

34. With respect to this great task, which man has to accomplish, "similitude" with God is ascribed to him, and he makes himself worthy of being under the special providence of God, *הַשְׁתַּבְּחָה פְּרָטִיָּה*. This important position which man occupies in creation, the Cabbalah styles "End of creation." Ezekiel saw a man sitting on a throne, and the three divisions of the Sephiroth, correspond to man's spiritual principles, Nephesh, Ruah, and Neshamah; *שֵׁשׁ, רִיחַ, נְשָׁמָה*.

ARTICLE VIII.

PROLEGOMENA TO TISCHENDORF'S NEW EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT.¹

Translated from the Latin by Charles Short, M. A., Roxbury, Mass.

§ 1. AMONG the literary remains of sacred antiquity, the Septuagint Version, so called, of the books of the Old Testament, holds a distinguished place. The whole of it, or rather a part,² was believed to have originated in an extraordinary manner before the Christian era,³

¹ *H ILAAIAI ALAGHKH KATA TOTZ EBOMHKONTA. Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. Interpretes.* Textum Vaticanum Romanum emendatius edidit, argumenta et locos Novi Testamenti parallelos notavit, omnem lectionis varietatem codicum vetustissimorum Alexandrini, Ephraemi Syri, Friderico-Augustani subjunxit, commentationem isagogicam praetexit Constantinus Tischendorf, Theol. et Phil. Doctor, Theol. Professor. Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus. 1850. II. Tom. 8vo. pp. lx, 682, 688.

For some account of the labors of Tischendorf, see the Critical Notices at the close of this Number.

² For the expressions *νόμος, νομοθεσία, τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντα*, used by Aristaeus and Aristobulus, and nearly the same by Josephus and Philo, are of uncertain import. A few in modern times, as Valckenaer, Haevernick and Oikonomos, explain them to mean the whole of the Old Testament. See next page, notes 2 and 3.

³ The most ancient authorities for this are: (I.) Aristaeus, of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, in a letter current under his name to Philocrates; and (II.) Aristobulus, of the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, in Clem. Alex. Strom. I, p. 410, ed. Potter, p. 341 seq. ed. Latet. 1641, and in Eusebius, Praep. Evang. IX, 6; ed. Gaisf. II, p. 356; XIII, 12; ed. Gaisf. III, p. 310; Hist. Eccles. VII, 32; ed. Heinich II, p. 420.

which was the opinion of Josephus and Philo;¹ and being often adduced by the apostles with marked deliberation, even when it did not coincide with the Hebrew text, it thus acquired a new authority which was supported by the belief and the use both of very many of the most eminent of the Fathers² and of the Church itself. And though St. Jerome set aside,³ and with reason, the miracle recorded in the letter of Aristæus, and produced a new Latin version from the Hebrew sources, his influence was not sufficient to despoil the Greek text of its ancient rank,⁴ or to drive it from general use.

§ 2. At the earliest dawn of letters, therefore, after the long night of the Middle Ages, learned and pious men strenuously exerted themselves in preparing editions of the LXX, and even the Roman Pontiffs undertook this work for the benefit of the Christian world. In the year 1587 appeared the edition of Sixtus V, who before his as-

¹ Josephus, *Antiqq. Jud.* XII, 3. 2 seq. Philo de Mose, II, p. 139 seq. ed. Mangey. Moreover, Philo invariably and Josephus commonly quoted the Greek text, not the Hebrew, in their writings.

² Very many, as Justin, Irenæus, Clemens Alex., Origen, Epiphanius, Hilary, Augustine and Rufinus, not only maintained that all the books of the Old Testament were rendered into Greek by the LXX, but even received the tradition of Aristæus concerning these translators. It is a matter of surprise that Justin and Irenæus themselves, and also Epiphanius, should have made many additions to the old tradition, which were soon generally believed.

³ Jerome without hesitation rejected those things with which the superstitious zeal of Aristæus had set off history and also firmly held that the Pentateuch only was translated by the LXX. On *Ezech. V.* he has: *Although Aristæus, Josephus, and the whole Jewish sect, aver that only the Five Books of Moses were translated by the LXX.* And on *Ezech. XVI.*: *Although the learned show that only the Five Books of Moses were translated by the LXX.* He makes similar statements elsewhere. In his *Apolog. adv. Rufin.* II, he says as follows: *I know not who first built of his own falsehoods the LXX. cells of Alexandria, to which, though separately assigned, they all wrote the same things; while Aristæus a ὑπερσπαστής of the name Ptolemy, and Josephus of a period long subsequent, relate no such thing, but merely state that the LXX. assembled in the cathedral and translated, not prophesied; it being one thing to be a prophet, another to be a translator; for, in the former case, the Spirit makes known the future, in the latter, learning and a command of language simply transfer ideas from one tongue to another.*

⁴ At length in later times both the inspiration of the version and nearly the whole account of the meeting of the Translators at Alexandria have been rejected by theologians very unanimously. Of the small number who take a different view, the most distinguished is, beyond question, Constant Oiconomos, of Athens, who has recently published four volumes on this subject, full of learning and enthusiasm, under the title: *Περὶ τῶν ὀ, ἐμπνευστῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς θείας γραφῆς βιβλία δ'. Συνταχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Πρωσβυτέρου καὶ Οἰκονόμου τοῦ Οἰκονομικοῦ Πατριαρχεικοῦ Θρόνου, Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ ἐξ Οἰκονομῶν. αἰμαδ' seq.*

cession to the Apostolic See, had been the adviser and supporter of Gregory XIII in attempting the same object.¹ This edition soon attained such a reputation, that it was everywhere preferred to the Venice and the Complutensian, which had preceded it by sixty years; nor was it afterward deprived of its preëminence by the Alexandrine codex, published under the supervision of Ernest Grabe. It is easy to state how it gained this distinction. It was from the circumstance that the Roman editors professed to have used, and almost in fact did use, as the basis of their edition, the very ancient Vatican MS., while each of the previous editions had been made to follow rather arbitrarily the authority of the later MSS.,² and Grabe too highly valued

¹ Pius V. had already directed his attention to this project, though no mention is made of this fact either in the Dedicatory Letter of Antonio Carafa to Sixtus V, in the Preface to the Reader, or in the Decree of the Pope. Jos. Silos, however, in the *Hist. clericor. regul.* P. I, B'k XIII, for the year 1575, bears testimony to it as follows: *The sacred Council of Trent carefully looked to this elegance of the Holy Scriptures, and in accordance with its decree Pope Pius V. undertook to revise them. Agellio being at that time in high repute at Rome for a critical acquaintance with the Sacred Books and with the literature upon them, and being especially skilled in languages, no discussion could be held concerning the minute points of this most weighty matter without consulting him with a few others, and employing him in the work. On this account, as he testifies himself in a letter to Latino Latini, this labor was intrusted to him in conjunction with the very learned Mariano Vittorio B'p of Riete, to Paulinus, a Dominican, and to Father Emmanuel Sa of the Society of Jesus.*

The supposition that in the foregoing, the Latin Scriptures, to which evidently the decrees of the council of Trent refer, are meant, rather than the Greek Scriptures, is precluded by what follows, where the LXX. themselves are mentioned.

² The *Editio Complutensis* is found in the Complutensian Polyglott: *Biblia Hebr. Chald. Græc. et Lat. nunc primum impressa, in Complutensi universitate de mandato et sumptibus Franc. Ximenes de Cisneros (Archbishop of Toledo) industria Arn. Gu. de Brocario 1514-17, 6 voll.* It was not published till shortly after 1522. This edition after a long period is now commonly rejected because an aim to accommodate the Greek text to the Hebrew appears. For this reason Walton declared it to be inferior to every other edition and to be the farthest removed of all from the genuine work of the LXX, alleging that it was indeed a new version and made up partly of the LXX, partly of the additions of Origen from Theodotion, partly of those of Aquila, Symmachus, and of other translators; and that it was, moreover, stuffed with the words of the Greek commentators, that by this means it might more exactly correspond to the Hebrew text, column to column. From what MSS. it was derived, is uncertain. The MSS. at the same time the most ancient and the most correct, which the Editors praise as used by them, are certainly, in our judgment, not rightly so styled. The Complutensian text has several times been reprinted. See further concerning this edition and the Aldine, in Grabe, *Proll.* c. III.

The *Editio Veneta* or *Aldina*, in three volumes, which contain the whole Bible

the Alexandrine codex, and without sufficient reason was required to conform somewhat to the Hexapla of Origen.¹ Yet among those profoundly acquainted with the sacred text, it is fully agreed that these three editions have each its peculiar excellences, and especially the Alexandrine, but that even the Vatican is by no means perfect in all respects.

§ 8. Under these circumstances, what was to be done by an editor who now proposed to prepare a new edition? If we possessed a critical apparatus which embraced many and particularly the most ancient authorities and accurately gave all the various readings, the arduous task of revising the text ought to be undertaken, since in that case it might be. But we are so far from having such an apparatus, that should one wish to furnish it, he could not employ the famous work of Holmes even as a foundation for his own; and, indeed, it would have betokened no slight rashness to attempt a new revision of the LXX, and at the same time to know how imperfect are the means which could be commanded for a perfect recension. It was the more proper for me to abstain from revising the text, because the edition I had in contemplation was intended for common use, not for the learned curiosity of a few persons. I thought, however, it was my duty not to decline the labor, if by a new manual edition I could contribute anything for a cautious but real advancement of criticism. My purpose, therefore, is to exhibit anew the text best approved during the last three centuries nearly, adding all the different lections of three very ancient MSS., which, as being the edited MSS., were almost the only ones I could employ with confidence. I thought if this course should be pursued, what was less correct or what was wrong in the Vatican text, would not be set forth as certain or right, nor would anything be rashly changed, nor one doubtful thing be replaced by another.

I must state at greater length what principles I adopted in reprinting the Roman text, and in what manner I have used the MSS. in

in Greek appeared in 1518 from the office of Aldo and his father-in-law, Andrea d' Asola. Though this for some time was pronounced purer than the Complutensian and much closer to the Roman, it yet departed from the truth in various important particulars, as Usher has already stated in these words: *I have remarked that this edition sometimes follows not the LXX, but the readings of Aquila; and that a great number of glosses are found here which were first made on the margin of the MSS. and afterward received into the text, these being taken from the various editions and versions and also found in passages quoted by the Apostles with variations from the common Greek reading of the LXX.*

¹ On this see below.

my apparatus; but before proceeding to do this, I must give a somewhat extended account of the Vatican edition.

