AN INTRODUCTION TO
THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK
London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE.
AVE MARIA LANE.

Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Bombay: E. SEYMOUR HALE.
AN INTRODUCTION TO
THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN GREEK

BY
HENRY BARCLAY SWETE D.D.
HON. LITT.D. DUBLIN
FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE LETTER
OF ARISTEAS EDITED BY
H. ST J. THACKERAY M.A.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1900

All rights reserved
ἐζεγερὼ τὰ τέκνα σοῦ, Σειών, ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἑλλήνων.
EBERHARDO NESTLE
Ph. et Th.D.

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

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

Such as it is, this volume owes more than I can say to the kindness of friends, among whom may especially be mentioned Principal Bebb, of St David's College, Lampeter, and Grinfield Lecturer at Oxford; Mr Brooke and Mr McLean, editors of the Larger Cambridge Septuagint; Mr Forbes Robinson, and Dr W. E. Barnes. But my acknowledgements are principally due to Professor Eberhard Nestle, of Maulbronn, who has added
to the obligations under which he had previously laid me by reading the whole of this Introduction in proof, and suggesting many corrections and additions. While Dr Nestle is not to be held responsible for the final form in which the book appears, the reader will owe to him in great measure such freedom from error or fulness in the minuter details as it may possess. Mr Thackeray’s work in the Appendix speaks for itself. Both the prolegomena to Aristeas and the text of the letter are wholly due to his generous labours, and they will form a welcome gift to students of the Septuagint and of Hellenistic Greek.

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

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

H. B. S.

Cambridge,
September 1, 1900.
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PART I.

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

CHAPTER I.

THE ALEXANDRIAN GREEK VERSION.

1. A Greek version of any portion of the Old Testament presupposes intercourse between Israel and a Greek-speaking people. So long as the Hebrew race maintained its isolation, no occasion arose for the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into a foreign tongue. As far as regards the countries west of Palestine, this isolation continued until the age of Alexander\(^1\); it is therefore improbable that any Greek version of the Scriptures existed there before that era. Among the Alexandrian Jews of the second century before Christ there was a vague belief that Plato and other Greek philosophical writers were indebted for some of their teaching to a source of this kind.\(^2\) Thus Aristobulus (ap. Clem. Al. *strom.* i. 22; cf. Eus. *praep.* *ev.* xiii. 12) writes: κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ’

---

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

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

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

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

---

1 δι’ ἐτέρων, Eus.
2 See Tischendorf, V. T. Gr. (1879) prolegg. p. xiii. n.
by their own free agency (Jo. vii. 35, Jas. i. 1, 1 Pet. i. 1)\(^1\). Such
settlements were at first compulsory, and limited to countries
east of Palestine. Between the eighth and sixth centuries
B.C. the bulk of the population of both the Northern and
Southern Kingdoms was swept away by Assyrian and Baby­
lonian conquerors (2 Kings xvii. 6, xxiv. 14 ff., xxv. 11 ff.,
21 ff.). A part of the Babylonian captivity returned (Ezra i. ii.),
but Babylonia and Mesopotamia continued to be the home of
a large body of Jewish settlers (Tob. i. 14 ff., 4 Esdr. xiii. 39 ff.,
Philo ad Cai. 36, Acts ii. 9, Joseph. Ant. xi. 5. 2, xv. 3. 1, xviii.
9. 1 ff.). This ‘Eastern’ Dispersion need not detain us here.
No Biblical version in the stricter sense\(^3\) had its origin in
Babylonia; there, as in Palestine, the services of the synagogue
interpreter (יִדְעָה) sufficed for the rendering of the lections
into Aramaic, and no desire was manifested on the part of the
Gentile population to make themselves acquainted with the
Hebrew scriptures. It was among the Jews who were brought
into relation with Hellenic culture that the necessity arose for
a written translation of the books of the canon. Egypt was
the earliest home of the Hellenistic Jew, and it was on
Egyptian soil that the earliest Greek version of the Old Testa­
ment was begun.

