ, Epiphanius.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Vulgate Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>'Ioνας</td>
<td>Ψαλμοι, Ψαλτήριον</td>
<td>Psalmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>Μελόθ</td>
<td>Παρομοιαί</td>
<td>Proverbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>'Ιωβ</td>
<td>'Ιωβ</td>
<td>Iob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>Σιρ άσφριμ</td>
<td>Άσμα, άσματα [άσματων]</td>
<td>Canticum canticorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>'Ροῦθ</td>
<td>'Ρήνοι</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>Κωλό</td>
<td>'Εκκλησιαστής</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>'Εσθήρ</td>
<td>'Εσθήρ</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>Δανίηλ</td>
<td>Δανιήλ</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התו</td>
<td>'Εσδρα</td>
<td>'Εσδρας</td>
<td>Esdras 1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 With variants Μεσλόθ, Μισλόθ (leg. for Μσλόθ). *Masaloth, Jerome; διεθαλώθ, Epiphanius.*

2 Origen includes Ruth with Judges under Σαφατελμ.

3 Epiph. *l.c.: ἕστι δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰ μικρὰ βιβλίσ ἡ καλεῖται Κνῶθ [Mishn. חוכמ], ἥς ἑρμηνευέται Ὁρήνος Ἱερεμίου.*
### B (1). Order of the Books in Jewish Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talmudic</th>
<th>Spanish MSS.</th>
<th>German &amp; French MSS.</th>
<th>Massoretic MSS.</th>
<th>Printed Bibles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Torah</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Nefi'm</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III Ketubim</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>Ezra-Neh.</td>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>Ezra-Neh.</td>
<td>1, 2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex Vaticanus (B)</th>
<th>Codex Sinaïticus (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Εσόδος</td>
<td>&quot;Αριθμός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λευέτικον</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀριθμόν</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δευτερονόμιον</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κριτᾶ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρωθ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βασίλειων α’—δ’</td>
<td>Παρασελευτομένων α’, [β’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παρασελευτομένων α’, β’</td>
<td>Εὐσάρας [α’], β’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐσόδρας α’, β’</td>
<td>Εὐσάρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψαλμοι</td>
<td>Τωβειθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παροιμίαι</td>
<td>Ιουνειθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐκκλησιαστὴς</td>
<td>Μακκαβαῖων α’, δ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀσμα</td>
<td>Ἡσαίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωβ</td>
<td>Ἰερεμίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφια Σαλωμῶνος</td>
<td>Θρήνοι Ἰερεμίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφια Σειράχ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βασῆρ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιουνειθ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τωβειθ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ως</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμώς</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μειχαίας</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωὴ</td>
<td>Ἰωὴ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὀβδειοῦ</td>
<td>Ὀβδειοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωνᾶς</td>
<td>Ἰωνᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ναοῦ</td>
<td>Ναοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀμβακοῦμ</td>
<td>Ἀμβακοῦμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφονίας</td>
<td>Σοφονίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγγαῖος</td>
<td>Ἀγγαῖος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζαχαρίας</td>
<td>Ζαχαρίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μαλαχίας</td>
<td>Μαλαχίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἡσαίας</td>
<td>Ψαλμοὶ Δᾶδ ρνα’ (subscr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰερεμίας</td>
<td>Παροιμίαι [ + Σολομώντος subscr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βαροῦχ</td>
<td>Ἐκκλησιαστὴς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θρήνοι</td>
<td>* Ἀσμα ἄσματων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐγίστολη Ἰερεμίου</td>
<td>Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰσχείλ</td>
<td>Σοφία Ἰησοῦ νῦν Σειράχ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δανηὴλ</td>
<td>Ἰωβ’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Codex Alexandrinus (A)

Γένεσις κόσμου
'Εξοδος Αλγύπτου
Δευτερικάν
'Αριθμόι
Δευτερονόμιον
'Ισραής υἱὸς Ναυή
Κριταί
'Ροῦθ [όμοι βιβλία γ']
Βασιλείων α'—δ'
Παραλεπομένων α', β' [όμοι βιβλία 5']
Προφήτης Ισ'
'Ωσής ά
'Αμώς β'
Μηχαίας γ'
'Ιωήλ δ'
'Αβδείου ε'
'Ιωάννας γ'
'Ναοῦς ζ'
'Αμβακοῦνη η'
'Σοφονίας θ'
'Αγγαίον ι'
'Ζαχαρίας κα'
'Μαλαχίας λβ'

'Ησαίας προφήτης γ'
Ιερεμίας προφήτης δ'
Βαρούχ
Ορθόνος [+ Ιερεμίου, subscr.]
'Επιστολή Ιερεμίου

'Ιερεμίας προφήτης ε'
'Ιακώβ [πλεον.]
'Εσθήρ
'Ιωάν
'Ιωάν

'Ετράς α' ο ιερεύς ('Εστρας α' ιερεύς, catal.)

'Ετράς β' ιερεύς ('Εστρας β' ιερεύς catal.)
Μακκαβαιων α'—δ'
'Ψαλτήριον (Ψαλμοί ῥω καὶ ιδιόγραφος α' subscr., seq. ρ' δι' Ψαλτήριον μετ' ψόδων catal.)

'Ιωβ
Παροιμίαι Σολομώντος

Codex Basiliano-Venetus (N+V)

* (N) Αποθετηρί
Δευτερονόμιον
'Ισραής
'Ροῦθ
Κριταί
Βασιλείων α'—δ'
Παραλεπομένων α', β'
'Εσθήρ

* (V) Ιωβ (subscr.)
'Εκκλησιαστής
'Ασμα φασμάτων
'Σοφία Σολομώντος
'Σοφία 'Ισραής υἱοῦ Σιράχ
'Ιωήλ
'Αμώς
'Ιωάν
'Ιωάν

'Μηχαίας
'Ναοῦς
'Αμβακοῦνη
'Σοφονίας
'Αγγαίον
'Ζαχαρίας
'Μαλαχίας
'Ησαίας
'Ιερεμίας
Βαρούχ
Ορθόνος
'Ιερεμίας
'Ιακώβ
'Εσθήρ
'Ιωάν

Μακκαβαιων α'—δ'

'Ασμα (Άσμα subscr.) φασμάτων
'Σοφία Σολομώντος (Σ. Σολομώντος subscr.; + Ἡ Πανάρετος, catal.)
'Σοφία 'Ισραής υἱοῦ Σιράχ (Σειράχ, subscr.)
Ψαλμοί Σολομώντος, catal.
B (3) (a). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN PATRISTIC AND SYNODICAL LISTS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.


Μωσείων πέντε
Γένεσις
"Εξόδος
'Αριθμός
Δευτερόμυλον
Δευτεροτάκτων
'Ησυχία Ναυὴ
Κριταί
'Ροῦθ
Βασιλείων έτσαρα
Παραλειπομένων δύο
Ψαλμῶν Δαβὶδ
Σαλομώνος Παροιμίαι, ἢ καὶ Σοφία
'Εκκλησιαστῆς
"Ασμα ἁμάτων
'Ἰόβ
Προφήτων
"Ησαλον
'Ιερεμίου
Τῶν δώδεκα ἐν μονοβιβλίῳ
Δανηλ
'Ιεζεκιήλ
"Εσδρας


Γένεσις
"Εξόδος
Δευτερόμυλον
'Αριθμός
Δευτεροτάκτων
'Ησυχία οὐδὲ Ναυὴ
Κριταί
'Ροῦθ
Βασιλείων α’—δ’
Παραλειπομένων α’, β’
"Εσδρας α’, β’
Βιβλίος Ψαλμῶν
Σολομώνος Παροιμίαι
'Εκκλησιαστῆς
"Ασμα ἁμάτων
'Ησαλας
'Ιερεμίας σὺν Θρήνους καὶ τῇ Ἑπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνὶ
Δανηλ
'Ιεζεκιήλ
'Ιόβ
'Εσθήρ
"Εξώ δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ
Τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά


Γένεσις
"Εξόδος
Δευτερόμυλον
'Αριθμός
Δευτεροτάκτων
'Ησυχία ο τοῦ Ναυὴ
Κριταί
'Ροῦθ
Βασιλείων τέσσαρα βιβλία
Παραλειπομένων α’, β’
"Εσδρας α’, β’
Βιβλίος Ψαλμῶν
Παροιμίαι
'Εκκλησιαστῆς

4. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catich. iv. 35).

Αἱ Μωσείων πρῶται πέντε βιβλία
Γένεσις
"Εξόδος
Δευτερόμυλον
'Αριθμός
Δευτεροτάκτων
'Εσθήρ δὲ
Τῶν Κριτίων βιβλίων μετὰ τῆς 'Ροῦθ
Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἱστορικῶν βιβλίων
Βασιλείων α’—δ’
Παραλειπομένων α’, β’
Τοῦ "Εσδρα α’, β’
'Εσθήρ (δωδεκάτη)

1 Cf. Eus. H.E. iv. 22 ὁ πᾶς τῶν ἀρχαίων χωρὸς Πανάρετον Σοφίαν τὰς Σολομώνος παροιμίας ἐκάλουν.
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

'Tá δὲ στιχηρά τύγχανει πέντε

'Ἰώβ

Βιβλίον Ψαλμῶν

Παροιμίαι

'Εκκλησιαστής

'Ασμα ψαμάτων (ἐπτακαίδεκατον βιβλίων)

'Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων τὰ προφητικὰ πέντε

Τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν μία βιβλίων

'Ησαλών μία

'Iερεμίου [μιὰ] μετὰ Βαρουχ καὶ

Θρίμων καὶ 'Επιστολῆς

'Iεσεκήλ

Δαυίδ (εἴκοστῇ δευτέρᾳ βιβλίῳ)

Τά δὲ λοιπά πάντα έξω κείσθω ἐν δευ-

tέρῳ

5ο. Epiphanius (Iaer. 1, i. 6).

α'. Γένεσις

β'. 'Εξωθος

γ'. Λευτικόν

δ'. 'Αριθμοί

e'. Δευτερονόμιον

ζ'. 'Ισραήλ τοῦ Ναυνάκη

η'. Τῶν Κριτῶν

θ'. Τοῦ 'Ιώβ

ι'. Τὸ Ψαλτήριον

ια'. Παρομαίοι Σολομώντος

ιβ'. 'Εκκλησιαστής

ιγ'. Τὸ 'Ασμα τῶν ψαμάτων

ιδ'-ιξ'. Βασιλείων ά'-δ'

η', ηθ'. Παραλειπόμενων α', β'

κ'. Τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον

κα'. 'Ησαλών ὁ προφήτης

κβ'. 'Ιερεμίας ὁ προφήτης, μετὰ τῶν

Θρίμων καὶ 'Επιστολῶν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Βαρουχά

κγ'. 'Ιεσεκήλ ὁ προφήτης

κδ'. Δαυίδ ὁ προφήτης

κε', κεθ'. 'Εσθῆρ α', β'

κζ'. 'Εσθήρ

'H Σοφία τοῦ Σιράχ

'H [Σοφία] τοῦ Σολομώντος

9ο. Epiphanius (de mens. et pond. 4).

Πέντε νομικά (ἡ πεντάτευχος ἡ καὶ

νομοθεσία)

(Γένεσις—Δευτερονόμιον)

Πέντε στιχουρίες

('Ἰώβ, Ψαλτήριον, Παροιμίαι Σα-

λομώντος, Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἀσμα

ψαμάτων)

'Αλλή πεντάτευχος, τὰ καλομενα Γρα-

φεια, παρά τις δὲ 'Αγγέλων αἱ

λεγόμενα ('Ισραήλ τοῦ Ναυνάκη, βιβλίων

Κριτῶν μετὰ τῆς 'Ῥοῦθ, Παραλει-

πομένων α', β', Βασιλείων α', β',

Βασιλείων γ', δ')

'Ἡ προφητικὴ πεντάτευχος (τὸ δώδε-

καπρόφητον, Ἡσαλών, 'Ιερεμίας, 'Ιεσ-

εκήλ, Δαυίδ)

'Αλλαι δύο (τοῦ 'Εσθῆρ δύο, μία λογι-

ζουμενη, τῆς 'Εσθήρ)

'Ἡ τοῦ Σολομώντος ἡ Πανάρετος

λεγόμενη

'Ἡ τοῦ 'Ισραήλ τοῦ νῦν Σιράχ
5. Epiphanius (de mens. et pond. 23).

6. Gregory of Nazianzus (carm. i. xii. 5 ff.).

Bíblíoi Ístotórikai iβ' (Γένεσις, 'Εξόδος, Δευτερικόν, 'Αριθ-

mòi, Δευτέρος νόμος, Ιησούς, Κρι-
tai, 'Ρούθ, Πράξεις Βασιλέων,

Paraleiptómenai, "Εσθρας)

Bíblíoi stíxhrai e' (Ιώβ, Δαυίδ, τρεῖς Σολομοντίαι,

'Ekklysiasthès, 'Άσμα, Παρι-

μαί)

Bíblíoi prophiτíkai e'

(Oi δώδεκα—'Ωσῆ, 'Αμώς, Μιχαλας,

'Ιωήλ, 'Ιωάν, 'Αβδιας, Ναούμ,

'Αβιζακούμ, Σοφοίας, 'Αγγαίος,

Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας—Θεσαλας,

'Ieremias, 'Εκζεκήρ, Δανιήλος)

carm. ii. vii., Migne, P.G. xxxvii. 1593).

'H pevntáteuxos

(Κτίσις, "Εξόδος, Δευτικόν, 'Αριθ-
mòi, Δευτερονόμιον)

'Ιησούς

Oi Κριταί

'H 'Ρούθ

Βασιλείων α'—δ'

Παραλειπομένων α', β'

'Εσδόρα α', β'

Στιχθραί Bíblíoi e'

('Ιώβ, Ψαλμοι, τρεῖς Σολομοντίοις—

Παρομαίαι, 'Εκκλησιαστής, 'Άσμα 

φωμάτων)

Προφητηται oi δώδεκα

('Ωσῆ, 'Αμώς, Μιχαλας, 'Ιωήλ,

'Αβδιας, 'Ιωάν, Ναούμ, 'Αβιζα-

κούμ, Σοφοίας, 'Αγγαίος, Ζαχα-

ρίας, Μαλαχίας)

Προφητηται oi τέσσαρες

('Θεσαλας, 'Ιερεμίας, 'Ιεζεκήρ, Δα-

νιήλ)

Τούτοις προσεγκινοῦσι τὴν 'Εσθρα 
tines

8. Pseudo-Chrysostom (syn. script. sacr. 
praet.). Migne, P.G. lvi. 513 sqq.

Τὸ Ἴστορικῶν, ως

'H Γένεσις

'H 'Εξόδος

Τὸ Δευτερικὸν

Oi 'Αριθμοὶ

Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον

'Ιησούς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ

Oi Κριταί

'Ρούθ

Αἱ Βασιλεῖα Α'—δ'

'Εσθρας

Τὸ συμβουλευτικῶν, ως

Αἱ Παρομαίαι

'H τοῦ Σώτηρ Σοφία

'O 'Εκκλησιαστής

Τὰ 'Άσματα τῶν φωμάτων

Τὸ προφητικὸν, ως

Oi δεκαεξ' προφήτας

'Ρούθ (?)

Δανιήλ
9. Συνοψις εν ἑπτάμοις ἀπὸ Λαγαρδη, Septuagintast., ii. p. 60 f.¹

Τὰ Μωσαϊκά

α’. Τένεις

β’. Ἑξόδος

γ’. Δευτικῶν

δ’. Ἀριθμοὶ

ε’. Δευτερονόμιον

Τὰ ἔτερα

η’. Ἡσοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυή

η’. Κριταὶ

η’. Ροῦθ

Τέλος τῆς ὀκταετίου

Τὸ τετραβασιλεῖον

θ’. Βασιλείων α’

τ’. Βασιλείων β’

ια’. Βασιλείων γ’

ιβ’. Βασιλείων δ’

ιγ’. Παραλειπόμενα α’

ιδ’. Παραλειπόμενα β’

ιε’. Ἑσόρα α’

ιε’. Ἑσόρα β’

ιη’. Τωβίτ

ιθ’. Ιουδαιὸν

κ’. Ιωβ

Τὸν σολομῶντος

κα’. Σοφία

κβ’. Παραμίλαι

κγ’. Ἐκκλησιαστῆς

κδ’. Ἀσμα ἀσμάτων

Οἱ ιδ’ προφῆται

κε’. Ὀσηέ

κς’. Ἀρῶν

κκ’. Μηχαίας

κη’. Ἰωήλ

κθ’. Αβίσιον

λ’. Ἰωνᾶς

λα’. Ναοῦμ

λβ’. Αβρακόμι

λγ’. Σοφούλιας

λδ’. Ἀγγαῖος

λε’. Παχαρίας

λδ’. Μαλαχίας

Οἱ δ’ μεγάλοι προφῆται

λε’. Ἡσαῖας

λη’. Ιρεμίας

λθ’. Ἰεζεκιῆλ

μ’. Δαυίδ

Τέλος τῶν ἐξ καὶ δέκα προφητῶν

μα’. Σοφία Ἡσωῦ τοῦ Σιραχ

1 Λαγαρδη, l.c.: “ich wiederhole sie, von mir redigiert.”

Historia (xvii)
- Genesis
- Exodus
- Leviticus
- Numeri
- Deuteronomium
- Iesu Nave
- Iudicum
- Ruth
- Regnum. i—iv
  [Adiungunt plures Paralipomenon i, Iob i, Tobiae i, Esdræ ii, Iudith i, Hester i, Macchabaorum ii]

Prophæia (xvii)
- Psalmorum cl
- Osee
- Esaiae
- Ioel
- Amos
- Abdiae
- Ioniae
- Naum
- Habacuc
- Sophoniae
- Hieremiæ
- Ezechiæ
- Daniel
- Aggaei
- Zachariae
- Malachiæ

Proverbia (ii)
- Salomonis Proverbiorum
- Iesu filii Sirach
  [Adiungunt quidam libr. Sapientiae et Cantica Cantico- rum]

Dogmatica (i)
- Ecclesiastes

12. Pseudo-Athanasi syn. scv. sacr. (Migne, P.G. xxvii. 283 ff.)

Γένεσις
- Ἑζώδος
- Λευιτικόν
- Ἀριθμοὶ
- Δευτερονόμιον
- Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυὴν
- Κριταὶ
- Ῥοῦδ
- ἐβασιλευοῦν ἂ', ὃ'
- ἐβασιλεύον ἐ', ὃ'
- Παραλειπομένων ἂ', ὃ'
- Ἐσόρας ἂ', ὃ'
- Ψαλτήριον Λαβιτικόν
- Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος
- Ἐκκλησιαστὴς τοῦ αὐτοῦ
- Ἀγια μάρτιοι
- Ἰωβ

Προφήται διδάσκαλοι ἐν ἀριθμομενοι
- Ὀσή, Ἀμώς, Μίχαιας, Ἰωήλ, Ἀβ- θιδιοῦ, Ἰωάνας, Ναοῦ, Ἀμβακοῦμ, Σοφωνίας, Ἀγγαίος, Ζαχαιρίας, Μαλαχίας
- Ἔζης δὲ ἑτεροι τέσσαρες
- Ἡσαίας
- Ιερεμίας
- Ἐζεκήλ
- Δανιήλ

Ἐκτὸς δὲ τούτων εἰς πάλιν ἑτερα
- βιβλία τ.τ.λ. (as in Athanasius, but adding
  - Μακκαβαία βιβλία ὃ'
  - Πτολεμαία
  - Ψαλμοί καὶ ψωμῦ Ἀγια τοῦ καλούμενα
  - Σωσάννα)

13. Leontius (de Sectis ii.).

Τὰ ἱστορικά βιβλία (ἄθ')
- Γένεσις, Ἑζώδος, Ἀριθμοὶ, Λευιτικόν, Δευτερονόμιον, Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Ναυὴν, Κριταὶ, Ῥοῦδ, Λόγοι τῶν βασιλείων ἂ—ὁ', Παραλειπόμεναι, Ἐσόρας)


Πρώτῃ πεντάευχος, η νομοθεσία
- Γένεσις, Ἑζώδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθμοὶ, Δευτερονόμιον

Δευτέρα πεντάευχος, τὰ καλούμενα
- Γαρφεια, παρὰ τισι ᾖ Ἀγιόγραφα
- Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυὴν, Κριταὶ μετὰ
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

15. Nicephorus, Stichometria.

A. "Oσαι εις γραφαί ἐκκλησιαστη&omicron;αν καὶ κεκαονυσμέναι

α'. Γένεσις στίχ. βτ',

β'. Ἑκκόδος στίχ. βω',

γ'. Δευτικὸν στίχ. βψ',

δ'. Ἀριθμὸι στίχ. γψλ',

ε'. Δευτερονόμων στίχ. γρ',

ζ'. Ἰησοῦς στίχ. βρ',

ξ'. Κραταί καὶ Ῥοῦθ στίχ. βωυ',

η'. Βασιλείων α', β στίχ. βσμ',

θ'. Βασιλείων γ', δ' στίχ. βαγ',

ι'. Παραλειπόμενα α', β στίχ. εφ',

ια'. Ἑσδρας α', β στίχ. εφ',

ιβ'. Βιβλίος Ψαλμῶν στίχ. ερ',

ιγ'. Παροιμίαι Σολωμῶν στίχ. αψ',

ιδ'. Ἐκκλησιαστής στίχ. ψν',

ιε'. Ἄσμα δαματῶν στίχ. σπ',

ιεσ'. Ἰωβ στίχ. μω',

ιετ'. Ἡσαίας πρωφήτης στίχ. χω',

ιη'. Ἰερεμίας πρωφήτης στίχ. δ',

ιθ'. Βαροῦχ στίχ. ψ',

κ'. Ἰεζεκιήλ στίχ. δ',

κα'. Δανιήλ στίχ. β',

κβ'. Οἱ δώδεκα πρωφήται στίχ. γ',

ομοῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλίων κβ'.
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B. "Oστα ἀντιλέγοντα καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλη-
σώστεται
α'. Μακκαβαίακα γ' στιχ. β'
β'. Σοφία Σολομώντος στιχ. φρ'
γ'. Σοφία νιώ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σιράχ στιχ.
δω'
δ'. Ψαλμοὶ και ψδαλ Σολομώντος
στιχ. βρ'
e'. 'Βασιλὴς στιχ. τν'
ς'. 'Ιωνίδι στιχ. ἀψ'
ζ'. Σωσάννα στιχ. φι'
η'. Τωβίτ, δ καὶ Τωβίασ στιχ. ψ'

17. Laodicene Canons (lx.).
α'. 'Γένεσις κόσμου
β'. 'Ἐξοδος ἐς Ἀλγυπτον
γ'. 'Λευτικὸν
δ'. 'Ἁρθημοὶ
e'. 'Δευτερονῆμον
ς'. 'Ἰησοῦς Ναυὴ
ζ'. 'Κριτα, 'Ῥοῦθ
η'. 'Ἐσθήρ
θ'. 'Βασιλείων α', β'
ι'. 'Βασιλείων γ', δ'
ια'. 'Παραλειπομένων α', β'
ιβ'. 'Βασίλεις α', β'
ιγ'. 'Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν ρν'
ιδ'. 'Παρακληθὲ Σολομώντος
ιε'. 'Ἐκκλησιαστῆς
ις'. 'Ἀσµα φαµάτων
ιτ'. 'Ιωβ
ιτ'. 'Δώδεκα προφήται
ιθ'. 'Ἡρωνία
κ'. 'Ἱεροµας καὶ Βαρούχ, Ὀρῆνοι καὶ
Ἑστιοτάλα
κα'. 'Ιέσεκιήλ
κβ'. 'Δανυῆλ

18. Apostolic Canons (lxxxiv.).
Μωσῆως πέντε
(Γένεσις, 'Ἐξοδος, Δευτικὸν, 'Α-
ρθημοῖ, Δευτερονῆμον)
'Ἰησοῦς Ναυὴ
'Ῥοῦθ
Βασιλείων τέσσαρα
Παραλειπομένων δό
'Εσθήρ δό
'Ἑσθήρ
Μακκαβαῖον τρία
'Ιωβ
Ψαλτήριον
Σολομώντος τρία
(Παρακλῆς, 'Ἐκκλησιαστῆς,
Ασµα φαµάτων)
Προφητῶν δεκάδῳ ἐν
'Ḥṣαλον· ἐν
'Ἰερουλαµ ἐν
'Ιεσοῦς ἐν
'Εσθήρ ἐν
'Εξωθεν δὲ προσιτοτελεῖα μανθά-
νειν ὑμᾶν τοῦ νέου τῆς Σοφίας
τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Σιρᾶχ

19. List in Codd. Barocc. 206; B.M. Add. 17469; Coisl. 120.
Περὶ τῶν ε' βιβλίων, καὶ ὅσα τούτων
ἐκτὸς
a'. 'Γένεσις
b'. 'Ἐξοδος
c'. 'Λευτικὸν
d'. 'Ἁρθημοὶ

S. S.
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B (3) (b). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN PATRISTIC AND SYNODICAL LISTS OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

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, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum
xvi. Duodecim Prophetae
xvii—xxii. Esaias, Jeremias cum Lamentatione et Epistola, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Hester

[xxiii—xxiv. Tobias, Judith]²

2. Ruffinus (Comm. in symb. 36).
Moysi[s] quinque libri
(Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium)
Iesu Naue
Iudicum, simul cum Ruth
Regnorum iv
Paralipomenon (= Dierum liber)
Esdrae ii
Hester
Prophetarum
(Ésaïas, Ieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, xii Prophetarum liber i)
Job
Psalmi David
Solomonis[iis] 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 λο'.
² "Quibusdam autem visum est additis Tobia et Judith xxiv libros secundum numerum Graecarum literarum connumerare."
3. Augustine (de doctr. Chr. ii. 13).

[Historiae:]  [Innocent I. (ep. ad Exsuperiutum).]
Quinque Moysëos [libri]  Moysi[s] libri quinque
(Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus,  (Genesis, Exodi, Levitici, Num-
Numeri, Deuteronomium)  meri, Deuteronomii)
Iesu Naue  Iesu Nave
Judicum  Iudicium
Ruth  Regnorum libri iv
Regnorum libri iv  Ruth
Paralipomenon libri ii  Prophetarum libri xvi
Iob  Salomonis libri v
Tobias  Psalterium
Esther  Historiarum:
Iudith  Job
Machabaeorum libri ii  Tobias
Esdrae libri ii  Hester
Prophetæ:  Iudith
David liber Psalmorum  Machabaeorum libri ii
Salamonis libri iii  Esdrae libri ii
(Proverbiorum, Canticum Can-
Psalterium  proprie prophetæ
thicorum, Ecclesiastes)  (Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel,
Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus  Ezechiel)
Prophetarum xii
(Ösee, Ioel, Amos, Ab-
(Ösee, Ioel, Amos, Ab-
dias, Ionas, Michaeas,  dias, Ionas, Michaeas,
Nahum, Habacuc, So-  Nahum, Habacuc, So-
phonias, Aggaeus, Za- phonias, Aggaeus, Za-
charias, Malachias)  charias, Malachias)
Prophetææ iv maiorum volu-
minum  (Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel,
(Proprie prophetæ  Ezechiel)
Iesu Naue
Judicum
Ruth
Regum i—iv

Moysis v libri:  Genesis
Genesis
Exodus
Leviticus
Numeri
Deuteronomium
Iesu Nave
Judicum
Ruth
Regum i—iv
Paralipomenon i, ii
Psalterium

5. 1 Of the canonicity of these two books Augustine speaks with some
reserve: “de quaedam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur...qui tamen
quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt inter propheticos numerandi
sunt.”
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Item libri prophetarum numero xvi:
(Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Michas, Iohel, Abdias, Jonas, Naum, Abacuc, Sofonias, Agaeus, Zacharias, Maleachias)
Paralipomena i, ii
Psalmorum cl
Salomonis libri iii
(Proverbiorm, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum)
Liber Sapientiae filii Siracis
Alius subsecuens liber Sapientiae

Item historiarum:
Job
Tobias
Hester
Judith
Macchabaeorum libri ii

7. Isidorus (de ord. libr. s. scr.).
1. Quinque libri Moysseos
2. Iesu Nave, Iudicium, Ruth
3. Regnum i—iv, Paralipomenon i, ii, Tobiae, Esther, Judith, Esdrae, Machabaeorum libri duo
4. Prophetae: Psalmorum liber i, Salomonis libri iii (Proverbiorum, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum), Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, libri xvi Prophetarum


Libri canonici
Genesis versus IIIDCC
Exodus vers III
Numeri vers IIII
Leviticus vers IIICC
Deuteronomium vers IIDCC
Hiesu Nave vers MDCCCL
Iudicium vers MDCCCL
Fiunt libri vii vers XVIIIIC
Rut vers CCL
Regnorum liber i vers IIICC

Salomonis libri v
(Proverbia, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum)
Prophetae
(Isaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Michaeas, Joel, Abdias, Jonas, Naum, Abacuc, Sofonias, Agaeus, Zacharias, Maleachias, qui et Angelus)
Job
Tobias
Esther
Judith
Esdræ [libri] ii
Machabæorum libri ii

Regnorum liber ii vers IIICC
Regnorum liber iii vers IIDL
Regnorum liber iv vers IIICCL
Fiunt versus VIIIID
Paralipomenon liber i vers IIXL
Machabæorum liber i vers IIICC
Iob vers MDCC
Tobias vers DCCCL
Hester vers 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 ver MC
Psalmi Davitici cli ver V
Salomonis ver VID
Prophetae maiores ver XVCCCCLXX
numero IIII
Esaias ver IIIIDLXXX

Ieremias ver IIIICCCCCL
Daniel ver MCCCL
Ezechiel ver IIIICCCXL
Prophetae xii ver IIIIDCCC
Erunt omnes versus numero LXVIIIID

Versus scripturearum sanctarum
ita Genesis versus IIIID
Exodus versus IIIIDCC
Leviticum versus IIIIDCCC
Numeri versus IIIIDLCL
Deuteronomium ver. IIIICCC
Iesu Nauve ver. II
Judicium ver. II
Rud ver. CCL
Regnorum ver.
primus liber ver. IIID
secundus lib. ver. II
tertius lib. ver. IIDC
quartus lib. ver. IIICCCC
Psalmi Davitici ver. V
Proverbia ver. I IDC
Aeclesiastes DC
Cantica canticorum CCC
Sapientia vers. I
Sapientia IHU ver. IIID
XII Profetae ver. IIIICX
Ossee ver. DXXX
Amos ver. CCCCX
Micheas ver. CCCX
Joel ver. XC
Abdias ver. LXX
Ionas ver. CL
Naum ver. CXL
Ambacum ver. CLX
Sophonias ver. CXL
Aggeus vers. CX
Zacharias ver. DCLXX
Malachie ver. CC
Escales ver. IIIDC
Ieremias ver. IIIILXXX

10. Liber sacramentorum (Bobbio, cent. vi, vii).
Liber Genesis
Exodus
Leviticum
Numeri
Deuteronomium
Josue
Judicium
Libri mulierum
Ruth
Hester
Judith
Maccabeorum libri duo
Job
Thobias
Regum quattor
Prophetarum libri xvi
Daviticum v
Solomonis iii
Esdra i
Fiunt libri Veteris numero xlili
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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’ (ἦλθεν και προκλητές) is changed into ‘Omissions’ (Παραλειπόμενα), 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 Παραλειπόμενον, ‘omitted books,’ as in some lists.
sion itself. Thus *Genesis* appears to come from *Gen.* ii. 4 αὐτή ἡ βιβλίον γενέσεως οὖδανον καὶ γῆς, *Exodus* from *Ex.* xix. 1 τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν νυών Ἰσραήλ ἐκ γῆς Ἀιγύπτου, *Numbers* from *Num.* i. 2 κατὰ ἀριθμοὺς εἰς ὄνοματος, *Deuteronomy* from *Deut.* xvii. 18 γράφει αὐτῷ τὸ δευτερονόμιον τούτο εἰς βιβλίον, *Ecclesiastes* from *Eccl.* i. 1 ἰηματα ἐκκλησιαστῶν.

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 βιβλίῳ ψαλμῶν, xiii. 33 ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ, Rom. ix. 25 ἐν τῷ Ὀσῆς λέγει4. Philo uses Γένεσις, Δευτικὼν or Δευτική βιβλίος, Δευτερονόμιον, Βασιλείαι, Παροιμίαι, but his practice is not quite constant; e.g. he calls Exodus ἞ξαγωγὴ; Deuteronomy is sometimes Ἐπινομίς, and Judges ἤ τῶν Κριμάτων5 βιβλίος. Similar titles occur in the Mishna6, whether suggested by the Alexandrian Greek, or independently coined by the Palestinian Jews; thus *Genesis* is בֵּית בֵּית, *Numbers* דְּתֵית דְּתֵית, *Proverbs* הָדְקָק הָדְקָק, *Lamentations* הָנִּיר.

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 נְבוֹתִים הָנִּיר.

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. ii.

4 So in Cohn-Wendland’s edition (iii. 4, 57, 230); in ii. 271 this title is ascribed to Moses, although Ἠξαγωγὴ does not like ἐξόδος occur in the Alexandrian version of the book. Ἦ Ἠξαγωγὴ was also the title of the Hellenist Ezekiel’s poem on the Exodus (see below, p. 371).

5 Cf. the change from נְבוֹתִים to בֵּית בֵּית.


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.
Cf. Hieron. *Pro! Gal.*: "tertius sequitur Samuel, quem nos Regnorum primum et secundum dicimus; quartus Malachim, id est Regum, qui tertio et quarto Regnorum volumine continetur... septicimus Dabre atiamim, id est, 'Verba dierum,' quod significantiuis Chronicon totius divinæ historiae possimus 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*: Ἰσραήλ ὁ Ναβ, ὁ τοῦ Ναβ, *Judges*: Κριταί τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, αἱ τῶν κριτῶν πράξεις. *Chronicles*: Παραλειπομένων τῶν βασιλείων Ἰουδα. *Psalms*: Δαυίδ προφήτων καὶ βασιλέως μέλος. When Nehemiah is separated from Ezra its title is: τὰ περὶ Νεείου or λόγοι Ν. νῦν Ἀχαλία. A few further forms may be gleaned from the patristic lists. As an alternative for Paraleipomenon the Apostolic Canons give τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν ἡμερῶν, while Ezra is known to Hilary as sermones dierum Esdrae. The Psalter is sometimes βιβλος Παλμῶν, liber Psalmorum, or Ψαλτήριον Δαβίδικόν, Psalmi Davidis regis, Psalterium Davitiænum. For Ἄσμα ἄσματων we have occasionally ἄσμα ἄσματων—a form rejected by Origen (ap. Eus. H.E. vi. 25 ὦ γὰρ, ὥς ὑπολαμβάνουσι τινες, "Ἄσματα ἄσματων"), 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 oi δώδεκα οἱ δεκαδοῦ, τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν μία βίβλος; τὸ δώδεκαπροφήτων, prophetae xii; the greater, oi τέσσαρες, prophetae iv, prophetae iv maiorum voluminum, or simply maiores; when the two collections are merged into one they become oi δεκαέξ or oi ἐκκατάδεκα, τὸ ἐκκατάδεκαπροφήτων, prophetae 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 another." 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.
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The Massora recognised, however, certain subdivisions within the second and third groups; the Prophets were classed as Former (תנינא), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; and Latter (תנינא), and among the ‘Latter’ the Twelve minor Prophets formed a single collection. Similarly ‘the five Rolls’ (תולにくい), 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 (I f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ’ αὐτούς ηκολουθηκότων: 6 f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων: 14 f. δὲ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητείαι 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 Μωσείου καὶ τοῖς προφηταῖς 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 Prophets. 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 groups (§ 3 νόμους, καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν, καὶ ἰμνους, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὡς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναντόνται καὶ τελειοῦνται).

Only the first of the three Palestinian groups remains undis-

---

1 So already in Sir. xlix. 10 τῶν ἰδίων προφητῶν.
2 See Ryle, Canon of the O.T., p. 165 f.
3 Unless we omit the comma after ἰμνους and regard ἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα as = the Hagiographa; cf. Joseph. c. Ap. as quoted below, p. 220.
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turbed 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, including the Mosaic Pentateuch; (2) poetical; (3) prophetical. Epiphanius, followed by John of Damascus, endeavours to combine this grouping with a system of pentateuchs—(1) legal, (2) poetical, (3) historical, (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 (δώδεκα την Ἕβρην καὶ τὰ μεν Ἰστορικά ταῦτα).
3 The term γραφεία (γραφεία) or ἀγνιγραφα is transferred to this group.
pherical—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' (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 prophetical books is less certain. Codex B places the poetical books first, whilst in Cod. Σ 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, Amphiloctius, 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 παραπερικά), but he classed the Psalter among them.
Chronicles, were originally single books, 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); 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: οἱ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἄσμη-φόνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τὸς εἶκος βιβλία...καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἔστι Μωυσέως...οἱ μετὰ Μωυσῆν προφητεύσαν...συνε-γραφαὶ ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις· οἱ δὲ λοιπὰ τέσσαρες ὑμνοὺς εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑποθέκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. He is followed by Origen ap. Eus. I.c. οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ τὸς ἐνδιάθέκους βιβλίους ἡς Ἑβραῖοι παραδίδουσιν, ὡς δὲ ἀριθμὸς τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς στοιχείων ἐστὶν· and Cyril. Hier. catech. iv. 33 ἀναγινώσκε τὰς θείας γραφάς, τὰς εἰκόνι δύο βιβλίους 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 Μ and Θ, and in Μ 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 libris 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 (א, ב, ג, ד, ו). 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, αὐτάι εἰσιν αἱ εἰκοσι ἑπτὰ βιβλία αἱ ἓκ θεοῦ δοθεῖσαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, εἰκοσι δύο δὲ ὡς τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς στοιχεῖα τῶν Εβραίων γραμμάτων ἀριθμοῦμενα διὰ τὸ διπλοῦσθαι δέκα βιβλία εἰς πέντε λεγομένα: dial. Tim. et Ag. (ed. Conybeare, p. 66), αὐτάι αἱ βιβλία αἱ θεάτρυνσιν καὶ ἐνδιάβε- 
τοι, κσ᾽ μὲν οὖσαι, κβ᾽ δὲ ἀριθμοῦμενα 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 literature, and the Canon is known in Jewish writings by the name כוב, "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 invenies." 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 xxviii 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 Hagiographa scriptitent et libros hos in suo putent numero supputan- dos 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 Palestine, 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 i—4 Regn. as two.

2 Zalin 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 op. Eus. H. E. iv. 26 ἑπείδη μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων ἐβουλήθης ακριβείαν, πόσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ὅποια τὴν τάξιν εἶχον...ἀνελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν καὶ ἔως τοῦ τόπου ἐνθα ἕκαρτο ἐρεύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη...ἐκειμένα σοι.
The next list comes from Origen. It belongs to his commentary on the first Psalm, which was written at Alexandria, i.e. before A.D. 231. The books included in it are expressly said to be the twenty-two of the Hebrew canon (εἰς δὲ αἱ έκκοσι δύο βιβλίαν καθ’ Εβραίους αἴδε). Yet among them are the first book of Esdras 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, ἕω δὲ τούτων ἔστι τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά. Athanasius takes up the expression, but names other books—the two Wisdoms, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. 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 (εἰς δὲ καὶ ἀλλαὶ παρ’ αὐτοῖς βιβλία ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ...
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

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 Esdras as canonical, he repeats the verdict of Epiphanius upon the two Wisdoms, 'Ἐνάρετοι μὲν καὶ καλαί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοῦνται.

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 Ruffinus 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 xliv libris Testamenti Veteris terminatur auctoritas"), 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 fænd. 4.
2 Like Origen, he explains that they form together but a single book (τοῦ Ἐσδρα αὐτὸς εἰς μίαν συναπτόμενα γραμματίαν).
3 The non-canonical books (τὰ ἐξω) are however carefully distinguished from real ἀποκρυφα 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 Rome\(^1\) places the story of Judith side by side with that of Esther; the Wisdom of Sirach is cited by Barnabas\(^2\) and the Didache\(^3\), and Tobit by Polycarp\(^4\); Clement of Alexandria\(^5\) and Origen appeal to Tobit and both the Wisdows, to which Origen adds Judith\(^6\). 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 \(\&\), 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.
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 roll. 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 rolls. The rolls were kept in boxes (κισταί, κισταί, καψαι, κασταί)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 Ibid. 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 it\(^1\). 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, Ezekiel\(^8\). 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, Ezra\(^3\).

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 Numbers\(^4\). The sequence is broken in some lists after Ruth (Laod., Epiph. 1), or even after Joshua

---

(Epiph. 3') 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. 8 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, Ebedjesu 2). (2) The internal order of the δωδεκαπρώφητον in most of the MSS. and catalogues 3 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 arrangement 4.” (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, Cassiodorus, 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, Cassiodorus), 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&N, 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).
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 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, Esther. 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.


CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF THE HEBREW CANON.

The books which are common to the Hebrew Bible and the Alexandrian Version 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.

1. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. xxxi. 46^b—52</td>
<td>Gen. xxxi. 48^a, 47, 51, 52^a, 48^b, 49, 50^a, 52^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, xxxv. 16—21</td>
<td>, xxxv. 16+21, 17—20, 22^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. xx. 13—15</td>
<td>Exod. xx. 14, 15, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, xxxv. 8—11, 12, 15—16, 17, 18, 19^b</td>
<td>, xxxv. 9—12, 17, 13—14, 16, 19, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
**Books of the Hebrew Canon.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod. xxxvi. 8b—40</td>
<td>Exod. xxxix. 1—31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 1—2</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvi. 8—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 8—6</td>
<td>&quot; 35—38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 7—21</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 9—23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 1—17</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvi. 1—24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 18—20</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvi. 20—34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 21—24</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 1—7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 25</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 27</td>
<td>&quot; xxx. 30—32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. I—10</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 24—31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 11</td>
<td>&quot; xxxix. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 13—23</td>
<td>&quot; 33—43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xl. 6b—8, 10—25, 26, 27—32</td>
<td>&quot; xl. 8—10, 12—27, 29, 33, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. i. 24—37</td>
<td>Num. i. 26—37, 24—25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 22—26</td>
<td>&quot; vi. 22, 23, 27, 24, 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxvi. 15—47</td>
<td>&quot; xxvi. 19—27, 15—18, 44—47, 28—43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. ix. 3—33</td>
<td>Josh. viii. 30—33, ix. 3—27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xix. 47—48</td>
<td>&quot; xix. 48, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regn. iv. 17, 18, 19</td>
<td>1 Kings iv. 18, 19, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 20—21, 22—24</td>
<td>&quot; 7—8, 2—4, 9—14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 25—30</td>
<td>&quot; v. 15—30, 32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; v. 1—16, 17</td>
<td>&quot; v. 31—32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 2—3</td>
<td>&quot; vi. 37—38, 2—3, 14, 4 —10, 15—36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 4—5, 6—7, 8, 9—15, 16—34</td>
<td>&quot; vii. 13—18, 21, 19—20, 23—24, 26, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vii. 1—6, 7, 8—9, 10—11, 12—13</td>
<td>&quot; vii. 27—51, 1—12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vii. 14—37, 38—50</td>
<td>&quot; ix. 15, 17—19, 20—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; x. 23—24a, 24b, 25</td>
<td>&quot; x. 25—26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 20—29</td>
<td>&quot; v. 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30</td>
<td>&quot; x. 27—29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31—33</td>
<td>&quot; xi. 4, 3, 7, 5, 8, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xi. 3—8</td>
<td>&quot; xx. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xx. xxi</td>
<td>&quot; Psalms x. 1—18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms ix. 22—39</td>
<td>&quot; xi.—cxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; x.—cxii</td>
<td>&quot; cxiv. 1—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiii. 1—8</td>
<td>&quot; cxv. 1—4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiii. 9—12</td>
<td>&quot; cxvi. 1—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiv</td>
<td>&quot; cxvi. 10—19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxv</td>
<td>&quot; cxvii.—cxlvi. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxvi.—cxlvi</td>
<td>&quot; cxlvi. 12—20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 $G =$ the Greek text, and $G^{A, B,}$ etc. = the Greek text as given in cod. A, cod. B, or as the case may be; $M=$ 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 J". $M$ is loosely put together, and v. 50b, which $G$ omits, is hardly consistent with vv. 48, 52. In $G$ 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 $G$ appears to be due to a desire to locate Eder (Γαθερ) between Bethel and Bethlehem; see art. Eder in Hastings' D. B. (i. p. 644).

Exod. xx. 13—15. $G^B$ and $M$ represent here two distinct traditions with regard to the order of the Decalogue. For the order followed by $G^B$ see Lc. xviii. 20, Rom. xiii. 9, Jas. ii. 11, Philo de x. orac. 10, de spec. legg. iii. 2; that of $G^M$ is supported by Mt., Mc., and Josephus. In Deut. v. 17—19 cod. B wavers between the two, but cod. A consistently agrees with $M^2$.

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 future." But whilst in c. xxxv. 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 Pentateuch."
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.

**Ornaments of the Ministers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek (G)</th>
<th>Hebrew (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephod (xxxvi. 9—12)</td>
<td>Ark (xxxvii. 1—9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyx stones (xxxvi. 13—14)</td>
<td>Table (xxxvii. 10—16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastplate (xxxvi. 15—29)</td>
<td>Candlestick (xxxvii. 17—24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe of Ephod (xxxvi. 30—34)</td>
<td>Altar of incense (xxxvii. 25—29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen vestments (xxxvi. 35—37)</td>
<td>Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 1—7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown plate (xxxvi. 38—40)</td>
<td>Laver (xxxviii. 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structure of the Tabernacle.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek (G)</th>
<th>Hebrew (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hangings (xxxvi. 8—19)</td>
<td>Court (xxxviii. 9—20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards (xxxvi. 20—34)</td>
<td>Furniture of the Tabernacle and its Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veils (xxxvi. 35—38)</td>
<td>Ark (xxxvii. 1—9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structure of the Tabernacle and Court.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek (G)</th>
<th>Hebrew (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hangings (xxxvii. 1—2)</td>
<td>Table (xxxvii. 10—16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veils (xxxvii. 3—6)</td>
<td>Candlestick (xxxvii. 17—24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court (xxxvii. 7—18)</td>
<td>Altar of incense (xxxvii. 25—29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Furniture of the Tabernacle, &c.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek (G)</th>
<th>Hebrew (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ark (xxxviii. 1—8)</td>
<td>Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 1—7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table (xxxviii. 9—12)</td>
<td>Laver (xxxviii. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick (xxxviii. 13—17)</td>
<td>Court (xxxviii. 9—20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 22—24)</td>
<td>Furniture of the Tabernacle and its Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Incense (xxxviii. 25—26)</td>
<td>Ark (xxxvii. 1—9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver (xxxviii. 27)</td>
<td>Table (xxxvii. 10—16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this comparison that both G and M 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 P\(^1\)." 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 contexts\(^2\).

**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 \(\text{G}\) and \(\text{M}\). In both lists \(\text{M}\) places Gad third, and Asher eleventh; whereas according to \(\text{G}\) 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 \(\text{G}\) is to bring Gad into close proximity to Asher, a position which this tribe occupies in i. 5—15 (\(\text{G}\) and \(\text{M}\)). For this there may have been genealogical reasons; see Gen. xxx. 10 ff., xlix. 19.

**C. vi. 22 ff.** Here \(\text{M}\) obviously has the simpler and more natural order, and \(\lambda\varepsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\vartheta\varepsilon\alpha\iota\rho\omega\varsigma\) at the end of \(v. 23\) seems to shew that the Greek order, though supported by \(\text{BA}\), 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 \(\text{G}\) 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. \(\text{M}\) "involves a geographical difficulty, for Ebal lies considerably to the north

---

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 thither". 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 G² and M respectively as follows:

**GB**

Provision for the royal table (iv. 20—23).
Solomon's power (iv. 24).
His wisdom (iv. 25—30).
His marriage (iv. 31).
His wife's dowry (iv. 32 ff.).
His negotiations with King Hiram (v. 1—12).
His corvée of workmen (v. 13—17).
Foundations of the Temple laid (vi. 1—5).
Dimensions of the Temple (vi. 6 f.).

**M**

Solomon's marriage (iii. 1).
Provision for the royal table (v. 2 f., 7 f.).
The King's power (v. 4).
His wisdom (v. 9—14).
His negotiations with King Hiram (v. 15—25).
His corvée of workmen (v. 27—32).
Foundations of the Temple laid (vi. 1).
Dimensions of the Temple (vi. 6).
Details of the building (vi. 2, 7, 36).

¹ Driver, Intr. p. 100.

² Cf. infra, p. 244.
Details of the building (vi. 8—34).
Work of Hiram the artist (vii. 1—37).
Building of the royal palaces (vii. 38—50).

Building of the royal palaces (vii. 1—12).
Work of Hiram the artist (vii. 12—51).
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: (i) 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, GB 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, GB 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 GB has been translated from a recension of the book earlier than that which is preserved in the Massoretic text.

C. x. 23—33. The text of GB, I. uc. 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 Kings." Under these circumstances it is not surprising that some of these notices occupied another

2 Intr. p. 181.
place in the text which was before the Alexandrian translator. C. v. 1\textsuperscript{a}, which in the Greek order is x. 30, belongs in \textit{B} to another similar collection of loosely-connected paragraphs. The arrangement followed by \textit{G}\textsuperscript{B} is perhaps not materially better, but it probably represents an earlier stage in the formation of the book.

C. xi. 3—8. Here \textit{G}\textsuperscript{B}, \textit{Luc.} presents a text which differs from \textit{A} and \textit{M} both in order and in form. A comparison of \textit{G}\textsuperscript{B} with \textit{A} and \textit{M} will be found to be instructive; the latter is diffuse and repeats itself unnecessarily (3 ἢκλιναν γυναῖκες αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ... 4 αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτοῦ ἐξεκλίναν τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ... 5 ἐπορεύθη Σαλωμὼν ὁπίσω τῆς Ἀστάρτης... 7 τότε ὤκοδομήσει Σ. ὕψηλάν... τῷ Ἀστάρτῃ); the former presents the facts\textsuperscript{1} briefly and in a logical sequence. Here as elsewhere in this book Cod. A represents the Hexaplaric Greek, and not the original lxx.\textsuperscript{2}

Cc. xx., xxii. The relative order of these chapters is reversed in \textit{M}, which justifies the change by prefacing the story of Naboth with the words ἄνα κατῆρα τὸν ἱδίον. “The dislocation may have been due to the desire to bring the prophecy of Ahab’s death nearer to the account of its occurrence\textsuperscript{3}.” Obviously wrong as the present Hebrew order is, Cod. A has adopted it, interpolating the inapposite ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταύτα, 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.—cxlvi.**

Throughout the greater part of the Psalter \textit{G} and \textit{M}

\textsuperscript{1} B however omits the important statement of v. 3\textsuperscript{a}, which comes “from the older narrative” (Driver).

\textsuperscript{2} See Field \textit{ad loc.}, and cf. Silberstein, \textit{über den Ursprung der im cod. Alex. u. Vat. des dritten Königsbuches...überlieferten Textgestalt} (Giessen, 1893).

\textsuperscript{3} C. F. Burney, \textit{I.e.}
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 one. Many Hebrew MSS. join Psalms cxiv., cxv., 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 150.

**Proverbs xxiv.—xxxii.**

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. i°) or the third (xxii. i—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. i—xxix. 21).
Words of Agur (xxx. i—33).

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.
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Words of Lemuel (xxiv. 69—77).  
Proverbs of Solomon (xxv. 1—xxix. 27).  
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 work. Moreover he has failed to understand the headings of the two sections attributed to Agur and Lemuel, 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.—lii. A glance at the table which stands near the beginning of this chapter will shew that the section c. xxv. 15—xlvi. 5 (א) answers in a general way to c. xxxii. 1—lii. 35 (ג), whilst c. xlvi. 1—lii. 64 (א) is represented, though not without considerable interruptions of the present Hebrew order, by c. xxv. 14—xxxii. 44 (ג). Speaking roughly these two sections have exchanged places in the Greek text. In ג the prophecies against the nations precede the parable of the intoxicating cup (xxv. 15 ff. = xxxii. 1 ff.); in א 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 ל, 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. iii; Toy, Proverbs, p. xxxiii.
3 Cf. Origen ad Afric. 4 πολλά δὲ τοιαύτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ῥημαίῳ κατανόησα- 
μεν, ἐν γὰρ πολλῶν μετάθεσιν καὶ ἐναλλάγῃς τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευονόμ- 
ων εὐρόμεν.

S. S.
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 M, 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 Ezekiel". A full examination of the context may be seen in Cornill, 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.

1. 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 (cp. ad African. § 3 καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς ἀγίως βιβλίως εὑρομεν τὴ μὲν πλείονα παρ’ ήμῖν κείμενα ἡ παρ’ Ἑβραίως, τὴ δὲ λειποντα); and the Hexapla, as we have seen, 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.
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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 (διέλθωμεν eis to πέδιον), which are wanting in the Hebrew Bible. The supplementary chapters of Exodus are on the whole shorter in ℶ than in ℶ; 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 ℶ into eight, thus:

[εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανῷ, ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ,
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ νῦν θεοῦ;]
εὐφράνθητε, ἐθνη, μετὰ τοὺς λαοὺς αὐτοὺς,
[kαὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ;]
ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται,
[kαὶ ἐκδικήσει] καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἔχθροῖς,
[kαὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσεις;]
καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ [Κύριος] τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ.

There is nothing in ℶ 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 Torah, there are in the last four chapters several important contexts in which \( G \) and \( \overline{M} \) differ by defect or excess.\(^2\)

C. xix. 47—48 (\( \overline{M} \)). The order of these verses is reversed in \( G \), so as to bring the words \( \alpha\nu\tau\eta \eta \kappa\lambda\iota\rho\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota \alpha \kappa\tau\lambda \) 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. translators."\(^3\)

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. 14.\(^5\).

---

1 See G. A. Smith in Hastings' D. B. ii. p. 784.
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.
I Samuel. (I Regn.).

C. ii. 9, 10. The closing stanza of this hymn, like that of the Song of Moses, is presented by G in a modified and expanded form. Vv. 8 c, 9 a are omitted in G, which substitutes διδοῦς εὐχὴν...δικαίου ("apparently an attempt to accommodate the Song more closely to Hannah’s position"), 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:—

1 Regn. ii.  
    ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει...ὁ δυνατός ἐν τῇ δυνάμει...τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαίοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.

Jer. ix.  
    ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ...ὁ ἱερός ἐν τῇ ἴσχυί...ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἐλέος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαίοσύνην 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 (καὶ ἠρρέθη ἡ γῆ ἐνῶπιον τοῦ Κυρίου). If so, the Song has been inserted in G and M at different points in the narrative; 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 G.

Cc. xvii—xviii. This is the most important of the contexts in which G differs from G 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 Kuenen, the Greek translator, or the scribe of the archetype followed by Cod. B, has deliberately

1 Driver, Samuel, p. 20.
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. translators." Driver 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, 92. C. xxiii. 11—12. Here G B omits by homoeoteleuton the Heb. from רָעָנִים (v. 11) to רְוֵי (v. 12). But it also omits בֶּן הָנַו (v. 11), and Wellhausen conjectures with probability that εἴ διόκλεισθησαν was wanting in the original form of the LXX. 2

1 Kings (3 Regn.).

In this book G B contains a large quantity of additional matter, of varying character and worth.

2 1 Samuel, p. 117.
3 Cf. Field ad loc. 4 See H. P. Smith, Samuel, p. 212.
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 (M), h = v. 16, i—k = x. 23 ff., l—o = ii. 8—9. Similarly, ii. 46 a = iv. 20 (M), b = v. 2 (M), c = iii. 1 (M), d = ix. 18 (M), e = iv. 22—23, f = iv. 24, g = v. 5 (M), h = ii. 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. (G²) omits viii. 12, 13, which in cod. A are thus supplied from Aquila¹: τότε εἰπεν Σαλωμῶν Κύριος εἰπεν τοῦ σκηνώσαι εἰ γνώφη. οἰκοδόμησα οἶκον κατοικητηρίων σου, ἔδρασμα τῆς καθέδρας σου αἰῶνος. But after v. 53 G gives the substance of these words in a poetical form which is expressly attributed to an older source:

τότε ἐλάλησεν Σ. υπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου ὃς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαι αὐτόν Ἡλιον ἐγνώρισεν (Luc., ἔστησεν) ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος· εἰπεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐκ γνώφου (A, ἐν γνώφῳ)· οἰκοδόμησαν οἰκόν μου, οἶκον ἐκ πρεπῇ (A, ἐν πρεπῇ) σαῦτο, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ κανώνησος. οὐκ ἰδοῦ αὐτὴ γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς φῶς;

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 βιβλίων τῆς φῶς from which it came is doubtless none other than the Book of Jashar (Ἱσχαριώτης, read as Ἰσχαρίωτης)³. Here G has preserved

1 Cf. Field ad loc.
2 See Field ad loc., who quotes from cod. 243, ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἔξαπλω παρὰ μνῆμοι φέρεται τοῖς ο'.
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 Μ has been first misplaced and then partly lost.

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. (Μ).

The parallels are xii. 24 a=xi. 43, xiv. 21—22; b=xi. 26—28; c=xi. 40; d=f=xi. 43b; xii. 2—5 (Μ); g—n=xiv. 1—20 (Μ); n—z=xii. 3—24.

But the passage is no mere cento of verses to be found elsewhere either in G or Μ; 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 Solomon.” 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 Μ 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. 240). 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 Lucian.

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 \( \text{G}^a \). Lucian, who agrees with \( \text{G}^a \) 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 \( \text{M} \) it finds a place only at the end (iii. 1—3). In this instance, however, \( \text{G}^a, \text{Luc} \) agrees with \( \text{G}^b \) 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 \( \text{G}^b \), 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 \( \text{M} \), and only in part assimilated to \( \text{G}. \)

2 Esdras xxi, xxii. (Neh. xi, xii.). The lists of princes and Levites are much shortened in \( \text{G}^b \), which omits altogether xxii. 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 \( \text{G} \) and \( \text{M} \) 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.) + $\psi$αλμός. So xiii. (xiv.), xxiv. (xxv.), xliii. (xliiv.), lxxx. (lxxxi.).
xxiii. (xxiv.) + τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου.
xxvi. (xxvii.) + πρὸ τοῦ χριστην.α.
xxviii. (xxix.) + εἶς τῶν τέλος.
xxix. (xxx.) + ἐκστάσεως.
xxxii. (xxxiii.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
xxxvii. (xxxviii.) + περὶ σαββάτου.
xlii. (xliii.) + ψαλμὸς τῷ Δανείδ (cod. A.).
xlvi. (xlvii.) + δευτέρα σαββάτου.
xlv. (xlvi.) + αὐτοκλήσις.
xlvi. (xlvii.) + τῷ Δανείδ (om. φόδης).
xlix. (lx.) + εἶς τῷ Σώσαί με Κύριον.
lx. (lxxi.) + τῷ Δανείδ, νιῶν ἵωναδόβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωσθέντων.
lxxv. (lxxvi.) + πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσοῦρον.
lxxix. (lxxx.) + ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦρον.
xc. (cxi.). Αἰῶνος φόδης τῷ Δανείδ.
xcii. (cxiium). Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτι κατφίκισατ αὐτὸν.
xciiii. (xciv.). Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δανείδ, τετράδι σαββάτου.
xciv. (xcv.). Αἰῶνος φόδης τῷ Δανείδ.
xcv. (xcvi.). Ὅτι ὁ οἶκος οἰκοδομεῖται μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν.
φόδη τῷ Δανείδ.
xcvi. (xcvii.). Τῷ Δανείδ, ὧτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται.
xcvii. (xcviii.) + τῷ Δανείδ.
xcviii. (xcix.). Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δανείδ.
xciiii. (cv.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
cv. (cv.). Ἀλληλουία: so cv., cvi. (cvi., cvii.), cxiii. (cxiv., cxv.), cxiv. (cxvii.) 1—9, cvxi. (cxvii.), cxvii. (cxviiii.), cxxv. (cxxxvi.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the equivalent of a final οἰκοδομεῖσθαι in the M.T. of the preceding Psalm].
cx. (cxi.). Ἀλληλουία: so cxiiii., cxiii. (cxiii., cxiv.), cxxiv. (cxxxv.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the equivalent of an opening οἰκοδομεῖς in the M.T. of the Psalm].
cxv. (cxvi. io—19). Ἀλληλουία. So cxvii. (cxvii.).
cxxxvi. (cxxxvii.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
Books of the Hebrew Canon.

251

cxxxvii. (cxxxviii.) + Ζαχαρίου Δ (-πιάς Τ).
cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) + Ζαχαρίου (κωδ. Α.) + έν τῇ διασπορᾷ (Ας Τ).
cxlii. (cxliii.) + ὁτε αὐτῶν ὁ νῦν καταδώκει (κατεδίωξεν Α').
cxliii. (cxliv.) + πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ.

cxli. (cxlvi.) Αλληλουία. 'Αγγαίον καὶ Ζαχαρίου (Heb. Ἰερώνυμος).

As cxli. but 'Αλλ. is here represented in Μ both at the end of the preceding Psalm and at the beginning of Ps. cxliii.

cxl. 'Αλληλουία. In Μ at the end of cxlviii. and the beginning of cxlix.

On the questions raised by the Greek titles see Neubauer in Studia Bibl. ii. p. 1 ff., Driver, Instr. 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 μᾶ πασαβάτων, δευτέρα σ., τετάρτη σ. 1, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου (cf. Mc. xv. 42)), and in those which attribute others to the time of the Return (Ζαχαρίου, 'Αγγαίου) or to the Dispersion (εἰ στῇ διασπορᾷ). On the other hand some of the Greek titles appear to be fanciful (πρὸ τοῦ χριστήνα, 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. 10 b, cxxxix. (cxl.) 4 b, ix. (x.) 17 a, Isa. lix. 7, 8, Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 1 a, 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. lxxxi. 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 ἰδιώγραφος)². The MSS. of the LXX. contain after Ps. cl. a Psalm which bears the title Οὖνος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιώγραφος εἰς Δανείδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἄρμον, ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιάδ, O. L., hic psalmus sibi proprium scriptum 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 καυχήσεως τῆς ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀπαγγέλλοντες λόγους εἰς кβ' καὶ κσ', λη...να': § 25 τῷ ἐκλεξαμένῳ κυρίῳ δίδονε δόξαν ψάλλε καὶ σῦ τὸν ῥνα' ὅδιον ὄντα τοῦ Δανείδ); 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, φησίν γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Μικρὸς ἡμῶν, κτλ.). Moreover the scribe of Cod. Ν regarded it as a part of the Psalter, for his subscription runs ψαλμοὶ ΔΑΔ ῬΝ. In cod. A, however, it is carefully excluded from the Psalter proper (subscr. ψαλμοὶ ῬΝ καὶ ἰδιώγραφος Α'); and the judgement of the Laodicene canon (βιβλος ψαλμῶν ἐκατὸν πεντήκοντα) is upheld by the title which in all the MSS.

² Cf. Oeconomus, iii. p. 634 f.
pronounces this ‘autograph’ (ἰοὐγραφὸς) work of David to be εἴσωθεν οἵ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἀρθροῦ, ἢς τῶν ρ' ψαλμῶν.

This Psalm is clearly based on 1 Kings xvi. 7, 11, 26, 43, 51; 2 Kings vi. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 26; Ps. lxxxviii. 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 φδαι (cantica). The following table shews the sources and order of those which are given by codd. A, R, T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deut. xxxii. 1—43.</td>
<td>Deut. xxxii. 1—44.</td>
<td>7. Magnificat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Regn. ii. 1—10.</td>
<td>1 Regn. ii. 1—10.</td>
<td>8. Isa. xxxviii. 10—20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ion. ii. 3—10.</td>
<td>Ion. ii. 3—10.</td>
<td>10. Dan. iii. 26—45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hab. ii. 1—19.</td>
<td>Hab. iii. 1—19.</td>
<td>11. Magnificat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Isa. xxxviii. 10—20.</td>
<td>Magnificat.</td>
<td>12. ” ” 52—56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prayer of Manasseh1.</td>
<td>Dan. iii. 52—90.</td>
<td>13. Benedictus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>” ” 52—88.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Morning Hymn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Magnificat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nunc dimitiss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Benedictus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Morning Hymn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The προεοχή Μανάσση (so Cod. A; Cod. T. πρ. Μανάσση υἱὸς Ἐξεκλω) 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 respectively. 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, dpp. 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 ὁργίσθησαν, cant. ἐρωτήσασαν: Deut. xxxii. 7 γενεάς γενεάς, cant. γενεάς γενεάς, γενεάς γενεάς: 18 γενεάς γενεάς, cant. ποιήσατα, const. pοιήσατα: 1 Regn. ii. 10a φρονίσει, cant. σοφία: 10b ἀκρα γῆς, cant. +δίκαιος δῶν. 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 books seems to have been already made when it was translated into Greek, for though the Greek codices have nothing to answer to the headings ἡ σεβασμός, χαίρε, 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. i. 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, Schürer, iii. 337 f.: and for the text with an apparatus, Fritzsche, V. T. Gr. libr. Apocr., pp. xiv. sqq., 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, Creeds, p. 263).

2 A pre-Christian arrangement, as Hippolytus already knew (hypoth. in Psalms, τὸ ψαλτήριον εἷς πέντε δειλίν βιβλία οί Εβραίοι). 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 Proverbi en. 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. 27a—b, vi. 8a—c) appear to be of Greek, perhaps early Christian, origin; others have been collected from various contexts (e.g. iii. 16 = Isa. xlv. 23a + Prov. xxi. 26; xxvi. 11 = Sir. iv. 21), or are fragments of the book which have been accidentally inserted twice (iii. 22a = iii. 8, 28c = 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 πλείστα τε δοσα διὰ μέσου δλου του 'Ιωβ παρ’ ἑβραίοις μὲν κεῖται παρ’ ἡμῖν δὲ οὕχι, καί πολλάκις μὲν ἔπη τέσσαρα ἢ τρία ἢ ἄρθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δεκαεννέα καὶ δεκαέξ (φορ. leg. ἐννέα καὶ ἕξ 1). 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 Job 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 uncial, 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 Μ.

Dr Hatch 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 Hellenist who intended his version for general reading, rather than for use in the synagogue. 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 scrunched 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 (χρόνον ...πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος...λέγων Ιδοὺ ἀναμένω κτλ.)