§ 4. This edition, styled *Editio Romana*, has the title: *ἡ πύλαια διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἐφδερακκοῦσα δι' αὐθεντίας ἔβουον ἑ ἀρχὸν ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς ἐκδοθεῖσα. Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. P. M. editum.* The book is very large, and consists of 788 pages. The pages of the text are divided into two columns, containing each about fifty-five lines. The chapters are distinguished, but not the verses. In the text no larger character is used to denote proper names or any others, or to mark the beginning of sentences. At the end of the chapter, notes are commonly subjoined,¹ in which the readings of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, or of the Fathers, translators, or MSS. are given, and the more difficult places explained. Thus under Gen. 1. we find:

“*α. Ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. Aquila, κένωτος καὶ οὐδὲν. Symmachus, ἀργὸν καὶ ἀδιάκροτον. Theodotion, κενὸν καὶ οὐδὲν. β. Συμακῆθῆεν τὸ ἕδαρ. A. et B., οὐσῆθῆε. γ. Σπείρον σπέρμα. A., σπικράτιζον εἰς τὸ γένος αὐτῶν. δ. Εἰς φασῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.”* L. V., *εἰς φασῶν τῆς γῆς.”*

And under Exod. xxxiii:

“*α. Καὶ εἰσέξω σε εἰς γῆν. AA. LL. εἰσάξει. quod prebavit S. Augustinus in Quest. β. Ἐμφάντισόν μοι σεαυτόν. AA. LL. δείξέ μοι τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν. γ. Γνωστῶς ἴνα ἴδω σε. AA. LL. γνωστῶς ἴδω σε. δ. Τὸ ἴδονος τὸ μέγα τοῦτα. In aliis libris deest τὸ μέγα, nec legit S. August. in Quest.”*

Also under Ps. iii:

“*α. Ψαλμός. Scholion, φθῆ, καὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς βίβλου ὁμοίως. β. διάφραγμα. Sch. Θεοδοτίων καὶ Σύμμαχος, διάφραγμα. ἡ δὲ πέμπτη ἔκδοσις. διαφαντός. καὶ δι' ὅλης δὲ τῆς βίβλου ἐπὶ τοῦ διαφράγματος ὁμοίως ἐκδοθείασιν. De hoc autem disputatum est a S. Hieronymo in Epist. ad Marcellam. γ. εἰ ὄρους ἀγίου αὐτοῦ. Aquila, ἡγιασμένου. Symmachus, ἀγίου ἑαυτοῦ. δ. ἀντιλήφεται μου. Justinus*

¹ Pierre Morin states that he made special contributions to the notes. In a letter to Silvio Antoniano he writes as follows: *The task of disentangling and reading through the commentaries on the Old Testament in the Vatican, which are called Catene, was exclusively assigned to me, with a view to my extracting the various readings and explanations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and also of the Editio Quinta and Sexta, and transferring them to the notes which I had undertaken to write. The immense labor of reading so much, I accomplished after some years, and emended very many passages by conjectures founded in the Hebrew.*

legit ἀναλάβειν μου. et ita est in paraphrasi Chaldaica, Psalterio Aethiopico, et Arabico. Item in translationibus Latinis, *auscospit me.*

To the text are prefixed the following :

1. ταξις των της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλιων εν τριδε της εκδοσει.¹
2. Letter of Cardinal Antonio Carafa, Librarian of the Vatican, dedicating the work to Pope Sixtus V.
3. Preface to the Reader.²
4. Decree of Sixtus V. concerning the edition.

§ 5. The letter of Antonio Carafa to Sixtus V. is as follows :

“ It is now nearly eight years since your Holiness, being exceedingly desirous to promote the interests of sacred learning, advised Pope Gregory XIII, of blessed memory, to revise according to the authority of the most esteemed MSS., the sacred books of the LXX, which both the Greek and the Latin Church have used even from the days of the Apostles. When your Holiness, in your critical reading of the Sacred Scriptures, had remarked that passages almost without number were quoted from them by the early writers of the Church with variations from the text of the current copies of the Greek Bible, judging that these discrepancies proceeded solely from the variety and the confusion of the renderings of ancient translators, you decided with the greatest propriety, that an appeal should be made to the MSS. of the highest character, with a view to draw from them, as much as possible, the reading which constituted the true and uncorrupted version of the LXX. I therefore very greatly admire your piety and wisdom, seeing that many years afterward the same plan suggested itself to the mind of your Holiness in regard to a careful revision of the Greek Scriptures, which I learn from the unpublished Acts of the Council of Trent, that the holy Fathers there assembled once had in view, being induced to this by the authority of the genuine and pure Version of the LXX, and by their reverence for it. When the duty of performing this revision was devolved on me by Gregory XIII, whose projects had the special aim to extend the Christian Religion as widely as might be, I had the best MSS. sought out in the more famous libraries of Italy, and the various readings copied from them and sent to me. These readings being repeatedly examined by the diligence of the accomplished scholars I had selected for this purpose with the judicious aid of Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto, whom I had purposed to consult on the more difficult passages on

¹ The order of the books, as given in the Vatican edition, is precisely that which we have adopted.

² By Pierre Morin.

account of his eminent learning and his various acquaintance with languages, they were carefully compared with your MS. in the Library of the Vatican, over which your grace lately placed me. By this collation and by the agreement of the Vatican MS. with the early ecclesiastical writers, we inferred that this codex excelled the others in age and in purity; and above all, that it very nearly approached if not throughout, at least in the greater part, to the very work of the LXX. which we were striving to regain. This seeming evident to me from the title itself, *κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα*, as well as from much other testimony, in compliance with the judgment of the persons above alluded to, I was careful to have this book edited according to the Vatican MS., or rather because that MS. was highly approved to have it printed word for word, being previously revised with the necessary care and increased with notes.

“Now by a truly Divine providence it has come to pass, that the labor begun at your instance in the time of your Cardinalship, after several interruptions arising from different causes, has at length been completed at the very beginning almost of your Pontificate, doubtless that this noble work, being dedicated to your most sacred name, should be an enduring memorial to all good men both of your devotion to the Christian Commonwealth and of my regard for your Holiness.”

~ § 6. The Preface to the Reader stands thus:

“Those who have studied the Sacred Scriptures with special care admit universally that the Greek version by the LXX. is much superior to all others used by the Greeks, in antiquity and in value. It appears that those translators, being Jews by birth, but acquainted with Greek, upward of three hundred and one years before Christ, during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, translated the Sacred Books under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and that this version from the earliest period of the church was both publicly set forth to be read in the churches, and privately received and explained by the ecclesiastical writers who lived previously to the time of St. Jerome, the author of the Latin Vulgate. Aquila of Sinope, was the next translator after the LXX. who rendered these books from the Hebrew into the Greek, flourishing a long time after them, under the Emperor Hadrian. The predictions in the Scriptures concerning Christ, he involved in obscurity in order to ingratiate himself with the Jews by making his version differ from that of the LXX, and on this ground, judicious persons have long disapproved of some parts of his work, though it was received into the Hexapla. Those who followed him

were Symmachus and Theodotion, the former a Samaritan of the time of L. Vero, the latter an Ephesian of the period of the Emperor Commodus. These translations were published in the Hexapla, but were both considered as wanting in fidelity; that of Symmachus, because, through his displeasure at the Samaritans, he corrupted several passages of the Sacred Scriptures by violating their meaning, in order to please the Jews; and that of Theodotion, because, being a follower of the heretic Marcio, he had in some places wrested rather than turned (*pervertit potius quam convertit*) the Sacred Books. Besides these, there were among the Greeks two other versions of uncertain authority, which were found in some wine-jars, one at Jericho, in the time of the Emperor Antonius Caracalla, the other at Nicopolis, in the time of the Emperor Alexander Severus. These were designated *Quinta* and *Sexta*, from the fact that in the Octapla they had respectively the *fifth* and the *sixth* place, and this designation they have retained. In respect of their character, they also were regarded as somewhat unfaithfully done. There is still another translation, that of St. Lucian the Martyr, who lived under the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian. Though this was highly valued, it was by no means to be compared with that of the LXX, according to the testimony of the Greek writers themselves, which is confirmed by these words of Nicetas in his commentary on the Psalms: *ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τὴν τοσαύτην ἑδοξω σβαζόμενοι, ἢ τῶν ἄβδαμήοντα προσποιήσασθα μάλιστα, οὗ διαφωμένους τὴν τῆς διαλέκτου μεταβολὴν ποιησόμενοι μίαν ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἔνοιαν καὶ λέξω ἀποθεδύνασιν.*

"The version of the LXX. was, therefore, in great and universal esteem, evidently because it appeared as a work of inspiration for the good of mankind. But it was at first arranged in the Hexapla by Origen with other versions set before the reader opposite to it for the convenience of comparison, and the various readings of these translations, and of these only, were added in notes to the LXX. under obelisks and asterisks; and these marks being effaced by time, this edition has reached us altered and corrupted to a great degree. The translations of others are everywhere introduced, and in some places a twofold and even a threefold rendering of the same passage; and being, moreover, misunderstood by the copyists, the version thus lost its splendor and its purity. We are in this way to account for the inconsistency of the various readings, and also for the discrepancies of the copies among themselves and when compared with the writings of the Fathers, a circumstance which for a long time greatly perplexed the most learned men. This evil was at first known only

to a few and afterward disregarded by others, but it continually increased so as to mar by no small blemishes a book of supreme importance, on which the whole law of God and the Christian ordinances depend.

“We are unable to express the obligation under which all good men are brought on this account to Pope Sixtus V. Having given nearly all his life to sacred literature, from which he derived his pious erudition, and having most carefully compared this book with the early writers, he was the first to see in what way the evil was to be remedied. By his influence he then induced the distinguished Pope Gregory XIII. to have the LXX. restored to its original splendor by an accurate revision. The performance of this task was intrusted by the Pope to Cardinal Antonio Carafa, a person of established piety, and devoted to all liberal studies. He immediately procured the services of eminent scholars, who were to meet at his house on certain days and there collate the MSS. which he had brought together from all quarters, and to select from them the readings most approved; these being afterward compared with the Vatican MS. several times and with great care, it was seen that this MS. was by far the best of all extant, and it was deemed advisable to prepare the new edition on its authority.

