

effort. Edwards, Bellamy and Hopkins were full of this theme. Under its inspiring influence they formed glowing conceptions of the conversion of the world, longed for it with intense desire, and consecrated their lives to its attainment. Thus they became a warm centre for missionary and reformatory effort for the world. Brainerd was the morning-star of modern missions. Hopkins led the way in efforts for colonizing and regenerating Africa, and for abolishing the slave-trade and slavery.

If, then, the rule of Christ still holds good, "by their fruits ye shall know them," we need no better proof of the substantial excellence of the Edwardean theology than a reference to such effects as we have disclosed. We do not arrogate for it perfection, but we would boldly defend it from such gratuitous and ungrateful denunciations as it has been too often called on to encounter, even from those who are largely indebted to it for almost the whole of their present vitality and power.

For it we take to ourselves no credit. For, though still marred by some human errors and imperfections, we cannot but regard it as in large measure the result of the interposition of God. To such an extent is this true, that the spontaneous language of our hearts is and ever shall be: "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name, O Lord, be the praise."

ARTICLE IV.

PROLEGOMENA TO TISCHENDORF'S NEW EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

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

[Concluded from Vol. IX. p. 608.]

§ 12. To the emendations already set forth as received into our text, we may add some other readings, the superiority of which to the Roman lections hardly admits of doubt. Not a few of them, indeed, have been approved by Walton, Bos and Grabe, the same scholars whom, as has been stated, we have in many previous cases followed; but most of these readings have been so collated that they

plainly show how preëminent is the value of the Alex. MS. in correcting the Roman text.¹

In Ex. 2: 8 ἡ νεάνις is certainly to be read, as it is quoted in Holmes from the Vatican MS. itself; 8: 29, after ἡ κορόμνια, ἀπὸ σοῦ was wrongly dropped, as the Alex. MS. and many others bear witness; and in the work of Holmes it is said that these words are found before ἡ κορόμνια in the Vatican codex; ἀπὸ Φαριζαῖ, which many other authorities exhibit, seems to have been introduced into the text when the genuine ἀπὸ σοῦ had disappeared; 12: 10, for ἀπολείψεται, we should read ἀπολείψετε, it appearing that *as* and *s* were very often confounded in MSS. of great antiquity; the Alex. codex has ἀπολείψεσθε; Lev. 5: 4, the strange reading ἡ ἄνομος ἡ, which is evidently sanctioned by the Alex. MS., where over the first ἡ the line denotes the breathing, and before the other ἡ there is a point, thus: ἡ ἄνομος ἡ, is to be corrected according to numerous other authorities, ἡ ἄν ὀμόση, without changing a letter; 11: 5, with the Alex. MS. read οὗ ἀνάγει for οὗ σὺν ἀνάγει, and 26: 22, with the same MS. ἀποσπλάσσει for ἀποσπλέσσει; Num. 23: 34, ἀρεσκῶν of the Alex. codex is much better than the Roman reading, ἀρεσκῶν; 80: 7, the words καὶ οἱ ὄραστοί seem to be altogether wanting before οὗς ὄρισαν, though cited by Holmes from no MS.; the Alex. and many other MSS. emend the place differently, substituting ὅσα for οὗς; Deut. 6: 2 it

¹ In passing, I will briefly speak of two very difficult passages, Gen. 31: 7 and 41, and Amos 8: 12, on which also the acute Grabe has hazarded conjectures. In the former connection δέκα ἄμνων, one MS. in Holmes exhibiting μων, and δέκα ἄμνων are read. That this is wrong. Jerome showed as follows: *Instead of DECEM VICIBUS, which we have given, the Seventy explained, DECEM AGNIS, induced by what view, I know not.* To this Grabe says: *But it is the copyists, not the LXX., who are at fault, on the supposition that our emendation is correct.* He alters the reading to δέκα μων and δέκα μων, comparing III. Bas. 10: 17; II. Eudr. 2: 69; and Neh. 7: 71 seq. (Ezek. 45: 12), where the LXX. seem to have rendered עֲשָׂרָה (עֲשָׂרָה) as well as עֲשָׂרָה (עֲשָׂרָה) in this chapter of Genesis, by the word μων. If this opinion is right, the famous passages, Ps. 87: 11 and Is. 26, 14 ought to be compared. In the other passage of Amos, ἱερεῖς commonly stands, joined with ἀνοίσαν. Grabe edited ἱερεῖς and made it an adjunct of ἐν Λαμασση, but was wrong in not remarking that in the Alex. MS., ἱερεῖς is plainly joined with ἀνοίσαν. Grabe imagined that עֲשָׂרָה, which Lucian rendered by κλήρη, the LXX. gave by ἱερεῖς; an opinion which is fully established by like cases. But again Jerome has testified to the corrupt version of this passage. *What in the beginning of the section, says he, was translated according to the LXX., SACERDOS, is not found in the Hebrew, but in place of this word, עֲשָׂרָה is read, which Aquila explained by GRABATUS; and I think the LXX. rendered that very Hebrew word, but some, not understanding it, for עֲשָׂרָה gave ἱερεῖς, SACERDOTES.* Thus what Grabe has edited is favored by the conjecture of Jerome himself.

is better to write φυλάσσεσθαι than φυλάσσεσθε, though the Alex. MS. does not exhibit -αι for -ε; 19: 19, after the Alex. codex read τὸν ποτηρὸν for τὴ ποτηρὸν; and 21: 12, on the same authority read εἰσάξε, for εἰσάξτε.

In Josh. 10: 9 υγιεῖς is indeed admissible, but as the ancient MSS. so frequently confound ε and η, I think that ὑγιές¹ should be restored; 15: 8, with the Alex. MS. write ἐπὶ βίβραῖν instead of ἐπὶ βορραῖ, and 22: 32, ἐκ γῆς Γαλααδ for ἐκ τῆς Γαλααδ.

In Judg. 6: 32, I prefer αὐτόν to αὐτό; 15: 6, I am disposed to think that τῷ ἐκ τῶν φίλων is better than τῷ ἐκ τῶν φίλων, if indeed that Attic form can have place in the LXX.

In I. Bas. 1: 15, write ἡμέρα; 4: 3, restore ἔπαυσεν for ἔπαυσαν, which Grabe himself left unchanged; 23: 1, τοὺς ἄλλω, which stands even in the Alex. MS., seems a faulty reading for τοὺς ἄλλω (ἄλλω); II. Bas. 6: 17, following the Alex. MS. read καὶ οἰρηναῖς; III. Bas. 2: 28, for κεκλημαῖς, with the Alex. MS. correct, κεκλιμαῖς²; 2: 30, with the Alex. MS. read παρενόσμαι for παρενόμαι; 8: 59, after the same MS. read οὐ, for ὡς; 15: 30, I should prefer to read εἰς for ὅς; compare 16: 13; IV. Bas. 5: 21, after καὶ εἶπεν Εἰρήνη the second καὶ εἶπεν Εἰρήνη, which the Alex. codex rightly adds, was wholly dropped; 17: 6, κατόκισεν is to be written instead of κατόκισεν,³ and v. 11 with the Alex. MS. ἀπόκισε for ἀπόκισε.

In I. Παρὰλ. 21: 10, αἰρῶ is given. I think it should be written αἶρω, just as it stands in II. Bas. 24: 12, though in the Hebrew text the former passage has אָרַב, the latter אָרַב; II. Παρὰλ. 28: 3, ἐν γῆ is an unaccountable reading, the Alex. lection ἐν γῆ is better.

In Job 8: 20, ἀποποιήσεται of the Alex. MS. is to be preferred to ἀποποιήσεται; 28: 8, αὐτόν ought, as it seems, to be corrected, αὐτήν, according to the Alex. and Ephraem MSS. (sic); 28: 12, 13, I would change εὐρέθη to εὐρεθῆ; 34: 20, ἐκκλειομένων is given, but perhaps either ἐκκλειομένων with the Alex. MS. or ἐκκλινομένων is to be restored; 36: 29, εἰς συνῆ ἀπεκτάσεις ought, it would seem, to be written instead of εἰς ἀπεκτάσεις⁴; the Roman edition has in a foot-note: Nonnulli libri habent ἐπεκτάσεις; 37: 3, βοήσεται φωνῆ seems better than β. φωνῆ.

¹ Grabe and Breiterger were not right in attributing this to the Alex. MS., for that sanctions ογμῖς.

² It is a matter of surprise that Grabe did not receive this reading into his text, and, what is more, that he did not even transcribe it from the Alex. codex.

³ The Alex. MS. also has κατόκισεν, not κατόκισεν as Grabe represents it.

⁴ I have retained the punctuation of the Vatican edition in this place, since it seemed incapable of restoration by any change in that respect.

In Ps. 4: 7 it is preferable to read with the Alex. MS. ἡμῖν for ὑμῖν, and 113: 5, σοί for σὺ; 7: 5, it is believed that ἀπὸ has been dropped between ἀρα and τῶν, and the word is properly added according to the Alex. codex; 13: 3, in ἰδὲ ἀσπίδων τὰ χειλῆ αὐτῶν the absence of ὑπὸ after ἀσπίδων seems insufferable; compare Ps. 139: 4; 104: 21, κτίσας has been given by *Isotacism* for κτίσεως,¹ but the Alex. MS. and others, though Parsons seems to have confounded the two forms, have κτίσεως; 130: 2. I should choose ἀνταπόδοσις rather than the received reading ἀνταποδώσεις, the Alex. MS. here having ἀνταποδόσεις; 139: 9, correct κατ' ὄρθον after the Alex. MS., κατ' ἄρθρον; 142, in the Inscription, κατεδίωκεν is superior to κατεδιώκει.

In Prov. 8: 8, with the Alex. MS. read ἐν αὐτοῖς; ἐάντοῖς; 9: 18, with the same MS. read ὄμμα for ὄνομα; 12: 18, μαχαίρα should, it seems, be restored for μάχαιραι; the Alex. MS. has μάχαιραν; 16: 30, restore διαλογίζεται or, as in the Alex. and Ephraem MSS., λογιζεται, for διαλογίζεται; 18: 4, both the Roman edition and the Alex. MS. have ἀναπηδῆς, but this was probably adopted by *Elacism* for ἀναπῆδῆς; 24: 78 (31: 5) ἐπιλάθονται should be altered to ἐπιλάθονται; on the other form, see Stephens, *Thesaurus Graec. Ling.*

In Wisdom Sol. 19: 4, read προσαναπληρώσωσι with the Alex. and Ephraem MSS. for προαναπληρώσωσι.

In Sirac. 3: 28, read ἐπαγωγῆ for ἐπαγωγή; and 10: 10, ἰατρόν for ἰατρός; 37: 5, in place of πολέμου put πολεμίου; 38: 22, the Alexandrine reading οὕτως is better than the Roman οὕτω ὡς, and 38: 28, the Alexandrine τήξει is superior to the received πήξει; 40: 1, ἐπιταγῆς after the Alex. and Ephraem MSS. is to be read for ἐπὶ ταφῆ; 43: 28, ἐφόντευσεν αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς, which is confirmed even by the Alex. and Ephraem MSS., is a strange reading; we should alter it to ἐφόντευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ ἡσούς; 43: 81, μεριλυεῖ is, I think, preferable to μεγαλοῦσι; 45: 24, προστατεῖν should be read for προστάτην.