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

---

1 The later Hebrew term was יָדְעָה, ‘exile”; see Dr Hort on 1 Pet. i. c.
2 The ‘Babylonian’ Targum is of Palestinian origin (Buhl, p. 173).
On early Aramaic translations arising out of the synagogue interpretations,
see id., p. 168 f.; and for the traditional account of the origin of the Syriac
O. T. see Nestle, Utext u. Übersetzungen der Bibel (Leipzig, 1897),
p. 229.
3 Authority and Archaeology, p. 87 f.
walls of the temple at Karnak. Isaiah (xix. 19 f.) foresaw\(^1\) that a time must come when the religious influence of Israel would make itself felt on the banks of the Nile, while he endeavoured to check the policy which led Judah to seek refuge from Assyrian aggression in an Egyptian alliance (xxx. 1 ff.). Jewish mercenaries are said to have fought in the expedition of Psammetichus I. against Ethiopia c. B.C. 650 (cf. Ps.-Arist.: έτέρων ξυμμαχιών έξεπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Ἀθηνῶν βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμιτίχος). The panic which followed the murder of Gedaliah drove a host of Jewish fugitives to Egypt, where they settled at Migdol (Μαγδώλος), Tahpanhes (Ταφνᾶς = Δάφνη\(^2\)), Noph (Memphis), and Pathros (Παθοῦρη\(^3\)), i.e. throughout the Delta, and even in Upper Egypt; and the descendants of those who survived were replenished, if we may believe Pseudo-Aristeas, by others who entered Egypt during the Persian period (ἠδὴ μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἰκανῶν εἰσεληλυθότων σὺν τῷ Πέρον). These earlier settlers were probably among the first to benefit by Alexander's policy, and may have been partly hellenised before his birth.

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

---

\(^1\) The passage is thought by some scholars to belong to the Ptolemaean age; see Cheyne, *Intr. to Isaiah*, p. 195.

\(^2\) Cf. *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 107.

\(^3\) Jer. li.=xliv. 1 ff. ἀπαγω τοῖς Ιουδαίοις τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν γῇ Δαγδιτου κτλ. Many of these refugees, however, were afterwards taken prisoners by Nebuchadnezzar and transported to Babylon (Joseph. *Ant.* x. 9. 7).

\(^4\) *Ant.* xi. 8. 4 f. The story is rejected by Ewald and Grätz, and the details are doubtless unhistorical: cf. Droysen, *l'histoire de l'Hellenisme*, i. p. 300.
people an instrument well fitted to assist him in carrying out his purpose of drawing East and West together. Jews served in his army (Hecataeus ap. Joseph. c. Ap. i. 22 ἐπὶ γε μὴν ὅτι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνεπτρεπόντα καὶ μετὰ ταὐτὰ τοῖς διαδόχοις αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηκεν); and such was his sense of their loyalty and courage that when Alexandria was founded (B.C. 332), although the design of the conqueror was to erect a monument to himself which should be essentially Greek¹, he not only assigned a place in his new city to Jewish colonists, but admitted them to full citizenship.

Joseph. ant. xix. 5. 2 ἐπιγραφὴς ἀνέκαθεν τοὺς ἐν ᾿Αλεξάνδρει ᾿Ιουδαίοις...ὑπὸς πολιτείας παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τετευχότας: c. Ap. ii. 4 οὖ γὰρ ἀπορία γε τῶν οἰκεσώντων τὴν μετὰ σπουδὴσ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ κτιζομένην ᾿Αλεξάνδρος τῶν ἥμετέρων τινὰς ἐκεὶ συνήθροισαν, ἀλλὰ πάντας δοκιμάζων ἐπιμελῶς ἀρετῆς καὶ πίστεως τούτο τοῖς ἥμετέροις τὸ γέρας ἔδωκεν. B. J. ii. 18. 7 χρησάμενος προβυποσὰς κατὰ τῶν Διγνητίων ᾿Ιουδαίως ᾿Αλεξάνδρος γέρας τῆς συμμαχίας ἔδωκεν τὸ μετοικεῖν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εξ ἵς οὖν μοῖρας πρὸς τοὺς ᾿Ελλήνας.

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

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


¹ Plutarch Alex. 26 ἐβούλετο πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ πολυάνθρωπον ᾿Ελληνίδα συμνοικίας ἐπάθωμον ἑαυτοῦ καταλιπεῖν.
² See Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 86.
³ On the relations in which the Jews stood to Alexander and his successors see Wellhausen, Isr. u. jiid. Geschichte, c. xvi.
The Alexandrian Greek Version.