“The design of the revision being thus explained, we now state in what manner it has been executed, and first of all describe the Vatican codex on which this edition is based. So far as it can be determined by the form of the letters, which are uncial and rightly termed the ancient character, this MS. appears to have been written 1200 years ago, at a period not later than the days of St. Jerome.¹ Of all the MSS. this in a singular degree aided the projected recension, seeming to consist of the very work of the LXX, at least in the greater part. Next to this were two others which approach nearest

¹ Since this first appeared at Rome many scholars have largely discussed the question of the age of the Vatican MS. But in these matters no one can know unless he has personally examined a great number of MSS. of the highest antiquity scattered everywhere throughout the world, omitting nothing which contributes toward fixing the age of these remains. The proof of extreme antiquity drawn by the Roman editors from the letters of this MS. is not by itself decisive; but the many important circumstances which combine with this are sufficient to justify us in not disagreeing with them in their judgment, that it was written in the fourth century. Of this subject I have treated more fully in the *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1847, I. p. 129 seq., and in the *Prolegomena* to my *Codex Friderico-Augustanus*, 1846. In the main I agree with Hug in his essay *De Antiquitate Codicis Vaticani*, Freiburg, Breisgau, 1840. He had already corrected the important errors of Birch.

to its age, though separated from it by a long period, the Venice¹ from the library of Cardinal Bessarion, which also is uncial; the other brought from Southern Italy and now in the possession of Cardinal Carafa,² and in all particulars so agreeing with the Vatican text that we may believe they were transcribed from the same original copy. In addition to this, the MSS. collected from the Medicean Library at Florence were of great use, corroborating or explaining the Vatican readings in numerous passages. But the excellence of the Vatican MS. appeared not so much from its wonderful agreement with these MSS, as from those passages which are quoted or interpreted by the Fathers, who in almost every instance produce and restore the readings of this codex, except where they bring forward a passage translated not by the LXX, but by other hands. When the LXX. was to be emended by a new revision, it was done with good reason on the authority of this MS. as being by far the most ancient and alone³ bearing the inscription, *According to the Seventy*, or rather with the best reason this MS. has been printed letter for letter, so far as the old mode of writing and the mistakes of the copyist allowed. The mode of writing in that period, being now obsolete, has not been imitated in some cases, though in all others, except the manifest errors of the transcriber, there has not been the slightest departure from the authority of this codex, not even in those passages, which, if they were not faulty, certainly did not seem free from the suspicion of being so. Some blemish must remain in a MS., however much it may have been corrected, and it was thought better that passages, even in some degree suspected, should be left as they stand in the

¹ By J. Morelli in the *Bibliotheca ms. Marciana Gr. et Lat.* (Bassano, 1802) it is given as *Codex I*, which he has described in Vol. I, pp. 3-6. It contains Job from c. 30, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, all the Prophets, Tobias, Judith, and three books of Maccabees. I examined it myself in 1843, and copied from it several things worthy of publication. Morelli, as well as others, thought it was written in the ninth century, but I am inclined to assign it to the eighth century. In their apparatus to the Oxford edition, Holmes and Parsons brought forward various readings drawn from this MS.; and as they found out too late that it was an uncial codex, they incorrectly numbered it the 23d.

² A Catalogue of the MSS. of Cardinal Carafa is preserved in the library of the Vatican. Compare Blume in his *Iter Italicum*, III. From this fact we infer that the MSS. themselves passed from the hands of Carafa to that library.

³ The subscription to the Proverbs of Solomon deserves special notice: *καταρματι σωλομωντος παρα εβδομηκοντα*; which I made out on the fragments of the *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus*, this MS. thus sharing that honor which the Roman editors accorded to the *Codex Vaticanus* alone.

original copy than that they should be corrected by the conjectures of any one, especially because many places in this MS., which at first seemed faulty or mutilated, were afterward found by a collation with other MSS. to be complete and entire. For the books of the Prophets, which, with the sole exception of Daniel, particularly savor in this MS. of the genuine work of the LXX, are strangely defective; yet, that what is wanting is with reason wanting and does not belong to the LXX, has been ascertained from the old Greek and Latin commentaries, and from MSS. in which the deficiencies are supplied and marked with asterisks.

"A similar course has been pursued also in the notes. Many things given here have been derived from the Greek commentaries, which are circulated in the MSS., partly mutilated, partly written with variations in some places. These have been printed as they are found in the original copies, that the reader might have an opportunity to restore them with the aid of the MSS. according to his own judgment. We must state, also, that we have not copied in the Notes everything which might have been introduced from the editions of others to confirm the readings of the Vatican text by references to profane writers, or to supply what is wanting in the LXX; because, being found in books in common use, they may easily be obtained from that source. But we have by no means omitted those things in the MSS. which served to indicate the diversity of the ancient readings and of the explanations there called *Scholia* as being of uncertain authority, and to corroborate the Vatican reading and to clear up its less intelligible passages.

"The order of the books in the Vatican codex is nearly the same as that which is common among the Greeks, but differs from the ordinary editions in giving the Twelve Prophets first and under a different arrangement, and then the remaining Four Prophets just as they have usually appeared. We infer that this is the right order from the circumstance that the early ecclesiastical writers recognize and approve it. Though there is no division into chapters throughout this codex (in the new edition the convenience of the reader being regarded in this matter), yet in the Four Prophets a rather obscure division appears, very similar to that described by Dorotheus the Martyr, who lived under Constantine the Great.

"The books of Maccabees are wanting in this MS., and nearly all the book of Genesis, this book being mutilated from the beginning to ch. xlvii, on account of the destruction of the parchment by great age. The book of Psalms, also, from Ps. cv. to cxxviii. is imperfect from the same cause.

“ If anything in the present edition shall seem, in the language of St. Jerome, mutilated or out of its order (*lacerata vel inversa*), because those things supplied by Origen and designated by obeliaks and asterisks are not also distinguished here; or if any parts shall appear obscure and confused, because they disagree with the Latin Vulgate, and are clearer and plainer in some other editions, it will be necessary to remind the reader that the object of this elaborate revision was not that this edition should be composed of a medley of the translations of those mentioned above (like that which St. Jerome states is called by the Greeks *συνήψ* and by us *communis*), and correspond word for word with the Latin Vulgate, and thus with the Hebrew; but our purpose was that it should approach, as near as the ancient MSS. would permit, to what the LXX. produced under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This work made clearer by new emendations, and increased by the existing remains of the other translators, will contribute not a little toward the understanding of the Latin Vulgate, and this no one will doubt who compares the former with the latter.

“ If these labors shall gain the approbation they deserve from pious and learned men, it will remain for them to make acknowledgment thereof to Pope Sixtus V, from whom this benefit proceeded; and publicly to beg from Almighty God that He would long preserve to us our excellent Prince, and grant him prosperity. And, whereas the Pontiff has given his every care and thought to the matter of the increase and the adornment of the dignity of the Church, and now through his influence the Christian Commonwealth being formed anew by the best laws and the most sacred institutions, religion and piety being invested with their own splendor by the reestablishment of the ancient rites; we ought not to doubt that he will also promote the public good in exercising his great benignity in purging these Sacred Books from the stains with which the carelessness or the wickedness of men had defaced them, and in sending them forth in the most perfect form possible.”

§ 7. We subjoin lastly the Decree of Sixtus V.

“ Be it remembered. Being desirous of providing in every way and by all means in our power for the welfare of the flock committed unto us, we think it especially pertains to our Pastoral care to see that the books of the Sacred Scriptures are freed from every blemish and spread abroad in their integrity and purity. Before our elevation we studiously and carefully labored for this end according to our ability, and from the period when we were stationed of God in this lofty watch-tower, we have not failed to keep our eye constantly fixed on the same object.

“Whereas, therefore, in former years our predecessor, Pope Gregory XIII, of pious memory, at our instance appointed the Old Testament in Greek according to the LXX, which the Apostles themselves sometimes used, to be revised on the authority of the most perfect MSS; and the charge of this matter was committed to our beloved son, Antonio Carafa, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, together with some other learned men chosen by him for that purpose; and such a revision being now accomplished by the careful collation and deliberate examination of a great number of MSS. from the different libraries of Italy, and particularly from our collection in the Vatican; it is our pleasure and decree, for the glory of God and the good of the Church, that the Old Testament in Greek according to the LXX, thus revised and emended, should be received and retained to be used chiefly for the understanding of the Latin Vulgate and of the Holy Fathers, and we forbid that any one should presume hereafter to change anything in this new edition of the Greek either by adding thereto or by taking therefrom.

“If any one transgresses our present ordinance, let him consider that he will thereby incur the indignation of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

“Given in Rome at St. Mark's, under the signet of St. Peter, on the 8th day of October, A. D. MDLXXXVI, in the 2nd of our Pontificate.
(Tho. Thom. Gualterutius.)”

§ 8. On two pages at the end of the work are given *Addenda* to the Notes, *Animadvertenda*, and *Corrigenda* in the Notes on the Psalter and some other parts. The last mentioned relate as well to the notes as to the text, and seem not to be given in all the common editions, since they have been little heeded by most editors, as Reineccius, Leander van Ess, even by Holmes and Parsons, and by Breitinger. Thus in Dan. 8: 11 we are directed to read ἐράχθη for ἐταράχθη; ἐταράχθη, which is found in the Alexandrian codex, being given among the various readings. In Ps. 143: 12 ἰδουμένα for ἰδουμένα, and in Ps. 118: 178, ἡρετισάμην for ἡρετισάμην, have been generally corrected already. But there are three corrections which we ourselves did not receive, except that they have been given among the various readings of the Alexandrine codex. We therefore should read in IV. Esd. 4: 31, ἐπέθηξ for ἀπέθηξε; in Ps. 94: 8, πειρασμοῦ for πικρασμοῦ; and in Jer. 22: 19, ταφίσεται for ταφίσουται.

Other corrections are also found in all the copies, it seems, of the first edition, there being passages in the text itself which were altered

with a pen by the editors, but not carefully noticed by those who have superintended the printing of the Vatican text. Where anything had thus been changed with the pen by the Roman editors, we have generally indicated it in our critical apparatus, as in Vol. II. p. 60. Pa. 46: 5; p. 284. Mich. 7: 16; p. 241. Jon. 4: 8; p. 264. Mal. 2: 17. But of this more particularly hereafter.

§ 9. We now state in what respects we have departed from the Vatican edition in reprinting the Vatican text. In the first place, the punctuation demanded an improving hand throughout the book, it being of such a character as would be pronounced alike obsolete and inconvenient for the reader. This appears in that frequent use of the marks so unlike the most ancient Greek MSS., and in the fact that the period is very often employed where it little consists with our views. Any page will serve for an example. Thus Gen. 4: 1 seqq. in the Roman edition is as follows:

Ἀδὰμ δὲ ἔγρετο τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. καὶ συλλαβοῦσα, ἔτεκε τὸν Κάϊν. καὶ εἶπεν. ἐκτεσάρμη ἀνθρώπου διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ προσέθηκα τεκεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἄβελ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἄβελ ποιμὴν προβάτων. Κάϊν δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ' ἡμέρας ἤσχετο Κάϊν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ. καὶ ἄβελ ἤσχετο καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σκεύων αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐπίειδεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώμας αὐτοῦ. ἐπὶ δὲ Κάϊν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ οὐ προσέσχε.

This in our edition stands thus:

Ἀδὰμ δὲ ἔγρετο Εὐῶν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκε τὸν Κάϊν. καὶ εἶπεν Ἐκτεσάρμη ἀνθρώπου διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ προσέθηκα τεκεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἄβελ. καὶ ἐγένετο Ἄβελ ποιμὴν προβάτων. Κάϊν δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ' ἡμέρας ἤσχετο Κάϊν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ. καὶ Ἄβελ ἤσχετο καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σκεύων αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐπίειδεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώμας αὐτοῦ. ἐπὶ δὲ Κάϊν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ οὐ προσέσχε.