In Hos. 14: 1, correct ἠσθένησαν, reading with the Alex. MS. ἠσθένησας; Hab. 2: 18, instead of γλυπτόν, τι which the Roman edition plainly exhibits, I think γλυπτόν ὅτι should be read with the Alex. MS.; Isa. 30: 22, following the same authority, we should restore ποιήσεις κ. λιμῆτις for ποιήσῃς κ. λιμῆσης; 30: 30, for δεῖξαι it would seem that we ought to write δείξει, though without the consent of the Alex. MS.; 58: 10, θῶται should be restored with ἡμῶν, on which place see above; Jer. 22: 16, for βασιλεύσης read βουλεύ-

¹ Of Ps. 105: 24 I take a different view. Grabe, however, in a learned annotation in his *Prolegomena*, which the reader may consult, is of the opinion that κτίσεως should be corrected again in this place.

ous with the Alex. and Frid.-Augustan MSS.; in v. 18 with the Alex. MS. read *Οὐαὶ ἐπί* for *Καὶ ἐπί*; in the Frid.-Augustan neither is found; consult the note; 23: 32. conforming to the Alex. and Frid.-Augustan MSS. drop the *οὐ*; 36: 28, *ἀπίστευεν* — *ἀπίστευε*, the former, it would seem, is to be erased; Ezek. 16: 41, adhering to the Alex. MS., we should restore *δῶς* for *δώσω*, and 17: 16, *ἄξει* for *ἄξει*; 39: 2, for *τὰ ὄρη τῶ* (Alex. MS., *του*) *Ἰσραήλ*, we must write *τὰ ὄρη τὰ Ἰσρ.*, just as it presently follows in v. 4; 40: 29, with the Alex. MS. change *τῶ αἰλαμμῶν* to *τὰ αἰλ.*; Dan. 9: 16, the lection of the Alex. MS., *ἐν πάσῃ ἐλεημοσύνῃ*, is superior to the received *ἐν πᾶσιν ἐλεημοσύνῃ*.

Many other things have been brought forward with a view to emend the Greek text of the O. T., by several scholars, and especially by Schleusner in his *Opuscula critica ad Versiones Gr. V. Test. pertinentia*, Leipsic, 1812. Though he seems generally not to have restored the translators themselves, but to have corrected them by referring to the Hebrew sources, yet his labors will in a peculiar degree aid one who undertakes a new revision of the text, not a few things which he has noticed being ingenious and having at the same time the recommendation of great probability. To afford others the means of proving the truth of this statement, I will adduce some examples, though I have already mentioned here and there certain things which did not escape his sagacity. The following were either first proposed by him or were sanctioned by his approbation.

Gen. 19: 33, 35, *αὐτήν*, the reading of many MSS., he rightly prefers to the received *αὐτός*; Ex. 16: 14, he proposes *λακτόν* for *λευκόν*; Judg. 5: 16 he endeavors to emend by three changes, wishing *ἐκάθισας*, *διγωνίας* and *ἀγελῶν* to be read; I. Bas. 11: 7, he justly recommends *ἔβησαν* for *έβροσαν*, and again in 13: 4, *ἀνεβόησαν* for *ἀνέβησαν*; IV. Bas. 23: 5, 11, he is of opinion that *κατέκρινες* should be read for *κατέκρινε*, compare below on Job 8: 17; 1 Παρ. 4: 40, he prefers *πίονας* to *πλείονας* (very often written *πλιονας*), and takes the same view of Isa. 17: 4 and Ps. 77: 35; Job 4: 6. he suggests *ἀκακία* instead of *κακία*, and in 11: 12, *σῆφεται* for *σῆχεται*; 13: 16, *δόλιος* for *δόλος*; 42: 18, *οὕτως* for *ουτος*; Ps. 47: 9, he proposes *ναοῦ* for *λαοῦ*, and in Sirac. 49: 12, *ναόν* for *λαόν*; 58: 4. he would have *κατευθυναν* read for *κατευθυνα*; 63: 7, in place of *ἐξερευνήσας* he suggests *ἐξερευνήσει*, but since the *ν* in *ἐξερευνήσεις*, as it is frequently written, could easily have been absorbed by the *π* that follows, I should prefer *ἐξερευνήσιν*, which very word, EXEREUNESIN, is in the Veronese Psalter, a document of high antiquity; 69: 1, he

proposes ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ σῶσαι με, κύριε εἰς τὴν β. μ. πρόσχε; but, scarcely departing from the published text, I would read: *Εἰς τὸ σῶσαι με κύριε· ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὴν κ. τ. λ.*; 78: 9, for κύριε he would have *καὶ* restored, and very properly, for I have in many instances seen *καὶ* and *καὶ* confounded; Prov. 9: 12, for *ἂν ἀντιλήσεις* he would read either *ἀντιλήσεις* or, with Grabe, *ἂν τλήσεις*; I would follow Grabe; 15: 10, for *παιδεία ἀκύκου* he would restore *π. κακοῦ*, an emendation which involves no difficulty; 26: 7, he would read *παροιμίας* for *παρανομίας*, and in 28: 28, *στέγνωσι* for *στένοσι*; Song. Sol. 1: 7, for *εἰαίρων* he suggests *ἐτέρων*, which is actually found in the Ephraem MS.; 6: 11, instead of *ἔγνω ἡ* he approves *ἔγνω ἡ*, and the ancient forms of *η* and *ϑ* are indeed very similar; Jer. 5: 31, *ἐπεκράτησαν* he prefers to *ἐπεκρότησαν*, and again in Amos 6: 5, *ἐπικροτοῦντες* to *ἐπικρατοῦντες*; Nahum 8: 12, he would write *κατ' ἀρχῶν* for *κατάρχων*; Mal. 1: 10, he would edit *ἀνάψετε* for *ἀνάψεται*. He shows that words consisting of Hebrew letters Grecized were given wrong by the copyists, not by the translators; for the latter gave in III. Βασ. 18: 32, 35, 38, *θααλαν*, not *θαλισσαν*; II. Παραλ. 3: 4, *αυλαμ*, not *αϊλαμ*; Esth. 9: 26, 28, 29, *φουρι*, not *φρουρι*; Isa. 66: 19, *Φουλ*, not *Φουδ*; Jer. 17: 26, *μαναα*, not *μαννα*. Many things, which the Roman editors brought forward in their notes, should, in his opinion, be received into the text: as, Gen. 15: 15, *ταφεῖς* for *τραφεῖς*; the Roman editors say: *Omnes LL. VV. τραφεῖς, nisi quæ ταφεῖς*; from which it appears that they considered it as a fault not of the copyists, but of the translators; Job 3: 17, *ἐξέπασσαν* for *ἐξέκασσαν*; Ps. 88: 21 and 91: 10, *ελαίω* for *ἐλέει* and *ἐλέω*; and Eccl. 7: 19, *μὴ ἀνῆς* for *μὴ μιάνης*.

§ 18. The contents of the chapters, as given at the top of the page, will, I hope, be acceptable to those who shall make use of our edition. The difficulty of writing these, arising from the want of space, was in some instances not inconsiderable; we have, therefore, availed ourselves of the labors of others where they could afford us aid in this matter.

In noting at the side of the text the parallel passages of the New Testament, we have made a distinction between those in which an allusion is made to some place in the Old Testament, and those in which the very words of the Old Testament are adduced or said to be adduced. To the former we have prefixed an asterisk; the latter we have given without it. When in the first three Gospels anything is quoted from the Old Testament, we have in some cases marked but one of the parallel passages; with which it will be easy to com-

pare those of the other two Gospels, and this we have commonly signified by the abbreviation *pp.*; that is, *and the parallel passages.*

§ 14. It remains for us to give an account of our Critical Apparatus. The number of Greek MSS. extant, that contain the text of the O. T., is very great; upward of three hundred are enumerated in Holmes's work, to which nearly a hundred others are to be added. They are found scattered through the East and Europe, especially at Rome, Paris, Florence, Vienna, London, Oxford, and Venice. Most were written from the tenth century onward, in the cursive character; a few, of which Holmes mentions fifteen, were written from about the fourth to the ninth century, in capital letters. Of all these codices, not even ten embrace the whole of the O. T.; more than eighty contain all the books of the Pentateuch or parts; about one hundred and fifty, the Psalms; about forty, Isaiah and Daniel; about thirty, Job; and about twenty, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon.

Collations of very many MSS. were made at great expense for the edition of Holmes, the first volume of which was published at Oxford in 1798 by Holmes, the second, third, fourth and fifth also at Oxford in 1810-27 by Parsons. These collations, as they appear in this work, all differ widely in respect to fidelity and exactness, and in the case even of the main authorities were made so carelessly and so incorrectly that again and again have we reason to lament that such an amount of money, furnished throughout England with singular generosity,¹ should have been of little benefit to the cause of sacred criticism. As this fact is already well known to discerning scholars, I shall prove it by only a few examples.

He pursued a very wrong course in using only the edition of Grabe to exhibit the text of the Alex. MS., which is an extremely important authority. For what, I pray, could be easier for an Oxford editor than to follow the MS. itself, which is accessible in London? And he not only contented himself with what Grabe published (on which see below), but did not even examine Grabe with care, who laboriously explains in his *Prolegomena* concerning many readings by no means to be passed over in a critical work, but not appearing

¹ To a list of the patrons given in Vol. I., in the year 1798, the editor added this note: *The foregoing, therefore, are the friends by whose influence I have been able thus far to succeed in my project, and through whose pecuniary aid, most generously rendered year by year for this work, I have been supplied with resources from which it has already been in my power to expend on this collation and edition over seven thousand pounds Sterling.*

in his own published text. Again, while he was confining his attention to the text of Grabe, he improperly attributed much to the MS. which in fact belongs to the editor. An instance of this is I. Bas. 2: 29, "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (sic) Alex.;" which is of the same character with δι' ἐκβολάς in Zach. 9: 10; ἐξ αἰρέσεως, Gen. 49: 5; ἀντῆς for ἀντίης, Π. Bas. 6: 17, and the like elsewhere.¹ For, since in his *Prolegomena* he states that he will distinguish between the MS. and Grabe's edition by employing *III* to denote the former, and *Alex.* the latter, whatever has *Alex.* alone added to it, it is fair to explain as belonging to both.² The readings given by Grabe in *smaller character*, he treated with little care. Of these Holmes says: *There are some readings, which being omitted in the Alex. MS. are added in smaller character to the text of the Alexandrine edition.* And on Genesis: *Into this edition some words have been admitted that were not found in the Alex. MS., and these have been printed in smaller letters.* Indeed, often, where the Alex. MS. agrees with the Vatican edition, it does not appear whether those things which are represented as written in Grabe in smaller characters, supply the defects of the Alex. MS. or correct its errors. Where he appends both *III* and *Alex.*, he does not do so with accuracy; as, Ex. 19: 7, on which he says: λαον] Ἰσραηλ *III*. λαον in *charact. minore Alex.*; but the Alex. MS. exhibits Ἰσραηλ instead of τοῦ λαοῦ and Grabe's edition has τοῦ λαοῦ in smaller letters, not λαοῦ.

We have already shown that Holmes often reprinted the manifest mistakes of the Roman edition, but that he should have noted on these readings only a few or no MSS. that differ, is a matter of strange carelessness. Thus, as we have before seen, in Judg. 9: 28 he repeats ἠθέτησαν without adducing ἠθίτησαν from any codex. We must not impute this to negligence rather than to ignorance, for he adds that ἠθίτησαν itself is read in *Arm. I. Arm. ed. Georg. Slav. mosq.* In Josh. 2: 19, he copies ὑμῖς δὲ ἀθῶοι, but as this was plainly intolerable, most editors have long given ἡμῖς δ. ἀ.; according to the testimony of Holmes only four MSS. differ from the faulty reading, ὑμῖς. In Deut. 14: 17, he transcribes the vicious πικαῦνα,

¹ In giving the punctuation he proceeds in the same way. Though Grabe had often settled this according to his own pleasure, even against the codex, Holmes invariably followed him.