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

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

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

1 In Philo's time the Jews occupied two districts out of five (in Flacc. 8).
2 Droysen, iii. p. 59.
3 Strabo, ap. Jos. ant. xiv. 7. 2; cf. Schürer Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes, iii. 40; Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 218; Droysen, iii. p. 40 n. On the ἀλαβάρχης (ἀραβάρχης) who is sometimes identified with the ethnarch see Schürer iii. 38.
(Philo ad Cai. 20, in Flacc. 6). In the time of Philometor the Jews stood so high in the royal favour that they were suffered to convert a disused Egyptian temple at Leontopolis into a replica of the Temple at Jerusalem, and the Jewish rite was celebrated there until after the fall of the Holy City, when the Romans put a stop to it (Joseph. ant. xii. 9, xiii. 1, B. J. vii. 10. 4). Under these circumstances it is not surprising that shortly after the Christian era the Jewish colony in Egypt exceeded a million, constituting an eighth part of the population (Philo in Flacc. 6, Joseph. c. Ap. ii. 4). In the Fayûm villages were founded by Jews, and they lived on equal terms with the Greeks. Nor were the Jewish settlers on the African coast limited to the Delta or to Egypt. A daughter colony was planted in Cyrenaica by the first Ptolemy, and at Cyrene as at Alexandria the Jews formed an important section of the community. The Jew of Cyrene meets us already in the days of the Maccabees (1 Macc. xv. 23, 2 Macc. ii. 23), and he was a familiar figure at Jerusalem in the Apostolic age (Mt. xxvii. 32, Acts ii. 10, vi. 9, xi. 20, xiii. 1; cf. Strabo ap. Joseph. ant. xiv. 7. 2).

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

---


2 A temporary check seems to have been sustained by the Alexandrian Jews under Philopator; see 3 Macc. ii. 31, and cf. Mahaffy, p. 270.

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

4 Where Blass (Philology of the Gospels, p. 69 f.) proposes to read Ἀὐστρίνων for Ἀὐσπερίνων.

5 Philo ad Cai. 36.
colonies which she sent forth at various times." No colony was more dutiful than the Alexandrian. The possession of a local sanctuary at Leontopolis did not weaken its devotion to the temple at Jerusalem; pilgrimages were still made to Jerusalem at the great festivals (Philo ap. Eus. praep. ev. viii. 14. 64; cf. Acts ii. 10); the Temple tribute was collected in Egypt with no less punctuality than in Palestine (Philo de monarch. ii. 3). But it was impossible for Jews who for generations spent their lives and carried on their business in Greek towns to retain their Semitic speech. In Palestine after the Return, Aramaic gradually took the place of Hebrew in ordinary intercourse, and after the time of Alexander Greek became to some extent a rival of Aramaic. In Alexandria a knowledge of Greek was not a mere luxury but a necessity of common life. If it was not required by the State as a condition of citizenship, yet self-interest compelled the inhabitants of a Greek capital to acquire the language of the markets and the Court. A generation or two may have sufficed to accustom the Alexandrian Jews to the use of the Greek tongue. The Jewish settlers in Lower Egypt who were there at the coming of Alexander had probably gained some knowledge of Greek before the founding of his new city; and the children of Alexander's mercenaries, as well as many of the immigrants from Palestine in the days of Soter, may well have been practically bilingual. Every year of residence in Alexandria would increase their familiarity with Greek and weaken their hold upon the sacred tongue. Any prejudice

1 See Schürer, iii. 97 ff.
2 Droysen, iii. p. 35.
4 There was a large Greek settlement on the Pelusiac arm of the Nile at an early period; see Herod. ii. 163.
5 Cf. Streane, Double Text of Jeremiah, p. 11 f.
which might have existed against the use of a foreign language would speedily disappear under a rule which secured full liberty in worship and faith. The adoption of the Greek tongue was a tribute gladly paid by the Alexandrian Jews to the great Gentile community which sheltered and cherished them.

But the Greek which the Jews of Alexandria learnt to speak was neither the literary language employed by the scholars of the Museum, nor the artificial imitation of it affected by Hellenistic writers of the second and first centuries B.C.\(^1\) It was based on the *patois* of the Alexandrian streets and markets—a mixture, as we may suppose, of the ancient spoken tongue of Hellas with elements gathered from Macedonia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Libya. Into this hybrid speech the Jewish colony would infuse, when it became their usual organ of communication, a strong colouring of Semitic thought, and not a few reminiscences of Hebrew or Aramaic lexicography and grammar. Such at any rate is the monument of Jewish-Egyptian Greek which survives in the earlier books of the so-called Septuagint.

7. The ‘Septuagint\(^2\),’ or the Greek version of the Old Testament which was on the whole the work of Alexandrian Jews, is, written in full, the *Interpretatio septuaginta virorum* or *seniorum*, i.e. the translation of which the first instalment was attributed by Alexandrian tradition to seventy or seventy-two Jewish elders. In the most ancient Greek MSS. of the Old

---


\(^2\) Irenaeus (iii. 21. 3) speaks of the *seniorum interpretatio*; Tertullian (Apol. 18) of the *septuaginta et duo interpretes*; Jerome, of the *LXX. interpretes*, or *translatores* (*praef. in Esdr.*, *Isai.*), *LXX. editio* (*praef. in Job*, ep. ad Panmach.), *editio LXX.* (*praef. in Paralipp.*). Augustine (cited by Nestle, *Utext*, p. 62) remarks: “*interpretatio ista ut Septuaginta vocetur iam obtinuit consuetudo.*"
The Alexandrian Greek Version.