The two notes at the end of the Greek Job (xliii. 17a, b—e) scarcely profess to belong to the book. The first (γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἀναστησοῦσθαι μεθ' δύν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησον) may be either a Pharisaic or a Christian gloss, intended to balance the ἐτελευτήσεως Ἰωβ of the previous hemistich, and arising out of

2 Burkitt, O. L. and Itala, p. 8.
3 Essays, p. 214 ff.
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., vol. i. pt. ii. p. 1723).
Beyond the second note, which professes to come from an Aramaic source (ὡς ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βιβλίου\(^1\)), confuses Job (יִבְּשָׁב) with the Edomite king Jobab (יִבְּשָׁב) (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 (praep. ev. ix. 25). From a comparison of this extract with the note attached to Job, Freudenthal was led to ascribe the note to Aristeas\(^2\). Beyond the geographical description of Uz (ἐπὶ τοῖς όριοι τῆς Ἰδομεναίας 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 book\(^3\). The Greek additions are distributed through the book in contexts as long as average chapters\(^4\). 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—xiii. 6 = A, xiii. i—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 “Εκ τῆς Σ. β. weist doch auf einen Midrasch oder ein Targum hin” (Dillmann, Ἱσόβ, p. 361).
2 Schürer\(^3\), iii. p. 311.
3 Cf. Origen, Ad Afric. 3 ἐκ τῆς Ἑσθήρ οὐτε ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου εἰκῆ οὐτε ἡ τῆς Ἑσθήρ...παρ’ Ἐβραίοις φέρονται’ ἀλλ’ οὔδε αἱ ἐπιστολαι’ ἀλλ’ οὔδε ἡ τῷ Ἀμαλαί ἐπὶ καθαρέσει τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐλθον γεγραμμένη, οὔδε ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου.
4 In the Cambridge LXX. they are distinguished by the Roman capitals Α—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; e 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 (ʼEσθηρ, 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 Φρουραί (Φρουραία Ν*, Φρουρμυ Ν.⁶), cf. c. ix. 26, and Jos. ant. vi. 13 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὰς προειρήμενα ἡμέρας ἔστράφουσιν προσαγορεύοντες αὐτὰς φρουρέας (v. I. 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 elsewhere”

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 M.T; the following are the most noteworthy: viii. 10b—12, x. 6, 8, 10, xvii. 1—5a, xxix. (xxxvi., LXX.) 16—20, xxxiii. (xl., LXX.) 14—26, xxxix. (=xlvi., LXX.) 4—13, lii. 28—30. Of these passages viii. 10b—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—5a was due to homeoteleuton, the eye of the translator or the scribe of his archetype having passed from נִלְנִי (xvi. 21) to נִלְנִי (xvii. 5a). It is more difficult to account for the absence from σ 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 (*καί ἔγεντο...ἐκάθεν ἑρεμίας 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 forms\(^1\) contains large contexts which have no equivalent in the Hebrew Bible. There are three such passages in the Greek Daniel: (1) the story of Susanna (Σωσάννα, Σωσάννα), which in the version of Theodotion\(^2\) as given by the great uncial preceded Dan. i. 1; (2) the story of Bel and the Dragon (Βῆλ 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 (ὁρασίς ἐβ' 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.\(^4\), 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 prophetae voces" (Sus. 56, 52 f.), iv. 5. 2 "quem et Daniel prophetam...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 J. 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.).
Notwithstanding the objection shrewdly based by Africanus on the paronomasia (σχίνος, 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 original. The LXX. version represents Bel as a fragment of Habakkuk (cod. 87, Syro-Hex., tit. ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμμακοῦμ ύιοῦ 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 original. The two hymns contained in it found a place, as we have seen, among the Greek ecclesiastical Canticles, where they appear as the προσευχὴ Ἀζαρίων and the ὄμος τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (cod. A) or ὁ τῶν τριῶν παῖδων (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.” 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


2 Ball, l. c., p. 308. See Nestle, Exp. T. xii. 527, and Daubney, Exp. T. xviii. 287.

3 Bevan, Daniel, p. 46.
Books of the Hebrew Canon.

(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.
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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 i 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. 73b—viii. 13a. The Greek book ends abruptly, in a manner which suggests that something has been lost; cf. ix. 55 καὶ ἔπιστων ἰχθυσάνων with 2 Esdr. xviii. 13 ἰχθυσάνων οἱ ἀρχοντες κτλ. The student may compare the ending of the Second Gospel (Mc. xvi. 8).

The context i 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 praevalet (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 grouped." In the grouping chronological order has been to some extent set aside; the displacement of Ezra iv. 7—24 (= i 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 Josephus,2 attracted perhaps by the superiority of the Greek style, uses i Esdras in preference to the Greek version of the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah, even embodying in his narrative the legend of Zerubbabel. He evades the difficulty

1 The future (praevalebit) is without authority. In v. 38 Cod. A gives ἵσχοιει, but in v. 41 ἐπερισχοίει 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 Cambyses\textsuperscript{1}. In the early Church the Greek Esdras was accepted without suspicion; cf. e.g. Clem. Alex. \textit{strom.} i. 21; Origen, \textit{in Joann.} t. vi. 1, in Jos. \textit{hom.} ix. 10; Cyprian, \textit{ep.} 74. 9. Jerome, however (\textit{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-Nehemiah\textsuperscript{2}.

The relation of the two Greek recensions of \textit{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' \textit{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. Howorth\textsuperscript{3}, 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[eeek] dress," 2 Esdras being "a more accurate rendering of the Heb[rew]" which was "subsequently...required and...supplied by what is now called the \textit{LXX.} version\textsuperscript{4}.

2. \textsc{Wisdom of Solomon. The} Greek title is \textit{Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος (Σαλωμῶντος, Σαλωμῶντος, Σαλωμών)}. But the book

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} ant. xi. 2, 1 sqq.
\item \textsuperscript{2} The English Article (vi) follows this numeration.
\item \textsuperscript{3} In the \textit{Academy} for 1893.
\item \textsuperscript{4} And possibly the work of Theod. (\textit{Gramm. of O. T. in Gk}, p. 13. (In Cod. \textit{N}, 1 Chron. xi. 22—xiv. 17 goes on without a break to Esd. \textit{β}. ix. 9, the whole being headed \textit{Eσδ. β}.))
\end{itemize}
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 fragment. 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 his. 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 virtues (c. viii. 7 εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις, οἶ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσίν ἄρεται: σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδίδασκε, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἄνδρείαν), and with the Platonic sense of ὕλη (c. xi. 17 κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐκ ἀμόρφου ὕλης: cf. Philo, de victim. 13, de mund. opif. 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 Φιλωνος. 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 rhetoric, 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, κρυσταλλειδής, ὀμοωπαθής, παντεπίσκοπος, πολυμερής, πρωτόπλαστος: ἀγερωχία, ἀπαύγασμα, ἀπόρροια, εἰδήθεια, ἐνέργεια, εὐδράνεια, ἰμβασμὸς, συλλογισμὸς, μετακρινάν, μεταλλεύειν, προυφεστάναι. 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—τὶς δὲ ὁ γραφὸς...τὸ μὲν ἄληθὲς 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 Σειράχ, but codd. AC give the fuller and more accurate form Σοφία Ἰησοῦ νῦν Σειράχ (cf. c. L. 27 παιδείαν...ἔχαραξα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦτῳ Ἰησοῦς νῦν


3 Σειράχ = נִשָּׁע. "In the Hebrew Josippon (Pseudo-Josephus) the form יִשָּׁע is a transliteration from the Latin" (Cowley and Neubauer, Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus, p. ix. n.).
Σειράχ). Jerome had seen a Hebrew Sirach which shared with the canonical book the title of Proverbs (praef. in libros Salom.: “Hebraicum reperi...Parabolas (מִשְׁלֵי) prae notatum”). 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 Ἡσυχός 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 ὑδάω καὶ τριακοστῷ ἐτῶν ὁ Ἐφεργέτου βασιλέως—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. Physcon, 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 Ἐλεαζῖρῳ (which follows Σειράχ in the Greek) see Ryssel in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 253. The newly-discovered Hebrew reads מִשְּלָהּ בַּנְיָם יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּנָּיִם on which see Schechter, Wisdom of Ben Sira, p. 65; Nestle in Hastings’ D. B. iv. p. 541 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 Greek\(^2\). At present few experts accept this theory, but the question must perhaps be regarded as sub indicet.

In all the known MSS. of the Greek Sirach\(^3\), 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 written\(^4\)—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 stichoi omitted by the rest of our Greek authorities; see Smith, *D. B.* 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. 492*) must be deleted. On this MS. see Fritzsche, p. xxiii; Zennier in *Z. A. T.* 7h., 1895. The text of Sirach after 248 has been edited by J. H. A. Hart, for the Cambridge University Press (1909).

been made. The true order is preserved in the Old Latin\textsuperscript{1}, Syriac, and Armenian versions.

4. \textbf{Judith} (Ἰουδείθ, -δείθ, -ηθο, = נודִיה), cf. Gen. xxvi. 34, where the same spellings are found in the cursives, though the uncial exhibits 'Ιουδείν, 'Ιουδίν), 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 \textit{terminus ad quem} is provided by the fact that Clement of Rome knew the story (\textit{1 Cor. 55} ἡ μακαρία...παρέδωκεν Κύριος Ολοφέρνην ἐν χερὶ θηλείας)\textsuperscript{2}; and the name of Judith's enemy has suggested a \textit{terminus a quo}, for Olophernes\textsuperscript{3} 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 Jews\textsuperscript{4}. The religious attitude of the author of \textit{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. \textit{ad African. 13}: 'Εβραϊοι τῷ Τωβίᾳ οὗ χρώνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ιουδήθ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις 'Εβραϊστί, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἔγνωκαμεν). Jerome, on the other hand, not only says expressly (\textit{praef. in Judith}): "apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha (v.l. hagiographa) legitur," but he produced a version or paraphrase from an Aramaic source ("ea quae intelligentia integra ex verbis Chaldaeis invenire potuit, Latinis expressi"). The relation of this Aramaic text to the original of the Greek book remains uncertain.

\textsuperscript{1} On the O.L. of the Wisdoms see above, pt. i. c. iv (pp. 96, 103).
\textsuperscript{2} See Lightfoot's note \textit{ad loc}. and his remarks in \textit{Clement} i. p. 313 f.
\textsuperscript{3} Not 'Ολοφέρνης, as is presupposed by the Latin.
\textsuperscript{4} Cf. art. \textit{Holofernes} in Hastings' \textit{D. B.} ii. p. 402. There were, however, earlier kings of the same name (\textit{op. cit.} p. 823; cf. Schürer\textsuperscript{3}, iii. p. 169 f., n. 19).
\textsuperscript{5} See however Ball in \textit{Speaker's Comm.} Apocr. i. pp. 243, 259 ff.; and F. C. Porter in Hastings' \textit{B. D.} ii. p. 822\textsuperscript{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. Tobit (Tωβειτ [Τωβειτ, -βειθ], 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 τῇ δὲ τοῦ Τωβειτ βίβλῳ ἀντιλέγοντον οἱ ἐκ περιστομῆς, 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. 1. c. χρόνται 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 prophetical 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. "exigit ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad latinum stylum tradam...feci satis desiderio vestro...et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguæ peritissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego

¹ Fritzsche, libri apocr. p. xviii sq.; Schürer, 3, iii. p. 172. The text in codd. 19, 108, is said to be Lucianic (Max Löhr in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 147).
accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui”). 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 istorical. In c. vi. 9—xiii. 18 Fritzsche adds a third text supplied by the cursives 44, 106, 107. 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 istorical. Harris, however, points out that while istorical 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 (Baro&, ’Epistol&’Ieremiou, [prophethia] 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 ’Ieremi&s kai σ&ν αυτ&ν Baro&, Θρ&νοιν, ’Epistol&, Cyril. Hier. catech. iv. 33 ’Ieremiou μετ&ν Baro&ν καί Θρ&νον καί ’Epistol&ς). 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 Chaldean text, corresponding in some respects to Jerome’s Latin, is preserved in the Bodleian, and has been edited by Neubauer (Oxford, 1878).
3 Origen, while omitting Baruch, includes the Epistle in a formal list of the Hebrew canon (Eus. H. E. vi. 25 ’Ieremi&s σ&ν Θρ&νοιν καί τ&ν ’Epistol&ν εν εν).
The Epistle (ἀντίγραφον ἐπιστολῆς ἦς ἀπέστειλεν Ἰερεμίας πρὸς τοὺς ἄχθησιόνεων [v. l. ἀπαχθέντας] αἰχμαλώτους εἰς Βαβυ-λῶνα) seems to have been suggested by Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) i (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.).

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), each of which may be subdivided (i. i.—i. 4, historical preface; i. 5—iii. 8, confession and prayer; iii. 9—iv. 4, exhortation; iv. 5—v. 9, encouragement). Of these subsections the first two shew traces of an Hebrew original; cf. e.g. i. 10 μάννα = נין ii. 3 ἄνθρωπον = ✠יק; iii. 4 τῶν τεθνηκότων = נין (for נין)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

² In the first section the Divine Name is Κύριος or K. ὁ θεός, while in the second it is either [ὁ] θεός or ὁ αἰώνιος, ὁ ἀγνο. 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.)
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 Constitutions² 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.


7. Books of Maccabees (Μακκαβαίων α’, β’, γ’, δ’, Μαχαβαειρν λιβρί; τὰ Μακκαβαίακά, 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 Hasmonaean or Maccabean³ family.

I 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 I 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, διαμώτης, 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 Μακκαβαίων see Schürer, Ε. Τ. i. p. 212 f. n.; it belonged primarily to Judas, cf. i Macc. i. 4 ἀνέστη Ἰουδᾶς ὁ καλούμενος Μ.; Joseph. ant. xii. 6 Ἰουδᾶς ὁ καλ. Μ.
Books not included in the Hebrew Canon.

Macca\(b\)aïkôv, Origen ap. Eus. l.c. tà Macca\(b\)aïkà ápèr èpìgê-γραπταὶ Σαρβηθ σαβαναίελ (v.l. Ἐ. σαβανε ἕλ). Whatever may be the meaning of this title\(^1\), 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 disappeared\(^2\), 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 mixed\(^3\).

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 πρῶτῃ βιβλίῳ 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 ἀλλοι δὲ ἐνυπανίσθησαν κτλ., cf. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 30).

---

\(^1\) For various attempts to interpret it see Ryle, Canon, p. 185; R. Kraetzschmar, in Exp. T., xiii. 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 οὐνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἑπιτομήν. This is precisely what he claims to do (c. ii. 23 ὑπὸ Ἰάσωνος τοῦ Κυρηναίου δεδηλωμένα διὰ πέντε βιβλίων, πειρασώμεθα δὲ ἐνὸς συντάγματος ἑπιτεμεῖν). 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 Μακκαβαϊκὰ finds a place

1 Westcott in Smith’s D. B., ii. p. 175.
2 See the list of words given by Westcott, l. c. i. and in Smith’s D. B., ii. 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 darin steht.”
in some Eastern lists (can. Apost., Niceph. stichom.). A Greek book under that title is found in codd. AV and a few cursives. 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. Ν 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 Ptolemaica. 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 probable.” 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 Ἀκκαβαίκα δ', Πτολεμαϊκά. Credner proposed to read Μ. καὶ (γ) 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 Πτολεμαϊκά means the letter of Aristeas.
3 Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 267 ff.
nected with another reign¹ (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 Josephus⁶.

Eus. H. E., iii. 10 πεπόνηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλο οὐκ ἀγεννής σπουδασμα τῷ ἀνδρί (sc. Ἰωσήφῳ) περὶ οἴκουρός λογισμοῦ, ὁ τινες Μακκαβαίκων ἐπέγραψαν τῷ τούς ἀγώνας τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὖτω καλούμενοι Μακκαβαϊκοῖς συγγράμμασιν ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείαν ἀνδρισμένων Ἑβραίων περίεχεν. Hieron. de virr. ill. 13 “alius quoque libro eius qui inscribitur περὶ οἴκουρός 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 αὐτόδεσποτὸς ἔστιν τῶν παθῶν ἐλεύθερος 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 εἰδέας καθιστάσων φρόνησις καὶ δικαιοσύνη

¹ That of Euergetes II. (Physcon); cf. Mahaffy, p. 381.
² Westcott in Smith’s D. B. ii. p. 179.
³ Schürer, 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.
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kaì òndria kai 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 Greek,” 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 ένδιάθηκα, τὰ εἰκοσιδύο) and the ‘external’ books (τὰ ἕξω), 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 (ἐγ. πέρα) τούτων ἕξω (the two Wisdoms, 1—4 Maccabees, Esther, Judith, Tobit), continues: Καὶ ὅσα ἀπόκρυφα: ’Αδάμ, Ἀνώχ, Λάμεχ, Πατριάρχαι, Προσευχὴ Ἰωνῆφ, Ἔλδάδ, Διαθήκη Μωσείως, Ἀνάληψις Μωσείως, Ψαλμοὶ Σολομώντος, Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἡσαίου ἄρασις, Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἐσθρα ἀποκάλυψις. The Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis and the Stichometry of Nicephorus count among the ἀπόκρυφα τῆς παλαιᾶς, together with certain of the above, Ἀβραάμ...Βαροῦχ, Ἄββακοῦμ, Ἀζεκήλ, καὶ Δανήλ, ψευδητήγραφο.2. Ebed Jesu mentions also a book called Traditions of the Elders, the History of Asenath, and

1 Westcott in Smith’s D. B. 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 diluvium 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 ἰδιωτικοὺς 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 ομού Βιβλία... and below, ψαλμοι σολομωντος

² By Dr J. R. Harris, who points out (*Johns Hopkins Univ. Circular, March '884*) that the six missing leaves in K 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.).

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 Solomon.

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. 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. 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 canticles.

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 Syncellus. But in 1886 a small vellum book was found in

1 In the latter case they go with the two Wisdems 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. Schürer,
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. i, 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, r<sup>er</sup> fasc. 1892; 3<sup>e</sup> 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. 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 εν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάντα φέρεται ός θεία τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνόχ βιβλία: in Ioann. t. vi. 25 εἰ τῷ φίλῳ παραδείγμας ὧς ἀγιον τὸ βιβλίων. 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 arnarium Judaicum 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 Schürer<sup>3</sup>, 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 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. Sinker), 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 λαπτή Πένος (ed. R. H. Charles).


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 (11. 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 Greek2, 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 (Cambridge, 1899). Ryle and James' edition is especially 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 aethiopicus (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 neugefunnenen gr. Text des Henoch-Buches (Berlin, 1802); 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. (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.

i. 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

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 lexicon. 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. 1. 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. Polybius found Alexandria inhabited by three races, the native Egyptians, who occupied the site of the old seaport Rhacôtis, the mercenary class (τὸ μυσθοφόρικὸν), 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 μεγάλες, Ἑλληνες ὁμοῦ ἀνέκαθεν ἦσαν, καὶ ἑμὲ-μυρτὸ τοῦ καυνοῦ 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 Italy, 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 changes, and the use of barbarous terms such as

1 ap. Strab. 797.
2 Mahaffy in Flinders Petrie Papyri, i. p. 42. Cf. Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 178 f.
3 As the change of φ into β (Βερεβίκη for Φερεβίκη, &c.), cf. Sturz, de dial. Mac., p. 51. n.
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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 patois, 'Ἀλεξανδρείων 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 Academy; similar collections have been published by Drs Grenfell and Hunt. 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: ἀναδεικνύον, ἀναφαίλακρος, ἀναφαλαγμός, ἀρχιστηροφιλαξ, ἀρχιτεκτονικός, ἁγιος, βασιλικός, γένης, διόρος, ἐπιγονή, ἐργοδοκίς, εὐπλοῦν, ἑβδομέ, ἑφωρκεῖν, θέριστρον, ὀλγοψυχεῖν, ὀξυρώμα, ὀψιόν, παϊδίον, παραδείξη, παρεπιδῆμος, περιδέξιον, περιποίησις, πράκταρ, προσβύτερος, στενοχωρεῖν, χώμα. The Berlin papyri yield many other such words, e.g. ἀναμέτρησις, γλύμμα, δικαίωμα, ἰεροψάλτης, ἰσοτιμία, καταλοχισμός, κτηνοτρόφος, μισοποιήρια, ὀδοχέρης, συμπλήρωσις, ύμηματισμός.

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).
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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 ἐλευθέρων ἄδικο-μεθα. τὰ γὰρ ὀμολογηθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ διοικητοῦ οὖθεν γίνεται ήμίν, ἐχει δὲ τὴν γραφὴν Διότιμος. σπουδασον οὖν ἵνα καθὰ ἐξειλήφαμεν ἡδῆ, ὑπὸ Διονυσίου καὶ Διοτίμου χρηματισθῇ ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ τὰ ἔργα ἐνελευθῆ, καθὰ καὶ ἐμπροσθὲν ἐγένετο. εἶν γὰρ αἰσθῶμαι οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι οὐθὲν ἡμᾶς εἰληφότας τὸν σιδηρὸν ἐνέχυρα θήσουσιν.

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 King.

To Soter is also attributed the establishment of the great library which is said to have contained 400,000 MSS. 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, Lycothron, 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, χρηματιζόμενοι, ἐνέχυρον). Sometimes these papyri afford illustrations of the LXX. which are not merely verbal; cf. II. xiv. 2 ἐς τὰ ἄχυρα πρὸς τὴν πλάθουν.

2 Strabo, 794; cf. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 91 ff.

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 onwards—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 language. 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.' A 'Hellenist' 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.
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 ΛXX., 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:** ἄνθρωπος, δευτερος, διάδεξε, ἐνευλογείσθαι, ἐξολεθρεύει, ἐξουθενα, εὐδοκέω, κατακληρονομεῖν, κατασκοπεῖν, κατεμβλέπειν, κατοδύναμ, διελθρεύειν, δροπομεῖν, δρηγίζειν, πνευματοφορείσθαι, πτωχίζειν, σκοπεῖν, συνεδρίαξε, τρειτίζειν, τροφεῦν, φιλεχθήν. **Nouns:** ἄγαπη, ἀσυνεθεία, ἀσφαλτόπισσα, βδελυγμα, γένημα, δόμα, ἐργοδόκτης, θλιμμός, καταπέτασμα, κρίμα, λατόμος, μέθυσμα, ὁλοκαυτώμα, ὁλοκαυτωσίς, ὁρόφωμα, παντοκράτωρ, 1 Or ἐξουθενας, other forms being due to mixture; Thackeray, *Gr. O. T.* p. 105.
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προσήλυτος, πρόσκομμα, βοίσκος, σύντριμμα. Foreign words (a) with Greek terminations: ἄβρα, άβισ, σίκλος (b) transliterated: αἴλάμ, δαβείρ, εφαυδ βάρ, νέβελ, ἔλω τοσαιωθ, οἴψι, σερσέρθ, χεροβείμ.

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 I. (li.) alone yields four important words (ἀγαθόνευ, ἀκούττευν, ἀνομημα, ἀνταναιρεῖν) 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, ἀποσάσσεσθαι, βασιλισσα, βούνως, βρέχειν (in the sense of νείν), γρηγορείν, ἑλεύσσεσθαι, ἐξάδελφος, κατόρθωμα, μεγιστάν, μέθυσος, οἰκοδομή, παιδίσκη, πάπυρος, παρεμβολή, πεποίθησις, πληξαί, ράπασμα, ρύμη, σκορπίζεσθαι, σύσσημον. Some of these words are said to be provincialisms; e.g. βούνως 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 γογγύςεων occurs in a papyrus of 241—239 B.C.; ἑργοδιώκης, 255 B.C.; παρεπίδημος, 225 B.C.; forms such as ἱθα, ἐπηλθοσαν, γεγοναν, ὀδείς, can be quoted from the papyri passim; ἀναστρεφθαι and ἀναστροφή in an ethical sense, λειτουργεῖν in reference to the service of a deity, περιτμένεσθαι, πρεσβύτερος of an official, are shown 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, γραμματεύς, διάβολος, εἴδωλον, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attic Greek</th>
<th>Greek of the LXX.</th>
<th>Attic Greek</th>
<th>Greek of the LXX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκρίνασθαι</td>
<td>ἄποκριθηναι</td>
<td>μιαρός</td>
<td>μιηρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφειλετο</td>
<td>ἀφειλετο</td>
<td>μόχλος</td>
<td>μόχλος (MSS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀχρι, μέχρι</td>
<td>ἀχρίς, μέχρις</td>
<td>νεοσσός, -σία</td>
<td>νοσσός, -σία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενεόθεια</td>
<td>γενεόθηναι</td>
<td>νομηνία</td>
<td>νομηνία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλωσσοκομείον</td>
<td>γλωσσόκομον</td>
<td>ὄρθριος</td>
<td>ὄρθριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διψήν</td>
<td>διψάν</td>
<td>ὀσίδεσ</td>
<td>ὀσίδες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δυνόν</td>
<td>δυνι</td>
<td>πεινήδις</td>
<td>πεινῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐδειτο</td>
<td>ἐδέετο</td>
<td>πῆχεων</td>
<td>πῆχὼν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐρήμα</td>
<td>εὐρέμα</td>
<td>ποδαπόσ</td>
<td>ποταπόσ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καβά</td>
<td>καβώς</td>
<td>ταχύτερον</td>
<td>τάχιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταιμύειν</td>
<td>καμμύειν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 οὐδεῖς began to yield again to οὐδεῖς 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 archaisms 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’ ὦς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τήν γῆν, τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαμβάνων, οὐχ ὃς οὖντα τινας τὴν κατὰ χρόνον. χρόνος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν πρὸ κόσμου, ἀλλ’ ἡ ἀναγκαία τοῦ κόσμου κυβέρνεσις ἐστὶν ὁ χρόνος, προτέρα δὲ τοῦ κινουμένου κίνησις οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, ἀλλ’ ἀναγκαίοις αὐτὴν ἡ ὑπερένθη τὰ αὐτὴ συνισταθαι, ἀναγκαίοις ἃρα καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἡ ισότικα κόσμου γεγονέναι ἢ νεώτερον ἐκεῖνον πρεσβύτερον δ’ ἀποφαίνεσθαι τολμᾶν ἀφιλοσοφοῦν. De migr. Abrahami 39: εἰς μέντοι σκοτούμενοι μὴ ραδίως καταλαμβάνεις δ’ ζητεῖς, ἐπίμενε μή καθὼς... νῦν ὁ φιλολαβὸς τοῦ τόπου Συνχείμενειληπται, μεταληψθέν δὲ τοῦναμα Συχέμις ὁμοίας καλείται, πόνον συμβόλω, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς μέρει τοις ἁρδθορεῖν ἔθος, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐτέρωθι μένηντες ἐπί τινος ἄθλητον τούτον τὸ τρίτον Ἐπιθηκεῖ τὸν ὄρον εἰς τὸ ποινεῖν, καὶ ἐγένετο ἀνήρ γεωργός. ὡστε μηδέποτε, ὡ διάνοια, μαλακισθείσα ὁκλάσθαι, ἀλλὰ κἀν τὶ δοκῇ δυσθεώρητον εἰσίν, τὸ ἐν σαυτῇ βλέπον διανοίξασα διάκυψον εἰσώ.

(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.

Joseph. ant. ii. 9. 4.

τρεῖς μὲν μήνας παρ’ αὐτοῖς τρέφοντες λανθάνοντες...μηχανῶντας πλέγμα βίβλιον, ἐπείτα χρίσαντες ἀσφάλτω, ἐντιθέασα τὸ παιδίον...Μαριμαὶ δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀδελφῆ...ἀντιπαρεξεῖ ἐφερμένον ὅποι χωρίσει ὑφομένε τὸ πλέγμα.

1 Regn. i. 1—4.

Joseph. ant. v. 10. 2.

ἀναρτωσος ἤν ἐξ Ἀρμαθάμ...ἐξ ὁρῶν Ἐφραίμ...καὶ τοιῷν δύο γυναῖκες: ὁμοιὰ τῇ μιᾷ Ἀννα καὶ τῇ μιᾷ Φειδία, καὶ τῇ Φειδία μιᾷ παιδίᾳ, καὶ τῇ Ἀννα οὐκ ἦν παιδίου...πλὴν τἄτη τῇ Ἀννα ἡγάπα Ἐλκανά ὑπὲρ ταύτην.
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2 Chron. iii. 1—2.  
καὶ ἡρῴατο Σαλωμὼν τοῦ οἴκοδομεῖν τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου...  
καὶ ἡρῴατο οἰκοδομή ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ τετάρτῳ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ.  

Isa. xxxix. 6—7.  
Ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα ἐρχονται καὶ λήμψονται πάντα τὰ εἰς τῷ οἶκῳ σου καὶ...εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἡζει...  
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου δὲ γεννήσεις λήμψονται, καὶ πούτου εἰσέρχονται εἰς τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Βαβυλώνων.  

Joseph. ant. viii. 3. 1.  
τῆς δὲ οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ Σαλωμὼν ἡρῴατο τέταρτον ἔτος ἤδη τῆς βασιλείας ἦκων μηνὶ δευτέρῳ.  

Joseph. ant. x. 2. 2.  
Ἰσθι οὖ μετ᾽ ὀλίγον χρόνον εἰς Βαβυλῶνα σου τοῦτον μετατεθησόμενον τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τοὺς ἐκχώνους εὐνοικοθησομένους καὶ ἀπολέσαντας τὸ ἄνθρας εἶνα, τῶν Βαβυλωνίων δουλεύσοντας βασίλειαν.  

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, accidence, 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-

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, i. Teil, Leipzig, 1898 (Progr. des Gymn. Heilbronn).
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But even in MSS. which like ΒΑΣC originally contained the whole of the Greek Scriptures, the Greek Old Testament possesses an orthography which is in part peculiar to itself, and certain features which are common to both Old and New Testaments are found with greater frequency and with a wider application in the LXX. than in the N.T. The reader of the Cambridge manual LXX. who is interested in this question, can readily work out the details from the apparatus criticus, and more especially from the appendix, where he will find all the spellings of the uncial MSS. employed which were not thought worthy of a place in the footnotes to the text. For those to whom orthography is of little interest the specimens given below will probably suffice.

Consonants. Assimilation neglected in compounds: ἐνγαε-τρίμβος, συνκαταληπονομεύω, συνσεσιμός, ἐνκαίνια, ἐνχειρίδιον. Assimilation where there is no composition: εἰ μέσῳ, ἐγ γναστῇ. Use of ν ἐφελκυστικῶν before consonants (omission is rare, except in a few cases such as πᾶς before the art.); use of the final ς in ἄχρις, μέχρις, ὀὗτος, ἀντικρός. Retention of the μ in fut. and aor. pass. of λαμβάνειν (λήμψωμαι, ἑλμφέθην), and in words formed from it, e.g. πρόσληψις. Οúdeις, μήθεις (see p. 297, note) for οὐδεὶς, μηδεὶς. Τ dropped in the middle of a word between vowels, as κραύ-, ἀλίς, φεῖν (especially in cod. N). 'Ρ not doubled in compounds, e.g. ἐπιμαρτυρίζειν, κολοβόρος, κατάρακτος, and reduplicated in the augment (ἐραντισμένος); σσ for ττ in ἕλανον, ἦσσων, and ρρ for ῃῥ in ἃρον, θαρσεῖν. In some verbal forms consonants are doubled, e.g. βέννειν, κτέννειν, χύννειν. Rough and smooth consonants are occasionally exchanged, e.g. κύθρα (1 Regn. ii. 14, B) for χύτρα.

Vowels. Ει for ι in syllables where ι is long, e.g. Semitic words such as Λευί, Λευίτης, Δαυίδ, Σεών, and Greek words as τραπεζεῖταις, γείνεσθαι, γεινώσκειν. Also (perhaps by itacism) in innumerable instances of ιι: e.g. ὁρεοῦν, ἀληθεῖν, ἀδικεῖα, κρεινεῖν. Ι for ει, e.g. τίχος, λιτουργεῖν, ἀλφεῖα, ἀλμα, κατελίθθην, παράδιγμα, δανίζειν, ὄριστος, σιγός, and esp. in nouns in -εία, -εια, e.g. ἀπολία, ἔνδια, πατίδια, Σαμαρία, στρατία, and those in είον, as δάνιον, εἰδόλιον. Α for ε, as ἐρανόν; ζ for α, as ἐκαθερίσθην, μερός, τεσσεράκοντα.

1 Especially in cod. B (O.T. in Greek, 1. p. xiii.).
Omission of a syllable consisting of ι, as in πειν, ταμειον. Prefixing of a vowel, as in ἐχθες.

Breathings. Rough breathing for smooth: e.g. ουχ ὀλίγος, ἐφὶ ἀπίδι, ἐφιδε, οὔχ εἰσακούσομαι (Jer. vii. 16), καθ' ὀρθαλμοῦς (Ezech. xx. 14). Similarly we find ἀλοσ, ἀλώπηξ, ἐνιαυτός Dt. xiv. 20 (Nestle, Septuagintstudien i. p. 19, ii. pp. 12, 13, 20 f.). Smooth breathing for rough: οὔκ ἐνεκεν (2 Regn. vii. 12), οὔκ 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 -ον from nouns in -ος: ἀμαγροίν, ἀποδεκατούν, ἀπολυτρούν, ἀποτυφλοῦσ, ἀσφαλτοῦν, διαβιῶν, ἐκτυποῦν, ἐλαττοῦν, ἐπιδιπλοῦσ, ἐπιπεμπτούν, ἐρυθροδανοῦν, εὐδοκοῦν, βανατοῦν, καταχυσοῦν, κυροῦν, παλαιοῦν, παραβηλοῦν, περικυκλοῦν, συγκυροῦν. In -ίζειν, -άζειν, -άζειν, -ύζειν: ἀγάζειν, αἰρετίζειν, ἀκουτίζειν, ἀναβιβάζειν, ἀναθοματίζειν, ἀπογαλακτίζειν, ἀυγάζεις, ἀφανίζεις, ἀφανίζεις, ἀφορίζεις, βαδίζεις, γελοιάζεις, γρύζεις, δανίζεις, διαγογιάζεις, διασκεδάζεις, διασκορπίζεις, διαχωρίζεις, ἐκθερίζεις, ἐκκλησίαζεις, ἐκμελίζεις, ἐκπερματίζεις, ἐκτοκίζεις, ἐνταφιάζεις, ἐνυψωμάζεις, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἐξευκονίζεις, ἐξητάζεις, ἐξοπλίζεις, ἐξορκίζεις, ἐπεκλίζεις, ἐπιαστάζεις, ἐπισκίαζεις, ἐπιστοιμαζέις, ἐπιφημίζεις, διοικάζεις, καταβάζεις, κατασκίαζεις, κατασοφίζεις, κληδονίζεις, κομίζεις, κούφιζεις, λεπίζεις, λευκαβίζεις, μακαρίζεις, μελίζεις, οἰωνίζεις, ὀνοχίζεις, ὀπτάζεις, ὀρθίζεις, παραπειγματίζεις, παραδοξάζεις, παραλογίζεις, περισσί-
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ζεῖν, περιονυχίζειν, περιραντίζειν, πλεονάζειν, πολυχρονίζειν, προσεγγίζειν, προσοχίζειν, σαββατιζέων, σκεπάζειν, σπερματίζειν, σταδίζειν, συμποδίζειν, συναθροίζειν, συνοικίζειν, σφακελίζειν, σχολάζειν, τειχίζειν, φαυλίζειν, φλογίζειν, χλωρίζειν, χρονίζειν, ψωμίζειν.

In -είτων: ἀγχιστείων, διοδευών, ἐξολεθρευών, ἱεραπευών, καταδυναστεύων, κατακυριεύων, κατοχείων, καταλλαλειών, κροφθείων, κρυολογεύσεων, σπαστοφεύσεων, τροφρευών, υδρευών.

Nouns.

In -μα, from verbs: ἀγίασμα, ἀγνίσμα, ἀδίκημα, αἴνιγμα, ἀλλαγμα, ἀνάστειμα, ἀνόμιμα, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀπόδομα, ἀσέβημα, ἀβγασμα, ἀφαίρεμα, βδελύγμα, δηήγημα, δικαίωμα, διώρυγμα, διγοτομμα, δόμα, ἐγκατάλλημα, ἐδέσμα, ἐκκόλαμμα, ἐκτύπωμα, ἐπίθεμα, ἐπικάλυμμα, ἐπιτηδευμα, ἐφέμα, ἡμίσεμα, δήρεμα, θρήμα, θωτίσμα, ἵππησις, κάρπωμα, κατάκαμψη, καταπέτασμα, καύχημα, κλέμα, λέπισμα, ὀλοκάτωμα, ὄραμα, ὄφελημα, ὄχυρωμα, παράδειγμα, παράθεμα, παράρθρα, περίθεμα, περιόρισμα, προσόχθισμα, πρόσταγμα, προτογένεσις, στερέωμα, συνάντησις, συνκάλυμμα, σύστασις, σύνταξις, σύντομα, τόπωμα, φαλάκραμα, φύλαγμα, χόρτασμα, χώνεμα.

In -μος, from verbs: ἀφανισμος, γογγυσμοι, ενδελεχισμος, εντορμισμος, ἐπιτριμος, ἐπιστασις, ἐπιστασις, καθάρισμος, μηρυκισμος, οιώνυμος, όρισμος, ρωσισμος, περασμος, σταθμος, στεναγμος, φραγμος, χωρισμος.

In -σις, from verbs: ἀναίρεσις, ἀνάμνησις, ἀποκιάρωσις, ἄθεσις, βεβαιωσις, γογγυσις, γυμνωσις, δήλωσις, διάβασις, διασάφησις, ἐκδικησις, ἐκκαταστάσις, ἐκχυσις, ἑπεράτωσις, κατακαρπωσις, καταλείψις, κατάδειξις, κατακληρωσις, ὁλοκαίρωσις, ὁλοκαύτωσις, ὁμοιωσις, πληρωσις, πόρεωςις, πράσις, σύνγραφος, συναντήσις, συντήρησις, σύνταξις, ταπείνωσις, υπεράρσης, υπέροψις, υπόστασις, φαύνις, χαράκωσις, χήρωσις.

In -η, from verbs: ἀλοιφη, ἀναξυγη, ἀποσκευη, ἀποστολη, ἀποστροφη, ἀφη, διασκευη, δοχη, ἐκτριβη, ἐντολη, ἐπαγωγη, ἐπισκοπη, καταφυγη, ὀλη, παραβολη, προνοη, προφυλακη, συναγωγη, τροπη.

In -της, from verbs (m.): ἀινιγματιστης, ἐνταφιαστης, ἐγγητης, ἐπιθυμητης, ἔρυμπητης, πολεμιστης, ραφιδευτης, σκηνατης, σχολατης.

Adjectives. In -νος: δειλωνος, δερματινος, καρυνωνος, ὀστρακινος, πρασινος, στυραινος, φλογινος.

In -νος: εναινιον, ὁμομετρος, πολυχρωνος, ὑποχειρος.

In -ικος: ἀρσενικος, εἱρηνικος, λαμπαρικος, λειαργικος, μυρηνικος, πατρικος, ποικιλικος, πολεμικος, προφαιστικος.

In -τος: ἀκατακεκαμτος, ἀλυσιδωτος, ἀόρατος, ἀπερικαδαρτος, ἀπικαταρατος, εὐλογητος, λαξευτος, μισθωτος, ωνοματος, πλεοναστος, φορολογιστος.

(δ) Words formed by composition:

Verbs compounded with two prepositions: ἀνθυφαιρεων, ἀνταιδοουναι, ἀποκαθισταν, ἐνκαταλείπετεν, ἐπιπεριτατεν, ἐξεισαστέλλεν, ἐπισυνισταν, κατεμβλέπετεν, παρεμβάλλεν, συναναλμβάνειν, συνανα-
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στρέφεσθαι, συναπολλείν, συνεκπολεμοῦν, συνεπακολουθεῖν, συνεπισκέπτειν, συνκατακληρονομεῖν, συνπαραλαμβάνειν, συνπροσέπειν.

Nouns. Compounded with nouns: ἀσφαλτόπισσα, δασύπους, ἐπερόγγυς, καμηλοπάραδες, κολοβόρος, μακροήμερος, μακροχώροις, μικρόβυσμα, ὀλόκληρος, ὀλοπόρφυρος, πολυελεός, πολυχρόνιος, σκληροτρύχιος, χοιρογρύλλων.

Compounded with a prefix or preposition: ἀντιπρόσωπος, ἀντιτίθεμεν, ἀρχίδεσμοφύλάξ, ἀρχιδεσμώτης, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιμάγερος, ἀρχιμονοχὸς, ἀρχισιτοποίος, ἐπίπεμπτος, ἐνυπόσωτος, κατάλοιπος, κατάξηρος, παράλος, παρεπίδημος, περιδέξιον, περίλυσος, περίχωρος, ὑπανδρός, ὑπερμήκης.

Compounded with a verb, and forming a fresh noun or a verb: ἀνεμοφθόρος, γλωσσοτύμητος, ἐργοδικήτης, βανατηβόρος, θηράλωτος, θηρόβρατος, ἵπποδρόμοις, ἰσχυρόμενος, κτυρτρόφος, νυμφαγωγός, σιτιτοποίς, σφυροκόπος, τελεσφόρος, χαρποίος, διχοτομεῖς, ξωγονεῖς, κλοποφορείς, κρεανεῖς, λιθοβολεῖς, λιμαγχονεῖς, νυροκοπεῖς, ὄρνιθοσκοπεῖς, συμβολοκοπεῖς, τεκνοποιεῖς, ψωραγιαί.

(ii.) Declension of nouns:

Declension 1  Nouns in -πα.-πία, form gen. in ἐς, dat. ἐς, μαχαίρη, μαχαίρις. Gen. xxvii. 49, Exod. xv. 9 ("vielfach bei A, bes. in Jerem., W.-Schm.), κυνομής Exod. viii. 17, ἐπίβεθικών 1 Regn. xxv. 20.

Declension 2. Certain nouns in -οῖς end also in -ος, e.g. χείμαρρος, αδελφόδες. The Attic form in -οῖς disappears; e.g. λαός and ναός are written for λέως and νεός—the latter however occurs in 2 Macc. (A). Nouns in -ἀρχος pass occasionally into the first declension, e.g. τοπάρχης Gen. xli. 34, κωμάρχης Esth. ii. 3, γενεσίαρχης Sap. xiii. 3 δοσέων usu. contr. in nom. acc., uncontr. in gen. dat.

Declension 3. Uncontracted forms are frequent, as βαβία Job xii. 22, πιμεων, χειλέων, and in the plural nom. and acc. of neuters in -ας, as κέρατα, πέρατα. Τήρας makes gen. γήρου dat. γῆρει. Metaplasmus occurs in some words, e.g. δύο, δυσι, πάν with masc. noun, πίλι, πίλεων (3 Regn. xxii. 11, A), σάββατα, σάββασιν, τέσσαρες, τεσσαρός, χείρ, χείραν. Acc. in -αν for -αν, νύκταν Exod. xiii. 21, τίναν Nah. iii. 19, and freq. in 8 and A 1.

Proper nouns. Many are mere transliterations and indeclinable, e.g. Ἀδάμ, Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Σαμοὺή, Δανείς, Ἀχαϊς, Ἡλείου, Ἑλείσας, Δανῆλ. On the other hand some well-known names receive Greek terminations and are declined, as Μωυσῆς or Μωυσῆ, Ιησοῦς, Ἑξεκίλιος, Ἱσαίας, Ἱερεμίας; while some are found in both forms, e.g. we have both Ἡλείου and ἦλειάς, Μανασσῆς and Μανασσῆς, Σολομῶν indecl. and Σολομῶν gen. -μῶν or -μώντως. But in the translated books the indeclinable forms prevail, and there is no appearance of the forms Ἀλβραμος, Ἰσαϊας, Ἰωάννας, 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, L.V. No. 110, p. 164 ff.
which are familiar to the reader of Josephus. In the case of local names transliteration is usual, e.g. Ἰερονοσάλημ, Βηθλέεμ, Βαβylim, Σειών. A few however have Greek terminations, as Σαμαρέα or Σαμαρία, Ἰόρδανος; and some names of foreign localities are Hellenised, as Βαβυλών, Συρία, ἡ ἑρυθρά θάλασσα, Ἰδουμαῖα, Ἀγγυτος, and the two Egyptian towns Ἡρώων τῶν (Gen. xlvi. 28), Ἡλίων πόλεως (Exod. i. 11). The declension of the Hellenised names presents some irregularities; thus we find Μωσῆς, -σή, -σεί, -σή, Ἰησοῦς, -σοῦ, -σοι, -σοῦν. Μακασάς, -σάς.

(iii.) Conjugation of verbs

Augments. Doubled, as in κεκατάρανται Num. xxi. 6, xxiv. 9, ἀπεκατέστησεν Gen. xxiii. 16, παρεσυνεβάλεται Ps. xviii. 13, 21 (A). Prefixed to prepositions, e.g. ἐπρονόμενων Num. xxi. 1, Deut. ii. 35, ἐπροφήτευσαν Num. xi. 25 f., ἦνωσάντο το 2 Esdr. xix. 30 (B). Lengthened, as ἡμέλλων Sap. xviii. 4, ἡμελόμενη Isa. i. 29, xiii. 9, ἡμελομήνη, ἡμελάνθην, 2 Chr. xx. 37, Jer. v. 4. Omitted, as in ἀνέθη Jud. viii. 3, ἀφέθη Isa. xxxiii. 24, αὐτάρκησαν Deut. xxxii. 10, ἐξολοθρεύσεν 1 Chr. xxi. 15, ἦδεν Gen. i. 4, κατορθώθη 2 Chr. xxxv. 10.

Tenses and Persons. (1) Verbs in -ω. New presents, as ἀμφιαύω, γρηγορῶ, βέννω, κτέννω. Futures and aorists1 with reduplication: κεκράξωμαι (Job vi. 5), ἐκέκραξα (Num. xi. 2), ἐπεσείζωσα (Jud. ix. 26 A); cf. ἐκεκράγων, Isa. vi. 3. Contracted futures in -ό with ἐργά Gen. iv. 2, ἄρπά Lev. xix. 13, ἐκδικάται Deut. xxxii. 43, ἐγκακαῖ Ps. li. 3, συμβίβασα Isa. xl. 13, ἀποδοκιμώ Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi. 37). Futures (and aor.) with short vowels, πονέω, Isa. xix. 10. Irregular futures: ἔδομαι, φάγομαι, χεώ (Exod. iv. 9). Second aor. forms with termination in -α: ἐδαμέν 1 Regn. x. 14, ἐφυγαν 2 Regn. x. 14, ἐφάγαμεν 2 Regn. xix. 42, ἐλθατώ Esth. v. 4. Person endings: 2nd p. s. pres. pass. or middle in -σαι: πιεσαί, φάγεσαι (Ezech. xiii. 18, Ruth ii. 9, 14), ἀπεξενουσαί 3 Regn. xiv. 6. 3rd p. pl. imperf. and aor. act. in -σαν: ἐγεννῶσαν Gen. vi. 4, ἐλθασαν Exod. xv. 27, κατελίπωσαν Exod. xvi. 24, κατενουσαν Exod. xxxiii. 8, ἠμοῦσαν Ezech. xxii. 11; cf. the opt. αὐτέσσαραν Gen. xlix. 8, ἐλθοσαν Deut. xxxiii. 16. 3rd p. pl. aor. mid. in -εντο: ἐπελάδεντο Jud. iii. 7 (A), Hos. xiii. 6 (B), Jer. xviii. 15 (B* A), &c. 3rd p. pl. perf. act. in -αν: ἐφάρακαν Deut. xi. 7; πέτοιδαν, Judith vii. 10. 2nd p. s. 1st aor. and perf. act. in -ες; ἀπέσταλκες Exod. v. 22; ἐδώκες, 2 Esdr. xix. 10, Ezech. xvi. 21. (2) Verbs in -μι. From εἰμί we have ἦμιν, ἦδα. From κάθημαι, κάθω Ps. cix. (cx.) 1. From ἱστημι, ἵστηκέναι, ἥστηκός. From δίδωμι, ἔδιδε Exod. v. 13 (A), Jer. xii. 34; δοι, Ps. xlii. 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.

S. S.
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 θεί, Ps. xxi. 2, esp. in the phrase Κύριε ὁ θεός; θυγάτηρ = θυγατέρ, Ruth ii. 2, 22, iii. 1, &c. Discussion of the Dual.

**Comparison.** Use of a preposition with the positive for the comparative, e.g. μέγας παρὰ πάντας, Exod. xviii. 11; ἀγαθός ὑπὲρ δέκα, 1 Regn. i. 8.

**Numerals.** ἐπτά = ἐπτάκις, 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 mood, and disappearance of that mood in dependent clauses. Periphrasis with εἰμί, e.g. πεποίθησα ἐσώμαι, 2 Regn. xxii. 3; ἦσθι πεποίθησα, Prov. iii. 5. Indicative with ἄν: imperf. and aor., ὅταν εἰσήρχετο, Gen. xxxviii. 9; ὅταν ἐπῆρεν, Exod. xvi. 11; ὅταν κατέβη, Num. xi. 9; ἤνικα ἄν εἰσεπορευότα, Jud. vi. 3; ἓν ἕσπεραν, Jud. vi. 2. Coordination of indicative with conjunctive: Exod. viii. 8 ἐξαποστέλλοντο αὐτούς, καὶ θύσωσι, Lev. vi. 2 ψυχή ἓν ἀμάρτη καὶ...παρίδῃ...καὶ...ψεύστη, ἡ...δικησε...ἐδρευ...καὶ...ψεύστη...καὶ...ομόσα κτλ. Use of infinitive, with or without the article, to express object, purpose, subject, or result; e.g. (a) ἐξῆτε ανελεῖν, Exod. ii. 15: ἡρέξατο τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν, 2 Chr. iii. 1; (b) παραγίνεται βοηθήνα, 2 Regn. viii. 5; ἀπέστειλεν τοῦ ἰδείν, Gen. viii. 7; (c) συνέβη κρεμασθήνα, Gen. xli. 13; τὸ προσκολλάσθαι ἀγαθόν Ps. lxxii. 28; (d) ὁ θεός ἐγὼ τοῦ θανάτωσαι καὶ ζωοποίησαι, 4 Regn. v. 7.

**Connexion of the sentence.** Use of gen. abs. in reference to the subject of the verb: e.g. πορευομένον σοῦ...όρα, Exod. iv. 21. Anacoluthon: ὦδων δὲ Φαραώ...ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία Φαραώ, 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 shown 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.
number of irregularities which are of Semitic origin. The following are examples.

(a) **Lexical.**

1. Transliterations, and Greek words formed from the Hebrew or Aramaic.

2. Words coined or adopted to express Semitic ideas, as ἀκροβυστία, ἀναθεματίζειν, διοκύτωμα, σκανδαλίζειν, στελαχνίζειν.

3. Phrases answering to the Hebrew idiom: e.g. ἃρτον φαγεῖν = ἐμφασις ἐμφασις, ἔλεως ποιεῖν μετά τινος = μετά τινος ἔκπληκτος, ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου = ἀρνίον, ἔτειν ψυχήν = πόνος πόνος, βουσία σωτηρίου = ἀνάμισχος, λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον = μιθήρις μιθήρις, πάσα σάρξ = ἄλογος ἄλογος, υἱὸς τεσσεράκοντα καὶ εἴνος εἰμαυτῶν = ἄγνωθι ἄγνωθι.

(b) **Grammatical**

1. **Nouns.** Repeated to express distribution, e.g. ἀνθρωπός ἀνθρωπός = ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, Num. ix. 10; ἔθνη ἔθνη = ἔθνος εἶθεν, 4 Regn. xvii. 29. Similarly δύο δύο, Gen. vi. 19; κατὰ μικρὸν μικρῶν (AF), Exod. xxiii. 30. Emphatic adverbs also are occasionally doubled after the Hebrew manner, as σφόδρα σφόδρα, Exod. i. 12, Exech. ix. 9; cf. σφόδρα σφόδρων, Gen. vii. 19 (A).

2. **Pronouns.** Οτοσ ὑπόσ use, e.g. Gen. xxx. 1 τελευτήσω εὖ (τῆς τῆς). Exod. ii. 14 σὺ θέλεις (σῦ τῆς τῆς); Exod. xxxvi. 4 αὐτός, αὐτοί. To Semitic influence is also due the wearisome iteration of the oblique cases of personal pronouns answering to the Hebrew suffixes, e.g. Jer. ii. 26 αὐτοί καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἁρχοντες αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ αὐτῶν. The fem. αὐτή is occasionally used for τοῦτο after the manner of the Heb. נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ נְּ הַ


The Greek of the Septuagint.

(Ἡ...Ῥυφὶ; Prov. iii. 15 δὲν...αὐτῶν. A similar redundancy occurs with relative adverbs: Deut. ix. 28, ὅθεν... ἐκεῖθεν (Ῥυφὶ... ὕψος); 2 Chr. i. 3, οὗ... 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, ἵδιον ἵδον (Ῥυφὶν ἄνα); Deut. xxxi. 18, ἀποστροφὴ ἀποστρέψω (Ῥυφὶν ἀποστρέψω); also the Heb. idiom ἀνατέλλω: e.g. Exod. xiv. 13, οὐ προσβήσεσθε ἐτὶ ἰδεῖν, 1 Regn. iii. 6 προσέβηστο καὶ ἐκάλεσεν (cf. v. 8 προσέθηκεν καλέσατον, Job xxix. 1 προσέβησεν εἶπεν (Ῥυφὶν...Ῥυφὶ). Constructions with prepositions contrary to the Greek idiom: βδελύσσεσθαι από (Ῥυφὶ), Exod. i. 12; φειδέσθαι ἐτὶ, Deut. vii. 16; ἐπερωτάν ἐν Κυρίῳ (Ῥυφὶν ἄνα), 1 Regn. x. 22; εὐδοκέω ἐν or ἐπί (Ῥυφὶ). Hebrew forms of adjuration as 1 Regn. iii. 14 εἰ (Ῥυφὶ) ἐξασθήσεται, ib. 17 τάδε ποιήσεις σοι ὁ θεός, εἶν... A question standing for the expression of a wish: Num. xi. 29 καὶ τίς δήλον πάντα τοῦ λαὸν Κυρίου...; Ps. lii. (lili.) 6 τίς δοσέω ἐκ Σειών τὸ σοῦθρον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; ἡγοῦ εἰμι followed by an ind. (Jud. vii. 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 = λέγω, often solocstically: e.g. Gen. xv. 1 ἐγενεῖθη ἡμια Κυρίου... λέγων, xlv. 16 διεβοθήθη η θεόν... λέγοντες.

Particles. Pleonastic use of καὶ and δέ, (1) in an apodosis, e.g. Num. xv. 14, εἰν... προσγένεσται,... καὶ ποιήσεις κάρπωμα; Prov. i. 28, ἔσται ὅταν... ἐγὼ δει...; (2) after a participle: Num. xxi. 11, καὶ ἐξάραντες... καὶ παρένεβαλον. Use of καὶ in a coordinated clause, where a dependent clause might have been expected; e.g. Num. xxxv. 2, συντάξεις τοῖς νεόν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ δόσουσιν 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 μύσχῳ (Ῥυφὶ); Lev. xxi. 10, ὁ μέγας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (Ῥυφῇ ἐν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ). A number of new prepositions or prepositional phrases are used to express the Hebrew רֵשתַל, e.g. ἔναντι, ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι, ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, ἀπό, ἐπί, πρό, προσώπου. Similarly ὁπίσω represents Ῥυφῇ; ἐν μέσῳ, ἀνὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσον = Ῥυφῇ, ἀπὸ (ἐκ) μέσου = Ῥυφῇ; διὰ χείρος, εἰς χείρας, ἐκ χειρός = ὁπίσω, ὑπίσω; ὅδον = Ρυπί. The use of σῶν to express the prefix ἦν, 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 ζωὴν (ἡμᾶς ἡμῖν) 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 philosophers 2." 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, προσκνώ, ἐνώπιον, πρόσκομμα, πειράζω, ἀκολουθώ, κοιμῶμαι, ὀς, κατοικῶ, καθέ-ζομαι, καθίζω, τὰ ἵματια, 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 standards 3. 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.
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.

1 Esdras.

ἐυφύης (Sap., 2 Macc.)
ἰερόδοulos
ἰεροψάλτης
ἱστορεῖν
καταλογισμὸς (1, 2 Chr.)
κολακεύειν (Job¹, Sap.¹)
ληστεύειν
λωποδυτεῖν
μανίκῃ (Dan.)
μεγαλειώτης
μεριδαρχία
μεταγενέστερος
ὀνοματογραφία
ὀρκωμοσία (Ez.)
πειθαρχεῖν (Jer., Dan.)
προκαθηγείσθαι (cod. B)
προσομπῆ
προσκεφάλαιον (Ez.)
συνβραβεέων
σωματοφύλαξ (Judith, 2 Macc.)
υπομηματίζειν
φορολογία (1 Macc.)
χαμαστείς
χάσκειν
χρηματιστήριον
χρυσοχάλινος (2 Macc.)

άκολούθως = κατά, dat. (2 Esdr., 2 Macc.)
ἀναγνώστης = γραμματεύς, 2 Esdr.
ἀναμφισβητήτως
ἀναπλήρωσις (Dan.)
ἀνεροῦν (3 Macc.)
ἀντίγραφον (Esth., Ep.-Jer., 1, 2 Macc.)
ἀντιπαρασύνειν
ἀπονείσθαι (2 Macc.)
ἀποσημαίνειν
ἀποστάτις (2 Esdr.)
βιβλιοφυλάκιον
δημαγωγεῖν, -γία
διάδημα (Esth., Sap., Isa., 2, 4 Macc.)
δογματίζειν (Esth., Dan., 2, 3 Macc.)
δυνσέβεια, -βημα (2 Macc.)
eἰδωλείον (Dan., 1 Macc.)
ἐμφυσιοῦν
ἐπακούστως
ἐπιδόξως
ἐπιστεύειν (Esth.¹, Prov.¹)
ἐρωμένη, ἥ (cod. B)
ἐὐθαρασίας (1, 2 Macc.)
ἐὐπρεπῆς (Sap.)

δημαρχία (Esth., Ep.-Jer.), 1—3 Macc.
Daniel.

άποθαυμάζειν (Sir.)
άποτυμπανίζειν (3 Macc.)
άρχιευνοχός
άρχιπατριώτης (Jos.)
δαμάζειν
δημένειν
διαμέλιζειν
diáπυρος (3 Macc.)
dιωκητής (2 Esdr., Tob.)
έγκυκλιος
e'ποργίζεθαί (2 Macc.)
έωταπορία (4 Regn.)
eύκαταφρόνητος
eύσημως
θερμωσia (Jer.)
κηλιδονίσθαι (Jer.)
κοινάμα

κοπανίζειν (3 Regn.)
μανιάκης (1 Esdr.)
μεγαλειώσης (1 Esdr., Jer.)
πρόσψυς (2 Macc.)
σαμβύκη
σοφιστής (Exod.)
συναλοάν
συνμολύνεσθαι
σύριγξ
ὕπατος
ὕπερεινετός
ὕπερένδοξος
ὕπερμεγεθής (1 Chr.)
ὕπερψυχών (Ps.)
ὕπερφερής
φιλόσοφος (4 Macc.)

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*.

άγερωχία (2, 3 Macc.)
άδιάπτωτος
άθανασία (4 Macc.)
άκατομάχητος
άκηλίδωτος (Ps.)
άκοιμητός
άλαξονεύσθαι (Ps.)
άλαμοντός
άδοποσίμως
άναποδηγμός
άνεκλιπής
άνεξικακία
άνυπόκριτος
άπτήμαντος
άπολογία
άποτόμοις, ἀποτόμοις
ἀτέλεστος
ἀτίμητος (3 Macc.)

αὐτοσχέδιος
αὐθόνως
βασκανία (4 Macc.)
δεκαμνίατος
διορθωτής
δύσχρηστος (Isa.)
ἐπισφαλὼς
ἐπιτηθίδεος (1 Chr., 1—3 Macc.)
ἐπισθημίζειν (Deut.)
ἐργατεία
ἐυκλείς (Jer.)
ἐυκυκλος
ἐυμορφία (3 Macc.)
ἐυστοχος
θυμήρης
ἰδίατης (3 Macc.)
κακοπραγία
κακότεχνος

* Cf. supra, p. 268 f., for some interesting examples from other parts of the book.
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.

αγορανομία  
ακραμίας  
ακρόπολις  
ακρωτηριάζειν  
αλλοφυλισμός  
αναλημματέος  
απενθανάτιζειν  
άρχηγενέτης  
άσυλια  
αυθαίρετος  
βαρβαροῦν  
δειλανδρίαν  
δευτερολογεῖν  
διώσταλσις  
δοξικός  
δυσπέτημα  
ἐπευλαβείσθαι

eυσανάνητης  
thoραχεῖν  
θωρακισμός  
κατευθετεῖν  
λεληθότως  
λειτανεία  
ὀπλολογεῖν  
pατρίδος  
pολεμοστροφεῖν  
pολυπραγμονεῖν  
pροσαναλέγεσθαι  
pροσυπομνημοσεῖν  
σπλαγχνισμός  
συμμισσοπονηρεῖν  
sυνεκκεντεῖν  
tερατοποιῶν  
ψυχαγωγία

3 Maccabees.

ἀλογιστία  
ἀμμηνικακία  
ἀνείκαστος  
ἀνεπιστρεπτός  
ἀνέφικτος  
ἀσωῆς  
βαρυχῆς  
βυθοτρεφῆς
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 Ἄβραάμ, Ἰσραήλ, Δανιήλ. But Ἱερουσαλήμ has become Ἱεροσόλυμα, and Eleazar is usually Ἑλεάζαρος. 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.
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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.² (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 Grācitāt 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.

I. (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 evidence\(^1\) 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 Psalms\(^2\) 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 literature\(^1\) 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 critic\(^2\) of being a work of the 4th century A.D.; the Greek Ecclesiastes savours of the school of Aquila\(^3\). 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. xxi. 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. 2Regn. xxii. 2—6.

\(^3\)Κύριος στερέωμα μου καὶ καταφυγή μου καὶ ρύστης μου ὁ θεός μου βοηθός καὶ ἐλπίδω ἐπ’ αὐτόν ......... ....
\(^4\)αἰνὶ ἐπικαλέσομαι Κύριον, καὶ Εὶ τῶν εἰχρῶν μου σωθήσομαι.
\(^5\)περιέσχον με ὁδίνες βανάτου, καὶ χειμαρροὶ ἀνομίας ἐξετάραξαν με. ὁδίνες ἄδου περιεκυκλώσαν με, προεφθασάν με παγίδες βανάτου. 7καὶ ἐν τῷ βληθεῖσαι μὲ ἐπεκαλεσάµην τὸν κύριον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν μου ἐκεκραξα- 6τον ἐν ναῷ ἀγίῳ αὐτοῦ φωνῆς μου, ἣ κρανγη ῥο μου [ἐν ω ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐισελεύσεται] ἐς τὰ ὁ δε δι ἀὐτοῦ.

\(^1\) 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 McNeile (Introdt. 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 נְטַחְתָּה 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 פָּנָיָה is uniformly represented in the Hexateuch by פְּלִיטָיָה, but in Judges and the later books by שלושת, פָּנָיָה is פְּלִיטָיָה or פְּלִיטָיָה in Chronicles(18) and Jeremiah(1), but פְּלִיטָיָה in all other books; יִרְדָּנוּ is דִּיוֹלָנֶה or דִּיוֹלָנֶה in the Pentateuch, but in Ezra-Nehemiah פְּלִיטָיָה, פְּלִיטָיָה; יִרְדָּנוּ is דִּיוֹלָנֶה in Exodus, but in Ezra תֶלֶיאוֹ; in Isaiah חֲנִינָם is מַשָּׁה more than 50 times, whilst מַשָּׁה or מַשָּׁה is the almost uniform rendering of the word when it is used as a title of Deity, does not once occur; חֲנִינָם is מַשָּׁה in Gen., Exod., Lev., Num., and again in the Prophets, but מַשָּׁה in Deuteronomy (with one exception) and onwards to the end of the historical books. The singular phrase מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה is limited to Judges, Ruth, and 2—4 Regn.; מַשָּׁה מַשָּׁה of the object occurs in the true LXX. only in Ecclesiastes; מַשָּׁה is peculiar to Chronicles and Ezra, other books which contain the Heb. word (Num., Deut., 1 Regn., Psalms, Jer.) preferring מַשָּׁה. Similar results may be obtained from a comparison of the forms assumed by the same proper names in different books. Elijah (יְהוּד) is יְהוּד in the Books of Kings, but יְהוּד in Malachi and Sirach. The lists in Chronicles use the Hebrew form of Gentile names (Thackeray, Gramm. O. T. p. 55).

1 On Job xxxiii. 31 see Thackeray, Gramm. O. T. p. 55.
'Αναθωθείτης, &c.). In Ezra ἱλαρίζει becomes Ἀσσούρος, but Ἀρταξέρξης is substituted by the translator of Esther, and Ἐρέξης by the LXX. translator of Daniel (ix. 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 literature 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 work." No wonder if even in the later books the Hebrew

---

1 Theod. has Ἀσσούρον in Daniel.
2 Cf. prol. to Sirach: τῶν ἄλλων πατριῶν βιβλίων.
idiom refused to lend itself to the forms even of Hellenistic Greek without losing to some extent its identity, as the translator of Sirach complains\(^1\). 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 Jew\(^2\). 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 text\(^3\). 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.

\(\text{(a)}\) 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., ό γὰρ ἵππως ἔγραμει 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 ἔξελενσεται. Ps. cxi. 4 προφασίζεσθαι. Hos. ii. 23 (25) ἡγατημένην, vi. 5 ἀπεδείχα. Isa. iv. 2 ἐπιλάθησεν, iii. 10 καθαρίσσα. Jer. xxxvii. (xxxvi.) 13 ἁρμόσουσαν. Arabic: Ps. lxxxiii. 7 δώσει. Dan. vii. 22 (LXX.) ἑδόθη.
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 proceeded. 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 letters. 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 letters 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 kephä dramatic name 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 י"וד 'וכ, or, as the Talmud calls it, ח"וד; 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 א and י, ב and מ, ה ה and מ, as well as ب and ت, ل and ر, were more or less difficult to distinguish².

A few examples may be given from Driver's list. (1) 1 Regn. ii. 29 δφθαλµαυ (ןע, for ff); xii. 3 αποκριθητε κατ'έµον (ןב, for דלע); Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 17 ὄρνταν (.guard, for הגר); Isa. xxix. 13 ματην δὲ σέβουται µε (ןו, for רה). (2) 1 Regn. vi. 20 διαλθεῖν (seven, for ליעומ); Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 25 τοῦ νῦν αὐτῆς (םב for ספ); 1 Regn. iv. 10 ταγμάτων (י, for לוהי), xxii. 7 דומק ὁ Σύρος (ר, for יר, יר, יר).

Another cause of confusion was the scriptio defectiva in the case of א and י where they represent long vowels, e.g. 1 Regn. xii. 8 καὶ κατφκίσαντ αὐτοῦς (יבנ, for יבנ); Ps. v. tit. ντρφ ᾿ης κληρονοµοῦσας (ד, for תחתתולא); Job xix. 18 εἰς τὸν αἰώνα (ות, for ארי, ליהל); Jer. vi. 23 ὃς πῦρ (כנ, for למכ). 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 τρια ἑτη, ἡ 'seven years,' where י has been read ל. Here כ 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 Penta-teuch; see Driver, i.e.
² A specimen of such a script, but of much later date, may be seen in Driver, op. cit., p. lxv.
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.

S. S.
cian inscriptions are without punctuation, and so were probably the early Biblical rolls. The division adopted by the LXX. is frequently at variance with that of the Massoretic text, and is sometimes preferable to the latter, sometimes inferior; but the differences witness to the absence of divisions in the Hebrew MSS. and the non-employment of the final letters רָשִׁים.

Thus Gen. xlix. 19, 20 αὐτῶν κατὰ πόδας. Ἅσηρ... = αἰτήσεσθε; Deut. xxvi. 5 Συριαν ἀπέβαλεν = ἁμαρτάνει (H, ἁμαρτάνει); 1 Regn. i. 1 εὖ Νασείβ = βελοβί (H, βελοβί); Ps. xliii. (xliv.) 5 ὁ θεὸς μου ὁ ἐπηλόμενος = ἀλλάζει (H, ἀλλάζει Μέρός); Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 15 διὰ τί ἔφυγεν ἀπὸ σου ὁ Ἀπίς; = μηρόν Μέρός κύριός (H, μηρόν κύριός); Zech. xi. 7 εἰς τὴν Χαναανίτην = κατ' Χαναανίτην (H, κατ' Χαναανίτην).

Lastly, almost every page of the LXX. yields evidence that the Hebrew text was as yet unpointed. Vocalisation was in fact only traditional until the days of the Massora, and the tradition which is enshrined in the Massoretic points differs, often very widely, from that which was inherited or originated by the Alexandrian translators.