² The cases which I have brought forward are of such a character that they may be found in the MS.; for in places of this kind, in order to avoid ambiguity, the breathing is occasionally added in the very ancient codices, but in these particular passages they are found only in the work of Grabe.

from which he states that sixteen MSS. vary, but in fact almost every one is different. In Neh. 10: 30, the absurd *τοῖς γῆς*, which the Roman editors had already corrected with the pen, he reprints, intimating that nine MSS. differ. And in Job 9: 4, not suspecting that anything is wrong, he gives *διαροία*, without the *Iota* subscript, which had faded away in the Roman edition.

Finally, with what special negligence he treated laws of grammar, and, indeed, those which are of great importance in criticism, I will show by two examples: on the reading *προσέβητε* in Jon. 4: 2, he mentions no variation of the MSS. whatever, nor on *παροργισμένην* in Sirac. 4: 3; yet that very many do vary in both passages is most certain; the Alex. codex itself has in the former place *προσῆβητε*, and in the latter *παροργισμένην*.

Many things may be learned to advantage from the work of Holmes, but the collation of the Vatican MS. is particularly to be prized. This was made on the several books except the Prophets, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Sirachides; and thus has been clearly proved, what was for a long period readily suspected, that the Roman editors did not recede from the MS. in the orthography merely, as they professed, but also in the readings in a great many instances.

§ 15. To leave out of consideration the important aid to be derived from the early translations, from the Fathers and other writers, there is no doubt that those few very ancient MSS. that are extant, are especially to be employed in restoring the text of the Seventy. The codices are of the more consequence, the nearer they approach to the age of Origen; being on that account, as appears on comparison, the less exposed to that confusion of the ancient readings with those of Origen, which Jerome says already prevailed in his time. Of the MSS. used by Holmes, about eight belong to the highest antiquity, being written from the fourth to the beginning of the seventh century. Of this number two contain only fragments of Genesis; one the Cottonian, in London, the readings of which are derived from the papers of Grabe, as almost the whole of the MS. itself was long ago destroyed by fire; the other a codex on purple vellum, in Vienna. The third comprises various parts of the Pentateuch, of which one portion and that the greater is preserved at Leyden, the rest in Paris. The fourth is the Coislinian, in Paris, containing the Octateuch and three books of Kings. The fifth, a palimpsest of Dublin, consists of fragments of Isaiah. The sixth, the Ambrosian MS., at Milan, exhibits the Pentateuch and a few other books. The others are the

Vatican codex, from which the Roman edition was drawn, and the Alexandrine. To these MSS. of Holmes are to be added six more of equal or greater age, as follows: the Friderico-Augustan; the palimpsest of Ephraem the Syrian; the Tischendorf palimpsest, at Leipzig, containing fragments of the Pentateuch;¹ the fragments of the Psalms on papyrus, in London;² and those on purple vellum at Zurich; and the Veronese Psalter.³ Of all the foregoing only those three have been published that we have employed in our apparatus, together with the Veronese Psalter, whose Greek text is written in Roman characters. The Alexandrine MS. contains the whole of the O. T. except I. Kings (I. Sam.) 12: 17—14: 9; Ps. 49: 19—79: 12, and a few verses and words elsewhere. In this respect it has no like among the ancient MSS. but the Vatican codex, in which the first forty-six chapters of Genesis are wanting, thirty-three Psalms, and three books of Maccabees; and, therefore, in these portions of the text the Alex. MS. has no superior nor even equal in point of antiquity.⁴ The books of Maccabees are found also in two uncial MSS. of about the eighth and ninth centuries. Fragments of I. Chron. and II. Esdras, and the entire books of Nehemiah and Esther, which are contained in the Friderico-Augustan codex, have been found in only one uncial MS. beside the Alexandrine and Vatican, and that of about the eighth century, and belonging to the Basiliano-Vatican MSS. The book of Tobit, whose first chapter and the beginning of

¹ The Tischendorf MS. ii, whose original contents have essays written over them in Arabic. I have treated of this MS., adding a *fac-simile* of it, in the *Serapion*, 1847, p. 54 seq.

² I furnished the first notice of these in the *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1844. It is my purpose soon to pursue the subject.

³ This was published by Bianchini, a person of great merit as a Biblical critic, under the following title: *Psalterium duplex cum Canticis juxta vulgatam Graecam LXX. Seniorum et antiquam Latinam Italiam Versionem. Prodit ex insigni cod. Graeco-Latino Ampl. Capituli Veronensis unciali charact. ante VII. saec. exarato.* Bianchini added this Psalter to his *Vindiciae canonicarum Scripturarum vulgatae Lat. editionis*, Rome, 1740. It is of about the fifth century, and a very remarkable work. That its singular nature may be the better understood, I will subjoin from an engraving on copper plate the beginning of Ps. cxlii.: PSALMOS TES PROWRUCES MU ENOTISE TEN DEESIN MU EN TE ALETHIA SU ISACUSON MU EN TE DICROSYNE SU CE ME IAELETES IS CRISIN META TU DULU SU OTI U DICROTHESETE ENOFION SU PAS ZON, etc.

⁴ I lately found in my travels another Greek MS. of very great value, written, it would seem, in the fourth century, and containing with others also three books of Maccabees. I shall use every exertion speedily to bring this rich treasure from its long darkness into light.

the second is in the Friderico-Augustan, has in addition to the Alexandrine and Vatican MSS. another authority, an uncial Venice codex of the eighth or ninth century. Lastly, Jeremiah, the greatest part of which the Frid.-Aug. exhibits, is in two uncial MSS. beside that noble pair, of about the eighth and ninth centuries. The contents of the very famous Parisian palimpsest, fragments of the book of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, and Ecclesiasticus, have been found in only two uncial MSS. beside the Vatican and Alexandrine; one a Venice codex commencing with the thirtieth chapter of Job, and of the eighth century; the other a Vatican MS. of about the ninth century, and containing the book of Job and that only.

Such being the case, it clearly appears, I think, what authority in respect to antiquity above all other MSS. belongs to those three which we adopted for our apparatus. We shall now speak of these severally somewhat more at length.

§ 16. The Alexandrine codex became the property of the British Museum after, as is stated in a note prefixed to it, it had been presented in the year 1098 to the cloister of the Patriarch (of Alexandria), and again in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch first of Alexandria and afterward of Constantinople, sent as a gift to Charles I., king of England. Cyril, also, bears witness, in his own writing, to the tradition according to which this MS. is said to have been executed by the hand of *Thecla, a noble lady of Egypt, shortly after the Nicene Council*. Many are of the opinion that this tradition owes its origin to a desire to add to the honor of the venerable work. But, as it is natural that a widely circulated report should have some foundation, this MS. seems with reason to have proceeded from the celebrated Convent of St. Thecla at Seleucia, which was flourishing in the time of Gregory Nazianzen,¹ and thus it might easily happen to be reported that it was written by Thecla herself. Besides, the shape of the letters, the simplicity of the punctuation, the infrequent occurrence of abbreviations, and whatever, in fine, contributes toward fixing the age of a MS., either in the Old Testament or the

¹ As is stated in the life of Gregory Nazianzen: *Τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπαγεχώρησε, καὶ καταλαβὼν Σελεύκειαν τῶ παρθενῶνι τῆς πανάγου Θέκλης ἐνδομητῆται κ. τ. λ.* And so Gregory of himself in his Iambics:

πρῶτον μὲν ἦλθον εἰς Σελεύκειαν φυγάς,
τὸν παρθενῶνα τῆς ἀοιδίμου κόρης
Θέκλας· κ. τ. λ.

Consult Grabe's *Prolegomena*, at the beginning.

New, is such that this codex is with the greatest probability believed to have been produced in the fifth century.

For the employment of this codex for critical purposes after the labors of Walton, who had the various readings extracted by Alexander Huish and inserted in his Polyglott, we are particularly indebted to the celebrated Ernestus Grabe,¹ he having undertaken to edit the MS. itself. Grabe's work appeared at Oxford in 1707-20, in four volumes folio, the first and fourth of which he gave to the world before his death, the other two being completed by two of his friends, one of whom, Francis Lee, prefixed a learned dissertation to the third volume. In his *Prolegomena*, Grabe gives in his own words a very full account of this edition. He set forth all the readings of the MS., either receiving them into his text or putting them in the margin, except those concerning which he thought it sufficient to have explained in his *Prolegomena*. Of this class are all that seemed to be manifest mistakes of the transcriber, and those which he attributed to the mode of writing used by the ancient copyists, this being different from our own. Of the latter,² however, he says he retained some few; as, *ανπροπέμφαι* in Gen. 12: 20 and elsewhere, and *εἰέλκυσσινόν* commonly before a consonant. On proceeding to recount the former,³ he makes the following preliminary remark: *The circumstance that among these mistakes some are found, which, or those similar to them, have elsewhere been placed in the margin of the text, is to be ascribed to a change of method on my part, or to the counsels of friends that were in some cases contradictory; a part suggesting that the outer margin of the work should not be marred with so many various readings, others, on the contrary, that only a very few should be*

¹ By the editors of Vols. II. and III. he is styled, even on the title-page, a Prussian by nation, though Francis Lee in his *Prolegomena* says: his country, Germany, was not duly grateful to him.

² Among these are given *ν* assimilated in *αυ μεση. εγ γωστρε; ν* with the assimilation neglected, as in *συναυλμυμι, ενχηματ, εντηνεν; ρ* left out in *ερημιας, παγρως*; the aspirate disregarded, as in *επιθροσ, written also ενχθροσ; μ* retained in the conjugation of the verb *λαμβάνω. as ελημεθην; ν* appended to the acc. of nouns properly ending in *α. as αουριδαν. νυκταν; and not only this, but also ε* confounded with *α* in *εσσαρακοντα. εκαθεμισεν; α* with *ε, as in ερανηεν; such forms as διαβινεντι. εριφεν κροσωτα; and ημεις, ημων* and so on, very often confounded with *υμεις. υμων* and so on.

³ Here belong: Gen. 1: 29, *παν* for *παντα*, on which see the 2nd note on § 18; 11: 17, *Φαλεξ* for *Φαλεγ*; 14: 1, *Βελλασαρ* for *Βλλησαρ*; 14: 5, *Σορμους* for *Ορμους*; 24: 32, *επισθεν* for *απισθεν*; 25: 27, *αβλαστος* for *απλυστος*; 27: 1, *Ιουα* for *Ιουαα*; 46: 20, *Πετραφη* for *Πετιφη*; Ex. 5: 22, *απισταλεις*; 8: 6, *η βιτραγος*, and like cases.

reckoned to the number of errors. In passages altered by an ancient hand he has generally given the correction of the second hand only;¹ but where the ancient corrector had wrongly changed anything, he admitted only the first hand. Though in these matters it is very difficult to satisfy all, and though, moreover, it is proper to form our judgment of an editor by considering his own plan, not the discordant views of others, yet I can easily adduce many things which he freely corrected without noticing the reading of the MS. itself either on the margin or in his *Prolegomena*, therein certainly departing from the proper duty of an editor of a MS.² Besides, throughout the four volumes of Grabe, not a few things, in which no error nor a trace of the ancient mode of writing appears, are found wrongly transcribed from the codex.³

¹ Thus on Ex. 8: 3 he states only that *και εν τοις φρασιν* is added in the Alex. MS. after *φρασιν σου*. But the reading of the original hand, *φρασιν* for *φρασιν σου*, found also in other MSS., ought not to have been passed over in silence.