Also Gen. 28: 1 seqq. in that edition:

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ ζωὴ σάφρα, ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἰκοσιακτά. καὶ ἀπέθανε σάφρα ἐν πόλει ἀρβόκ, ἣ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ κοιλωματι. αὕτη ἔστι χερβῶν ἐν τῇ γῆ χαναάν. ἦλθε δὲ ἀβραὰμ κόπασθαι σάφραν, καὶ περθῆσαι. καὶ ἀέσθη ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ αὐτοῦ. καὶ εἶπεν ἀβραὰμ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ χετ, λέγων. πάροικος καὶ παρεπιδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν. δότε μοι οὖν κτήσιον τάφου μεθ' ὑμῶν, καὶ θάψω τὸν νεκρὸν μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. ἀπεκρίθησαν δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ χετ πρὸς ἀβραὰμ, λέγοντες. μὴ κύριε. ἄκουσον δὲ ἡμῶν. βασιλεὺς παρὰ Θεοῦ οὐ εἶ ἐν ἡμῖν. ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μνημείους ἡμῶν θάψον τὸν νεκρὸν σου. οὐδεὶς γάρ, etc.

The above in our work is written thus :

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ ζωὴ Σάρρας ἕτη ἑκατὸν εἰκοσιπεντά. καὶ ἀπέθανε Σάρρα ἐν πόλει Αἰθῶν, ἣ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ καλωματι· αὕτη ἐστὶ Χεβρον ἐν τῇ γῆ Χαναάν. ἦλθε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ κόψασθαι Σάρραν καὶ πενήτησαι. καὶ ἀπέσθη Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ αὐτοῦ· καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβραὰμ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ Χετ λέγων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν· δότε μοι οὖν κτήνη εἰς μεθ' ὑμῶν, καὶ θάψω τὸν νεκρὸν μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. ἀπακριόθησαν δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Χετ πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ λέγοντες Ἐμὴ, κῆρυξ ἀκουσον δὲ ἡμῶν. βασιλεὺς παρὰ θεοῦ εὐ εἶ ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μνημείους ἡμῶν θάψον τὸν νεκρὸν σου· οὐδεὶς γάρ, etc.

There are, moreover, very many passages which seemed less correctly, others which seemed badly pointed in the Roman edition; the less important of these we have corrected without reminding the reader that the Roman edition differs; but in a great many instances, particularly in the last part of the work, we have given the Roman pointing in our notes. Thus in Ex. 19: 15, for γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοί, τρεῖς ἡμέρας μὴ προσέλθητε γυναῖκά, we have written Γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, μὴ προσέλθητε γυναῖκά. And in Ex. 22: 30, for αὐτῷ ποιήσεις. τὸν μόσχον σου καὶ τὸ πρόβατόν σου καὶ τὸ ὑπόζυγιόν σου ἐπτά ἡμέρας ἔσται ὑπὸ τὴν μητέρα, etc., we have written οὗτα ποιήσεις τὸν μόσχον σου καὶ τὸ πρόβατόν σου καὶ τὸ ὑπόζυγιόν σου· ἐπτά ἡμέρας ἔσται ὕ. τ. μ. etc. Also in Ex. 30: 36, we have given ὅθεν γνωσθήσομαί σοι ἐκείθεν· ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων ἔσται ὑμῖν. Ἐθυσίματα κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν ταύτην οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς, etc., for ὅθεν γνωσθήσομαί σοι ἐκείθεν· ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων ἔσται ὑμῖν θυσίματα. κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν ταύτην οὐ π. ὕ. ε. etc. Cases in which the Roman punctuation has been exhibited in the notes are on Ezek. 25: 9, 10. 26: 2. 27: 25, 26.

In revising the punctuation, however, it has been our principle to make no alteration unless the change was very probable. For this reason we have left untouched, to give an instance, II. Bas. 22: 12 πύκλω αὐτοῦ ἢ σιγή αὐτοῦ σκότος ὑδάτων. ἐπάχυνεν ἐν νεφέλαις ἀέρος; though it seemed better, after the Alexandrine MS., to join σκότος ὑδάτων with what follows it, the Hebrew text also favoring this arrangement. Nor have we made any alteration in those passages, as Ezek. 21: 12, where emendation was impossible without a change in the reading itself.

In the use of capitals as initial letters, especially in writing proper names, we have followed other editors. We have thought it well to mark by a capital also the beginning of a discourse, questions, answers, and the like, the capital thus serving as a sign of punctuation. This is not the usage of ancient MSS., but it is hoped that it will be approved by the discerning reader.

In dividing the text into verses, we have generally imitated the example of former editors, who were accustomed to point off the Greek text according to the Latin copies, from which this practice passed also to the Hebrew. The Greek, however, demands a method of its own, which we have sought to satisfy, where it seemed important, by giving in a twofold numbering both the Latin and the Greek order of the verses. We have adopted the same course where a difference of chapters was observed, and we particularly mention in this connection the second part of Jeremiah, which we have endeavored to enable the reader easily to compare with the Hebrew, in which the divisions have a very different order from the Latin.

§ 10. I proceed to the accentuation. Great pains have been bestowed on the correction of this. In the case of nouns, for example, we have written: ἄπισ for ἄπις, ἀνθρακιά for ἀνθρακία, ἀργάσι for ἀρῆσαι, βορέβαν uniformly for βορέβαν, τὰς γὰς for τὰς γὰς, γαλῆ for γαλή, γρόπα and γῆπα for γρόπα and γῆπα, γομόρ for γομορ, both of which are found in the Roman edition, δυναστειῶν for δυναστειῶν and σατραπειῶν for σατραπειῶν and the like, εὐθυναν for εὐθύναν, ἐνίδραν for ἐνεδραν, θερμάστρεϊς for θερμαστρεϊς, θῦμα for θύμα, κηλιδα for κηλιδα, κλίμαξ for κλίμαξ, κρηπίδος for κρηπίδος, κρίμα everywhere, the Roman edition fluctuating between κρίμα and κῆμα,¹ κύτος for κῦτος, λαίλαψ for λαίλαψ, λάρον for λάρον, λεγῶς for λεγῶς, μεγιστᾶνας for μεγιστάνας, μυῖαν for μυῖαν, μῦσος for μῦσος, ὄσφῶν, restored in the Roman edition with the pen, for ὄσφῶν, πλήμυρα for πλημύρα, ποία always, the Roman edition has both ποία and ποιά, πούς invariably, the Roman edition has sometimes πούς, sometimes ποῖς, πρᾶσις for πράσις, πρεσβῦται for πρεσβῦται, σκύλα in every instance, for it was now and then σκύλα, σκνίφες for σκνίφες, σμίλαξ for σμίλαξ, σμαράγδος for σμαράγδος, στῦλοι for στῦλοι, σὺς for σὺς, σφηκίαν for σφηκίαν, σφραγίδος for σφραγίδος, σφῦραν for σφύραν, τεχνίται for τεχνίται, χῶρα for χῶρα, χρίσμα and χρίσις for χρίσμα and χρίσις, ψύχος for ψύχος, and other words.

In adjectives: βαρεία for βαρεία, ἐρυνθᾶν for ἐρυνθᾶν, which is often found in the Roman edition, λιῶ and λιῶς for λιῶ and λιῶς, πλησίοι for πλησίοι, χαλκοῖ, -οῖς for χαλκοῖ, -οῖς, and so χρυσοῖ, -οῖς, ὠραία for ὠραία, and so on.

In verbs: ἐνειρας for ἐνειρας, ἐστάναι for ἐστάναι, ἐκφάνωσι for ἐκφανῶσι, εὐρέ, εἰπόν for εὐρε, εἰπον, λῆς for λῆ, πρᾶσσε for πράσσε,

¹ It is certain that both modes are found in the ancient MSS., just as Aeschylus lengthened the ἰῶτα, and Nonnus shortened it. The former seems to have been used in the earlier Greek, the latter in the Alexandrine dialect.

περιέσχον for περιέσχον, συνιωῶν, συνιωῖς, etc. (as elsewhere συνιωῶν), and ἀφιωῶσι (as elsewhere ἀφιωῶσι), have been given in all cases,¹ ὄσας for ὄσας. Also ἰλαρῦναι, μεγαλῦναι, πληθῦναι, λεπτῦναι and σῦρον for ἰλαρῦναι, etc., καμμῦσαι, κηρῦσαι, ἰσχῦσαι, κατισχῦσαι, ἐνισχῦσαι for καμμῦσαι, etc., ἐκκλίνας, θλίψαι, συντρῦψαι, ῥίψον, χρίσαι for ἐκκλίνας, etc. Also κεραννύντες, ὀρνύντες, σβεννύντι for κεραννύντες etc., ἐκβιάσαι, ἐκσπᾶσαι, κρημάσαι for ἐκβιάσαι, etc., καθυβρίσαι, for -ῖσαι, and many similar cases.²

In adverbs: ἐπίμιξ for ἐπίμιξ, etc.

Here belong also such cases as Ex. 11: 9, ἵνα πληθύνω, where the Roman edition has ἵνα πληθυνῶ; and Deut. 8: 8, ἀποστείλαι, ἀναστήσαι, which the Roman edition wrongly writes -εἶλαι, -ῆσαι.

There were many things needing correction in the names of nations; as, Σπαρτιάται for -άται; Μωαβίται, Ἀμμωνίτις, Γαλιθαίτις, Σωμανίτις, which were everywhere given -ίται, -ίτις. So also Λευίται, which was commonly accented Λευίται.

Much effort was made that the proper names might be given uniformly with the same accents and breathings; as, Ἀμράμ;³ Βαροῦ, Γασιῶν Γαβέρ, Λεββῶρα Ἐδραῖν, Ἐλεαλήν, Ἐλιαβ, Ἐλισαφ, Ἐλισαφάν, Ἐλισούρ, Ἐσεβῶν, Ἡράμ, Ἡσαῦ, Ζακχοῦ, Ἰεριχώ, Ἰεμνι, Ἰησοῦς, Ἰού, Ἰωζαβδος, Ἰούαν, Ἰωάθαμ, Κῦρος, Μαγδωλον, Μαρών, Νουά, Ὀλδα, Ὀζιήλ, Σελμωνᾶ, Χάλεβ; also that the same names might not appear sometimes with the diaeresis, and sometimes without it; as, Ἀμσαδαί, Ἀρμαθαίμ, Ἐφραῖμ,⁴ Ἰεῖήλ.

But in all these matters the want of uniformity, which exists in the Roman edition and in the others, is very great indeed; and this defect extends, as will be shown below, not only to the accents and the breathings, but to the letters themselves.⁵ Therefore, though we have corrected many things, we cannot hope that no traces of the inconsistency of the Roman work will yet be found.