A few examples may suffice: Gen. xv. 11 καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς = συνεκάθισε (H, συνεκάθισε); Num. xvi. 5 ἐπισκέπται = ἐπισκέπτεσθε (H, ἐπισκέπτεσθε); 1 Regn. xii. 2 καθίσομαι = καθισίμενον (H, καθισίμενον); Nah. iii. 8 μερίδα Ἀμμών = μοιασθείτις (H, μοιασθείτις); Isa. ix. 8 δάνατον (רָדָנָה, H, רָדָנָה) ἀπέστειλεν Κύριος ἐπὶ Ἰακώβ. In proper names the differences of the vocalisation are still more frequent and apparent, e.g. Μαδιάμ (מָדִים); Βαλαάμ (בָּלָאָֹמ), Γόμορρα (גּוֹמְרָה), Χοδολογόμορ (חֹדֹלוּגָוֹר), Φασγά (פָּסָגָא), Σαμψών (סָמָסָו)

(c) One other preliminary consideration remains. The student must not leave out of sight the present state of the Greek text. A homogeneous text is not to be found even in the

1 Jerome in the last years of the 4th century knows nothing of a system of vowel points; see Nowack, Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die ATliche Textkritik (Göttingen, 1875).
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 doublets\(^1\). 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. 7. 4 ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους. 7. 5 ἐγένετο ἐσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωῒ, ἡμέρα μία. 7. 20 ἔρπετὰ ψυχῶν ἑωσ̄ων. 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 ἄφικέθαν ἕως πρὸς τινα, παρασιωπᾶν ἀπὸ τινος, προστιθέναι (τοῦ) ποιεῖν, λαλεῖν ἐν χειρὶ τινος, ἔχθες καὶ τρίτην, ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς (ἕως γενεᾶς καὶ γενεᾶς, εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν), 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.
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desire to be true to what they conceive to be the meaning of the Hebrew, as when in 1 Regn. i. 26 they render ἐν ἑμοί. 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 considerable, 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 Ῥήχαβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς where Ῥήχαβ(τ) seems to have been read as Ῥήχαβ, and consequently treated as a proper name; in others, the Hebrew form is purposely maintained (e.g. ἀλληλούα, 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 ἁβαρκηνεὶς, 4 Regn. ii. 14 ἀφφο (Μωνή και), Jer. xxxviii. (xxxvi.) 40 πάντες ἀσαρμιῶθ εἰς νᾶχαλ 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 'Αρμαθάμ (Ὁμορμάτ)2. Similarly the κ is taken over in the transliteration, as in Gen. xxxv. 6 εἰς Λοῦζα = Νῦζ. Sometimes two words are rolled into one, as in Ὠλαμμαίς = Νῦζ Ὠλαμ (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 a is here prothetic, which is however less probable.
A doublet is occasionally created by adding a translation to the transliterated Hebrew, e.g. in i Regn. vi. 11, 15 ὅθμα ἐργάζεται, vii. 4 τὰ ἄλογος Ἀσταρὼθ, xxiii. 14 ἐν Μασεφέμ ἐν τοῖς στενόῖς. 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 Ζωῆ (Ἡρώη); xi. 9 ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σύγχυσις (Ὑγίς); xiv. 13 ἀπήγγειλεν Ἀβράμ τῷ περάτῃ (Ἀβραάμ).

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 ἵδιον ἡ γῆ πλατεῖα ἐναντίον ψιμῶν, xl. 17 ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γενημάτων ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς Φαραώ ἔσθει, Deut. vii. 16 φάγῃ πάντα τὰ σκύλα 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

---
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to be understood (Gen. xxix. 9 αὐτῆ γὰρ ἔβοσκε τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς, Heb. ‘fed them’; xxxiv. 14 καὶ εἰπαν αὐτῶς Συμεὼν καὶ Δευνι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Δεινας νιοί δὲ Δειας, 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 πέτωκας: xvi. 10 καὶ ἀφετε αὐτῶν καὶ ὤτως καταράσθω = Ἆπταν (ד נב נב), or they make good an apo-

siopesis (Exod. xxxii. 32 εἰ μὲν ἀφεῖς αὐτῶς τὴν ἄμαρτίαν αὐτῶν ἀφεῖς). Less frequently they insert a whole sentence which is of the nature of a gloss, as in Gen. i. 9 καὶ συνήθη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἠφθη ἡ ἕρα, which is merely an expansion of καὶ ἐγένετο ὄτως in the terms of the preceding command συναχθήτω κτλ.; or i Regn. i. 5 δι υ ἕν αὐτῆ παιδίον, a reminiscence of v. 2 τῇ Ἀνων ὦν ἕν 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 τῶν ποταμῶν (Heb. ‘he rose up and passed over’), ib. 31 εἶπα γὰρ Μὴ ποτε κτλ. (Heb. ‘Because I was afraid, for I said…’); i Regn. i. 9 μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτῶς ἐν Σηλῶ (Heb. ‘after they had eaten in Shiloh and after they had drunk’).

(b) The translators frequently interpret words which call for explanation. Hebraisms are converted into Greek phraseology, e.g. יהַסִּק becomes ἄλλογενής (Exod. xii. 43), and γνήσιος (Num. vii. 15); μισθοὶ ἡμᾶς is rendered by ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλογος 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 ὑπαρξεῖν (Gen. xii. 9); ‘Urim and Thummim’ become ἡ δηλωσις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια (Exod. xxviii. 26); in the Psalms ἀντιλήμπται is written for ἱππ (Ps. iii. 4), βοηθός for Ἕλ (xvii. = xviii. 3), and γλώσσα for ἔλαιον (Ps. xv. = xvi. 9); similarly in Jer. ii. 23 τὸ πολυάνδριον ‘the cemetery’ stands for κητίς, i.e. the valley of Hinnom. An effort is made to represent Hebrew money by its nearest Greek equivalent; thus for יבצ we have διδραχμων (Gen.

1 Similarly in Prov. xxii. 10, where the LXX. read יר חוכ בּוֹשֶׁת, the last two words are rendered εἰν συνεδρίῳ.
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xxiii. 15, Deut. xxii. 29, 2 Esdr. xv. 15) as well as σίκλος, and for ἴδια δοβολός. Occasionally a whole clause is interpreted rather than translated; e.g. Gen. i. 2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, Exod. iii. 14 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὄν, 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 ἔση τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (ῥηθαι); xxiv. 10 εἶδον τὸν τόπον σὺ εἰστήκει δὲ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Heb. ‘they saw the God of Israel,’ Aq. εἶδον τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ); ib. 11 τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς; Num. xii. 8 τὴν δόξαν (Ἡλει) Κυρίου εἶδεν; Exod. xv. 3 Κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους (ἡλει θεα); Deut. xiv. 23 ὁ τόπος δὲν ἀν ἐκλέξηται Κύριος δὲ θεός σου ἐπικληθήναι (Ἰσραήλ) τὸ νόμομα αὐτῷ ἐκεί; Jos. iv. 24 ἡ δύναμις τοῦ κυρίου (Ἰσραήλ). 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 יְהֹוָה or בָּבַל בָּבַל. In other places the LXX. appear to be guided by the Jewish Halacha, e.g. Gen. ii. 2 συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ (ὑπερδειφιννόμενος, Aq. τῇ ἐβδόμῃ); Lev. xxiv. 7 ἐπιθύμησε ἐπὶ τὸ θέρα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἀλα; xix. 7 ἐὰν δὲ βρῶσει βρωθῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ, ἄθυτον ἑστων (Heb. ‘an abomination’). Of Haggada also there are clear traces, as in Exod. xii. 40 ἐν γῇ Ἀγγυπτῷ καὶ ἐν γῇ Χανάαν, 1 Regn. i. 14 ἐπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πανδάριον Ἡλεῖ; 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” (II. P. Smith, Samuel, p. 10).
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(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.) yap is translated by ἀμαρτωλός in vv. 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 32, 40, but by ἀσεβῆς 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 ἀφέω, 'give', 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 ἀποστύμαι σε (ἵνα μη γένηται (ἵνα ἀφέω) ; when it is rendered directly, the following Greek verbs (besides διδόω and its compounds) are used to represent it: ἅγεω, ἀποστέλλω, ἀποτίνω, ἀφιέω, δεικνύω, δώρεισθαι, ἐών, ἐκτίθεναι, ἐκτίνων, ἐκχείν, ἐλεῖν, ἐμβάλλων, ἐγκαταλείπειν, ἐπαίρειν, ἐπιβάλλων, ἐπιτιθέναι, ἐπιχείνω, ἐφιστάναι, ἰστάναι, καταβάλλων, καθιστάναι, κατατάσσειν, κρεμάζω, παρατιθέναι, περιτιθέναι, ποιεῖν, προεκφέρειν, προσείναι, προστιθέναι, στηρίζω, συνάγω, 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: ἦς is variously rendered by ἀκρον, 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 διδόω and its compounds).
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χρόνος; among the equivalents of Ἴν are ἀπόκρισις, ἐπερώτησις, κρίμα, πράγμα, τρόπος, φωνή; for ἔδωκα we have not only καρδία, ψυχή, φήνη, νοῦς, διάνοια, στόμα, φρόνησις, but στήθος and even σάρξ; for ἄρα, ἄρθροι, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, ἐτάξεω, ἐκδικεῖν; for ἡρῴ, δικαίος, ἐλεημοσύνη, ἐμφροσύνη. Conversely, the same Greek word often serves for several Hebrew words. Thus διαθήκη, which is generally the LXX. rendering of הָלַקְנָא, stands also for הָלַקְנָא (Exod. xxvii. 21, xxxi. 7), הָלַקְנָא (Dan. ix. 13, LXX.) and even רַבָּרוֹן (Deut. ix. 5); ἔζησεῖν, ἀντροῦν, ἔμεθσαι are all used to represent בָּרֶנ, ἔδωκαν appears in different contexts for לַקְנָא, אֹתוֹלֶא, לֵו לִלְקָל, הָקָבָא, לְעַבָּרְב, בָּרֶנ, בָּרֶנ, לְעַבָּרְב, מַלְאָה, מַלְאָה, מַלְאָה. Even in the same context or verse this sometimes occurs. Thus in Gen. i.—iii. γῆ translates מִיתָא, הָלַקְנָא, הָלַקְנָא, הָלַקְנָא, הָלַקְנָא; in Exod. xii. 23 רַבָּרוֹנ and נָבֶנ are both represented by παρεὑρέσθαι; in Num. xv. 4 f. θροία is used both for נטָנ and נב. In such cases it is difficult to acquit the translators of carelessness; but they are far less frequent than instances of the opposite kind. On the whole the LXX. even in the Pentateuch shews no poverty of words, and considerable skill in the handling of synonyms.

(d) In reference to metaphors the Alexandrians allow themselves some discretion. Thus in Gen. vi. 2 'the sons of God' become οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ; in Num. xxiv. 17 'a sceptre (ὕπο) shall rise' is rendered by ἀναστήσεται ἀνθρωπος; in Deut. x. 16 'the foreskin of your heart' is turned euphemistically into τῆς σκληροκαρδίας ὄμων; in Isa. ix. 14 μέγαν καὶ μικρὸν represents Heb. 'both branch and rush.' Occasionally the translators indulge in paronomasia, without authority from the Heb., e.g. Gen. xxv. 27 οἰκῶν οἰκῖαν = ἡμῶν ἡμῖν; xxvi. 18 καὶ ἐπωνύμασεν αὐτοῖς ὄνόματα γῆς ὑπὲρ ἦλθεν; Job xxvii. 12 κενὰ κενοῖς; xxx. 13 ἐξετρίβησαν τρίβοι μοῦ.

(e) Lastly, the reader of the Septuagint must expect to find a large number of actual blunders, due in part perhaps to
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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 ρήματα...ρήμα, Heb. בְּרִיבָה...סָרְפָה. Λέγων = Ῥέματα; cf. v. 4, where, as elsewhere, Aq. renders, τῷ λέγειν. ἡ περαστὶς ὁ σου, Heb. ὅτι άμα a shield to thee; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29, Prov. ii. 7, al. Ο' μοῦσας σου πολύς. Vulg., A.V., R.V. connect Heb. with the foregoing, supplying ι. 2. Δεσπότης = ὁ διός, as in v. 8, and not infrequently in Jer. and Dan. (LXX.). Ἀπολύομαι ἀκένος—an interpretation rather than a literal rendering of ὁ διός. Yīōs Μάσεκ θῆς οἰκογενεוסις μου = ὅτι ἥν τὸ οὐκ ἦν, τὸν πρὸς. ib: cf. Hieron. quaest.

1 Philo has ἀπελεύσομαι (see below).
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in Gen. "ubi nos habemus Et filius Masec vernaculæe meæ, in Hebraeo scriptum est יְהִי בַּעַל [בַּעַל], quod Aquila transtulit ό νῦς τοῦ ποτίζοντος οίκιαν μου...Theodotio vero καὶ νῦς τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς οίκιας μου." Δαμασκός Ἐλείζερ, a literal rendering of the Heb., leaving the difficulty unsolved. 3. 'Ἑπειδὴ οὖν, and so in xviii. 31, xix. 19; did LXX. read ὑμῖν? Οἰκογενεῖς here = οἰκεῖοι. Κληρονομίσει με—a Hebraism, = κληρονόμοις μου ἔσται. 4. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐγένετοι = γαῖα. Φωνῇ = ἔσται, as in xi. 1, but apparently not elsewhere. ὁσ...οὐτος, ἄνω...ἐπὶ. 'Εκ σοῦ, euphemism for Heb. ἡ ἔπαθε, unless the LXX. read ψυκῆς. 5. Πρὸς αὐτὸν, Λ Ἰερ. 6. Καὶ ἔπιστευεν = οἰκεῖοι (cf. Haupt ad loc.). 'Ἀβαράμ, Λ Ἰερ. Τῷ θεῷ = ἡ γαῖα. 'Ελογίσθη...εἰς δίκην, 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 = ἡ γαῖα...ἐπὶ. Γεννήθηντος πρὸς ὄρον = ἡ γαῖα ἡ γαῖα. 'Ἐπὶ ὄροις Σεινά, Heb. 'on the mountain.' Φωνῇ, cod. F with Μ pr. καὶ. 17. 'Ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος Σ. (om. Ἱ. AF), Heb. 'at the nether part (ἡ γαῖα) of the mountain.' 18. Διὰ τὸ καταβαθμηκέναι, an idiomatic rendering of ὢν τὸ ὄρος τὸ ὄρος. Τὸν θεὸν = ἡ γαῖα, cf. 21. 'Ὁ καπνός, Heb. 'the smoke of it.' 'Ἐξεστή, Heb. as v. 16 where LXX. renders ἐπτομήθη. 'Ὁ λαὸς = ἡ γαῖα; Μ.Τ., ἡ γαῖα. 19. Προβαίνουσα ἵγχωρότερα = ἡ γαῖα ἡ γαῖα. 20. Ἐκάλεσεν...Μωϋσῆν, Heb. ἡ γαῖα; the 5 after ἡ γαῖα is dropt in accordance with Greek idiom. 21. Δέγγον, Λ. Ἰερ. 'Ἐγγίσκωσαν, a softening of the Heb. 'break forth' (ὁρα); in the next verse εὖγίζεω = ὀπτά. 22. καὶ, Ἰερ. 'and also' (ὅτι), usually καὶ γε, Α.καὶ καἰγε (Burkitt, Aquila, p. 13). Κύριον τῷ θεῷ, a double rendering of ἡ γαῖα...-svg. 'Ἀπαλλάξῃ αὐτὸν: another instance of euphemism: Heb. 'break forth upon them' (Α.κ. διακόψῃ ἐν αὐτοῖς). 23. Προσαναβήσατε: the double compound occurs six times in Jos. xi.—xix. 'Ἀφόρσωσι: the verb is here as in v. 12 the equivalent of בת הבן hi. 'enclose,' but with the added thought of consecration which is latent in ἀφορίζειν, ἀφόρισμα, ἀφορίσμος (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.
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26, Ezech. xx. 40).  24. 'Απολέση, euphemistic, as ἀπαλλάξῃ in v. 22; Aq. again, διακόψῃ.

Num. xxiii. 7—10.

7. Παραβολήν: here for the first time ἀνίνη. Lyons Pent., parabula. Ἑφεσοναμίας, i.e. βλέπεις νομάς (Gen. xxiv. 10), or ἡρμήν (Gen. xxv. 20); here an interpretation of the simple βλέπεις. 'Απ', λέγον, A Heb. 'Επτικατάρασαι μου, and κατάρασσαι in v. 8, represent לֵית, whilst אֶרֶס answers to וִיה, and אֶרֶסloyd (v. 8) to בָּל, an unusual instance of carelessness or poverty of language on the part of the translator; ἄρειν (v. 9) is equally unfortunate as a rendering of בָּל, while on the other hand לֵית, προσοφόρω fairly represent the Heb. Προσνοεῖν renders νυμ' again in Job xx. 9, xxiv. 15. 10. ἐξακριβάζεσθαι (Num.1, Job1, Dan. LXX.1.), a late form for ἐξακριβῶν in LXX. and Jos. Τὸ σπέρμα, Heb. 'the dust': did LXX. read χειρ, or have they glossed ταύτη? Καὶ τὰ ἐξαραθμηστα, reading ἐκάρα τοίς, Heb. 'the fourth part of Israel' (Aq. τὸ τετάρτου ἑαντοῦ'). ὁ ψυχή μου, as Heb., whilst the next word is sacrificed to an alliteration (ψυχή, ψυχαίς). Τὸ σπέρμα μου is a gloss on νυμ' (cf. Brown, Heb. and Eng. Lex., p. 31); ὃς 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. Ἀλτι τα, αἱ ἐντολαί, Heb. 'this is the commandment,' ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, Heb. 'your God.' Οὗτος, A Heb. Ἐπιστορεύεσθε, Heb. 'go over'; the Greek has lost the local reference, as in iv. 14, 4 Regn. iv. 8. 2. Ἰνα φοβισθῇς...ὑμῶν, Heb. 2nd pers. sing. Σήμερον, A ἧμ. Οἱ νῦν κτλ., Heb. 'thy son and thy son's son.' Ἰνα μακροπορεύσηστε, Heb. 'and that thy days may be prolonged'; μακροπορεύεσθαι (μακροπορεύεσθαι γίνεσθαι) represents this or a similar phrase in iv. 40, v. 30, xi. 9, 21, xxxii. 47; μακροχρόνους, μακροχρονίζεσθαι 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 A M.T.; perhaps added to complete the sense of the Greek; yet see v. 10 ἔως ἐνίκησα.

4. Καὶ ταῦτα...Αλγυττοῦ A Heb; perhaps repeated from iv. 45 to form an introduction to Ἀκοῦε κτλ. 5. Διανοιασ...ψυχής...δυνάμεως. The readings vary; for διανοίας AF Luc. read καρδίας, and the text of B is here super rasuram; for δυνάμεως some texts give ἵσχεις. The N.T. citations (Mt. xxii. 37 = Mc. xii. 29 ff.,
Lc. x. 27) present much diversity, giving both renderings of ἔπιστλευτον and both of ἀνάβλευτον: cf. Dittmar, V. T. in Novo, p. 50f. 6. καὶ ἐν τῷ ψυχῷ σου, Ἀαρ: for 'in thy heart' Heb. has 'upon,' 'as if they were imprinted there (Jer. xxxii. 33).'

Jos. x. 12—14.

12. ἡ ἡμέρα παρέδωκεν...ὑποχείριον—idiomatic rendering of νῦν...τεταγμένον. The words that follow (νῦν...Ἰσραήλ) seem to be a gloss derived from v. 10. Καὶ εἶπεν Ἰσραήλ, Heb. 'and he said in the eyes of Israel.' Στήθω, Heb. 'be still.' 

JUD. v. 28—30.

28. Β here omits the difficult word ἰβιχα (_ASC, 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)
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θανεν). 'Εκτὸς τοῦ τοξικοῦ, 'forth from the loophole'; cf. Symm. in Ezek. xl. 16 δυρίδες τοξικαί: ἘΔA διὰ τής δικτυωτῆς, 'through the lattice' (cf. 4 Regn. i. 2, Ezek. xli. 16). 'Επιβλέπουσα...Σῶσαρά in A appears to be a supplementary gloss. Ἡσχύνη (B) confuses ἄριστον with ἄριστον; the general sense of the former is given by ἡσχύσιστον Α. For ἐσκατήσεων cf. i Macc. v. 53; has it been suggested here by its similarity to the word used in B? Πόδες: Α more literally ἁχην, but τούς represents ΟΥ elsewhere, e.g. Ps. Ivii. (Ivii.) 6, Prov. xxix. 5. 29. Αυ σοφάι ἁρχοντι: A, again aiming at a literal rendering, σοφάι ἁρχοντι. On the other hand B's ἀπεστρέψεν λόγοις αὐτῆς έαυτή is close and yet idiomatic, while A's ἀπεκρινατο εν ῥήματι αὐτῆς goes too far afield; the latter appears to be a Hexaplaric correction (Field, ad loc.). 30. Οὐχ ἑυρήσουσιν αὐτῶν διαμερίζοντα σκιλα; so ΕΔA; Heb. 'are they not finding, [are they not] dividing booty?' LXX. seem to have read πληθυντι for πληθυντι. Οικτείρμων οικτείρσει B, φιλιώξων φλωρ Α; both, while labouring to keep up the alliteration of the Heb., miss its point through ignorance of a rare use of θιν; for φιλάεσαι cf. xiv. 20 B, 2 Chron. xix. 2. Ποικιλτον (A, ποικιλων) misses the dual 'embroidery on both sides' (R. V.), or 'a couple of pieces,' "precisely as μίνθρων above" (Moore). Βαθη in A seems to be an error for βαφη, which is found in several cursives; see Field, ad loc., and Lagarde's Lucian. Τῷ πραξιλω αυτοῦ σκιλα= apparently μαλαζάζηκε; M.T. 'for the necks of the spoil.' ΕΔA substitutes the usual <ναλη for the spirited and literal rendering of B (cf. Ps. xviii. = xix. 7), and appears to have read ἡμαρμεν; 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. Α begins τὰς τραύλους, A, Luc. καί εἰπεν Δ. 'Εκ χειρὸς τοῦ λέοντος...τῆς ἄρκου, an exact rendering; cf. Gen. ix. 5 ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν θηρίων. Luc., Th., εκ στόματος τοῦ λ. καί ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου. Τοῦ ἀπετιμήτου, repeated from v. 36. (A ΑΔ). 38. μαντίναν (Jud. iii. 16, 2 Regn. x. 4): +αὐτοῖ, A, with ΑΔ. Περικεφαλαίαν χ. περὶ τῆν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ : Luc. (Α), with ΑΔ, τ. χ. ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ κτλ., adding, καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτῷ θόρακα. 39. Ἐξώσεν τῶν Δαυείδ, sc. Σαοῦλ (cf. v. 38); Luc., A, follow Heb. in making David the object of the verb ἐξώσετο Δαυείδ). Ἐκοπίασεν περιπατήσας (A, περιπατήσας) ἁπαξ καὶ δις, '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 ἀνυμάλη ἐν ζῳ καθιστηρίᾳ (Wellhausen, Driver, H. P. Smith). "Ἀπαξ καὶ δίς 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 μηδὲν μὴν. 'Αφαίροις αὐτὰ ἀπ' αὐτῶν, reading the verb probably as μηδὲν, and omitting καὶ.

40. Λίθους τέλειοις in B is obviously wrong, and A scarcely mends matters by omitting the adjective. Correct, with Lucian, λίθους λείους. 'Εν τῷ καθιστήριῳ πομενικῷ: καθιστήριος = καθιστήριος, here only in LXX., and perhaps unknown elsewhere: πομενικὸς (Ἡμηρία) again in Zach. xi. 15. Εἰς συλλογήν, apparently for μηδὲν (ἦμηδὲν), Aq. καὶ ἐν ἀναλεκτηρίῳ. 41 is wanting in 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. Πυρράκις: cf. xvi. 12, Gen. xxv. 25. 43. Ὁσεί, added by the translators to soften the opprobrious κύνος. 'Εν ῥαβδῷ καὶ λίθοις, ἐὰν '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 Δανείδ Οὐχί, ἄλλον ἄγακον εἰκονῶν are evidently of the same character—a "singularly rapid reply" (Driver).

4 REGN. ii. 11—18.

11. Αὐτῶν πορευομένων ἐπορεύωντο καὶ εἰλάδουν—an interesting attempt to combine Greek idiom with some reminiscence of the Heb. phrase; Lucian abandons the Heb., and corrects, αὐτῶν πορευομένων καὶ εἰλάδουν. Ἡπειρός πυρός, Heb. 'horses of fire'; cf. ἡπειρός, Heb. 'horsemen,' v. 12. Ἀνὰ μέσον (ἵππ.; cf. Gen. i. 7 διεκώρσας...ἀνὰ μέσον. 'Ἀνελθημβῆν, Heb. 'went up'; the Greek verb is apparently repeated from vv. 9, 10, where it = πηλί. From this passage it has been borrowed by the translator of Sirach (xlviii. 9, 14, xliv. 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. 'Ως ᾧ Καθαρίστηρι; cf. 1 Regn. xvii. 43 (above). 12. Πάτερ πατήρ, Heb. 'my father' δίς. Διέρρησεν...ὑγματά, after the Heb.: Lucian omits the noun, probably because of the harshness of the assonance. 13. Καὶ ὑψώσεν = ὑψεῖ; Luc., καὶ ἀνείλατο. Μηλωτής, 'sheepskin,' an interpretation of Ἡμηρία (Vulg. pallium) wherever it is used is an interpretation of Elijah's characteristic raiment (3 Regn. xix. 13, 19, 4 Regn. ii. 8 f.); cf. Heb. xi. 37 περὶλαθον ἐν μυλοται. 'Επικαθαρίστηρι, sc. αὐτοῦ (Heb., Luc.). 'Ελεισάιε, ᾧ Ἑβαί. καὶ Επτιστρεφεν Ἑλεισάιε is Hexaplaric, and wanting in B*, but
supplied by B\textsuperscript{ab}A Luc. 14. 'O \textit{thēōs}, \textit{fē\textdegree} \textit{θῆθι} ἡ μηθ. 'Aπφω, a transliteration answering to \textit{ήμηθι} (\textit{fē\textdegree}); in x. 10 the same form = \textit{ήμηθι}, which was perhaps the reading before the LXX. in this place. Aq. \textit{κάιπρ} αὐτός, but Symm. \textit{καί} νῦν, whence Jerome \textit{etiam nunc}. 15. \textit{kai} oi \textit{εν} 'Ισραήλ: \textit{kai} A Luc. with \textit{fē\textdegree}. 16. \textit{ίη} is not represented by \textit{GAB}; Luc. adds \textit{eisīi}. \textit{Yioi} δυνάμεως, \textit{μὴν} ἀνασκέψη. 'Ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, Ἐλευσιαν, \textit{καί} Heb., Luc. 18. In A Luc. Aq. Th. \textit{fē\textdegree} the verse begins 'And they returned to him', cf. v. 13.

Ps. cix. (cx.) 1—4.

1. ['Ο] \textit{κύριος} τῷ \textit{κυρίῳ} μου, \textit{καὶ} \textit{δέχομαι}; in v. 5 the same Gr. is used for \textit{καὶ} \textit{δέχομαι} ἡμέραν \textit{λίθω}; \textit{Ἐκ} \textit{δέχομαι}, \textit{οὐκ} \textit{ἔλεε} ἡ \textit{μηθ}. \textit{Ὑποκάτω} is the reading of the best authorities in Mt. xxii. 44, Mc. xii. 36, but \textit{ὑπόστα} keeps its place in Lc., \textit{et al.}, Hebrews. 2. \textit{kai} \textit{katакυρίευε}=\textit{δύναμαι} apparently. 3. \textit{Μετά} \textit{σου, ἡμέραν} (\textit{fē\textdegree}, \textit{και}) \textit{Η} \textit{ἀρχή} seems to point to a reading \textit{ἡμέραν} or \textit{ἡμέραν} (cf. Job xxx. 15, Isa. xxxii. 8); \textit{τῶν} \textit{ἀγίων} (\textit{σοῦ})=\textit{οὐσίαν} \textit{(ὁ} \textit{σωτήρ}) Symm. \textit{ἐν} \textit{δρεσιν} \textit{(ὁ} \textit{σωτήρ} \textit{ἐν} \textit{δρεσιν} \textit{ὑπὲρ} \textit{αὐτῶν}) \textit{Ἐκ} \textit{καταστάρω} \textit{πρὸ} \textit{ἐσωφόρου} \textit{ἐγέννησά} \textit{σε}, though not quoted in the N.T., had an important place in post-apostolic Christian teaching from Justin onwards (cf. Justin, \textit{Tryph.} cc. 63, 76, 83; Tert. \textit{adv. Marc.} v. 9; \textit{Cypr. test.} 17, ep. 63); in the Arian age it was commonly cited on the Catholic side—see e.g. Cyril. Hirius., \textit{catech.} vii. 2, xi. 5; Athan. \textit{or. c. Arian.} iv. 27 sq.; \textit{de decr.} 3, \&c.; Hilar. \textit{de tr.} vi. 16, xii. 8. The O.L. seems to have rendered uniformly \textit{ex ultero ante lucifera} genui te, with the variant \textit{generavi} in Tert. \textit{l.c.}; Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter reads with \textit{fē\textdegree} quasi \textit{de vulvo orientur tibi ros adolescentiae} The LXX. appear to have read their Heb. text as \textit{μήμα} \textit{σοῦ} \textit{ἰννήθη} \textit{γε} \textit{ἐξ} \textit{τῆς} \textit{μαθήματος} \textit{ὃς} \textit{ἐκκαθίσθη}, perhaps dropping \textit{μὴν} as unintelligible.

4. \textit{Κατά} \textit{τὴν} \textit{τάξιν}, \textit{τὸν} \textit{βίον} \textit{ὑπέρ} \textit{αὐτοῦ}, Aq. Symm. \textit{κατά} \textit{λόγον}. Cf. Heb. v. 6 ff., vii. 11, 15 (\textit{κατά} \textit{τὴν} \textit{ομοιότητα}). The translator probably had before him the LXX. of Gen. xiv. 18; he transliterates the unique name \textit{μὴν} \textit{καθίσθη} in the same way.

Prov. viii. 22—25, 30—31.

22. 'Εκτισεν \textit{με}. So \textit{GnBRA} \textit{etc.} O.L. (\textit{condidit, creavit}); codd. 23=\textit{V}, 252, with Aq. Symm. Th. Vulg. (\textit{possedit}), give 'ἐκτισα—both possible meanings of \textit{νῦν}. The former rendering supplied the Arians with one of their stock arguments (cf. Athan. \textit{or. c. Arian.} ii. 44 sqq.). \textit{Εἰς} \textit{ἐργα} \textit{αὐτοῦ}, a loose and partial translation, probably a confession of inability to understand the Heb.; Th.


23. ἐκθεμέλισεν μὲ, reading apparently ἐκθέσιν, where Μ has ἐκθέσις; cf. Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 59. Πρὸ τοῦ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἀπὸ τὸτε. 24. LXX. overlook ἡ χρήση and ἑνεκείσθαι, unless they intend to convey the general sense by ποιήσας and προειδοθείν. 25. Πάντων, Α Μ. Γεννᾶ μὲ, Μ Η 'I was brought forth.' 30. ἀρ- μόκοουσα = τῶν, the word being referred by the translator to τῶν; similarly Symm. Th., ἐστηριγμένη. 'Ἡ προσέχαιρεν implies the reading τῶν, as Lagarde suggests; had ἡμῖν stood in their text, οἶκουμένη would have been ready at hand as a rendering (cf. 2 Regn. xxii. 16, Ps. ix. 9, &c.). Εὐφραίνεσθαι, reading ἱματίσας. Υἱὸς ἄνθρωπων = τῶν, bin; cf. vius 'Αδάμ, Deut. xxxii. 8; ὁ θεὸς ὁ παράκλητος. is connected by LXX. with the next clause. 31. 'Ὅτε...συντελέσας: Heb. ' rejoicing in the world of his earth.' LXX. seem to have read τῆς κληρονομίας, as Lagarde suggests; had ἡμῖν stood in their text, οἶκουμένη would have been ready at hand as a rendering (cf. 2 Regn. xxii. 16, Ps. ix. 9, &c.). Εὐφραίνεσθαι, reading ἱματίσας. Υἱὸς ἄνθρωπων = τῶν, bin; cf. vius 'Αδάμ, Deut. xxxii. 8; ὁ θεὸς ὁ παράκλητος. is translated by this phrase in Ps. x. (xi.) 4, and repeatedly in the poetical books.

Job xix. 23—27.

23. Τὸ γὰρ ἀν δόμῃ; See above p. 308; the phrase is repeated in the Hebrew, but the translator contents himself with using it once. ἡμῖν is ignored; its usual equivalent in the LXX. is νῦν or οὖν, unless it is transliterated (p. 324). Εἰς τὸν αἶωνα seems to represent τῶν, which in Μ belongs to the next verse; Th. translates it εἰς μαρτύριον, reading the word as τῶν. 24. B* omits ἐν πέτραις ἐγνυφήναι which appears to be necessary to the sense; in supplying it Bαβνα prefix η, a manifest gloss. 25. 'Αδέναις ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλεισάτων με μελλόνων, a paraphrase of Heb. 'my Goel lives'; ἀδένας in the LXX. elsewhere = τῶν, and ἡμῖν is ἀγιοτέτως (Ruth iii. 9, etc.), or λυτρωθής (Ps. xviii. 14, lxxvii. 35). 25—26. Ἑπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσαι or ἀναστήσει appears to correspond with ὑπὸ τοῦ (ὑπὸ) θεοῦ, and τὸ δὲμα μου τὸ ἀναπτυξάν ταῦτα with τῆς ἰδίας ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ (ὑπὸ) θεοῦ, and τὸ δὲμα μου τὸ ἀναπτυξάν ταῦτα with τῆς ἰδίας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ (ὑπὸ) θεοῦ. ΚΑ points to τῆς ἰδίας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ (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*, and see Dan. xii. 2, 2 Macc. vii. 14, xii. 43); as cited by Clem. R. i Cor. 26 (ἀναστήσεις τῆς σάρκα μου ταύτῃ τῆς ἀναπτυξάσας ταῦτα πάντα), the words are brought into still nearer agreement with the faith of the

S. S.
The Septuagint as a Version.

Church; see Apostles’ Creed, p. 89 f. Παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου...συντελεσθῇ corresponds in position with words which Μ divides and points as "κρυφῇ διδασκαλίᾳ," but seems to be partly borrowed from the next verse. Σ suggests λάθος ἀλλ’ ἔν διδασκαλίᾳ (Siegfried).

27. Πάντα δὲ μοι συντελεσθαι’ Μ, ἦν οὐ τἀληθεῖν.

MICAH v. i (iv. 14)—4 (3).

1. Ἑμφραξθησαται θυγατὴ ἐμφραγμῷ, i.e. ὅρις ὁ βασιλεὺς.

Tας φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ: LXX. read ἄγεται for ἁμην. 2. Βηθλεὲμ οἶκος Ἐφρά: did LXX. read ἄνθρωπος; ἦν ἄνθρωπος; 'Ολογοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι 'art little to be,’ as Heb. The passage is quoted in Mt. ii. 6 in a Greek paraphrase1 which substitutes οὐδεμᾶς ἐκατοστή for ‘little to be,’ and τοῖς ἱγμαῖοι (ἐκαται) for ‘thousands’ (ἐκατοστή). 3. Ἐως καιρὸν τικτούσης τέτειται, apparently for ἔως καιροῦ οὗ τικτοῦσα τέτειται or ὡς κ. τικτούσης οὗ τέτειται. 4. Καὶ ὄψεται, τὸ ποιμνὸν αὐτὸν were obelised in Hex. and find no place in Μ; the former has perhaps originated in a misreading of ἀνασα as ἀνασα, so that καὶ ὄψεται, καὶ ομοίως is in fact a doublet. Κύριος, subject; Heb. ‘in the strength of J.,’ the subject being the same as in v. i. ‘Ὑπάρξουσιν, ἃν δὲ;’ the LXX. read ἐσι, connecting the verb with the previous words; for ἐσι = ὑπάρχειν cf. Ps. liv. (iv.) 20 ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων.

JEREM. xxxviii. 31—37 (xxxvi. 30—36).

Vv. 31—34 are cited in Heb. viii. 8—12, q.v. 31. Διαβήσομαι, in Hebrews συντελεσθῶ, cf. Jer. xii. (xxxiv.) 8 συντελεσθῶ (ἡμᾶς) διαβήσω, and ib. 15. Τῷ οἴκῳ δίς, in Hebrews ἐπὶ τὸν οἴκον. 32. Διεθέμην, in Hebrews ἐποίησα: the writer appears to dislike the repeated alliteration in διατίθεσα διαβήσης. 'Εν ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβομένοι μοι, for the more usual τοῦ ἐπιλαβαζόμενοι με ορ ὅτε (ἡ) ἐπιλαβομένοι. 'Οτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν...Heb. ‘which...they broke’; ἡμελῆσα αὐτῶν, reading ἡμελῆσα for ἡμελῆσα. 33. ἡ διαβήσης μοι, Heb. ‘the covenant.’ Εἰς διὰ τῶν δώσω, a Hebraism not represented in Μ; in Hebrews διὰ τῶν δώσω appears without δώσω, and so AQ in Jer. Εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, Heb. ‘in their inward parts.’ 34. τὴν ἱερὰς ἕσσε ἐκ νησίν, which blends Mic. v. 19, 3 a. It will be observed that cod. A reads θυγατήρα with Mt.

1 The paraphrastic character of the reference appears more distinctly in the second stanza ἐκ σοῦ...Ἰσραήλ, which blends Mic. v. 19, 3 a. It will be observed that cod. A reads θυγατήρα with Mt.
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with an Alexandrian version. Από...εως, ἰσι...; ἀδικίας...
Φησίν Κύριος, Heb. ‘thus saith J.’ (at the beg. of the verse).
’Υψωθῇ, reading γινομένοι γινομένοι, Heb. ‘be searched.’
Οὐκ ἀποδοκιμῶ: ἀποδ. is a contracted future (cf. p. 305);
οὐκ is inserted, because the drift of the verse has been mis-
understood (cf. Streane, p. 156 f.). Τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ, Heb. ‘all
the seed of I.’; γένος—γινομένοι, again in v. 37. 36. Σελήνην, Μ, ‘the
ordinances of the moon’ (but cf. Μ βίβλια in v. 35, Heb.). Κρανγήν, 
reading perhaps νῦν or νῦν for νῦν. 37. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ
=θέαμα τῆς φωτοῦ, as almost invariably in the Prophets1 from Hosea
xii. 5 (6) onwards, with the exception of Isaiah, who transliterates
θάλαμος (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 οὐραν (cf. Bevan,
p. 48); παρελεύσεται (LXX.), reading ῥῆπτην for ῥῆπτη—(ἀναστήσεται,
Th.). 'Ο ἄγγελος (LXX.), a gloss; Th. literally, ο ἄρχων. 'Επὶ
tοὺς νυός (LXX., Th.),...ιεύ τιν. Ἕκεινη ἥ ἡμέρα, LXX., ἔσται
cαιρός Th.; Th. is again more literal than LXX. Θελψις οἰα 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 ής, while Th. adds έν τῇ γῆς or έπὶ τῆς
γῆς. 'Υψωθήσεται LXX.; Bevan suggests a corruption for έκσωθήσεται
or some other compound of σωθήσεται; but ὑπ. may be a gloss
upon the tamer word which stood in the original. Th. rightly,
σωθήσεται. 2. Οὐς ἂν εὐρεθῇ, ἐναντίον—overlooked by Th., unless we
accept the reading of ΑQ, δ ο Εὐρεθεῖς [ό] γεγραμμένος. 2. Ἐν τῷ
πλατεῖ τῆς γῆς, LXX.; έν γης χώμει Θ., Heb. ‘in the ground of
dust’ (but see Bevan, p. 201 f.). Διασποράν καὶ αἰσχύνην, LXX.;
διασπ. is perhaps a gloss on αἴσχ. ; for the word see Deut. xxviii.
25. 3. Οἱ φωστήρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, LXX., a reminiscence of Gen. i. 14
(LXX.); cf. Sap. xiii. 2. Οἱ κατοικοῦντες τοῦ λόγου LXX., reading
πάντα ἡμῖν ὅπλαν καὶ τείχισμα μεταμορφοῦσαν μαέστρουσι
μεταμορφοῦσαν μαέστρουσι; Th. translates οἱ ἐπικαίρως ἐν 
τα ἀστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (LXX.), the ordinary Biblical phrase, used
in iiii. 36, 63; Heb., Th. have ‘the stars.’ 4. Ἀποσκοπῶσιν (LXX.),
διδακτίζωσιν (Th.). Both senses have been found in the Heb.;
cf. Bevan, ad loc. Πληροθῇ γῆ ἀδικίας, LXX., reading ἡ γῆ or
γῆς for γῆς.

1 Zech. xiii. 2, Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 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 (1—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 recognised, 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. Smith. 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 palästinischen 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.
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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. F. 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 Ἐλσαγωγή of Adrianus (Migne, *P. G.* xcvi. or ed. F. Gössling).
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 chapter.

A system of verse-division is mentioned in the Mishnah (Meg. 4. 4, Kidd. 30. 1). The Massorets noted the number of verses (ספירות) 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 포함ים. 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.).

graphs, which begin a new line, and sub-paragraphs\(^1\), which are preceded only by a space. They are still registered in the printed Bibles by the ד (for נפתח, ‘open’) and קר (for נסגר, ‘closed’) which occur at intervals throughout the Torah\(^2\). (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 exceptions\(^3\) 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 ד or קר. The Prophets were similarly divided for synagogue reading, but the prophetic lections were known as הפטראות (פתראות) 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 פסוקים.

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. xlvi. 28 (Ryle, p. 236).

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 text.

Neither the verses nor the chapters of the existing text-division occur in MSS. of the Greek Old Testament, except in relatively later copies, 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, κώλα, 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 βοῶν, 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 stichì he had written; cf. e.g. Diogenes Laertius iv. 24, Κράντωρ κατέλυτεν ύπομήματα εἰς μυριάδας στίχων τρεῖς: Dionysius Halicarn. vi. 1126 τέντε ἢ ἐξ μυριάδας στίχων τοῦ ἀνδρός (sc. Δημοσθένους) καταλελοιπότοσ. 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 produced\(^1\) 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 syllables\(^2\). 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 cost\(^3\). The compiler of the Cheltenham list explains that dishonest scribes at Rome and elsewhere purposely suppressed or mutilated the stichometry\(^4\). 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 *κωλα* or *κομματα*. The *colon*, according to Suidas, is a line which forms a complete clause (*δ’ ἀπηρτισμενήν ἔννοιαν ἕχων 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

---

2 J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, pp. 8, 15.
4 "Indiculum versuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi avariciae causa non habent integrum."
authors; cf. Hieron. praef. ad Isa.: "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 distinctimus"; praef. in Ezec.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 Dodecapropheton in the same way 3: ἐστὶ μὲν ἄρχαιον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπουδάσμα στιχηδόν, ὡς τὰ πολλά, πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετομένων σαφῆνειαν τὰς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι. οὐτως ταυγαροῦν ὄψει μὲν τῶν Δαβίδ κυθαρίζοντα, τῶν Παροιμιασθῆν δὲ τὰς παράσολας καὶ τῶν Ἐκκλησιασθῆν τὰς προφητείας ἐκθέμενοι. οὕτω συγγραφέεσαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰαβ βίβλῳ, οὕτω μερισθέντα τοῖς στίχοις τὰ τῶν Ἀσμάτων ἢσματα...οὐ μάθην ἐν ταῖς δῶδεκα βίβλωι τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἱκολούθησα.

Specimens of colometry may be seen in Codd. N 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.'
Stichometry of Stichometry of Stichometry of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Nicephorus</th>
<th>Cod. Clarom.</th>
<th>Mommsen’s list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kingdoms</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esdras</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dodecapropheton)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>[2970]</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4070</td>
<td>4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 156ff., 142ff., 138ff.). 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. lxv. 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 οὐκ, or as Allatius read the MS., γῶν (3808); see Cozza, Sacr. bibl. vet. fragm. iii. p. xv.
³ De cod. March., p. 23 f.
where in F the stichii are 3000\(^1\), but in Nicephorus 3100. On the other hand the later uncial K makes the stichii of Numbers to be 3535, which comes very near to the reckoning of Nicephorus\(^2\).

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 misunderstood\(^3\), 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Stichometry</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>4308(^5)</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat. gr. 746; Pal. gr. 203; Athos, Pantocr. 24, Laur. y. 112; Athens, Nat. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Athens, Nat. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 52, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2; 2000, Athens, Nat. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>3535(^6)</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 52, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat.gr. 2122; Athens, Nat. 44; Paris, Reg. gr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 52, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Vat. gr. 2122; Paris, Reg. gr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>H.-P. 30, 54, 85; Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The symbol used is \(\|\), which occurs also in B. On this symbol, see J. Woisin, *De Graccorum notis numerallibus*, n. 67 (Kiel, 1886).

\(^2\) The numeration of the stichii in the poetical books ascribed to the greater uncial s in the Cambridge manual LXX. is derived from Dr Nestle’s *Supplementum* (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.


\(^5\) 4400 in H.-P. 54.

\(^6\) 3530 in H.-P. 54.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>2100(^1) Barb. iii. 36; 2156, Paris, Reg. gr. 2; Athos, Pantocr. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>300 Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2500 Barb. iii. 36 (500, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2343 Barb. iii. 36; 2042, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2400 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2600 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralip.</td>
<td>2000 Barb. iii. 36(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralip.</td>
<td>3000 Barb. iii. 36(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esdras</td>
<td>1300 Barb. iii. 36(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>1800 Barb. iii. 36(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>5100 Barb. iii. 36(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1750 H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>750 H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>286 H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>2200 (including asterisked lines, 1600 without them) H.-P. 161(?), 248; Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>1250 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>2650 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>750 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>1300 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>750 Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>750 H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>210 H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>150 H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>160 H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>120 H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>670 H.-P. 86; 776, H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>190 H.-P. 86; 204, H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3700 H.-P. 231; 3820, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4500 H.-P. 231; 3800, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>514 H.-P. 231; 350, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations(^4)</td>
<td>H.-P. 86; (\overline{\mu}) H.-P. 231; 860, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep. of Jeremiah</td>
<td>200 Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>4500 H.-P. 231; 4000, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1800 H.-P. 231; 1720, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>224 H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) 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 \(\overline{\mu}\) (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 itself 1. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proverbs</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Zephaniah</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ep. of Jeremiah</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (iB) and proceed regularly (x. 1, 16, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38; xi. 1, &c.) down to xix. 17 (a7); in 3 Regn. the first numeral occurs at c. viii. 22 (kβ), and the last at xxi. 17 (νθ); 4 Regn. returns only one or two numbers (e.g. θ stands opposite to c. iii. 20). In Isaiah, again, the entries are few and irregular; β appears at c. ii. 1, and θ at xxi. 1.

Cod. Ν seems to have no chapter-marks *prima manu*, but in Isaiah they have been added by Νce throughout the book.

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 origin.

Cod. M like cod. B exhibits two systems of capitulation,

---

1 Tischendorf, notes to facsimile, p. v.
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 Kingdoms, differ considerably, as the following table will shew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal Capitulation</th>
<th>Capitulation accompanied by titles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>65^2</td>
<td>94^3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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., 63^4.

A list of sections quoted by Dr Klostermann^5 from the cursive MS. cod. Barberini iii. 36 (cent. x. or xi.) exhibits another widely different scheme^6:

| 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 δούλεια Α, Β, &c., and the exploits of the successive judges by κριτής Α, 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. 80f. 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 Ecol. Gr. Men. i. p. 1. The chapters
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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 provenance. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Cod. K.</th>
<th>Cod. M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii. 5</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ τῶν Λευ[τῶν].</td>
<td>Αφορισμὸς τῶν Λευιτῶν εἰς τὸ λειτουργεῖν Κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 16</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λῃσφομένων2 τὸ πνεῦμα.</td>
<td>Περὶ ὁ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προφητευσάντων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 cursive: the following list of cursive 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, 40, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 64 (double system of capitulation), 68, 70, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79 (in Gen. χπμ'), 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; Athens, Pantocr. 24 (double system of capitulation, τίτλοι), Vatop. 513, 516; Laur. γ. 112 (both chapters and στιχοι numbered); Athens, nat. gr. 44; Sinai I, Jerusalem, H. Sep. 2.

2 Tischendorf (Mon. sacr. ined. n. c. i. p. 78) prints ἀγομενων.
The following τίτλοι for Exod. ii.—viii. are taken from a Vienna MS. (Th. gr. 3):

a. περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως Μωσέως.
b. πρώτη ὀπτασία πρὸς Μωσῆν ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.
c. περὶ τῆς συναντήσεως μετ’ (?') Ἀρων.
d. εἰσόδος (?) Μωσέως καὶ Ἀρων πρὸς Φαραώ.
e. περὶ τῶν μαστιγωθέντων γραμματέων.
f. περὶ τῆς βάβδου τῆς στρατείας εἰς ὁψιν.
g. πρώτη πληγή; μεταστροφή τοῦ ὕδατος εἰς αἰμα.
h. δευτέρα πληγή, τῶν βατράχων.
i. τρίτη πληγή, τῶν σκυνίτων. 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 Isaiah. The numbers are as follows: Hosea

1 Migne, P. G. xciii., 1345 sqq. The titles for Isaiah with a collection
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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: ἀ. Εἰκὼν τῆς τῶν Ὑποδαίων συναγωγῆς, εἰς ὅς ὁ Χριστός τὸ κατὰ σάρκα τίκτεται, καὶ λαοῦ τὸ μὲν ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ ἔμεινεν, τὸ δὲ ἱστερον ἑπιστρέφει καὶ σφέτει. (b) The Syro-hexaplaric Daniel is divided into ten chapters, each headed by a full summary of its contents.

3. One class of sections calls for separate treatment. In Part 1. 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 centuries. 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 Church.” 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 περαχαλ (or ὑποθέσεις) eis τῶν ψαλμῶν 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, ἔκτικριτικ, i. p. 337.

3 H. S. v. 22 ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ γραφαὶ
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. xvi.* Origen apologises to his hearers for not
keeping strictly to the lesson for the day: “licet non ordo lectio-
num quae recitantur de illis dicere magis exigat quae lector
explicit,” tamen quoniam nonnulli fratrum deposcunt ea potius
quaes de prophetia Balaam scripta sunt ad sermonem disputationi-
nis adduci, non tæ ordinis lectionum satisfacere aequum credidi
ut desideriis auditorum.” This homily probably belongs to Ori-
gen’s life at Caesarea, 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 ἀναγρωσθέντα πλεονά ἐστιν, καὶ
ἐπεὶ χρή ἐπιτεμνόμενον ἐπείν, δυσὶ περικοπαῖς ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ περὶ
Nabath...ἐίτα μετὰ τούτο ἡ ἱστορία ἡ περὶ τοῦ κεκρύβθαι τὸν Δαβίδ...
ἐίτα τὰ ἔξης ἡ ἱστορία ἡ τρίτη, ὅτε κατέφυγεν πρὸς Ἀχάρ...ἐξῆς τοῦ
τουτοῦ ἦν ἡ ἱστορία ἡ διαβοσθεσι ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐγγαστρήμου...πεσάρων
ουσῶν περικοπῶν...οὐτοὶ ποτὲ βούλεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος προτεινώτω. 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 chapters.

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

...ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκας.


2 Cf. the τίτλοι in the Coislin MS. (M), where μη’, μδ’, ζ’ 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 seventh. 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 rites. 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 Testament; 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 περικοπή. Such traces of adaptation to liturgical use are found even in cod. B, though not prima manu. 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. 173ff.).
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 Synagogue\(^1\), and in some early monastic communities arrangements were made for a regular recitation of the Psalter both in public and private\(^2\). 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:

Kανόνες ἡμερινῶν ψαλμῶν. K. νυκτερινοὶ τῶν ψαλμῶν.

\(\Omega[\alpha]\) \begin{align*}
\gamma' & \xi' \alpha' \rho' \beta' \\
\beta' & \kappa' \\
\gamma' & \alpha' \\
\delta' & \mu' \\
\epsilon' & \nu' \\
\varsigma' & \omicron' \\
\zeta' & \xi' \\
\eta' & \omicron' \\
\theta' & \rho' \\
\iota' & \theta' \\
\iota' & \rho' \\
\iota' & \kappa' \\
\iota' & \rho' \\
\iota' & \kappa' \\
\end{align*}

\(\Omega[\alpha]\) \begin{align*}
\gamma' & \rho' \theta' \rho' \iota' \\
\beta' & \kappa' \\
\gamma' & \nu' \\
\delta' & \omicron' \\
\epsilon' & \nu' \\
\varsigma' & \mu' \\
\zeta' & \nu' \\
\eta' & \omicron' \\
\theta' & \nu' \\
\iota' & \nu' \\
\iota' & \nu' \\
\iota' & \nu' \\
\end{align*}

The existing order of the Orthodox Eastern Church divides the Psalter into 20 sections known as καθισμάτα, 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., xxxii.—xxxvi., xxxvii.—xliv., xlvi.—li., lv.—lxiii., lxiv.—lxix., lxx.—lxxvi., lxxvii.—lxxxiv., lxxxv.—xc., xci.—c., ci.—civ., cv.—cviii., cix.—cxvii., cxviii., cxxix.—cxxx., cxxxii.—cxl., cxxli.—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 δό (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 ῥηθόναι τὸν ὁρθρινόν.

\(^4\) Cf. Const. viii. 34, τὸν ἑπταλυχνικὸν 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’—λόσ’, cf. Eus. H.E. vi. 36). Both in Isaiah and in Daniel certain prophetic ὄρασεις were distinguished. Thus cod. Qms places ὄρασις δ’ opposite to Isa. vii. i, and ὄρασις η’ at c. xvii. i. In Daniel cod. A marks 12 ὄρασεις, which begin respectively at Sus. i, Dan. i. i, ii. i, iii. i, iii. ii, iv. i, v. 30, vii. i, viii. i, ix. i, xi. i, Bel i, and the same method of division is used in codd. QT. In Lamentations each stanza is preceded by a representation of the Hebrew letter with which it begins, e.g. ἄλφ (ἄλφ, ἄλφαι), βηθ, γεμαλ (γυμλ), δέλθα (δέλθα, δελθ’, δελθ), and so forth. In the analogous case of Psalm cxviii. (cxix.), there are no signs of this treatment, except in the Graeco-Latin Psalters RT.

In the Song a marginal enumeration distinguishes the speeches of the interlocutors, and some MSS. (e.g. Δ and V) add marginal notes after the manner of stage-directions, such as ἦ νυμφη πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον, ταῖς νεανίσιν ἦ νυμφη, αἱ νεανίδες τῷ νυμφίῳ.

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 3—18. 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 manus; and the systems of enumeration differ to some extent. Thus according to B, α’ = prologue, β’ =i+ii, γ’ =iii, δ’ = iv, ε’ = v, ζ’ = vii, η’ = vii, θ’ = ix, i’ = x, while A 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 ff. 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 K 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 εὑρόντα τὸν νυμφίον ἦ νυμφη καὶ ὡς ἐν νυκτί εὑρέθεισα ἀπὸ τῶν φυλακῶν τῆς πόλεως τραυματιζότες, καὶ ἀφρο汉语 αὐτὴς τὸ θέριστρον οἱ τειχο- φυλακοῦντες.
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.


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 ἐκλογαὶ or παραγραφαὶ, or as ἐπιτομαὶ ἐρμηνείων, or ἐγγυγέως ἐρανισθείσαι ἀπὸ διαφόρων πατέρων, or συνόψεις σχολικαὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ὑπομνημάτων συλλεκθείσαι, or by some similar periphrasis. The use of the technical term catena (σειμα) is of comparatively modern date. *Catena aurea* is a secondary title of the great

2 *Ch. Q. R.* i. 69, p. 34: "the process of drawing up Catenae 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 χρυσὴ ἄληψις. Σεφρά is used in this sense by the editor of the Greek catena of Nicephorus, which bears the title Σεφρά ἐνὸς καὶ πεντῆκοντα ὑπομνηματιστῶν εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάευξιν καὶ τὰ τῶν Βασιλείων. 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 σεφραὶ. 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 ἔργον, ὁργή, ἐσόμοι, ὑπάρχω, ἡνίκαι, ἔλλογα. If a second passage from the same author occurs in the same context it is introduced as τῷ ἄλλῳ; an anonymous writer is ἄλλος. 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, Catenae, 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 Catenae). For lists of the catenae in the great libraries of Europe and the East, the student must consult the published catalogues, e.g. Montfaucon, Omont (Paris), Stephenson (Vatican), Lambecius (Vienna), Lambros (Athos), Papadopoulos (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 Montfaucon’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.

\[ \delta = '\Lambda k\nu\la. \quad \epsilon', \\gamma = \Sigma\upmu\mu\alpha\chios. \quad \theta', \\theta\epsilon' = \Theta\epsilon\sigma\delta\sigma\tau\iota\nu\nu. \]

\[ \omega' \kappa' \pi' \epsilon\beta' = \text{of keita}\ 'E\beta\rho\ai\ous. \quad \text{oi} \ \omega' \ \text{of} \ \kappa' \ \pi' \ \epsilon\beta' = \text{of evleisymenoi (stichoi) of keita}\ 'E\beta\rho\ai\ous. \quad \text{om\\'toic} \ \sigma' = \text{omoiws tois e\betao\meta\kappaonta.} \quad \text{oi} \ \tilde{\tau} = \text{oi treis, i.e. Aquila, Sym-} \]
machus, Theodotion. \( \pi' = \pi'\nu\tau\varepsilon \). \( \lambda = \Lambda \sigma\upsilon\kappa\iota\alpha\nu\sigma \) (Field, Hexapla, i. lxxxv.). \( \omicron \lambda = \omicron \lambda \omega\tau\omicron\omicron \). \( \mu\omicron \nu = \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron \). \( \varphi = \varphi\rho\alpha\iota\omicron \), \( \varphi \) or \( \varphi = \Omega \rho\gamma\varepsilon\nu\sigma \). For \( \pi\iota\pi\iota \) see above, p. 39 f.

\( \Theta = \sigma\mu\miu\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\sigma \), \( \sigma\mu\iota\mu\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma \), \( \sigma\mu\iota\sigma\iota \). \( \Gamma \rho = \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\omicron \) or \( \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron \).  

\( \Delta \rho^{\chi} = \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota \). \( \tau\epsilon = \tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron \). \( \sigma\tau\iota\chi = \sigma\tau\iota\chi\sigma\sigma \). \( \kappa\epsilon = \kappa\epsilon\phi\lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron \). \( \kappa \theta = \kappa\theta\iota\sigma\mu\alpha \). \( \Delta \alpha = \alpha\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\omicron\sigma\sigma \). \( \Delta = \delta\omega\rho\theta\omicron\omega\tau\omicron \) (i.e. ‘corrected thus far’), a mark inserted by the \( \delta\iota\omicron\rho\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron \) \( \chi \) usually at the end of a book. For further particulars see Field, \emph{op. cit.}, p. xciv. sqq.
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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 Polyhisor (ὁ πολυπρωτός), 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 Polyhisor'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 Aristeas, 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 Polyhisor (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.

S. S.

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: (a) τὸν θεὸν τὸ Ἀβραὰμ προστάξαι Ἰσαὰκ τὸν γῆν ὀλοκαρπῶσαι αὐτῷ. ἦν δὲ ἀναγαγόντα τὸν παιδί ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος πυρᾶν ἔψαι καὶ ἐπιθεῖναι τὸν Ἰσαὰκ. σφάζειν δὲ μέλλοντα καλυθῆναι ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου κριὸν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν κάρπωσιν παραστήσατον. (b) ἐκέθενε δὲ ἐλθεῖν εἰς Χαφράδα, ἐνθὲν παραγενόθαι εἰς Ἐφραίμ, ἢν εἴηναί Βηθλεέμ...καὶ τελευτήσαι...Ραχὴλ τεκοῦσαν τὸν Βεναμίν. (c) φησι γὰρ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ παῖδας πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἐπὶ κατοικίαν πέμψαι. διὰ τούτο δὲ καὶ Ἀδρῶν καὶ Μαριὰμ εἰπτεῖν ἐν Ἄσχροδ Μωσῆν Αἰθιοπίδα γῆμαι γυναίκα. (d) μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὡς ἐκεί γλυκὸ ἀλλὰ πικρόν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπτοῦντος, ζύλον τι ἐμβάλειν εἰς τὴν πηγὴν, καὶ γενέσθαι γλυκὸ τὸ ὡς ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Ἐλείμ ἐλθεῖν, καὶ εὐρεῖν ἐκεί δώδεκα μέν πηγὰς ὑδάτων, ἐβδομηκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων. (For other coincidences, see above, p. 18.)

Euplemus: εὐλογητός ὁ θεὸς ὁ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔκτεινε, ὁς εἰλετο ἀνθρωπόν χρηστὸν ἐκ χρηστοῦ ἀνθρώπος...καὶ ἀρχιτεκτόνας σοὶ ἀπέσταλκα ἀνθρωπόν Τύρων ἐκ μητρὸς Ἰουδαίας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δαύδ.
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Aristeas: τὸν Ἡσαῦ γῆμαντα βασιλέαν ἐν Ἑλὼν γεννήσαι Ἰώβ· κατοικεῖν δὲ τοῦτον ἐν τῇ Ἀγίστιδι χώρα ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀρίοις ταῖς Ἀδαιμάδας καὶ Ἀραβίας. οὐκέσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ πολύκτηρον, κτῆσαι δὲ αὐτῶν πρόβατα μὲν ἐπτακισίλια, καλόλογα δὲ τρικισίλιας, εὐγενὴς βωμὸν πεντακόσιων, ὅνοις θυλεῖας νομιδάδας πεντακοσίας.

Ezekiel (in his tragedy Ἡ Εξαγωγή):

Μαριμά δ' ἀδελφὴ μου κατώπτενες πέλαν· κάπετα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως ἄδερμος ὅμοιος κατηλθε λουτροῖς, χρώμα ψευδήνει νέον. Ἡ Ιδοὺς δ' εὐθὺς καὶ λαβοῦν ἀνεῖλετο, εἰνηθ' δ' Ἐβραῖον ὄντα· καὶ λέγει τάδε Μαριμά ἀδελφὴ προσδραμοῦσα βασιλέιδι· Θέλεις τρόφον σου παιδί τῶν εἴρων ταχύ ἐκ τῶν Ἐβραίων; ἡ δ' ἐπέσπευσεν κόρην· μολὼνα δ' εἰσέπρεπε καὶ παρὰ καὶ ταχύ αὐτὴ τε μήτηρ καλαβέν· μ' ἐς ἀγκάλας, εἰπέν δὲ θυγάτηρ βασιλέως Τοῦτου, γύναι, τρόφευε, κάρῳ μισθὸν ἀποδόσω σέθεν.

* * * * *

οὐκ εὔλογος πέφυκα, γλῶσσα δ' ἐστὶ μου δύσφραστος, ἵκνοφωμος, ὡστε μὴ λόγους ἐμοὺς γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἐναντίον.

Aristobulus: (α) ἐν χειρὶ κραταῖα ἐξήγαγεν ὁ θεός σε Ἕξ Αἰγύπτους. (β) Ἡ Ἐβραίος Χείρ Κυρίων ἐχθαί ἐν τοῖς κτήνεις σου 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 εὐλογός is read by cod. F.

3 Exod. xiii. 9.

4 Exod. ix. 3. "Ἐσται Α', ἐπέστατα 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 τοῖς ἰπποῖς 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. xliv. 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 ascribed.²

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 ἔχεισα is a reminiscence of Ps. lxxviii. 3, lxx.; ib. 606 χειροποίητα...ἐν σχισμαῖς πετρῶν κατακρόψαντες 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

A.D.; in 40 A.D. he could speak of himself as already an old man, 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.


In his exegetical writings Philo quotes the LXX. directly, announcing each citation by a formula such as φησί, είπεν,
λέγει, λέγεται, γεγραπταί, or some more elaborate phrase. In this way he reproduces a considerable portion of the Greek text of the Pentateuch, as well as a few passages from Joshua, Judges, 3 Kings, 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 task. 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 ἡως (LXX. εἰς ψ. ζωσιν). iv. 21 οὖτος ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὁ καταδείξας ψαλτήριον καὶ κιθάραν (LXX., ἵνα ὁ κ.). vi. 7 ἐθνικός (LXX. ἐθνικὴμήθην). vi. 14 νοστιμᾶς νοστιμίας ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν (νοστιμά σεμελ ΛXX.). ix. 25 παῖς οἰκήτης δοῦλος δούλων ἐσται (LXX. π. οἰκήτης ἐσται, and so Philo, ii. 225. 20). xv. 18 ἔως τοῦ ποταμοῦ, τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου (LXX. οἰκ. ποταμοῦ 24). xviii. 12 ὀντῷ μου γέγονε το εὐθαμονεῖν ἔως τοῦ νῦν (LXX. omit τὸ εὐθ. and so Philo once, iii. 184. 28). Exod. iv. 10 οὐκ εἰμί εὕλογος (so Philo, apparently 6: LXX. οὐκ ἴκανος εἰμι). xv. 17 ἑδραγμα εἰς καθάραν σου κατεργάσω (LXX. εἰς ἐταμον κατακτήτηριν σου ὁ κατ.). xx. 23 μετ’ ἐμοῦ (LXX., ἐμῖν αὐτοῖς). xxiii. 2 μετὰ πολλῶν (LXX., μετὰ πλείων). Lev. xix. 23 ἐξον βρόσεως (LXX., ξ. βρόσιμον, and so Philo ii. 152. 8). Deut. viii. 18 ἀλλὰ μινεία μενοθηγή (LXX. καὶ μμοθῆ). xxi. 16 κληροδοτῇ (LXX., κατακληρονομῇ Β, κατακληροδοτῇ AF, and these readings are found as variants in Phil. i. 209. 4).

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. B, 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 ὅ ποιήσας; Deut. xii. 8 ὄσα, xxi. 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. 30 καὶ δραμοῦσα ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ὑδρεύσατο ταῖς καμήλοις (LXX., καὶ ἐδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἀντλῆσαι ὕδωρ καὶ ὑδρ. πάσαις ταῖς καμήλοις). (b) Num. v. 2 ἔξαποστειλάτωσαν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίου ψυχῆς (LXX. ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς) πάντα λεπτοῦ. (c) Gen. xxviii. 13 ἡ γῆ (v. 1. τὴν γῆν) ἐφ’ ἥς σὺ καθεύθεις (+ 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.
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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 oracles; 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 age.