² Such as Gen. 24: 21, where *εισοδικων* stands in Grabe for *εισοδικων* in the MS.; Ex. 15: 17, *κατειργασω* for *κατηρ;ασω*, the like of which is often found elsewhere; Gen. 32: 7, *μεθ αυτων* for *μετ αυτων*; I. Bas. 18: 13, *αφ αυτου* for *απ αυτου*; III. Bas. 11: 18, *μεθ αυτων* for *μετ αυτων*, a kind of correction often made without giving notice; Gen. 38: 9, *ουχ αυτη* for *ουκ αυτη*; 42: 27, 28, *μαρσιπος* occurs thrice for *μαρσιππος*; Lev. 18: 4, *πορευσθαι* for *πορευεσθαι*, as in the Roman edition; 18: 6, *προτελεσσε* for *προελεσσε*, as in the Roman edition; Num. 31: 3, [*και*] *παταξασθαι* for *και παταξασθε*, as in the Roman edition; Deut. 15: 6, *δανειη* for *δανιη*, where the Roman edition has *δανιεις*; 17: 16, *αποστρεψι* for *αποστρεψη* which is in the Roman edition; I. Bas. 3: 17, *διακρυψι* for *διακρυψη*; the Roman edition having *δη κρυψη*; Ex. 25: 16, *πηξωσ*, but the Alex. cod. with the Vatican has *πηξωσ*; 6: 5, *ων οι*, but the Alex. cod. and the Vatican, *ων οι*; 16: 17 seq., *ω* four times occurs for *ο* which is given by the Alex. MS. and the Vatican; 18: 18, *τω γομορ* for *το γομορ*; Lev. 25: 16, *ουτος* for *ουτως*, which also the Roman edition has; 10: 16, *Μιουσης*, but the Alex. cod. and the Vatican exhibit *Μιουσης*; IV. Bas. 17: 9, *ημφισαντο* for *ημφισαντο*; 16: 5, *εδυνατο* for *ηδυνατο*; Lev. 19: 29, *εμπληθησεται* for *εμπληθησεται*; and also very many other cases, to the correction of which, if in his judgment they were to be corrected, Grabe ought to have added the readings of the MS.

³ The following are a few out of many instances of this: Ex. 4: 13, *αλλον δυναμον* for *δυν. αλλον*; 13: 15, *θωκ τω κρηω* for *θωκ τω θωκ*; 18: 6, *ειπω* for *ειπαι δε*; Lev. 2: 3, *απο θουων* for *απο των θουων*; 10: 10, *και διαστειλα*, where *και* is in fact not found; 11: 10, *εν χειμαρρος*, and v. 11, *εν τοις χειμαρρος*, while the MS. in the former case has the article, and in the latter omits it; 13: 5, *ημερα* for *τη ημερα*; 24: 11, *της γυναικος Ισρ.*, but it is *της γυναικος της Ισρ*; 25: 10, *εω και εκατος* for *εω κατ' εκατος*; I. Bas. 1: 21, *εν* is not wanting; 1: 26, *κρηω* is not omitted, but *κρηωσ* is read instead of it; 3: 7, he gives *και πριν*, but *πριν* is not in the MS.; 7: 12, *Μασσηραθ* is not wanting, but *Μα-*

The foregoing statements were made in Grabe's edition concerning the Alex. MS. only. But not satisfied with publishing this codex, he labored to imitate the renowned edition of Origen; prefixing asterisks to some things added to the text of the LXX. from Theodotion or another translator, and marking with obelisks, *lemnisci* or *hypolemnisci*, other things found in the Greek text, but not in the Hebrew. It is not necessary for us, on this occasion, to examine this matter more particularly, but it is obvious that the project conceived by Grabe was extremely difficult, of a nature hardly to consist with editing the Alex. MS., and such as easily involved him in error.¹

§ 17. It is not strange, therefore, that about a hundred years after the death of Grabe, English scholars, full of the lasting glory of their treasure, were seized with a strong desire to prepare an edition that should represent the entire MS. in the most faithful and elegant

σπμα is read for it; 17: 11, it is not *ηκουσαν* but *ηκουσεν*, and v. 18. *στρυγαλιδας*, not *στρυγαλιδας*; II. *Bas.* 2: 13. *την* is not wanting before *αρηνην*; III. *Bas.* 10: 1, according to Grabe *εν* is omitted, but the MS. reads, *ων ουρηματων η. τ. λ.* An unaccountable thing was done in the last part of the book of Habakkuk, where the *προσευχη Αμβρακιμ* is given; the editor who continued the work of Grabe did not here proceed with the text of the Prophet, as he ought to have done, but copied the Prayer from the collection of hymns subjoined to the Psalter, in which there are many variations from the text.

¹ The studies of Grabe on the Alex. MS. and the whole text of the LXX. were industriously prosecuted by Breitinger, who published at Zurich in 1730-32, in four volumes: *V. T. ex versione LXX. Interpretum. Olim ad fidem codicis ms. Alex. summo studio et incredibili diligentia expressum, emendatum ac suppletum a Jo. Ern. Grabe S. T. P. Nunc vero exemplaris Vaticanæ aliorumque ms. codd. lectionibus Var. nec non criticis dissertationibus illustratum insigniterque locupletatum.* In this work, whatever faults Grabe had committed are repeated without alteration. To the readings of the Vatican edition (edition, not MS.; and *aliorumque ms. codd.* on the title-page is also quite wrong) he often opposed the emendations of Grabe, confounding them with the Alexandrine lections. For examples see the note preceding the last; Ex 6: 5. 16: 17. 25: 16. Lev. 16: 5. 18: 4, 6. 25: 16. Deut. 17: 16. Of these errors, if he could not avoid what Grabe had silently admitted into the text, then he should have corrected those which Grabe had treated of in his *Prolegomena*. Such are: Ex. 14: 13, *ποιησαι υμων. ΑΙ·Χ* and *Vat. ημων*; Deut. 12: 9, *θεος υμων.* Alex. and *Vat. ημων*; Josh. 3: 10. *προσωπον υμων.* Alex. and *Vat. ημων*; and *υμων* twice in 10: 19. Also *αποστειλω* in I. *Bas.* 21: 2, instead of which it was correctly stated in the *Prolegomena* that the MS. exhibited *απροσπειλω*, written by mistake in Grabe's work *αποτελω*, and copied by Breitinger as he found it. Moreover, it sometimes happened that Breitinger confounded the small letters used by Grabe with the larger; that is to say, the corrections with the readings of the MS., as on Deut. 29: 12, where he parades *σε την διαθηκην* as the reading of the codex, while in fact Grabe added *σε* as his own suggestion, and duly signified it by the smaller character.

manner. Accordingly types were cast, at great expense, to imitate the codex, and the publication was entrusted to the Rev. H. Herv. Baber. The work was finished in fourteen years, the first volume appearing in 1812, the third with the *Prolegomena* in 1826. It is plain that this genuine edition of the Alex. MS. immeasurably surpassed that of Grabe, and a copy of it having been kindly placed at our disposal from the Royal Library at Berlin, we have everywhere used it in our apparatus. Our labors, therefore, will not be judged of by a comparison either with Grabe or, what is still worse, with Breitinger; each of whom being commonly before us in the preparation of our apparatus, we marked very many things in which they are to be corrected after Baber, a few of which we have already brought forward above.

In his *Prolegomena*, p. xxxiv., speaking of his labors on the MS., Baber states that he had gone through a truly Herculean task in copying off the books of the O. T. with types representing the characters of the Alex. MS., having compared the sheets three, four, and in some instances, even six times, with the original. The meaning of these words I fully comprehend, having been so often engaged in the same kind of toil myself, and with gratitude do I acknowledge how great is his merit in these critical studies, though the difficult labor undertaken by him he surely has not performed without swerving from the fidelity and neglecting the accuracy of an editor in numerous cases to the great detriment of his work.

In the first place, it contains a surprising number of mistakes made by himself or by the printer, and while he has corrected a large part of these in the Appendix, he has left others unaltered. In the book of Genesis more than thirty have been noticed; and in Prov. vi. on half a page three are pointed out, to which, if I mistake not, a fourth is to be added, *μηθε* having been given for *μησε*. Examples of the errors unnoticed in the Appendix are: I. *Bus.* 4: 10, *χαιαδες* for *χιλιαδες*; 16: 3, *ον θαν ειπω* for *ον εαν ειπω*; IV. *Bus.* 22: 1, *ερασλευσιν ιλημ* for *εφ. εν ιλημ*; I. *Εοδρ.* 8: 56, *στιαβοντα* for *στιλβοντα*; and *Job* 3: 28, *ιδης* for *η οδος*. While all these cases are of such a nature that they seem to have proceeded rather from the editor than from the copyist, they are left wholly untouched in the Appendix, where many similar things are treated; nor are they found among the errors of the MS. given in a list by Grabe. So also in Gen. 46: 10, I received with Grabe *Αωδ*, and in v. 16, *Αροηλεις* as the reading of the codex, since *Αωδ* and *Αροηδεις* seem to have arisen entirely from a mistake committed by Baber. In Gen. 46: 31, the o

before *αικος*, and in 47: 4, the *ρ* in the word *γαρ* were supplied with a pen in the edition of Baber. From the contradiction subsisting between the Appendix and the text, it is often uncertain, or not at all clear, what the codex exhibits: For instance, in I. *Ἔσθρ.* 1: 23, *καλχαμως* stands in the text, but in the Appendix we find: *χαλχαμως*. *Ita in cod. ms.* I have adopted the latter, as Grabe also testifies for it. In IV. *Βασ.* 2: 3, though the text has *επανωθεν*, the Appendix says: *απανωθεν*. *Sic cum cdd. mss. plurimis legit codex noster.* Since Grabe also supports *απανωθεν*, the other form is merely a mistake of Baber. In Jer. 31: 86, the text exhibits *κερδαρεις*, which is maintained also by Grabe, but the Appendix says: *κεριδας*. *Ita habet cod. ms.* I have received the former; the Appendix, not the text, seeming to be in fault. Of the same kind is I Macc. 4: 52, where the text has *χασ·ελεον*; the Appendix, *χασ·ελον*. *Sic cod. ms.* But Grabe also testifies for the former. In Gen. 50: 8, the text has *συγγενειαν* with Grabe; the Appendix wrongly, as it would seem, *συγγενεσιαν*; and in Eath. 6: 1, the text with Grabe *εισφερων*, the Appendix by mistake, as it appears, gives the Roman reading *εισφερειν*. On the other hand, in I Macc. 8: 17, *αχως*, though defended by Grabe, seemed incorrect, since in the Appendix we find: *ακως*. *Sic cum duplici x.* 3 Macc. 7: 17 remained doubtful to me. The text here presents *ροδοφορον*, which is given also by Grabe; but the Appendix says: *ροδοφορον*. *Sic legit cod. ms.* It therefore stands in my apparatus: *ροδοφορον* (?). In Gen. 49: 21, where Baber has given *γεννηματι*,¹ Grabe has *γενηματι*. We here made no note on the Roman lection *γεννηματι*, but it would be better to have received *γενηματι* from Grabe, affixing the sign of doubt,² just as in III. *Βασ.* 18: 12, we admitted *ουκ ευρησει* (?) from Grabe, instead of which in Baber *ουχ ευρησει* is read and the variation of Grabe not mentioned. I pass by other cases of this sort that caused me trouble, and which I settled only by carefully examining everything connected with them.

In the second place, I certainly do not approve Baber's labors on those passages that had been touched by a second hand, the majority of which he dismisses with the words: *Quid a prima fuerit, non liquet*. But he ought to have formed a conjecture from the remains

¹ The same form occurs in the Alex. MS. elsewhere, as Job 39: 4.