¹ For it is better to employ these instead of the contract forms from the root *EQ*, though *συνιόντος*, which I have used for *συνιόντος*, is not unknown to the LXX; compare II. Παρᾶ, 2 6: 5,

² From *πειράω* and *πειράω* we have received both *πειράου* and *πειράου*, and likewise *ἀμαρῶν*, as in II. Παρᾶ. 6: 39 *ἀμαρῶντι*, and *ἀμαρῶν*.

³ In the Roman edition, Num. 26: 58 *ἄμραμ* and 59 *ἄμραμ*; but Ex. 6: 18, *Ἀμβράμ*.

⁴ The Roman edition gives *ἔφραμ* several times and then commonly *ἔφραμ*. We have uniformly written *Ἐφραῖμ*; in the Alex. MS. and in the Friderico-Augustan, also, it is generally *ἔφραμ*, though we have not noticed it everywhere.

⁵ Sometimes a difference of accent may seem advisable on account of a difference of form; as, *Κισων*, *Κισων*, *Κισων*; *Φισων* and *Φισων*; *Γων* and *Γων*. We have, however, marked even these with the same accent.

It often happened, moreover, that the Roman editors and those who followed them, marked the genitive of proper names ending in *-ās*, with the accent *-ās*. We have, therefore, restored *Ἀδάς* in Gen. 36: 10 seq., just as *ζιλαῶς* in Gen. 46: 18 stands correct in the Roman edition. So *Βαλλᾶς*, Gen. 46: 15. *Μελχᾶς*, Gen. 24: 15, 24. *Μασεκκᾶς*, Gen. 36: 36. *Ὀλιβεμᾶς*, Gen. 36: 14, 18. *Σωφᾶς*, 1. Chron. 7: 36. Also *ἀπὸ Μαριοῦς*, which is elsewhere written *Μαρισᾶ*, *Μαρησᾶ*; and the like.

In the case of the enclitics, the use of which even in the ancient MSS. is by no means fixed, we have done, we think, what was most likely to be correct.¹

In the Roman edition *ἀναμέρον, διαπαντός, καίγε*, etc. are written. We preferred to write *ἀνά μέσον, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*:² *ἀφ' ὅτε, διὰ παντός, διὰ κενῆς, διὰ τί, εἰς αὐριον, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἵνα τί, καί γε, πρὶν ἢ, τὸ δευτερον, τὸ δειλινόν, τὸ πρότερον, τὸ πρῶν, τὸ τάχος*, and other expressions of this class, though the limits of this rule are difficult to define. For in similar cases, as in *καθόλου, διόλου, οὐκέτι*, it certainly will not be proper always to write the component words separately.³

The diversity in the breathings, we have already touched upon in speaking of proper names. Passing by other cases, such as *ἐλικτά* which we have given for *ἐλικτά* in Lev. 6: 21, we specially mention here the use of the reflexive pronoun *αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶ*, etc. Where one would expect this pronoun, according to the custom of most editors of the New Testament and of other Greek works, the Roman editors with perfect correctness usually employed the demonstrative pronoun *αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶ*, etc.; it being highly probable that the reflexive power of the pronoun was more frequently overlooked than regarded, at least at those periods to which the Greek text of the Old Testament and the books of the New Testament belong.⁴ This opinion is supported both by the authority of the ancient MSS. written with breath-

¹ When *τίς* is used instead of the relative pronoun, it seems now and then to have been confounded with the indefinite *τίς*; as, Lev. 14: 35. 21: 17, in which passages we have edited *τίνος* (for *τινός*) *αὐτοῦ* and *τίνι* (for *τινὶ*) *ἔδν*. Equally intolerable was Num. 22: 38, *δυνατός ἔσομαι λαλῆσαι τί*; we have written *λαλήσαι τι*, which is favored by the Hebrew text itself.

² But in I. Bas. 2: 29, we have retained *ἀπαρχῆς*, because it seemed necessary to refer it to *σπαρχή*. In the Wisdom of Solomon 14: 23, we have given *ἐξἄλλων* (from *ἐξἄλλος*) instead of *ἔξ ἄλλων*.

³ Thus also for *μη δέ*, which is often found in the Roman edition, we have written *μηδέ*.

⁴ I apprehend that many have formed their judgment of the usage of the earlier Greeks, also, too much from editions wanting in accuracy and from MSS. of a later age.

ings and accents from about the eighth century onward, and particularly by the fact that in many places where it might be a question whether *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτοῦ* should be read, we find *ἀπ', ἀν', ἐπ', κατ', μετ'* preceding, and not *ἀφ', ἀνθ', ἐφ', καθ', μεθ'*. On this matter in the LXX, compare I. *Bas.* 9: 5 *μετ' αὐτοῦ*; 18: 18 *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*; II. *Bas.* 18: 19 *ἐπ' αὐτῆς*; IV. *Bas.* 3: 27 *ἀντ' αὐτοῦ*; Judg. 3: 23 *κατ' αὐτοῦ*; I. *Παράλ.* 15: 15 *ἐπ' αὐτούς* (the Alex. MS. has *ἐφ' ἰαντούς*¹); and of the same nature is II. *Παράλ.* 29: 9 *οὐκ* (Alex. MS. *οὐχ*) *αὐτῶν*. Of these examples the most important are those where one would look for the very reverse; as, IV. *Bas.* 3: 27. Judg. 3: 23.² There are also other cases where no preposition precedes; from these it clearly appears what was the principle of the Roman editors in this matter; as, Sirach 27: 25, *Ὁ βάλλον λίθον εἰς ὕψος ἐπὶ κεφαλῆν αὐτοῦ βάλλει*. For this reason those passages also in which they departed from their own usage, we have thought should be made to conform to it. Accordingly *αὐτοῦ* has been restored for *αὐτοῦ* in Gen. 41: 11. 46: 1. II. *Bas.* 1: 11. 15: 14; *αὐτῆς* for *αὐτῆς* II. *Bas.* 11: 4. 18: 19; *αὐτῶ* for *αὐτῶ* Deut. 12: 18. 17: 16, 18. 29: 13; *αὐτῶν* for *αὐτῶν* Deut. 25: 2. II. *Bas.* 18: 19; and the same in a few other passages with one exception and one only, if I mistake not, II. *Παράλ.* 8, 1, where the reflexive form has peculiar force.

There are other changes depending on the breathing, though not made in the breathing itself. In the Roman edition some places are found where *οὐκ* stands before aspirated syllables, and *οὐχ* before syllables not aspirated. This seems to have proceeded in very great measure from the Vatican MS., but that it was done against the judgment of the editors is seen from the circumstance that they have corrected it here and there with the pen; as, Ex. 12: 19, where before *ἐνρεθίσεται*, *οὐχ* has been restored for *οὐκ*. We have, therefore, had the other cases also changed. These are nearly as follows: Gen. 37: 7 *οὐκ οὕτως*; Deut. 21: 7 *οὐκ ἐωράκασιν*; III. *Bas.* 8: 46 *οὐκ ἀμαρτήσονται*; I. *Ἔσδρ.* 8: 66 *οὐχ ἐχώρισεν*; II. *Ἔσδρ.* 3: 13 *οὐχ ἦν*, and 9, 1 *οὐχ ἐχώρισθη*; Nehem. 13: 26 *οὐχ ἦν*; Ps. 105: 11 *οὐκ ὑπελείφθη*; Prov. 29: 7 *οὐκ ὑπάρχει*; Sirach 44: 19 *οὐκ ἐνρέθη*, and 48: 13 *οὐκ ὑπέφησεν*. We add, as belonging to the same class, II. *Ἔσδρ.* 6: 11 *καθ' ἐμέ*, and III. *Macc.* 2: 22 *καθ' εἰδάφους*.

¹ Indeed, where a later period had occasion to use the reflexive pronoun, it seems to have preferred the fuller form *ἐαυτοῦ* to the shorter *αὐτοῦ*. Compare also Gen. 39: 6, where the Alex. MS. has *καθ' εαυτον* instead of *καθ' αὐτόν* which stands in the Roman edition.

² The reverse of this is infrequent; as, III. *Bas.* 11: 18 *μεθ' αὐτῶν*; in the Alex. MS. *μετ' αὐτῶν*.

I omit to give those words in which the *iota* subscript sometimes appears, but which we have written differently from the Roman editors; as, ζῆν for ζῆν, ἦρεν for ἦρεν, etc., and pass by the fact that we have not used the *iota* ad-script in *Λίσωμεν*, *Ἐιδῆ*,¹ where they have commonly² employed it.

It has given us much trouble that * ἐφελκυστικόν in the Roman edition, contrary to usage and not without carelessness, I think, has sometimes been added and sometimes omitted; as, Deut. 1: 21, *παρὰ δίδωκε ἡμῖν*; 4: 20, *ἔλαβε ὁ θεός*; 23: 22, *ἔστι ἐν σοί*; Josh. 24: 27, *εἶπε Ἰησοῦς*; 6: 22, *τοῖς κατασκευεύσασι εἶπεν*; Judg. 19: 14, *ἔστι ἐν*; I. Bas. 17: 8, *ἀνεβόησε εἰς*; Ex. 14: 14, *εἰγγαγεν κύριος*; 23: 22, *ἔστιν πᾶσα*; 26: 18, *εἰκοσι στύλους*; 38: 10, *εἰποίησεν τοῖς*; Num. 22: 11, *κακάλυφεν τήν*; Josh. 18: 3, *ἔδωκεν κύριος*. Of such cases I have left untouched only those which could be defended by a pause in the discourse or by some other sufficient reason; as, Job 36: 16, *πρεσπιπᾶτησέν σε*. We have likewise everywhere restored *εἰκοσι*, even where a vowel follows. The Roman edition conforms to this rule in IV. Bas. 16, 2 *εἰκοσι ἐτών* and II. Bas. 3, 20 *εἰκοσι ἀνδρας*, but not in several other passages; as, Gen. 6: 3. Judg. 4: 3. I. Bas. 4: 18. 14: 14.³ Indeed, I have learned that with very few exceptions it is uniformly given thus in all the most ancient MSS, though Ludwig Dindorf, following the *Etym. Magn.* p. 297, 51, has adopted a different view; compare *Steph. Thes. Gr. Ling.* under *εἰκοσι* and *εἰκοσιεννία*.

§ 11. We next give an account of the more important emendations. A great number of these have been made according to the corrections added with a pen in the Roman edition;⁴ and such of them as have been disregarded by us in common with other editors will be given together. That other things which we have corrected were thus written by mistake in the Roman edition, is so evident that it is strange that nearly all who have reprinted that text, should have had these things repeated without alteration. In regard to other emendations made by us and by others,⁵ only the smaller part proceed-

¹ This mode of writing is at variance with the usage of the Alex. codex and other very ancient MSS.

² Commonly, but not always; as, p. 475 *Ἐιδῆ* is found three times, *Ἐιδῆ* but once.