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 family; 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 Pharisees. His earliest work, on the Jewish War, was written in Aramaic, and when he desired to translate it into Greek, he was constrained to seek assistance (c. Ap. i. 9 χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνήν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν). But the Antiquities of the Jews (ἀ Ισραήτων ιστορίαι τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας),

1 See Ryle, p. xvi. ff.
3 Vit. i.
4 Ib. 2.
5 B. J. proem. 1 τῇ πατριώ [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. 1 ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἑνεστώσαν εἰκεχειρίσμαι πραγματείαν, νομίζων ἀπασι φανεῖσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησίων ἀξίαν σπουδῆς· μέλλει γὰρ περιέχειν ἀπασαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τῶν πολιτεύματος ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθηρμηνευμένην γραμμάτων. His chief source, therefore, was the Hebrew Bible, with which he was doubtless acquainted from boyhood. 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 Ὑπα...σημαίνει...πάντων μητέρα (Gen. iii. 20); i. 2. 1 Κάις...κτίσιν (v. 1. κτίσιν) σημαίνει (Gen. iv. 1); iii. 1. 6 καλούσι δὲ Ἑβραίοι τὸ βρώμα τούτο μάννα· τὸ γὰρ μὰν ἐπερώτησι...τί τοῦτ' ἐστών' ἀνακρίνουσα (Exod. xvi. 15); v. 10. 3 Σαμουηλον...θεαίτητον ἀν τις εἴποι (I 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 ἔσαν ἔβδομη-κοντα τὸν ἄρμιθός (I Regn. ix. 22, ΜΟΙῐτίαν); vi. 11. 4 ὑποθείσα τοῖς ἐπιβολαίοις ἄπαρ (ἴσα) αἰγός (I Regn. xix. 13, ΜΟΙῐτία); vi. 12. 4 Δῶγγος δ' ὁ Σύρως ἀ τάς ἡμίώνους αὐτοῦ βόσκων (I Regn. xxii. 9, ΜΟΙῐτία καὶ Τοῖς ἑκκαθαριστητηρίδας); vii. 2. 1 μέγαν εὐρώντες...τον Ἰέσσαβων καὶ μήτε τοὺς φύλακας παρόντας μήτε τὴν θυρωρίαν ἐγρηγορών (cf. 2 Regn. iv. 6 LXX. καὶ ἵδον ἡ θυρωρία εὐστατέαν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν); vii. 5. 3 ὑστερον δ' τῶν

1 He possessed a copy of the sacred books which Titus granted him from the spoils of the Temple: Vit. 75 τὴν αἰετήσε ς ἐποιήμην Τίτων...βιβλίων ἱερῶν [καὶ] ἔλαβον χαρισμένου Τίτων.
Alyv7TTL<DV paaiXevs 1ovo-aKO<;...k'

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 ἐκτισθεὶς ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν...γενέσθαι φῶς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ θεὸς... διεξώρισε τὸ τε φῶς καὶ τὸ σκῦτος...καὶ ἀσὺ μὲν ἄν εἶν πρῶτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, Μωυσῆς δ’ αὐτὴν μίαν εἶπε...τὸ τῶν τετραπόδων γένος ἀρρεν καὶ θῆλυ ποιήσας. i. 10. 3 (Gen. xv. 9 f.) δάμαλιν τριετίζουσαν καὶ αἶγα τριετίζουσαν καὶ κριόν ὕμωσ τριετῆ καὶ πρινγόνα καὶ περιστεράν κελεύσαντος δειείλη, τῶν ὀρέων οὐδὲν δειλῶν. i. 18. 7 (Gen. xxvii. 30) παρῆν Ἦσαΐς ἀπὸ τῆς θῆρας. i. 20. 2 (Gen. xxxii. 23 f.) χειμάρρουν τῳ 'Ἰάβακχον λεγόμενον διαβεβηκότων 'Ἰάκωβος ὑπολειεμένος...διεπάλαιεν. ii. 4. 1 (Gen. xxxix. 1) Ἰώσηφον δὲ τωλοῦμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμπόρων ωνησάμενος Πετεφρῆς ἀντὶ Αἰγύπτιος ἐπὶ τῶν Φαραώθου μαγείρων. ii. 6. 1 (Gen. xli. 45) προσηγόρισαν αὐτὸν Ψενθονφάνηχον...ἀγεται γὰρ καὶ Πετεφρῷ θυγατέρα τῶν ἐν τῇ 'Ηλιούπόλει ἵπτεν...Ἀσέννηθιν ὄνοματι. ii. 7. 5 (Gen. xlv. 28) ἀπανθησόμενος ἐξεισὶ καὶ καθ’ Ἡρώων πόλιν αὐτῷ συνέβαλεν’. (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.) Κύρος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγει Ἐπεῖ με ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγιστος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπεδείξε βασιλέα, τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομήσω ἐν Ἰεροσολύμων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ χώρᾳ. xi. 2. 2 (1 Esdr. ii. 21, cf. 2 Esdr. iv. 17) βασιλεὺς Καμβυσῆς Ῥαθύμῳ τῷ γράφοντι τὰ προσπίπτοντα καὶ Βαελζέῳ καὶ Σεμελίῳ γραμματεῖ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς συντασσομένοις καὶ οἰκονόμου ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ τόθε 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.
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was also known to Josephus in its Greek form, 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 Basle, 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 $\text{M}$. (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.'


1 Bloch, Die Quellen d. Fl. Josephus, p. 8 ff.
2 Die Bibel des Josephus, p. 79 ff.
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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.
Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.

By passages formally cited we understand (1) those which are cited with an introductory formula, such as τούτο γέγονεν ἣνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥῆθεν (Mt.), οὕτως or καθὼς γέγραψαται, or γέγραψαται simply (Mt., Mc., Lc., Paul), γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν (Jo.), Μωυσῆς (Δαυείδ) λέγει or εἶπεν, λέγει or εἶπεν ἡ γραφή (Jo., Paul), or τὸ ἀγιον 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 27 (v. 2)</td>
<td>xix. 4, Mc. x. 6</td>
<td>iv. 4</td>
<td>xvi. 45</td>
<td>xix. 5 f., Mc. x. 7 f., 1 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. v. 31</td>
<td>xvi. 14</td>
<td>iv. 17</td>
<td>iii. 25, Gal. iii. 8</td>
<td>vi. 13 f.</td>
<td>vii. 12</td>
<td>xi. 21</td>
<td>vii. 27 f.</td>
<td>xxii. 32, Mc. xii. 26, Lc. xx. 37, Acts vii. 32 f.</td>
<td>xix. 17</td>
<td>xix. 36</td>
<td>xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxxvii. 24)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>xix. 13</td>
<td>xx. 12—17 (Deut. v. 16 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 27</td>
<td>xi. 23, Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. 6 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b (xxii. 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 10, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 16 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 5 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxxiii. 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxxvii. 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 12—17 (Deut. v. 16 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 16 (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exod. xxii. 24</th>
<th>Mt. v. 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lev. xxiv. 20, Deut. xix. 21)</td>
<td>Acts xxiii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 40</td>
<td>Heb. ix. 19f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 1</td>
<td>viii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acts vii. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii. 19</td>
<td>1 Cor. x. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. xi. 44 f. (xix. 2, xx. 7, 26)</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 6, 8</td>
<td>1 Pet. i. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 5 (2 Esdr. xix. 29)</td>
<td>Lc. ii. 22 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 18</td>
<td>Rom. x. 5, Gal. iii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi. 1f. (Ezek. xxxvii. 27)</td>
<td>Mt. v. 43, xix. 19, xxii. 39, Mc. xii. 31, Lc. x. 27, James ii. 8, Rom. xiii. 9, Gal. v. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. xvi. 5</td>
<td>2 Cor. vi. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. iv. 35</td>
<td>2 Tim. ii. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 4 f.</td>
<td>Mc. xii. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 16</td>
<td>Mt. xxii. 37 f., Mc. xii. 29—33, Lc. x. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 3</td>
<td>iv. 7, 10, Lc. iv. 8, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 19</td>
<td>iv. 4, Lc. iv. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 15, 18 f.</td>
<td>Heb. xii. 21 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 15</td>
<td>Acts iii. 22 f., vii. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 23</td>
<td>Mt. xviii. 16, Jo. viii. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 1</td>
<td>Gal. iii. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 4</td>
<td>Mt. v. 31, xix. 7, Mc. x. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii. 26</td>
<td>1 Cor. ix. 9, 1 Tim. v. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 4</td>
<td>Gal. iii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rom. xi. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 12—14</td>
<td>Heb. xii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi. 6, 8 (Jos. i. 5)</td>
<td>Rom. x. 6—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 21</td>
<td>Heb. xiii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rom. x. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (Ps. cxxxiv. 14)</td>
<td>xii. 19, Heb. x. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Ps. xcvi. 7)</td>
<td>Heb. x. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regn. vii. 8, 14</td>
<td>i. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regn. xix. 10, 14, 18</td>
<td>2 Cor. vi. 18, Heb. i. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm ii. 1 f.</td>
<td>Rom. xi. 3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acts iv. 25 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 2</td>
<td>xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—7</td>
<td>Mt. xxii. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 3 (v. 10, ix. 28, xxxv. 2, lii. 1—3, cxxxix. 4, Isa. lix. 7 f.)</td>
<td>1 Cor. xv. 27, Heb. ii. 6—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. iii. 10—18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Psalm xvi. 8—11
xvii. 50
xviii. 5
xxi. 2
9
19
23
xxiii. 1
xxxi. 1 f.
xxxii. 13—17
xxxiv. 19 (lxviii. 5)
xxxix. 7—9
xl. 10
xliii. 22
xliv. 7 f.
l. 6
liv. 23
lxvii. 19
lxviii. 10
23 f.
26
lxvii. 2
lxxxvi. 6
lxxxviii. 21
xc. 11 f.
xcii. 11
xciv. 8—11
ci. 26—28
ciii. 4
cviii. 8
cix. 1

Acts ii. 25—28
Rom. xv. 9
x. 18
Mt. xxvii. 46, Mc. xv. 34
xxvii. 43
Jo. xix. 24
Heb. ii. 12
1 Cor. x. 26
Rom. iv. 6—8
1 Pet. iii. 10—12
Jo. xv. 25
Heb. x. 5—7
Jo. xiii. 18
Rom. viii. 36
Heb. i. 8 f.
Rom. iii. 4
1 Pet. v. 7
Eph. iv. 8
Jo. ii. 17, Rom. xv. 3
Rom. xi. 9 f.
Acts i. 20
Mt. xiii. 35
Jo. x. 34
Acts xiii. 22
Mt. iv. 6, Lc. iv. 10 f.
1 Cor. iii. 20
Heb. iii. 7—11
i. 10—12
i. 7
Acts i. 20
Mt. xxi. 44, Mc. xii. 36, Lc.
xx. 42 f., Acts ii. 34 f.,
Heb. i. 13
Heb. v. 6 (vii. 17, 21)
2 Cor. ix. 9
iv. 13
Rom. xv. 11
Heb. xiii. 6
Mt. xxi. 42, Mc. xii. 10 f.,
Lc. xx. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 7
Heb. xii. 5 f.
Jas. iv. 6, 1 Pet. v. 5
1 Pet. iv. 18
Rom. xii. 20
2 Pet. ii. 22
1 Cor. iii. 19
Rom. ix. 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>Roman Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hos. ii. 23</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 6</td>
<td>Mt. ix. 13, xii. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 1</td>
<td>ii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 14</td>
<td>1 Cor. xv. 55 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos v. 25, 27</td>
<td>Acts vii. 42 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 11 f.</td>
<td>xv. 15—17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic. v. 2</td>
<td>Mt. ii. 5 f. (Jo. vii. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel ii. 28—32</td>
<td>Acts ii. 17—21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab. i. 5</td>
<td>xiii. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 3 f.</td>
<td>Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11, Heb. x. 37 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech. iii. 2</td>
<td>Jude 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 9</td>
<td>Mt. xxi. 5, Jo. xii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 13</td>
<td>xxvii. 9 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 10</td>
<td>Jo. xix. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 7</td>
<td>Mt. xxvi. 31, Mc. xiv. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. i. 2 f.</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 1</td>
<td>Mt. xi. 10, Mc. i. 2, Lc. vii. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. i. 9</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 14</td>
<td>i. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 14</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 33, 1 Pet. ii. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Heb. ii. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 1 f.</td>
<td>Mt. iv. 15 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 22 f.</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 27 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 10</td>
<td>xv. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 13</td>
<td>1 Cor. xv. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxviii. 11 f.</td>
<td>xxv. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 10</td>
<td>xi. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mt. xv. 8 f., Mc. vii. 6 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 Cor. i. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl. 3—5</td>
<td>Mt. iii. 3, Mc. i. 3, Lc. iii. 4—6, Jo. i. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—8</td>
<td>1 Pet. i. 24 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 f.</td>
<td>Rom. xi. 34 f., 1 Cor. ii. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 1—4</td>
<td>Mt. xii. 18—21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv. 23</td>
<td>Rom. xiv. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix. 6</td>
<td>Acts xiii. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 Cor. vi. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lii. 5</td>
<td>Rom. ii. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Nah. i. 15)</td>
<td>x. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 Cor. vi. 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt.</th>
<th>Mc.</th>
<th>Lc.</th>
<th>O. T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>Mc.</td>
<td>Lc.</td>
<td>O. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i. 3</td>
<td>iii. 4—6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>13 (xii. 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>i. 2</td>
<td>vii. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18—21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>14 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 18 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>vii. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>5 f.</td>
<td>x. 6—8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 f.</td>
<td>x. 19</td>
<td>xviii. 20 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>4 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xi. 17</td>
<td>xix. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>xii. 10</td>
<td>xx. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. xxv. 5 (cf. Gen. xxxviii. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29 f.</td>
<td>x. 27 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>xx. 42 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>xiii. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>xiv. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii.</td>
<td>9 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>xv. 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(2) Quotations in the Fourth Gospel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter and Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>i. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xix. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxviii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxxvii. 24 f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>liv. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxxxi. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>ix. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>liii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vt. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xlv. (xli.) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxiv. 19 (lxxvii. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxi. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>xii. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Quotations in the Acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter and Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>i. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 17—21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25—28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 22 f. (vii. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 25 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 f., 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 32 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 16—18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxviii. 26 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxviii. 26 + cviii. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>ii. 28—32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xv. 8—11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cix. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xviii. 15, 18 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>xii. 3 + xxi. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>ii. 1 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>xii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 13 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>ii. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 6—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxii. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>v. 25—27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lxvi. 1 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liii. 7 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxxxviii. 21 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lv. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xv. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>i. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xlix. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>xii. 15 + Amos ix. 11 f. +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. xlv. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>vi. 9 f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.**

### (4) Quotations in the Catholic Epistles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James ii. 8</td>
<td>Lev. xix. 18</td>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Gen. xv. 6</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 6</td>
<td>Prov. iii. 34</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Peter i. 24 f.</td>
<td>Isa. xl. 6—9</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>6—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 6</td>
<td>xxviii. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 10—12</td>
<td>Ps. xxxiii. 12—17</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>12—17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 18</td>
<td>Prov. xi. 31</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 7</td>
<td>Ps. liv. 23</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Peter ii. 22</td>
<td>Prov. xxvi. 11</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (5) Quotations in the Epistles of St Paul.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom. i. 17</td>
<td>Hab. ii. 4</td>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 24</td>
<td>Isa. lli. 5</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 4</td>
<td>Ps. l. 6</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10—18</td>
<td>xiii. 1—3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>cxlii. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 3, 22</td>
<td>Gen. xv. 6</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 f.</td>
<td>Ps. xxxii. 1 f.</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>1 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gen. xvii. 5</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>xv. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 7</td>
<td>Exod. xx. 14, 17</td>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>14, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 36</td>
<td>Ps. xlili. 23</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 7</td>
<td>Gen. xxii. 12</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>xviii. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>xxv. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 6—9</td>
<td>Mal. i. 2 f.</td>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>2 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Exod. xxxiii. 19</td>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ix. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos. i. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Isa. x. 22 f.</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>22 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 f.</td>
<td>i. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 14 + xxviii. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deut. xxx. 11—14</td>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>11—14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Isa. lli. 7 (Nah. i. 15)</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lli. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>llii. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 f.</td>
<td>Ps. xviii. 5</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. xxxii. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. lxv. 1 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See above, p. 251 f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter and Verse(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>xi. 1 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 20 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>i. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>iv. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>ii. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>iv. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xciii. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regn.</td>
<td>xix. 10, 14, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xxix. 10 + Deut. xxix. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxviii. 23 f. + xxxiv. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lix. 20 + xxvii. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>xxv. 21 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xx. 13 ff., Lev. xix. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xlv. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxviii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 50 (2 Regn. xxii. 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xxxii. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>cxvi. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xi. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxix. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>ix. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lxiv. 4 + lxv. 17 (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xciii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>ii. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xxv. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xxxii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>xxiii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xxviii. 11 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxii. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>ii. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xxv. 8 + Hos. xiii. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>cxv. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>xlix. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td>xxxvii. 27 + Isa. lii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xvi. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>cxii. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>ix. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>cxlii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>xv. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xxvii. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>ii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>xviii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xxi. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>liv. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>xxi. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>xix. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxviii. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>viii. 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eph.</th>
<th>iv. 26</th>
<th>Ps.</th>
<th>iv. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 31</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>ii. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>xx. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>xxv. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>ii. 19</td>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>xvi. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heb.</th>
<th>Ps.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 5</td>
<td>ii. 7 (2 Regn. vii. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>xcvi. 7 (Deut. xxxii. 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ciii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 f.</td>
<td>xliv. 7 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10—12</td>
<td>ci. 26—28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>cix. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 6—8</td>
<td>viii. 5—7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>xxii. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Isa. viii. 17 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 7—12</td>
<td>Ps. xciv. 8—11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 4</td>
<td>Gen. ii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6 (vii. 17, 21)</td>
<td>Ps. cix. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 13 f.</td>
<td>Gen. xxii. 16 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 5</td>
<td>Exod. xxv. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—13, x. 16 f.</td>
<td>Jer. xxxviii. 31—34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 20</td>
<td>Exod. xxiv. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 5—10</td>
<td>Ps. xxxix. 7—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Deut. xxxii. 35 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 f.</td>
<td>Hab. ii. 3 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 5</td>
<td>Gen. v. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>xxii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>xlvii. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 5 f.</td>
<td>Prov. iii. 11 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deut. xxix. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Exod. xix. 12 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hagg. ii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 5</td>
<td>Deut. xxxi. 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ps. cxvii. 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. writing.
(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 185; and by another that “not more than fifty” of the citations “materially differ from the LXX.” 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.
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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. 27a = LXX., with variants1. Mt. xxii. 39 = Mc. xii. 31 = Lc. x. 27b = LXX. Mt. xxii. 44 = Mc. xii. 36 = Lc. xx. 42 f., = LXX. with the variant ὑποκάτω 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 προσκόλλησεται κτλ. Mt. xxiv. 15 = Mc. xiii. 14 = LXX. and Th. Mt. xxvi. 31 = Mc. xiv. 27 (omitting τῆς ποίμνης) = 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 διαφυλάξαντος 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=xi. 7, xi. 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 Greek. 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. 35b. 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 τοῦ νιὸν μου for τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶς 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. (יִלָּהְו).

The three last-named causes of variation need to be considered at some length.

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 \((\epsilonιπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιῶν Ἰδοὺ κτλ.).\) Lc. iv. 18 f., which is professedly an extract from a synagogue lesson Isa. lxii. 11 ff., inserts in the heart of that context a clause from Isa. lviii. 6 \(\left(\text{ἀποστείλαι τεθραυ-}
\text{σμένους ἐν ἀφέσει}\right)\). 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. 3. Here the parallel passages in Mt., Lc., quote Isaiah only, using Malachi in another context (Mt. xi. 10, Lc. vii. 27).

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, by Dr W. Staerk, who shews that the witness of the N. T. almost invariably goes with codd. ΑΑΦ and Lucian against the Vatican MS., and that its agreement with cod. A is especially close. It may of course be argued that the text of these authorities has been influenced by the N. T.; 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. Some instances have been given already; we may add here Mt. xii. 18 = Isa. xlii. 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt.</th>
<th>LXX.</th>
<th>Th.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου δὲν ἡρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου δὲν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.</td>
<td>Ἰακόβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐκλεκτὸς μου, προσεδέξατο ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ μου.</td>
<td>Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐκλεκτὴ μου.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 St Mark, p. 2.  
2 In nos. xxxv., xxxvi., xxxviii., xl.  
3 xxxvi., p. 97 f.  
5 Cf. p. 48.
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 σὺ, Βηθλεέμ, γῆ Ιουδα, οὐδαμὸς ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἤγεμόσιν Ιουδα.· ἐκ σου γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὡστις πυμανεῖ τῶν λαῶν μου Ἰσραήλ.

οὐδαμὸς] μὴ D | εκ σου] εξ  
ou (B*)NC(D) | om γαρ κ.*.

Mic. v. 2, 4

καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεέμ, οἶκος Ἐφράθα, ὄλγοστὸς εἰ τοῦ εἰναι ἐν χλωσίν Ιουδα.· εἴς οὐ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἰναι εἰς ἀρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ...καὶ πυμανεῖ...

ἐξ οὐ] εκ σου BbcAQ | εξε- 
λευσεται] + ἡγούμενος A

On the relation of the LXX. in this passage to the M. T. see above p. 338. Χλιάσων, ἡγεμόσων answer to different vocalisations of Ὁλός, but οὐδαμὸς ἐλαχίστη εἰ and ἡγούμενος ὡστʼ τῶν 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 Ζαβουλῶν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλείμ, ὁδὸν βαλάσις, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλειλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκοτίᾳ φῶς εἶδεν μέγα· καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιὰ βανάτου φῶς άνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.

οἰ καθημένοι D | καὶ σκια] 
om καὶ D*
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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 εὖθνων, χῶρα [καὶ] σκιᾶ. On the other hand ὁδὸν βαλαίσσῃς, εἰδέν, αὐτοὶς agree with M.T. The writer quotes from memory, or from a collection of loosely cited testimonia.

Mt. viii. 17  
αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενεῖς ἡμῶν ἠλάβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν.

Isa. liii. 4  
οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὁδυνάται.

Mt.'s version is based upon Heb., from which the LXX. departs. Cf. Symm.: τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνέλαβεν καὶ τοὺς πόνους ὑπέμεινεν.

Ps. lxxxvii. 2  
ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου· ἐρευνάμαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.

καταβολῆς] + κοσμού Ἦ*CD

V. 35 in Mt. follows the LXX. verbatim, while 35b 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 ἐρευνάμαι is nearer to ἡμῖν than φθέγξομαι, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς introduces a conception which has no place in ἡμῖν, 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.  
καὶ ἠλάβον... tôn τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμήμενον ὡς ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ νίῶν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτά εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν τοῦ κεραμεὼς, καθὰ συνετάξεν μοι Κύριος.

Zach. xi. 13  
καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς μέ Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον καὶ σκέψωμαι εἰ δύκιμων ἐστιν, ὡς τρόπον εὐδοκιμᾶσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἠλάβον... καὶ ἐνεβάλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἴκον Κυ-ρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

ἐδώκεν Ἀ*vid εἰδώκα Ν  
ἐδοκιμασθην B*fort NaQ

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 ἐτιμήθην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

1 Mt. ascribes this prophecy to Jeremiah: τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρήθεν διὰ Ἰερεμίου 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 ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαῖοις 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 vii. 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 εὐθύνατε τὴν δῶν Κυρίου for ἐτοιμάσατε τ. δ. 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 ὑφάλμους καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, which agrees neither with the LXX. nor with M.T.; in xiii. 37 ὁμοναὶ εἰς δὲ ἑξεκέντησαν is a non-Septuagintal rendering of Zach. xii. 10, which was perhaps current in Palestine, since εἰς δὲ ἑξεκέντησαν appears also in Theodotion (cf. Aq., Symm., and Apoc. i. 7).

(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. 32, 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. (Ῥαμφᾶ or Ῥαμφᾶν, Μὴ ὑπέρ). Similarly in xiii. 34 (= Isa. lv. 3) τὰ ὅσια Δανεὶδ is read with the LXX. for γῆ ἱερά. C. xiii. 22 is a conflation of Ps. lxxviii.

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.
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21 + lxxi. 20 + 1 Regn. xiii. 14 + Isa. xlv. 28. C. xv. 16 ff., which is introduced by the formula τούτῳ 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 ταύτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυείδ τὴν πεπτωκυίαν, καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν, ὅτες ἄν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὖς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὀνόμα μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταύτα * * *

κατεστραμμένα] κατεσκαμμένα ACD

Jer. xii. 15 + Amos ix. 11 ff.

μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψω ... ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυείδ τὴν πεπτωκυίαν..

καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς ἡμέρα τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὖς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταύτα.

κατεσκαμμένα] κατεστραμμένα A ὁ Q

* ὁ ποιῶν Λ | ἀνθρώπων] + τον κύριον Λ

The combination in this quotation of looseness with close adherence to the LXX. even where it is furthest from the Heb. (e.g. in ὁπως ἐ<νήτηςωσιν θλ.) 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, 11, 23, iv. 6, 1 Pet. i. 24, 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 ἀγαπῶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς for θέλων ζ., ἀγαπῶν ἰδ. ἡμ. ἀγαθάς 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) κύων ἐπιστρέφας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδον ἔξεραμα is nearer to the Heb. than κ. ἐπέλθη ἐπὶ τὸν έαυτοῦ 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 ff., 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; i 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 ζών LXX.; ix. 9 κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτου ἐλέωσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρμα νίός for ἥξω...κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτου...καὶ ἔσει νίόν Σάρμα LXX.; ix. 17 εἰς αὐτὸ τούτο ἐξέγειρά σε for ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, and δύναμιν for ἰδχίν LXX.1; ix. 27 ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν νιῶν 'I., ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; xiv. 11 ζῷ ἐγὼ for κατ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμινῶ, ἔξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ for ὀμεῖται τὸν θεόν LXX.; i Cor. i. 19 ἄθετήσω for κρύψω LXX.; Gal. iii. 8 πάντα τὰ ἐβήν for πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς LXX.; iii. 13 ἐπικατάρατος (cf. v. 20) for κεκαταραμένος LXX.; Eph. iv. 8 ἐδωκέν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for ἐλαβές δ. ἐν ἀνθρώπω 2 LXX.; iv. 25 μετὰ τοῦ πλησίουν for πρὸς τὸν πλ. LXX.; v. 31 ἀντὶ τούτου for ἐνεκεν τ., om. αὐτοῦ 1o, 2o; cf. Mt. xix. 5 f., Mc. x. 7 f.; vi. 3 καὶ ἐση μακροχρόνιον for κ. ἐνα μακροχρ. γένη).

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, i Cor. xv. 45, Gal. iv. 30; conflation occurs in Rom. iii. 10 ff.3, ix. 33, xi. 8, 9, 26 f.; i Cor. xv. 54 f., 2 Cor. vi. 16 ff.

1 BA reads δύναμιν.
2 αἱ ὁ φ. BA NR.
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 Σωτ. λίθων προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου; καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται.

Rom. xi. 8 ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεύμα κατανύσως, ὁφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μή βλέπειν καὶ ὀτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἐως τὴς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

Rom. xi. 9 ὁ ὁφθαλμὸς οὗτ ἀδειὸν καὶ οὐδὲν ἠκούσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὗτ ἀνέβη, ὡς ἡ τούτοις θεὸς τόσο ἀγάπωσιν αὐτῶν. 3 ἀγαπωσιν] ὑπομενονοσ Clem. R. i. 34, 8.

Rom. xv. 54 f. κατεπόθη ὁ δάνατος εἰς νῖκος. ποῦ σου, βάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, βάνατε, 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 ἦν ἄλλα ἀλλ’ ἡ γραφὴ...Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου κατέκαψαν, κάγω ὑπελείφθην μόνος, καὶ ἐπείστη τὴν ψυχὴν μου. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει οὗτ ὁ χρηματισμός; Ἐπεκ- λίπον ἐμαυτῷ ἐπτακισχυλίων ἀνθρώπων, οὗτοι οὐκ ἤκαμψαν γόνο τῇ Βααλ.

Isa. viii. 14 οὐχ ὡς λίθων προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε οὖν ἐδώ πέτραν πτώματι. xxviii. 16 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σειων λίθων πολυτελῆς, ἐκλεκτῶν ἀκρογονιουσί, ἐντιμον...καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατασχυνθῇ.

Isa. xxix. 10 πεπότικεν υἱὸς ὁ Κύριος πνεύματι κατανύσως. Deut. xxix. 4 καὶ ὁ οὐκ ἠδωκεν ὁ θεὸς υἱὸν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὁφθαλμοὺς [τοὺς] βλέπειν καὶ ὀτα ἀκούειν ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.

Isa. lxiv. 3 οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδέ οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἰδον θεὸν πλήρη σοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἐργά σου ὁ ποιησεις τοῖς υπομενονον έλεον. lxv. 17 οὐδ’ οὐ μὴ ἐπελθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ καρδίαν.

Isa. xxv. 8 κατέπιν ὁ δάνατος Σαχύσας. Hos. xiii. 14 ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, βάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ἄδη;

3 Regn. xix. 14 ff. καὶ εἶπεν Ἡλειοῦ...τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου καβείλαν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν...καὶ ὑπολέκυμα έγὼ μονωτάτου καὶ ζητοῦν τὴν ψυχὴν μου...καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν...καταλείψεις εἰς Ἰσραηλ ἐπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα α ὁ ἄδελφον γόνω τῷ Βααλ.

1 Aq. καὶ εἰς στερεόν σκανδάλου.
2 Cf. i Pet. ii. 8 (Hort).
3 On this passage see Resch, Agrapha, p. 154 ff.
4 So Theodotion.

S. S.
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

έν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι

\[\text{ἔν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χειλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδὲ οὗτος εἰσακούσονται μου, λέγει Κύριος.}\]

Isa. xxviii. 11 f.

\[\text{διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων, διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας ὅτι λαλήσωσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ...καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσαν ἀκούειν.}\]

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 χειλεσιν 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 κατηρτίσω μου, 37 ἕαν ὑποστειληταί, xi. 21 ῥάβδου, xii. 5 μαστυγοί⁴). But he sometimes deserts both version and original, substituting a free paraphrase, or apparently citing from memory (i. 6, ix. 20 ἐνεστιλατό, x. 30⁵, xii. 19 ff., 26). Some of his readings are interesting: in i. 7 we have πυρὸς φλόγα for πῦρ φλέγων⁶; in i. 12 ὃς ἱμάτιον seems to be a doublet of ὦσει περιβόλαιον. Notice also ii. 12 ἀπαγγελῶ for διηγήσομαι (perhaps after Ps. xxi. 31 f.); iii. 9 ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ for ἐδοκιμασαν (ἐδοκιμασία for ἐδοκιμασά), and iii. 10 τεσσεράκοντα ἐτής διὰ προσώπῃσα for

¹ As ἐν τῷ νόμῳ seems to indicate.
² Cf. p. 338.
³ Yet "he nowhere shews any immediate knowledge of the Hebrew text” [Westcott, pp. cit., p. 479].
⁴ Cf. Rom. xii. 19. Apparently a stock quotation, current in this form.
⁵ Ἄρχι has πυρὸς φλέγα (sic) in Ps. ciii. 4.
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tes. etn προσώπῳ.; x. 6 ειδόκησας for ἵτησας B, ἤτησας nART; xii. 15 ενοχλη for εν χολη, 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. xxii. 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. 39, 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 James\(^1\) 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., 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 Canon\(^2\). 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 cited\(^3\). 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. lxviii. 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.
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CHAPTER III.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE LXX. IN EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

"The quotations from the LXX. in the Greek Fathers are an almost unworked field." 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 Fathers 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. (xviii. 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. i f. (l. 6), io (xxii. 8), xxxiii. 12—20 (xxii. 1 ff.), xxxvi. 35 f. (xv. 5), xlix. 16 ff. (xxxv. 7 ff.), l. 3 ff. (xviii. 2 ff.), lxi. 5 (xv. 3), lxxvii. 36 (xv. 4), lxxviii. 21 (xviii. 1), ciii. 4 (xxxvi. 3), cix. 1 (xxxvi. 5), cxvii. 18 (lvi. 3), 19 f. (xlvi. 2), cxxxviii. 7 f. (xxvii. 3), cxl. 5 (lvi. 5); Prov. i. 23 ff. (lvi. 3 ff.), ii. 21 f. (xiv. 4), iii. 12 (lvi. 3 f.), 34 (xxx. 2), xx. 21 (xii. 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 (xvii. 3); Mal. iii. 1 (xxx. 5); Isa. i. 16 ff. (viii. 4), vi. 3 (xxxiv. 6), xiii. 22 (xxvii. 5), xxix. 13 (xv. 2), liii. 1 f. (xvi. 3 ff.), lx. 17 (xlii. 5), lxvi. 2 (xiii. 3); Jer. ix. 23 f. (xiii. 1); Ezek. xxxiii. 11 (vii. 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 ἐθουθένημα, ΝΑ; xxxi. 1 f. ος, Ν*ΒΑ (ag. Ν*Α); xxxiii. 14 Χείλη τοῦ, Ν*ΑΡ; 16 om. ος, Ν*ΑΡ; xxxvi. 36 ἐξεζήτησα (H. P. 99, 183); xlix. 21 ἄνοιξε, Ν*; 22 ἄρπ. ως λέων, R; l. 17 τὸ στόμα...τὰ χείλη; lxxxvii. 21 ἐλέει, B*; Prov. ii. 21 χρηστὸν ἐσουνται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἀκακοὶ δὲ ὑπολειψόνται ετό αὐτῆς, cf. Ν*Α—a doublet wanting in B, whose reading "appears to shew the hand of an Alexandrian reviser" (Toy, cf. Lagarde); iii. 12 παιδεύει, NA; xx. 21 (27) λύγγος, a reading found in A as a doublet (φῶ... ἣ λύγγος); Job iv. 21 ἐτελεύτησαν (for ἐπηράνθησαν), A; v. 17 ff. is without the additions of the A text, and nearly as in B; Isa. i. 17 χρη, B*, ag. B*ΒΑ, δεέτε καὶ διελευχθ. (διαλευχ. Cclem.), ΝΑQ; liii. 5 ἀμαρτίας...ἀνομίας τρ., ΝΑQ; 6 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν; 8 ἡκε for ἡχθη, Qmg, 62, 90 al., Syrohex.mg; 9 εὑρέθη δόλος, Ν*ΑQ (see Lightfoot's note); τῆς πληγῆς, B (A, ἀπὸ τ. πλ.), lx. 17 ἀρχοντας] ἐπισκόπους | ἐπισκόπους] διακόνους; Ezek. xxxiii. 11 ἀμαρτωλοῦ, A (B, ἀσεβοῦς); Dan. vii. 10 ἐλευθοῦργου, Th. (LXX. ἐθεράπευν)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. cxviii. 8 ἐὰν καταστρῶσω, 'A. Σ. ἐὰν στρῶσω (LXX. ἐὰν καταβω); Isa. lxvi. 2 πρᾶον, 'A. (LXX. ταπεινῶν). 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. Ixxxviii. 21 ἡλεεις: Mal. iii. ἰ ἄγιος for ὀ ἄγγελος.

(b) A large proportion of Clement's quotations are composite; 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. cxi. 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 21b). 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 ἐξομολογήσωμαι σοι· καὶ ἐκομιμήθη καὶ ἐπνώσα· ἐξηγήρθην, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοὶ ἐί, 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. cxviii. 7), xxii. 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 ἀπελθε for ξελθε (LXX. and Acts), but rejects καὶ δεύρῳ 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.
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(2) Exod. ii. 14 = Acts vii. 27 = Clem. iv. 11: Clem. reads κριτήν for ἀρχοντα—"perhaps from confusion with Lc. xii. 14" (Lightfoot).

(3) Jer. ix. 23 f. (1 Regn. ii. ro) = i Cor. i. 31, (2 Cor. x. 17) = Clem. xiii. 1; here the relation of Clement to the Biblical texts is best shewn by juxtaposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer. l.c.</th>
<th>1 Regn. l.c.</th>
<th>Clem. l.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούσιῳ αὐτοῦ. ἄλλῃ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχόμενος, συνίει καὶ γινώσκει ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρονήμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνάμης ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούσιῳ αὐτοῦ. ἄλλῃ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχόμενος, συνίει καὶ γινώσκει τὸν κύριον, καὶ κοινοὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, μὴ δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, μὴ δὲ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούσιῳ αὐτοῦ. ἄλλῃ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοιοῖς κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cf. p. 245.

(4) Ps. xxi. 9 = Matt. xxvii. 43 = Clem. xvi. 15; Clem. agrees with lxx., Mt. substitutes πέποιθεν for ἡλπίσεω, τὸν θεόν for Κύριον, and ei for óti. (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. שֵׁם, but with reference to נַעַם 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.
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Isa. l.c.  
έγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς χειλεσίων αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.  
ομ ἐν τῷ στόμ. αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ΧΑΩ.

Mt., Mc. ll.cc.  
ὁ λαὸς οὗτος (οὗτος ὁ λαὸς Mc.) τοῖς χειλεσίων με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.  
ἀπέχει] Mc. ἀφέστηκεν D ἀπεστίων L ἀπέστων εἰς  

Clem. l.c.  
Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χειλεσίων με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέστων ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.  
τοῖς χειλεσίων] τῷ στόματι Cclem.  
ἀπέστων] ἀπέχει Cclem.

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 ἀπεστίων 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 suggested, 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. i (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. 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 γραφὴ ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ. 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 ὄνομα ἔστωτεν Ἡσέρι, καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ σε λυμάνῃ. Compare Dan. vi. 22 (23) Th., ὁ θεὸς μονόν ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὸ στόμα τῶν λεόντων (LXX. σέσωκε μὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων), καὶ οὐκ ἐλυμήναντό με.

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 Ἡσέρι or the like, must be an attempt to reproduce the verb Ἡσάρι (Dan. i. 2).

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 Isaiah\(^1\), 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 Μωυσῆς αυτὸς; Ἰδοῦ τάδε λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεός Εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἁγαθὴν, ἢν ᾤμοσεν Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ κατακληρονομήσατε αὐτὴν, γῆν ἰδέωσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι. Similar liberties are taken even when the writer mentions the book which he is quoting: x. 2 Μωυσῆς...λέγει αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Δευτερονόμῳ Καὶ διαθήκησαι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον τὰ δικαίωματά 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 ff.), xvii. 45 (ix. 1), xxii. 19 (vi. 6), Gen. ii. 10 ff. (x. 1), cxvi. 12, 22 (vi. 4, 6), Prov. i. 17 (v. 4), Isa. i. 2, 10 ff. (ii. 5, ix. 3, xv. 8), x. 9 f. (vii. 7), v. 21 (iv. 11), xxviii. 16 (vi. 2 ff.), xxxiii. 13 (ix. 1), 16 (xii. 1), xl. 12 (xvi. 2), xlvi. 6 ff. (xv. 7), xlvi. 2 f. (xi. 4), xlix. 6 ff. (xv. 8), liii. 5, 7 (v. 2), lxvi. 1 f. (xv. 9), lxvi. 1 f. (xv. 2). (b) Partly exact, partly free: Gen. xxv. 21 ff. (xiii. 2), xlvi. 9—11, 14 ff. (xiii. 4 ff.), Isa. xxviii. 16 (vi. 2), lviii. 4 ff. (iii. 1 ff.), Jer. ii. 12 f. (xi. 2). (c) Free: Gen. i. 26 (vi. 12), 28 (vi. 18), Lev. xxxi. 29 (vii. 3), Deut. ix. 12 (iv. 8), x. 16 (ix. 5), Ps. xxii. 21, cxviii. 120, xxi. 17 (v. 13), Zech. xiii. 7 (v. 12), xli. 1 f. (x. 3), xl. 3 (x. 3), Isa. i. 6 ff. (v. 14, vi. 1), lxv. 2 (xvi. 4), Jer. iv. 3 (ix. 5), vii. 2 (ix. 2), ix. 26 (ix. 5), Ezek. 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+xxxi. 18 (iv. 7), Ps. xli. 3+xxii. 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), Ezek. xliv. (x. 10). (f) Very loose citation: Gen. ii. 2 (xv. 3), xvii. 5 (xiii. 6), Exod. xvii. 14 (xii. 9), xxiv. 18+xxxi. 18 (xiv. 2), xxxiii. 1 ff. (vi. 8), Lev. xvi. 7 ff.

---

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 ἑπὶ καθέδραν, BN (ag. ἑ. καθέδρα AR), 5 οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, ἀμαρτωλοί, B (ag. ἀσεβεῖς, οἱ ἀμ. A). xvii. 45 ὑπῆκουσαν, N*, μου, Nc.a RU (ag. μοι 1ο BN#A). xxi. 17 περιέσχεν, H.-P. 81, 206. cix. 1 Κύριος, R | ὑποκάτω (ag. ὑποκάτω, Mc. xii. 36, BD). Isa. iii. 9 ὅτι, AΓ; v. 21 ἐαυτῶν, ΑΩ; xxviii. 16 ἐμβιαλώ, ΝΑΩ; xlii. 7 καὶ ἔξαγαγεν | δεδεμένους πεπεπθημένους (as Justin, Dial. 26, 65, 122). xlii. 6 τέθεικα, ΝΑΩ* (ag. δέδωκα ΒQmeg), 7 λυτρωσάμενος (for ρύσα-μενος); liii. 5 ἁνομίας, ἀμαρτίας, ΝΔΩ, 7 τοῦ κειμένου αὐτών, Nc.a ΑΩ; lviii. 5 λέγει Κύριος, Q, 6 ἵδον αὐτῇ ἡ ἡστεία ἡν; lxii. 1 τα-πεινώσαι, Ν*; lxvi. 1 ἢ δὲ γῆ, ΝΑΩ | ἢ (for καὶ 2ο), ΝΑ.

The leaning in Isaiah towards the text of Q, especially when found in company with A or ΝΑ, 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 ποτίον. Occasionally the text used by Barnabas seems to have been revised from the Heb.; e.g. in Jer. ii. 12 ἐξεστη, ἐφριζεν become ἐκστηθι, φριζάτω 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. τ. τῇ ἐκτῇ.

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' ομασ δια παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν appears to be changed into οὐδὲ οὐ ματαιότητι τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπὶ τινῶν βλασφημεῖται—a form which occurs also in Pseudo-Clement (2 Cor. xiii. 2) and Polycarp (Phil. x. 3). (b) Polycarp is no less sparing in his references to the O.T. than Ignatius. He quotes only Isa. lii. 5 (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 list.

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 (iv. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotations in early Christian Writings.</th>
<th>415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ix. 5f. (v. 14); xiii. 14f. 27 (v. 32.2); xiv. 22 (v. 5); xix. 18</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. 5. 2, 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); xlvii. 9 (i. 5. 4), xlviii. 22 (i. 16. 3); xlix. 16 (v. 35. 2); li. 6 (iv. 3. 1), lii. 4 (iv. 33. 11), 8 (ii. 28. 5); liv. 11 ff. (v. 34. 4); lxii. (iv. 34. 4), 16 (v. 12. 2); lxv. 6 ff. (iv. 17. 3), 14 (v. 34. 2); lxvii. 17; lxvi. 1 ff. (iii. 9. 3); lxviii. 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. 9); 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); xxi. 21. 9); xxii. 7 f. (v. 34. 1), 20 (iv. 26. 1), 23 (iv. 19. 2), 29 (v. 17. 4), xxxi. 20 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. I). Ezech. ii. 1 (iv. 20. 10); xx. 12 (iv. 16. 1), 23 f. (iv. 15. 1), xxviii. 25 f. (v. 34. 1); xxxvii. 25 ff. (iv. 31. 1); xxxvi. 26 (iv. 23. 4); xxxvii. 1 f. (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 (iv. 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 (Mmg δ απόκειται); 18 in salutem tuam sustinui te, Domine (cf. Fcorr ap Field). Exod. xxxv. 40 facies omnia (F ποιήσεις πάντα, Luc.) secundum typum eorum quae vidisti. Num. xxiv. 17 surget dux in Israel (cf. Heb. לֶבִי, Σ. σκόπτηρον; LXX. ἀνθρωπός εξ 1.). Deut. v. 22 (19) scripsit ea in duabus tabulis lapideis (+λίθων B Ab A Luc.); xxxii. 6

1 Cf. Justin, Dial. 120.
et fecit te et creavit te (+καὶ ἐκτισέν σε ΑΦ, +καὶ ἐπλασέν σε Λυκ.). I Regn. xv. 22 auditus bonus super sacrificium (ἀγαθή Λυκ.). Ps. xxxix. 7 aures autem perfecisti mihi (possibly a correction from the Gallican Psalter, but a few cursives read after the Heb. ὤτα or ὅτα); xliv. 17 facti sunt tibi filii (B3AR ἐγεννησαν, ag. B*ΣΝ ἐγενν.); xlix. 10 bestiae terrae (ἀγροῦ ΣναA, δρυμοῦ ΒΝ*), 15 in die tribulationis tuae (θλύφεως σου ΣnostiAR); ci. 27 mutatis eos (ἀλλάξεις Σ*, ἔλιξεις B(Σn)AR(T)); cix. 1 suppedaneum pedum tuorum (ὑποπόδιων, not ὑποκάτω); cxi. 11 om. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (with ΣnostiAT). Mic. vii. 19 ἐβσε (αὐτὸς ΑQ)...proicit (ἀπορρίπτει A(Q), ἀποριφσοῦται B), om. πάσας. Hab. iii. 3 pedes eius (οἱ πόδες ΑQ, καὶ πόδας B). Isa. i. 17 iustificate viduam (χήραν ΒaBNAG ag. χήρα B*Q*); xi. 4 arguet gloriosas terrae (τοὺς ἐνδόξους ΣQcor, ag. τ. ταπεινοὺς BAQ*); xxv. 9 om. καὶ σώσει ἡμᾶς...ἐπεμείναμεν αὐτῷ (with ΝΑQ*, a hexaplaric addition, cf. Field, ad loc.); xxix. 13 populus hic labitis me honorat (om. with ΝΑQ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ εillé); xlii. 23 non servisti mihi in sacrificiis=οὐ[θὲ] ἐδούλευσας μοι ἐν ταῖς θυσίας [σου] Σnosti (ΑΓ), fectisti in (cf. Α* εποίησαεν); lxv. 1 qui me non quaerunt (ὑγτοῦνοι ΝΑQ, ag. ἐπιρρωτῶσιν B). Jer. xliii. 31 inferam super eos (αὐτοὺς ΝΑQ*, ag. αὐτῶν ΒQcor); locutus sum super eos (ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ΑQ, πρὸς αὐτ. BN). Bar. v. 2 laetitiae (LXX. δικαιοσύνης).

A special interest attaches to Irenaeus’ extracts from Daniel. 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 Ἀπότρευξε, Δανιὴλ· οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ λόγοι ἐμπεφραγμένοι εἰσίν, ἦς οἱ συνειτες συνειτε καὶ οἱ λευκοὶ λευκανθῶσι, where ἀπότρευξε is a LXX. reading, whilst ἐμπεφραγμένοι is from Th. and the rest of the sentence seems to be suggested by his version (cf. ἦς...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 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. iv. 4 (_D._ 120); xxviii. 10—19 (_D._ 58, 120); xxxi. 10—13 (_D._ 58); xxxii. 22—30 (_D._ 58, 120); 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); vii. 2—4 (_D._ 126); xvii. 16 (_D._ 49); xx. 22 (_D._ 75); xxii. 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 ff. (_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. 36 f. (_D._ 56); xxviii. 10 (_A._ 33, 51, _D._ 85); xxxi. 2 (_D._ 141); xlv. (_D._ 38); xlv. 7 ff. (_D._ 56, 63); xlvii. 6—9 (_D._ 37); xlvii. 17—19 (_D._ 64); lxix. 152; xcv. 1 ff. (_A._ 41), 5 (_D._ 79), 10 (_D._ 73); xc. 7—17 (_D._ 64); cxiv. (_D._ 32); cix. 1 ff. (_A._ 45, _D._ 56), 3 ff. (_D._ 63), 4 (_D._ 118); cxxv. 3 (_D._ 119); cxxviii. 1 ff. (_A._ 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. 1. 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 ff. (_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
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.

Quotations in early Christian Writings.

[Translation]

16 καθ' ὁραν] καρπὸν | τῇ βατφ | ἐπ'
ἐν, AF 17 τῆς γῆς, AF | Ἰοσ. v. 13—vi. 2. 13 om καὶ 2ο | ἐν | ἐναντίων] κατέναντι | om καὶ ἥρωμαίναι...ἀυτοῦ | ὁ Ἰησοῦς
14 ὥς καὶ | 15 τὸ υπόδομα ἐκ | τὰ υπόδομα | ἐφ' ὧν | om νῦν
(σο A, but adding το) | ἄγως | γῆ | ἀγια. vi. 1 ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔξεπορο. | om οὕτω διεσπαρετοῦ 2 om ἐγώ Ps. xxi. 1—24.

4 τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
7 καὶ ἄνθρωπων, ΝΡU | ἐξουθενίσκει, ΝΑR | 8 καὶ (ΝΥ)
ἐλάλησαν χειλεσιν | 11 ἀπὸ γαστρὸς, Ν.α. 12 βοήθουν | μοῦ,
7καὶ Ρ* 14 ὁ ἀρπάζων | om ὁ, ΡU | 15 ἐξευθύνη, Ν.αR
16 ὥστε] ὡς, ΝΑR' | 17 πόδας] + μοῦ, Ν.α. ARU | Ps. xlix.
1 om καὶ 2ο, Ν.α. RT | 3 ἐναντίων] ἐνώπιον, RT 4 διακρινᾶτε

pt τοῦ, Ν.α. ART 6 ὁ θεός, Ν.Α. 7 διαμαρτυρομαι, Ν.α. T
10 ἄργου] ἄγροι, Ν.αA 16 ἐκδιηγῇ, Ν.α. AT 19 δολήτρας,
Ν.α. Ra 21 τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου, Β.Ν.α. T | 22 ὀὐ μή, Ν.α. RT
23 τοῦ θεοῦ] μοῦ, Ν.α. T. Prov. viii. 21a—36.
24 τὰς πηγὰς προσελθείν (but in D. 129 τρ. τ. πηγάς)
25 τῶν βουνῶν (but D. 129 omits art.)
26 ὁ θεός 28 καὶ ὥς (1ο)
8 η\νικά, ΝΑ | 29 καὶ ὥς | ἡ\νικα 35 ἡθομασται 36 ἀρεσβοῦν
7 + εἰς, Ν.α. A. Amos v. 18—vi. 7. 18 τοῦ κυρίου 19 εὰν φύγη
ὅταν ἐκφύγῃ, A | ἁρκτος | ὁ ὄφις 20 αὐτῆς | αὐτοῖς
22 ἠλοκαντώματα, A | τὰς θυσίας | προσδέξεμαι] + αὐτά, ΑQ* | σωτηρίου,
A 23 ἀπόστασιν | ἡ\νιν | πλῆθος | ἡ\νιν | ὄργανον 25 om μ' ἔτη | + λέγει Κύριος, ΑQ | 20 Ραβὰν | om αὐτῶν, A. Q*
7 | vi. 1 ἀπετρήσθησαν | pr το οὐνομασμένον εἰτό τοις ἄρχηγοις (a doublet for
the Greek which follows, ascribed to Symmachus by SH) | om καὶ 2ο | αὐτοῖς, Q*
8| om τοῦ | Ἰσρ. | om τοῦ 2 + εἰς Χαλάνην,
22, 36, 42; Ηεβ. | διέδατε | πορεύθητε | Ἐμᾶδ 'Ραββά] Ἀμᾶθ τὴν
멜άνη (τὴν μεγάλην, Symm. "20, 36, 51 al.") | ἀλοφύλουν | pr τῶν
πλείου, A | om. ἐστῖν | ὑπετέρων ὄριων | ὄρ. ὑμῶν 3 κα-κιν
4 | πονηράν | 4 καθεύδουσε | κοιμόμενοι | ἑρίφουσε | ἀρισθα
5 ἐστῶτα, ΑQ | 6 τῶν διψιμένων (a doublet) | ἐν φιάλαι (Ḥeb.)
7 | ἄναστών ] + τῶν ἀποκείμενων | και μετατραφήσεται οἶκημα
κακουργῶν (a doublet of και ἐξαρκθ. κτλ.) | Zach. ii. 10—iii. 2.
10 τέρτου ] χαίρε (cf. Eus. d. e., p. 252) | ὧτι, Ν | 11 καθαφε-ξονται | προστεθθοῦνται | κατασκηνώσω | ἐπιγνώσῃ | γυνώσονται | Παντοκράτωρ | τῶν δυνάμεων | ἀπέσταλκε 12 τῇ μερίδι | και
7 τῆν μερίδα, Ν.αA, and, without καὶ, Ν* | Q | ἀἱρετεῖ] ἐκλέξεται "86
in textus ex allo videlicet interprete" (Field).
8 | i om Κύριος,
9 | Ἐκ μού | τὸν Ἰησοῦν | om τον, ΑQ | ὁ διάβολος | om ὧτι 2 om ἐπιτίθεναι (1ο)...διάβολε | om ὧτι (Ḥeb.)
Mal. i. 10—12.
10 δέλημα μοῦ | τὰς θυσίας ύμῶν | ΝΑ | ἄνατο, ΑΓ | om καὶ 1ο,
ΑQ | προσάγεται | ἐπισφέρεται διότι μέγα | ὁτι τιμᾶται (ὅτι μέγα
41 | om Παντοκράτωρ.
Isa. i. 16—20.
17 χήραν,
BαβΝΑΓ | 18 δεῦτε] + καί, ΝΑQ | διαλεχθῶμεν | χίωνα, ἐρεον | ἐρεον, χίωνα | 19 (A. 61 omits καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε...φάγεσθε.)

1 See above, p. 407.
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, Dial. 31.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dan. vii. 9—14, LXX.</th>
<th>Ibid., Th.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐθεώρον διός ὅτι θρόνον ἔτεθησαν, καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς ἠμερῶν ἐκάθετο ἐξών περιβολήν ὥσει χώνα λευκῆν, καὶ τὸ τρίχωμα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἐριον καθαρῶν, ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἄλοξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλεγόν. τοπαῖος πυρὸς ἐκκεν ἐκπορευέμενος ἐκ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. χιλιαὶ χιλιάδες θειούργοιν αὐτῷ καὶ μυριαὶ μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ. Βιβλίοι ἀνεύχθησαν καὶ κρίσιον ἐκάθισεν. ἐθεώρον τότε τὴν φωνήν</td>
<td>ἐθεώρον ὅς ὅτι θρόνον ἔτεθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἠμερῶν ἐκάθετο, καὶ τὸ ἔνθαμμα αὐτοῦ ὥσιν χώνα λευκῆν, καὶ ἡ θρής τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσιν ἐριον καθαρῶν. ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ὥσιν ἄλοξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγων. τοπαῖος πυρὸς ἐκκεν ἐκπορευέται ἡ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. χιλιαὶ χιλιάδες ἐλειτουργοῦν αὐτῷ καὶ μύρια μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ. Βιβλίοι ἀνεύχθησαν καὶ κρίσιον ἐκάθισεν. ἐθεώρον τότε τὴν φωνήν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 cursive. Most of the remaining words are to be found in the three texts.
Justin, Dial. 31.

Dan. vii. 9—14, LXX.

Ibid., Th.

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 uncial 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 8*, sometimes of s8*; (d) in the Prophets it not seldom agrees with Q (AQ, sAQ). 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. Ελευθορώγον meets us here, as in Clement of Rome, and the phrases τὰ λοιπὰ θηρία μετεστάθη τῆς ἀρχῆς, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν ἐρχόμενος, ἦσαν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, προσήγαγον αὐτῶν, are undoubtedly due to Theodotion, or rather to the version on which he worked. On the other hand ἔχων περιβολήν, τὸ τρίχωμα, πῦρ φλέγου, ἀπετυμπανίσθη, κρόνος ἦσαν, 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 Tertullian.

In a few instances Justin shews a disposition to criticise the LXX. reading. E.g. in Ps. lxxxii. (lxxxxi.) 7, he probably proposed to read ὦς ἀνθρωπός (ὑπὲρ) for ὦς ἀνθρωποῖς. Similarly in Deut. xxxii. 8 he realises that the LXX. has substituted ἀγγέλων θεῶ for ἀνθρωποί. He maintains that in Gen. xlix. 10 the reading of the LXX. is ἦσαν ἂν ἐλθῇ ὃ ἀπόκειται, though according to the Jewish interpreters of his time the words should rather be rendered ἦσαν ἂν ε. τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. His text of the LXX. contained some remarkable interpolations; thus he quotes Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 10 in the form ὁ κύριος

1 Burkitt, Old Latin and Itala, p. 23 ff.
2 Dial. 124. In the editions ἀνθρωποῖ occurs twice, but the context appears to shew that the singular should stand in the quotation.
3 Dial. 13 f.
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 commentaries. These included works on the Hexaemeron and its sequel (τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἔξαημερον); 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 Daniel.

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 τοῦ εὐλογοῦντος κυρίος θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκουμημένων εἰς γῆν χωματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐναγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτηρίον αὐτοῦ. He cites also some words which appear to have found a place in his copy after 2 Esdr. vi. 21: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἑσδρας τῷ λαῷ ὁ Τούτῳ τὸ πάσχα δὲ σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν. And 2 Chr. 30:2: εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν οἳ Μέλλωμεν αὐτοῦ ταπεινοῖς ἐν σημείοις, καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ἐλπίσωμεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὐ μὴ ἔρημωθη δὲ τότος οὕτως εἰς ἀπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων. εἰς τῇ γῇ μὴ πιστεύσῃ αὐτῷ μὴ ὑπὲρ εἰς εἰσακουσῆτε τῷ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἐσεσθε ἐπίχαρα τοῖς ἔθνεσι. 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.

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, 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 quotations, but the minor theological works collected by Lagarde 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.


The text of Hippolytus, it will be seen, like most of the patristic texts, leans slightly to AF in the Pentateuch, Ν* or Ν"c"a in the poetical books, 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 προτερπτικός 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 Bible. 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) καὶ εἰκόνα καὶ ὄμοιός ὅμετέραν (elsewhere Cl. reads ὅμ. ὑμῶν, or omits the pronoun). xxxvii. 24 (strom. v. 54) δὲ λάκκος κενός, DE. Exod. xx. 13 ff. (protrept. 108, strom. ii. 33) οὐ φωνεύεις οὐ μοιχεύεσθαι οὐ κλέεσθαι οὐ φευγομαρτυρήσεις, AF. Lev. xviii. 1 ff. (strom. ii. 46). 3 εἰς αὐτὴν (ἐπ' αὐτῇ B*, ἐπ' αὐτῆς B*AF) οὐ ποιήσετε (ποιηθήσεται B*) 4 παρεύσεθε B A δ ὁ ποιήσαι αὐτά. Deut. xxxii. 23 ff. (paed. i. 68) 23 συντελέσεις (συντελέσω AF, συντελεμέσω, B) 24 ἐπατούστω, A ἐπὶ γῆς, Α (F) 41 ff. ἀνταποδοῦσον, AF 42 καὶ ἡ μάχαιρα μου φάγεται κρέα ἀπὸ αἵματος τραυματῶν, AF (b) Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff. (strom. iv. 111). 13 ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν, ΝΑΡ 14 χεὶλη σου, Νc^aAR. xcv. 5 (protrept. 62) δαιμονίων εἰςν εἰωδά (cf. Iren.). cii. 14 (paed. i. 62) μύηθητι, BN* Th. cxxl. 5 (paed. i. 79) ἐλεγχέτω με δίκαιοι καὶ παιδευσάτω. cl. 4 ὄργανον, BNRT. Prov. i. 25 (paed. i. 85) ὑπηκούετε, ΝΑ οὐ προσέχετε, ΝΑC (ἡτεύθησατ, B). iii. 5 ff. (strom. ii. 4). 6 εἰς πάσαν, A [tας ὁδοὺς σου] ὁ δὲ ποίς σου οὐ μὴ προσκόπη (cf. Νc^a: SH pr ⅔) 12 παιδευέ, ΝΑ (ἐλέγχει, B). xxiii. 13 μὴ ἀπόσχου (ἀπόσχυ) LXX. νῆπιον παιδεών (A; παιδεύειν, B). Sir. i. 18 (paed. i. 68) φόβος γὰρ Κυρίον ἀποθείεται ἀμαρτήματα (so far 248), ἀφηθός δὲ οὐ δυνήσεται δικαιωθῆναι, O.L. ix. 9 (paed. i. 54) μὴ συμβο-

lokoπήσῃ] μὴ συμματακληθῆς ἐπ' ἀγκώνα, O.L. xxxiv. 25 (paed. ii. 31) ἀπόλεσεν] ἡχρείωσε. xxxvi. 6 (paed. i. 42) ὡς φιλὸς μῶκος] οἱ φιλὴδόνοι καὶ μοῖχοι (cf. ὡς φιλημοχίους, 55, 254). xxxviii. 1 (paed. ii. 68) ὁ τιμιώτατος, 106, 296, O.L. xxxix. 13 (paed. ii. 76) ἀγροῦ (ἀγροῦ ΝΑC) ύπάτων. 18 (paed. ii. 44) ὡς εὐλαύνεις ἐλάττωσες ἐλάττωσες, Heb. (c) Am. iv. 13 (protrept. 79) ἴδον ἐγώ, B*ABQ (om B*). Nah. iii. 4 (paed. i. 81) ἐπίταχυς, B*ABQ. Mal. i. 10 ff. (strom. v. 137). 11 om. καὶ ἐν, ΑQ | θυμίαμα | δυνά | προσάγεται | προσφέρεται (cf. Justin). Isa. ix. 6 (paed. i. 24) οὕς καὶ ἐδώθη, ΝΑQΓ | om ἐγενήθη, Γ | ἐκλήθη (καλεῖται, BNQΓ, καλέται, A) | ὧν ἀναμεταφέρεται οὕς ἀναμετάφησα (Νc^bA) θέως δυσνόητος πατὴρ αἰώνιος ἀρχων εἰρήνης (Νc^aA). 7 μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχή 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) οὐ δοκεῖς οὕτως οὕτως χείλεσθιν αὐτῶς τιμωσὶ με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἐστίν ἀπ' ἐμοί· ματὴν 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).]
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Kovres Bidao-KcKias ivraXpara (cf. Mt. XV., Mc. vii.). Jer. ix. 23 f. (paed. i. 37): v. 24 abbreviated as in 1 Cor. i. 31. xiii. 24 ff. (strom. iv. 165 f.). 24 διέσπειρα, BNQ (διεφθείρα A) | ιύτο, NAQ (ἀπό, B) | [φερόμενα] πετόμενα 23 ἀπειδεύνυμι ὑμᾶς ἐμοὶ 27 μοιχεῖα anarthr., Q | χρεματισμός anarthr., B. xxiii. 23 f. (protrept. 78). 24 εἰ ποιήσει τι ἄνθρωπος (εἰ κρυφήσεσαι τις, B, eἰ κρ. ἄνθρωπος, AQ). Bar. iii. 13 (paed. i. 92) om χρόνον, B. Thren. i. 1 (paed. i. 80) ἀρχοντα χωρῶν ἐγενήθη εἰς φάρος. Dan. ix. 24 ff. (strom. i. 125) as in Th. (B*), with the addition καὶ ἡμῶν τῆς ἐβδομάδος καταπαύσας θυμίαμα θυσίας καὶ πτερυγίου ἀφανισμοῦ ἐως συντελεῖας καὶ σπουδῆς τάξιν ἀφανισμοῦ (cf. BbabAQ).

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 Diogonet, there will still remain the fragments collected in the Relliquiae 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. 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. 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 chapter.

II. 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 ampest 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. remains may be of service to the student of the LXX.

\textit{Genesis.} Fragments of Commentary (t. i., iii.), and notes from catenae. Homilies (17) in Latin, tr. by Rufinus. \textit{Exodus.} Fragments of Commentary, and notes. Homilies (13) in Latin,

\footnote{1 \textit{Essays}, i. p. 129 ff. (“On Early Quotations from the Septuagint.”)}
\footnote{2 See Part III. c. vi.}
\footnote{3 They are collected in Migne, \textit{P. G.} xi.—xvii.}

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.
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Apostolical Constitutions, cent. iii.—iv. (ed. Lagarde).
Asterius of Amasea, c. 400. (xl.)
Athanasius of Alexandria, †373. On the Psalms; Titles of the Psalms, fragments in the catenae. (xxv.—xxviii.)
Basil of Caesarea, †379. Homilies on the Hexaemeron, the Psalms and Isaiah i.—xvi. (xxix.—xxxii.)
Basil of Seleucia, c. 450. Homilies on the O.T. (lxxiv.)
Cosmas Indicopleustes, c. 550. (lxxxviii.)
Cyril of Alexandria, †444. Works on the Pentateuch (περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθεία προσκυνήσεως, and γλαφυρά), comm. on saiah, comm. on the xii. Prophets; fragments on Kingdoms, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and the minor Prophets. (lxvii.—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. (lxxviii.)
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 ὄνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ and περὶ τῆς τῶν βιβλίων τῶν προφητῶν ὄνομασιας.
Eusebius of Emesa, †359. Fragments in the catenae of a comm. on Genesis. (lxxvi.)
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. (xxv.—xxxviii.)
Gregory of Neocaesarea, †c. 270. (x.)
Gregory of Nyssa, †395. (xliv.—xlvi.)
Hesychius of Jerusalem, †c. 438. (xciii.)
Isidore of Pelusium, †c. 450. (lxviii.)
John Chrysostom, †407. Homilies on 1 Regn., Psalms (iii.—xii., xlvii.—xliii., cvii.—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.
Maximus Confessor, †662. (xc.—xcii.)

1 See, however, H. M. Gwatkin, Arianism, p. 69 n.
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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 Carpathia, 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, i Regn.—2 Chr., Prov., Cant., Isaiah. (lxviii.)
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. (xvii.)
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 Cyrrhus, †c. 458. Εἰς τὰ ἀπορά 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. (?).

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 vernacular.

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 (מעסורה, מסורה, traditio) is already mentioned in the saying of R. Akiba, Pirge Aboth, iii. 20 המסורה היא לוהה, 'tradition is a fence to the Law'\(^1\); 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 (צליזה מסורה), 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 Massora\(^2\) embodies the readings which tradition substituted for the written text (י'א, ב'ג), the corrections known as the ניקין מפרשים\(^3\), 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 UText (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 Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study.

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 Origen. Origen, when the problem forced itself upon him, adopted, as we have seen, 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:

\[\text{prol. gal. "quandam mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quidpiam de Hebraica veritate ... interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum cui magis accommodare debas fidem."} \]

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. 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. 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 (+134), Robert Grosseteste (+1253), Roger Bacon (+c. 1292), the Spaniard Raymundus Martini (+c. 1286), and especially the Norman Jew, Nicolaus de Lyra (+1349). On Lyra see Siegfried in Merx, Archiv, i. p. 428, ii. p. 28.
1488, and three editions followed before the end of the fifteenth century. 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.'


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 ducent.1

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 ã καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Σαμαρείτων Ἠβραίου μετεβάλομεν, xxi. 13 ã ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαρείτων ἐφόρμεν: see Field, Hex. i. p. lxxii. f.), and by so late a writer as Georgius Syncellus (cent. viii.), who attaches a high value to its testimony (Chronogr. p. 83 διαφωνοῦσι τὰ Ἠβραϊκὰ ἀντίγραφα πρὸς τὸ Σαμαρείτων ἀρχαίώτατον καὶ χαρακτήριος διαλλάττων. ã καὶ ἀληθὲς εἶναι καὶ πρῶτον Ἠβραίως 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 undoubtledly to be found among the early Palestinian settlers in Egypt. Of the first Ptolemy Josephus writes: πολλοὶς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαρῆσιν, κατοικοῦσιν ἀπαντας εἰς Αἰγυπτόν ἀγαγὼν. It is significant that Σαμάρεια occurs among

1 Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum (Leipzig, 1840), p. 731.
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the names of villages in the Fayûm, 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.


The prevalent belief in the originality of the Massoretic text appeared to receive confirmation from the researches of Kennicott and De Rossi, 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).
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no MS. of the Hebrew Bible has come down to us which is earlier than the beginning of the tenth century\(^1\), 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 Bibles\(^2\). 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 questions\(^3\). 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 reproduced.  

(6) 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

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 discussed\(^2\); 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 writes\(^3\)) 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 reason-
ably 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 books\(^4\)."
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
archetypes\(^5\).

\(^{1}\) See Ryle, *Canon*, p. 91 ff.
\(^{2}\) *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 א and will enable the student to practise himself in the critical use of the Version.

**Gen. iv. 8** א does not give the words of Cain, though יא led the reader to expect them. ג supplies 

\[\text{Διελθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέδινον (חַיְם)},\]

and this is supported by Sam., Targ. Jer., Pesh., Vulg. xxxi. 29 א רבי (τοῦ πατρὸς σου); so Sam., cf. v. 30. xli. 56 א פᾶν τῶν σιωποσκόλων (רְבּוֹת תְּרָעָה), cf. Sam., xxxi. 24 ל כל אש שבע בר ב (רְבּוֹת תְּרָעָה). xl. 10 א ἐστὶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις αὐτῷ, perhaps reading ἱλά (ἴλα) for א הלי: but see Ball in Haupt, Sacred Books, ad loc., and cf. the Greek variant ἀπὸκεῖσαν. Exod. v. 9 א מְפֹרֲס אָנָּשׁ, א μεριμνά- 

tosan...μεριμνάτωσαν (μνημονεύσαν). xiv. 25 ארוב, א καὶ συνέδοθησαν (συνέβησαν).xxx. 6 ...ἀνεκδόθη συνέκλιθαι...πλῆθος (πλῆθος).