² Nor am I confident about Lev. 13: 49. Grabe gave *πυρρ:ουσα*; Baber *πυρρ:ουσα*, as it stands in the Roman edition, adding the note: *πυρρ:ουσα pro πυρρ:ουσα*. I have followed Baber and have made no mention of the discrepancy of Grabe.

of the letters erased and from the nature of the space, with a cautious reference to the apparatus of Holmes, what reading was probable, and to have done this in most cases, if not in all, as the true reading in the greater number of passages does not seem to be so difficult as to baffle a searching investigation.¹ We have ourselves, therefore, occasionally given in our apparatus what we approved by conjecture, adding the mark of interrogation or *videtur, vdr.* How little acuteness Baber addressed to this matter, I will show by a few cases discussed by him in his Appendix. In II. Παρὰλ. 19: 7, he gave: γερασθω ||| φοβος; denoting thereby that a letter had been erased, and saying in the Appendix: *Littera quaedam perperam scripta derasu est.* But nothing had been written wrong, only the article *ὁ*, which many MSS. preserve, had been inserted by the first hand. In II. Παρὰλ. 29: 10, between *διαθεσθαι* and *διαθηκην κν-κν* he intimates that some ten letters have been removed, and in the Appendix he thus explains: *Vox quaedam forsam bis perperam scripta erasa est.* But it is *διαθηκην μου*, which the Vatican edition adds in that very place, that appears to have been destroyed in the Alex. MS. In Jer. 9: 12, after *διοδυσσθαι*, he says that five letters have been erased, adding in the Appendix: *Uti ope vitrearum cerni potest, librarius bis scripserat και ειπεσ.* But nothing is more probable than that *αυτην*, which stands in the Vatican text, displeased the corrector. And in II. Παρὰλ. 6: 26, he gave *οτι* with this note: *Correctio manus senioris.* But if it were so, then from the nature of the space, it ought to be plain whether *οτε* or *οταν* was written by the original hand. In other places he makes no remark where the absence of a note is particularly felt; as, I. Έσδρ. 4: 7, where he gives *αποκτε* : : : : *ουσις*, by which he denotes a more ancient and a more modern reading, but neither in an intelligible manner. As Grabe had here edited *αποκτεινουσιν*, I conjectured this to belong to the second and *αποκτερουσιν* to the first hand. And in Num. 7: 8, *αμνο-ενα* stands in the text of Baber, which cannot have been written thus by the copyist, but was, if I mistake not, *αμνο-*, to which *ενα* was added by the corrector.²

¹ Passages disturbed by the hands of correctors are very numerous in the fragments of the N. T. contained in the Ephraem MS.; but there are few of these whose more hidden reading I do not think I have probably drawn forth. It is easy to see that this matter is attended with greater difficulty in the case of a palimpsest than in other MSS.

² From Grabe it might have been learned that the corrector restored *α* in Num. 2: 3, from *εσρεα*, and also that he transposed *εις την πολιν ναβα προσεκειν* in Josh. 6: 5, according to the Vatican MS., thus: *ναβα ηρ. εις τ. πολ.* Such

Nor did Baber take greater pains to give the different correctors with proper distinction, but put everything down promiscuously except that by the ambiguity of his notes he made confusion worse confounded. For we there find at one time *manu antiqua*, at another *manu perantiqua*; now *corrector quidam vetustissimus*, then *corrector vetus*; and again other expressions like them. Such things are indeed very incompatible with an accurate examination of a MS.

Finally, in the third place, the very faulty character of the whole Appendix deserves our censure. Why, I ask, does he repeat ten thousand times that *ειπε* stands in the codex for *ειπε, εποησεν* for *εποιησεν*, and the like? And when, at the outset, reference was made to everything that was wrong or unusual, afterward many cases of the same nature were passed over, and this fact makes you uncertain whether these are to be imputed to the copyist or to the printer. The same inconsistency attaches to his manner of giving the readings incorrectly copied from the MS. in Grabe's work. Lastly, such things are here and there put forth as betray the editor's imperfect acquaintance with the matter he is handling; as, III. *Bas.* 20: 9, *και εγγραπτο*: *linea est a manu quadam vetustissima*. For the little line over the *ε* seems to have come entirely from the copyist, by means of which he wished in a manner to separate the *και* and *ε* which were near together, the remainder of the word, *γγραπτο*, following at the beginning of the next line of the text; as is in fact done sometimes in the Alex. and other MSS. And on *δοτη* in Sirac. 46: 26, he says in a note: *Forsan pro δωτη*; a kind of annotation which often occurs.

§ 18. We have already stated, directly or by implication, that our labors are based on the edition of Grabe, though we have aimed to correct what appeared to be wrong in his work. On this subject a few things more must be added. In noting various readings we encounter difficulty from the fact that things seem worthy of note to some persons that do not to others. For our part we chose to displease by giving rather than by withholding, having introduced much that was found in the writing of the ancient copyist, though faulty, careless or uncommon. But there are often things in themselves defective and of no consequence, which will yet lead the more curious investigator to what is probable or to what is true. At the same time we were compelled to use care lest, by scrupulously copying off all the absurd or most trifling variations, we should carry our

matters, however, are of but little consequence, and others of this kind are seldom noticed in Grabe.

apparatus beyond due limits, and make it more inconvenient than useful to the reader.

We have, therefore, generally passed without remark, the *ν ἐφελκυστικόν*, contrary to custom added almost everywhere in the Alex. MS.; also cases where *αι* and *ε* are interchanged, since the diversity is quite unimportant, for instance in *ὑμεῖς ὄψεται, αὐτὸς λέγεται, ἐν παιδες* for *ἐν παιδαῖς* in IV. *Bas.* 25: 7; the confusion of *οι* and *υ*, as Tob. 3: 2, *σοι κρινεις*, Ps. 118: 114, *εἰ σοι*: of *η* and *ι*, as Prov. 10: 12, *φηλια*, IV. *Bas.* 16: 17, *λιθητην*, Gen. 21: 23, *αδικισιν* for *αδικησων*, Lev. 11, *διχλων* for *διχλων*, sometimes one, sometimes the other being found in the MS.: of *η* and *ει*, as Gen. 39: 9, *υπεξιοηται* for *υπεξιοηται*, Prov. 17: 1, *μεθ' ειδουης*; of *ι* and *οι*, as *φινικης*, I. a. 28: 2; of *η* and *υ*, which is very rare, but an instance is found in Ex. 28: 27, *υποδητην* for *υποδυτην*; we have also commonly omitted to notice that *ν* is not changed before labials and palatics, nor assimilated before liquids, as *επνονν*, *συνπεπτοκα*, *συνβιωτης*, *πανφυλων*; *εγκατελιπες*, *απακτανακα*, *εγχειριδιον*, *εγχεσαι*, *συγγραφην*; *εμματα*, *συνμαγειν*, *συμμεγη*. Generally, as we have indicated, *εμ μεσω* stands in the MS. as I think it better to write the words instead of *εμμεσω*, and so *εγ γαστρι* for *εγγαστρι*, but *εμ μεσω* also is found, as in Ezek. 7: 14; 9: 2: *εγ γαστρι* is the usual form, which we have in some cases passed over, as in Gen. 16: 11; 38: 18 seq., but *εμ γαστρι* is not avoided; see Ex. 2: 22 and II. *Bas.* 11: 5.¹ Here also belong *εγ χαραν*, Gen. 29: 4; *διακεχυμενοι*, I. *Bas.* 30: 16, cases such as I have for the most part pointed out elsewhere, as in Isa. 49: 12. *εγ γης*; and that we have omitted *εχθρια* in Gen. 26: 21 and *εχθραις* in Deut. 28: 48; also sometimes *ορθου*, as in Josh. 6: 15, and *ορθισας* as in Ex. 34: 4, in place of *ορθου*, *ορθρισας*, as in Ex. 32: 7 and elsewhere, though similar cases, which here and there occur, as *κελγας*, *επαρσιδας*, we have carefully indicated. But here especially we must explain concerning the interchange of *ι* and *ει*, as this is so frequent and so irregular, that it seemed useless to exhibit every instance of it with exactness in our notes. It has been given much oftener in the later than in the earlier portion of the work.² nor has

¹ There is a similar inconsistency in other cases, as it commonly exhibits *τεσσαρακοντα* and *εξυλοθρευειν*, but sometimes, as in Neh. 6: 15 and Ex. 16: 35, *τεσσαρακορτα*, and in I. *Bas.* 2: 31, 33, *εξυλοθρευειν*. So *ερανων* is often found, but here and there also *ερετων*. There are many other things of like kind, all of which have been carefully given. To some also *τεσσαρες* in Num 7: 7, *τεσπερις βοας*, will seem worthy of note. This is very frequently *τεσπερις*.

² In the earlier chapters of Genesis we have also omitted to notice that *ιδεν* *ιδον* are generally put for *ειδεν*, *ειδον*. Though these seem to be written indis-

is been lightly passed by where it had any importance or at least any appearance of regularity. Thus, *ειδα* has everywhere been noticed, which is found in some cases even in the Vatican text, and other forms; and again, *αλιμμα*, *κατααλιμμετος* and the like. But we have omitted *ισραηλεται*, *ισμαηλεται*, *μωαβιται*, in cases where the correct forms *ισραηλιται*, *ισμαηλιται*, *μωαβιται* were found very near them; also in many instances *οικτειρροι*, *οικτειρων* for *οικτιρροι*, *οικτιρων*; we have also omitted to notice some cases in which *φλεια*, *πλημμαια*, *δουλεια*, *αγγιστεια*, *πανσοκεια* are found at one time, and at another *φλεια*, *πλημμαια*, *δουλεια*, *αγγιστεια*, *πανσοκεια*; and forms that are used promiscuously we have more frequently left out than inserted, as *λειτουργια* and *λειτωργεια*, *λιτουργια* and *λιτωργεια*, *κλειτος* and *κλειτος*, in Ex. xxv., *κλειτος*, *κλειτη*, *κλειτοι*, *κλειτων*, *κλειτους*, and *κλειτου*; occurring within the compass of a few verses. We have in some instances passed by *εξεκμιας*, though it was generally *εξεκμιας*; and have often omitted *ιδωλον* for *ειδωλον*, but have given it in the greater number of cases. To the above is to be added a great number of faults of such a nature as serve merely to prove that the Alexandrine MS., as well as so many other similar documents, is disfigured by numerous defects, a fact to which sufficient testimony has already been borne by those things we have had occasion to bring forward in the course of our discussion. What kind of defects I mean, the following examples will show: in Gen. 8: 10, *περιπατος* for *περιπατουτος*; 10: 9, *τιρας* for *γιρας*, and elsewhere *πη* for *γη*

criminally, as *ειδεν* 9: 22. 29: 32, and **ειδεν* 1: 4. 31: 2, and though also *ειδεν* 44: 23, *ειδοντες* 37: 3 and the like are met with, yet the cases that we have omitted we will here insert. In the Alex. MS. *ιδεν* is found; in 1: 4, but also **ειδεν*; 8, 10, 13, 18, 21, 25, 31; 3: 6; and 4: 4 *επιιδεν*; 6: 12. 8: 13 which is written over; 13: 10. 18: 2. 19: 28. 21: 19. 22: 4, 13, 14. 24: 30, 63, 64. 26: 8. 29: 10. 30: 8. 31: 42. 32: 25. 33: 1 also written over; 5. 34: 2; and *ιδον* in the following places: 7: 1. 9: 23. 12: 15. 16: 13, 14. 32: 30. 33: 10. There are in the same book a few others besides these inadvertently passed by in our edition; as, 2: 22, *κρησος ο θεος*; 7: 19, *επεταλυμεν* and v. 23, *εξηλειφθησαν*; 11: 6, *επιθωντας ποιησαι*. And on Gen. 1: 29, *παν χορτον οσποριμον* should be supplied (*σπειρων* moreover follows this), the same solecism, for such it appears to be, often occurring as well in the Vatican edition as in the Alex. MS. Compare IV. *Βασ.* 24: 14, *παν τεκτονα* in both Vat. and Alex.; 25: 9, *παν οικον* Vat. only; III. *Βασ.* 8: 37, *παν πονον* Vat. only; I. *Παριλ.* 27: 1, *παν λογον* Vat. only; II. *Παριλ.* 6: 28, *παν πονων* Alex. only; 19: 11, *παν λογον* twice occurs, but only in the Alex.; Judith 4: 15, *παν οικον* Alex. only; Sirac. 38: 7. *παν πονον* Alex., but Vat. *τον πονον*. Supply also as the title to the book of Genesis, *γενεσος κοσμου*, which is the same as the subscription; and on Isa. 66: 19, *σημεια*.