Testament it is described as the version ‘according to the LXX.’ (κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομῆκοντα, παρὰ ἑβδομῆκοντα, O. T. in Greek, i. p. 103, iii. p. 479), and quoted by the formula οἱ ο´ or οἱ οβ’. All forms of the name point back to a common source, the story of the origin of the version which is told in the pseudonymous letter entitled Ἀριστέας Φιλοκράτης.

LITERATURE. The text of the letter of Aristeas is printed in the Appendix to this volume. It will be found also in Hody de Bibl. text. orig. (Oxon. 1705), and in Constantinus Oeconomus περὶ τῶν ο´ ἑρμηνευτῶν βιβλία θ´ (Athens, 1849); the best edition hitherto available is that of M. Schmidt in Merx, Archiv f. wissensch. Erforschung d. A. T. i. p. 241 ff.; a new edition is promised under the title: Aristaeae ad Philocratem epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX. interpretum testimoniiis. Ex Ludovici Mendelssohnii schedis ed. Paulus Wendland. For the earlier editions see Fabricius-Harles, iii. 660 ff.; the editio princeps of the Greek text was published at Basle in 1561.


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

1 From the mention of Cyprus as ‘the island’ (§ 3) it has been inferred that Aristeas was a Cypriot. The name occurs freely in inscriptions from the islands of the Aegean and the coast of Caria (C. I. G. 2262, 2266, 2349, 2399, 2404, 2655, 2693, 2694, 2723, 2727, 2781, 2892), and was borne by a Cyprian sculptor (see D. G. and R. B., i. 293). The Aristeas who wrote ἡμᾶς ὑπάρχει (Euseb. praep. ev. ix. 25) was doubtless an Alexandrian Jew who, as a Hellenist, assumed a Greek name.

2 See Ostermann, de Demetrii Ph. vita (1857); Susemihl, Gesch. d. gr. Litt. in d. Alexandrinertei, i. p. 135 ff. On the royal library at Alexandria
described as librarian of the royal library at Alexandria, had in conversation with the King represented the importance of procuring for the library a translation of the Jewish laws (τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα μεταγραφῆς άξια καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοι βιβλιοθήκης εἶναι). Philadelphus fell in with the suggestion, and despatched an embassy to Jerusalem with a letter to the High Priest Eleazar, in which the latter was desired to send to Alexandria six elders learned in the law from each of the tribes of Israel to execute the work of translation. In due course the seventy-two elders, whose names are given, arrived in Egypt, bringing with them a copy of the Hebrew Law written in letters of gold on a roll composed of skins (σῶν...ταῖς διαφόροις δύθέραις ἐν αἷς ἡ νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφίᾳ τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς γράμμασι). A banquet followed, at which the King tested the attainments of the Jewish elders with hard questions. Three days afterwards the work of translation began. The translators were conducted by Demetrius along the Heptastadion to the island of Pharos, where a building conveniently furnished and remote from the distractions of the city was provided for their use. Here Demetrius, in the words of Aristeas, 'exhorted them to accomplish the work of translation, since they were well supplied with all that they could want. So they set to work, comparing their several results and making them agree; and whatever they agreed upon was suitably copied under the direction of Demetrius....In this way the transcription was completed in seventy-two days, as if that period had been pre-arranged.'

The completed work was read by Demetrius to the Jewish community, who received it with enthusiasm and begged that a copy might be placed in the hands of their leaders; and see Susemihl, i. p. 335 ff., and the art. Bibliotheken in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, v. 409 f.

1 The mole which connected the Pharos with the city; see art. Alexandria in Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geography, pp. 96 f.
a curse was solemnly pronounced upon any who should presume to add to the version or to take from it. After this the Greek Pentateuch was read to the King, who expressed delight and surprise, greeted the book with a gesture of reverence (προσκυνήσας), and desired that it should be preserved with scrupulous care (ἐκέλευε μεγάλην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖθαι τῶν βιβλίων καὶ συντηρεῖν ἅγιως).