ג omiss the second clause: so Sam. Lev. xiii. 31 א רָעִי מֵעַל, ג בֵּית וָיוֹדָא (יִתְרָעָה). Num. xxiv. 23 ג prefixes καὶ ἕδων τὸν "Ωγ" (אֹחֵל נְעָרִים); cf. vv. 20, 21. Deut. iv. 37 ג πρὸς καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἤλιον, i.e. Abraham's posterity (Driver, ad loc.); ג τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν μετ' αὐτῶν ὑμᾶς, i.e. בוריסια αἰφιρεϋο, so Sam. Josh. xv. 59 א +Θεκω...πολεις ἐνδεκα καὶ αἱ κόμαι αὐτῶν. The omission of these names in א is doubtless due to homoioteleuton. Jud. xiv. 15 ג ἑλώτα ἐκατέρτως. ג, as the context seems to require, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ (ηὔμερα); but see Moore in Haupt, Sacred Books, ad loc. xvi. 13f. ג supplies a long lacuna in א (καὶ ἐνκρούσῃς...τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ) caused by homoioteleuton; on the two Greek renderings of the passage see Moore in Haupt, ad loc. xix. 18 ג εἰς τῶν οἰκῶν μοῦ ἑγὼ πορεύομαι (א וְנַחֲנֵנוּ נְהָנָּה בְּתוֹם). The final letter of יְהֵיבָּנ has probably been taken by א for an abbreviation of יְהוֹוָּנ. 1 Sam. i. 24 א טְפֹרֲס אָנָּשׁ, ג ἐν μῶσχῳ τρευτίζοντι, 

dividing and pronouncing στήλες ὁ στήλ. ii. 33 ג supplies ἔνα (ἐν ὑμῖν) which א seems to have lost. iii. 13 ג ὅτι κακολογοῦντες θεῶν νῦν νῦν αὐτοῦ, reading מִלָּה for מָלָה. iv. 1. The first clause in א is irrelevant in this place, and must either be connected with iii. 21 or struck out altogether. In place of it ג has 

the appropriate introduction, καὶ ἐγενώθη...εἰς πολεμοῦ (הוֹז בִּית).
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6. For ἡμισερνοὶ G has καὶ μέσον τῆς χώρας αυτῆς ἀνεφύγασαν μῦδες. 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 G καὶ οὖκ ἡσμενίσαν οἱ νιώτ'Iεχονίον ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσις Βαρθάμναν, where the first six words represent an original of which Ἔρρ preserves only three letters. Restoration is complicated by the fact that ἡσμενίζετο is ἔπει. λεγ. in the LXX. Klostermann suggests ἡμισερνοὶ ἀναφορὰ νενιώθη. G, more in harmony with the context, καὶ διετροφοῦσαν τῷ Σαουλ (Ἰάου πρὸς Ἀβεβλία τεύχος, καὶ ἐκεκομήθη (ἔκθεσις). x. 21 G καὶ προσάγοντας τὴν φυλήν Ματταρεὶ ἐις ἀνδρας, a clause necessary to the sense. xii. 3 Ἰναλαβὼν βοὺς Ἡστίος. G καὶ ὑπόδημα (cf. Gen. xiv. 23, Am. ii. 6, viii. 6); ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ (νεκροί). With G compare Sir. xlv. 19 χρήματα καὶ ἐως ὑποθύματων...οὐκ εἶλθη, where for ὑπόδει; a secret gift,' leg. fort. ἡμισερνοὶ 'a pair of sandals'; see, however, Wisdom of Ben Sira, p. lxvii. xii. 8 G supplies καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτοὺς Ἀγιωτάτος, omitted by Ἐρρ through hometeleteuton. xiv. 18 Ἰναλαβὼν ἡμών Ἐρρὶς, G προσάγαγε τῷ ἐφούδ. "The Ephod, not the ark, was the organ of divination" (Driver). xiv. 41 f. Ἐρρὶς ὑποθήκη πνευμάτων. GLuc, supplying the lacuna, Τί οὖν ἐπεικριθή τῷ δούλῳ σου σήμερον; εἰ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν Ἰωναθάν τῷ νιῶ μου ἡ ἀδικία; Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, δός δῆλον (ὁ Κύριος) καὶ εἰ τάδε εἴποις ἐν τῷ λαῷ ἡ ἀδικία, δός σοι κρίσιν (ὁ κύριος). Similarly in v. 42 G preserves the words ἄν κατακληρωσάσθαι...τοῦ νιῶ αὐτοῦ, which Ἔρρ has lost through homoteleteuton. See the note in Field, Hexapla, i. p. 510. xx. 19 Ἰναλαβὼν Ἐρρὶς, G παρὰ τῷ ἐργάζετε ἐκεῖνο = Ἰναλαβὼν Ἐρρὶς, 'beside yonder cairn.' Similarly v. 41 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐργάζετε ἐκεῖνο = Ἰναλαβὼν Ἐρρῃς. 2 Sam. iv. 6. For the somewhat incoherent sentence in Ἐρρ, G substitutes καὶ ἵδιον ἣ θυρώρος τοῦ οίκου ἐκάθαιρεν πυροῦ, καὶ ἑνυσταξεν καὶ ἐκάθευθεν—words which explain the incident that follows. xvii. 3 G δυ τρόπον ἐπιστρέφει ἡ νυφὴ πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα αὐτῆς· πλήν ψυχὴν εὗος ἀνδρός σὺ γητεῖς. In the archetype of Ἔρρ the eye of the scribe has passed from ἐκεῖνο to Ἐρρ, and the sentence—thus mutilated—has been re-arranged. xxiv. 6 Ἰναλαβὼν Ἐρρὶς, Ἐρρἰς Ἐρρὶς, No 'land of Tahtim Hodshi' is known. GLuc here preserves the true text, εἰς γῆν Ἀχτείμων Καδής...
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_the land of the Hittites, even to Kadesh.' For the last word Ewald, followed by H. P. Smith, preferred ἐκ θεοῦ τῆς Γαλααδ ('to Hermon'). _Kings xvii._ _Chron. xxxiii._ 19. _G_ εἰπὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν ὑφώνων (ῥήματα). _Neh. ix._ _Ps._ _xxvi._ 13. *(so_ _M_ _is_ apparently read by _G_ as ἢ, 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 _M_ without the _puncta extraordinaria_. _xlii._ _xxvii._ *(in_ _M_ is repeated from _v._ 8 which has displaced the true ending of _v._ 10. _G_ restores the latter (ὄ δὲ ἐλέγχων μετὰ παρρησίας εἰρήν-νοποιεῖ), and thus supplies the contrast to _10_ which is required to complete the couplet. _Jer._ _xi._ 15. _G_ μὴ ἐβχαί...; (μὴ ὅρατον); see however Streane, _Double text_, p. 133. _xxii._ 33 _G_ ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ ἱμαμα (dividing and pronouncing ὑμεῖς ὑμῖν). _Ezek._ _xlv._ 20. _G_ ἐν τῷ ἐξῳδομῳ μηνι, μα τοῦ μνήσεως (ὑμᾶς ὑμῖν ὑμῖν). _Mal._ _ii._ 3. _G_ τῶν ὄμοιν = ὑμῖν. *(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 under-
stand 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 $G$ and $M$ 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, $G$ 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 Samari-
tan Pentateuch and the Targum, or of Hebrew variants which
survive in existing MSS. of the Massoretic text, or in the Q'ri$^1$.

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 Pro-
verbien, 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. xlviii. 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 evi-
dent 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 ἔκτισάμεν ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. iv. 7 οὐκ ἔσεν ὄρθως προσενέγχης ὄρθως δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ήμαρτες; ἡσύχασον. vi. 3 οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν σάρκας. xxx. 11 καὶ εἶπεν Δείς ἔν τύχῃ καὶ ἐπονόμασεν τὸ όνομα αὐτοῦ Γάδ. xxxvii. 3 ἐποίησεν δὲ αὐτῷ χῆτον ποικίλον (cf. 2 Regn. xiii. 18). xlii. 43 ἐκήρυξεν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ κήρυξ. xlvi. 31 προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ὧδεδο οὐκ. xlviii. 14 ἐναλλάξας [D ἐναλλάξας] τὰς χεῖρας. xlix. 6 ἐνευροκόσμησαν ταύρον. 19 Γάδ, πειρατήριον πειρατεύοντες αὐτῶν ἀπό τοῦ διομεῖτε ἀντὶ κατὰ πόδας. Exod. i. 16 καὶ ὄψων πρὸς τὸ τίκτειν. iii. 14 εὐγ ἐλμὶ δ ὄνν. xvi. 15 εἶπαν ἔτερον τῷ ἔτερῳ Τῷ ἐστίν τούτῳ; xxi. 15 ἐπονόμασεν τὸ όνομα αὐτοῦ Κύριος καταφύγῃ μου. xxii. 6 πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. xxxii. 32 καὶ νῦν εἰ μὲν αφεῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν, ἄφες. Lev. xxiii. 3 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδομή σάββατο αὔσαναι κλητὴ ἅγια τῷ κυρίῳ. Num. xxiii. 10 ἀποθάνοι η ψυχή μου ἐν ψυχαῖς δικαίων, καὶ γένοιτο τὸ στέρμα μου ὡς τὸ στέρμα τοῦτον. xxiv. 24 καὶ κακώσοντι τοὺς Ἑβραίους. Deut. xx. 19 μὴ ἄνθρωπος τὸ ἄει τοῦ ἀγρόφι εἰσελθεῖν...εἰς τὸν χάρακα; xxxii. 8 ἐστησέν ὁρία ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. 15 ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαστηρινός. Jos. v. 2 ποίησον σεαντό μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτήμου. Jud. i. 35 ἦρατο ο Ἀμορραίος κατοικεῖν εἰς τῷ ἄρει τῷ ὀστρακώδει (Α τοῦ μυρσινόνοσ), ἐν ὃ οἱ ἄρκοι καὶ ἐν ὃ οἱ ἀλώπεκαι, ἐν τῷ μυρσινών καὶ ἐν Θαλάβειν (Α ομ. ἐν τῷ μ. κ. ἐν Θαλάβειν). viii. 13 ἐπέστρεψεν Τεθεόν...ἀπὸ ἐπάνωθεν τῆς πυρατάξεως Ἄρεως (Α ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ ἀναβάσεως Ἀρεως). xii. 6 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ἐιδὼν δή Στάχυς (Α Σύνθημα). xv. 14 ἦλθον ἐως Σιαγώνος...καὶ εὐρεν
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σιγώνα ὤνο...καὶ ἐρρήζεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν λάκκον τὸν ἐν τῇ Σιαγώνῃ...διὰ τούτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὅνομα αὐτῆς Πηγή τοῦ ἐπικαλομένου, ἢ ἐστὶν ἐν Σιαγώνῃ. xviii. 30 υἱὸς Γαρσόμ υἱὸς (A υἱὸς) Μανασσή (ὁ γιος: on the suspension see Moore in comm. on Sacred Books, ad loc.). 1 Regn. x. 5 οὗ ἐστιν ἐκεί τὸ ἀνάστημα τῶν ἀλλοφυλῶν ἔκει Νασείβ ο ἀλλόφυλος. xiii. 21 καὶ ἦν ὁ τρυγιθὸς ἔτοιμος τοῦ θερικεία τὰ δὲ σκεύη ἦν τρεῖς σίκλοι εἰς τὸν ὄδωντα, καὶ τῇ ἀξίνῃ, καὶ τῷ δρεπάνῳ ὑπόστασις ἦν ἢ αὐτῇ. xx. 30 υἱὸς κορασίων αὐτομολούντων (Luc. + γυναικοτροφῆ). xxvii. 10 κατὰ νῦν τῆς Ἰουδαίας. xxxi. Τὸ ἀνώθηκαν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ 'Ασταρτείουν. 2 Regn. i. 21 θυρεός Σαουλ ὦ ἡχρώθη ἐν ἔλαιῳ. xii. 31 διήγαγεν (A ἀπήγαγεν) αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ πλωθείου (Luc. περιήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐν μαθηβᾶ). xx. 6 μὴ ποτε...σκιάζει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμῶν. xxv. 15 ἀπὸ προῖθεν [καὶ] ἐως ὥρας ἀριστοῦ. 3 Regn. xiii. 12 καὶ δεκινοῦντοι αὐτῶ ὦν νῦν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἄδων. 4 Regn. i. 2 f. ἐπιστήσατε ἐν τῷ Βαᾶλ μᾶς τὸν 'Ακκαρών (Luc. ἐπερώτησε διὰ τοῦ Βαᾶλ μνήμα προορίσθημα θεὸν 'Ακκαρών). viii. 13 τίς ἔστιν ὁ δοῦλος σου, ὁ κωνὸν τὸ τεθηκός, ὅτι πούση τῷ ἄνδρῳ τούτῳ; xxiii. 22 f. οὐκ ἐγενήθη [κατὰ] τὸ πάσχα τούτῳ ἀφ᾿ ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν...οτὶ ἀλλ᾿ ἢ τῷ ἑκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ᾠτί τοῦ βασιλεῶς ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα [τούτῳ] (cf. 2 Chr. xxxv. 18).

(6) 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, ῥόμπιν passim (ὢϊσαι in Ps. vii., ῥυσ in Ps. xlvi. (xlvvi.)).
'Ωδή, ῥύσ passim (Ῥομπιν in Ps. iv., ῥομπιν in Ps. ix. 17).
Ψαλμός ρόδης, ῥυσ Pss. xxix., xxvii., xivv., lxxiv., lxxixii., lxxxvi., xci., xciii. (A); ροδη ψαλμοῦ, ῥυσ ὁ καὶ ῥόμπιν ρα (lxv., lxxii., lxxviii., cvii.).
Προσευχή, ῥοπα (Pss. xvi., lxxv., lxxxix., ci., cxli.).
'Αλληλουία, ῥομπιν (Pss. civ.—cvii., cx—cxiv., cxvi., cxvii., cxxxiv., cxxxv., cvl., cxvii., cxviii.—cl.).
Δοξασις, ῥοπα (Ps. cxlv.).
Στηλογραφία, εἰς στηλογραφίαν, ῥοπα (Pss. xv., lv.—lxxi.). Απ. τοῦ ταπεινώφρου καὶ ἀπλου, Th. τοῦ ταπ. καὶ ἀμώμου.
Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ῥοπα (Pss. iv.—xiii., xvii., xviii., xci., xxix., xxx., xxxv.—lxv., lxvi.—lxix., lxxix., lxxx., lxxxi., lxxxix., lxxv.—lxvii.).

1 The titles which are given in the LXX. but are wanting in STU, have been enumerated in Pt. ii. c. ii. (p. 250 ff.).
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Ἐν ψαλμοῖς (Pss. vi., liii., liv., lx., lxvi., lxxv.).

Ἐν αἰώνιος, ἡμέρα (Ps. iv.).

Ὑπέρ τῆς κληρονομοῦσας, (ἢ) ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. v.). Aq. ἀπὸ κληροδοσίων, Symm. ὑπέρ κληρονομοῦν.

Ὑπέρ τῆς ὀγδόης, ἡμέρα (Pss. vi., xi.).

Ὑπέρ τῶν λόγων Χουσεί αἰών ἑμενεί, ἡ ἀρχὴ (Ps. viii.).

Aq., Symm., Th. περί, κτλ.

Ὑπέρ τῶν λημνῶν, ἡμέρα (Pss. viii., lxxx., lxxxiii.). Aq., Th. ὑπέρ τῆς γενελίδου.

Ὑπέρ τῶν κρυφῶν τοῦ αἰῶν, ἦλθεν ἡμέρα (Ps. ix.; cf. xlv.). Aq. ὑπέρ νεανιστότητος τοῦ αἰῶν, Th. ὑπέρ ἀκμῆς τοῦ αἰῶν, Symm. περί τοῦ βανάτου τοῦ αἰῶν.

Ὑπέρ τοῦ ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἐωθινής, ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. xxi.). Aq. ὑπέρ τῆς ἑλάφου τῆς ὀρθομηνίας. Symm. ὑπέρ τῆς βοσθείας τῆς ὀρθρίου.

Ὑπέρ τῶν ἀλλωσθεωμένων, ἡμέρα (Pss. xlv., lxxvii., lxxxviii., lxxxix.).

Aq. ἐπὶ τοῖς κρίνοις, Symm. ὑπέρ τῶν ἀνθῶν, Th. ὑπέρ τῶν κρίνων.

Ὑπέρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ (φίλη), ἡ ἡμέρα (Ῥιζ) (Ps. xlv.). Aq. ἀγάμα προσφιλίας, Symm. ἀγάμα εἰς τὸν ἀγαπητόν, Th. τοῖς ἡγαπημένοις.

Ὑπέρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων μεμεκρυμμένου, ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. iv.). Aq. ὑπέρ περιστερᾶς ἄλλου μακροζῶν. Symm. ὑπέρ τῆς περιστερᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ φίλου αὐτοῦ ἀπωσμένου. Ε’, ὑπέρ τῆς π. τῆς μογγαλάδου κεκρυμμένων.

Ὑπέρ Ιδισθοῦν, ἡ ἡμέρα (Pss. xxxviii., lxi., lxvi.).

Ὑπέρ μαελθ (τοῦ ἀποκριθήναι), ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. lxxvii., lixxvii.).

Aq. ἐπὶ χωρεία (Symm. διὰ χοροῦ) τοῦ ἐξάρχειν.

Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα (Pss. xxxvii., lxix.).

Εἰς ἐξομολόγησιν, ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. xcix.). Aq. εἰς εὐχαριστίαν.

Εἰς σύνεσιν, συνεσία (Pss. xxxxi., xli.—xliv., li.—lxxi., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., cxli.). Aq. ἐπιστήμονον, ἐπιστήμη, ἐπιστήμονης.

Μὴ διαφθέρῃ, ἡ ἡμέρα (Ps. li.—lxxi., lxiv.). Symm. (Ps. lxxiv.) περί ἀφθαρσίας.
It may be added that ἰδία (Pss. iii. 3, 5, iv. 3, 5, vii. 6, &c., &c.) is uniformly διάφαλμα in the LXX.; Aq. renders it αἰεί, Symm. and Th. agree with the LXX. except that in Ps. ix. 17 αἰεί 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. ἕνα, and Jerome: "ipsi L.XX. rerum necessitate compulsī...nunc transluterunt 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 δειλινὸν. 15 τηρῆσαι...τηρήσεις. vi. 2 οἱ ἀγγέλοι τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Deut. xxxii. 8, Job i. 6, ii. 1). 4 οἱ γίγαντες. viii. 21 διανοηθεῖσαι. xxii. 2 τὸν ἀγαπητὸν. xlix. 10 ἡγούμενος. Exod. vi. 12 ἄλογος. vii. 21 κυνόμαι. xii. 22 υἱὸς ωσποσ. xxv. 29 ἀμωτὶ εὐώπιοι (cf. α. προκείμενοι xxxix. 18 = 36, α. τοῦ προσώπου 1 Regn. xxi. 6). xxviii. 15 λόγιον, Vulg. rationale. Exod. xxxiv. 13 τὰ ἁλία Vulg. lucii. A.V. groves. Lev. xvi. 8 ff. ὁ ἀποστομαίος, ἡ ἀποστομη. Deut. x. 16 σκληροκαρδία. Jud. xix. 22 νῦν παρανόμων (cf. νῦν λαοὶ 1 Regn. ii. 12, and other renderings, which employ ἀνομία, ἀνόημα, ἀποστασία, ἀσέβεια, ἀφρω). 2 Regn. i. 18 τὸ βιβλιον τοῦ εὐθύου. 3 Regn. x. 11 ζυλα πελεκητά (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 8, ix. 10, ξ. πεύκα). Ps. viii. 6 παρ' ἀγγέλους. xv. 9 ἡ γλώσσα μου. xvi. 8 κόρα ὀβθαλμοῦ. i. 14 πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικόν. cxxxviii. 15 ἡ ὑπόστασις μου. 16 τὸ ἀκατέργαστὸν σου. Prov. ii. 18 παρὰ τῷ ἄδη μετά τῶν γηγενῶν (a doublet). Job ix. 9 Πλειάδα καὶ 'Εσπερον καὶ 'Αρκτοῦρον (cf. cxxxviii. 31). Zeph. i. 10 ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας (cf. 4 Regn. xxii. 14). Isa. xxxviii. 8 (4 Regn. xxii.) τῶν δέκα ἀναβαθμοῦς. Ezech. xiii. 18 προσκεφάλαια, ἐπιζώλαια.

(2) Abarim, mountains of, אבראים, τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν, Num. xxvii. 12 (cf. xxi. 11, xxxiii. 44). Agagite, Bouyiou, Esth. iii. 1, A 17 (xii. 6); Madephon, E (xvi.) 10. Ararat, land of, ארארט, Armevia, Isa. xxxvii. 38. Ashthoreth אשורית, 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.

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. μακάρωι οἱ πτωχοὶ...οἱ πενθοῦντες...οἱ πραεῖς (Isa. lxi. 1 ff., Ps. xxxvi. 11). vi. 6 εἰσελθείς εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον σου (Isa. xxvi. 20). x. 21, 35 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς...ἥλθον γὰρ διχάσαι...θυγατέρα κατὰ τὴν μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νῦμφην κτλ. (Mic. vii. 6). xxii. 33 ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελώνα καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν κτλ. (Isa. v. 2). Mc. ix. 48 βλέπῃ αὐτῷ εἰς γέφυραν ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται (Isa. lxvi. 24). Jo. i. 51 ὄψθεν τὸν ὀφρανὸν ἀνεφώστα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας (Gen. xxviii. 12); (b) in the translated evangelical record: Mc. vii. 32 φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφόν καὶ μογιλάλον...καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός κτλ. (Isa. xxxv. 5 f., xlii. 7). xv. 29 οἱ παραπομονοῦντες ἐβλασφήμων αὐτῶν κινοῦντες τάς κεφαλάς: cf. Lc. xxiii. 35 ἵστηκεν ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν ἐξεμυκτῆριζον 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. 19 ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλέκτων, βασιλείαν ιεράτευμα, ἐθνός ἁγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησον, ὅπως τάς ἀρετάς ἐξαγγείλῃ κτλ. (Exod. xix. 5 ff., xii. 22 ff., Isa. xliii. 20). iii. 14 τῶν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῇτε μηδὲ παραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τῶν χριστῶν ἀγίαστε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν (Isa. viii. 12). Rom. xii. 17 προσούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἄνθρωπων: cf. 2 Cor. iii. 21 προσοόμενοι γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἄνθρωπων (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 εὐφυγελίσατο εἰρήνην υμῶν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγὺς (Isa. lvii. 19, cf. lii. 7, lxii. 1). Phil. i. 19 οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτο μοι ἀποβῆσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν (Job xiii. 16). Heb. vi. 8 γῆ...ἐκφέρουσα...ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους...κατάρας ἐγγὺς (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.” 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. Kennedy 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, ἀγαθοσύνη, ἀγαλλιάσθαι, ἀγαλλίασις, ἀγάζειν, ἀγασμός, ἀγωσύνη, ἀίνεις, ἀκρογωνιάς, αἰχμαλωτεῖν, ἄληγγημα, ἀληλοιώμα, ἀλλογενής, ἀμέθυστος, ἀμύρη, ἀμφιάζειν, ἀναζωννεῖν, ἀναθεματίζειν, ἀνεξίχυναστος, ἀνροπάρεσκος, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀποθε-κατοῦ, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποκεφαλίζειν, ἀποφθέγματα, βάτος, βδέλ-λυμα, βεβηλοῦ, βροχή, γέεννα, γνώστης, γογγυζεῖν, γωμότης, δεκατῶν, δεκτός, διαγογγυζεῖν, δολίων, δότης, δυναμοῦν, ἐβδομη-κοντάκις, ἐφημοποιεῖν, ἐκζητεῖν, ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, ἐκπειράζειν, ἐκτο-γεῖνε, ἐκφίλοι, ἐλεγμός, ἐλεγξίζεις, ἐμπαιγμός, ἐμπαίκτης, ἐναντί, ἐνδοδύσκειν, ἐνδοξάζειν, ἐνδυναμοῦν, ἐνευλογεῖν, ἐνκαυνίζειν, ἐνταλμα, ἐνταφάζειν, ἐνώπιον, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἐξαίτια, ἐξαστράπτειν, ἐξολε-θρείειν, ἐξουθενών, ἐξυπνίζεις, ἐπαύριον, ἐπισκοπή, ἐπανασαύεις, ἐπιγαμβρείν, ἐπιφαινέσθαι, ἐρήμωσις, εὐδοκία, ἐφημερία, ἦττημα,
Since the publication of Dr Kennedy’s book some of these words (e.g. 
γογγύζειν, λειτουργικός) 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, ἀγαλλιάσθαι, ἁγνίζειν, ἁγνυπεῖν, ἀίνιγμα, ἀἱρετίζειν, ἀλαζωεύεσθαι, ἀλλογενὴς, ἀδιαλείπτως, ἀμάραντος, ἀμερμονος, ἀμφιθληστρον, ἀμφιδιά, ἀπερίτημος, ἀπλοῖς, ἀπόκρυφος, βδέλυγμα, γλωσσόκομος, γνωρίζειν, διάδημα, δίδρακμα, δίστομος, δυσλίθεις, δωρεάν, ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, ἐπταφιάζειν, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἐφορτάζειν, ἐξεφύση, ἐξουθενοῦν, εὐκολος, εὐδοκοῦν, θεοσεβεῖα, ικανοῦσθαι, ικανός, ἰκμᾶς, ἴστορεῖν, καμμύειν, κατάγελως, καταδιυναστεῖα, κατακλυσμοῦ, κατακραυγέως, κατακυριεύειν, καταθυμεῖν, καθίζειν, κλάσμα, κοράσιον, κόψινος, λιθόστρωτος, λειμάνην, μεσονύκτιον, μυγαλῶς, μυκτηρίζειν, νεομηνία, νίκος, νυστάζειν, οἰκουμένη (ἡ), ὀμοθυμα-

1 Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 106, 138.
(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:

Many of the characteristic phrases of the N.T. also have their roots in the LXX., e.g. εἰκών θεοῦ (Gen. i. 26), ὄσημε ἐωθίας (viii. 21), πάροικος καὶ παρεπιδήμος (xxiii. 4), πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον (xxiii. 30), λάος περίουσι (Exod. xix. 5), δόξα Κυρίου (xl. 29), θυσία αἰνετάς (Lev. vii. 2), λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον (xix. 15), ἡ διασπορά (Deut. xxx. 4), γενεὰ διεστραμμένη, σκολιά (xxiii. 5), μὴ γένοιτο (Jos. xxii. 29), ἠλέως σοι (2 Regn. xx. 20), μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον (xxvi. 20), διάβολος (1 Chron. xxi. 1), τῷ σωτῆρι τοῦ θεοῦ (Ps. xcvi. 3), ὁ δὲ καὶνή, ὅνομα καινών, 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 (xlii. 8, &c.), ἐγὼ εἰμὶ (xliii. 10), ἐκ κολλιῶν μιτρός
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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: αὐών, ἀπαύγασμα, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποστολή, ἀσύνετος, ἄφεσις, βασπίζειν, βασιλεία (τοῦ θεοῦ), δαμώνιον, διακονία, διαπονείσθαι, δικαοῦν, ἐκβασις, ἐκλεκτός, ἐμβατεύειν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιστροφή, ἐπιτιμία, ἐπιφάνεια, εὐσπλαγχνος, εὐχαριστία, ἔδως, ἡλάσμος, ἡαστήριον, κανών, κλήρος, κληροῦν, κοινός, κόσμος, κτίσις, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, μυστήριον (τοῦ θεοῦ), νόμος, παρουσία, πεντηκοστή, σημεία καὶ τέρατα, σκανδαλίζειν, συμπάθεια, συμπαθεῖν, 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 meaning." These principles led him to

1 Essays, p. 35.
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some remarkable departures from the traditional interpretation of N.T. words (e.g. ἀρετή = ἡμι or ἄλεις = δόξα, ἐπαινος; διάβολος = ἄντι = 'enemy'; ὁμοθυμαδόν = ὁμος, ἡμι = 'together'; πτωχοί = πένθες = πραισ = ταπεινοί = 'fellain'; πονηρός, malicious, mischievous; ὑποκρύτης, the equivalent of πονηρός, πανοδρόμος, and the like). A searching examination of these views will be found in Dr T. K. Abbott's essay On N.T. Lexicography. 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. 'Αγάπη 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. 18 sq.). 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. 'Εκκλησία 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 Christ, 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 'Αγάπησις occurs in the sense of Divine love (Hos. xi. 4, Zeph. iii. 17, Jer. xxxi. 3).
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 ἐναγγελίζεσθαι 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 linguæ Hebraicae erant transfusi...multa itaque Graeca sunt in Novo Foedere vocabula quae ex usu Graecae linguæ intelligi non possunt, ex collatione autem Hebraea et ex usu LXX. interpretum facile intelliguntur.”

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 ἐνυμολογικῶς 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 readings, 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 tongues, 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 Vulgate. 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 version. (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.
5 See Burkitt, Aquila, p. 18 ff.
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receptus of the Greek Old Testament, preserves in his text of the other books traces of a recension of the LXX. which seems at one time to have had a wide circulation, since Theodotonic readings occur in the LXX. quotations of the N.T. and in those of other Christian writers before A.D. 1501.

2. All the post-Christian translators of the O.T., but especially Aquila, Symmachus, and the author of the Quinta2, appear to have been not only competent Hebraists, but possessed of a more or less extensive knowledge of Greek literature. These qualifications render them valuable allies to the interpreter whether of the New or of the Old Testament. (a) In the case of the O.T. they serve to confirm or correct the LXX. renderings, or to illustrate their meaning. The renderings of the earlier version are not infrequently retained, e.g. Gen. i. 2

τὸ ἱερόν Ο' ἐπεφέρετο, Ἀ.Σ.Θ. ἐπιφερόμενον. 6 ὥστε, Ο' Α.Σ.Θ. στερέωμα. 10 Ἵονεῖς, Ο' Σ.Θ. τὰ συστέματα (συντήματα) τῶν ὑδάτων. More often they are set aside in favour of other words which do not materially differ in signification, but seem to have been preferred as more exact, or as better Greek, e.g. Gen. xlix. 19

Ὁ οἱ ἐργοδουχοί, Ἀ. οἱ εἰσπράκται. Exod. v. 13


O' oi ἐργοδουχοί, Ἀ. οἱ εἰσπράκται. Jud. v. 16

And at other times their rendering lies far apart from that of the LXX., manifesting complete dissent from the Alexandrian version, e.g. Gen. xlvii. 31 ἡμέρα Ὁ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἱερατά, Ἀ.Σ. τῆς κλίνης. Num. xxiii. 21 (ἵπτην) τὴν ἱερατὴν Ὁ τὰ ἔνδοξα, Ἀ. ἁλαλαγμός, Σ. σημασία, Θ. σαλπισμός. 1 Regn. xiii. 20 ἡμέρας Ὁ τὸ θεριστροφέαν (Ἀ.Θ. ἄροστρον, Σ. οὐν) αὐτοῦ. Ps. ii. 12, ἡμέρας Ὁ δράκασθε παιδείας, Ἀ. καταφιλήσατε ἐκλεκτῶς,

1 See pp. 47 ff., 395 f., 403, 417 etc.
2 On the excellence of his Greek scholarship see Field, op. cit. p. xlv.
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2. irpoo-KvvqaraT*.

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 δὸξα for the interpretative γλῶσσα.

(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. Ἀδημονεῖν, 'A. Job xviii. 20, Σ. Ps. lx. 3, cxv. 2, Eccl. vii. 17, Ezek. iii. 15; ἀποκαραδοκία, cf. 'A. Ps. xxxvi. 7 (ἀποκαραδόκει); δαμμονίζειν, 'A. Ps. xc. 6. ἐνκακεῖν, ‘to faint,’ Σ. Gen. xxvii. 46; ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, 'A. Ps. vii. 12, Σ. Isa. xvii. 13; ἐνθύμησις, ‘thought,’ Σ. Job xxi. 27, Ezek. 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. xliiv. 13. Even where the unusual word and meaning occur in the LXX., it will often

1 Essays, p. 28.

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.

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 factura sit et antequam Christiani ostendentur 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 argumentur a nobis...et enim apostoli quem sint his omnibus vetustiores, consonant praedictae interpretationi, et interpretatio consonat apostolicae traditioni. et enim Petrus et Ioannes et Matthaeus et Paulus et reliqui deinceps et horum sectatores propheta 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. : "anagynwose tais theias grafaas, tais ekosi duo βηβλους tis palaias dathikes tautas, tais upo tov εβδομηκοντα duo emmenewn tovν ememesiais...ou γαρ ευρεισλογια και κατασκευη σοφισματων ανθρωπιων Ыι το γνωρεν, αλλ' εκ πυνυματος αγιον Ψ των αγιω πυνυματι λαληθευσων θειων γραφων ερμηνεια συνετελειτο. Chrys. in Matt. hom. v. tovν αλλων μαλλον απαντων το αξιοπιστων οι εβδομηκοντα ξεχων αν δικαιον. οι μεν γαρ μετα την του Χριστου παρουσιαν ίμμηνεναι, Ιουδαιοι μειναιτε, και δικαιον αν υποπτευουσο ατε απευθεια μαλλον ειρηκοντες, και τας προφητειας συνακαζοντες επιτιθες: οι δε εβδομηκοντα προ έκαστον Ψ και πλειονων ετον της του Χριστου παρουσιας επι τουτο εδουντες και τοσοουτο αντε πας τουαντε ευντ υποψια απηλλαγηνυν. και δια των χρονον και δια το πληθος και δια την συμφωνιαν μαλλον αν ειν πυντευσοθαι δικαιον. Hieron. ep. xxxiii. (ad Pammach.): "jure LXX. editio obnuit 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...impellere ut Hebraea volumina Latino sermone transferrem." Aug. de doctr. Chr. 22 "qui (LXX. interpretes) iam per omnes peritiores ecclesiis tanta praesentia Sancti Spiritus interpretati esse dicuntur ut os unum tot hominum fusisse...quonobrem, 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. cxxv. ; 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 shewn. But they were not content to cite it as the best available version of the Old

\[1 \text{See above, p. 219 ff.}
\[2 \text{Part III. c. 3.}\]
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 Bible. To Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as to Clement and Barnabas, Justin 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 Hexapla, was accustomed to preach and comment upon the ordinary Greek text. He even builds his system of interpretation on the LXX. rendering of Prov. xxii. 20. 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 obloquy. Augustine, while sympathising with Jerome's purpose, thought it a doubtful policy to unsettle the laity by lowering the authority of the LXX.

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 obtectas 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."
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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. I τὸν ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀπόκρυφον αὐτῆς μηνύοντα εἰπεῖν Ἡ δὲ γῆ κτλ. Tert. baptism. 3 "(aqua) plurima suppetit, et quidem a primordio... terra autem erat invisibilibus et incomposita...solus liquor dignum vectaculum Deo subiciebat." ii. 2 τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἑκτηῦ. Iren. v. 28. 3 φανερῶν οὖν ὅτι τὴν συντέλεια αὐτῶν ὁ τέκτων ἐστί. iv. 7 οὐκ εἰν αὐτῶν προσενέγκεις 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 acquirivit, sed adiecit peccatum super peccatum"; cf. iv. 18. 3. xiv. 14 ἱρμιθμησεν...δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ καὶ τριακοσίους (cod. D). Barn. 9. 8 μάθητε ὅτι τῶν δεκακτώ πρώτων, καὶ διάστημα ποιήσας λέγει τριακοσίους: τὸ δεκακτὸ (ΠΗ) ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρός ἐν τῷ Θ ἤμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν λέγει καὶ τριακοσίους (Π). Cf. Clem. Al. Strom. vi. 11. Hil. Syn. 86. Ambr. de fide i. prol. xxxi. 13 εἰσὶν οἱ θεοὶ οἱ ὁρθῶν σοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ (DsilE). Just. Dial. 58 (cf. 60). xlviii. 14 ἐπέβαλεν...ἐναλλάξ ταῖς χείρας. Tert. baptism. 8 "sed est hoc quoque de vetere sacramento quo nepotes suos...intermutatatis manibus benedixeret et quidem ita transversim obliquatis in se, ut Christum deformantes iam tunc portenderent benedictionem in Christum futuram." xlix. 10 οὐκ ἐκλειψεν άρχων ἐξ Ιουδα καὶ ἱγνώμενος κτλ. Justin Dial. 52 οὐδὲπέτε ἐν τῷ γενεὶ ὑμῶν ἐπάναστο ὦστε προφήτης οὐτε ἄρχων...μέχρις οὐ οὕτος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἐπιθέειν (cf. ib. 120). Iren. iv. 10. 2 "inquiring enim... id tempus in quo defectit princeps et alius ex Iuda et qui est gentium spes...et inventenon alium nisi Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum annuntiatum." Cypr. test. i. 21. Eus. dem. ev. i. 4. Cyril. H. xii. 17 ομοἶνοι οὖν ἐδοκει τῆς Χριστοῦ παρουσίας τὸ πανσασθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Ιουδαίων. εἰ μή νῦν ὑπὸ Ρωμαίων εἰςιν, οὕτω ήλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς: εἰ ἔχουσι τὸν έκ γένους 'Ιουδα καὶ τοῦ Δαβίδ, οὕτω ήλθεν ὁ προσδοκώμενος.

Exod. xvi. 36 τὸ δὲ γόμορ τὸ δεκατὼν τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν. Clem. Al. Strom. ii. 11 εν ἡμῖν γάρ αὐτοὶ τρία μέτρα, τρία κρήτη προκύπτε ται, αἰσθήσεις...λόγος...νοῦς. xvii. 16 ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαία πολεμεῖ Κύριος ἐπὶ 'Αμαλήκ ἀπὸ γενέων εἰς γενεάς. Just. Dial. 49 νοῆσι δύνασθε ὅτι κρύφια δύναμι 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 ὄνοματι Κύριον ἐναντίον σου (AF). Amb. S. S.
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 ἵππος ὁ χρυσός. Tert. bapt. 7 “Aaron a Moysé unctus est, unde Christus dicitur a chrismate, quod est unctio, quae Domino nomen accommodavit.”

Num. xxxiii. 19 οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς διαρτηθήναι οὐδὲ ὡς νῦν ἀνθρώπον ἀπειληθήναι. Cypr. test. ii. 20 [under the heading “Quod cruci illum fixuri essent Iudaei”].

xxiv. 17 ἀνατελεὶ ἀπρόθετον ἐκ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἀνθρωπος ἐκ 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 ζωή σου κρεμαμένη ἀπέναντι τῶν ὄφελμάν των...καὶ οὐ πιστεύεις τῇ ζωῇ σου. Tert. (Jud. i) quotes this as “Eritis vita tua pendens in ligno ante oculos tuos; et non credes vitae tuae,” explaining the words of the “signi sacramentum...in quo vita hominibus praestruetur, in quo Judei non essent creditori.” Cf. Cyril H. xiii. 19 οὗτος ἡ ζωή ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξυλοῦ κρεμαθείσα Μωάμης ἀπκολαύομενος φυσι κτλ.

xxvii. 8 ἐστήσαν ὁρία ἑθνών κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἄγγελων θεοῦ. Justin (diai. 131) cites the last three words as κ. ἀριθμοὺς ὕων Ἰσραήλ, adding οἱ ἑθελοντα ἐγγίσαντο οὗτος ἑστησαν ο. Εθνών κ. ἀριθμοῦ ἄγγ. θεο. ἄλλο ἔπει καὶ οκ τούτου πάλιν οὐδέν μοι ἐλαττοῦσιν ὁ λόγος, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐγγίσας εἰπον. Iren. iii. 12, 9, quoting the LXX., comments: “populum autem qui credit Deo iam non esse sub angelorum potestate.”

Jos. v. 3 ἐποίησεν Ἡσιοὺς μαχαῖρας πετρίνας ἀκρότομους καὶ περιέτεμεν τοὺς νῦν 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 ἀπένευσαν τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὴν κρίνην Σαμαρείας...καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐλούσαντο ἐν τῷ αἵματι: Amb. de Sp. i. 16 “fidelis ad putem (Gen. xxiv. 62), infidelis ad lacum (Jer. ii. 13)...meretrices in lacu Jezabel se cruore laverunt.”

Ps. ii. 12 δράξασθε παρείας. Cypr. test. iii. 66 “contineat disciplinam” [under the heading “Disciplinam Dei in ecclesiasticis praeceptis observandum”].

iv. 7 ἐσημειώθη ἐπ' ἥμᾶς 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 sancto.”

vi. 6 ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀδηθί τῆς ἐγκυμονήσεσται 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. ὅπερ τῶν κρυφῶν τοῦ νῦν. Orig. ad loc. κρύφια ἐστὶ γνωσίς ἀπόρρητος τῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἁλή-

1 v.i. adprehendite. 2 Eph. i. 13.
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...quod Christus idem sit sermo Dei”. cix. 3 ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησα σε. Just. apol. i. 45, dial. 32. Tert. Marc. v. 9 “nos edimus evangelia...nocturna nativitate declarantia Domum 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, id est, ex solo utero sine viri semine?” Cypr. test. i. 17. Cyril. H. vii. 2 άπερ ἐπὶ ἀνθρωπῶν ἀναφέρει πάσης ἀγνωστικῆς ἀνάπλευσ. xi. 5 τὸ ‘σήμερον’ (Ps. ii. 7) ἄχρονον, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐωσφόρον κτλ. Cf. Athan. or. c. Ar. iv. 27 f.

Prov. viii. 22 Κύριος ἐκ τις ἐν με ἁρχήν ὄνομαυτοῦ. 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 naturam ante saecula Deum rursum in initium viarum Dei et in opera creari.” Cf. Athan. or. in Ar. ii. 16 ff. xxii. 20 καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπάγραψα ἄυτὰ σεαυτῷ τρισώσο. Orig. Philoc. i. 11 (de prisc. iv.) οὐκόν τριχῶς ἀπογράφεσθαι δει εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ψυχὴν τὰ τῶν ἀγίων γραμμάτων νοῦματα.


Hos. xii. 4 (A) ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ἐφοσοῦν 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. i.)

Amos ix. 6 ὁ οἴκοδομόν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ. Tert. Marc. iv. 34 “aedificantem illis ascensum suum in caelum.

Hab. ii. 11 λίθος ἐκ τοίχων βοήσεται καὶ κάνθαρος ἐκ ἀκούς φθεγξέται αὐτὰ. Ambr. in Luc. xxiiii. “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 peepdidt in ligno...illum (inquam) qui sicut scarabaeus clamavit ut persecutoribus suis Pater peccata donaret.” Hieron. in Abac., ad loc. “quidem e nostris verem in ligno loquentem illum esse aiunt qui dicit in Psalmo (xxi. 7) Ego natus sum vermis et non homo.” iii. 2 ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζῴων γνωσθήσῃ. Tert. Marc. iv. 22 “in medio duo animalium cognosceris, Moysi et Eliæ.” Eus. dem. ev. vi. 15 δύο ζῴα (reading ζῷαν in text) τοῦ προφητευομένου δηλούσθαι ἐδομεν, μίαν μὲ τὴν ἐνθεου, θατέραν δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην.


Isa. i. 22 οἱ κάπηλοι σου μισοῦσα τον οἶνον ὕδατι. Iren. iv. 12 i “ostendens quod austero Dei praecepto miscerent seniores aquatam traditionem.” iii. 9 f. ουκ ἣ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν, διότι βεβοῦ-
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Bar. iii. 38 μετα τουτο επι της γης άδεθη και εν τοις άνθρωποις συναιστραθη. Cyril. H. xi. 15 Βλητεις θεον μετα την Μοσεως νομοθεσιαν ενανθρωπησαντα;

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 version. 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

as well as Catholics appealed to the Alexandrian version. Thus Arius did not hesitate to argue from Joel ii. 25, LXX. (ἕ ἀκρίς 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 nature. Both parties had recourse to Prov. viii. 22, where the LXX. rendering of ἡ ἐκτυσέν με seemed to Arius to justify the statement that the Logos Himself had a beginning of existence, like the created universe. 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) ὁς αὐτοῖς καρδίαν καινήν καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθεῖας ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις αὐτῶν (Ps. 1. 12); ib. (B. 8) καὶ ἀποδώσῃ αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν τοῦ σωτηρίου καὶ πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στηρίσῃ αὐτοὺς (Ps. 1. 14); St James (B. 37) σῶσον ὁ θεὸς τῶν λαῶν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου

1 Fragment of the Thalia, in Athan. or. c. Ar. i. 6.
2 Ib. ἀρχὴν τοῦ κτίσεωθαί ἔσχε καὶ αὐτὸς.
3 The references are to the pages of Mr Brightman’s Liturgies, Eastern and Western, i. (Oxford, 1896).
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(Ps. xxvii. 9)\(^1\); ib. (B. 55) ἐπιλαβοὺς ὀπλοῦ καὶ θυρεόν καὶ ἀνάστηθι εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου (Ps. xxxiv. 2); St Mark (B. 117) ἑξαπόστειλον τῷ φῶς σου καὶ τῷ ἀλήθειάν σου (Ps. xliii. 3)...καὶ ταχὺ προκαταλαβέτωσαν ἡμᾶς οἱ ὀικτεῦμοι σου, Κύριε (Ps. lxviii. 8). (b) Many of their magnificent addresses to God and to Christ are from the LXX. e.g. St Clement (B. 12) Κύριε παντοκράτωρ, ὑψιστε, ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν, ἀγιε ἐν ἀγίοις ἀιαπανόμενε, ἀνάρχε, μόναρχε (Isa. lvii. 15 + 3 Macc. ii. 2); ib. (B. 24) ὁ μέγας, ὁ μεγαλώνυμος (Jer. xxxix. 19); St James (B. 44) ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ ἐφορῶν (Ps. cxii. 5 f.); St Mark (B. 137) ὁ καθήκοντος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ (Ps. lxxix. 2); Sarapion (J. Th. St. i.) θεὰ 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 τῶν ἀνθρωποκτόνων ὅφιν δεσμώτην παραδοσίαν ἡμῖν ὡς στροφῆθων παιδίως (cf. Job xl. 14); ib. (B. 15) λόγον θεόν ἀγγελον τῇς μεγάλης βουλῆς σου (Isa. ix. 6); St James (B. 55) τῶν τὸ ἀγίον σου θυσιαστήριου κυκλούντων διακόνων (Ps. xxv. 6); ib. (B. 57) ἐν χώρᾳ κατοικῆς (Ps. cxiv. 9); St Mark (B. 126) εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους ἡμῶν ἐν πάγη εἰρήνῃ κατακόσμησον (1 Regn. xxix. 6: Ps. cxx. 8); ib. (B. 133) ἐς ἐποίμον κατοικητηρίου σου (Exod. xv. 17; 3 Regn. viii. 39 ff.); St Basil (B. 335) ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ἀνθρωπομενῶν (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 ἀγία (Lev. xxii. 2), ἀναφορά (Num. iv. 19), δῶρα (Gen. iv. 4), θυσία (Gen. iv. 3), λειτουργία (Exod. xxxvii. 19), θυσία αἰνέσεως (Lev. vili. 3 f., Ps. xlix. 14, 23), πρόθεσις (Exod. xxxix. 18), προκείμενα (Lev. xxiv. 7), προσφορά (3 Regn. vii. 34), τελείον (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. i 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).

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 ἁγία, ἀνάστασις, εἰκὼν, ἐκκλησία, ἑφόδιον, θυσία, θυσιαστήριον, Κύριος, λόγος, μονογενής, ξύλον, οὐσία, παντοκράτωρ, παντοδύναμος, παράδεισος, πνεῦμα ἁγίον, πίστις, προσφορά, σάρξ, σόφια, 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, misericordia, 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 ὁθαλῶτος ὤν 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 Bible," 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 forms. (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 πεδίον); 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" (Ἀνατολὴν). 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), *chytopus* (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), *rhomphaea* (Sir. xxi. 4), *tympanistria* (Ps. lxvii. 26), *zelare* (Ps. lxxii. 3). Several of these words belong to ordinary post-Augustan Latin, but their use in the Vulgate may fairly be

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. Moyses, Balaam, Gomorrha, Gabaon, Jerusalem, Pharao, 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 readings: Exod. ii. 5 in papyreone (’Α. ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παπυρεῶνος); Deut. xxxiii. 12 quasi in thalamo morabitur (’Α. παστῶσει); Job xiv. 12 donec atteratur caelum (’Α. ἕως ἀν καταρρίβη οὐρανός); Amos ii. 13 ego stridebō subter vos, sicut stridet plaustrum (’Α. τριζήσω...τριζεί); Jer. xlix. (xxix.) 19 ad pulcritudinem robustam (’Α. πρὸς εὐπρέπειαν στερεὰν). His debts to Symmachus are still more numerous, and only a few can be given here: Num. xxv. 8 in lupanar (Σ. εἰς τὸ πορνεῖον); Jos. x. 42 uno cepit impetu (Σ. ἡχυμαλωτευσεν μαδρυῆ); Jud. xv. 19 molarem dentem (Σ. τὴν μύλην); 1 Regn. ix. 24 quia de industria servatum est tibi (Σ. ὅτι εἰπτηθεὶς τετήρηται σοι); 4 Regn. ii. 14 ubi est Dominus deus Eliae etiam nunc? (Σ. καὶ νῦν); Isa. liv. 8 in momento indignationis (Σ. ἐν ἀτόμῳ ὅργῆς); 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, ’Α.), laicus (1 Regn. xxi. 4, ’Α. 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 necessaria\(^1\)." 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.


\(^1\) *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 διαφάσασθαι, καθὼς έθος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, εἴ τις διασκενάσει 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. 32; 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 γῇ ὑπεί καλῶ), adding the comment: οὐκοῦν...τὸ τέλειον γένος...εἰρήνη καὶ ἑλευθερία 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 οὖ χαρεῖται 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. Aἢη); Exod. xvii. 6 ἑστηκα πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας ἐγχωρεῖν (de somn. ii. 32, cf. B πρὸ τοῦ σε...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 Τάνων Ἀλγύπτου.
Justin, as we have seen, 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 τέλεον περιείλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξηγήσεων τῶν γεγενημένων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαῖω γεγενημένων πρεσβυτέρων). 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 text."

Accidental corruptions\(^2\), 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 parts\(^8\) (comm. in Matt. t. xv. 14 δηλονότι πολλη γέγονεν ἢ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἰτε ἀπὸ βαθμίας τινῶν γραφέων εἰτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων εἰτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀειτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέμενων ἢ ἀφαίρεσιν\(^4\)). Besides intentional changes he notices elsewhere (1) double renderings: hom. in 1 Regn., i. 4 "non me latet... quod in aliquis exemplaribus habetur erat vir quidam (ἀνθρωπός τις ἤν, codd. M, 44, &c.), sed in his exemplaribus quae emendatoria probavimus ita habetur, erat vir unus (A, ἐγένετο ἀνθρωπὸς εἰς)"; (2) transpositions: on Jer. xlvii. 4 he has the note ἢ τῶν ὅ ἐν τισι τόποις μετατεθείσα ὡστε τὰ πρῶτα ύστερα καὶ τὰ ύστερα πρῶτα γενέσθαι; (3) errors of transcription: in Jer. xv. 10, where most of his copies read, as ours do now, ωφέλησαι, ωφέλησεν, 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 (Ἰη). The name of Joshua’s father in the LXX. is Ναγή (O. L. Ναβε), probably in the first instance an error for Ναίν (ΝΑΤΗ for ΝΑΤΝ) = Να. Another well-known instance is the A text of Jud. v. 8 σκέπη νεανίδων σιρμάστων ἀνήφη καὶ σιρμᾶστης, which, as Ewald pointed out, conceals the doublet (1) σκέπην ἐὰν ἴδω καὶ σιρμάστην, (2) σκέπη ἐὰν ὄφη καὶ σιρμᾶστης. 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 ὄν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωτιῶν κτλ. (see, for the rest, above, p. 60).

4 The gravest instance of ἀφαίρεσις was found in the book of Job; see above, p. 255.
Textual condition of the LXX.

Such faults were specially common in the case of proper names: *in Joann. t. vi. 41 τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον* perì ὧν ὀνόματα σφάλμα πολλαχοῦ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἐστιν ἰδεῖν, ὥσ ἤκριβώσαμεν ἀπὸ Ἑβραίων μαθῶντες, καὶ τοὺς ἀντιγράφους 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 *κοῦντι ἕκδοσις*, 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 texts"; 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 *κοῦντι*.

2. Of the Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Hesychian recensions some account has been given already. 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 *κοῦντι*, as it was read in Palestine, Syria, and Egypt during the

---

1 In the context Origen refers to the apparent confusion of Πάδαρα and Πέργεσα in the Gospels.
2 ᾿Η κοῦντι ἕκδοσις 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.
4 See above, Part 1. c. iii.

S. S.
third century. But in order to recover from them this un-
revised 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. Regg. gr. 129, 131, 132, Ars. 8415, Escurial Σ. 1. 16,
Leipzig gr. 361, Zurich c. 11, Athos Vatop. 516, Pantocr. 24,
Protaton. 53, Laur. γ. 112. Versions: Sahidic (in part), Arme-
nian (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 Antioch.³

_Hesychian_⁴. Codd. Q, 26, 44, 49, 68, 74, 76, 84, 87, 90, 91, 106,
107, 134, 198, 228, 238, 306. Paris suppl. gr. 609. Versions:
Bohairic, Armenian (in part). Cyril of Alexandria; other Egyp-
tian 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 Hexa-
plorum quae supersunt_ may be found all the remains of

¹ For fuller information see pp. 78, 112 ff., 118 ff., 137 ff., 140, 148 ff.
² See pp. 82 ff., 93, 116 ff., 148 ff.
³ Lagarde would add (Ankündigung, p. 27) the writings of the Em-
peror 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 Lagarde, 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 begin.

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 hexaplarem curare...tertio loco...adparatum criticum integrum adiungere cogito."
representation of Lucian's text: "conlatis codicibus versionibusque eam praeabantibus et patrum ea utentibus excussis efficiendum erit ut etiam in minuitioribus adcurate edita dici merito possit." 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 א B. 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 Proverbi en (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.
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 manuscipete 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 hauphilfsmittel muss die fähigkeit sein, die ihm vorkommenden lesarten auf ihr semitisches original zurückzuführen oder aber als original-griechische 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 aliquius codicis auctoritatem, sed conlatis integris codicum familiis esse curandam: nam familiis non accedere auctoritatem a codicibus, sed codicibus a familis: [2] unius aliquius familiae editionem nihil esse nisi procedendi ulterior adminiculum: [3] errare qui si quando ipsa manus veterum interpretum inventa sit, in ea legenda adquiesci debere perhiebeant, quum conlatis vetera emendandi periculis omnibus indagandum sit quae explicationis veteris testamenti per quatuo saecula fata
fuerint, ut tandem aliquando pateat quam incerta in hoc literarum genere omnia sint, et quam multa nulla alia re nisi coniectura nitantur sciolorum, superstitionis, 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 uncial codices 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 Hesychian 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 Pamphilus. Lagarde, however, at once pointed out the difficulties which beset Cornill’s theory, 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 Hexapla.” 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 corrections.

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 ff., 183 ff.
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 see Hort, Intr., 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 out\(^1\), “the O. L. and the Hexaplar text convict B here and there of interpolation, especially in Isaiah.” “Certainly (he writes in another place\(^2\)) 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 *koiné* 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 Latin\(^3\).” 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 recension\(^4\), 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 εἰπὼν "Ω (A, with Μ, καὶ εἰπάω). The process of corruption is evident (ἐπανώ, εἰπανώ, εἰπόνω). In Sirach instances are especially abundant, e.g. xliii. 17 ἠλείδισεν (A, ἠλίπησεν); 23 ἑφύτευσεν αὕτη Ἰησοῦ (H. P. 248 ἐφ. ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους); 26 εὐώδα τέλος (248 εὐωδεί ὁ ἄγγελος).

\(^4\) Grabe, *ep. ad Millium* (1705).

\(^5\) Moore, *Judges*, p. xlvi.
and especially of the extant remains of the Hexapla—a remark which is capable of a much wider application.

Cod. A, the great rival of cod. B, "exhibits a text which has been systematically corrected so as to agree more closely with the Hebrew." "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 rest." 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 unanimity. These phenomena point to the presence in A of an underlying text of great antiquity, possibly a pre-Christian recension made in Syria.

It must be observed, however, that the text of this MS. is not

---

2 On the B text of Sirach and Tobit see above, pp. 271, 274.
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 $\aleph^c$. 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 prophetical 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 Pamphilus. 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 materials. 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. 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 text, 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

---

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. ABGLQΘ, facsimiles or printed texts of nCDEFHKO RTUYZΤHI, and collations of the remaining uncial s, and of a large number of the cursive s. 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.

(6) 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,
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77, Paris Reg. Gr. 128, and many others), the pair H. P. 54, 75, with which Θ 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 text. 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 aid.

(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 axioms. 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 Masoretic text. The application of these rules, however, calls for knowledge and judgment of no ordinary kind.

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. Β, 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 book, 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.

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 Phalerus, 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 

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. lxviii. 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): Ed 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, re-
ssembling 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 
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. 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 hexaplarem 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. τὰῦ O' hexaplamem 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.


'Aggiungasi che Origene l'aveva arricchita di prolegomeni e di scolii, per non dire degli obelì e degli asterischi, coi quali s' ingegnò di rendere anche più visibili le singole parole e particelli crescenti o mancanti nei l.XX., rispetto all' Ebraico, se pure questa operazione non fu ristretta alle Tetráplo od al testo dei l.XX., estratto dall' una delle due collezioni mentovate, secondo che altri ha voluto,' with a note 'E veramente distribuito il testo, come lo è nel palimpsestò Ambrosiano delle Esaple non rimane più tanto necessaria questa aggiunta d' obelì 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 kouvē without corrections or additions, or a text already revised, [and] provided with obeli and asterisks; that is, with the additions from Theodotion? 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 ὀκτασελίῳ παρὰ μᾶνου τοῖς ὦ ἐκεῖτο ὑφάσκεται—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 S 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 Nobiliius 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 κωνή see A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta-Studien, II. pp. 134, 170f. 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 κωνήν, id est communem appellant, atque vulgatam, et a plerisque nunc Δουκιάνδος dicitur; aliam Septuaginta interpretum quae in 'Εξαπλοΐς codicibus reperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est, et Jerosolymae atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur.'


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. 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 ט and ת 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 AQ. 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. i—59 and 932—953 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.


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 _Muséeon_, 1912,
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P. 147 ff. (Nouveaux Fragments préhexaplastaires du livre de Job en copie sahidique) supports the previous view, in opposition to Professor Burkitt and Mr Crum (on No. 939 in his Catalogue).


P. 119. Add: J. Goettsberger, Die Syro-armenischen...Bibelicitate...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 Zwillingsbruder 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 ZUQNNINENSIS. Two Syriac MSS., Vat. Syr. 162, at Rome, 122 leaves, and B.M. Add. 14665 foli. 1—7, five leaves, contain, under a valuable chronicle, including that of ‘Joshua the
Stylist, palimpsest fragments which are assigned to six Greek uncials MSS., distinguished by the editor as under:

Z[^1], cent. vi, portions of Judges xvi—xxi. The text is Lucianic, to be compared with K 54 59 75 82.

Z[^2], cent. vi, portions of 3 Reg. ii—viii. and xxi. Lucianic, akin to 82 rather than 19 108. (Part in Brit. Mus.)

Z[^3], 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[^4]. Doubly palimpsest; the liturgical writing above the biblical text and below the Syriac, is, according to Tisserant, not, as was thought, Coptic but Greek.

Z[^4], cent. vi, large portions of Pss. vii—xxxvii. Lucianic? the text is said to be of a character between A and K[^a].


Z[^6], cent. vi—vii. Fragments of later chapters of Ezek., and Dan. iii. 2—15. Lucianic.

The MSS. are named from Zuqmin, 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. The 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[3] inches. There is a lacuna in Deuteronomy from v. 16 ὅς θέος σου to vi. 18 ἄναβην ἄναβην, and in Joshua from iii. 3 τῶν λαῶν λέγοντες to iv. 10—λατοῦ 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 Rahlf, Sept.-Studien, II. p. 5. It comes from Ashmunēn, in Middle Egypt, and contains Ps. xxx. 5—xxxi. I, xxxii. 18—lv., with gaps in the earlier part. Rahlf 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: Rahlf, op. cit. p. 14; see p. 164, note. Rahlf mentions some other uncial Psalters, still awaiting complete collation: Paris, Arsenal 8407; Jerusalem, Patr. Lib. 96, containing Ps. xx. 10—cxlvi. 6, six leaves at St Petersburg; Berlin, Royal Lib. Harn. 552 (Graeco-Latin); one at Moscow (Rumjantzowski Museum), see Tischendorf *V. T. Gr.* proleg. 45; and one at Uspenskoe, dated A.D. 862, described by Amphilochius (Amflokhy, 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 Y 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:


Exod. xv. Heidelberg.


Additional Notes.

1 Sam. (1 Regn.) ii. Heidelberg.
2 Sam. (2 Regn.) xv. xvi., fragm. Strassburg. See Deissmann, Licht vom Osten....
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.
Amos ii. 6—8, 9—12. Sixth century, large heavy uncial. Oxyrh. 846.


P. 158. The cursive 67, Mr Thackeray points out, is a near

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. lxvii. (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.,


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.


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. 9 ff., 17 ff. 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[CS], as on p. 124.

(b) Containing the Octateuch, or parts of it: DEFGHKLMΘ.
II. Cursives, quoted by small letters:

\[a = \text{Holmes and Parsons' 15.}\]
\[b' = \text{same as 19.}\]
\[b = \text{same as 108.}\]
\[c = \text{H.-P. 38.}\]
\[d = \text{same as 44.}\]
\[e = \text{same as 52.}\]
\[f = \text{same as 53.}\]
\[g = \text{same as 54.}\]
\[h = \text{same as 55.}\]
\[i = \text{same as 56.}\]
\[j = \text{same as 57.}\]
\[k = \text{same as 58.}\]
\[l = \text{same as 59.}\]
\[m = \text{same as 72.}\]

\[b'_2 = \text{St Peters burg, Imp. Library, 62 (p. 153)}\]
\[c'_2 = \text{same as 135.}\]
\[d'_2 = \text{same as 61.}\]

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:

\[U_2 = \text{Amh. Pap. i. iii c. Gen. i—5, Lxx. and Aq.: p. 148, note 2.}\]
\[U_4 = \text{Oxyrh. Pap. 656. Gen. xiv. xix. xx. xxiv. fragm.: parts of four leaves of a codex.}\]
\[U_5 = \text{Amh. Pap. cxcii. Exod. xix. 1, 2, 5, 6.}\]
\[U_6 = \text{Amh. Pap. cxcii. Deut. xxxii. 3—6, 8—10.}\]
\[\Delta_2 = \text{Vellum fragments in binding of Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 1397.}\]
\[\Delta_3 = \text{Strassburg, Pap. Gr. 748: vellum fragm. of Gen. xxv. xxvi.}\]
\[\Delta_4 = \text{Geneva, 99 vellum fragm. of Gen. xxxvii.}\]
\[\Delta_5 = \text{Palimpsest fragm. Gen. xl. 3, 4, 7: p. 148, note 2.}\]
\[\Delta_6 = \text{Vellum fragm. Levit. xxii. 3—xxiii. 22: p. 146 (2).}\]
\[\Delta_7 = \text{Vellum fragm. from Sinai, Numb. xxxii. 29: p. 147 (3).}\]

V. Versions:

\[\mathcal{A} = \text{Armenian: Zohrab's edition, Venice, 1805: p. 119.}\]
\[\mathcal{A}-\text{ed.} = \text{Z.'s text, } \mathcal{A}\text{-cod or -codd variants in his notes.}\]
**B** = Bohairic: p. 107.

**B**\(^1\) = Lagarde’s edition, Leipzig, 1867.

**B**\(^w\) = Wilkins’ ed., London, 1731.


**B**\(^v\) = Rome, Vat. Copt. 1 (for Deut.).

**C** = Sahidic: p. 107.

**C**\(^c\) = Ciasca’s edition, Rome, 1885.

**C**\(^m\) = Maspéro’s ed., Paris, 1892.

**C**-cod = Ciasca’s Bodleian MS.

**C**\(^p\) = Paris, Bibl. Nat. Copt. 1296 (fragm.).

**C**\(^b\) = B. M. Or. 5287 (fragm.).

**C**\(^t\) = B. M. Add. 17183 (Thompson, *A Coptic Palimpsest*).

**E** = Ethiopic: p. 110.

**E**\(^c\) = Dillmann’s Codex C.

**E**\(^f\) = F.


**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.

**P** = Palestinian Aramaic: p. 114.


**P**\(^d\) = Christlich-palästinisch-aramäische Texte, ed. H. Duensing.

**P**\(^s\) = fragm. in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Sem. Series, I. v, ix.), ed. G. H. Gwilliam and J. F. Stenning.

**P**\(^p\) = St Petersburg fragm. in *Anecdota Syriana*, ed. J. P. N. Land, 1875.

**P**\(^t\) = *Palestinian Syriac Texts*, from Palimpsest Fragments in the Taylor-Schechter collection: ed. Mrs A. S. Lewis and Mrs M. D. Gibson.

**P**\(^h\) = Christlich-palästinische fragmenta, ed. F. Schulthess.


**P**\(^p\) = quotations in the Ausar Râzê (Horreum Mysteriorum) of Bar-hebraeus.

**P**\(^m\) = readings supplied by A. Masius from his MS.


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 M 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. a 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 Ezekiel 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. ἐστησεν was an attempt to correct LXX. ἐγνώρισεν, not, as had generally been said, reading ἤβη, but without reference to the Hebrew, which must almost certainly be בִּיהָדוֹ. Mr Thackeray, taking this evidence to the letters of the original Hebrew, proposes to divide them differently, and instead of

stream of the river

stream of the river

The Lucianic alteration may have been caused by the awkwardness of the preposition which now disappears. Reading ἐκ γρόφου, he takes ἐκ as ὑπ' τοῦ, 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 vv. 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 καυνότητος. The link between καυνότης and what might be expected to correspond from the M.T. in v. 13 (cf. 2 Chron. vi. 2), namely מֵעָלִים 'for ever,' is found in יַעַל, 'youth'; ἐπὶ is ὑπ' τοῦ; τοῦ κατοικεῖν is ἐπὶ, which can better be rendered 'for the Sabbath'; and emending מֵעָלִים to מֵעָלִים, 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, מֵעָלִים; i.e.:

For the Sabbath. On Alamoth ('for soprano voices').
Additional Notes.

Mr Thackeray is inclined to connect 'Jashar' with רשי 'sing' rather than with רוש 'upright'; in which case the LXX. βαθαντε ευς φυσικε εκει 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. διάφαλμα, occurs. Four MSS., namely Β (= 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 Analecata (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: רכזש, 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 σκηνείρα λέγει [κυριος], a gloss: Sinker, and Nestle (ZAW. 1900, p. 167 ff.), suggested ἐπὶ τά for ἐπὶ τὰ. But the Barberini text, which Mr Thackeray believes to be the oldest Greek version, has ἔχορτασας [τα] βολίδας τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ.

The details must be sought in his paper; here it can only be pointed out that he shows how ἔχορτασας (= ρουσ) and βολίδας (= חומם) support the consonants of M.T., while LXX. λέγει suggests רמא. (Kυρίος 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 Prophetic 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 רמא, 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. 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:

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.