and *ογον* for *οικον*; 18: 17, *αυτης* is written twice; 24: 14, *εν τω* for *εν τοντω*; 37: 3, *ηγα* for *ηγαπα*; 41: 27, *επα εστη* for *ε. ετη*; Ex. 14: 25, *αξονας* for *αξονας*; 15: 21, *αναβατηρ* for *αναβατην*; Lev. 25: 18, *εστωπει* for *εν τω ετι*; I. Βασ. 7: 12, *ετα βεσον* for *α. μασον*; Gen. 28: 22, *αποδεικατωσι* for *αποδεικατωσω*; Gen. 40: 20, *εποιον* for *εποιαι*; Deut. 10: 8, *επεχεσθαι* for *επεχεσθαι*; sometimes in Genesis *αβραη* for *αβραμ*; *οις οικον* for *εις οικον*, *εν οδνη* for *εν οδνη*, *διατεβαι* for *διαβαινα*, *η καρδια* for *η καρδια*; I. Βασ. 1: 12, *επληθυνθη* for *επληθυνεν*; *εωσσον* for *εως ου*, and *οι δουλοισον* and the like; 19: 31, *προς την νωτερα*; 7: 9, *τον κιβωτον*, though *την κ.* precedes and follows it; Ex. 7: 17, *μεταβασιλει* for *μεταβιλει*; Gen. 41: 51, *επελαθεσθαι*; the following though utterly absurd; Gen. 38: 16, *προς με* for *προς σε*; 27: 6, *ισαακ* for *μικωβ*; 27: 17, *ρεβεικας* for *μικωβ*, I. Βασ. 15: 5, *πολεμων* for *πολεων*, and Deut. 28: 31, *οινος* for *οινο*; also *νμεις* and *ημεις*, *νμων* and *ημων*, and so on, confounded with each other in passages such as 1 Macc. 3: 22, *ημεις δε μη φοβηθητε*, Jer. 3: 22, *νμεις εσομεθα*, Josh. 9: 19, *τα ματια ημων και τα υποδηματα νμων*, and in v. 30, *εφοβηθημεν περι των ψυχων νμων απο προσωπου νμων*.

On the other hand, we judged that there were suitable reasons for our giving certain forms which to a cursory eye will appear to be of no consequence; as II. Βασ. 22: 40, *δυναμι* for *δυναμει*, where conjecture may fluctuate between *δυναμιν* and *δυναμει*; 4: 15, *αντων* for *αντον*, since in the former the reading *αντω* may lie hid; Deut. 13: 15, *αναιλων αναιλεις* for *αναιρων ανελεις*, was noted to show how easy it was to pass from one to the other; II. Παρ. 18: 26, *αποθεσθαι* for *αποθεσθε* was given on account of the similar passage III. Βασ. 22: 27. So here and there I have drawn attention to *εξελουμαι* or *εξελου μαι* for *εξ. με*, though it has scarcely any other importance except to show that the sleepy copyist was thinking of the form of the future tense on account of the resemblance of the sounds. On Jonah 1: 15, I copied off *σαλονς αυτης*, adding the note, (? *σαλον εαυτης*?). For the copyist certainly must be thought to have confounded the *σ* with the *ε*, if perchance it was not done by the editor of the MS.¹

Moreover, to omit other points which seem to require no comment, it is proper to state that what is written under an abbreviated form in the codex we have commonly given in full; as *κς. θς. πηρ. μηρ. ανος. ουνος. πνα. ιλημ. ιηλ.* and here especially belongs *διδ.* in regard

¹ *δη* for *δφ*, though in itself unimportant, should be supplied on Lev. 24: 19, since I have given it on 27: 9.

to which there may be doubt whether it should be written *David* as we have given it, or *David*.

Lastly, we show the order of the books. That this differed in the Alex. MS. from the order in the Vatican edition, could not be indicated in the notes. For the purpose in view, I may transcribe the Index prefixed to the text by an ancient hand in the MS. itself. It is as follows: *Γενεσις κοσμων. Εξοδος αιγυπτου. Δευτεριος. Αριθμοι. Δευτερονομιοι. Ιησους Ναωη. Κριται. Ρουθ.* Here is added: *Ομον βιβλια η.* It proceeds: *Βασιλειων α. Βασιλειων β. Βασιλειων γ. Βασιλειων δ. Παραλειπομενων α. Παραλειπομενων β.* Again is added: *Ομον βιβλια ε.* Then follow: *Προφηται ις* thus: *Ωση α. Αμως β. Μιχαιας γ. Ιωηλ δ. Αβδειου ε. Ιωνας ε. Ναουμ ζ. Αμβακουμ η. Σοφοτιας θ. Αγγαιος ι. Ζαχαριας ια. Μαλαχιας ιβ. Ησαϊας ιγ. Ιερემιας ιδ.¹ Ιεζεκιηλ ιε. Δαυηλ ις. Εσθθρ. Τωβιτ. Ιουδειθ. Εσζρας α ιερεις.² Εσζρας β ιερεις.³ Μακκαβαιων λογος α. Μακκαβαιων λογος β. Μακκαβαιων λογος γ. Μακκαβαιων λογος δ. Ψαλτηριον μετ ωδωρ.⁴ Ιωβ. Παροιμια. Εκκλησιαστης. Ασματα ασματων. Σοφια η παναρετος. Σοφια Ιησου νιου Σιραχ.*

§ 19. I pass to the second very important source from which material was drawn for our apparatus, the Friderico-Augustan MS. In the year 1844, having gone through the most renowned Libraries of Europe, I was visiting the East, and the monasteries still flourishing there, when I found this codex among some remains of MSS. that had been torn in pieces and thrown away. The treasure thus discovered I brought the same year from the East to my own land,

¹ After this, *Βαρουχ, Θρηνοι* and *Επιστ. Ιερειμων* follow separately in the text.

² The text is inscribed, *ο ιερεις*; subscribed, *εζρας α.*

³ The title of the book itself is, *ιερεις*; Nehemiah comes next, but not separated from the foregoing book.

⁴ To the Psalter are prefixed: (1) *Αθηνασιου αρχιεπισκοπου Αλεξανδριαις εις τους ψαλμους*, a letter of Athanasius to Marcellinus; (2) *Υποθουσι* (so the codex has it) *Επιεθειου του Παμφυλου*; (3) *Περιοχη εις τους ψαλμους*; (4) *Καποτες ημερινοι ψαλμωι*; (5) *Κανονες νυκτερινοι ψαλμωι*. At the end we find: *υμνοι α' το ιδ'.* α' is the Song of Moses, Ex. 15: 1 seqq. β' is the Song of Moses, Dent. 32: 1 seqq. In γ'—θ' are given the prayer of Hannah the mother of Samuel, Isaiah, Jonah, Habakkuk, Hesekiah, Manasseh (*Προσευχη Μανασση*). *Κυριε παντοκρατωρ επουρανε το και σου εστιν η δοξα εις τους αιωνας· αμην*), and of Azariah. ε' is *υμνος των πατερων ημων*, Dan. 3: 52 seqq.; ια', *προσευχη Μαρίας της θεοτοκου*, Luke 1: 46 seqq.; ιβ', *προσευχη Σιμεων*, Luke 2: 29 seqq.; ιγ', *προσευχη Ζαχαριου*, Luke 1: 68 seqq.; ιδ', *υμνος ιωακιμ*, beginning with *Δοξα εν υψιστοις θνω και επι γης ιωηηη*, and ending with *Παταινον το ελεος σου τοις γινωσκοις· εε.*

and having bestowed on it the honorable name of Friederich Augustus, king of Saxony, under whose auspices I had undertaken the journey, I yielded it, with an expression of my gratitude, to those in whose hands was lodged the management of the affairs of my country. In accordance with their pleasure it was deposited in the Public Library of the University at Leipsic, whereupon I prepared a most exact and magnificent edition of it under the following title: *Codex Friderico-Augustanus, sive Fragmenta Veteris Testamenti e codice Græco omnium qui in Europa supersunt facile antiquissimo. In Oriente detecti, in patriam attulit, ad modum codicis editi Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ. 1846.*¹ In the Preface I explained somewhat fully, not to mention other matters, concerning the country, the age, the correctors, and the notes of the MS.; and as I shall advert to these points briefly in this place, I may refer those, who wish for more information, to my edition of the codex.

As regards its country, I think it was the same part of Egypt from which the Version of the Seventy is said to have first appeared; but if this was not the case, it was probably executed in one of the monasteries nearest Lower Egypt.²

I have spoken of the age of the MS. in § 11. I there began with stating what presumption men of learning in other respects showed in estimating the age of ancient MSS.; of whom one party in every way detracts from the praise of their antiquity, and the other in every way magnifies it, while often both are ignorant of the merits of the question; since no one can have a knowledge of the matter unless he has carefully pursued this kind of studies, which especially demands that he should have examined with his own eyes whatever Greek papyruses and parchments are of the highest antiquity. Having set forth these facts, I then discussed the evidences of extreme antiquity appearing in this codex, by comparing similar very ancient MSS. that I had myself seen; such as the Vatican MS. of the Bible, the Vatican MS. of Dion Cassius, the Borgian Fragments of St. John, the Vienna MS. of Genesis, both of Dioscorides, the Fragments of the Pentateuch at Paris and Leyden, the Florentine Pandects, the Alexandrine MS., and the rescript codex of Ephraem the Syrian. By this comparison it was shown that there is no MS. that surpasses the Friderico-Augustan in age; very few, as the Vatican MS. of the Bible and those Fragments of the Pentateuch, which approach it.

¹ It was lithographed by Uckermann, published by K. F. Köhler. Price 32 thlr. or 128 frs.

² See § 10.

In proof of this, the following considerations in particular are here brought forward :

First ; The shape of the letters, which are uncial, is at once so simple, elegant, and uniform, that it agrees, beyond all other Greek MSS., with some Herculanean papyruses.

Second ; In the writing, no initial letters whatever appear ; and while these are found in the Herculanean rolls and other papyruses, also in the Vatican MS. and in the famous Fragments of the Pentateuch, they are unknown to the very ancient Alexandrine MS., that of Dion Cassius, that of Ephraem the Syrian, the Vienna MS. of Genesis, the Cambridge and other codices, which are, for adequate reasons, believed to have been produced in about the fifth century¹.

Third ; The punctuation is so simple, and the marks so rarely used that, for example, a point is found nowhere on two of the columns of the second leaf, on the third once, and on the fourth twice only,¹ and this feature it has in common with no MS., perhaps, except the Vatican codex of the Bible.