³ In this connection and elsewhere Grabe has wrongly given from the Alex. codex, *εἰκοσιν*; again, in other passages, as IV. Bas. 16, 2, he has correctly written *εἰκοσι ἐτών*.

⁴ Compare above § 8.

⁵ In this number we ought certainly to include Walton, Lambert Bos, and Ernest Grabe.

ing in the first instance from us, no one will doubt that they are well founded.

In Gen. 19: 5 we have given *πρὸς ἡμᾶς* for *πρ. ὑμᾶς*; 20: 14, 16, *δίδραγμα*, just as in 28: 15, 16 and elsewhere, for *δίδραγμα*; 21: 21 with Morin, Reineccius, Ess, the Venice editor of 1822, and with others,¹ we have followed the Roman text as printed: *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ γυναῖκα ἐκ φαραν αἰγύπτου*. But in some copies, perhaps not in all, *φαραν* has been introduced with the pen after *ἐρήμῳ*, and *ἐκ φαραν* has been changed into *ἐκ τῆς*. Both corrections approach near to the Alexandrine MS. and are favored by much additional testimony, except that most authorities have *γῆς*, with the Alexandrine MS., instead of *τῆς*; 28: 8, *Ἐφρών*, which presently follows in v. 20, we have written, for *Ἐφρώμ*; 27: 45, *τῶν δύο ὑμῶν* for *τ. δ. ἡμῶν*; 38: 18, *παρετίβαλε* for *παρετίλαβε*; 36: 37, *Σαμαδά*, according to the correction of the pen, for *σαμαά*;² 41: 1, *ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* for *ἐπὶ καὶ π.*; 50: 18, *Μαχίρ*, as it stands twice 46: 20, for *Μαχείρ*.

Ex. 10: 26, *τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν* for *τ. θ. ὑμῶν*; 30: 33, *ὃς ἂν δῶ* for *ὡς ἂν δῶ*; 33: 16, *μεθ' ἡμῶν* for *μ. ὑμῶν*; 34: 11, *ἐντέλλομαι* for *ἐντέλλωμαι*; which had already been corrected in the Roman edition; 35: 7, *ἤρθηθροδανομένα*, as it had twice occurred before, for *ἤρθηθροδανωμένα*; 35: 13 I have not changed, but the second *τούς* which is wanting in some of the authorities of Holmes, has been erased with the pen in the Roman edition. Lev. 8: 26, *ἔλαβεν*, the Roman editors had put *καί* before this, but afterward cancelled it with the pen; 18: 8, *ἐπ' αὐτῇ*, after the correction by the pen, for *ἐπ' αὐτῆς*. Num. 1: 10 we have written *Φαθασούρ*, just as it is found in four instances in ch. ii. and vii, for *φαθασούρ*; 1: 13, *Φαγεῖλ*, as in 2: 27 and twice in ch. vii, for *φαγαῖλ*; 6: 20, *στηθνίου* for *στηθηνίου*, 7: 42, *Ἐλισάφ*, which precedes and follows, for *ἐλεισάφ*; 10: 19, *Σουρισαδαί*, as in 2: 12. 7: 36, 41, for *σουρισεδαί*; 10: 22, *νιὸς Ἐμιούδ*, as in 2: 18. 7: 48, 53, for *νιὸς Σεμούδ* (a different person is intended in 34: 20, *Σαλαμιήλ νιὸς Σεμούδ*); 14: 29, *ἐγόγγυσαν* for *ἐγόγγυζαν*; 16: 1, *Ἰσαάαρ*, as in some cases before, instead of *Ἰσαάρ*; 21: 14 seq., *χειμάρρους* for *χμαρρῶν*; 26: 39, *δῆμος ὁ Σουδαλαί*, just as it stands cor-

¹ Nor does Bretinger mention it. Holmes seems thoughtlessly to have it in his text; for he does not speak of the alteration with the pen, as he usually does in other cases. It is strange that he made his apparatus agree with the text as printed, and not as it stands corrected with the pen.

² Bretinger in his *Prolegomena* less correctly says on this place that *Σαμαδ* was given instead of *Σαλαμί* by a typographical mistake. For as *Σαμαδά* (not, as in the Alex. MS., *Σαλαμά*) preceded, so in this passage *Σαμαδά* ought to have been given.

rect in the foot-note, except that τ is confounded with δ , for δ . δ . $\sigma\upsilon\delta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu$; 28: 4, $\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$ for $\tau\acute{o}$ $\tau\omicron\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$, 33, $\Lambda\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu$ we have always given, as it stands in the Roman edition both in Ex. 25: 27 and in Num. 33: 10; on the other hand in 33: 9 it was written $\alpha\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu$; 33: 14. 15, as everywhere previously, we have edited Ῥαφαὲλὶν for Ἰαφριδὶν ; 34: 8, $\Lambda\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\theta$, as in 13: 22, for $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\theta$.

Deut. 2: 13 seq., Ζαρὲδ , as in Num. 21: 12, for ζαρετ , in the latter place the Alex. MS. has ζαρε , and in the former it fluctuates between ζαρε and ζαρετ ; 4: 43, Γαλααδ , as it had preceded, for γαλααθ ; 14: 17, παλεκᾶνα , as in Lev. 11: 18, for παλακᾶνα ; 14: 8, μηρυκᾶται , as in Lev. 11: 26, for μαρυκᾶται ; Ess gave by corruption μηρυκᾶται ; in both passages the Alex. MS. has αναμαρυκαται ; 28: 29, $\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\epsilon\iota$, as we have corrected, for $\alpha\iota\varsigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\epsilon\iota$; 28: 57, χόριον preserved by the Alex. MS, we have left untouched, but in the Roman edition it has been changed with the pen to κόριον ; 29: 18, $\text{εἶνος ἢ διάνοια ἐξέλιπεν}$ for $\text{τινός ἢ δ. ἐξέλιπον}$; it was already corrected ἐξέλιπον with the pen; Breiting is wrong in ascribing ἐξέλιπον to the Roman edition and ἐξέλιπεν to Morin as an emendation; in Walton and Bos and from them in Ess it stands, $\text{εἶνος ἢ διαν. ἐξέλιπεν}$; 32: 39, according to what follows, we have restored ἀποκτενῶ , which also the Alex. MS. has, for ἀποκτείνω ; Walton and Bos preferred ἀποκτείνω .

Josh. 2: 19, we have written ἡμεῖς δέ for ὅμοις δέ ; 7: 12, ἐγενήθησαν for ἐγενήθησαν ; 18: 22, Βέωρ , as in every previous case, for βαίωρ ; 14: 13 seq., 15 seq., Ἰαφρονῆ , as elsewhere very frequently, for ἰεφρονῆ and ἰαφρονῆ ; 15: 63, ἠδυνάσθησαν , as also Ess after other editors, for ἠδυνασθησαν , which Holmes strangely retains; Reineccius and others have given ἠδυνήθησαν .

Judg. 1: 24, Λεῖζον ἡμῖν for Δ. ὑμῖν ; 3: 8, Χουσαρσαθαίμ before εἰτη for κουσαρσαθαίμ , as it precedes in the same verse and follows three times in v. 10; 5: 1, ἦσαν for ἦσαν ; 6: 8, ἀνέβαινον for ἀνέβαιναν ; 9: 23, ἠθέτησαν , as corrected with the pen in the Roman edition, for ἠθέτισαν ; Holmes has absurdly kept this, and gives no various reading with it; 11: 24, κληρονομήσομεν , according to the correction with the pen, for κληρονομήσωμεν ; 16: 9, στνππίου we have put for στιππίου , comparing 15: 14. Lev. 13: 47, 59; the Alex. MS. uniformly exhibits the latter form, and we ourselves have not altered it in the Prophets; 18: 14, $\text{ὅ$ $\tau\iota$ for ὅτι , the Alex. MS. having $\tau\iota$; 20: 6, ἐμέλισα , as already restored by the pen in the Roman edition, for ἐμέλῃσα ; xxi, we have always given Ἰαβεὶς Γαλααδ ; the Roman edition has in the same chapter sometimes Ἰαβίς Γ. , as in vv. 9, 14; sometimes Ἰαβεὶς Γ. , as in vv. 8, 10, 12.

Ruth 6: 11, *Λίσαν*, as everywhere before, in the place of *λίαν*.

I. *Bas.* 8: 20, *δικάσει*, after the pen in the Roman edition, for *δικαίσις*; 10: 5, with Reineccius, Ess, and others, we have restored *ἀνάσσημα*, as in the Alex. MS, for *ἀνάστομα*; 25: 10, *πεπληθυσμένοι*, according to the correction with the pen in the Roman edition, for *πεπληθυσμένοι*; 25: 29, *ἐνδοθεμένη*, as we have edited, for *ἐνδοθεμένη*, which, absurd as it is, has been copied by Ess; 25: 35, *ἡρέτεια* for *ἡρέτεια*; compare above § 8, on Ps. 118: 173. II. *Bas.* 3: 10, *Βηρσαβεά*, as elsewhere often, for *βηρσαβεί*; 18: 4, *ὑμῶν* for *ἡμῶν*; 28: 4, *οὐ* for *ὄ*, as restored by the pen in the Roman edition, but still overlooked by Ess. III. *Bas.* 2: 23, *ἀρχιστράτηγος*, as elsewhere, for *ἀρχιστράτηγος*; 3: 3, *σαλωμών* for *σαλωμόν* by the correction with the pen in the Roman edition; 3: 36, *ὀικοδόμησον* for *οἰκοδόμησον*; 4: 12, *ἐκ Βηθσάν* for *ἐκβηθσάν*; 7: 35, *εἰς ἱπαρσούρις* for *ε. ἱπαρσούρις*; 12: 24, *πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν* for *π. τ. ἀ. ἡμῶν*; 18: 11, *κατόκει* for *κατόκει*; 18: 20, *ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης* for *ἐ. τῆς τε τρα.*, in the Roman edition the *τε* being erased; 16: 23, *δυναστεία*, as immediately after in 16: 5 and 28, for *δυναστεία*; 16: 28, *Συρία Νασίβ· καὶ σουρία· νασίβ· καὶ*¹; IV. *Bas.* 8: 8, 9 we have twice given *ἀρρῶστας*, the Roman edition in the former verse *-ίας*, in the latter *-ίας*; 16: 10 we have written *θαλασφολλασάρ* for *θαλασφολλασάρ*; 19: 25, *σπηγαρον*, as restored by the pen in the Roman edition, for *ἡγαρον*; 19: 28, *ἐν τοῖς* for *ἐκ τοῖς*, which Ess left unchanged; 19: 30, *οἶκον*; after the correction with the pen, for *οἶκον*; 21: 4, *τὸ ὄνομα* for *τῷ ὄνομα*, which Ess reprinted without alteration; 22: 19, *ὅσα ἐλάλησα* for *ὅσα ἐλάλησας*, the *σ*, though crossed out with the pen in the Roman edition, is retained by Ess.