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.).

Dodecapropheton. P. Riessler, Die Kleinen Propheten oder das Zwölfprophetenbuch, Rottenburg, 1911; W. O. E. Oesterley, Codex Taurinensis, 1908.


Ezekiel. G. Jahn, Das Buch Ezechiel nach LXX., 1905.


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. 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 S 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 B' (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 Προλεγομένα esse Aristaeo, qui ex Ptolemaei ephe meridibus 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 100thnote 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. N; 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:


Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew have been published jointly by the Universities of Oxf. and Camb.


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 Ahikar, 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 Ašīkār; 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 ko\(\text{w}^{\text{ij}}\), 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:


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:

- **Paris Papyri** (in Notices et Extraits), ed. Brunet de Presle, 1858, 1865.
- **Flinders Petrie Papyri**, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in Proc. R.I.A.), 1891, etc.
- **Corpus Papyrorum Raineri**, ed. C. Wessely, Vienna, 1895.
- **Die Septuaginta Papyri...der Heidelberger Papyrus Sammlung**, ed. G. A. Deissmann, 1905.

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.


Here may be mentioned also ΑΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ, 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. E. Fund, etc.... texts edited...by W. E. Crum, London, 1902.

In connexion with the study of these papyri, various selections and aids have appeared.


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:


The Berlin *Inscriptions 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 kouβi 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 kouβi, and are not altogether remote from the more 'vulgar' Greek which is found in the bulk of papyri.)

P. 317. γενοστο also occurs in Isa. xxv. 1, where the Hebrew word has presumably been taken for יָֽזְֽעָ for 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>י and י, see 4 Regn. v. 19, where מָרְכָּבָה is transliterated δεβραθά.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י and י, Isai. xxviii. 10, 13, ὀλίψει (יו) for יו.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י and י, Isai. viii. 12, σκληρόν = שָׁלְפִּ for רָשָׁל ‘conspiracy.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד and ד, Isai. iii. 10, δήσωμεν, root רָשָׁ for רָשָׁ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cf. the strong remarks in Driver’s *Hebrew Tenses* (p. xiii. in first ed.) on the worthlessness of LXX.’s evidence as between 1 and 2, with numerous instances.

P. 324. With ἑν ἐμοὶ of 1 Regn. i. 26, cf. ἑντ’ ἐμοὶ, Isai. xxi. 2, for ἑντ, “Go up.”

(6). On transliteration, Thackeray (Gramm. O.T.G. p. 31) points out that it is rare in the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Jerem. a, and the Minor Prophets; and absent altogether from Ezek. β, Proverbs, Psalms (except in titles, and ἀλλὰ λέγουσα), and from Job, apart from the Hexaplar additions from Theodotion. In Isaiah, moreover, only two instances occur, of which σωρήξ, v. 2, is possibly a proper name; while νεχόθα, 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 Dent. 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; Ἡβακ. 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.


1. πολὺς ἐσται. Heb. has here Hiphil inf. abs., used predicatively.
2. ἀπολύμαι. For this sense of the verb, cf. Soph. Antig. 1265, 1314; also in Polybius. Can ἦδοι 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.


Consult throughout this passage Burney’s *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*.


P. 340. Literature.

P. 360. It was pointed out by the late Dr C. Taylor that in Lam. ii.—iv., whereas in the Hebrew  ה precedes  א, the Greek uncials (except  and sometimes  *) do not preserve the order of the verses, prefix  and  in the order now usual. Conversely, in Prov. xxix. 43, 44 (= Heb. xxxi. 26, 25) א have the  ה verse before the  א verse.


P. 387. The phrase χλωρός χόρτος, 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 κατωρχοσαντο, i.e. רוכ for רוכ (see Bp Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 136).


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 no support in MSS. of the LXX.; and the reading  δοσιμεν 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, δοσιμεν; 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 αυτη εστιν Βαυθλειμ 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. 89ff., 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 εὐθεῖας κατασκηνώσουν γῆν]
Clem. Al. Strom. II. 19, 483p
χρηστοὶ δὲ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς,
.orig. text χρηστοὶ δ’ ἔσονται τῆςδε γῆς οἰκήτορες.
Cf. Cod. V, Arm. and Clem. Rom.; also the readings of ΝΑ.
vii. 23 b. καὶ ἠλεγχος καὶ παιδεία]
Strom. I. 29, 247p
ὀδοὺς γὰρ βιώτης ἐλέγχει παιδεία,
.orig. παιδεία γὰρ ὀδοὺς βιώτης ἐλέγχει.
βιώτης = βιῶς is else a ἀπαξ λεγ. in Prov. v. 23.
Similarly Chrysostom is possibly right in reading, in Prov. xv. 17b:

ἡ παράδεισος μοσχων μετά ἐχθρας
естественнον ἑκάτης.

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. 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); Geschäftsliche 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 Cambridge 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. S 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; S 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 NB, but nearer to the latter. The pre-hexaplar 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, doublots, 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.

S. S.
M. Dieu considers that A's text in Job is nearer to the original than that of 8B; 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:

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 Vaticanae’ 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 undertaken. 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 naively 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 foctum supposittium penitus rejicio, Amicos soliciare, et in Partes longinquas mittere, vix opera pretium existimavi. Eas curas reliquuo 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 1.) 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. 1. 1870).
of the official titles and phraseology of the Ptolemaic court, was first pointed out by Prof. Lumbroso. He says 1, '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 magis-
trature, 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 Maccabees 3.

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 ἀρχισωματόφιλακες, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χρείων, χρηματισταλ, οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν ταγμάτων (cf. ταγματικὸς ὑπηρέται Wilcken, Actenstücke Par. VIII.), the phrase ἐὰν φαίνηται, the correct use of εὑρύχει at the close of a petition from a subordinate to a higher official, the words ἐκατοντάρουσι and παρείρεσις, the phrase παραγενεσθαι εἰς τῶν τόπων.
3 Cf. especially 3 Maccabees iii. 25—28 (προστετάχαμεν—διειλήφαμεν—μηρίεν δὲ τῶν Βουλαμενον) with Λρ. p. 523, 23 ff. (προστετάχαμεν—διειλή-

φαμεν—τόν δὲ Βουλαμενον προσαγγέλειν).
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A fifth of the letter with commentary but without introduction, was published soon after his death. 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 testimony critically edited, and full and valuable indices. 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.
A Paris 128.
D Paris 130.
F Brit. Mus. Burney 34.
L Vat. 746.
K Vat. 383.
R Basle O. iv. 10 (Omont 21).
G Venice 534.
I Palat. 203.

M Ottobon. 32.
Q Paris 950.
T Florence Laur. Acquisti 44.
B Paris 129.
C Paris 5.
P Barberini iv. 56.
S Vat. 1668.
Z Zurich Bibl. de la Ville C. 11 (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).


12. Letter of Theodoret to Hypatius. καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν φιλομαθεῖς ἄνδρες—εἰς προοίμιον τῆς θεοπνευστοῦ γραφῆς.
13. Catena of Theodoret and other patristic writers on the Octateuch.

259. πόσαι παραδόσεις εἰσὶ τῆς θελας γραφῆς.
260. ποσάκις καὶ ποτὲ ἐπορθήθησαν οἱ ἑξ Ἰσραήλ.

A beautiful MS., in clearly written cursive characters, which hang from ruled lines, containing coloured illustrations throughout (five in the Aristea portion), ornamental red head-pieces and red initial letters in the margin. Single column, 48 lines in a page; size of page 14 x 10½ in., of writing 11¼ x 7¾ in.

The Catena is apparently by the same hand as the Aristea, the LXX. text being in the same size of writing as the Aristea, and the marginal Catena in smaller writing (80 lines in a page). There is one large omission in the Aristea, two leaves of the MS. apparently having been lost. The verso of fol. 3 ends with τὴν τράπεζαν (p. 530. 8), and λείτου is written in an early hand at the foot of the page; fol. 4 begins with μὲν πεδινῶν (538. 11) and † is written in the margin.

fol. 1. Aristeas.
29. Theodoret to Hypatius.
19vo. Catena on Genesis.

Size of page \(12\frac{2}{3} \times 9\) 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. to (Omont 1 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, διαθήσεις καθαρά KR (καθ. διαθήσεις cett.) p. 519. 8, κυριωτέρον KR (κυριωτατον cett.) p. 519. 9, οι ανδρες ασφαλος KR (ασφ. οι ανδρες cett.) p. 528. 10, σαλισθουμενοι KR (συνάλισθ. 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 Sbardii Magdiburgiensis.'


26. Theodoret to Hypatius.
27. Preface to Genesis from Gregory of Nyssa, inc. ἐπειδὴ ἐπερ εἰςα-γώγημον πρὸς θεογνωσίαν...
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 \(11 \times 7\) in. A hand of the fourteenth century (Lumbroso) 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, + ἐσον εν (?) ταυτα εἰς δόξαν | θυ καὶ τῆς αγίας τριάδος φιλα [? φιλλά] τριακοσία γ ητοι (?) ὅ ἐ. +.

1 Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse (Leipzig, 1886).
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Descendants of A (DFL).


fol. 1. Aristeas.
26vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.
27. Gregory of Nyssa’s Preface.
28. Catena on Genesis and Exodus, 1—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 Gregoropoulus’; 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 $13\frac{3}{4} \times 9\frac{3}{4}$ 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).


Same contents as A, viz.
21. Theodoret to Hypatius.
22. Passages from Gregory of Nyssa’s book on the six days of creation.
25. Catena on the Octateuch.
643. πῶς αἱ παραδοσεῖς κ.τ.λ.
644. ποσάκις καὶ ποτε ἐπορθήθησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.
644. Evagrius Scolensis on the ten names of God.
645. Three chronological notes.
645. On the works of God in the six days.


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
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13 x 11 in., of writing 11\frac{3}{8} x 8\frac{3}{8} 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 elsewhere the writing becomes more compact and neat, with more lines in a page; with the words τὰ συμβαλλοντα τοῖς φιλοις (p. 568. 10) the writing comes in again. The beginning of the Aristeas is lost; the MS. begins with -ματων ὦ βασιλευ (p. 521. 24). It ends with ριστεας ολοκρατει (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, αμβανεων for λαμβανεων, 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—ποιησειν επιτελοι (50 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.
(2) p. 566. 10. εστιν επιτελεια—διατηρει την (53 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.
(3) p. 559. 19. καθως νπο—διοικειαι 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) Η αναπτω Α*; 562. 20 απαν H (τ suprascr H εορ) apav 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 εισεληλυθεινι ADFL (ειληλυθεινι cett.), 547. 3 ευλογιας ADFL (λογιας cett.), 569. 21 επαινεσαισαι (sic) ADFL, and the omissions which they have in common:

539. 27. ουτος δε εξεσιν—Δεωτιοι χωραν
550. 21. γαρ ὦν ανθρωπος—συνεστρωσε δε παντα} om ADFL.
554. 8. προς ευφροσυνην—ελυθη τη δε

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: μεταδοτικοι ὦν και μεγαλομερης ονθεσι αν απολιποι δοξης ινα δε τα προειρημενα σοι διαμενην. 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 και Ἀλεξανδρος εἶπεν ἑρωτηθείς πώς ἐν ὀλίγῳ
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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.


fol. 1. Aristeas.

6vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.

7. Catena on the Octateuch.

296. πόσαι παραδόσεις εἰσὶ τῆς θελες γραφῆς.

Size of page 12\(\frac{4}{12}\) \(\times\) 9\(\frac{1}{2}\) in., of writing 9\(\frac{4}{12}\) \(\times\) 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\(\frac{1}{2}\) leaves. The Aristeas with the Theodoret seems to have been tacked on to the MS. later, as there is a second numbering of pages (a, b, 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 Italico’.


fol. 1. Aristeas.
22. Theodoret to Hypatius.
304vo. Catena on Genesis and Exodus.
304vo. 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 $14\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $11\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{8}$ 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 Heidelbergca capta spolium fecit et P. M. Gregorio XV trophaeum misit Maximilianus utriusque Bavariae Dux etc. S. R. I. Archidapifer et Princeps Elector, anno Christi MDCCXIII.’


fol. 1—14. Παλλαδίου περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν Βραγμάνων.
15, 16. blank.
17—27. τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸ ἐπίλογον τῆς φυσικῆς ἀκρό-
άσως.
28. blank.
29—44. τοῦ φιλοσοφοφωτάτου καὶ ἰησοῦκωστάτου Κύρου Θεωροῦτον
προδρόμου.
45—70vo. Αριστέας Φιλοκράτης.

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 next 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, Aristaeas. Ex codicibus Ioannis Angeli Ducis ab Altaemps.’

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 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 ἁσφαλως GIM, mistakes such as 529. 14 καταβήκουσα GIM (καθήκ. cett.), 534. 1 μεγαλος GIM (μεγαλοι cett.), 552. 26 δυναμεων GIM (δυναμων cett.), and peculiarities of spelling and vocalization. They almost always insert ν ἐβελκυστικών before consonants, write iota adscript, interchange ο and ω (προτενουσα, πασχωμεν [=πασχομεν], μεταφερον [=ων]) and ι and η (φιλικοος, δαψηλως, τινικαυτα, προδικως), and use itacisms such as βουλεσθε for βουλεσθαι, αρειν 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 παυδεία αυτη G, η παυδείας 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 χρησιν την τραπεζαν IM (την τραπ. προς την χρ. cett.), 540. 7 μετα IM (μεταλα 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:


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 Spiritu 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 υποχειρα ποιουμενος, and (p. 353) 529. 24 inc. δυο πηχεων το μηκος—537. 21 προκαθημενου προς θεωριαν. They are introduced by the heading επισταλης Αριστεως προς Φιλοκρατην εκφρασις. χρυση τραπεζης την εποιησεν o βασιλευς Πτολεμαιος και απεστειλει εις Ιερουσαλημ προς τον τον 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 Aristeae.'

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 (λεγαν for λεγαν), 534. 8 αναστασιν (for αναστασιν), 535. 4 σιμειω (for σιμειω), 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.


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 14½ × 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 hang from ruled lines.

fol. 1. Aristeas to Philocrates.
11vo. Introduction to O.T. books: τά ἐν τῇ παροδίᾳ βιβλίῳ ἀναγεγραμμένα τεῖχη....διατέκαστον τούτων οὕτως καλεῖται καὶ ἀπό μέρους τί περιέχει έκαστον....
14vo. Theodore, εἷς τά ἀπόρα τῆς θείας γραφῆς.
15. Pentateuch with Catena.
311. Joshua—Chronicles, Esdras 1—3, Esther, Judith, Maccabees 1—4, Tobit (to 3. 15).
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It contains the inscription, 'Codicem e Liguria adventum propone nente A. M. Bandinio comparavit Ferdinandus III magnus dux Etruriae et Bibl. Laurent. donavit die 3 Aug. MDCCXCVIII.'


15. Catena on the Octateuch.

It is written in double columns: size of page 13½ x 9¼ in., of writing 10½ x 3¼ 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 (περὶ 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.


fol. 1. Aristeas fragments.


45. Catena on the Octateuch.

The Aristeas is written in a single column: the size of page being 12½ x 9 in., of writing varying from 9 x 7 in. to 7½ x 5¼ 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 Ἀνδραϊαῖος—532. 17 δῦο μεν ησαν τη, 553. 10 ὁ δε εἰπεν εὐχομενος—563. 16 ἡρωτα, 567. 7 -σίλευ κροτω δε—end.


fol. I. Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis (frag.)

inc. πασα γραφη ημων των Χριστιανων θεοπνευστος εστι, at end λειπει.
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2. Fragment of Aristeas inc. (538. 10) πισοσαυντες της γαρ χωρας expl. (568. 1) περιβαλλοντας το ἄγνωστο (note leppei).
10. Catena on the Octateuch.
224. Catena on the Apocalypse inc. δηλει (sic) των 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 9¼ × 7 in., of writing 8¼ × 3¼ in. At the bottom of fol. 1 is written 'Caroli Strozziæ Thomae filii 1635.'


It is written in single column, with 29 lines in a page, the size of page being 12¼ × 8¾ 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 illmi Lelii Ruini ep'l Balneoregian. 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. ii (169 Omont's catalogue), saec. xiii. bombyc., 736 pagg.¹

p. i. Aristeas.
p. i (=21). Catena on the Octateuch.
p. 669. Τερονυμον επιστολη προς Δεξτρον επαρχον πραιτωρι απο ρωμαιαν εις ελληνικα μεταβληθεια ('S. Hieronymi liber de viris illustribus a Sophronio graece versus,' Omont). It is written in single column, the size of page being 13¾ × 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. ως φιλοφρονησει, ως 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.

S. S.
members of the group which are extant at the several passages referred to.

(1) 523. 9. ευκρατεῖς ευενοντο—καὶ τὴν χώραν (78 letters) om BΤΖ.

(2) 529. 11. βουλοθασι καὶ—δισταζεῖν δὲ (51 letters) om BCTΖ.

(3) 532. 17. ἀπὸ τῆς βασεως—τορεία καὶ (48 letters) om BΤΖ.

(4) 533. 13. θεσιν ἥθελεν—ὡς αὖ τίς (41 letters) om BΤΖ.

(5) 547. 12. καὶ κακοποιουσι—τροφην ἀλλα (48 letters) om BPTΖ.

(6) 548. 13. -ται ὡμερα θυσιαζεῖν—οἱ προσφερον- (46 letters) om BPTΖ.

(7) 552. 13. γενοιο—τῇ περὶ σεαυτὸν (47 letters) om BPTΖ.

(8) 564. 25. θεου δέ—τοις αξίοις (45 letters) om BPTΖ.

(9) 566. 24. ἤσιαν γαρ ἰκανοὶ προσβείς (20 letters) om BPTΖ.

Also at 533. 4 the words πρὸς τὴν τῆς αληθείας—τεθεντὼν (48 letters) are omitted by ΤυςSZ (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 ἐν λογῳ before βραχείς, 525. 12 εὰν οὐν φανὴται σοι εὐνομον B (εὰν οὐν φανὴται cett., εὰν οὐν φανὴται Eus.). The phrases εὰν φανὴται σοι and εὰν φανὴται are abundantly attested by the Alexandrian papyri in petitions of subordinates to high officials, but the insertion of εὐνομον receives no support. Again we have 526. 13 χαριστηριον B (χαριστικον cett. Eus.), 527. 18 ἀνδρες των τετιμημενων παρα σοι Ανδρεας και Αριστεας B (Ανδρεας των τετ. παρα σοι και Αρ. cett.: B has misunderstood the genitive), 529. 18 οὐδα γαρ ὃς δαψιλοὺς τῆς υλης αυτοις οὐσης B (ετι γαρ ἐπι τα της ουσης cett. Eus.), 538. Ι σχῆμα B (χῆμα=‘size’ cett.: B has removed a characteristic word of Aristeas, cf. 521. 17, 507. 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 διατελου ἕχων BT (ex. diat. 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 ὡστε κα. την των κυματων θεσιν, while CSZ retain them and add πεποιηθαι καθ ὀ αν μερος.
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569. ἵνα τινὲς ἔρρησιν τὶνες ΒΤ (τὶνες τ. ἰδ. 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 ἀναπαραστῶς ΒΤΖΓΙ Eus¹ (ἀναπαραστῶς ΗΚΑ), 526. 6 προσωπας Βορε TZ Eus. (προσωπας cett.), 547. 7 ins καὶ ποσῶν ΠΖΓΙ Eus¹ (ομ cett.), the Β 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 εὐαυτὸς προεδωκαμὲν εἰς τὸν προερχόμενον ἀνάρα πρεσβεῖαν, but the reading εὐαυτὸς επεδωκαμὲν κ.τ.λ. of the other MSS. is corroborated by the usage of the papyri of the second century B.C. (Paris Pap. 49 καταπεπεραματίσει...εἰς παν τὸ σοὶ χρησίμον εὐαυτὸν επιδίδοναι, Par. Pap. 63 col. 6 πρὸθυμος εὐαυτὸς επιδίδοντων, Grenfell, Erotic Fragment, etc. XI. 6 εἰς τε παν τὸ παραγελλόμενον | προθυμ]ῶς εὐαυτὸς επεδωκομένων).

A few instances where correction is seen at work may be quoted. At 550. 10 ἩΚΑΓΙ read παντα δύναμιν εἰπε παρεσταὶ καθηκοῦντος, ὅσι συγχρησθεῖ (σεσθεί), καμοὶ μὲν ὑμοί. Παντα δύναμιν, which is clearly wrong, is corrected by ΒΤΖ to πασαν δύναμιν, by Ρ to παντὶ (=πανθ)ι δύναμιν; παρεσταὶ is further corrected by ΒΤΖ to παρεσταναι and καμοὶ to καμε, corrections which give a grammatical but hardly an intelligible sentence. The slight alteration of δὲ ὑμῖν for δύναμιν (a correction of Mendelssohn, which had also suggested itself to the present writer) restores sense to the passage, and the Β text is seen to be due to conjecture. Similarly at 555. 1 Β and Ρ have corrected in different ways the characteristic word ἀπεφνατο (‘answer’), Β reading εἰπε and Ρ ἀπεκρινατο: a little before (553. 21) Β reads ἀποκρινεσθαι where the remaining MSS. have ἀποφαίνεσθαι. At 527. 1 ΒΤΖ read τὸν ἀρχισωματοφυλακα (Β at first wrote σωματοφυλακα: τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλακῶν 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 Β 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 γραφεί ΒΤ Eus. (γραφ.clone cett.). In this instance Eusebius altered the form of the sentence by reading γραφεὶ and inserting γαρ after κεκαρισμένος; in ΒΤ the change γραφεί was due to κεκαρισμένος ἐστὶ having become
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corrupted to καὶ χαρισμένος εἰσή; the participle γράφων is corroborated by Josephus (ἐπιστέλλων περί δὲν ἀν θέλησεν 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 Heikeli 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 Eus and Eus'. 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 Freudenthal 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 εἰ δύνατον om Eus. (ins Jos. Ar. codd.), 525. 10 καὶ πολυτυμένων 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 ρυσκοφυλάκας is altered to χρηματοφυλάκας (Jos. paraphrases τοὺς φύλακας τῶν κιβωτῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐτύγχανον οἱ λίθου), 526. 17 επικρίνων κατεστήσα (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 ἀκρίβως (ηκρίβωμενος Ar. codd.), 573. 2 κατὰ δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν (κατὰ δὲ τὴν αὖεσι Δοσ. Ar. codd.). In a few cases a rather longer addition is made; at 544. 22 before τῶν συγγενικῶν the words οὗτε τῶν υποθεσικτων οὗτε are possibly, and at 546. 14 the words επὶ τῶν πολέων καὶ οἰκησεων διὰ τὸ σκέπαζεσθαι are certainly to be attributed to the hand of Eusebius; just before the last passage (546. 11) συντηροῦντας τας αρχας καὶ μεσοτήτας καὶ τελευτας is an unintelligible₁ alteration of the correct reading καὶ συντηροῦντος. Among passages where Eusebius is certainly right may be mentioned 526. 2 ανασπαστός Eus¹ GIBTZ (αναρπαστός cett.), 542. 10 ευδεικτικὸς (ευδικὸς Ar. codd.), 547. 7 the insertion of καὶ ποτὼν Eus¹ GIPZ, and lastly 541. 21. The readings in this passage are instructive:

(1) πρὸς τὰ δὶ ημῶν ἐπιζητῆθεντα Eus.
(2) πρὸς δὶ ημῶν ἐπιζητῆθεντα GIMZ*.
(3) πρὸς ημῶν ἐπιζητῆθεντα HKADFL.
(4) πρὸς δὲ ημῶν ἐπιζητῆθεντῶν BPTZ⁶⁰⁰².

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 αναγραφής (αντιγραφὴς Ar.), 525. 5 τετυχίκε (τετευχὲ Ar.), 526. 8 omission of the negative, 528. 7 the perfect ἀπεσταλκαμεν (Jos. has the perfect πετομφαμεν: ἀπεστειλαμεν Ar.), 527. 20 ποιητῶν Jos. Eus. B (ποιητικῶν οὐ ποιητικῶς 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 ε, ο μέν δὴ θέος, ὡσπερ καὶ ο παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχήν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὀντῶν 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 Νικόλαου Τουρριανοῦ καὶ βασιλικοῦ ἀντιγραφῶν, 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 B\(^1\), T\(^1\) 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 Ἑβ. βιβλ. τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Σακκέλλωνος καὶ Ἀλκ. Ι. Σακκέλλωνος (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 ποσεῖν, 549. 21 μια φωνή (for ὑπὸ μ. φ.), 550. 14 προσκελευσμένος, 572. 20 om τῶν ἱστορικῶν, 573. 19 κυλινδίον.
'Αξιολόγου διηγήσεως, ὦ Φιλόκρατε, περὶ τῆς γενεθείης ἡμῖν ἐντυχίας πρὸς Ἑλεάζαρον τῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερέα συνεσταμένης, διὰ τὸ σὲ περὶ πολλοῦ πεποίηθαι, παρ’ ἑκαστα ὑπομομνήσκων, συνακοῦσα περὶ ὅν ἀπεστάλημεν καὶ διὰ τὶ πεπείραμαι σαφῶς ἐκθέσθαι σοι, κατελθήσω ἂν ἐξεῖς φιλομαθὴ διάθεσιν, ὅπερ μὲ γιατίν ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ, προσμαθόφων οἷος τί καὶ προσλαμβάνειν, ἣτοι κατὰ τὰς ἱστορίας, ἢ καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ πράγμα πεπειραμένῳ. οὕτω γὰρ κατασκευάζεται ψυχής καθάρα διάθεσις, αναλαβόντα τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ πρὸς τὸ πάντων κυριώτατον νενεκύια τὴν εὑσέ-βειαν ἀπλανεί κεχρημένη κανόνι διοικεῖ. Τὴν προαιρέσιν ἐχοντες ἢμεῖς πρὸς τὸ περιέργως τὰ θεία κατανύσω, ἐναυτοῦ ἐπεδωκαμέν εἰς τὸν προερθημένον ἀνδρὰ προσβείαν, καλοκαγαθία καὶ δόξῃ προτειμημένον ὡτὸ τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ κατακεκτημένον μεγίστην ὁφέλειαν τοῖς σὺν ἐαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους τόπους πολίτας, πρὸς τὴν ἔρμηνειαν τοῦ θείου νόμου, διὰ τὸ γεγράφοντα παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐν διφθέραις ἐβραῖκοις γράμμασιν. ἢν δὴ καὶ 4 ἐπουσάμεθα ἢμεῖς σπουδῆ, λαβόντες καιρὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα περὶ τῶν μετουκισθέντων εἰς Αἰγύπτων ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, πρῶτως κεκτημένου τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἰγύπτων παρειληφότος. Ἀξιόν ἔστι καὶ ταύτα σοι δηλώσω, πέπεισμαι γάρ σε μάλλον ἐχοντα πρόσκλησιν πρὸς τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων διάθεσιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν σεμνὴ νομοθεσίαν διεξαγόντων, περὶ ὃν προαιρομέθεα <δηλοῖν, ἀσμένως σε>

Άκουστεθαί, προσφάτως παραγεγενημένων ἐκ τῆς νήσου πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ουκόμενον συνακούειν ὅσα πρὸς ἐπισκευὴν ψυχῆς
6 ὑπάρχει. καὶ πρότερον δὲ διεσημάτησε τοι ἐπὶ δὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀξιωματούσως εἶπε τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἣν μετελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν
cατὰ τὴν λογιστάτην Αἴγυπτον λογιστάτων ἀρχιερέων περὶ τοῦ
7 γένους τῶν Ἰουδαίων. φιλομαθῶς γὰρ ἔχοντι σοι περὶ τῶν δυνα-
μένων ὑφελήσαι διάνοιαν δέον ἐστὶν μεταδιδόναι, μάλιστα μὲν πᾶσι
tοῖς ῥήμασιν, τολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον σοὶ γινθήσεται ἐχόντι τὴν αἴρεσιν, οὐ
μόνον κατὰ τὸ συγγενεῖς ἄδελφον καθεστώτι τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ
8 πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὁρμῆν τὸν αὐτὸν ὅντα ἡμῖν. χρυσοῦ γὰρ χάρις ἐκ
cατασκευὴ τῆς ἄλλη τῶν τετμιμένων παρὰ τοῖς κενοῦσι τυφέλειαν
οὐκ ἔχει τὴν αὐτήν, ὅσον ἡ παίδειας ἀγωγή καὶ ἡ περὶ τούτων
φροντίς. ἦν δὲ μὴ περὶ τῶν προλεγομένων μηκύνοντες ἀδόλεσχον
tι ποιοῦμεν, ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχές τῆς διηγήσεως ἐπανήλθομεν.

§ Jos Eus 9
1 Ἀκατασταθεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως βιβλιοθήκης Δημήτριος ὁ
Ραφηρεύς ἐχρηματίσθη ὁπλά διάφορα πρὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν, εἰ
dυνατὸν, ἀπαίνετα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην βιβλία· καὶ ποιοῦμενος
ἀγορασμοὺς καὶ μεταγράφας ἐπὶ τέλος ἤγαγεν, ὅσον ἐφ' ἐαυτῷ, τὴν
10 τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν. παρόντων οὖν ἡμῶν ἐρωτήσεις Πόσαι
τινὲς μυριάδες τυγχάνουσι βιβλίων; εἶπεν 'Ὑπὲρ τὰς εἰκοσὶ, 20
βασιλεὺς. σπουδάσω δὴ ἐν ὅλῳ χρόνῳ πρὸς τὸ πληρωθῆναι πεντή-
κοντα μυριάδας τὰ λοιπά. προσήγγειται δὲ μοι καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
νόμιμα μεταγράφης ἠξία καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοι βιβλιοθήκης εἰναι.
11 Τῇ τὸ κωλύνον οὖν, εἶπεν, ἐστὶ σε τούτο ποιῆσαι; πάντα γὰρ ὑπο-
tέτακταί σοι τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν. δὲ Δημήτριος εἶπεν 25
'Ερμηνείας προσδέιται χαρακτῆρι γὰρ ἰδίους κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίων
χρώνων, καθάπερ Ἀλυπτεί τῇ τῶν γραμμάτων θέσει, καθὼ καὶ
φωνὴν ἰδίαν ἔχουσιν. ὑπολαμβάνων τὴν Συριακὴν χρήσιμαν· τὸ δ'
οὖν ἐστιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐτέρος τρόπος. Μεταλαβῶν δὲ ἐκαστὸν ὁ βασιλεύς ἐπε γραφήναι πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅπως τὰ προειρημένα τελείωσιν λάβῃ.⁴

Νομίσας δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ ἤλιοι, ἐνεργεία περὶ τῶν πολέμων τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως—ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐπελθὼν τὰ κατὰ κοίλην Σωτῆραν καὶ Φωνῆκαν ἀπαντά, συγχρόνως εὐθυμεῖ, μετὰ ἀνδρείας, τοὺς μὲν μετωρίους, οὐ δὲ ζημιαλωτίζε, φόβῳ πάντα ὑποχείρια ποιούμενος· ἐν ὅσῳ καὶ πρὸς δέκα μυριάδας ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρας εἰς Λύγιππον μετήγαγεν, ἂφ᾽ ὅπως τρεῖς μυριάδας 13 καθοπλίσας ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν κατόφυσεν ἐν τοῖς φρουρίοις (ἢδ᾽ μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἱκανῶν εἰσελθουσῶν σὺν τῷ Πέρσῃ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἐτέρων συμμαχιῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμιτίχῳ· ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὸσοῦτοι τῷ πλήθει παρεγεννηθήσαν, ὅσους Πτολεμαῖος δ ὁ τῶν Δάνην μετῆγαγε) καθὼς δὲ προειπομεν, ἐπιλέξας τοὺς ἄριστους 14 ταῖς ἕλκιαις καὶ ρώμῃ διαφέροντας καθόπλισε, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν χῦμα πρεσβυτέρων καὶ νεωτέρων, ἐτι δὲ γυναικῶν, εἰσαεν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, οὐχ ὡς τῇ προσαρέσει κατὰ ψυχὴν ἔχων, ὡς κατακρατούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιῶτων, δὲ ἂς ἐπεσυνήτῳ χρείας εἰς τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἁγῶσιν—ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπεὶ τινα παρεύρεσιν εἰς τὴν ἀπόλουσαν αὐτῶν ἀπελάβομεν, καθὼς προδεδήλωται, τουτούτως ἐχρησάμεθα λόγους πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. Μὴποτε ἀλογον ἃ· ἐλέγχεσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν 15 τῶν πραγμάτων, ὦ βασιλεῦ. τῆς γὰρ νομοθεσίας κείμενης πάσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἢν ἡμεῖς οὐ μόνον μεταγράφαι ἐπινοοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διερμηνεύσαμεν, τίνα λόγον ἐξόμεν πρὸς ἀποστολήν, ἐν οἰκείας ὑπαρχόντων ἐν τῇ σῇ βασιλείᾳ πληθῶν ἱκανῶν· ἀλλὰ τελεία καὶ πλουσία ψυχῆ ἀπόλυσον τοὺς συνεχόμενος ἐν ταλαιπωρίαις, κατευθύνοντος σου τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ τεθεικότος αὐτοῦ θεοῦ τὸν 30 νόμον, καθὼς περιείργασαί. τῶν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτύσθην 16
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απεριφρηκτική λέξη που δεν έχει αποκτήσει σημασία.
τινες προῆσαν, ἣ μετὰ ταῦτα παρεισῆχθησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν.

6 ὑπὲρ τὰ τετρακόσια τάλαντα τὴν δόσιν ἀπέφαινον εἶναι. καὶ τοῦ 21 προστάγματος ἐδὲ τὸ ἀντίγραφον οὐκ ἀχρηστὸν οἴνομα κατακεχωρίσθαι. πολλῷ γὰρ ἡ μεγαλομοιρία φανερωτέρα καὶ εὐδηλος ἐσται τοῦ βασιλέως, τοῦ θεοῦ κατασχύνοντος αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σωτηριὰν γενέσθαι πλήθεσιν ἰκανοῖς. ἣν ἐδὲ τοιοῦτο Τοῦ βασιλέως προσ- 22 τάξαντος—"Οσοὶ τῶν συνεστρατευμένων τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην τόπους ἐπελθόντες τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χῶραν ἔγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο σωμάτων Ἰουδαίων καὶ ταῦτα διακεκομίσαν εἰς τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἣ καὶ πεπράκασιν ἐτέροις, ὅμοιος δὲ καὶ εἰ τινές προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσὶν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀπολύειν παρὰ χρῆμα τοὺς ἐξοντας, κομιζομένους αὐτίκα ἐκάστου σῶματος δραχμὰς ἐκοσι, τοὺς μὲν στρατιώτας τῇ τῶν ὦφωνῶν ὀδοῖ, τοὺς δὲ λουποὺς ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης. νομίζομεν 23 ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν βουλησάν καὶ παρὰ τὸ καλῶς ἔχων ἡχιμαλωτεῦσαι τούτους, διὰ δὲ τὴν στρατιωτικὴν προπέτειαν τὴν τε χῶραν αὐτῶν κατεφθάραι καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων μεταγωγὴν εἰς τὴν Ἀγίουπτον γεγονέναι: ἰκανὴ γὰρ ἢν ἡ παρὰ τὸ πεδίον γεγονία ἐκ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὤφελεία. διὸ παντελῶς ἀπετιεῖκης ἐστι καὶ ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καταδυναστεία. πάσιν ὁ δὲ ἀνθρώποι τὸ 24 δίκαιον ἀπονεμεῖν ὀμολογούμενοι, πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀλόγως καταδυναστευμένους, καὶ κατὰ πάν ἐκζήτητες τὸ καλῶς ἔχων πρὸς τε τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν κατὰ πάντων εὐσέβειαν, προστετάγμενον ὡσα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστὶ σωμάτων ἐν οἰκείαις <πανταχῆ> καθ' ὄντινόν τρόπον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, κομιζομένους τοὺς ἐξοντας τὸ προκειμένον κεφάλαιον ἀπολύειν, καὶ μηδένα κακοχόλως περὶ τοιῶν μηδὲν οἰκονομεῖν. τὰς ὀ ἀπογραφὰς ἐν ἡμέραις τρισίν, ἀφ' ἃς ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκκεῖται τὸ πρόσταγμα, ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τοὺς καθεστάμενους περὶ
25 τούτων, καταδεικνύτας εἴθε καὶ τὰ σώματα. διειλήφαμεν γάρ καὶ
ήμιν συμφέρειν καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τούτοις ἐπιτελεσθήναι. τὸν δὲ
βουλόμενον προσαγγέλλειν περὶ τῶν ἀπειθησάντων, ἐφ᾿ ὧν τοῦ φανέρο-
τος ἐνόχου τὴν κυρίαν ἔξευσ· τὰ δὲ ὑπάρχοντα τῶν τοιούτων εἴς
26 τὸ βασιλικόν ἀναληφθῆσαι. Εἰσδοθέντος τοῦ προστάγματος, ὅπως ἐπαναγινωσκῇ τὸ βασιλεῖ, τὰ ἄλλα πάντες ἔχοντες
πλὴν τοῦ. Καὶ εἰ τινὲς προῆσαν ἤ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσηγημένοι εἰς
tῶν τοιούτων, αὐτὸς τοῦτο ὁ βασιλεὺς προσέθηκε, μεγαλομορφία καὶ
μεγαλοψυχία χρησάμενος, ἐκέλευσε τοῖς διαφόροις δόσιν ἀθρόων ὅσαν ἀπομειρίσατο τοὺς ὑπηρέταις τῶν ταμγαῖων καὶ βασιλείας.

27 λικνίστι τραπεζίτισι· οὗτος δοξθεὶν ἐκεκυρωτο ἐν ἡμέραις ἐπταυτές· πλείον δὲ ταλαντών ἐξακοσίων ἐξήκοντα ἤ δόσις ἐγεγονεί. πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ
tῶν ἐπιμαστίδιων τέκνων σὺν ταῖς μητράσεις ἑλευθερώστηκαν. προσαν-
εισχθέντος εἰ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐκκοσῳδαχμία δοθῆσαται, καὶ τοῦτο
ἐκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ποιεῖν, ὀλοσχερῶς περὶ τοῦ δόξαντος ἄπαντ' ἑν
tεπιτελών.

§ Εὐσκαρχήθη ταῦτα, τὸν Δημήτριον ἐκέλευσεν εἰσδοθόναι
περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων βιβλίων ἀναγραφῆς. πάντα γὰρ διὰ
προσταγμάτων καὶ μεγάλης ἀσφαλείας τοὺς βασιλεύειν τούτους
dιψκέτο, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπερριμμένως οὐδὲ εἰκῇ. διόπερ καὶ τὸ τῆς 20
εἰσδοσθαυς καὶ τὰ τῶν ἑπιστολῶν ἀντίγραφα κατακεχώρικα, καὶ τὸ
tῶν ἀπεσταλμένων πλῆθος καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου κατασκευήν, διὰ τὸ
μεγαλομορφία καὶ τέχνη διαφέρειν ἐκάστον αὐτῶν. τῆς δὲ εἰσδο-
29 σεως ἐστιν ἀντίγραφον τοῦτο ὁ βασιλεὺς μεγάλων παρὰ Δημήτριου.
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τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἐπιμέλειαν, προσαναφέρω σοι τάδε. τοῦ νόμου Ἱουδαίων βιβλία σὺν ἑτέροις οἷς τούτον ἀπολείπεις τυγχάνει γάρ Ἐβραίκοις γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγόμενα, ἀμελέστερον δὲ, καὶ οὖχ ὡς ὑπάρχει, σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδῶν προσαναφέρεις. τούτοις προσνόμησαι γὰρ βασιλικῆς οὐ τέτευχε. δεόν δὲ ἔστι καὶ ταῦθ' ὑπάρχειν παρά σοι διηκριβωμένα, διὰ τὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον εἶναι καὶ ἀκέραιον τὴν νομοθεσίαν ταύτην, ὡς ἣν οὖσαν θείαν. διὸ πόρρω γεγόνασι οἳ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλῆθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προεἰρήμενῶν βιβλίων, καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰ πεπολυτεμένων καὶ πολυτευμένων ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἀγνήν τινα καὶ σεμνῆν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν, ὡς φησίν Ἐκατάοις ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης. εὰν οὖν φαίνεται, βασιλεύς, γραφήσεται πρὸς τὸν Ἱσραηλίτην, ἀποστειλάς τοὺς μάλιστα καλῶς βεβιωκότας καὶ προεβυτέρους οὕτως ἁγίας, ἐμπείρους τῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν ἑαυτῶν, ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἔξ, ὡς τὸ σύμφωνον ἐκ τῶν πλείονον ἐξετάσαντε καὶ λαβόντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἔρμηνεαν ἀκριβές, ἀξίως καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς σής προαιρέσεως, θώμεν εὐσήμως. εὐτύχει διὰ παντὸς. Ἡ τῆς δὲ εἰσδόσεως ταύτης γενομένης, ἔκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γραφήναι πρὸς τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον περὶ τούτων, σημαίναντα καὶ τὴν γενομένην ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν αἵματων. ἐδώκε δὲ καὶ εἰς κατασκευὴν κρατήρων τε καὶ φιαλῶν καὶ τραπέζης καὶ σπουδείων χρυσῶν μὲν ὀλίγης τάλαντα πεντήκοντα καὶ ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ λίθων ἰκανῶν τι πλήθος— ἔκέλευσε δὲ τοὺς βισκοφύλακας τοὺς τεχνιταῖς, ὡς ἄν προαιρότατα, τὴν ἐκλογήν διδόναι—καὶ νομίσματος εἰς θυσίας καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς τάλαντα ἐκατόν. δηλώσομεν δὲ σοὶ περὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς, ὡς ἄν τὰ τῶν ἑπταστόλων ἀντίγραφα διέλθωμεν. ἥν δὲ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴ τὸν τύπον ἔχουσα τούτοις Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος 35
Ἐλεάζάρῳ ἀρχιερεὶ καὶ ἔρρωσθαι. ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει πλείονος τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν χώραν κατωκίσθαι γεννηθέντας ἀνασπάστους ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσόλυμων ὑπὸ Περσῶν, καθ’ ὅν ἐπεκράτον ἔρρωσθαι· ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ συνεληφθεὶν τῷ πατρὶ ἦμῶν εἰς τὴν Ἁγιασμνον 36 αἰχμαλώτους.— ἀφ’ ἐν πλείονος εἰς τὸ στρατιωτικὸν σύνταγμα 5 κατεχώρισεν ἔτι μείζονες μισθοφορίας, ὥμως δὲ καὶ τοὺς προόντας κρίνας πιστῶν φοβοῦρα κτίσας ἀπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς τὸ τῶν Ἁγιασμνον ἐθνὸς φάβον [μῆν] ἔχη διὰ τούτων καὶ ἦμεις δὲ παραλαβοῦντες τὴν βασιλείαν φιλανθρωπότερον ἀπαντῶμεν τοὺς πάσιν, τολὺ δὲ 37 μᾶλλον τοὺς σοὶς πολίταις—δύτερ δέκα μυριάδας αἰχμαλώτων ἠλευ- 10 θερώκαμεν, ἀποδόντες τοῖς κρατοῦσι τὴν κατ’ ἄξιαν ἀργυρικήν τιμὴν, διὸ ἐπερημοῦνεν καὶ εἰ τι κακῶς ἐπράξη διὰ τὰς τῶν ὀργὰς ὀρμᾶς, διειληφότες εὐσεβῶς τοῦτο πράξαι, καὶ τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ ἱεράστηκαν, ὥς ἦμεν τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δόξῃ κατάστητι 15 παρ’ ὅλην τὴν ὀικουμένην διατετήρηκεν· εἰς τὸ στρατεύμα τοὺς ἅμαιστάτους ταῖς ἡλικίαις τετάχαμεν, τοὺς δὲ δυναμένους καὶ περὶ ἦμας εἶναι, τῆς περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν πίστεως ἄξιους, ἐπὶ χρειῶν καθεστά- 20 καμεν. βουλομένων δ’ ἦμῶν καὶ τούτους χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσι ποῖς κατὰ τὴν ὀικουμένην Ἰουδαίους καὶ τοὺς μετέπειτα, προκήρυμεν, ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμον ἦμων μεθερμηνευόντα γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν παρ’ ἦμῶν λεγομένων Ἐβραίκων γραμμάτων, ἐν ὑπάρχῃ καὶ ταῦτα παρ’ 25 ἦμιν ἐν βιβλιοθήκῃ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις βασιλικοῖς βιβλίοις. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας σπουδῆς ἄξιος ἐπιλεξάμενος ἀνδρὰς καλῶς βεβιωκότας προσβύτεροι, ἐμπειρεῖς ἐχοντας τοῦ νόμου, καὶ δυνατοὺς ἐρμηνεύσαι, ἀφ’ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἦς, ὡς ἐκ τῶν πλείονων τοῦτο σύμφωνον εὐφρενῇ, διὰ τὸ περὶ μεζόνων εἶναι τὴν σκέψιν. οἰόμεθα γὰρ ἐπιτελεσθέντος τούτου μεγάλην ἀποφέτευθαι δοξαν.
απεστάλκαμεν δὲ περὶ τούτων Ἄνδρεαν τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων 40 καὶ Ἀριστέαν, τιμωμένους παρ᾽ ἡμῖν, διαλέξομένους σοι καὶ κομι-ζοντας ἀπαρχαῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναθημάτων καὶ εἰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑκατόν. γράφων δὲ καὶ σὺ πρὸς ἡμᾶς περὶ δὲν ἕαν 5 βούλη κεχαρισμένος ἐσθ, καὶ φιλιὰς ἄξιον τι πράξεις, ὡς ἐπιτελεσθησομένων τὴν ταχίστην περὶ δὲν ἄν αἰρῇ ἐρρωσο. Πρὸς 41 ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀντέγραψεν εἰδεχομένως ὁ Ἐλεάζαρος ταῦτα Ἐλεάζαρος ἀρχιερεὺς Πτολεμαίῳ φίλῳ γνησίῳ χαίρειν. αυτὸς τε ἐρρωσο καὶ ἡ βασιλισσα Ἀρισινή, ἡ ἀδελφή, καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι καὶ ὡς βουλήμεθα, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ γυϊάνομεν. λαβόντες τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολὴν μεγάλως 42 ἐξάρημεν διὰ τὴν προαρτήκειν καὶ τὴν καλὴν βουλὴν, καὶ συνα-γαγόντες τὸ πῶς ἐπήθης παρανέγωμεν αὐτοῖς, ἕνα εἰδοῦ ἐν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν εὐσέβειαν. ἐπεδείξαμεν δὲ καὶ τὰς φιλιὰς ὡς 15 ἀπέστειλας, χρυσὰς εἴκοσι καὶ ἀργυρὰς τριάκοντα, κρατὺς πέντε, καὶ τράπεζαν εἰς ἀνάθεσιν, καὶ εἰς προσαγωγὴν θυσίων καὶ εἰς ἐπισκεύας ἄν ἄν δέησαι τὸ ἱερὸν ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑκατόν, ἀπέρ 43 ἐκόμισσαν Ἄνδρεας τῶν τετμημένων παρὰ σοὶ καὶ Ἀριστέας, ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παιδείας διαφέροντες καὶ τῆς σῆς ἁγωνίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἄξιοι κατὰ πάντα· οἱ καὶ μετέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὰ παρὰ σοῦ, πρὸς ἄν καὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἀνηκόσιον ἀρμόζοντα τοὺς σοὺς γράμμασιν πάντα γὰρ ὅσα σοὶ συμφέρει, καὶ εἰ παρὰ φύσιν ἔστιν, ὑπακούσο-μεθα· τοῦτο γὰρ φιλίας καὶ ἀγαπήσεως σημείον ἔστι. μεγάλα γὰρ καὶ σὺ καὶ ἀνεπιληπτικὰ τοὺς πολίτας ἡμῶν κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους 44
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45 εὐπρέπεικας. εὐθέως οὖν προσηγάγομεν ὑπὲρ σοῦ θυσίας καὶ τῆς ἄδελφης καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν φίλων· καὶ ηὔφασ τὸν τὸ πλήθος, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθὼς προαιρῇ διὰ παντὸς, καὶ διασώζῃ σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ δόξης ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεός, καὶ ὅπως γένηται σοι συμφερόντως καὶ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἥ τοῦ ἀγίου νόμου 5

46 μεταγραφῆς. παρὸντων ἐπέλεξαμεν ἀνδρας καλους καὶ ἁγαθοὺς πρεσβυτεροὺς, ἀφ’ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ, οὕς καὶ ἀποστείλαμεν ἐχοντας τὸν νόμον. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις, βασιλεῦ δίκαιε, προστάξας, ὅς ἂν ἡ μεταγραφὴ γένηται τῶν βιβλίων, ἵνα πάλιν ἀποκαταστα-

1Jos Eus 47 ὦσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἅσφαλῶς οἱ ἄνδρες. ἐρρωσ.Ἡ Εἰς ὁ δὲ πρῶτης 10

φυλῆς. Ἰώσηφος Ἑξεκίας Ζαχαρίας Ἰωάννης Ἑξεκίας Ἑλισσαῖος. δευτέρας. Ἰουδᾶς Σίμων Σομόηλος Ἀδαῖος Ματταθίας Ἑσχελμίας. τρίτης. Νεκμίας Ἰώσηφος Θεοδόσιος Βασίας Ὀρνίας Δάκις. 48 τετάρτης. Ἰωνᾶθας Ἀβραάμ Ἑλισσαῖος Ἀνανίας Χαβρίας...

πέμπτης. Ἰσακος Ἰάκωβος Ιησοὺς Σαββατάιος Σίμων Λευι. 15 ἐκτης. Ἰουδᾶς Ἰωσήφος Σίμων Ζαχαρίας Σομόηλος Σελεμίας. 49 εἰδιομῆς. Σαββατάιος Σεδεκίας Ἰάκωβος Ἰσαχος Ἰησοὺς Ναταθίος.

δύοδεκ. Ἡθοδόσιος Ἰάσων Ἰησοῦς Θεοδόσιος Ἰωάννης Ἰωάννης.

τρίτης. Ἡθοφιλος Ἀβρααμ Ἀρσαμος Ἰάσων Ἑνδεμίας Δανίλου. 50 δεκάτης. Ἡρεμίας Ἑλεάζαρος Ζαχαρίας Βαβέας Ἑλισσαῖος Δαβαίος. 20 ἐνδεκάτης. Σαμουήλος Ιωσήφος Ἰουδᾶς Ἰωάννης Χαβεῦ Δοσίλεος.

δωδεκάτης. Ἰσαήλος Ἰωάννης Ἡθοδόσιος Ἀρσαμος Ἀβεῖλης Ἕξε-

51 κῆλος. οἱ πάντες εἰδιομῆκοντα δύο. Καὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸς τὴν 

τοῦ βασιλείους ἐπιστολῆν τοιαῦτης ἐτύχχαν ἀντηγραφῆς <ὑπὸ> 

tῶν περὶ τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον.
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ωσ δὲ ἐπηγγειλόμεν καὶ τὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων διασαφῆς, § 10 ουήσω. πολυτεχνία γὰρ διαφέροντα συνετελέσθη, τοῦ βασιλέως πολλῆς ἐπίδοσιν ποιουμένων καὶ παρ‘ ἐκαστὸν ἐπιθεωροῦντο τοὺς τεχνίτας. διὸ παριδεῖν οὐδὲν ἥδυναν οὐδὲ εἰκὴ συνετελέσαι. 5 πρῶτον δὲ σοι τὰ περὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἐξηγήσομαι. Ἡρωδών 52 μεῖον μὲν οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπέροπλον τι ποιήσας τοὺς μέτροις τὸ κατασκευασμα. προσέταξε δὲ πυθέοθαι τῶν ἀνὰ τὸν τόπον, ηθικὴ τὰς ἑστὶν ἥ προοίμα καὶ κειμένη κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. ὅσ δὲ ἀπεφήναντο τὰ μέτρα, προσεπηρώτησεν, εἰ κατασκευάσει 53 μείζων. τινὲς μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἔλεγον μηδὲν ἐπικυλύειν. οὐ δὲ εἶπε βουλεύεις καὶ πενταπλὴν τοῖς μεγέθεσι ποιῆσαι, διοστάξεις δὲ μήποτε ἀχριστὸς γένηται πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας. οὐ γὰρ αἱρεῖσθαι τὸ κεῖσθαι μόνον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ <τὰ> παρ’ 54 αὐτοῦ, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον χάριν ἔχειν, εάν τὰς καθηκονίας λειτουργίας ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπ’ αὐτοῦ κατασκευασμένων οἷς καθήκε ποιώντα δεόντως. οὐ γὰρ ἑνεκὲν σπάνεως χρυσοῦ τὰ προσυντελεσμένα βραχύμετρα 55 καθέτηκεν, ἀλλὰ φαίνεται πρὸς τινα λόγον, εἶπεν, οὕτως συνεστηκέναι τοῖς μέτροις. ἐτι γὰρ ἐπιταγῆς οὕσης οὐθὲν ἀν ἐπιστάνσε. διόπερ οὐ παραβατέον οὐδὲ ὑπερβηθέν τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα. τὴν μὲν 56 οὖν ποικιλία τῶν τεχνῶν ἐκέλευσεν ὅτι μάλιστα χρήσασθαι, σεμνῷς ἀπαντα διανοούμενοι καὶ φύσιν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν εἰς τὸ συνιδεῖν πραγμάτων ἐμφασιν. ὡσα δ’ ἂν ἥ ἀγραφα, πρὸς καλλονὴν ἐκέλευσε ποιεῖν: ὡσα δὲ διὰ γραπτῶν, μέτρα αὐτοῦς κατακολουθήσαι. ἄγο γὰρ πίθεων τὸ μύκος, τὸ δὲ ᾿Ὑσος πίθεος καὶ ᾿Ημίσος 57 ψυκτέλουν, χρυσίον δοκίμων στερεάν πάντοθεν τὴν ποίησιν ἐργα- 24 Ex 25ρρ ff

σάμενοι, λέγω δὲ οὗ περὶ τι περιπτυγμένου τοῦ χρυσοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἑλασμὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεδέσθαι. στεφάνης δὲ ἐπέσησαν παλαιστιαίαν κυκλόθεν· τὰ δὲ κυμάτια στρεπτά, τὴν ἀναγυλφὴν ἔχουσα σχοινίδων ἐκτυποῦν, τῷ τορείᾳ θαυμαστῶς ἔχουσαν ἐκ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν· ἤν γὰρ τριγυνία. καὶ καθ' ἐκαστον μέρος ἡ διατύπωσις τῆς ἐνεργείας τῇ αὐτήν διάθεσιν ἔχειν, ὡστε, καθ' ὁ ἄν μέρος στρέφοιτο, τῇ πρόσοψιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτήν, κειμένον δὲ κατὰ τῆς στεφάνης τὸ μὲν ἥν εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν τράπεζαν ἀπόκλιμα τὴν διατύπωσιν ἔχειν τῆς ὁραίωτητος, τὸ δὲ ἐκτός κλίμα πρὸς τὴν προσάγωντος εἶναι θεωρεῖν.

60 διὸ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν δὲ εἶναι τῶν δύο κλιμάτων συνέβαινε, μετέρων 10 ἐπικείμενην, ὃς προειρήκαμεν, τριγώνου κατεσκευασμένου, καθ' ὁ ἄν μέρος στρέφοιτο. λιθῶν τε πολυτελῶν ἐν αὐτῷ διαθέσεις ὑπήρχον ἀνὰ μέσων τῶν σχοινίδων· ἐτέρος παρὰ ἐτέρον πλοκὴν εἴχον ἁμήν 61 μητὸν τῇ ποίησε. πάντες δὲ ἥσαν διὰ τριμιᾶτον κατειλήμμενοι χρυσαῖς περόναι πρὸς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γωνιῶν αἱ 15 κατακλείδεις συνεσφυγοῦν πρὸς τὴν συνοχήν. ἐκ πλαγίων δὲ κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην κυκλόθεν τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀνω πρόσοψιν ψωθεία κατεσκευαστῷ διάλθεος, ἐκτύπωσιν ἔχουσα προσοχής συνεχεῖσίν ἀναγυλφαὶς βαδδωταῖς, πυκνὴν ἔχουσας τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλα θέσιν περὶ 62 ὀλὴν τὴν τράπεζαν. ὅτα δὲ τῆς τράπεζης πρὸς τὰς λίθους τῆς 20 ψωθείας, στεφάνων ἐποίησαν οἱ τεχνίται πάγκαρπον, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ προδήλως ἔχουσα βοτρύων καὶ σταχύων, ἐτί δὲ φοινίκων καὶ μῆλων ἐλαιὰς τε καὶ βοῶν καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, τοὺς δὲ λίθους ἐργασάμενοι πρὸς τὴν προειρημένοις καρπῶν διατύπωσιν, ἔχοντας
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ἐκάστου γένους τὴν χρόναν, ἀνέδησαν τῷ χρυσίῳ κύκλῳ περὶ ὀλην τὴν τῆς τραπέζης κατασκευήν κατὰ κρόταφον. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ 64 στεφάνου διάθεσιν, ὄμος κατὰ τὴν τῆς φωθεσίας διασκευήν κατεσκεύαστο, καὶ τὰ λουτά τῆς ῥαβδώσεως καὶ διαγλυφής, <διὰ τὸ> 5 καὶ' ἀμφότερα τὰ μέρη τὴν τράπεζαν πρὸς τὴν χρήσιν πεποιηθαί, καθ' ὃ ἂν μέρος ἀἱρεύτω, ὡστε καὶ τὴν τῶν κυμάτων θέσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς στεφάνης εἶναι κατὰ τὸ τῶν πολῶν μέρος. ἔλασμα γὰρ ἐποίησεν 65 σαν καθ' ὅλου τοῦ πλάτους τῆς τραπέζης στερεόν δακτύλων τεσσάρων, ὡστε τοὺς πόδας ἐνίσθαυ εἰς τούτο, περόνας <σύν> κατακλείσω
10 ἔχοντας ἐσφύγχαι κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην, ἵνα, καθ' ὃ ἂν ἀἱρεύται μέρος, ἡ χρήσις ὀ. τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ ἑπιφάνειαν θεωρεῖται ἀμφοτεροδεξίον τῆς κατασκευής οὐσίας. ἐπ' αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς τραπέζης 66 μαϊάνδρου ἐκτυπών ἐποίησαν, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ λίθους ἔχοντα κατὰ μέσον πολυτελείς <τῶν> πολυειδῶν, ἀνθράκων τε καὶ σμαράγδων, ἐτὶ δὲ 15 ὄνυχος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γενών τῶν διαφερόντων ἐν ὑφαίστητη. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ μαϊάνδρου διάθεσιν ἐπέκειτο σχιστή πλοκή, 67 θαυμαστὰ ἔχουσα, ἁρμοβυθὴν ἀποτελοῦσα τὴν ἀνά μέσον θεωρίαν· ἐφ' ὡς κρυστάλλου λίθου καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ἕλεκτρον ἐντευτόπω, ἀμύητον θεωρίαν ἀποτελοῦν τοῖς θεωροῦσιν. τοὺς δὲ πόδας ἐποίησαν 68 20 τὰς κεφαλιδὰς ἔχοντας κρινωτάς, ἀνάκλασιν κρίνων ὑπὸ τὴν τράπεζαν λαμβανόντων, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἔντος προσώψεως ὀρθὴν ἔχοντα τὴν πετάλωσιν. ἦ δὲ ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἔρεισι τοῦ ποδὸς ἀνθρακὸς λίθου πάν· 69 τοθεν παλαιστίαια, κρηπίδος ἔχουσα τάξιν κατὰ τὴν πρόσωψιν, ὡς τῷ δὲ δακτύλῳ τὸ πλάτος ἔχουσα· ἐφ' ὅν ἐπίκειται τὸ πάν ἐλασμα 25 τοῦ ποδοῦ. κατασκεύασαν δὲ ἐκφύνοντα κισσῶν ἀκάνθων πλεκόμενον 70 ἐκ τοῦ λίθου, σὺν ἀμπελῷ περιελεύομεν κυκλόθεν τῷ ποδὶ σὺν
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τοίς βότρυσιν, οἱ λιθουργεῖς ἦσαν, μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς. ἡ δ' αὐτὴ διάθεσις ἦν τῶν τεσσάρων ποδών, πάντα ἐνεργῶς πεποιημένα καὶ προσηγμένα, τῆς ἐμπερίας καὶ τέχνης τῶν ὑπεροχὰς ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχοντα πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὡστε καὶ ῥητέρων τοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα πνεύματος κίνησιν ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὴν τῶν φύλλων 5 θέσιν, πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀλήθειας διάθεσις τεσσαρωμένων ἀπάντων.

71 ἐποίησαν δὲ τριμερές τὸ στόμα τῆς τραπέζης, οἰονεὶ τριπτυχον, πελεκύνως συναρμοζόμενα γομφωτοὺς πρὸς ἕαυτα κατὰ τὸ πάχος τῆς κατασκευῆς, ἀθέατον καὶ ἀνέφερον τὴν τῶν ἁρμῶν κατασκευάσσετε συμβολήν. ἡμιπιχών δὲ οὐκ ἐλάσσονος ἦν τὸ πάχος τῆς ὀλίγης 10 τραπέζης, ὡστε πολλῶν εἶναι ταλίνων τῆς ὀλίγης διασκευήν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐ προήρτο τοῖς μεγέθεσιν οὐδὲν προσθεῖναι οὐ βασιλεὺς, ὡσπον ἔδει δαπανηθῆναι κατασκευαζομένων μειζόνων, ταῦτα ἀποδέδωκε πλείονα: καὶ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐπετελέσθη θαυμασίας καὶ ἀξιολόγοις ἔχοντα, καὶ τοῖς τέχναις ἀμίμητα, καὶ τῇ 15 καλλονή διαπρεπῆ.

73 Τῶν δὲ κρατήρων δύο μὲν ἦσαν <χρυσοὶ> 17 γάρ κατασκευὴν, φολιδωτὴν ἔχοντες ἀπὸ τῆς βάσεως μέχρι του μέσου την διασκευὴν τῇ τορείᾳ, καὶ τὴν τῶν λίθων ἀνά μέσον τῶν φολίδων 20 σύνδεσιν πολυτέχνως ἔχοντες. εἶτα μαίανδρος ἐπέκειτο πηχαίος ύψει, τὴν δ' ἐκτύπωσιν ἐνυπήρχε διὰ λιθώσεως ποικīλής, ἐμφαίνων σον ὀραίοτητι τὸ τῆς τέχνης φιλόσοφον. ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτων βάσιν, ἐφ' ἃ διαπλοκή ράμμβον, δικτυωτὴν ἔχουσα τὴν πρόσοψιν ἐως ἐπὶ τὸ 25 στόμα. τὸ δ' ἀνὰ μέσον ἀπαθίδαικοι λίθων ἑτέρων παρ' ἑτέρως, τοῖς γένεσι παραλλαγὴν ἔχοντων, τετραδακτύλων οὐκ ἐλαττὼν, ἀνεπληροῦν τὸ τῆς καλλονῆς ἐναργεῖ. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς στεφάνης τοῦ στόματος κρίνουν τύπωσις σὺν ἀνθέμισι καὶ βοτρύνων σχοινία διάπλοκοι 30 διευτυπῶντο κυκλόθεν. οἱ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοιαύτην εἰχον τὴν κατασκευήν, χωροῦντες ύπὲρ δύο μετρητάς· οἱ δ' ἀργυροὶ λείαν

KAGIBC 1 oi] o GI 2 εναργῶς ΒΖ 3 προηγεμένα Wend. 7 στοιμά] σχημα Jos 8 συναρμοζόμενον KA 9 αδείον codd txt ex Jos (αραιτόν) 10 ἡμιπιχώνου B | ην KB | η cett 12 προειρήτω GCTZ | οἰων CTZ 13 om μειζόνων C | απεδωκέ Wend. cf autem § 173 14 απετελεσθη BCT 15 την τεχνήν C 16 χρυσοί (om codd) ex Jos (χρυσοί) suppl. 17, 18 apó τῆς βασ.—τορεία καὶ om BTZ 18 πορεία G 19 κυκλόθεν GI 25 ? ενεργεῖς 26 σχοινίω codd txt ex Jos conj Schmidt 28 λιαν
ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ. 565

εἶχον τὴν διασκευὴν, ἐνοπτρὸν δὲ γεγονοῦναν πρὸς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θαυμασίως ἔχουσαν, ὡστε πάν τὸ προσαχθὲν ἄπανγαζοσθαί σαφέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τοῖς κατόπτροις. οὐκ ἐφικτὸν δ΄ ἐστὶν ἐξήγησασθαι τα προσυντελεσθέντα πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐμφασιν. ὡς γὰρ ἐπετελέσθη, τεθέντων τῶν κατασκευασμάτων ἐτέρου παρ’ ἑτέρον—λέγω δὲ πρὸτόν ἄργυρου κράτηρος, εἶτα χρυσοῦ, πάλιν ἄργυροῦ καὶ χρυσοῦ—παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητος ἐγένετο τῆς προσόψεως ἡ διάθεσις, καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν προσιόντων οὐ δυναμένων ἀφίστασθαι διὰ τὴν περιαγγείαν καὶ τὸ τῆς ὀψεως τερπνὸν. ποικίλη γὰρ ἢν ἢ τῆς 78

10 ἐπιφανείας ἐνέργειας. προσορώντων γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ κατασκευῆς, ψυχαγωγία τις ἦν μετὰ θαυμασμοῦ, συνεχῶς ἐφ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐπιβαλλοῦσας τής διανοίας τεχνίτευμα. καὶ πάλιν ὅτε πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀργυρῶν προσβλέψαι τις θέσιν ἦθελεν, ἀπέλαμπτα τὰ πάντα κυκλοθεῖν, ὥς ἀν τις ἐστήκη, καὶ διάχυσιν ἐποιεὶ μείζονα τοῖς θεω-

15 μένους. ὡστε παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητον εἶναι τῶν ἐνηργημένων τῆς πολυτεχνίας. Τὰς δὲ χρυσῶς φιάλας διετέρευσαν στεφάνοις 79 ἀμπελοῦ κατὰ μέσον, περὶ δὲ τὰ χείλη κυσσοῦ τε καὶ μυροῦνης ἐτὶ ἐλαιὰς ἀνέπλεξαν στεφανὸν ἐκτυποῦν, πολυτελεῖς ἐνέντες λίθους καὶ τὰς λειτάς δὲ τορείας διηλλαγμένως ἐπετέλεσαν, ἀπαντο φιλοτη-

20 μηδέντες εἰς ὑπεροχῆς δάσκος τοῦ βασιλέως ποιήσας. καθόλου γὰρ 80 οὐτ’ ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ὑπῆρχε μισοκοπικὸς τοιαύτη κατασκευὴ τῆς πολυτελείας καὶ τεχνουργία, οὐτ’ ἐν τινὶ ἀλλοί. πρόνοιαν γὰρ οὐ μικρὰν ἐποιεῖτο δ’ βασιλεύς, φιλοδοξῶν εἰς τὰ καλῶς ἐχοντα. πολλάκις γὰρ τὸν δημόσιον χρηματισμὸν παρεί, τοῖς δὲ τεχνίταις 81

25 παράδρευεν ἐπιμελῶς, ἵνα καθηκόντως τῷ τόπῳ συντελέσωσιν, εἰς ὅν ἀπεστῆλετο τὰ τῶν ἔργων.1 διὸ πάντα σεμνῶς ἐγερόνει, καὶ ἵνα καταξὶς τοῦ τε ἀποστέλλοντος βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ προστατοῦντος ἀρχιερέως τοῦ τόπου. καὶ γὰρ τὸ τῶν λίθων πλῆθος ἀφίδων, καὶ 82
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μεγάλοι τοις μεγέθεσιν, οὐκ ἔλαττον πεντακωσιλίων· καὶ ταῖς τέχναις κρατιστεύοντα πάντα, ὥστε πενταπλασίως τοῦ χρυσοῦ τιμωτέραν εἶναι τὴν τῶν λίθων δόσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν τεχνῶν ἐνέργειαν.