Fourth ; Of all the MSS. it is peculiar to the Friderico-Augustan alone that each page of the text is divided into four columns, and in this respect it comes nearest to the papyrus rolls from Herculaneum. How strong an evidence this is of its antiquity, may be inferred from the fact that three columns are found in the very ancient MSS., and in them only ; as, the Vatican MS. of the Bible, the MS. of Dion Cassius, the two very old copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch that I saw at Nablûs in Syria, the Syrian MS. lately conveyed to London from Nitria, which the subscription shows to be of the fourth century, and also the Fragments of the Latin Pentateuch at Leyden, which are of very great age.

There are other considerations less special, but among them that relating to the correctors is of importance. For while it is probable that the second and third of these put their hand to the MS., some centuries almost after the MS. was written, they seem to have belonged to a period not later than the end of the sixth century. Having fully weighed all these particulars cautiously and with discrimination, I judged that the Friderico-Augustan MS. was written at about the middle of the fourth century, and to this judgment I still adhere. If, however, any one else will examine this question in a learned and conscientious manner, he will do us a very great favor ; but I make no account of a reckless passion for doubts nor of ignorance, whatever be its pretensions.

¹ Consult † 5.

Of the character of the text of this MS. I have not treated at great length in my *Prolegomena* to it, nor is it my purpose to do so here; but I have always believed that the Friderico-Augustan codex ought to be reckoned among the best means of restoring the text of the Seventy, a fact which recently Adelb. Lipsius, in a learned essay on my edition,¹ has most correctly proved from the marked resemblance that subsists between the readings of this MS. and those of the Vatican in the very passages where the Vatican exhibits the greatest peculiarities.

§ 20. The contents of this codex are as follows: on the first four leaves I. Παλαι. 11: 22, -βασαηλ ουτος ηπαταξεν to 19: 17. και επολεμησαν αυτους; on the next fifteen leaves II. Έσθρ. 9: 9 κηριος ο θεος ημων to the end of the book; and the entire books of Nehemiah and Esther,² together with the book of Tobit to 2: 2; πτωχων των αδελφων ημων; then from the twentieth to the forty-second leaf, Jeremiah from 10: 25, επι γενεας, to the close of the book; lastly, Lamentations to 2: 20, ιερα και προφη-.

In this MS. there is an important diversity of hands, several having been employed on it. The person who first followed the writer of the MS. appears to have belonged to the class called by the ancients, διορθωται; that is, those whose duty it was carefully to revise what had just been written by comparing it with the MS. from which it was copied. The labors of this person we have indicated in our notes by two asterisks (**), but they consist almost exclusively of corrections where mistakes had been committed in the process of

¹ Compare the *Serapeum*, 1847, No. 15—17, pp. 223—264: *On the Edition of the Frid.-Aug. MS.* We there find on p. 258 seq.: *The most important circumstance . . . is certainly this, that the original text of the Frid.-Aug. MS. coincides with no other codex more frequently than with the Vatican, a circumstance in itself sufficient to put the value of the newly discovered treasure far above all doubt . . . ; this one thing further may be mentioned, that this coincidence is most clearly seen precisely where it would be least expected; that is, in the mode of writing the Hebrew proper names. Consult I. Παλαι. 11: 12, 14, 15; II Έσθρ. 10 and so on.*

² When the learned O. F. Fritzsche edited the book of Esther in 1848, at Zurich, in restoring the text he made very great use of our codex, of which he remarks in his Preface: *On a careful comparison of this MS. with the rest, one will easily see that it deserves a place among the best, that few are to be regarded as equal to it, and that the II. only, that is, the Vatican, is perhaps to be preferred. It exhibits a text, therefore, the least faulty for its period, but the hands, apparently different, which have altered it, are for the greater part corruptions.*

copying. The third and fourth hands, or the second and third correctors, then follow, and are designated in our edition thus: $\circ\circ$, $\circ\circ\circ$ respectively. Each of these touched many passages and for the most part made additions to them, but they agree in many instances; for as the third corrector here and there changed or cancelled what the second had written, so those things seem to have been approved by the third, which were not thus changed or cancelled.¹ Indeed, both resorted to the Hexapla of Origen for additions to the text, to which a double note of the second revised by the third corrector bears witness; at the close of the book of *Ἑσθρ. β.* the following being subjoined by the third hand: *Ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιωτάτου λίαν ἀντιγραφῶν δεδιωρθωμένοι χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μαρτυροῦ παμφίλου· ὁπρὲ ἀντιγραφῶν πρὸς τῷ τελείῳ υποσημειώσις τῷ ἰδιοχειρῶς αὐτοῦ ὑπεκείτο εἶχουσα οὕτως· μετελημφθῆ και διορθωθῆ πρὸς τὰ ἐξαπλά ωριγενούς ἀνωπῶντος· ἀντεβύλεν· παμφίλος διορθῶσα.* And the same is stated at the end of the book of Esther in the same hand, but more fully, precisely, and in a more accurate manner, as follows: *ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιωτάτου λίαν ἀντιγραφῶν δεδιωρθωμένοι χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μαρτυροῦ παμφίλου· πρὸς δὲ τῷ τελείῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιωτάτου βιβλίον ὁπρὲ ἀρχῆς μὲν εἶχεν ἀπο τῆς πρώτης τῶν βασιλείων· εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐσθῆρ ἐλήγεν· τοιαυτῆ εἰς ἐν πλατεῖ ἰδιοχειρῶς (the ω is altered to ο), υποσημειώσις (-μι- is changed to -μει-), τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαρτυροῦ ὑπεκείτο εἶχουσα οὕτως· μετελημφθῆ και διορθωθῆ πρὸς τὰ ἐξαπλά ωριγενούς ὑπ αὐτοῦ διορθῶμενα· ἀνωπῶντος· ὁμολογητῆς ἀντεβύλεν· παμφίλος διορθῶσα τὸ τευχὸς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· δια τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ πολλῆς και χαμν και πλατυσμοῦ· και εἰ γε μὴ βάρυ εἴπειν τούτω τῷ ἀντιγραφῶ παραπλησίον εὐρεῖν ἀντιγραφῶν οὐ ραδίον·— διεφώνη δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ παλαιωτάτου βιβλίον πρὸς τοῦδε τὸ τευχὸς εἰς τὰ (τα is corrected, τινα) κύμα ὀνοματα.* From this note it also appears why far more corrections have been made up to the end of the book of Esther than in the fragments of Jeremiah. But how it happened that the same correctors did not even touch the first four leaves of the books of Chronicles, though the note testifies that these books were contained in the copy of Pamphilus, may be

¹ As there is great difficulty in distinguishing between the second and the third correctors in the MS. itself and in its published form, those things which I have made out by a careful examination and inserted in my apparatus may be considered as notes upon it. Further, in the case of proper nouns and others in which *ι* appears, it cannot be said whether the diacresis is from the corrector only or he simply retouched what he found. I am disposed to believe this sign was in every instance correctly copied from the Alex. MS. by Baber, but Grabe gave what he himself thought fit.

learned from what is found written by the third hand at the bottom of the fourth leaf, with the sign of a triple cross affixed. This is as follows: *Μεχρι του σημειου των τριων σταυρων εστιν το τελος των επτα φυλλων των περισσων και μη οσιων του εσδρα.* It is thus testified that these four leaves, along with three others long since destroyed, were not so much inserted in the codex in an improper place, as introduced by mistake on the part of the copyist and perhaps twice written on. It was for this reason, I think, they were passed over by the reviser. Lastly, the fifth hand, whose special business it was to restore, or rather to mar, the letters which here and there had faded, made one addition on Jer. 52: 12 which we have admitted into our notes under the sign, *••.

In citing the readings of this codex we followed the same rule as in the Alexandrine MS., except that fewer even of those things have been omitted that less strictly belong to such an apparatus.¹ I will here add a few not unworthy of mention. *Οι* and *υ* are found interchanged more frequently than has been given in the notes; as in Neh. 9: 6, *σοι*, which is also in the Alex. MS.,² for *ου* in *ου ελ αυτος*; Jer. 22: 6, *σοι μοι*; Esth. 1: 6, *σχυνοις*; and Jer. 15: 18, *λοιπονντες*. In the word *φενγειν* and the like, the *γ* has sometimes been thrown out by the first hand; as in Jer. 27: 28, *φενοστων*; and 45: 19, *πεφενοστων*; of a similar nature is *βιβιον*,³ which occurs twice in Jer. xxviii., in vv. 60 and 63, and *ισουμαια* which is found in several instances for *ιδουμαια*. There are some cases of the confusion of *ει* and *ι* which might have been noted in their proper place, as in I. Παρ. 12: 26, *λευει*, found in this passage also in the Alex. MS.; 15: 4, *λευειτας*; and Lam. 1: 6, *ευπραπια*. It has been already remarked above, that in I. Παρ. 12: 30, not *εφραϊμ*, but *εφραμ* is the reading of the Frid.-Augustan as well as the Alexandrine MS.

§ 21. The third MS. of the Septuagint that we employed in our apparatus is the rescript codex of Ephraem the Syrian, together with fragments of those books which, according to Gregory Nazianzen and others, were styled by the ancients *βιβλοι στιχηραι* and written in verse.⁴ These fragments, done in a quite uniform though not the

¹ See § 18.

² *προστομα*, which is found in both MSS. in Neh. 2: 13 for *προς στομα*, is still more strange.

³ It may perhaps be thought that the Italian *bibbia* and the like should be compared with this.

⁴ On this subject read the following passage in a letter to Garbelli from Bianchini in his *Vindiciae canonicarum Scripturarum Vulg. Lat. editionis*, p. cccix.: *Of the Sacred Volume, seven books, the Psalter, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes,*

same hand,¹ were intermixed with fragments of the N. T., on account of which for the last two centuries this MS. has had such celebrity. For while the attention of several scholars had been devoted to the latter before I edited them in 1843, the fragments of the O. T. were lying almost buried in oblivion. Wetstein here and there looked at them, as, for example, on I. Thess. 2: 8 he quotes the reading *ὀυέλγορται* from the Alexandrine and Ephraem MSS. in Job 3: 21; and the author of the Catalogue of the Royal Library correctly pointed out to what books of the O. T. most of the leaves belonged, but beyond this no person was found to seek the honor of examining these treasures of sacred antiquity. So much the more, when my labors on the fragments of the N. T. had reached a successful end, did I conceive it to be my duty also to usher these venerable remains of the O. T. from their long darkness into the light. Whatever, therefore, of the ancient text, which had been purposely destroyed, such a long series of ages before, could be made out by study, so much I made out and carefully published, in 1845, in a work entitled: *Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus sive Fragmenta Veteris Testamenti e codice Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo quinti ut videtur post Christum saeculi.*²

In the *Prolegomena* to that work, and more particularly in our Preface to the Fragments of the N. T.,³ we have discussed more at large the antiquity of the Ephraem MS., a name which is derived from the fact that the Treatises of Ephraem the Syrian were translated into Greek and written over the original writing of the codex. To that place I refer the reader for the evidences which we said induced us to ascribe this document to about the middle of the fifth century, thus making it a little older than the Alexandrine MS., if it were not better to reckon both as of the same age.

In respect of the country of this codex, several things were adduced in the *Prolegomena* to the N. T. to prove that it was written at Alexandria or certainly in Egypt; that being carried thence to Palestine, Syria, or Asia Minor, it was at length in the twelfth cen-

Job, Wisdom Sol., and Siracides were anciently written in verse. And I doubt not, to use the language of the venerable Cardinal Tommasi, in his Preface to the Psalter of the Vulgate, that this was done in the first five books by the LXX. themselves in imitation of their oldest Hebrew MSS., and in the last two books by the writers of them.