I. *Παραλ.* 2: 9, *Ἰεραμειήλ*, as read in vv. 26, 27, and already corrected in this passage with the pen, we have given for *Ἰεραμειήλ*; 5: 23, *Βαὰλ Ἐρμών*, as elsewhere, for *βαίμλ, ἔρμών*; 18: 1, *Γέθ*, as elsewhere, for *γεθ*. II. *Παραλ.* 3: 16, *δαβίρ*, as it follows in 4: 20. 5: 9, for *δανίρ*; 18: 7, *λαλεῖω* for *λαλήτω*; 18: 21, *ψουδός* for *ἀμρουδός*, though the *μ* was already obliterated with the pen; 30: 18, *Ἰσαάκωρ καὶ Ζαβουλών* for *Ἰσαάκωρ· ζαβουλών*; 36: 22, *Κέρον*, as already altered by the pen, for *κυρίων*.

I. *Ἔσδρ.* 4: 56, *φρουρούσι*, as we have corrected with others, for *φρουρούσι*; 9: 12, *στήτωσησεν* for *στήτωσησεν*. II. *Ἔσδρ.* 2: 61, *ἐκλήθη* for *ἐκλήθη*; 4: 10, *τὸ κατάλοιπον* for *τὸ κατάλοιπον*; Neh. 1: 9, *ἡ δαυπορά ὑμῶν* for *ἡ δ. ἡμῶν*; 2: 18, *ἐκκραυαῖθήσαν* for *ἐκκραυαῖθήσαν*;

¹ *αὶ κίνες* in III. *Bas.* 20: 20, we have not altered. Others, as Reineccius and Holmes, have written, *οὐ κίνες*.

8: 22, ἀνδρες Ἐκκεχάρ we have written; so also, as it seems, in the Roman edition, ἐκκεχάρ, but Ess with others gave ἐκ Χεχάρ; 4: 11, φουτεύσωμεν, as we have given it, for φωνεύσωμεν; 10: 30, τῆς γῆς, after the correction of the pen, for τοῖς γῆς, which even Holmes with others retained. Tob. 1: 7, αὐτὰ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις for α. εἰς ἱερ.; 2: 7, ὀφύξας, as was corrected with the pen, for ὀφύξας; 3: 9, ἡμᾶς for ὅμας; 3: 10, ὥστε, according to the correction with the pen, for ὅς τα.¹ Judith 6: 5, Ἀμμών for ἀμμών; 9: 6, εἶπαν, after the alteration with the pen, for εἶπα; Esther 6: 7, τῷ εἶδει for τὸ εἶδει, which Ess retains; 8: 14, ἐν Σούσοις for ἐκ σοῦσοις, the ἐκ also being found in Ess.

Job 3: 25, ἰδεδοίκειν for ἐνδεδοίκειν; 5: 15, ἀπόλωτε is our correction for ἀπώλοιτε; 9: 4, we have given διακρίαι, and the same stands in the Roman edition, but the *iota* subscript has almost disappeared, and hence Holmes, Ess, and others, have given διακροία, without the *iota*; 9: 14, διακριταῖ for διακρίναι;² 18: 11, ὀδύσαι, as corrected by the pen, for εἰδύσαι, which Ess retained; 18: 17, ἀπόλοιτε for ἀπώλοιτε; 19: 2, ποιήσετε for ποιήσεται; 21: 31, ἀνταποδώσει for ἀντακωδώσει; 25: 5, σελήνη for σελήνη; 30: 14, κέχρηται for κέκριται, by a correction with the pen; 39: 24, ὄργῃ for ὄργη; 42: 8, ὅμας for ἡμᾶς.

Ps. 6: 2, ἐλέγξας for ἐλλέγξας; 9: 29, ἐνέδρα, as Ess correctly gave, the Roman ed. ἐνέδρα, Bos, Keineccius, and Holmes ἐνεδρα; 21: 9, σωσάτω by our correction for σωσάτω;³ 34, 26, μεγαλοῤῥημονοῦντες for μεγαλοῤῥημοῦντες; 42: 1, ἀνθρώπου, by an alteration with the pen, for προσώπου; 44: 6, with Walton, Bos and others, I have omitted μου before τοῦ βασιλέως; 47: 5, we have given οἱ βασιλεῖ; for οἱ βασ. τῆς γῆς; this addition, though found in the Alex. MS., being cancelled by the pen of the editors themselves; 67: 22, τριχός for θριχός; 77: 1, προσέχετε for προσέχετε; 88: 1, Ἰσραηλίτη for ἰσραηλίτη; 50, αἴματος for αἷματος; 89: 14, εὐφρανθήμεν with Walton, Bos, and the rest, we have left unchanged; Keineccius thus points: ἡμῶν. Εὐφρανθήμεν, ἀνθ'; but the Roman edition has it erased with the pen, and does not recognize it in the Notes. Compare the

¹ In Tobias 7: 3, ἐκ Νινευή, I have made no change; Holmes, after the Alex. MS, gave ἐν Νινευή, but quotes ἐκ from the Vatican codex.

² It was my judgment that οὐδ' ὥς in Job 9: 11, ought not to be altered, though Holmes, Ess, and perhaps others, have edited οὐδ' εἰς.

³ Other words of this class, as πρὶν for πρὸς, ἀνθρώπος, ἀνθρωπος, etc. have not been given in this list.

Alex. MS.;¹ 101: 4, *συναφρόγησαν* for *συναφρόγισαν*; 101: 28 and 103: 29, *ἐκλείψουσιν* for *ἐκκλείψουσιν*.²

Prov. 6: 14, we have given *διστραμμένη καρδιά* for *διστραμμένη καρδιά*; 24: 21, *μηδέτερω* for *μηθ' ἐτέρω*; 25: 3, *ἀνεξέλεγκτος* for *ἀνεξέλεγκτος*; 29: 2, *ἐγκωμιαζομένων* for *ἐγκωμιαζομένων*; 29: 9, *κρίνει* for *κρινεῖ*; 29: 27, *ἀδίκω*, according to the correction with the pen, for *δικαίω*; 38: 20, *οἰνοπότης* for *οἰνοπότης*.

Eccl. 5: 17, *ποιεῖν* for *ποιεῖν*; 6: 10, *ἰσχυροτέραν* for *ἰσχυροτέρον*. Song Sol. 5: 11, *ἐλάται* for *ἐλαταί*. Wisdom Sol. 15: 18, *ἀνοία* for *ἄνοια*; 16: 16, *ἐν ἰσχύι* for *ἐν ἰσχύει*. Sirach 4: 17, *διστραμμένος*, after the alteration with the pen, for *διστραμμένος*, and *παιδεία* for *παιδεία*; 4: 31, *ἐκτεταμένη* for *ἐκτεταγμένη*; 11: 12, *ἰσχύι* again for *ἰσχύει*; 12: 11, *φύλαξι* for *φύλαξε*; 22: 11, we have restored *ἐξέλιπε γέω* before *φεις*, which was evidently dropped by mistake in the Roman edition; 27: 14, *πολιόρκου* we have edited for *πολιόρκου*; 30: 9, *σύνπαιζον* for *σύνπαιζον*; 30: 15, 16, *ὑγίεια* and *ὑγείας* for *νίγεια* and *νίγείας*; 32: 12, *καθ' εὔρεμα* for *καθενύρεμα*; 32: 25, *κρίνη* for *κρινῆ*; 37: 6, *ἀμνημονήσης* for *ἀμνημονύσης*; but Ess, after others had corrected, *ἀμνημονεύσης*; 38: 16, *ἐναρξαι* for *ἐναρξε*; 39: 7, *κατενθυνεῖ* for *κατενθύνει*; 39: 13, *εἰσακούσατε* for *εἰσακούσατε*; 46: 12, *ἀντικαταλασσόμενον* for *ἀντικαταλασσόμενον*; 51: 2, *ἀπολείας* for *ἀπολείας*, and *βοηθός*, from the correction by the pen, for *βοηθός*.

Hos. 14: 3, we have given *μὴ εἰπόμεν* for *μὴ εἶπόμεν*. Mich. 5: 4, *ἰσχύι* again for *ἰσχύει*; 6: 14, *παραδοθήσονται* for *παραδοθήσονται*; 7: 16, *ἀποκωφωθήσεται*, as corrected by the pen, for *ἀποκωφωθήσεται*; 7: 17, *ὄφεις* for *ὄφεις*. Joel 2: 4, *ὡς ὄρασις* for *ὄς ὄρασις*; 2: 16, *παστοῦ* for *μαστοῦ*; 2: 30, *δώσω* for *δώσωσι*.⁴ Jonah 4: 8, *ζῆν*, as was changed by the pen, for *ζεῖν*. Habak. 3: 8, *ὠργίσθης* for *ὠργίσθης*; 3: 9, *τοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* for *τ. ἐπικαλεῖσθε*, found also in Ess. Hag. 1: 6, *εἰσπρέγκατε* for *εἰσπρέγκατε*. Zachar. 7: 11, *ἠπειθήσαν* for *ἠπειθήσαν*. Mal. 2: 17, *παροξύναμεν*, after the alteration with the pen, for *παροξύναμεν*.

Isaiah 1: 8, *πολιορκουμένη* for *πολιορκουμένη*; 4: 1, *ἡμῶν* twice for *ἡμῶν*; 5: 5, *καθελῶ* for *κατελῶ*; 8: 10, *μεθ' ἡμῶν* for *μεθ' ἡμῶν*; 9:

¹ We have not changed *ἀγλλιασόμεθα* in Ps. 94: 1. Holmes and others write, *ἀγλλιασόμεθα*.

² In Ps. 118: 129, I read *ἐξερεῖνῃσεν* without alteration; Holmes thought this should be *ἐξερεῖνῃσεν*. Compare next page, note 2.

³ It seemed that *μυσοφορῶν* in Sirach 34: 21 ought not to be changed. Henry Stephens in his *Theaurus Græc. Ling.* preferred with others to write *μυσοφορῶν*.

⁴ It appears that Lambert Bos first corrected these passages in Joel.

6, *συναπαύεσται*, after the correction with the pen, for *συναπαύο-
ται*, and *βοσκηθήσονται* for *βοσκηθήσονται*; 9: 7, *Δαβὶδ* for *δαβὶδ*;
15: 8, *Μωαβίτιδος*, according to the emendation with the pen, for
μοαβεΐτιδος; 16: 4, *διάνοτες* for *διάνοτες*; 19: 8, *τομὸς ἐπὶ τομὸν*
for *τόμ. ἰ. τόμ.*; 33: 18, we have not received *οἱ συνβουλευόντες*,
which in the Roman edition was formed from *οἱ συμβουλευόντες*; 34:
2, *τὰ ἔθνη* we have given for *τὰ ἔθνη*; 36: 2, *τοιχον* for *τοιχον*; 40:
18, *ὁμοίωμαι* for *ἰμοίωμαι*; 41: 23, *ἐπερχόμενα* for *ἐπερχόμενα*; 42:
24, *εἷς* for *οἷς*; 43: 28, *ἀπολέσαι* for *ἀπωλέσαι*; 53: 10, if *δῶτε*¹
was retained, I thought it necessary to write *ὑμῶν* for *ἡμῶν*; 61: 3, *κατα-
στολήν* for *κατὰ στολήν*.