83 ἦπολαμβάνων ὑπὸ καὶ τούτων τῆι ἀναγραφῆι ἀναγκαίων εἶναι, δεδήλωκα σου. τὰ δ' ἐξῆς περιέχει τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον ὅδων 5 ἡμῖν γενομένην· τῇ δὲ θέσιν τῆς ὅλης χώρας πρῶτον δηλώσω. Ὡς γὰρ παρεγενήθημεν ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους, ἐθεωροῦμεν τὴν τόλμην μέσην κειμένην τῆς ὅλης ᾿Ιουθαίων ἐπ' ὀροὺς ψυχῆν ἔχοντος τῆν ἀνάτασιν. 84 ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κορυφῆς κατασκεύαστο τὸ ἱερὸν ἑκτρεπτοῦ ἐξον· καὶ οἱ περίβολοι τοις, ὑπὲρ ἐβδομήκοντα δὲ πῆχεις τῷ μεγέθει, καὶ τὸ 10 πλάτος ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸ μῆκος τῆς κατὰ τὸν ὅλον διασκευής υπῆρχε, μεγαλομορφία καὶ χορηγία κατὰ πάντα ὑπερβαλλόντος 85 διψικοδομημένων ἀπάντων. καὶ τοῦ θυρώματος δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸ συνδέσμων κατὰ τὰς φλίας καὶ τῆς τῶν ὑπερθύρων ἀσφαλείας 86 ἐκδηλοῦ ἢν ἦ τῶν χρημάτων γεγονόνα ἀφεδής διαπάνη. τοῦ τε 15 καταπετάσματος ἡ διατύπωσις θυρώσει κατὰ πάν ὀρκοιστάτη ὑπῆρχε· καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποδρομῆς ἄδιάλειπτον κίνησιν λαμβανούσης τῆς δυνῆς, διὰ τὸ ἀπ' ἐδάφους γινομένης τῆς υποδρο-

87 Ἡ τε τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κατασκευῆς ὑπερβαλλόντος ἐξουσιασθέντι πρὸς τὸν τόπον καὶ τὰ δύσματα διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξανάλυμενα τὴν διουκοδομήν εἰς, τῆς δ' ἀναβάσεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ, πρὸς τὴν εὐκοσμίαν ἐχοντος τοῦ τόπου καθηκόντως το κλίμα τῶν λειτουργούντων ἱερῶν κεκα-

KAGIBTZ 1 μεγαλοῖς GI | ἐλαττων]+τῶν KA 5 ἡμῖν ὅδων B 6 δῆλωσον GIZ -σαι K 7 επὶ τοῦ τόπου BT1 επὶ τοῦ καὶ τοποὺς GI et sic cedd cum lacuna post τον et ἐπὶ καὶ posito, επὶ τον... (+tous LD) τοποὺς. Txt ex papyris confirmatur 8 Ἰουθαίων KAGI] ᾿Ιουθαίας cett | ψηλὴν K | ανα-

80 στασιν GI 9 ενεργεῖτος BT 12 ὑπερβαλλ. B] ὑπερβαλλοῦσα Acorr peri-

βαλλοῦση cett [13 καὶ 10] kak conj Schmidt 16 θυρωσι GIZ -αν Z 17 αἰ ραληπτοῦν KAGIZ 18 απ'] επ B | γενομ. BTZ 19 κατα codd κατα-

τευνὰ conj Schmidt 20 εχεὶν ex εχοντος T*vid 21 om κατακεκεν T* (ins T1) Z | συμμετρὸν εχουσα codd txt ex corr Mend. 24 λειτουργοῦντων codd Mend.] λειτουργοῖν (-γινὸν BT) τῶν codd
λυμένων μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν Βυσσίνωις Χιτώσιν. Ὅδε οἷκος βλέ- 88 § Eus πεῖ πρὸς ὶ, τὰ δ' ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἑσπέραν· τὸ δὲ πάν ἔδαφος λιθόστρωτον καθέστηκε καὶ κλίματα πρὸς τοὺς καθήκοντας τόπους ἔχει τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων ἐπιφοράς ἐνεκεν, ῥ γίνεται διὰ τὴν σμήξιν τῶν 5 ἀπὸ τῶν θυσιῶν αἰμάτων. πολλαὶ γὰρ μυριάδες κτηνῶν προσά- γονται κατὰ τὰς τῶν ἑορτῶν ἡμέρας. ἦδατος δὲ ἀνέκλεπτος ἔστι 89 σύστασις, ὡς ἂν καὶ πηγῆς ἐσοθεν πολυρρύτων φυσικῶς ἐπιρρεούσης, ἥτις δὲ θαυμασίως καὶ ἀδιηγητῶν ὑποδοχείων ὑπάρχοντων ὑπὸ γῆς, καθὼς ἀπέφαινον πέντε σταδίων κυκλόθεν τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν κατα- 10 βόλης καὶ ἐκάστου τούτων σύργας ἀναρίθμους, καὶ ἐκαστὸν μέρος ἐαντὰ συναπτόντων τῶν ἑυμάτων· καὶ πάντα ταῦτα μεμο- 90 λιβόσθαι καὶ ἐδάφους καὶ τοῦ τοίχου· ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κεχύσθαι πολὺ τι πλήθος κοινάσεως, ἐνεργῶς γεγενημένων ἀπάντων· ἐναι § Eus δὲ πυκνὰ τὰ στόματα πρὸς τὴν βάσιν, ἀδράτος ἔχοντα τοῖς πάσι 15 πλῆν αὐτοῦ οἷς ἐστὶν ἡ λειτουργία, ὡς ὑπὸ καὶ νείματι πάντα καθαρίζεσθαι τὰ συναγόμενα παμπληθῆ τῶν θυμάτων αἰμάτων. πεπεισμένος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν τῶν ὑποδοχείων κατασκευὴν δηλῶσιν 91 καθὼς ἐπιστώθην. προῆγαγον γὰρ πλέον σταδίων τεσσάρων ἐκ τῆς πόλεως· καὶ πρὸς τινὰ τόπον ἐκελεύθησαν κατακύψαντα συνακοῦσαι 20 τοῦ γινομένου ψόφου τῆς ἀπαντήσεως τῶν ὑδάτων· ὡστε συμφανές μοι γεγονέναι τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἀγγείων, καθὼς δεδήλωται. Ὁ τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν ἡ λειτουργία κατὰ πᾶν ἀνυπέρβλητος ἐστὶ τῇ βρόμῃ 92 καὶ τῇ τῆς εὐκοσμίας καὶ σιγῆς διαθέσει· πάντες γὰρ ἀυτοκελεύ- στοις διαπονοῦσι πολλῆς γινομένης κακοπαθείας, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τὸ 25 διατεταγμένον μέλει, καὶ ἀδιαλείπτως ὑπηρετοῦσιν, οἱ μὲν τὴν ἐνελείαν, οἱ δὲ ἔλαιον, οἱ δὲ σεμιδαλιν, οἱ δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων, ἔτεροι

1 Ex 3635 (cf 2839)
τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ὁλοκαυτοῦντες, ἵππῳ διαφερότως συγχρόμενοι. 93 διαλαβόντες γὰρ ἀμφοτέραις τῶν μόσχων τὰ σκέλη, πλειον ὄντα ταλαντών δύο σχεδόν ἐκαστὸν, ἀναρρίπτουσιν ἐκατέραις βαμματίοις ύψος ἱκανὸν καὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτάνουσι τῆς ἐπιθέσεως. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ τῶν προβατῶν ἐτὶ δ’ αἰγῶν τοῖς βάρεσι καὶ πιμελὴ βαμματίοις ἐξε. 5 κατὰ πᾶν γὰρ ἐκλεγομένου ὀις ἐπιμελεῖς ἐστίν ἁμώμητα καὶ τῇ 94 παχύτητι διαφέροντα, τὸ προερχόμενον ἐπιτελεῖται. πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν τόπος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν ἀποτεταγμένος, οὐ καθίζουσιν οἱ διαναπαύσιμοιν. τοῦτον δὲ γνωμονένοι τῶν διαλεοπτῶν ἐγείρειται. 95 πρόθυμοι, οὖδειν ἐπιτάσσοντος τὰ τῆς λειτουργίας. ἣ τε πᾶσα 10 στιγμή καθότητικεν, ὡστε ὑπολαμβάνειν, μηθ’ ἕνα ἀνθρωπόν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ παρεῖναι, πρὸς τοὺς ἐπτακοσίους παρόντων τῶν λειτουργῶν—καὶ τῶν προσαγόντων δὲ τὰ βύματα πολὺ τὸ πλήθος—ἀλλὰ φόβῳ 96 καὶ καταξίως μεγάλης θεατότητος ἀπαίτετελεῖται. Μεγαλὴν δὲ ἐκπλήξειν ἤμιν παρέσχεν, ὡς θεοθάμεθα τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον ἐν 15 λειτουργία, τᾶ τοῦ στολισμοῦ καὶ τῆς δόξης, ἡ συνισταται διὰ τὴν ἐνίδιναν οὐ φορεὶ χιτώνος καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν λίθων· χρυσοὶ γὰρ κώδωνες περὶ τὸν πολύρη ἐισίν αὐτοῦ, μέλους ἧξον ἀνείνετι ἱδιάξοντα· παρ’ ἐκάτερον δὲ τούτων ἄνθει πεποικιλμένοι ῥοῖκοι, 97 τῇ χρώμα βαμματίου ἐχοντες. κατέξωστο ἀδίκαφον 20 διαπρεπεί, δισφασεμένη καλλίστοις χρώμασιν. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐλθόγος φορεῖ τὸ λεγόμενον λόγιον, ἐν ποσεπηριγμένοι λίθοι δεκαλύο, διαλαβάσσεται τοῖς γένεσι, χρυσῷ κεκολλημένου, τὰ τῶν φυλάρ-χων ὑπόλαμα κατὰ τὴν ἐς ἀρχής διαταξῆς γεννηθέσων, ἀπαγά-98 ζοντες ἐκαστος ἀνεξήγητο τῆς ἱδιότητος τὴν φυσικήν χρώμαν. ἐπὶ 25 δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐξεῖ την λεγόμενην κίδαριν, ἐπὶ δὲ ταύτης τὴν ἁμίμητον λίτραν, τὸ καθηγομένου βασίλειου εκτυποῖν ἐπὶ

17 ff Ex 284-27-31 20 ib 21 ff ib 15-23 26 ff ib 32 ff 

KAGIBTZ 1 χρωμένοι A 2 πλειων BT 3 ταλ. δυο] ταλαντον B 4 ύψος] 
pr eis BT | epΘεσ.] epθυμιας Z (-εσεως sup ras in T) 5 προβ.] πραγμα-
tων Zext (προβ. Zmξ) | βαρέσι codd 6 οις τι πιμελεσ εστιν B 8 om 
αυτοις BT 11 ωστε υπολαμβανειν conj Schmidt] ως τυπων λαμβανειν 
codd | ep] eti A 12 τας επτακοσιας Z 16 η] ης BTZ | συνιστατο KA 
19 τουτον K 21 δισφασεμενοι K 27 εκτυπουν G1 (-πων Z)
πετάλω χρυσοί γράμμασιν ἁγίους ὅνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ μέσον τῶν ὄφρων, δώξει πεπληρωμένον, ὁ κριθεὶς ἔξιος τούτον ἐν ταῖς λειτουργίαις. ἦ δὲ συμφάνεια τούτων ἐμποτεί ὁ βοῦ καὶ ταραχὴν, 99 ὡστε νομίζεων εἰς ἑτερον ἐληλυθέναι ἐκτός τοῦ κόσμου· καὶ διαβε-βαίομαι, πάντα ἀνθρώπων προσελθόντα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν προειρη-μένων εἰς ἐκπλήξιν ἤξει καὶ θαυμασμὸν ἀδύνατον, μετατραπέντα τῇ διανοίᾳ διὰ τὴν περὶ ἕκαστον ἀγίαν κατασκευήν. Ἡρῴο100 γὰρ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπάντων ἐπὶ τὴν παρακείμενην ἄκραν τῆς πόλεως ἀναβάντες θεωροῦμεν· ἦ καὶ ταῖς ἐν ὑψηλότατῳ τόπῳ, πύργοις,

10 ἐξησφαλισμένῃ πλείσσι, μέχρι κορυφῆς ἐδιήκεσί λίθους ἀνωκοδομη-μένων αὐτῶν, ὡς μεταλλάβανομεν, πρὸς φυλακὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τόπων· ἵνα, ἐὰν ἐπίθεσις τις ἡ νεωτερισμὸς ἢ πολεμίων ἐφοδεῖ τὸν γένηται, μηθεὶς δύναται ὁδὸν εἰς τοὺς περίβολους ποιησάμαι τοὺς περὶ τὸν οἶκον· ἐπικείμενοι καὶ ἐξυβελὼν ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων τῆς ἄκρας καὶ ὄργανοι ποικᾶλων, καὶ τοῦ τόπου κατὰ κορυφὴν ὄντος τῶν προειρημένων περιβόλων, ὥσπερ ἀνωκοδομομένων τῶν πύργων ὑπὸ τῶν πιστοτάτων ἄνδρῶν καὶ τῇ παράδειγμα ἀποδείκτες δεδωκό- των· οὕτως οὖν εἶχον ἐξουσίαν ἐξεῖναι τῆς ἄκρας, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἔστασι, καὶ τούτῳ ἐκ μέρους, οὐδὲ εἰσδεδείμεν εἰὼν οὐδέναι· μετὰ τὸν

20 ἀκριβείας δὲ πολλῆς εἶχον, εἰ καὶ τις ἐπιταγή γένοιτο διὰ τοῦ προκαθηγομένου πρὸς θεωρίαν· εἰσδεξασθαι τινας· οὐδὲ καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐγερόμεν. μόνος γὰρ ἀνόπλους ὅντας ἡμᾶς δύο παρεδέχαστο πρὸς τὸ κατανοῆσαι τῶν θυσιῶν. ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ δὲ ὄρκων πεπι-τὸν στῶθαι τοῦ τοιοῦτον· τοὺς γὰρ πίνακας ὀμωμόκεναι, κατ’ ἀνάγκην

25 <ἐπιτελουμένου> θεᾶς τὸ κατὰ τὸν ὄρισμὸν πόραμα, ὅντας πεντα-κοσύνοις μὴ παρεδέχασθαι πλείον ἀνθρώπων πέντε κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ· τοῦ γὰρ ἱεροῦ τὴν πάταν εἶναι φυλακὴν τὴν ἄκραν· καὶ τὸν κατα-βαλλόμενον αὐτὴν τὴν προφυλακὴν τῶν εἰρημένων οὐτως ἡσφαλί-
105 σθαί. Τῆς δὲ πόλεως ἐστὶ τὸ χῦμα συμμέτρως ἔχον, οἷον τεσσαράκοντα σταδίων ὄντος τοῦ περιβόλου, καθόσον εἰκάσαι δυνατόν. ἔχει δὲ τὴν τῶν πύργων θέσιν θεατροειδῆ, καὶ φαινομένων διδόνων—

106 τῶν ὑποκειμένων, τῶν δ᾽ ἐπάνωθεν—<εἰθισμένος>, καὶ τάς διὰ τούτων διεξόδους. ἀνάκλασιν γὰρ ἔχει τὰ τῶν τῶπων, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ ὅρους τῆς

107 θυγγάνωσιν ὅν οὐ δέον ἔστιν. Οὐκ ἀλόγως δὲ τὴν πόλιν
§ Ρ συμμετρία καθηκούσῃ κατεσκεύασαν οἱ πρῶτοι, σοφῶς δὲ ἐπιπον—10
§ 11 σαντες. τῆς γὰρ χώρας πολλῆς οὕσης καὶ καλῆς, καὶ τίνων ἄνεν πεδινῶν, τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σαμαρείτιν λεγομένην, καὶ τῶν συναπτόντων τῇ τῶν Ἰδομαίων χώρᾳ, τινῶν δὲ ὀρεινῶν, τῶν <συναπτόντων> τῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρᾳ, χρή> πρὸς τὴν γεωργίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς γῆς γίνεσθαι συνεχώς, ὅν καὶ διὰ τούτο ὁ οὖτος τὴν εὐ—15 καρπίαν ἔχωσιν. οὐ καὶ γινομένου γεωργεῖται <πάντα μετὰ> δαφέλειας

108 πολλῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ προερημένῃ χώρᾳ. τῶν δὲ πόλεων ὅσαι μέγεθος ἔχονσι καὶ τὴν ἀκόλουθον εἰδαιμονίαν, ταύταις συμβέβηκεν εὐανδρεῖν, ἀμελεῖοι δὲ τῆς χώρας, πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν ἑλαροῦνται γενεκτών, καὶ τῇ κατασκήνῃ πάντας ἀνθρώπους 20

109 ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς εὐκαταφύρους εἶναι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγίνετο περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὑπερβάλλουσαν πάσας τὸ μεγέθει καὶ εἰδαιμονία τὰς πόλεις. οἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποξενούμενοι κατα-

110 μένουτες ἐφ᾽ ἰκανόν ἐις ἐλάττωσιν ἥγον τὰ τῆς ἐργασίας. θέσον δὲ βασιλεύς, ὅν μὴ καταμένουσι, προσέταξε μὴ πλέον ἐκοσιν ἥμερων 25 παρεπιδημεῖν· καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν χρείων ὅμως δὲ ἐγγράπτων διαστολᾶς ἐδωκεν, ἐὰν ἀναγκαῖον ἥ κατακαλέσαι, διακρίνειν ἐν ἡμέραις πέντε. πρὸ πολλοῦ δὲ ποιούμενος καὶ χρηματιστάς καὶ

HKAGIBP

τοὺς τούτων ὑπηρέτας ἐπέταξε κατὰ νομοὺς, ὅπως μὴ πορισμοῦ λαμβάνοντες οἱ γεωργοὶ καὶ προστάται ἡς πόλεως ἑλλαττῶι τὰ ταμεῖα, λέγω δὲ τὰ τῆς γεωργίας πρόσφορα. Ἡπειρομενεῖ 112 δὲ ταῦτα διὰ τὸ καλῶς ἦμιν τὸν Ῥελαάρον ὑποδειχνέι τὰ 15 προειρημένα. μεγάλη γὰρ ἑστὶ τῶν γεωργομένων φιλοποιία. καὶ γὰρ ἑλαίοις πλήθεσι συνδεδρῶς ἐστὶ καὶ σιτικοῖς καρποῖς αὐτῶν ἡ χώρα καὶ ὀστρόσεις, ἐτι δὲ ἀμπέλω καὶ μέλιτε πολλῷ. τὰ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων καὶ φοινίκων οὐδὲ ἀρίθμεται παρ’ αὐτοῖς. κτήνη τε πολλὰ παμμηγῆ, καὶ δαυιδῆς ἡ τούτων νομῆ; διὸ καλῶς 113 ἐξελεύσαι, ὅτι πολυάνθρωπας οἱ τόποι προσδέονται, καὶ τὴν κατα-

σκευήν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν κωμῶν ἐδεντὸ κατὰ λόγον. πολὺ δὲ 114 πλήθος καὶ τῶν ἀρωμάτων καὶ λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ χρυσοῦ παρα-

κομίζεται διὰ τῶν Ἄραβων εἰς τὸν τόπον. ἐργάσιμοι γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐμπορίαν ἐστὶ κατεσκευασμένη ἡ χώρα, καὶ πολύτεχνος ἡ πόλις, 15 οὐ σπανίζει δὲ οὖδὲν τῶν διακομιζόμενων διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. ἔχει 115 γὰρ καὶ λιμείας εὐκαίρους χορηγούντας, τὸν τε κατὰ τὴν Ἀσκαλώνα καὶ Ἰόπτην καὶ Γάζαν, δομοῖς δὲ καὶ Πτολεμαῖδα τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτισμένην. μέση δὲ κεῖται πρὸς τοὺς προειρημένους τόπους, οὐκ ἀπέχουσα τούτων πολύ. ἔχει δὲ πάντα δαυιδῆ κάθυγρος 20 οὕσα πάντοθεν ἡ χώρα καὶ μεγάλην ἁσφάλειαν ἔχουσα. περιρρεῖ 116 δ’ αὐτὴν ὁ λεγόμενος ᾿Ιορδάνης πτοιμὸς ἀείρρους. <τῆς δὲ χώρας> οὐκ ἔλαττον ἐξακισχιλῶν μυριάδῶν ἀρουρῶν κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὀνόμα (μετεπείτω δὲ οἱ γεγονότα ἐπέβησαν αὐτής) ἐξήκοντα μυριάδες αἰνῶν ἐγκληροι καθεστήκεισαν ἐκατοντάραποι. πληρομένοις δὲ 25 ὁ πτοιμὸς, καθὼς ὁ Νεῖλος, ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὸν θερισμὸν ἡμέραις, πολλὴν ἀρδεύει τῆς γῆς. ὅς εἰς ἑτερον πτοιμὸν ἐκβάλλει τὸ ἑδώμα 117 κατὰ τὴν Πτολεμαίων χώραν, οὕτως δὲ ἐξεισὶν εἰς θάλασσαν.
Ἀλλοι δὲ χειμάρροι λεγόμενοι κατάσσι, περιλαμβάνοντες τὰ πρὸς τὴν Γάζαν μέρη καὶ τὴν Ἀζωτίων χώραν. περιέχεται δὲ ἀσφαλείας αὐτοφυεῖς, δυσείσβολος οὖν καὶ πλήθειν ἀπραγμάτευτος, διὰ τὸ στενᾶς εἶναι τὰς παρόδους, κρημνῶν παρακείμενων καὶ φαράγγων βαθέων. ἔτι δὲ τραχείας υύψης πάσης τῆς περιεχούσης πᾶσαν τὴν 119 χώραν ὅρεινης. Ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρακείμενων ὅρεών τῆς Ἀραβίας μετάλλα χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου συνιστασθαί πρότερον. ἐκλέειπται δὲ ταῦτα, καθ' ὃν ἐπεκράτησαν Πέρσαι χρόνον, τῶν τότε προστατοῦντων ποιησμένων διαβολῆν, ὡς ἄρχηστος ἦ 120 κατεργασία γίνεται καὶ πολυδάπανος, ὡς μὴ διὰ τὴν μεταλ- λείαν τῶν εἰρημένων συμβῆ καὶ τὴν χώραν καταφθείρεσθαι, καὶ σχεδον διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων δυναστείαν ἀλλοτριωθῆναι, παρεύρεσθαι λαβόντων εἰς τοὺς τόπους εἰσόδου, διὰ τὸ τὴν διμβολῆν γεγονέναι ταύτην.

"Οσον οὖν καὶ περὶ τούτων ἔδει, κεφαλαιωδῶς σεσήμαγκά σοι, ὥς Φιλάκρατες ἄβελφει· τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπομένως δηλώσομεν. 121 Ἐπιλέξας γὰρ τοὺς ἀρίστους άνδρας καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντας, ἀτέ δὴ γονέων τετευχότας ἐνδόξων, οὕτινες οὐ μόνον τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἔξιν περιεποίησαν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν εἰρήνης διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὰς προσβείας εἰκῆτοι καθεστήκεσαν, καὶ τούτ' ἐπέτελον οὕτε δεό, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ὁμιλίας καὶ τὰς ἐπερωτήσεις τὰς διὰ τοῦ νόμον μεγάλην εὐφυίαν ἐξον, τὸ μέσον ἐξηλωκότες κατάστημα (τοῦτο γὰρ κάλλιστον ἐστιν), ἀποτεθειμένοι τὸ τραχύ καὶ βάρβαρον τῆς διανοίας, ὁμώαι δὲ καὶ τὸ κατοίκεσθαι καὶ νομίζειν ὑπερφρονεῖν ἐτέρους ὑπερβεβηκότες, τὴν δὲ ὁμιλίαν καὶ τὸ συνακολούθιν καὶ πρὸς ἐκαστὸν ἀποκρίνεσθαι δεόντως παραδεδεχόμενοι, καὶ πάντες ταῦτα συνητριώντες καὶ μᾶλλον ἐν τούτοις βουλόμενοι ὑπερφέρειν ἐτέρος ἐτέρου, καὶ τοῦ καθηγομένου ἱκαγιβρ
πάντες ἄξιοι καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς. νοήσαι δ’ ἣν, ὡς ἡγάπησαν 123 τοῦ Ἐλεάζαρον δυσαποσπάστως ἔχοντες, καὶ ἐκεῖνος αὐτοὺς· χωρίς καὶ τοῦ πρὸς τοῦ βασιλέα γεγραφέναι περὶ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως αὐτῶν πολλὰ παρεκάλεσε τοῦ Ὄνδρεάν ποῆσαι, συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι 5 παρακαλῶν, καθ’ ὁ ἄν δυνάμεθα. καὶ ἡμῶν ἑπαγγελμένον <ἐν φρον-, τίσεω> περὶ τοῦτων, ἐφη καὶ λίαν διαγωνίζων εἰδέναι γάρ, ὅτι φιλάγαθος ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάντων μέγιστον ἦγετα τὸ μεταπέ- πεσθαί, καθ’ ὁ ἄν τόπον ὄνομαθή τις ἄνθρωπος διαφέρων ἀγωγῆ καὶ φρονήσει παρ’ ἑτέρους. μετείληφα γὰρ καλὸς αὐτῶν λέγειν, ὅτι 125 περὶ ἐαυτοῦ ἔχων ἄνδρας δικαίους καὶ σωφρονας τὴν μεγίστην ἄν φυλακήν τῆς βασιλείας ἐξεῖν, συμβουλεύοντων παρρησία πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον τῶν φίλων, ὃ δὴ σύνετοι τοῖς ἀποστελλομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ. καὶ δι’ ὄρκων ἐπιστούτο, μὴ προάσθαι τοὺς ἄνθρωπος, εἰ 126 τις ἑτέρα χρεία πρὸς τὰ κατ’ ἱδίαν αὐτοῦ κατεπέγα, πρὸς δὲ τὴν 15 κοινὴν πάση τοῖς πολίταις ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐξαποστέλλει αὐτοῖς. τὸ 127 γὰρ καλῶς ἐξ ἐν τῷ τὰ νόμιμα συντηρεῖν εἶναι· τούτῳ δὲ ἐπιτε- λείσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως πολλοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως. προσιθέμενος οὖν ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τούτοις παραπλησία φανερὸς ἦν τὴν 20 διάθεσιν, ὅς ἦν πρὸς αὐτοῦς.


γάρ ἡμῶν, διὰ τή, μᾶς καταβολῆς εὔσης, τά μὲν ἀκάθαρτα νομίζεται πρὸς βρῶσιν, τά δὲ καὶ πρὸς τήν ἀφήν (δεσιδαιμονῶς γάρ τά πλείστα τήν νομοθεσίαν ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἔπανυτι δεσιδαιμονῶς)

130 πρὸς ταῦτα οὕτως ἐνήργετο Θεωρεῖς, ἔφη, τάς ἀναστροφὰς καὶ τάς ὁμιλίας, οἷον ἐνεργάζονται πράγμα, διότι κακοῖς ὁμιλήγατοι 5 διαστροφὰς ἐπιλαμβάνουσιν ἀνθρώπου καὶ ταλαίπωροι δὲ ὅλον τοῦ ἔχουν εἰσιν. ἦν δὲ σοφοὶ καὶ φρονίμους συζώσιν, ἦς ἀγνώδαις ἐπανορ-θώσεως εἰς τῶν βίων ἐτυχόν. διαστελλόμενοι οὖν τά τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης πρῶτον ὁ νομοθέτης ἡμῶν, καὶ διδάξας ἐκαστα περὶ τούτων, οὐκ ἀπαγορευτικῶς μόνον ἀλλ' ἐνδεικτικῶς, καὶ τάς βλάβας 10 προδηλος καὶ τάς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γνωμένα εἰπτομπᾶς τοῖς αἰτίοις—

132 προτείθει διε ήγι πάντων πρῶτον, ὅτι μόνον ὁ θεὸς ἑστι, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται, πεπληρωμένου παντὸς τόπου τῆς δυναστείας, καὶ οὐθὲν αὐτὸν λανθάνει τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γνω-μένων ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κρυφίως, ἀλλ' ὅσα ποιεῖ τις αὐτῷ φανερά 15 καθέστηκε, καὶ τά μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι— ταὐτ' οὖν ἐξεργαζόμενοι ἀκριβῶς καὶ πρόδλα θεῖς ἔδειξεν ὅτι, καὶ ἐννοηθή τις κακίαν ἐπιτελείν, οὐκ ἂν λάθοι, μή ὅτι καὶ πράξεσ, διὰ πάσης τῆς νομο-θεσίας τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνατὸν ἐνδεικνύμενος. ποιημάμενος οὖν τὴν καταρχὴν ταυτην, καὶ δείξης ὅτι πάντες οἰ λοιποὶ παρ ἡμᾶς 20 ἀνθρώπων πόλλους θεοὺς εἶναι νομίζονσιν, αὐτοὶ δυναμικῶτεροι

135 πολλῷ καθεστῶτες ὅν σέβονται ματαιῶς—ἀγάλματα γάρ ποιήσαντες ἐκ λίθων καὶ ἔξων, εἰκόνας φασιν εἶναι τῶν ἐξεροῦντων τι πρὸς τὸ ἔτυμν αὐτοὺς χρήσιμον, οἰς προσκυνοῦσι, παρὰ πόδας ἔχοντες τὴν ἀνα-σθήσιαν. εἰ τί γάρ καὶ ἔκεινο τις <θεὸς εἰς>, κατὰ τὴν ἐξερέσειν, 25
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3 τῆς νομοθεσίας B | πανύ] πας B παλιν πανυ HKA παλω cett Eus
παντελῶς ἀνόητον· τῶν γὰρ ἐν τῇ κτίσει λαβόντες τινὰ συνέθηκαν καὶ προσυπέδειξαν εὐχρηστά, τὴν κατασκευὴν αὐτῶν οὐ ποιήσαντες αὐτοὶ· διὸ κενὸν καὶ μάταιον τὸς ὀμοίους ἀποθεοῦν. καὶ γὰρ ὅτι 137 καὶ νῦν εὕρεματικότεροι καὶ πολυμαθέστεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν πρὶν 5 εἰς πολλοί, καὶ οὐκ ἂν φθάνουν αὐτοὺς προσκυνοῦντες. καὶ νομίζουσι οἱ ταύτα διαπλάσαντες καὶ μυθοποιήσαντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ σοφότατοι καθεστάναι. τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων πολυματαῖων τί δει καὶ 138 λέγειν, Αἰγυπτίων τε καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, οἵτινες ἐπὶ θηρία καὶ τῶν ἐρετῶν τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ κυνωδάλων τὴν ἀπέρειαν πεποιητάται, 10 καὶ ταύτα προσκυνοῦσιν, καὶ θύουσι τούτοις καὶ ζώσι καὶ τελευτάσαι; — συνθεωρήσας οὖν ἔκαστα σοφὸς ὃν ὁ νομοθέτης, 139 ὑπὸ θεοῦ κατασκευασμένος εἰς ἐπίγγυσιν τῶν ἀπάντων, περιέφραξεν ἡμᾶς ἀδιακόπτους χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχεσιν, ὅπως μηθεί τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνων ἐπιμισγώμεθα κατὰ μηδὲν, ἁγνὸι καθεστώτες κατὰ σῶμα 15 καὶ κατὰ ψυχήν, ἀπολελυμένοι ματαιών δοξών, τὸν μόνον θεόν καὶ δυνατὸν σεβόμενοι παρ’ ὅλην τὴν πάσαν κτίσιν. οἶδεν οἱ Αἰγυπτίων 140 καθηγεμόνες ἡρεμεῖς, ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς πολλὰ καὶ μετεχήκοτες πραγμάτων, ἀνθρώπους θεοῦ προσονομάζουσιν ἡμᾶς· τὸ τούτο λοιπὸς οὗ πρόσεστιν, εἰ μὴ τοις σέβονται τὸν κατὰ ἀλῆθειαν θεόν, ἀλλ’ εἰσὶν 20 ἀνθρώποι βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ σκέψις. ἡ γὰρ πάσα διάθεσις 1.41 αὐτών ἐπὶ ταύτα καταφέυγει. τοῖς δὲ πάρ’ ἥμων ἐν οὐδενι ταύτα λε- λογίσται, περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυναστείας δε’ ὅλου τοῦ ζῆν ἡ σκέψις αὐτοῖς ἐστιν. ὅπως οὖν μηθεὶς συναλλογούμενοι μηδ’ ὀμλυνότε— 142 τες φαύλους διαστροφᾶς λαμβάνωμεν, πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέφραξεν 25 ἀγνείας καὶ διὰ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ ἀφῶν καὶ ἀκοῆς καὶ ὀράσεως

1.43 ονομασώ. τὸ γὰρ καθόλου πάντα πρὸς τὸν φυσικὸν λόγον ὅμοια καθέστηκεν, ὡσποδὲ δυνάμεως οἰκονομοῦμενα, καὶ καθ’ ἐν ἐκαστὸν ἔχει λόγον βαθύν, ἀφ’ ὦν ἀπεχόμεθα κατὰ τὴν χρήσιν, καὶ οἰς συγχρώμεθα. χάριν δὲ ὑποδείγματος ἐν ἡ δεύτερον ἐπιδραμῶν σοι
1.44 σημανῖ. Μὴ γὰρ εἰς τὸν καταπετσωκότα λόγον ἐλθής, ὅτι μγῶν 5 καὶ γαλᾶς ἢ τῶν τοιούτων χάριν περιεργίαν ποιούμενος ἐνομοθετεὶ ταῦτα Μωσῆς· ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἄγνιν ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ τρόπων ἐξαρτισμὸν
1.45 δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκεν σεμνῶς πάντα ἀνατάσκαται. τῶν γὰρ πτηνῶν, οἷς χρώμεθα, πάντα ἡμερα καθέστηκεν καὶ διαφέρει καθαρότητι, πυροὶ καὶ ὀσπρίῳς χρώμενα πρὸς τὴν τροφήν, οἷον περιστεραὶ 10 τρυγόνες ἄττακοι πέρδικες ἐτὶ δὲ χήνες καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τοιαῦτα.
1.46 περὶ ὅν δὲ ἀπηγορεύτω πτηνῶν, εὐρήσεις ἠγριὰ τε καὶ σαρκοφάγα καὶ καταδυναστεύων τῇ περὶ ἕαυτα δυνάμει τὸ λουπά, καὶ τὴν τροφήν ἔχοντα δαπάνησθαι τὸν προειρημένων ἡμέρων μετὰ ἀδικίας· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταύτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἁρνας καὶ ἔριφους ἀναρπάζουσι, 15 καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπως δὲ ἀδικοῦσι νεκροὺς τε καὶ ζωντας. παράσημον οὖν ἔθετο διὰ τούτων, ἀκάθαρτα προσονομάσας, ὅτι δέον ἐστὶ κατὰ ψυχὴν, οἷς ἡ νομοθεσία διατάκτηκα, δικαιοσύνης συγχρήσθαι καὶ μηδένα καταδυναστεύειν, πετοιθότας ἵσχυς τῇ καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς, μηδὲ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι μηδέν, ἀλλ’ ἐκ δικαίου τὰ τὸ βίον κυβερνῶν, ὅς τὰ 20 τῶν προειρημένων πτηνῶν ἡμερα ξῶα τὰ φυόμενα τῶν ὀσπρίων ἐπὶ γῆς δαπανά, καὶ οὐ καταδυναστεύει πρὸς τὴν ἐπαναίρεσιν τῶν συν-
1.47 γενικῶν. διὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὖν παραδέδωκεν δε νομοθέτης σημειοῦ-
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σθαί τοῖς συνετοῖς, εἶναι δικαίους τε καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιτελεῖν βία, μηδὲ τῇ περὶ ἐαυτῶν ἰσχύι πεπουθότας ἐτέρους καταδυναστεύειν. Ὅπως ὅρκαις ἅμα που καθήκη τῶν προερείμενων διὰ τὴν περὶ ἐκαστα διά-
θεσιν, πῶς ὁ φυλακτὸν παντάπασι τοὺς τρόπους εἰς τούτῳ κατακλα-
σθήναι; πάντα ὁμ η τῆς συγχωρῆσεως ἡμῖν ἔπι τοῦτων καὶ τῶν 150
κτημῶν τροπολογῶν ἐκτέθειται. τὸ γὰρ δικηλεύειν καὶ διαστέλλειν
ὁπλὰς ὄνειχας σημείον ἐστὶν τοῦ διαστέλλειν ἐκαστα τῶν πράξεων
ἐπὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον; ἤ γὰρ ἰσχὺς τῶν ὀλῶν σωμάτων μετ’ ἐνεργείας 151
ἀπέρεισιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀμοὺς ἔχει καὶ τὰ σκέλη. μετὰ διαστολῆς οὐν
10 ἀπαντὰ ἐπιτελεῖν πρὸς δικαιούμενον ἀναγκαίζει ὧ το σημειοῦσθαι διὰ
tοῦτων· ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ διότι παρὰ πάντας ἄνθρωπος διεστάλμεθα. οἱ 152
gὰρ πλείονες τῶν λοιπῶν ἄνθρωπον ἐαυτὸς μολύνουσιν ἐπιμιγγό-
μενοι, συντελοῦντες μεγάλην ἀδίκιαν, καὶ χωρᾶ καὶ πόλεις ὅλαι
σεμνοῦνται ἐπὶ τοῦτοι. οὐ μόνον γὰρ <προάγουσι> τοὺς ἀρσειας,
15 ἀλλὰ καὶ τεκούσας ἐπὶ δὲ θυγατέρας μολύνουσιν. ἤμεις δὲ ἀπὸ
tοῦτων διεστάλμεθα. περὶ οὖν δὲ εἰσίν ὁ προερημένος τῆς δια-
153 στολῆς τρόπος, περὶ τοῦτον εἶναι καὶ τὸν τῆς μνήμης κεχαρακτη-
ρικεν. πάντα γὰρ ὃς δικηλεῖ καὶ μηργκικισμὸν ἀναζεί σαφῶς
τοῖς νοσόν ἐκτίθεται τὸ τῆς μνήμης. ἦ γὰρ ἀναιμηρύκησις οὐθέν
20 ἑτέρου, ἀλλὰ τῆς ξωῆς καὶ συστάσεως ἐπίμνησις. τὸ γὰρ ξῆν διὰ
6 Lev 113ff (Deut 14ff)
18 Lev 118ff

1 om τε P Eus[ν] vid 2 autous Eus | ετερων BT 4 ou] ouv KAIG[H] HKAGIBP
(corr Gmg) 5 παντα ouv Eus] παντων (+ de B) Ar codd | τα Eus] om Ar
ἡμων ενεκα B txt Eus! Ar cett 6 εκτεθειται Eus]| εζεθετο B εκθεται (τε
g1) Ar codd cett εκθεθεικε Eus[ο] | δικβληται K 7 οτιλας B | σημεια B |
εκαστην P 10 το σημειουσθαι HKAGIZ (το σημι και Eus!) το ομοιοσκει
Τ(τω ομ. B) τω σημ. Eus, προ απαντα 10—μολυνουσι 12 εξηιβει βωσκο-
μεν· τω σημειουσθαι σι παρα παντας διαιστελλομεθα· οι γαρ ἀλλοι
μολυνουσι οινους. Fortasse legendum o σημειουσται 12 ανθρωποι
om Eus 13 ολαι B 14 επι τουτ. σημι Eus[ο] | προσαγουσι conj
Schmidt] προσαγουσι codd et Eus qui legit προς αρεσας (app.) προσαγουσι
15 de]+ και HKAG Eus[ο] 16 εσταλμεθα BPTZ | ou] ouv BPT 17 τροπος
BPT Eus] τοπος cett | τουρων BPT | και τ. τ. μν. ειναι Eus[ο] τo την μυνη
P | κεχαρακτηρικαι (-τρεα Ζ) codd Ar txt Eus 18 παντα] ειπας
Eus| 19 εκθεθαι Eus] εκθεθαι (εκτιθημι P) Ar codd | ουδεν B
20 αλλ η Eus[ο] συστασεως] πρ της B | υπομηνησις εστι Eus

S. S.  37
153 τῆς τροφῆς συνεστάναι νομίζει. διὸ παρακελεύεται καὶ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ὁ λέγων οὖσιν· μνεῖα μνημονίας κυρίου τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἐν σοι τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαγματά. κατανοοούμενα γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα καὶ ἐνδόξα φαίνεται· πρῶτον μὲν ἡ σύμπτωσις τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἡ
156 τῆς τροφῆς διοίκησις καὶ ἡ περί ἐκαστον μέλος διαστολή· πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον ἡ τῶν αἰσθήσεων διακόσμησις, διανοίας ἐνέργημα καὶ κίνησις ἀφάτος, ἡ τε ἐξής τοῦ πρὸς ἐκαστον τι πράσσειν καὶ
157 τεχνῶν ἐφερέσι ἀπέραστον περιέχει τρόπον. διὸ παρακελεύεται μνεῖαν ἔχειν, ὡς συντηρεῖται τὰ προειρήμενα θεία δυνάμει σὺν κατασκευῇ· πάντα γὰρ χρόνον καὶ τόπον ὄρκος τὸ διὰ τοῦ
158 παντὸς μνημονεύειν τοῦ κρατούντος θεοῦ καὶ συντηροῦντος. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν ἀπαρξᾶμένους εὖθεώς τότε ἵππος ἐκλείει· καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐκ τῶν περιβολαίων παράσημον ἡμῖν μνεῖα δέδωκεν, ὥσποτές δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν καὶ θυρῶν προστέταχε μὲν ἡμῖν τιθέναι τὰ λόγια, πρὸς τὸ μνεῖαν ἐναί θεοῦ· 159 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἥξιδον διατρήθην τὸ σημεῖον κελεύει περιθύμοι, σαφῶς ἀποδείκνυς ὅτι πάσαν ἐνέργειαν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιτελεῖν δὲ, μὴν ἡμῖν ἔχοντας τῆς ἐαυτῶν κατασκευῆς, ἐπὶ πάσι δὲ τῶν περὶ
160 θεοῦ φόβον. κελεύει δὲ καὶ κοιταζομένους καὶ διανικταμένους μελετῶν τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ κατασκευάς, οὐ μόνον λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ διαλύεις 20
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θεωροῦντας τὴν κίνησιν καὶ ὑπόληψιν ἐαυτῶν, ὅταν εἰς ὑπὸν ἔρχονται, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν, ὡς θείᾳ τίς ἐστι καὶ ἀκατάληπτος τούτων ἡ μετάθεσις. Δέδεικται δὲ σοι καὶ τὸ περισσὸν τῆς λογίας τής 161 κατὰ τὴν διαστολὴν καὶ μνείαν, ὡς ἔξεσθήμεθα τὴν διχήλιαν καὶ τὸν μηρυκισμὸν. οὐ γὰρ εἰκῆ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐμπεσὸν εἰς ψυχὴν νενομοθέτηται, πρὸς δὲ ἀλήθειαν καὶ σημείωσιν ὅρθον λόγον. διατάξεις 162 γὰρ ἐπὶ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀφᾶς ἐκαστα, κελεύει μηθὲν εἰκῆ πρᾶσσειν μὴτε ἀκουεῖν, μήτε τῇ τοῦ λόγου δυναστεία συγχρωμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἁδικίαν τρέπεσθαι. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν 163 κνωδάλων δὲ ταύτων ἐστὶν εὑρέων. κακοποιητικὸς γὰρ ὁ τρόπος ἐστὶ καὶ γαλακτικός καὶ μυγών καὶ τῶν τούτων ὁμοίων, ὅσα δηγορεῖται, πάντα γὰρ λυμαίνονται καὶ κακοποιοῦσι μόνος, οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὴν 164 ἐαυτῶν τροφὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ παντελῶς ἀχρηστὸν γίνεσθαι ἄνθρωπω, δὲ τὶ ἄν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ εἰπτάλαθη κακοποιέον. τὸ τε τῆς γαλής 165 γένος ἰδιόν ἐστὶν χωρίς γὰρ τοῦ προερημένου ἔχει λυματικὸν κατάστημα· διὰ γὰρ τῶν ὧτων συλλαμβάνει, τεκνοποιεῖ τῇ στόματι, καὶ διὰ τούτο ὁ τοιοῦτος τρόπος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀκαθαρτός ἐστίν. 166 ὅσα γὰρ δὲ ἀκοής λαβόντες, ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ σωματοποιησάντες, κακοὶς ἐτέρους ἐνεκύλισαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἐπετέλεσαν, 20 μιανθέντες αὐτοὶ παντάπασι τῷ τῆς ἁσθείας μολυσμῷ. καλῶς δὲ τοιῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν τοὺς τοιούτους ἀναιρεῖ, καθὼς μεταλλαβᾶνομεν.—Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐτεῦχα Τούς ἐμφανιστάς οἰοραὶ σε λέγειν· καὶ γὰρ 167 αἰκίας καὶ βανάτος ἐπαλύγνωσι αὐτοὺς περιβάλλει συνεχῶς.—Ὁ δὲ Τούτων γὰρ καὶ λέγω· ἡ γὰρ ἐπαγρύπνησις ἀνθρώπων ἀπωλείαν

11 Λευ 1129
168 ἀνόσιος. ὥστε νόμος ἡμῶν κελεύει μῆτε λόγῳ μῆτε ἔργῳ μηδένα κακοποιεῖν. καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν, ὡσον ἐπὶ βραχὺ <διεξήλθον, προσυποδείξας> σοι διότι πάντα κεκανόνισται πρὸς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ οὐδὲν εἰκῆ κατατέκτακται διὰ τῆς γραφῆς οὔδε μυθοδώς, ἀλλ' ἰνα δι' ὦλου τοῦ ξῆν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἀσκήμεν δικαιοσύνην 5
169 πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, μεμνημένοι τοῦ δυναστεύοντος θεοῦ. περὶ βραχτῶν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων ἑρπτέων καὶ κνωδάλων καὶ τὰς λόγους ἀνατείνει πρὸς δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνανα- 170 στροφῆν δικαίαν. Ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν καλῶς ἐνμίζε περὶ ἐκάστων ἀπολογεῖσθαι καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν προσφερομένων ἔλεγε τοὺς μόσχων τε καὶ κριῶν καὶ χιμάρων, ὅτι δεὶ ταῦτα ἐκ βουκολίων καὶ ποιμνίων λαμβάνοντας ἡμερα θυσιάζειν, καὶ μηθὲν ἄγριον, ὡς οἱ προσφέροντες τὰς θυσίας μηθὲν ὑπερήφανον ἐαυτοῖς συνιστορώς, σημειώσει κεχρημένοι τοῦ διατάξαντος. τῆς γάρ ἐαυτοῦ ψυχῆς τοῦ παντὸς τρόπου τὴν προσφορὰν ποιεῖται ὁ τὴν θυσίαν προσάγων. 15
171 καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν νομίζω τὰ τῆς ὁμιλίας ἄξια λόγῳ καθεστάναι: διὸ τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ ῥώμου προῆγαμι δια- Ὑσ σαφῆσαι σοι, Φιλόκρατε, δι' ἐν ἔχεις φιλομάθειαν.1

§ Jos 172 1 'Ο δὲ Ἐλεάζαρος ποιησάμενος θυσίαν καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπιλέξας καὶ πολλὰ δώρα τῷ βασιλεῖ κατασκευάσας προσέπημεν ἡμᾶς μετὰ 20
173 ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς. ὡς δὲ παρεγενήθημεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, προσ-
ηγγέλη τῷ βασιλείς περὶ τῆς ἀφίξεως ἡμῶν. <παρειμένοι> δὲ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν Ἀνδρέας τε καὶ ἑγώ, φιλοφρόνως ἡσπασάμεθα τὸν βασιλεία καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀποδεδώκαμεν τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Ἕλεαζίρου. περὶ πολλῶν δὲ ποιούμενος τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀνδράσις ἐντυχείν, 174 ἐκέλευσε τοὺς λοιποὺς πάντας ἀπολύσας τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν χρειῶν, καλεῖν δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. οὐ πάσι παραδόξου φανεῖν—διὰ τὸ 175 κατὰ ἐθὸς εἶναι, πεμπταῖοι εἰς πρόσωπον ἔρχεσθι βασιλεῖ τοὺς περὶ χρήσιμον ἀφυσιμόνησας, τοὺς δὲ παρὰ βασιλεῶν ἤ πόλεων ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς μόλις ἐν τριάκοντα εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν παρέσταθα—τοὺς δὲ ἢκοντας τιμῆς καταξιών μείζονος, καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν κρίνον τοῦ πέμψαντος, ἀπολύσας οὖς ἐνόμισεν περισσοῦς, ὑπέμενεν περιπατῶν, ἦς ἀν παραγινομένους ἀστάσηταν. παρελθόντων δὲ σύν τοῖς 176 ἀπεσταλμένοις δόρους καὶ ταῖς διαφόροις διήθεραις, ἐν αἷς ἡ νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφίᾳ τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς γράμμασι, θαυ-μασών <εἰργασμένον τοῦ υμένος>, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἄλληλα συμβολὴς ἀνεταισθήτου κατεσκευασμένης, ὦς εἶδεν δὲ βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἄνδρας, ἐπηρώτα περὶ τῶν Βιβλίων. ὥς δὲ ἀπεκάλυψαν τὰ τῶν ἐνειλημμάτων 177 καὶ τοὺς υμένας ἀνείλεισι, πολλὸν ἐπιτάσσας χρόνον καὶ προσκυνήσας ὑπέκακε εἰς τὸν Ἐυχαριστίον μὲν, ἄνδρες, ὑμῖν, τῷ δ' ἀποστεί-λαντι μᾶλλον, μέγιστον δὲ τῷ θεῷ, οὐνίας ἐστὶ τὰ λόγια ταῦτα. μοιουμαθὸν δὲ πάντων εἰπόντων ὕπο μιᾶν φωνήν, τῶν 178 τε παραγεγονότων καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων, Εὖ βασιλεῦ, προθῆκῃ διακρίνει τῇ χαρᾷ πεπληρωμένος. ἡ γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐντασίς καὶ τὸ

1 παρειμέν ὁ ΗΚΩΖ παρημέν ὁ ΚΑΡΤ ως δε παρημέν B txt ex conj ΗΚΑΓΙΒΡ Τ2 Jos Schmidt 3 επιδεδωκάμεν BZ. Fort leg apedw. (απεδαίων [Jos]) | τας 20

τῆς τμῆς ὑπερτεινὸν δακρύειν ἀναγκάζει κατὰ τὰς ἐπιτυχίας.
179 κελεύσας δὲ εἰς τάξιν ἀποδοῦναι τὰ τεύχη, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἀσπασάμενος τοὺς ἄνδρας εἰπε Δίκαιον ἡν, θεοσεβεῖς ἄνδρες, ὅν χάριν ὑμᾶς μετατεσμήμην, ἐκεῖνοι πρῶτον σεβασμόν ἀποδοῦναι, μετὰ ταῦτα
180 τὴν δεξιὰν ὤμον προτείναν: διὸ πεποίηκα τοῦτο πρῶτον. μεγάλην δὲ τέθειμα τὴν ὑμέραν ταῖτην, ἐν ᾧ παραγεγόνατε, καὶ κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπίσημος ἦσταν πάντα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς ὤμοι χρόνον συντέτυχε γὰρ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ὤμον προσπεπτωκέναι τὴς πρὸς Ἀντέγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δειπνῆσαι σήμερον μεθ’ ὤμοι βουλήσομαι.
181 πάντα <δ’> ὤμον, εἰπε, παρέσται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρησθῆσθε, 10 καριὶ μεθ’ ὤμοι. τῶν δὲ ἀσμενισάντων ἐκέλευσε καταλύματα δοθῆναι τὰ κάλλιστα πλησίον τῆς ἁκρας αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸ συμπόσιον ἐτομαίοις.

182 'Ο δὲ <ἀρχεδεάτρος> Νικάνωρ Δωρόθεον προσκαλεσάμενος, ὅς <Nonnull> ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀποτεταγμένος, ἐκέλευσε τὴν ἐπομαινὰν εἰς ἑκαστὸν 15 ἐπιτελεῖν. ἡν γὰρ οὕτω διατεταγμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως, α μὲν ἐτὶ καὶ νῦν ὄρας· ὡσα γὰρ πόλεις εἰσὶν, <ἀ> τοὺς αὐτοῖς> συγχρώνται πρὸς τὰ ποτὰ καὶ βρωτα καὶ στρωνάς, τοσούτω καὶ προσετέστω ῥήσαν· καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐθυμοῦν οὕτως ἐσκευάζετο, ὅταν παραγένοντο πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ἕνα κατὰ μηθὲν δυσχεραίνοντες ἱλαρῶς διεξά- 20 183 γωσίν· καὶ περὶ τοῦτον ἐγεγονέ· προσεχέστατος γὰρ ὁν ἀνθρωπος δ Δωρόθεος εἶχε τὴν τῶν τοιούτων προστασίαν. συνε-στρωσε δὲ πάντα τὰ δ’ αὐτοῦ χειριζόμενα, πρὸς τὰς τουαίτας ὑποδοχὰς διαμερισμένα. διμηρὴ τε ἐποίησε τὰ τῶν κλησιῶν, καθὼς προσε-
taëven ὁ βασιλεὺς· τοὺς γὰρ ἡμῖνες ἐκέλευσεν ἀνά χεῖρο κατακλώναι, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ κλισίαν, οὐδὲν ἐλλιπών εἶς τὸ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἀνδρᾶς. Ὅσ ὃς δὲ κατεκλύθησαν, ἐκέλευσε τῷ Δωροθέῳ τοὺς ἑθύσιοις οἳς χρῶνται πάντες οἱ παραγωγοὶ πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας, οὕτως ἐπιτελεῖν. διὸ τοὺς ἑροκήρυκας καὶ θύτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, οἷς ξῆς ἤν τὰς κατευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, παρηγήσατο· τῶν δὲ παραγεγονότων σὺν ἡμῖν Ἐλισαίαν ὄντα τῶν ἵερων πρεσβύτερον παρεκάλεσε ποιήσασθαι κατευχήν, ὃς ἐξεισάγοντας εἶπε Πληρώσαι σε, βασιλεῦ, πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν 185 δὲ ἐκτενεῖν ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς· καὶ δόψῃ σοι ταῦτ' ἔχειν καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοι καὶ τοῖς ὁμοούσιοι πάντα ἀνέκλειπτα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς χρόνον. Ἐποίητος δὲ ταῦτα τούτου κατερράγη κρότος μετὰ κραγηγῆς 186 καὶ χαρᾶς εὐφροσύνου πλείονα χρόνον· καὶ τὸ θηματᾶ πρὸς τὸ τέρπεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἥτοιμαμένων ἐτράπησαν, τῶν λειτουργῶν ἅπασῶν διὰ τῆς τοῦ Δωροθέου συντάξεως ἐπιτελουμένων· ἐν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ παίδες ἤσαν, καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως. 1.

"Οτε δὲ καίρον ἔλαβεν ἐκ διαστήματος, ἡρώτησε τὸν ἐξοντα τὴν πρῶτην ἀνάκλισιν (ἠσαν γὰρ καθ’ ἥλικίαν τὴν ἀνάπτωσιν πετούμενοι) Πῶς ἄν τὴν βασιλείαν μέχρι τέλους ἀπαιτητὸν ἔχων διατελοῖ; βραχὺ δὲ ἐπισχῶν εἶπεν Οὕτως ἂν μάλιστα διευθύνοις, 188 μιμούμενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἐπιεικέις. μακροθυμία γὰρ χρώμενος, καὶ βλημάξων τοὺς ἄξιον ἐπιεικέστερον, καθὼς εἰσὶν

189 ἀξιοὺ, μετατιθεῖς ἐκ τῆς κακιᾶς καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄξεις. Ἑπαι-
νέως δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν ἐχόμενον ἥρωτα Πώς ἢν ἐκαστά πρά
tτοι; οὖ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη Τὸ δίκαιον εἰ πρὸς ἄπαντας διατηροῖ, ἐαυτῷ καλῶς
τὰ ἐκαστὰ πράξει, διαλαμβάνων ὅτι πᾶν ἐννόημα σαφές ἔστι θεῷ.
190 καταρχῆν δὲ θείον φόβου λαμβάνων οὐ οὐδεὶς διαπίπτως. Καὶ 5
τοῦτον δὲ εὐ μάλα παραδεξάμενος ἐτερον ἐπηρώτα Πώς ἢν ὁμοίως
ἐαυτῷ ἔχω τοὺς φίλους; κακεῖνος εἰπεν Ἐι θεωροῦσαν πολλὴν σε
πρόνοιαν ποιούμενον ἄν ἀρχεῖς ὡς ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦτο πράξει ἐπι-
βέλτιον ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐνεργετεὶ τὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων γένος, ὃ ὑγείαν
ἀυτοῖς καὶ τροφὴν καὶ τὰ λουτά κατὰ καυρὸν παρασκευάζων 10
ἀπαίτα.
191 Συνεπιμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἥρωτα
Πώς ἢν ἐν τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς καὶ διακρίσεις εὐθημίαις <τυχάνοι>
καὶ ὅπο τῶν ἀποτυγχανόντων; οὖ δὲ εἰπεν Ἐι πᾶσιν ἴσος γένοι τῷ
λόγῳ, καὶ μηδὲν ὑπερηφάνον μηδὲ τῇ περὶ σεαυτὸν ἴσχυί πράσσοις
192 κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων. τοῦτο δὲ τούσχες τὴν διάταξιν βλέπων 15
τὴν ὅπο τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ γὰρ ἰκετεύομενα συντελείσθαι τοὺς ἄξιοὺς,
τοῖς δὲ ἀποτυγχάνοντι ἦ δὲ ὀνείρων ἢ πράξεως σημαίνονται τὸ
βλαβερὸν αὐτοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας οὔδε <κατὰ> τὴν μεγαλω-
σύνην τῆς ἴσχύος τοῦτον αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικεῖα χρωμένον τοῦ
193 θεοῦ.
Εὗ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον καταπαύεσας ἥρωτα τὸν ἄξιον Πώς 20
ἀν ἐν ταῖς πολεμικαῖς χρείαις ἁγίττητος εἶν; οὖ δὲ εἰπεν Ἐι μή
πεποιθὼς ὑπάρχοι τοῖς ὀχλοῖς μηδὲ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν
ἐπικαλοῦτι διὰ πάντων, ἵνα τὰς ἐπιβολὰς αὐτοῦ κατευθύνῃ δικαίως
194 διεξάγοντι πάντα. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ἐτερον
ἥρωτα Πώς ἢν φοβερὸς εἰν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς; οὖ δὲ εἰπεν Ἐι τῇ τῶν 25
ὀπλῶν καὶ δυνάμεων παρασκευὴν πολλὴν χρωμένος <εἰδεῖ> ταῦτα
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1 μετατιθεῖς] + τε B μετατιθῆς A* 2 εκαστά <καλλιστά> Wend.
3 παντας P | διατηρεῖ BPTZ -ροη A<corr> | εαυτω BPTZ (-το) | εαυτων cett
4 πραξις K 6 τουτο A | επηρώτα B<corr> | επηρώτα cett | ομοιως B 7 εαυτω
εαυτον H om Z 10 κατασκευαζων P 12 διαρέσεων Z<corr> διαρέσεων Z<close> |
τυχάνων codd corr Schmidt 13 ἴσως BPTZ | γενοί—σεαυτων (14) | om
BPTZ 14 πραττείς P πρασοις H* (σ altera suprascr) K 18 κατα 20]
om codd 19 autois GI 21 om tais BPTZ | εις Z | o BPTZ<corr> τω
cett 22 υπαρχοι K | υπαρχοι HAGI υπαρχεῖς BPTZ | υχλοις] οπλως P
23 επικαλη B | επιβουλας Ι 25 τη] τω T 26 οπλων P | και δυναμεων] om Z και δυναμεων G | ειδει ex conji] εις ei de ei (oiei B) codd
οντα κενα επι πλειονα χρονον προσ το συμπερασμα δραν τυ και 
γαρ ο θεος διδους ανοχας και ενδεικνυμενος τον της δυναστεια 
φοβου εγκατασκευαζει παση διανοια. 
Και τοιτον δε επαι 
νεσας ειπε προς τον εχομενον Τι καλλιστον αυτω προσ το εξει 
ει; κακεινοι εφη Το γνιωσκειν ότι θεος δυναστειει των απανων 
και επι των καλλιστων πραξεων ουκ αυτοι κατευθυνομεν τα 
βουλευ 
θεντα θεος δε τελειοι τα παιτων και καθηγειται δυναστειων. 
Επι 
Φωνησας δε και τοιτω καλως λεγειν του έτερον ηρωτα Πιως 
αν 
ακεραια συντηρησας απαντα τοις εγγονοις την αυτην παραδει 
διαθεσιν επι τελει; 
ο δε ειπεν Ευχομενους αει προς τον θεον § C 
αγαθας επινοιαι λαμβανειν προσ τα μελλοντα πρασσεσθαι, και 
τοις 
εγγονοις παρακελευνεμοι μη εκπληττεσθαι τη δοξη μηδε τη 
πλουτω 
θεον γα ειναι του χαριζομενον τατα, και ου δε εαυτουσ 
εχειν την υπεροχην απαντων. 
Επιμαρτυρησας δε τοιτοις 
του μετα τατα επινθανετο Πιως αν τα συμβαινοντα μετριω 
φεροι; εκεινοι δε εφηςεν Ει προληψιν λαμβανοις, ότι γεγονα 
υπο του θεου παντες ανδρωτοι μετασχειν των μεγιστων κακων, 
ωσαυτως δε και αγαθων, και ουκ εστιν ανδρωτον οντα 
τοιτων αμιγη 
γενασα 
θεος δε την ευφυιαν διδοσιν, ουκ ικετευειν ανα 
καιον. 
Φιλοφρονηθεις δε και τοιτουν 
καλως ειπεν απαντας 
αποφαινεσθαι επερωτησας δε ετι ενα καταληξω το νυν εχον, 
ινα 
και προς το τερπεσθαι τραπεντες ηδεως διεξαγομεν. εν δε ται 
μετα 
τατα εξ εξης ημεραις και παρα των λοιπων εξης μαθησομαι 
τι πλεον. ειτ επηρωται τον ανδρα Τι περας ανδρειας εστιν; 
ο δε 
ειπεν Ει το 
βουλευθεν ορθως εν ταις των καινων πραξεων 
επιτελουτο κατα προδεσιν. 
τελειουται δε υπο του θεου παντα σοι 
και 
ολως 
βουλευμενοι, βασιλευ, συμφεροντως. 
Επιφωνησαντων 
των και 
κροτω σημαναμενυ προς τους φιλοσοφους ειπεν ο 
βασιλευς 
(ουκ ολιγοι γαρ παρησαν τοιτοις) Οιομι διαφερεν 
τους 
2 των] τα recte ut vid Wend. 
8 om και BPTZ | τουτο Ζ 
9 ekge 
νοις ABT 
10 ετι τελει P] επιτελειν BZ:corr επιτελη Τ επιτελου cett 
12 εκγονοι AB*T 
13 om ou B 
14 απαντων] pr των H | toutous I 
16 ϕερει P | λαμβανεις BT | γεγοναιν BPT 
18 αγαθον] pr των BT 
19 om de C 
20 τουτω P 
21 αποκρινεσθαι B | om de C 
23 ημεραι 
24 ετι επηρωτα BCTZ (εται BC)] ετ επηρωτα 
27 βουλευμενον BT] βουλομεν cett 
28 σημαναμενον CTZ 
29 ολιγοι Ζ


1. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

2. άνδρας ἀρετῆ καὶ συνιέναι πλείον, οἶνον ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ τοιαύτας ἐρωτήσεις λαμβάνοντες, ὡς δέν ἔστιν ἀποκεκριμένοι, πάντες ἀπὸ
3. τὸν θεοῦ τὸν λόγου τὴν καταρχὴν πιούμενον. Μενεὼμος δὲ ὁ Ἐρέτριευς φιλόσοφος εἶπε Ναί, βασιλεὺς προνοίᾳ γὰρ τῶν ὀλίγων
4. διακομένων, καὶ ὑπειληφότων ὀρθῶς τούτῳ, ὅτι θεόκτιστόν ἔστιν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀκολουθεῖ πάσαν δυναστείαν καὶ λόγου καλλονήν ἀπὸ
5. τοῦτο κατάρχεσθαι. τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπιφεύγοντος τὰ περὶ τούτων ἤληξεν, ἐτράπησαν δὲ πρὸς εὐφροσύνην. ἐπιλαβοῦσης δὲ τῆς
6. ἐστέρας τὸ συμπόσιον ἐλύθη.

7. Τῇ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάταξιν τὰ τῆς ἀναπτύσσεσαι καὶ συμποσίας ἐπετελεῖτο. καθὼς δὲ ἐνόμιζεν ὁ
8. βασιλεὺς εὐκαίριον πρὸς τὸ πυνθάνονσαι τι τῶν ἀνδρῶν,
9. ἐπηρώτα τοὺς ἐξῆς τῶν ἀποκεκριμένων τῇ προτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. πρὸς τὸν ἐνδεκατὸν δὲ ἦρεσ τὴν κοινολογίαν ποιεῖτο: δέκα γὰρ ἦσαν
10. οἱ Ἴρωμενοι τῇ προτέρᾳ. συγγες δὲ γενομένης ἐπυνθάνετο Πῶς
11. ἐν πλούσιοι διάμενοι; βραχὺ δὲ ἐπισχῶν ὁ τὴν ἐρωτήσειν ἐκδειγμένοις ἐπέπελεν Εἰ μηδὲν ἄναξιον τῆς ἀρχῆς μηδὲ ἀσέλγεις πρᾶσσον,
12. μηδὲ διαπάνη εἰς τὰ κενὰ καὶ μάταια συντελοῖ, τοὺς <δὲ> ὑποτεταγμένους εὐεργεσίας πρὸς ἔννοιαν ἁγιοί τὴν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσιν
13. αἰτίοις ἀγαθῶν ἐστίν, ὁ κατακολουθεῖν ἀναγκαῖον.