¹ Consult the *Prolegomena* to my edition of these Fragments, §§ 1, 2.

² It is sold at Leipsic by B. Tauchnitz for 9 thlr. or 36 frs.

³ I published this at Leipsic, in 1843. Price 18 thlr. or 72 frs. The fragments of both parts together have the title: *Codex Eplr. Syri rescriptus sive Fragmenta utriusque Testamenti e cod. Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo, etc. Lipsiae, 1845.* Price 32 thlr. or 128 frs.

tury brought to Constantinople and there fell into the hands of the person who obliterated the original contents of the parchment, and then again wrote upon it. From Constantinople, Andrew John Lascaris, who had been sent into the East by Lorenzo de' Medici for the purpose of purchasing MSS., brought it to Italy, whence, on coming into the hands of Catherine de Médicia, it passed into the Royal Library of Paris.

Fewer emendations of the ancient text are found in the Fragments of the O. T. than in those of the N. T., and the hand in which they are made is very similar to the first corrector of the N. T., whom I conjectured to have lived in about the seventh century.

The text of the Ephraem MS. holds a place midway between the Vatican and the Alexandrine, but how much nearer than the rest it approaches the genuine work of the Seventy, whom in the subscription to the Proverbs¹ it professes to follow, is fully seen from the circumstance that it appears not to have been subjected to the influence of the study of the Hexapla.²

§ 22. We must give a list of the fragments remaining in the Ephraem MS., and as many things in different places had so far perished that they could not possibly be read, I will here point out together what portions have been lost, lest any one should suppose that this codex corresponds with the Roman edition where in fact it has not been read.

Job 2: 12, *-ρηξαντες εκαστος*, to 4: 12, *εν λογους σου*; 5: 27, *ου δε* to 7: 7, *ιδειν*, and several words are wanting after *σεαυτω* in 5: 27, several here and there as far as *ισχυς μου* in 6: 12, a few as far as *παντων* in 6: 18, from which to *μελετα* in 6: 30 a great number is gone, and some as far as 7: 7; 10: 9, *μνησθητι* to 12: 2, *εστε ανθρωποι*, from the beginning to *η και* in 11: 2 something is wanting in every verse, two words after *αμμεπτος* in 11: 4, the rest is nearly complete; 13: 18, *οιδα εγω* to 18: 9 *παριδες*; from *μου αντ-* in 16: 8 to *αουικητος* in 18: 4 several words are missing in various places; 19: 27, *α ο οφθαλμος* to 22: 14 *ου κρινει νεφ-*, almost entire; 24: 7, *γυμνος* to 30: 1 *εν μερει*; between *αδικως* in 24: 10 and *ορφανων* 24: 20 a few things are here and there wanting, and also 25: 1 and 26: 1,³ and after

¹ See No. 35, p. 590, note 3.

² On this point compare the essay of the accomplished Lipsius concerning my edition of the Fragments of the O. T. from the Ephraem MS., in the *Scrutatum*, 1849, No. 22, pp. 346 seq.

³ *Τπολαβων δε Βαλδαδ ο Σαυχητης λεγει, Τπολαβων δε Ιωβ λεγει* and the like, as they were written with red ink, have almost everywhere faded entirely away.

μωδουσοται to και ουκ in 26: 5, 6; 31: 6 εσταμαι to 35: 16 οργη αυτου; between αυτου in 31: 28 and και ει δε επιχαρης in 31: 29 some things are destroyed, but the rest is almost perfect; 37: 5 βροσται to 38: 17 θνατου; 38: 1 has disappeared because it was written in red ink; 40: 20 -σεις δε φροβειν to 42: 17 βασιλευς; a very few things are gone between 40: 20 and 42: 4.

Prov. 1: 1 νοησε τε to 2: 8 διαφυλαξει, what precedes νοησε τε was written in red ink and has faded quite away: 15: 29 κρισων to 17: 1 μετα μαχης; 18: 11 η δε δοξα to 19: 26 εσται; between καρδια αυτου in 19: 3 and -μωρητος 19: 5, very much is wanting; 22: 17 την δε εην to 23: 25 η τεκουσα σε; 24: 23 (29: 27) ωστε αβρωτα to 24: 56 (30: 21) σιωπαι η γη; 26: 23 χειλη λεια to 28: 2 αυτου; 29: 30, 31 ψευδεις το ο κρη αυτης.

Ecd. 1: 1 ματαιωτης ματ. τα το v. 14 προαιρεσεις πνευματος; what goes before ματ. μ. ε. was written in red ink and is gone; 2: 18 υπο τον ηλιον to 12: 24 σπηρον; between τον χουν in 3: 20 and και τιμι εην in 4: 8, several things are missing; nothing is legible from πεσωσω to τον μετοχον in 4: 10, and a few things are covered up in various places between τον βασι- in 4: 13 and αγαθον in 5: 4.

Song Sol. 1: 1, but beginning with και οσμη, three verses having disappeared, to 3: 9 σαλωμων; after συσκιος to κεδροι in 1: 16, 17, after ελημ almost to εαν in 2: 7, and some other things here and there are not plain.

Wisdom Sol. 8: 5, -ζομενης to 12: 10 μετανοιας; 14: 19, ο μιν γαρ to 17: 18 ευμελης; 18: 24 επι γαρ to 19: 22 περισταμενος; a very few things in different places are gone; as in v. 10, for example, the letters between γη ουκ- and αντι.

Sirac., the Prologue beginning with -φητων to 7: 14 πρσβυτερων; in the Prologue the letters between υπερ ων and τον ισλ, between εννοου and -ην ηρμενικην (sic) and a few others are concealed from view, and also 1: 1, 2. but what follows is nearly entire; 8: 15 αυτος γαρ to 11: 17 ενσβεβειν; 12: 16 και εαν to 16: 1 αχρηστον; between τι ποιω- in 18: 2 and μη επεχε in 18: 11, some things here and there are wanting, very many between αυτη in 13: 16 and και εν τοις in 14: 4, many between παρελθω in 14: 14 and εν καταλυματι in 14: 25, and also a few in the remaining portion; 17: 12 διαθηκην to 20: 5 σεφος; almost perfect; 21: 12 ου παιδευθησεται to 22: 19 αισθησις; 27: 19 και ως to 28: 25 σταθμον; 30: 8 ιππος to 31: 5 καρδια; 32: 22 και ο κυριος to 34: 22 ου μη σοι; a few things in different places are missing; 37: 11 μετα γυναικος to 38: 15 εις χε-; a few things are here and there wanting; 39: 7 αυτος; κατευθυνει to 43: 27 εφικωμεθα;

between *ἀναστρεφει* in 40: 11 and *η γίλωι* in 41: 12 some things are here and there mixed, and also a few between 42: 18 and *χει* in 43: 19; 45: 24 *ινα* to 49: 12 *ιωνεδεν*, but from 45: 25 to 46: 9 very much is lost, and some things between 46: 9 and 47: 4; after *ευραυνιδα* in 47: 21 to *εν αρματι* in 48: 9, the greatest part is wanting and some things in what follows; nothing can be made out after *αεβη σεννα* in 48: 18 to *εποιησεν* in v. 22, and moreover very much is wanting quite to the end of these Fragments.

The plan we adopted in writing down the various readings has been already stated, as our remarks on the Friderico-Augustan MS. relating to this matter apply also to the Ephraem codex. The forms *εμ μωω*, *λιγμα*, *λαρυξ* and the like, which appear in this MS., have been cited with care. Beside *συμβασιχθησεται* adduced on Job 28: 16, 19, there are many other cases of the same class; as *συμβασις* Wisdom Sol. 8: 9, 16; *ενκρατης* 8: 21; *εκατελιπεν* and so on, though *εκαταλειψει* is found in Sirac. 4: 19 as well as other regular forms here and there. To *ορθινη* noted on Wisdom Sol. 11: 23, add *ορθιζοντες* on Sirac. 4: 12, though in Sirac. 6: 36 *ορθιζει* occurs. It has often been indicated that *η* and *ει* are confounded; as *παθηρους* in Job 29: 25; *οη* twice in Job; *η ει* Eccl. 6: 10; *η καλη* twice in Song Sol. 1: 15; and in all these connections this confusion seemed to be somewhat important, but not so in the following: Eccl. 7: 5, *επιτημησιν*; 10: 19, *συνηδησει*; Song Sol. 1: 15, *πλισιον*; Sirac. 21: 10, *μηδιασει*; 7: 6, *θεισεις*; Job 38: 5, *δηρηται*; Wisdom Sol. 15: 13, *διμουργων*; and in a few other passages. *Ρειπου* has been given on Job 14: 4 and *φεικων* on 40: 25. *Οι* and *υ* have been interchanged in about five words, which we have noted: *λοιμυεται* on Prov. 27: 13; *σοι*, Job 15: 4, for *συ*; and *διανυξει* 11: 5: to which add *λοιμυειται* on Prov. 23: 8.

The reader may also supply in our notes, on Sirac. 28: 19: *Ο ο ν κ ει λ κ υ σ ε*, *ουκ* standing instead of *ουχ* here as in various other places that have been mentioned; and on 27: 29, *Ο αυτον προ αυτων*, where the former seems to be an oversight of the copyist.¹

¹ I avail myself of this opportunity to make the following corrections in my edition of the Ephraem MS.: p. 11, line 26, read *αυτοις*; 22, 30, in Job 28: 8, *αυτην*; 50, 30, *αμπελον*; 75, 16, *μηλοια* for *μημηλοιας*; 95, 2, *ηκολουθηκοτων*; 115, 14, *μη πορευον*; 135, 3, *φυλας* for *φυλας*; 68, 2, at the end, in Eccl. 9: 12, *κακω* was wrongly omitted; also 69, 30, at the end, and 80, 5, at the end, the words *ου βασιλια μη καταραση* and *εαν μη ο θς δω* were carelessly overlooked; 88, 25, in Wisdom Sol. 16: 17, when I was in doubt whether I had rightly given from the codex *πλεον* for *πλειον*, the distinguished Hase wrote back to me that the MS. is now so discolored in that place, that nothing can be discerned.

§ 23. Nothing now remains but to give thanks to God that my work has been brought to a happy end in such troublous times, and heartily to pray that by these labors of mine the studies of many on this great and venerable record of ancient faith may be encouraged and aided. Having fully set forth my purpose in undertaking the task of an editor in this instance, I wish all fair judges would bear it in mind, lest haply they should accuse me of not having performed what it was not my intention to do. While I was preparing this edition, I was constantly reflecting, what a field of labor here lay open for the critical study of the Greek text of the Old Testament, and how much fruit might thence be gathered for explaining and illustrating the laws of the Greek language, and especially of that dialect in which the books of the New Testament are written. This field, so God please and grant me life and strength, I shall steadily strive to go over, and shall do this with the greater care, the more I hope that my labors on the text of the New Testament will thus be furthered; believing, as I indeed do, that severe study bestowed on these sacred texts by a Christian is not only in keeping with his own piety, but will yield good fruit to the Church herself, to whom Divine Truth is of the highest concern.

LEIPSIK,
30th March, 1850.

ARTICLE V.

OUTLINES OF A JOURNEY IN PALESTINE IN 1852 BY E. ROBINSON, E. SMITH, AND OTHERS.

Drawn up by E. Robinson, D. D., of New York.

EVER since the publication of my work on Palestine, I had cherished the desire of once more visiting that interesting country; partly for the purpose of examining some points anew; but still more in the hope of extending my researches into those portions which had not yet been explored.

In March of the present year (1852) I arrived at Beirût, on my way to carry these plans into execution. Here I was detained for some time; at first by the unsettled state of the weather, which con-