Jer. 11: 20, for *πρὸ σέ* we corrected, *πρὸς σέ*;² 15: 11, *κατενθύνον-
των* we have put instead of *καθενθύνόντων*; 31: 33, *οὐκ ἐποίησαν
αἰδέ.*³ *ἀπὸ* for *οὐκ ἐποίησαν*, *αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ*; 39: 17, *ἐν ἰσχυί* again for *ἐν
ἰσχύι*; 45: 27, *ἠρώτησαν* for *ἠρώθησαν*. Lam. 3: 26, *φρυγὴ* for *ψυχὴ*;
3: 31, *οἰκτιρήσει* for *οἰκτιρήσει*; 4: 21, *ἀποχεῖς* for *ἀποχεῖς*. Ep.
Jer. 1: 19, *τὸν ἱματισμὸν* for *τὸ ἱμ.*

Ezek. 17: 17, *ἐν χαρικοβολίᾳ*; Ess was careful not to add the *ισα*
subscript, which had been omitted here by the Roman editors; 18:
25, *κατενθύνει* in the second instance in which this verb occurs, for
κατενθύνει; this verse ought to have been emended according to v.
29; 28: 21, *ἐπισκέψω* for *ἐπισκέψω*; 25: 7, *χειρῶν* for *χειρῶν*; 26: 4,
λεωπετρίαν, as in v. 14, for *λεωπετρίαν*;⁴ 40: 22, 26, 31, 34 and 43:
17, *κλιμακτῆρα* and *κλιμακτῆρα*, by the correction with the pen, for
κλιμακτ.; 41: 15, *κατόπισθεν* for *κατώπισθεν*; 45: 7, *τὰ ὄρια τὰ* for
τὰ ὄρια τὰς; 45: 17, *ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις* for *ἐν ταῖς σαββ.* Dan. 5: 4,
λιθίνους for *ληθίνους*; 6: 25, *ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ* for *ἐν πᾶσι τῇ γῇ*, which
Ess reads without change.

I. Macc. 2: 66, *πολεμήσει πόλεμον* for *πολ. πόλεμος*; 3: 37, *τὰς κα-
ταλιφθείσας* for *τ. καταλιφθήσας*; 3: 45, *κατάλυμα* for *κατάλυμμα*;
3: 49, *ιερωσύνης* for *ιεροσύνης*; 4: 45, *ἐπέπεσαν αὐτοῖς* for *ἐπ' αὐτῆς*;
7: 23, *τὰ ἔθνη* for *τὰ ἔθνη*, which Ess leaves unaltered; 9: 48, *ἐνε-*

¹ That there is no want of care here appears from the Commentary of the Roman edition, which gives: [*ἐάν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας*]. So both St. Jerome and St. Cyril read. Some MSS., however, have *δῶται*, which is found also in Justin Martyr.

² *ἀποκίσθη*, in Jer. 13: 19, has received no change either at the hands of the Roman editors or at our own. In like manner elsewhere in their edition *ἐξολόθρευσεν*, *εὐδωδῆ*, *ἐξερεῖνθησεν* are given. Some have corrected, *ἀπωκίσθη*, *ἐξωλίθρευσεν*, *εὐδωδῆ*, *ἐξηρεῖνθησεν*.

³ I incline to think that Grabe more properly writes, *Αἰδέ*.

⁴ In Ezek. 28: 24, I have left *σκόλιψ* untouched; others have written, *σκόλιψ*.

κῆδον for *ἐκκῆδον*; in the Roman edition itself it seems to have been an *η*, not an *ε*, but half the letter was broken off;¹ 15: 10, *αἱ δυνάμεις* for *αἱ δυνάμις*. II. Macc. 9: 24, *τὴν χώραν* for *ε. χώραν*; 11: 4, *ταῖς μυριάσι* for *ε. μυριάσι*; 13: 15, *προσεύχοντα* for *προσεύχοντα*; 14: 8, *ἀνημότων* for *ἀνημότων*; 14: 42, *ἀληθρίους* for *ἀλητηρίους*; 15: 4, in *ἀποσημαμένων* the letters *σην* are written over an erasure, but I do not see what stood there before; 15: 80, *προσταγοριστής* for *προσταγοριστής*. III. Macc. 1: 23, *θαφάλλιος* for *θαφάλλιος*; 3: 16, *ἀληθρίων* again for *ἀλητηρίων*; 4: 2, *ἐλεθρίας*, by the correction with the pen, for *ἐλεθρίας*; 4: 5, *πεπνυασμένων* for *πεπνυασμένων*; 5: 19, *ἄγχοχέται* for *ἄγχοχέται*; perhaps, however, some will think that the form *ἄγχοχέται*, to which the reading of the Alex. MS. *ἄγχοχέται* approaches very near, ought not to be quite disapproved.

Moreover we have restored *Μωσῆς* in several instances, as in Jer. 15: 1. Mich. 6: 4; *ἀνδρεία, λαιουργία* as in I. Παρ. 23: 24, 26, 28. 24: 3, which the Roman edition commonly exhibits, for *Μωσῆς, ἀνδρεία, λαιουργία*; also in Gen. 5: 9, *ἐννεήματα*, as in v. 17, for *ἐννεήματα*. We regret that we have not done this in every instance. I think it would have been better also not to receive the double forms *ἔνατος* and *ἑνατος*, *ἀίνας* and *ἀέννας*. But it will not be possible to reduce most or all the cases of this class to one and the same form, unless a new and exact revision of the whole text is undertaken. For though the diversity may seem rather a light matter which exists between *ζαργία* and *ζωργία*, *ἀργία* and *ἀργία*, *ὑπερηφανία* and *ὑπερηφάνεια*,² *κανῶνες* and *κανῶνες*, *χλιδῶνες* and *χλιδόνες*, *εὔρημα* and *εὔρημα*, *σύστημα* and *σύστημα*, *φυλάσσειν* and *φυλάττειν*, and the like; the strange difference in the proper names involves extreme difficulty. This is sometimes so great, that one would doubt whether the words designated the same thing; it commonly shows itself in a very free interchange or doubling of letters, especially kindred ones, and also in a change of syllables. The following are examples: *Ἄβινεμ* and *Ἄβινεμ*, *Ἄβουσαι* and *Ἄβουσαι*, *Ἄβραμ* and *Ἄβραμ*, *Ἀχμελεχ* and *Ἀβιμελεχ*, *Ἀχνααμ* and *Ἀχνοομ*, *Ἄνταν* and *Ἄντ*, *Βαλταν* and *Βαλταν*, *Βαθλεμ* and *Βηθλεμ*, *Βεθσαμνς* and *Βαιθσαμνς*, *Βαριμωθ*

¹ I. Macc. 14: 9 is a similar passage, where Ess gave *κῆδοντο*. The Roman edition has *ἐκκῆδοντο*, but the *ε* in our copy is pale and faded almost away.

² Since in the earlier books *ὑπερηφάνεια* is generally found, afterward [as on Prov. 8: 13] in our notes giving the reading of the Alex. MS., *ὑπερηφανα*, we have commonly stated that the latter stands in the Roman text itself. But the Alex. MS. does not always exhibit this word in the same form; compare Amos 8: 7.

Καδης and Μαριμωθ Καδημ, Γεων and Γηων, Γηρσων and Γεδσων, Έδραιν and Έδραειν, Ίεζραηλ and Ίεζραηλ, Ίεσσεμον and Ίεσσαμιον, Κιτσιων and Κιτσιαιων, Κισων Κισσων and Κεισων, Μαγεδδω and Μαγγεδω, Μαδιαμ and Μαδιαν, Μαλαα and Μαλαα, Μαρησα and Μαριασα, Μελχιηλ and Μελχιυλ, Μεραρι and Μεραρει, Μηδεια and Μηδια, Μωδεϊν and Μωδειμ, Νινευη and Νινευι, Ναθινιμ and Ναθα-νιμ, Όμουσι Όμουσι and ο Μουσι, Ραφακης and Ραβσακης, Ραγαν and Ραγαν, Σεπφαροναϊμ¹ Σεπφαροναϊν and Επφαροναϊμ,² Σηλωμ and Σηλω, Σιδων and Σειδων, Σολομων Σαλομων and Σαλωμων, Φαλλος and Φαλλους, Φισων and Φεισων, Χετιιμ Χεττιειμ and Χετ-τειμ, Χαριμ and Χαριμει. Though this diversity is a circumstance of great importance in treating the question of the unity of the whole Greek version of the Old Testament, and it is not fully certain whether books composed in Greek are to be conformed to the same law as those translated into the language, I am yet confident that these names in most cases by a careful revision will one day appear very different from what they now do. For the present we were obliged to content ourselves with having pointed out a way to emend the Greek, which is often free from obstacle, by giving in foot-notes under the Roman text, the readings of the Alex. MS. and occasionally those of the Friderico-Augustan and the Parisian Rescript, but critical readers will well understand that even the most excellent MSS. do not always give the same name and word under the same form.⁴

[To be concluded.]

¹ In IV. *Bas.* 18: 34, we have confidently corrected, *Σεπφαροναϊμ*, which elsewhere invariably appears, for *-ουρα-*.

² In Isaiah 36: 19 37: 13, we have restored *Έπφαροναϊμ* for *Έκφαροναϊμ*, since this word had been given everywhere, as IV. *Bas.* 18: 19, with the diaeresis. Moreover, a strange diversity of readings exists in the parallel passages, IV. *Bas.* 18: 19 and Isaiah 36: 37. They certainly cannot have been written in this way by the same translator.

⁴ I cannot leave this discussion without briefly stating how far the editions of the LXX, for the greater part servile copies of the Vatican edition, are from being such a revision of the *editio princeps* as we ourselves have undertaken, or at least have projected and recommended. In the edition of Reineccius many things have received the correction they needed, but errors enough of the same nature still remain untouched; *α*, Lev. 8: 26, *και ελαβεν*; Num. 26: 35 (39), *δημος ο Σουθυλιν*; Deut. 4: 43, *Γαλαδθ*; 14: 17, *καλαπδνα*; I. Sam. 25: 10, *πεπληθυ-μενος*, etc., also with the approval of Holmes and Eas, *λδρον*, Deut. xiv, and *λδ-ρον*, Lev. xi; *Αινδν*, Gen. 14: 13, and *Αινδν*, Gen. 14: 24, etc. Of the work of Holmes we shall speak hereafter; a very important case of ignorance or carelessness in his edition we have adduced above on Josh. 9: 23. But a recent edition, now in general use, particularly demands our notice. I mean the stereotyped