14. Ἅπαται -
15. νέας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τούτον ἐπέρωτα Πῶς ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειαν διατηροῖ; δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀπεκρίθη Γινώσκων ὅτι μεγαλύν ἀληξύνην ἐπιφέρει τὸν ψεῦδος πᾶσιν ἄνθρώποις, πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον
toί βασιλεύσων ἐξουσίαν γὰρ ἔχοντες δὲ βουλοῦνται πρᾶσσεν, τίνος ἔνεκεν ἀν ψεύσαντο; προσλαμβάνειν δὲ δεῖ τούτο σε, βασιλεῦν, διότι
16. φιλαλήθης ὁ θεὸς ἐστίν. Ἀποδεδείχθης δὲ εἰ μᾶλλα καὶ
toύτον ἐπιβλέψας εἶπεν Τί ἔστι σοφίας διδαχῆ; δὲ ὁ ἐτερος
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3 om τοῦ Β | Μενεὼμος ΒΤ Βενεὼμος Ζ | om de ΒΤ 8 de 1ο B] de
ta cett | πρὸς εὐφροσ.—τῇ de (10) om A 13 προτῆς Κ | πρὸς τον εὐδοκ.—
προτερα (15) om Bext ins Bmg 15 om οἱ ΚΒ | προτερα] προτερα Α*
(=παία Αcorr) + θεο recounted Bmg 16 διαμελεῖν P 18 δαπανὴν Mend. | συν-
tελεῖ ΒΣ συντελῆ Ζ συντελεῖ P | de Mend. (et sic L) om codd cett
19 ευεργεσία] + de Β | αγε ΒΤ 21 επηρώτα ΒΤ] επηρώτα cett 22 δια-
tηροῦν ΒΑcorr 23 επιφέρει ΚΒ επιφέρον cett 24 ευεργεσία—πρασσέν
om C | o] αὐτόν B 25 αν ενεκεν Ζ | προσλαμβάνειν ΒΤ] προσλαμβάνειν cett |
σε] σοι Α 26 om o θεός P 27 post τούτων fort eti τον μετ αυτον vel
aliquid simile excidit
ἀπεφήνατο Καθὼς οὐ βούλει σεαυτῷ τὰ κακὰ παρείναι, μέτοχος δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπάρχειν ἀπάντων, εἰ πράσσοις τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς ὑποτε-
tαγμένους καὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας, εἰ τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιεικέστερον νουθετοῦσι καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
5 ἀπαντᾷ ἐπιεικεία ἄγει. 'Επαινέσας αὐτον τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν 208
ἐπεὶ Πῶς ἂν φιλάνθρωπος εἶτ; κάκεινος ἐφή Θεωρὼν ὡς ἐν τολλῷ χρόνῳ καὶ κακοπαθείας μεγάστας αὐξεί τε καὶ γεννᾶται τὸ
tῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· οὗτοι οὐτὲ εὐκόπως δεί κολάζειν, οὗτε αἰκίας περιβάλλειν· γινώσκον ὅτι τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζην ἐν ὁδοῖς τε καὶ
10 τιμωρίας καθέστηκεν. ἐπινοῶν οὖν ἐκαστα πρὸς τὸν ἔλεον τραπέζῃ:
καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐλεήμων ἔστιν. 'Αποδεξάμενος δὲ τοῦτον 209
ἐπυνάντο τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔξης Τίς ἀναγκαίοτατος τρόπος βασιλείας; Τὸ συντρεπτικόν, εἰπεν, αὐτὸν ἄδωροδόκητον, καὶ νίφεεν τὸ πλεῖον μέρος
tοῦ βίου, καὶ δικαίωσάν την προτιμάν, καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους φιλοποιε-
thου; καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς φιλοδίκαιος ἐστιν. 'Επισημήνας καὶ 210
τοῦτον πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον εἰπεν Τί τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἔστιν κατάστασμα; ἔκεινος δὲ ἐφή Τὸ διαλαμβάνειν ὅτι πάντα διὰ πάντος ὁ θεὸς ἐνεργεῖ
καὶ γινώσκει, καὶ οὐδὲν ἂν λάθοι ἄδικον ποιήσαι ή κακόν ἐργασά-
μενος ἀνθρωπος· ὥς γὰρ θεὸς ἐνεργεῖτε τὸν ἀλον κόσμον, οὕτως καὶ
20 σὺ μιμούμενος ἀπρόσκοπος ἂν ἔης. 'Επιφωνήσας δὲ τοῦτῳ 211
πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον εἰπεν τὰς ὀροὺς τοῦ βασιλεὺς ἐστιν; ὃ δὲ ἐφή Τὸ καλῶς ἀρχεῖν ἐανοῦ, καὶ μὴ τὸ πλοῦτι καὶ τῇ δόξῃ φερόμενον
ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἀσχημόν τι ἐπιθυμήσαι, εἰ καλῶς λογίζοι. πάντα
gάρ σοι πάρεστιν οὕτω οὐδέν. ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀπροσδήσῃ ἔστι καὶ ἐπιεικῆς.

1 απεφήνατο] εἰπεν B απεκρινατο P | βουλῃ HGCZ | om ta BCTZ HKAGIB
2 πρασσεις KBCP | aμαρτ. kai touς υποτεταγ. P | 3 om touς το B
4 νουθετες KBPT | 6 om av Z* ins Z' | 7 om τε I | 8 ouet 10 | oude Z | aikiais (cf 3 Macc 6. 26) BT | aitias HKCPZ aitias GIA
9 ton avraν HKB | om τε KB | 11 δε] + kai GI | 12 om epnuhaneveto
13 Katt ins post eixi K | το τον K | basileias] pr om της P | 13 eanov P
14 φιλοποιεσθαι H | 16 om τον BT | om της B | katapsteia eanov Z
17 om de K | diapantos] plus om K | energei kai ginwsecei o θεος P | 19 theos]
pr om olov P | 20 tou ἄνεον CPZ | 22 eanov] + kai basilevein e sto K
23 uperephayon] + τη BT* (ras 2 litt) | om τη B | epihymiasa P | epihymiasa Β epinoseio Z epihymiasio cett | 24 ws oued] osa deon conj
Wend.
βασιλεύς: πάντες γὰρ θέλουν μετασχείν ταύτης τῆς δόξης, ἀλλ' οὖ 225 δύνανται: θεοῦ γὰρ ἐστι δόμα. Ἔπαινεσάς δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα διὰ πλειόνων ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἑτερον Πῶς ἀν καταφρονοῦ τὸν ἐχθρῶν; ὅ δὲ ἐλευθεροκόμων πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εὑροίοι καὶ κατεργασάμενος φιλίας, λόγον οὕθεν ἄν ἔχοις: τὸ δὲ κεχαριτωσθαι πρὸς 5 πάντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ καλὸν δόμον εἰλήφειν παρὰ θεοῦ τουτ' ἐστι 226 κράτιστον. Συναινεσάς δὲ τούτου τὸν ἔξης ἐκέλευσεν ἀποκρυθῆναι, πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπὼν Πῶς ἀν δοξαζόμενος διαμένοι; εἴπε δὲ Τῇ προσθυμίᾳ καὶ ταῖς χάρισι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους μεταδοτικὸς ἄν καὶ μεγαλομερῆς οὐδέποτε ἤν ἀπολέσαι δόξης. ἵνα δὲ τὰ προερή- 10 227 μένα σοι διαμένῃ, τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦ διὰ παντὸς. Εὐθυ- μήσας δὲ τούτον ἑτερον ζῇ ῥώτα Πῶς τινα δεῖ φιλότιμον εἶναι; ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφη: Πρὸς τοὺς φιλικοὺς ἔχοντας ἡμῖν οἴνοιται πάντες ὅτι πρὸς τούτους δεόν ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολαβῶνα, πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδοξοῦντας φιλοτιμίαν δεῖν χαριστικήν ἔχειν, ἵνα τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ μετάγωμεν 15 αὐτούς ἐπὶ τὸ καθῆκον καὶ συμφέρον ἐαυτοῖς. δεῖ δὲ τὸν θεὸν λιτανεύειν, ἵνα ταῦτ' ἐπιτελήται τὰς γὰρ ἀπάντων διανοιαὶς 228 κρατεῖ. Συνομολογήσας δὲ τούτοις τὸν ἐκτὸς ἐκέλευσεν ἀποφήνασθαι πυνθανόμενος Τίτι δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι; ἐκεῖνος δ' ἀπεκρίθη: Γονεῦσί διὰ παντὸς, καὶ γὰρ δὲ θεὸς πεποίηται ἐντολήν 20 μεγίστην περὶ τῆς τῶν γονέων τιμῆς. ἐπομείνως δὲ τὴν τῶν φίλων ἐγκρίναι διάθεσιν, προσονομάσας ἰκόν τῇ ψυχῇ τὸν φίλον. σὺ δὲ καλῶς ποιεῖς ἀπαντᾶς ἀνθρώπους εἰς φιλίαν πρὸς ἐαυτὸν καθ- 229 ιστῶν. Παρακαλέσας δὲ καὶ τούτον ἐπιθυμᾶνετό καὶ τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί καλλονῆς ἄξιόν ἑστιν; δ' δὲ εἶπεν Εὐσέβεια. καὶ 25 γὰρ αὐτὴ καλλονῆς τίς ἐστὶ πρωτεύουσα. τὸ δὲ δυνατὸν αὐτῆς 22 Deut 13β
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ετίνιν ἀγάπην· αὐτὴ γὰρ θεοῦ δόσις ἐστὶν· ἢν καὶ σὺ κέκτησα πάντα
περιέχων ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ ἀγαθά. 

Διὰν δὲ φιλοφρόνως ἐπικρο-
tίσας ἔπεσε πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον Πῶς ἂν πταίσας πάλιν τῇς αὐτῆς
κρατήσαι δόξῆς; δὲ ἐὰν ἢ ἦν μὲν οὐ δυνατὸν ἐστὶ πταίσαι, πᾶσι
γὰρ χάριτος ἐσπαρκας, αἱ βλαστάνουσιν εὐνοιαν, ἢ τὰ μέγιστά τῶν
ὄπλων κατισχύονσα περιλαμβάνει τὴν μεγίστην ἀσφάλειαν· εἰ δὲ
231
τινες πταίσωσιν, ἐφ᾽ οἷς πταίσωσιν, οὐκέτι χρή ταύτα πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ
φιλιάν κατακτησάμενον δικαιοπραγεῖν. θεοῦ δὲ δῶρον ἄγαθῶν
ἔργατὴν εἶναι καὶ μὴ τῶν ἑναντίων. 

Συναρεσθεῖς δὲ τούτως 232
10 πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον εἶπε Πῶς ἂν ἐκτὸς γένοιτο λύπης; ὃ δὲ ἐφήσεν Εἰ
μὴ δέναι βλάπτοι, πάντας δὲ ὕφελοί, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ κατακολουθών
τοὺς γὰρ ἂν αὐτῆς καρποὺς ἀλυπίαν κατασκευάζειν. ἤκετευν δὲ
233
τὸν θεόν, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παρὰ τὴν προάρεστον ἡμῖν ἀνακύπτοντα
βλάπτῃ, λέγω δὴ οἶον θάνατοι τε καὶ νόσοι καὶ λύπαι καὶ τὰ
15 τοιαῦτα. <αὐτῷ> δὲ σοὶ εὑσεβεί καθεστώτα τούτων οἴδεν ἂν
προσέλθου. 

Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τούτων ἑπανέσας τὸν δέκατον ἥρωτα 234
Τῇ μεγίστῃν ἔστιν δόξῃς; δὲ ἐπὶ ἔπεσε Τῷ τιμῶν τὸν θεῶν· τούτῳ δὲ
ἐστὶν σὺ δώρος οὐδὲ θυσίας, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς καθαρότητι καὶ διαλήψεις
δοσίας, καθὼς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα κατασκευάζεται καὶ διοικεται
20 κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν· ἢν καὶ σὺ διατελεῖς ἑξῶν γνώμην, ἢ
πάρεστι σημειούσαι πάσιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ συντελεσμένων καὶ
συντελούμενων.

Μετὰ μείζονος δὲ φωνῆς πάντας αὐτοὺς δὲ 235
βασιλεὺς ἡστάζετο καὶ παρεκάλει, συνεπιφωνοῦντων τῶν παρόντων,
μάλιστα δὲ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἀγωγαῖς καὶ τῷ λόγῳ
25 πολὺ προέχοντες αὐτῶν ἦσαν, ὥς ἂν ἀπὸ θεοῦ τὴν καταρχὴν ποιο-
μένοι, μετὰ δὲ ταύτα δὲ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ φιλοφρονεύονθαι προηλθε
διὰ τῶν προτόσεων.

1 ἃρ] de B | θοὸ δοις BCTR] θεοδοσίους cett 2 αὐτῇ] εαυτῇ K αυτῷ HKAGIB
B* εαυτῷ B1 txt cett 3 της αὐτῆς παλιν P 5 επερκας HA | ευνοιαν] CPTZ
+εἰ de tines πταίσων εφ οἰς πταίσωι K* (del rubricator) 8 κτησ-
μένους BT | αγαθον CT*Z 9 συναρκεσθεῖς B 10 εφήσεν] εφη ΑΡ
11 βλάπτου] λυσεται Zvid (fin ex corr) | ωφελεί KT ωφελοῖ P 12 αυτοὺς
Κ 13 om τα KBCTZ 14 βλάπτοι CPZ | λέγω δὴ (de Z) om P | om
te P 15 τοιαῦτα de σοι codd (cum lacuna post τοιαῦτα BC) autw inserui |
αὐτω—καθεστωτι] εὑσεβεί de σοι οντι P 19 καθως—κατα (20) om
HKAGI 22 de μείζονος Z 25 προσέχοντες BZ | αυτῷ B* | ισαν P)
om cett 27 προτόσεων BTHcorr] πρακτοσιτων PKcorr προτόσεων cett
236 Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῆς διατάξεως τοῦ συμποσίου
gενομένης, καθὸς ἐκείρων ἐγένετο τῷ βασιλεῖ, τοὺς ἐξῆς ἡρώτα τῶν
προαποκεκριμένων, εἶπε δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ Τὸ φρονεῖν εἰ διδακτὸν ἔστω;
ὅς δὲ ἐπεὶ Ψυχῆς ἐστὶ κατασκευὴ διὰ θείας δυνάμεως ἐπιδέχεσθαι
πᾶν τὸ καλὸν, ἀποστρέφεσθαί δὲ τάναντία.

Συνομολογοῦσας 5
de τὸν ἐχόμενον ἡρώτα Τί πρὸς ὑγείαν μάλιστα συντείνει; ἐκεῖνος
de ἐφ᾽ Ἡσυφροσύνης ταύτης δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶ τυχεῖν, ἔναν μὴ θεὸς κατα-

237 σκευάσῃ τὴν διανοίαν εἰς τοῦτο.

Παρακάλεσας δὲ τούτων πρὸς
tὸν ἐτερον ἐφή Πῶς ἄν γονεύσῃ τὰς ἄξιας ἀποδόῃς χάριτας; ὅς δὲ ἐπεὶ Μηδὲν αὐτοῦς λυπήσας· τούτῳ δ' οὐκ ἔστων, εἰ μὴ θεὸς τῆς δια-

238 νοίας ἡγεμῶν γένοιτο πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα.

Προσπενεύσας δὲ
tούτῳ τὸν ἐξῆς ἡρώτα Πῶς ἄν φιλήκοος εἰή; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐπεὶ Δια-
λαμβάνων ὧτι τὰς ἐπινοιας ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκε τοῖς νομοθετήσας
πρὸς τὸ σώζεσθαι τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀκόλουθος εἰς

239 ἄν αὐτοῖς.

᾿Αποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἐτερον ἐφῆ Τίς 20

ὁφέλεια συγγενεῖας ἐστὶν; ὁ δὲ ἀπεφήνατο Ἐάν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι νομίζωμεν ἀτυχοῦσι μὲν ἠλπιοῦσθαι, καὶ κακοπαθῶμεν ὡς αὐτοῖς,

240 φαίνεται τὸ συγγενὲς ὅσον ἰαχῦν ἐστὶ—τελομένων δὲ τούτων καὶ
dόξα καὶ προκοπὴ παρὰ τοὺς τοιούτους ὑπάρχει· τὸ γὰρ συνεργεῖs

H K A G I B
C P T Z
2 γενομένου BT | тους] тοις I
3 апокεκριμένων T 4 dia] καὶ P
6 εκείνων B* | екеινοί B1 | 7 εαυ] ει A | κατασκευασει HAGCZ* 8 om de
9 εἰτε Z | αποδῶν G | αποδώση Z | γονευσαν αποδων тас еβ. χαρ.
B 10 λυπησας P | λυπησαί cett | της διανοιας ἡγεμων bis scripsit К
12 om κα] ειη] pr κα Z | διαλαμβανει B 13 συμφερει T 14 ανυπο-
ποτιθης T (Wend.) txt (ant. GICZ) cett 15 αν αντιπρασηται] αντιπρα-
σηται G | αν πη πρασ. IB | txt (fort recte) cett (αν αντ. Wend.) | συγχειρα-
γωγια A*GITZ | еστιν аι] еστι και P 16 η των πρ. τελεωσις T* | ? εισω
υπ αυτων 17 πρασσοι παρα των βουμ BCPTZ 18 δεδωκε P 19 ειης]
pr аν BTZ* (post ras) 20 om аν BT | аυτων] тουτων P | еτερων] pr тон
HFZ 22 νομιζομεν KAcorr Bcorr T] νομιζομεν cett | ατυχουσι KAcorr BPT
ατυχωσι cett | ωs аυτωи BCcorr Tcorr] ws аυτωн PC*T* vid ωs аυτων cett
(ω σωστωσ) 23 οσον—συνεργεισ (24)] om Btxt ins Bmg | om και P
24 υπαρχει GI | συγγενες Bcorr T
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eυνόμων γινόμενον ως ε' έαυτού ἀδίαλυτον πρὸς ἀπαντα—μετα δὲ εὐη-
μερίας, μηδὲν προσδείσοιν των ἐκείνων· ἀλλὰ δέον ἢθεν ἢκετεύειν,
pάντα γαθοσοποίειν. Ὅσατοσ δὲ ἐκείνοις ἀποδεξάμενοι 243
αὐτὸν ἄλλον ἠρώτα Πως ἀφοβία γίνεται; εἴπε δὲ Σωιστοροῦνης
τῆς διανοίας μηδὲν κακὸν πεπραχέναι, θεοῦ κατερθύνοντος εἰς τὸ
καλὸς ἀπαντα βουλεύεσθαι. Τοῦτω δὲ ἐπιφωνήσασ τρὸς 244
ἄλλον εἴπε Πως ἂν προχεῖρως ἠχοῖ τὸν ὅρθον λόγον; δὲ εἴπεν
Εἰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀτυχήματα διὰ παντὸς ἐπιβλέποι γυνώσκων
ὅτι ο θεός ἀφαίρεται τὰ εὐημερίας, ἐτέρους δὲ δοξάζων εἰς τὸ
10 τιμᾶσθαι προάγει.

Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τούτον ἀποδεξάμενος τὸν 245
ἐξής ἀποκριθήναι παρεκάλει Πως ἂν μὴ εἰς ῥαθυμίαν, μηδὲ entend τὰs
ὑδονάς τρέποντο; δὲ Προχεῖρως ἠχων, εἴπεν, ὅτι μεγάλης
βασιλείας κατάρχει καὶ πολλῶν ὄχλων ἀφήγεται, καὶ οὐ δει περὶ
ἐτερόν τι τὴν διάνοιαν εἶναι, τῆς δέ τούτων ἐπιμελείας φροντίζειν;
15 θεον δὲ ἄξιον, ὅπως μηθὲν ἐλλήπτη τῶν καθηκόντων.

'Επαινέσας δὲ καὶ τούτῳ τὸν δεκατον <ήρωτα Πως ἂν ἐπιγνωσκοῖ> τοὺς
δόλω τυν πρὸς αὐτὸν πράσσοντας; δὲ ἀπεφήματο πρὸς τοῦτο Εἰ
παρατηροῦτο τὴν ἀγωγήν ἐλευθερίων ὅπως, καὶ τὴν εὐταξίαν διαμέ-
νουσαν ἐν τοῖς ἀστασμοῖς καὶ συμβουλιαῖς καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ συναν-
20 στροφῆ τῶν τῶν αὐτῷ, καὶ μηθὲν ὑπερτείνοντας τὸν δέοντος ἐν ταῖς
φιλοφρονήσει καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἀγωγὴν. θεοὶ δὲ 247
τὴν διάνοιαν <ἀξεί> σου, βασιλεύ, πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα. Συγ-
kροτήσας πάντας τ' ἐπαινέσας κατ' ὄνομα, καὶ τῶν παρόντων ταῦτα
ποιοῦντων, ἐπὶ τὸ μέλπει ἐτράπησαν.

1 διάλυτον Ζ 2 θεον ins. Mend. 3 is in ekeinos sup HKLAGIB
ras T 4 πως ex opws Tvid | om eite de K 6 απαρτας G τουτο
CPTZ βα

13 καταρχή Z | om όξλων B 15 ελλειπει B* ελλειπὴ Bcorr PT
16 ερωτα codd [an επιγνωσκο] επιγνωσκοι B επιγνωσκει (-eis Z) cett
17 δολων τυν Λcorr | πρασσοντα προς αυτον BT | προς τοπο τουτον B*
Tcorr vid απεφήματο P 18 αυταιαν ΚΙ (ευ sup ras ΙΙ) 19 συμβου-
λιαι [(-eis GICZ)] συμβουλιας HK (-eis) Λ* 20 μηθει HKBP | υπε-
tεινειν Π υπερτεινιν B* (as add Bcorr) υπερτεινινται Zcorr 22 διανοιαν]
di anoi C | eixe codd | συγκροτησας + de B +ouw καὶ P cum praeced conj
cett o de βασιλεὺς συγκροτησας edd pr (cod Mon) 23 τ (τε Κ)] om P | τα
auta Bvid T

s s

38
Τῇ δὲ ἐχομένῃ τὸν καὶ ρῶν λαβών ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἔξις Τῖς ἔστιν ἀμέλεια μεγίστῃ; πρὸς τούτ’ ἔφη Εἰ τέκνων ἀφροντίς τις εἶη, καὶ μὴ κατὰ πάντα πρόπον ἀγαγεῖν <σπευδοὶ>: εὐχόμεθα γὰρ ἅμι κρὸς τὸν θεόν, οὐχ οὐτως περὶ ἐπιτών ὡς περὶ τῶν ἑγγόνων, ἕνα παρῇ πάντα αὐτοῖς τὰ ἀγαθά. τὸ δὲ ἐπειδεῖσθαι παίδια σωφροσύνης μετασχεῖν, τεθεὶν δυνάμει τούτῳ γίνεται. Φύσας δὲ εὐλογεῖν ἄλλον ἤρωτα Πῶς ἄν φιλόπατρες εἰη; Προτιθέμενος, εἶπεν, ὅτι καλὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ καὶ ξῆν καὶ τελευτᾶν. ἦ δὲ ἕξειν τοῖς μὲν πένησι καταφρώνησον ἐργαζέται, τοῖς δὲ πλουσίοις ὄνειδος, ὥς διὰ κακίαν ἐκπεπτωκόσιον, ἐδεργάτων οὖν ἀπαντας, καθὼς συνεχῶσ τούτ’ ἐπιτελεῖς, θεοῦ διδόντος 10

250 σοὶ πρὸς πάντας χάριν, φιλόπατρες φανήση. Τούτων δὲ ἀκούσας τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔξις ἐπυνθάνετο Πῶς <ἀν> ἀρμόσαι γυναικὶ; <Γινώσκων> ὅτι μὲν θράσυ ἔστιν, ἔφη, τὸ θῆλι γένος, καὶ δραστικῶν ἐφ’ ἃ βουλεῖται πράγμα, καὶ μεταπίπτον εὐκόπως διὰ παραλογισμοῦ, καὶ τῇ φύσει κατεσκεύασται ἀσθενεῖς. δεὸς ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ ύγιῆς 15

251 χρησκαὶ, καὶ μὴ πρὸς έριν ἀντιπράσσειν. κατορθοῦται γὰρ βίος, ὅταν ὁ κυβερνῶν εἶδῷ, πρὸς τίνα σκοτόν δεὶ τὴν διέξοδον ποιεῖσθαι. θεοῦ δ’ ἐπικλῆσει καὶ βίος κυβερνᾶται κατὰ πάντα. Συν- αὐθομολογησάμενος δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἔξις ἠρώτα Πῶς <ἀν> ἀναμάρτητος εἰη; ο δὲ ἐφησεν Ἡμᾶς ἀπαντα πρᾶσον καὶ μετὰ διαλογισμοῦ 20 καὶ μὴ πεθόμενος διαβολαῖς, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἂν δοκιμασθῇ τῶν λεγομένων καὶ κρίσει κατευθύνων τὰ τῶν ἑπτεύξεων καὶ διὰ κρίσεως ἐπιτελῶν ταῦτα ἀναμάρτητος, ἐφησεν, ἄν εἰης, ὃ βασιλεῦ. τὸ δ’ ἐπινοεῖ ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀναφροδέσθαι θεῖας δυνάμεις ἐστὶν
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μετὰ τοῦτο διαμένη; πρὸς τούτ' εἶπεν Εἴ μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ταῖς ποιήσεσιν ἐπιτελοῦ, πρὸς τὸ φεύσασθαι τοὺς θεωροῦντας διὰ τὴν καλλονήν, καὶ μηθέναι τῶν κατεργαζομένων τὰ τουώτα παρατέμπου, μηδὲ τοὺς ἀλλοὺς ἁμισθὶ συντελεῖν ἀναγκάζει τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν.

259 διανοοοῦμενος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πολυωρίζει τὸν ἀνθρώπων γένος, χρόνιος γάρ αὐτοῖς καὶ υγείαν καὶ εὐαίσθησιν καὶ τὰ λοιπά, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκόλουθον τί πράξει τῶν κακοπαθείων ἀποδιδοῦ τὴν ἀντάμειψιν.

260 τὰ γὰρ ἐκ δικαιοσύνης τελοῦμενα, ταῦτα καὶ διαμένει. Ἕν δὲ καὶ τοῦτον εἰρήκεναι φύσας τὸν δέκατον ἴσωτα Τί ἐστι σοφίας καρπός; ὄ δὲ εἶπε Τὸ μὴ συνιστορεῖν ἐαυτῷ κακὸν πεπραχότι, τὸν 10

261 δὲ βίον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διεξάγειν. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ κρατίστὴ χαρὰ καὶ ψυχῆς εὐστάθεια σοι γίνεται, μέγιστε βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἐλπίδες ἐπὶ θεῷ καλαί κρατοῦντέ σοι τῇ ἀρχῆς ἑσσέβως. ὶς δὲ συνήκουσαν πάντες ἐπεφώνησαν σὺν κρότῳ πλείον, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ προσπεὶν ὁ βασιλεῖς [λαμβάνεις] ἐτράπη, χαρὰ πεπληρωμένος.

262 Τῇ δ’ ἐξῆς καθὼς πρότερον ἡ διάταξις ἤν τῶν κατὰ τὸν πότον ἐπιτελούμενον, καμροῦ δὲ γενομένον τοὺς ἀπολιποῦτας ὁ βασιλεῖς ἐπηρώτα. πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον δὲ ἐφῆ Πῶς ἂν μὴ τραπείνης εἰς 15

263 ὑπερηφανίαν; ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Εἴ τὴν ἑσοχήν τηροῦ, καὶ παρ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐαυτὸν ὑπομιμήσκοι, καθὼς ἄνθρωπος ὁν ἄνθρωπον ἡγείται. καὶ 20 ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὑπερήφανους καθαρεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ ταπεινούς

264 ὑποῖοι. Παρακάλεσας δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐξῆς ἐπηρώτα Τίσι δεὶ συμβούλους χρήσθαι; τοῖς δὲ πολλῶν, ἐφῆ, πεπειραμένους πραγμάτων καὶ τὴν εὐνοιαν συντηροῦν ἀκέραιον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν τρόπων ὅσοι μετέχουσιν αὐτῷ. Θεοῦ δὲ ἐπιφάνεια γίνεται πρὸς τὰ 25
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τοιαύτα τοῖς ἀξίοις.

'Επαινέσας δὲ αυτὸν ἄλλον ἡρώτα Τίς 265 ἔστι βασιλείᾳ κτήσει ἀναγκαιοτάτη; Τῶν ὑποτεγαμένων φιλαν-
θρωπία καὶ ἀγάπησις, ἀπεκρίνατο. διὰ γὰρ τούτων ἀλωτος εὐοίας
dεσμὸς γίνεται. τὸ δὲ γίνεσθαι κατὰ προαιρέσεις ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς
5 ἐπιτελεῖ.

Καταπεινέσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἔτερον διεπινθάνετο 266 Τι πέρας ἔστι λόγου; κάκεινος δὲ ἔφησε· Τὸ πείσαι τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα,
dιὰ τῆς ὑποτεγαμένης τάξεως τὰς βλάβας ἐπιδεικνύντα· οὕτω γὰρ
λήψῃ τὸν ἀκροατὴν οὐκ ἀντικείμενος, συγχρῶμενος δὲ ἐπαινὺ πρὸς
tὸ πείσαι. θεοῦ δὲ ἐνεργείᾳ κατευθύνεται πειθῶ. 

Εὗ δὲ 267 λέγει φήσας αὐτὸν ἔτερον ἡρώτα Πῶς ἂν, παμμεγῶν ὀχλῶν ὄντων
eν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, τούτους <ἀρμόσαι>; Τὸ πρέπον ἐκατότι συνυποκρινό-
μενος, εἶπε, καθηγημένα λαμβάνων δικαιοσύνην· ὃς καὶ ποιεῖς θεοῦ
σοι διδόντος εὗ λογίζεσθαι.

Φιλοφρονθεὶς δὲ τούτῳ πρὸς 268 τὸν ἔτερον εἶπεν Ἐπὶ τίς δὲι λυπεῖσθαι; πρὸς ταῦτα ἀπεκρίθη Τὰ
15 συμβαίνοντα τοῖς φίλοις ὅταν θεωρῶμεν πολυχρόνια καὶ ἀνέκφευκτα
gινόμενα. τελευτήσας μὲν γὰρ καὶ κακῶν ἀπολελυμένοις οὐχ
ὑπογράφει λύπην ὁ λόγος· ἄλλα ἐφ' εαυτοὺς ἀναφερόντες καὶ τὸ
πρὸς εαυτοὺς συμφέρον λυποῦνται πάντες ἀνθρώποι. τὸ δ' ἐκφυγεῖ
πάν κακὸν θεοῦ δύναμει γίνεται. 'Ως ἐδει δὲ φήσας αὐτὸν 269 ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς ἔτερον εἶπε Πῶς ἀδοξία γίνεται;
ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφησεν "Οταν ὑπερηφανία καθηγήται καὶ θράσος ἀληκτὸν, ἀτιμα-
σμὸς ἐπιφύτει καὶ δόξης ἀναίρεσις. θεοῖς δὲ δόξης πάσης κυριεύει,
ρέτων οὖ βούλεται. 

Καὶ τούτῳ δ' ἐπικυρώσας τὰ τῆς ἀπο-
270 κρύσεως τὸν ἐξῆς ἡρώτα Τίς δὲι πιστεύειν εαυτόν; Τοῖς δὲ τὴν
25 εὐνοιαν, εἶπε, συνυούσι σοι, καὶ μη διὰ τὸν φόβον μὴ διὰ πολυ-
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ορίαν, ἐπανάγουσι πάντα πρὸς τὸ κερδαίνειν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄγα-
πῆσεως σημείον, τὸ δὲ δυνανόιας καὶ καιροτρησίας: ὦς γὰρ ἔπο-
tὸ πλεονεκτεῖν ὁ ὀρμάται προδόθης πέφυκε. σὺ δὲ πάντας εὖνοις

271 ἔχεις θεοῦ σοι καλὴν βουλὴν διδόντος. Σοφῶς δὲ αὐτῶν
eἰπών ἀποκεκρίθαι, ἐτέρῳ εἴπε Τί βασιλείαν διατηρεῖ; πρὸς τούτοις ἔφη Μέριμμα καὶ φροντίς, ὃς οὐδὲν κακογρηγθήσεται διὰ τῶν ἀπο-
tεταγμένων εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους ταῖς χρείαις καθὼς σὺ τούτο πράσσεις

272 θεοῦ σοι τὴν σεμνὴν ἐπίνοιαν διδόντος. Θαραύνας δὲ τοῦτον
tερον ἐπηρώτα Τί διαφυλάσσει χάριτα καὶ τιμήν; ὦ δὲ εἶπεν Ἄρετῆ.
καλῶν γὰρ ἐργῶν ἐστὶν ἐπίτελεια, τὸ δὲ κακὸν ἀποτρίβει. ταῖς
cαθὼς σὺ διατηρεῖς τὴν πρὸς ἄπαντας καλοκαγαθίαν παρὰ

273 θεοῦ δῶρον τοῦτον ἔχων. Κεχαρισμένως δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἀπο-
dεξάμενος τὸν ἐνδεκατὸν ἐπηρώτα (диὰ τὸ δύο πλεονάζει τῶν ἐβδο-
μήκος). Πῶς ἄν κατά ψυχήν καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις εἰρηνικῶς ἔχοι; ὦ δὲ ἀπεφήνατο Διαλαμβάνων ὅτι κακὸν οὐδὲν είργαζατο τῶν ὑπὸ-
tεταγμένων οὐθενί, πάντες δὲ ἀγωνιοῦνται περὶ τῶν εὐεργετι-
μάτων, εἰδότες, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ ξύν ἀποτρέχουσιν, ἐπιμελητὴν σε τῶν

274 βίων. οὐ γὰρ διαλείπεις ἐπανορθῶν ἄπαντας τοῦ θεοῦ σοι καλο-

φροσύνην δεδοκότος. Ἐπιστημηνίας δὲ κρότῳ πάντας αὐτοὺς
ἀπεδέξατο φιλοφρονούμενος, καὶ προπίνων ἐκάστῳ πλείον τι πρὸς τὸ
tο τερβόθηναι <ἐτράπη>, μετ' εὐφροσύνης τοῖς ἀνδράσι συνών καὶ

275 Τῇ ἐβδόμῃ δὲ τῶν ἁμερῶν, πλείονος παρασκευῆς γενομένης,

προσπαραγιγομένων πλείονῶν ἐτέρων ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων (ἡσαν γὰρ
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ικανοὶ πρεσβεῖς), ἐπηρώτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καιροῦ γενομένου τὸν πρωτεύοντα τῶν ἀπολιπόντων τῆς ἐρωτήσεως. Πῶς ἀν ἀπαραλ-γιστὸς <εἶν>; ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐφῆ Δοκιμάζων καὶ τὸν λέγοντα καὶ τὸ 276 λεγόμενον καὶ περὶ τίνος λέγει, καὶ ἐν πλείονι χρόνῳ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ 5 ἑτέρων τρόπων ἐπερωτῶν. τὸ δὲ νόημα ἐξειν ἐξειν καὶ δύνασθαι κρίνειν ἑκατά θεοῦ δόρῳ καλὸν ἔστιν ὃς μὲν τοῦτο κέκτησαι, βασιλεὺ. Κρότω δὲ ἐπισημηνάμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔτερον 277 § C ἑπηρώτα. Διὰ τῇ τὴν ἁρετὴν ὡς παραδέχονται τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ πλεῖονες; "Οτι φύσικῶς ἀπαντήσεις, εἰπεν, ἄκρατες καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς 10 ὄδονας τρεπόμενοι γεγόνας δὲν σοὶ ἀδικία πέφυκα καὶ τὸ τῆς πλεονεξίας χώμα. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἁρετῆς κατάστημα κωλύει τοὺς ἐπιφέ- 278 ρομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἡδονοκρασίαν, ἐγκράτειαν δὲ κελεύει καὶ δικαιο-σύνην προτιμάν. ο ἡθος πάντων ἥγεται τούτων. Εὖ δὲ 279 ἀποκεκριθαί τούτον εἰπὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρώτα Τίσι δὲι κατακολου- 15 θεῖν τοὺς βασιλεῖς; δὲ ἐφῆ Τούς νόμοις, ἵνα δικαιοπραγοῦντες ἀνακτῶνται τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καθὼς σὺ τοῦτο πράσσεις δέναν ἡμᾶς καταβέβλησαι σεαυτῷ, θείω προστάγματι κατα- κολουθῶν. ἕπινεν δὲ καὶ τούτον καλῶς λέγειν τὸν ἐξόμενον 280 ἡρώτα Τίνας δὲι καθιστάνειν στρατηγοῦς; δὲ δὲ εἰπεν "Οσοὶ 20 μισοπονηρῶν ἐχοῦσι, καὶ τὴν ἄγωγὴν αὐτοῦ μιμοῦμεν, πρὸς τὸ διὰ παντὸς εὐδοξίαν ἔχειν αὐτοὺς, τὰ δίκαια πράσσοντος· καθὼς σὺ τοῦτο ἐπιτελεῖς, εἰπέ, μέγιστα βασιλεὺ, θεοῦ σοι στέφανον δικαιο-σύνης δεδωκότος. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν μετὰ φωνῆς ἐπὶ τὸν 281 ἐξόμενον ἐπιβλέψας εἰπέ Τίνας δὲι καθιστάνειν ἐπὶ τῶν δυνάμεων 25 ἁρχοντας; δὲ ἄπεφινητο Τοὺς ἄνδρεία διαφέροντας καὶ δικαιο-σύνη, καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιομένος τὸ σῶζειν τοὺς ἀνδρὰς ἢ τὸ
1 τρικαίον, τῷ θεός εὖ ἐργάζεσαι πᾶσι, καὶ σὺ τούτον μιμούμενον ἐφεργετεῖς τοῦτον ὑπὸ τοῦτον. "Ο δὲ ἀποκεκριθαι φήσας αὐτὸν εὖ, ἀλλον ἡμῶν Τίνα θαυμάζεσαι ἢ ἴστιν ἀνθρώπων; οὐ δὲ ἔφη Τὸν κεχωρηγημένον δόξη καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ ψυχήν ἵστιν πάσιν ὡντα, καθὼς σὺ τούτῳ ποιῶν ἀξιοθαύμαστος εἶ τὸ θεοῦ σοι διδόντος εἰς ταῦτα τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν. Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ καὶ τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἐτέρον ἐπεν 'Εν τοῖς δεῖ πράγμασι τοὺς βασιλεῖς τὸν πλεῖον χρόνον διά- γεν; οὐ δὲ ἐπεν 'Εν ταῖς ἀναγνώσει καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν πορειῶν ἀπογραφαῖς διατρῆβειν, ὅσα πρὸς τὰς βασιλείας ἀναγεγραμμέναι ἔχουν. Πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν καὶ διαμονὴν ἀνθρώπων. οὐ δὲ πρόσων ἀνέφικτον ἀλλοις δόξαν κέκτησαι θεοῦ σου τὰ βουλήματα συντελοῦστος. "Ενεργοῖς δὲ καὶ τούτῳ προσεπτὼν ἐτέρον ἡρώτα Τίνας δεῖ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς διαγωγὰς ἐν ταῖς ἀνέσει καὶ βαθμίδαις; οὐ δὲ ἐφη Θεωρεῖν ὡσα <παίζεται> μετὰ περί-15 στολῆς καὶ πρὸ ὄφθαλμων τιθέναι τὰ τοῦ βίου μετ' εὐφημι- σύνης καὶ καταστολῆς γυνώμενα <βίω συμφέρον καὶ καθήκον>. 285 ἐκείνη γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐπισκεφθείς τις. πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐλαχίστων αἱρέτων τι δείκνυται. σὺ δὲ πᾶσαν ἡσυχίας καταστολῆς διὰ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν φιλοσοφεῖς διὰ καλοκαγαθίαν ὑπὸ θεοῦ τιμῶ-20 286 μενοι. Εὐφρεστήσας δὲ τοῖς προειρήμενοι πρὸς τὸν ἑτανοῦ εἴπε Πώς δεῖ διὰ τῶν συμποσίων διεξάγειν; οὐ δὲ ἔφησε Παραλμπαζόντων τὸν τοιοῦτον φιλομαθέοις καὶ δυναμεῖνς ὑπομιμησθήναι τὰ <χρήσμα τῆς βασιλείας> καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀρχωμένων βίοις—ἐμμελέστερον τῇ μονῇ-287 σικώτερον οὐκ ἄν εὗροι τοῖς τούτοις ὑπὸ τούτου γὰρ θεοφιλεῖς εἰσὶ πρὸς τὰ 25 κάλλιστα πεπαίδευκτὸς τὰς διανοίας—καθὼς καὶ σὺ τοῦτο πράσσεις, 288 οUSART τὸ θεοῦ σοι κατευθυνομένων ἀπάντων. Διαχυθέως
δε ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐπυνθάνετο τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί κάλλιστόν ἔστι τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἡ ἴδιωτον βασιλέα κατασταθήναι <ἐπὶ> αὐτῶν, ἢ ἐκ βασιλέως βασιλέας; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη Τὸ ἁιστὸν τῇ φύσει. καὶ γὰρ ἐκ βασιλέων βασιλείς γινόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους ἄνήμε

τε καὶ σκληροὶ καθιστάνειν πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τίνες τῶν ἴδιωτῶν καὶ κακῶν πεπεραμένοι καὶ πενίας μετεσχηκότες ἀρξάντες ὄχλων χαλεπώτεροι τῶν ἀνοσίων τυράννων ἐξέβησαν. ἀλλὰ ὥς 290 προεῖπον, ἥθες χρηστόν καὶ παιδείας κεκοιμηθηκὸς δυνατὸν ἀρχεῖν ἐστὶν καθὼς σὺ βασιλεὺς μέγας ὑπάρχεις, ὅπως τοσοῦτον τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ πλούτῳ προσχών, ὅσον ἐπιμείκῃ καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ πάντας ἄνθρωπος ὑπερήφανος τοῦ θεοῦ σοι δεδωρημένον ταῦτα. Ἔπι 291 πλείονα χρόνον καὶ τοῦτον ἐπαινέσας τὸν ἐπὶ πάσιν ἡρώτα Τί μέγιστόν ἐστί βασιλείας; πρὸς τούτο ἐπὶ Τὸ διὰ παντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καθεστάναι τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους, καὶ κομίζεσθαι τὸ δίκαιον ταχῶς ἐν ταῖς διακρίσεις. ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται διὰ τὸν ἴγουμενον, ὅταν 292 μισοπόντηρος ἢ καὶ φιλάγαθος καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενος ψυχὴν ἄνθρωπον σώζειν καθὼς καὶ σὺ μέγιστον κακὸν ἴγγησιν τὴν ἀδικίαν, δικαίως δὲ πάντα κυβερνῶν ἁνάναι τὴν περὶ σεαυτὸν δόξαν κατεσκευάσας, τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδώστως ἔχειν ἀγίνην καὶ ἀμύγη παντὸς 20 κακοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. Καταλήξαντος δὲ τοῦτον κατερράγη 293 κρότος μετὰ ψωφῆς καὶ χαρᾶς ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον. ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο, ὁ βασιλεὺς λαβὼν ποτήριον ἐπεχέατο καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀπώτων καὶ τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων. ἐπὶ πάσι δὲ ἐπὶ Τὰ μέγιστὰ μοι § Ἰος γέγονεν ἀγαθὰ παραγεννηθέντων ὄμων πολλὰ γὰρ ὑφέλημαι, κατα- 294 βεβλημένων ὄμων διδαχὴν ἐμοὶ πρὸς τὸ βασιλεύειν. ἐκάστῳ δὲ τρία τάλαντα προσέταξεν ἀργυρίου δοθῆμαι καὶ τὸν ὑποκαταστή-
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σκέψασας H1 | om εἰεχω Z | αμυγὴ C 22 λαβὼν cum cod M restitui] λαλὼν codd cett 23 τον εἰρημένων λογον K | λογον Zmk | μεγίστα] παμ-

μεγίστα A 24 παραγενημένων B | φωλήμα GA | καταβεβληκότων B
602 ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

1 Τος σοντα παΐδα, ἡ συνεπιφωνησάντων δὲ πάντων, χαρᾶς ἐπληρώθη τὸ συμπόσιον, ἀδιαλείπτως τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς εὐφροσύνην τραπέντος.

295 Ἡγὼ δὲ <εἰ πεπλεόνακα> τούτοις, ὁ Φιλόκρατες, συγγνώμην ἔχειν. τεθαυμάκως γάρ τοὺς ἀνδρας ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον, ὥς ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ τάς 296 ἀποκρίσεις ἐποιοῦντο πολλοῦ χρόνον δειμένας, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἐρωτήστων 5 μεμεριμνηκότος ἐκαστά, τῶν δὲ ἀποκριμόμενων καταλλήλως ἐχόντων τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἐρωτήσεις, ὥς θαυμασμοῦ κατεφάινοντο μοι καὶ τοῖς παροῦσι, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις. οὕτω δὲ καὶ πάσι τοῖς 297 παραληψομένοις τὴν ἀναγραφήν ἀπιστον φανείτα. ἤφεσαν μὲν οὖν οὐ καθήκον ἔστι περὶ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων· εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ παρα- 300 βαθὺν, οὐχ οὐσίων ἐν τούτοις· ἀλλ', ὡς γέγονεν, οὕτως διασαφοῦμεν ἀφοσιούμενοι πάν ἀμάρτημα. διόπερ ἐπειράθην ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτῶν τὴν τοῦ λόγου δύναμιν παρὰ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων ἐκαστὰ τῶν γυνομένων ἐν τε τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ταῖς συμ-

301 ποσίαις μεταλαβέειν. ἔθος γάρ ἔστι, καθὼς καὶ οὐ γινώσκεις, ἀφ' 15 ἢς ἂν [ἡμέρας] ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφεται χρηματίζειν, μέχρις οὐ κατα-

κομηθῆ, πάντα ἀναγράφεσθαι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πρασοῦμένα, καλῶς 299 γυνομένου καὶ συμφερόντως. τῇ γὰρ ἐπιούσῃ τὰ τῇ πρότερον πεπραγμένα καὶ λειλαμένα πρὸ τοῦ χρηματισμοῦ παραγιγνώ-

σκεται, καὶ εἰ τῷ μὴ δεόντως γέγονε, διορθώσεως τυχάνει τὸ 20

300 πεπραγμένον. τάντ' οὖν ἀκριβῶς <παρὰ τῶν> ἀναγεγραμμένων, ὡς ἐλέγχθη, μεταλαβόντες κατακεχωρίκαμεν, εἰδότες ἤν ἔχεις φιλομά-

θειαν εἰς τὰ χρήσιμα.

ς 301 1 Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὁ Δημήτριος παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, καὶ διελθὼν τοῦ τῶν ἐπτὰ σταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν 25 νῆσον, καὶ διαβᾶς τὴν γέφυραν, καὶ προσελθὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια...

HKGAGIB
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3 εἰ πεπλεόνακα (cf Diod. 1. 90. 4) bene Mend.] εἰσα πλεύσα καὶ codd

6 καταλλήλως BT] αλλήλως cett 7 τα] τας C 8 δὲ 2ο] + ως B

9 απιστα K 12 αφοσιωμένοι HGICZ (αφοσιωμένοι A) 15 om καὶ I

16 om an B | ημερας codd] omittendum vid ημερας ωρας Wend. ωρας Mend.|

<ἀρ<εται B 18 γενομένοι I | τῆ 2ο] om H 19 λαλήμενα Z | παραγαγων. BT| παραγιγνωσκεται cett 20 δεότως CZ | γεγονε BT] γεγονος (-ως GI) cett | om το πεπραγμένον B 21 παντ] παντες C | παρα των Wend.| παντων codd | παντ—μεταλαβοντες (22)] παντων ουν ακριβω των αναγεγραμμενων μεταλαβοντες παντες BT 22 ελεγχθη Z | κεχωρηκαμεν CZ κατα-κεχωρηκαμεν codd cett 26 διαβας προς τὴν γέφυραν Jos | προσελθων Jos | om ως Z
μέρη, συνεδριον ποιησάμενος εἰς κατεσκευασμένον οἶκον παρὰ τὴν
ηῷα, διαπρεπόντες ἔχοντα καὶ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας ἐφεδρὸν, παρεκάλει
tους ἀνδρὰς τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπιτελεῖν, παρόντων ὅσα πρὸς τὴν
χρείαν ἔδει καλῶς, οἱ δὲ ἐπετέλουσι ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιούντες 302
πρὸς ἐαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον
πρεπότως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου. καὶ 303
μέχρι μὲν ὄρας ἐνάτης τὰ τῆς συνεδριάς ἐγίνετο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα
περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος θεραπείαν ἀπελύοντο γίνεσθαι, χορηγούμενοι
αὐτοὺς δαψιλῶς ὅπως προηροῦντο πάντων. έκτος δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν, 304
ὅσα βασιλεῖα παρεσκευάζετο, καὶ τούτοις ὁ Δωρόθεος ἐπετέλει
προστατευόμενον γὰρ ἦν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βασιλείου. ἀμα δὲ τῇ πρώτῃ
παρεγώνυτο εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν καθ' ἡμέραν, καὶ ποιησάμενοι τὸν
ἀσπασμὸν τοῦ βασιλείου, ἀπελύοντο πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτῶν τόπον. ὡς δὲ 305
ἐδος ἐστὶ πασὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, <ἀποσιαμένου> τῇ θαλάσσῃ τᾶς
χεῖρας, ὡς ἄν εὑρόνται πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἐτέρποντο πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν
καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου διασάφησιν." τοι. Ἐπηρωτήσει δὲ καὶ τούτω 306 τ Ἰος
Τάνοις χαίρων ἀπονιξόμενοι τᾶς χεῖρας τὸ τηνικαῦτα εὑρόνται; διεσά-
φον δὲ, ὅτι μαρτυρύμενοι ἐστὶ τοῦ μηδὲν εἰργάσθαι κακῶν
πάσα γὰρ ἐνέργεια διὰ τῶν χειρῶν γίνεται· καλῶς καὶ ὅσιῶς μεταφέροντες ἐπὶ
tὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα. καθὼς δὲ προειρήκαμεν, 307
οὗτος καθ' ἐκάστην εἰς τὸν τόπον, ἔχοντα τερπνότητα διὰ τὴν
ἡσυχίαν καὶ καταγείλειν, συναγάγεις τὸ προκείμενον ἐπετέλουσι.
συνέτυχε δὲ οὕτως, ὅτε ἐν ἡμέραις ἑβδομηκόντα δυσὶ τελεωθῆναι
τα τῆς μεταγραφῆς, οἴονει κατά πρόθεσιν τινα τοῦ τοιούτου γεγεν-
25 μένου.
"Τελείωσιν δὲ ὅτε ἔλαβε, συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημητρίος 308 τ Ἰος

1 κατασκευασμένων ΚΖ 2 ηνοὺς (ηνοι Ζ) αὐτικεπτὼς Η*ΓΙΖ ηνω τ ΗΚΑΓΙΒ
διαπρεπώς Α 3 τα της] τας ΒΤΖ 5 τας αντιβολαίς part sup ras Β |
γενομένον ΒΤΖ 7 ενατής ΗΚ] τ Κ ενατής cett [συνεδριάς ΒΤΖ
9 αυτοίς ΚΒΤΖ] ιοίων cett [10 Δωρόθεος C 13 προς] εἰς ΒΤ (sed Β
primum aliud scripsit quod postea erasit) τον έαυτῶν ΚΒΤΖ] έαυτῶν codd
tον αυτόν Ιος 14 απονιξόμενοι ΑΙΚονικόν ΑΙΚονικόν Β* -μενοις
cett 15 εὑρόνται Κ] ηυξαντό (εὑξ- GI) cett 16 επηρωτήσα ΣΤ]
ἐπηρωτά Β επηρωτά σα cett | τουτον Τ 18 μηδεν Κ 20 οἰκειακον Ι
21 τερπνότητα ΒΤΖ (ωτ.) τερπν τινα ΗΚΑ*Ζ (τερπων τινα Μ τερ-
πνοτητα Δκορρικόν) 23 εβδομηκόντα συν δυσιν Κ εβδ. καὶ δυσιν Ιος εβδομη-
κόντα δου Τ οβ ΒΤΖ 24 γραφής Ι 25 οτε δε ελαβε τελεωσιν Β
309 μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν παρατίθεντες. ὥσαυτῶς δὲ καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον ἀποδεξάμενοι παρεκάλεσαν μεταδοῦναι τοὺς ἱγουμένους.

310 αὐτῶν, μεταγράφαντα τὸν πάντα νόμον. Ἡκαθὼς δὲ ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ τεύχη, σταύντες οἱ ἰερεῖς καὶ τῶν ἑρμηνεύων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τῶν ἁπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος οἱ τε ἡγούμενοι τοῦ πλήθους ἔτυχον, ἵπτει λαβὸς καὶ ὀσίως διηρμήνευται καὶ κατὰ πάν ἡκριβωμένως, καλῶς ἔχον ἑστῶν, ἵνα διαμείγνυ ταύθ' οὐτῶς ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται.

311 μηδεμία διασκευή. πάντων δὲ ἐπιφωνησάντων τοὺς ἐρμημένους, ἐκέλευσαν διαράσσασθαι, καθὼς ἐδοὺς αὐτοῖς ἑστῶν, εἰ τις διασκευᾶσθαι προστιθεῖς ή μεταφέρων τί τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἡ ποιούμενοι ἀφαίρεσιν, καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διὰ παντὸς ἀδεηναὶ καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσηται.

312 Προσφωνηθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων τῷ βασιλεί μεγάλως ἐξάρῃ τὴν γὰρ πρόθεσιν, ἡν ἐξεν, ἀσφαλῶς ἐδοξε τετελεσθαί. παραγνώσθη δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πάντα, καὶ λίαν ἐξεδαύμαν ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν. καὶ πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον εἶπε Πᾶς τηλικοῦτος συντελεσμένων οὐδείς ἐπεβάλετο τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἡ ποιητῶν ἐπι-

313 μηθήρας; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐφή Διὰ τὸ σεμνὸν εἶναι τὴν νομοθεσίαν καὶ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγονέναι καὶ τῶν ἐπιβαλλομένων τυχε ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πληγέντες τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἀπέστησαν, καὶ γὰρ ἐφήσεσθαι ἀκηκοέναι Θεοπόμπου, διότι μέλλων τινά τῶν προηγημενεμένων ἐπισφα-

HKAGIB
CTZ Jos

Eus

1 καὶ τα] κατα Z*
6 om de Eusο | τα| pr ταυτα Eusο
9 om kalos
Eus | και 2ο] om I | akribos Eusο
10 διαμενη Eus1 (διαμενει Eusο vid) txt
ex Jos confirmatur (διακει) | om μη Eus1 | γνηται Eus1
12 εκελευσαν
Jos Eusedd] εκελευσε (σεν Eus) Ar cudd Eusο | επαρσθαι Eus | καθω I
kathο A | εστι αυτοις Eusο
13 μεταφερον GI | om τι Eusο
14 πρασσοντος HKA txt cudd cett Jos (πραττ) Eus
15 και μενοντα] μενοντα
Eusο menoentes Eus1 vid
17 παραγενυσηθη KBCT Eus] παρεγνωσηθη HAGI
19 τηλικονων] + πραγματον fort recte Eus
20 επεβαλετο ΠΚΒΕΤ Eus]
epilabete AGI | η] ουδε Eus | ποιητων B Eus Jos] ποιητικως HK ποιητικων
22 epibaloemenow Eus1 | om του Eusο
23 επισουλη H* vid KAGI
24 Θεοπομπου Ar cudd txt Jos Eus | προηγημενεμένων

HKGIC
λέσστερον ἐκ τοῦ νόμου προστοροεῖν ταραχὴν λάβοι τῆς διανοιάς πλείον ἡμέρων τρίακοντα· καθὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνεοὶ ἐξιλασκεσθαι τῶν θεῶν, σαφές αὐτῷ γενέσθαι, τίνος χάριν τὸ συμβαίνον ἔστι. δι' 315 ὄνειρον δὲ σημανθέντος, ὦτι τὰ θεία βούλεται περιεργασάμενος εἰς 5 κοινοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκφέρειν, ἀποσχόμενον δὲ οὖτως ἀποκαταστήναι. καὶ παρὰ Θεοδόκτου δὲ τοῦ τῶν τραγῳδίων ποιητοῦ μετέλαβον ἐγὼ, 316 διότι παραφέρειν μελλόντος τι τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ πρὸς τὸ δράμα τὰς οὐείς ἀπεγλαυκόθη· καὶ λαβὼν ὑπόνοιαν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτῷ τὸ σύμπτωμα γέγονεν, ἐξιλασάμενον τῶν θεῶν ἐν 10 πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ἀποκατάστην. Μεταλαβὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς, 317 καθὼς προείπον, περὶ τούτων τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου, προσκυνήσας ἐκέλευσε μεγάλην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ συντηρῆσαι ἀγνώστα· παρακάλεσάς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἑρμηνεύς, ἵνα παραγίνονται 318 Ἔως πυκνότερον πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἕαν ἀποκατασταθῶσιν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.— 15 δέκαν γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκομπήν αὐτῶν γενέσθαι· παραγενθέντας δὲ, ὃς δέμοις, ἐξειν αὐτοὺς φίλους, καὶ <πολυφρίας> τῆς μεγάλης τευχεσθαι παρ' αὐτού. τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκομπὴν αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσεν ἐτοιμαζέως, μεγαλομερῶς τοὺς ἀνδράς χρησάμενος. ἐκάστῳ γὰρ στόλας ἐδωκε τῶν κρατιστῶν τρεῖς καὶ χρυσίον τάλαντα δύο καὶ κυλίκιον 20 ταλάντων καὶ τρικλίνων πάσαν κατάστρωσων. ἐπεμψε δὲ καὶ τῷ 320 'Ελεαζάρῳ μετὰ τῆς ἐκκομπῆς αὐτῶν ἀργυρόποδας κλίνας δέκα καὶ τὰ ἀκόλουθα πάντα καὶ κυλίκιον ταλάντων τριάκοντα καὶ στόλας δέκα καὶ πορφύραν καὶ στέφανον διαπρῆκταν καὶ βυσσίνων θδονών

1 προστορεῖν HKAGI txt BCT Eus | λαβ' Εισ] λαβειν Ar codd HKAGIB  
2 τριάκοντα] Ἡ KA | ανεσώ Ar codd Jos | αιτησων Eus 3 om το Eus  
4 σημανθέντος] μαθοντος Eus 5 de οὔτως] ωσαντως BT de αυτως CZ  
8 υψι C | ἄπεγλαυκωθη Eus Acorr | ἀπεγλαυκῳθη ΗΚΑ*GI επεγλαυκῳθη  
B*CTZ* (-γαλακ. Bcorr Zimg γαλακωθηθη Jos) 9 taut Eusl | αυτως BAcorr Eus] auto cett | om το συμπτωμα Eus  
11 προείπε Eusio | περι—Δημητρίου em Cobet] περι τοιων τα περι του Δ. Eus περι των (om των C) του Δ. Ar codd (ταυτα para του Δ. Jos) 12 συντηρεσθαι Eus°  
13 αργων CTZ* αγνα B | τοις I | παραγινονται GIC 14 αποκαταστωσιν K | Ιουδαιων  
15 om γαρ B (hab Jos) 16 om thesi Eus | ωσανθις Acorr | ezein Acorr (cod Mon ap Wend.) ezeis II ezei cett | poluφριας (cf 270) Mahaffy]  
poludωριας codd et Jos | τενξασθαι BCTZ txt cett Jos 18 μεγαλοπρεπως 
K | χαρισαμενος Wend. 19 κυλικιον ABT Jos] κυλιδιου cett κυλικιον hic et 22 Wend. 22 τριακοντα] Ἡ KA 23 στεφων T
ιστοὺς ἐκατὸν καὶ φιάλας καὶ τρυφλία καὶ κρατήρας χρυσοὺς δύο
321 πρὸς ἀνάθεσιν ἐγραψε δὲ καὶ παρακαλῶν, Ἰνα, εἰν τινες τῶν
ἀνδρῶν προαιρῶνται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνακομισθῆναι, μὴ κωλύσῃ, περὶ
πολλοῦ ποιούμενος τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις συνεῖναι, καὶ εἰς τοιούτους
Jos τὸν πλοῦτον κατατίθεσθαι δαψιλῶς, καὶ οὐκ εἰς μάταια.¹

322 Σὺ δὲ, καθὼς ἐπηγγειλάμην, ἀπέχεις τὴν διήγησιν, ὁ Φιλόκρατες.
tέρπειν γὰρ οἴομαι σε ταῦτα ἢ τὰ τῶν μυθολόγων βιβλία. νέυκας
γὰρ πρὸς περιεργάν τῶν δυναμένων ωφελείν διάνοιαν, καὶ ἐν τούτοις
tὸν πλείονα χρόνον διατελεῖς. πειράζομαι δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν
ἀξιολόγων ἀναγράφειν, ἵνα διαπορευόμενος αὐτὰ κομίζῃ τοῦ βουλῆ-10
ματος τὸ κάλλιστον ἐπαθλον.
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‘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.
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áκριβασμα, -μός, 45
ἀλαβάρχης, ἀραβάρχης, 6
ἀλήθεια, 21, 317
ἀληθεύα, 250 f.
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Ἀριστάρχεια σήματα, 69
ἄρχη, 358
ἀρχιμάγειρος, ἀρχιονοχός, 21
ἄχει, 21

N, cod., 75, 77, 129 ff., 201, 219, 252, 352, 496
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Burney, C. P., 502, 526
Buxtorfs, the, 436
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Canticles, the book, 216, 360
Canticles, the Ecclesiastical, 141 f., 253 f.
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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
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Lagarde, P. de, 109, 118 f., 121, 188, 206, 255, 443, 483 ff., 494, 502
Lake, K., 502, 505
Lamentations, book of, 226 ff., 259, 360
Langton, Stephen (Archbp), 343
Laodicean canons, 209, 219, 282
Latin versions, 88 ff., 493
Lectious, 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
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
Auckianus, 80, 365
M, cod., 78, 140 f., 352 ff.; M, 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-Massoretic 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 indebted to, 1
Moses bar-Cephas, 111; M. of Khoren, 118, 120
Mozley, F. W., 518
MSS. of LXX., uncial, 124 ff.
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cursive, 148 ff.; notation of, 122 ff.; grouping of books in, 123; distribution of, 123 ff.; displacements in, 131, 271; recensions in, 78, 80, 84 ff., 482
Muratorian Fragment, 268
Museum, the Alexandrian, 16 f., 293

Μακκαβαϊκά, τά, 222, 226 ff.; Μακκαβαίος, 276
Μωαϊκά, τά, 206

N, cod., 131 f., 202
Nathan, R. Isaac, 343
New Testament, the: use of LXX., 26, 381 ff.; tables of quotations from LXX., 382 ff.; number of quotations, 386, 391 ff.; discussion of passages quoted, 392 ff.; LXX. indispensable to the study of the N.T., 459 ff.; vocabulary of N.T., how far indebted to LXX., 453 ff.
Nicephorus, stichometry of, 208 ff., 340 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

Nαυ, Nave, 480

Ωίον, 217

Ο, 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.
Orthography of LXX., 300 ff.
Oxyrhynchus papyri, 508 f.

ὀκταπλά, 66
ὀκτασελίδων, τά, 66
ὀκτάευχος, ἦ, 123
ὀράσεις (in Isaiah and Daniel), 360
ὁδαλ, 123, 253 f.
Ὀργένης, Π, 72, 77, 365

P, 124, 164
Pachymius, 79
Pagnini, S., 343
Palaeography, Hebr., 320 ff.; Greek, 364
Palestinian Syriac version, 114 f.
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
Index II.

Philadelphus, 10 f., 16 f., 293
Phileas of Thmuis, 79
Philo, 12 f., 25 f., 268, 298, 372 ff., 478 f.; the poet, 369
Philometer, 7, 17, 25
Philopator, 279
Philostorgius, 117
Philexenus of Mabug, 115; Philoxenian version, 115 f.
Phrynichus, 296 f.
Pius V., 99
Points, the Hebrew, 321 f.
Polycarp of Smyrna, 414; the chorepiscopus, 115
Polyhistor, 269
Printed editions of LXX., 171 ff.
Prologue to Sirach, the, 24, 300, 319
Procksch, O., 529
Proper names, 304, 313, 449 f.

Psalterium Romanum, Gallicanum, Hebrew, 98 ff.
Pseudo-Apocrypha, 265, 281 f., 519;
Oxford edition, 521
Pseudo-Aristaeus, see ‘Aristaeus’;
Pseudo-Athanasius, 82, 85, 207, 282;
Pseudo-Chrysostom, 205;
Pseudo-Clement, 411;
Pseudo-Gelasius, 211 f., 282
Ptolemy, list of the early, 5 f.
‘Ptolemy and Cleopatra,’ 25, 258

Π, cod., 141
Παλαιστιναῖοι, τό, 77
Παλαιότερος, ή, 208
Παραγραφάς, 361
Παραμετρίκη, τά, 208
Παραλείπομενα, 214, 216
Παρθένος (in Isa. vii. 14), 30
παράσκευα, φάσεκ, 317
περικοπή, 358

πεντασέλιδον, τό, 67
πεντάτευχος, ή, 123, 204 ff.
ΠΠΠ (συν.), 39 f.
προσευχή 'Αβαρίαν, 253, 260; προσ-
ευχή Μαννασσή, 253 f.
προσήλυτος, ο (τῆς), 32
προφητικόν, τό, 205; προφητικά, τά, 208
Πτολεμαίκα, τά, 279, 519
φρυγά, 258
ψαλιαός εἰδιγραφος, 125, 141, 252 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 literature, 406 ff.

R., cod., 141 f., 495
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, 536
Roman edition of LXX., 174 ff., 486;
editions based on, 182
Rufinus, 210, 223
Ryle, H. E., 25 f., 215, 275, 283, 342, 374, 404

S (=N), 75, 77, 129 ff., 201, 219, 252, 352, 490; C’, CY’, 364; S’, 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
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Scrivener, F. H. A., 189
Selah, 449
Semitic words in l.xx., 19, 306 ff.;
Semitic idioms, 323 ff.
'Septima,' the, 53 ff.
'Septuagint,' the name, 9 ff.; early
history of the version, 9 ff.; a
collection of versions, 315 ff.; was
there any version anterior to it? 2;
Origen labours upon it, 59 ff.;
recensions, 76 ff.; versions based
upon the l.xx., 87 ff.; MSS. of
l.xx., 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 ff., 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
Sinaic MS., the, 129 ff., 490, 505
Sinko, 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., 30 f.,
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
Stichometry, 344 ff.; of Latin MSS.,
360 f.; of Coptic MSS., ib.
Stoicism of 4 Macc., 280
Strane, A. W., 259
Susanna, 260 f.
Symmachus, 30, 49 ff., 52 ff., 458 f.,
476, 483
Synagogue use of l.xx., 29 f.
Synopes, 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.
Syco-Hexaplar, 77, 112 ff., 356,
493 f.
σάββατα, 19
σαρήθιον σαβανή Ἑλλάδος, 277
Σειρά, 411
σειρά, 361
Σειράς, 269
σελήν, 64
σκολογραφείν, 75
Σωσάμων, Σωσάμων, 260
Σωφία, ἡ, 268
στάσεις, 142, 359
στηρικόν, τά, 219
στίχος, 344 f.
συνουσίαν χρήσιμον, 85
συμβουλευτικόν, τά, 205, 219
σύν = Νῆξος, acc., 39, 308, 317
σύνοψις ἐν ἔπειτοσ, 206
Σύρος, ὁ, 56, 116
σχήνος, 261

ןַחֵם, 269
ןּלָקִים, 449

T, cod., 142, 495; 6, 66, 364
Talmud, Aquila, quoted in the, 33
Targum, the Babylonian, 3
Taylor, C., 33, 41, 67, 271, 286, 527
Tertullian, 9, 284, 351
Τετραγραμματος, the, 39 ff., 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
Tisserant, E., 506
Tobit, book of, 273 f.
Transliteration, 46, 67, 324 f., 526
Trifaria varietas, 86
Turin Prophets, 145, 508
Tyconius, 97

Thεγρλ, 411
ταχυγράφοι, 73
τέλος, 358
τέσσαρες, 123
τέτραβασιλείου, 76, 206
τήταος, 354 ff.
τόμοι (in Isaiah), 360

בִּנְסָתָם, 221
בִּנְסָתָם הַחַיָּה, 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), 131
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

υμως των πατέρων ημων, 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 ff., 286
Wulfila, 117

X, cod., 143
Xenophon, Greek of, 204
Ximenes de Cisneros, F., 171 ff.

Y, cod., 145
Yebna, 439
Young, P., 183

Z, cod., 140 f., 144 f.; §, 53
Zugninensis, cod., 505
Zurich Psalter, 142