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

Aristobulus ἀφ. Eus. praep. ev. xiii. 12. 2: ἡ δὲ ὄλη ἐρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλάδελφου βασιλέως σοῦ δὲ προγόνου [he is addressing Philometor] προσευγκαμένον μείζονα φιλοστίμιαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσάμενον τὰ περὶ τούτων1. Philo, vii. Mops. ii. 5 ff.: Πολεμαίος ὁ Φιλάδελφος ἐπικληθεὶς...ζηλον καὶ πόθον λαβὼν τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῶν εἰς Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν τὴν Χαλδαϊκὴν μεθαρμοζοῦσα διενοεῖτο, καὶ πρέσβεις εὐθὺς ἔξεπεμπε πρὸς τὸν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἄρχερα...δὲ, ὡς εἰκος, ἡσθεὶς καὶ νομίσας οὐκ ἀνευ βείας ἐπιφωσώμης περὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔργον ἐπισωδικέναι τὸν βασιλέα...ἀσμένως ἀποστέλλει...καθίσσατε δὲ ἐν ἀπόκρυφῳ καὶ μηδὲνα παρόντος...καθάστε ἐνθονωσώτες ἐπροφήτευν, οὐκ ἄλλα ἄλλα, τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ πάντες ὁμόματα καὶ ῥήματα ὡς πρὸς ἢπολεος ἐκάστος ἀφιῶτος ἐνχούτους κτλ. Josephus, ant. i. præpem. 3: Πολεμαίοις μὲν ὁ δευτέρος μάλιστα δὴ βασιλεὺς περὶ παιδείαν καὶ βιβλίων συναγωγὴν σπουδάσας εξαιρετῶς ἐφιλοσοφικὴν τὸν ἥμετερον νόμον καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν διάταξιν τῆς πολιτείας εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν μεταλαβέσθαι κτλ. In ant. xii. 2. 1—15 Josephus gives a full account obviously based on Aristeas (whom he calls 'Ἀρισταῖος'), and to a great extent verbally identical with the letter.

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

1 In defence of the genuineness of this testimony see Schürer, G. J. V. iii. 384—392. On the other hand cf. L. Cohn in Neue Jahrbücher f. d. Klass. Alterlhum i. 8 (1893), and Wendland in Byzantinische Zeitschrift vii. (1898), 447—449. For Aristobulus see Susemihl, p. 630 f.
states (l. c.) that the completion of the work of the LXX. was celebrated at Alexandria down to his own time by a yearly festival at the Pharos (μέχρι τών ἐνα πάντως έσπορή καὶ πανήγυρις ἀντικατα τῶν Φάρων νήσον, εἰς ἦν οὐκ Ἰουδαίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ παμπληθείς ἔτεροι διαπλέοντο, τῷ τε χαρίων σεμύνοντες εν ὧ πρώτων τῷ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐξέλαμψε κτλ.). A popular anniversary of this kind can scarcely have grown out of a literary work so artificial and so wanting in the elements which ensure popularity as the letter of Aristeas. The fragment of Aristobulus carries us much further back than the witness of Philo and Josephus. It was addressed to a Ptolemy who was a descendant of Philadelphus, and who is identified both by Eusebius (l. c.) and by Clement\(^1\) (strom. i. 22) with Philometor. Whether Aristobulus derived his information from Aristeas is uncertain, but his words, if we admit their genuineness, establish the fact that the main features of the story were believed by the literary Jews of Alexandria, and even at the Court, more than a century and a half before the Christian era and within a century of the date assigned by Aristeas to the translation of the Law.

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

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

\(^1\) Clement of Alexandria identifies this Aristobulus with the person named in 2 Macc. i. 10 Ὀραστοβοῦλῳ διδασκάλῳ Πολεμαδόν τοῦ βασιλέως. See Valckenaer diatribe de Aristobulo (printed at the end of Gaisford's edition of Eus. praep. ev. iv.).
doret. praef. in Psalms; Cyril of Alexandria, adv. Julian. or. 1; Pseudo-Athanasius, synops. scr. sacr. § 77; the anonymous dialogue of Timothy and Aquila (ed. Conybeare, Oxford, 1898, p. 90 f.).

Most of these Christian writers, in distinct contradiction to the statement of Aristeas, represent the Seventy as having worked separately, adding that when the results were compared at the end of the task they were found to be identical (so Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, &c.). The author of the Cohortatio ad Graecos\(^1\) declares that at Alexandria he had been shewn the vestiges of the cells in which the translators had worked (αὐτοὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρείᾳ γενόμενοι καὶ τὰ ἱχνη τῶν οἰκίσκων ἐν τῇ Φάρῳ ἐωρακότες ἔτοι σωζόμενα, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ ὡς τὰ πάτρια παρειληφότων ἀκηκο-ότες ταῦτα ἀπαγγέλλομεν). This story of the cells therefore was probably of Alexandrian origin, and had grown out of the local belief in the inspiration of the Seventy which appears already in the words of Philo quoted above\(^2\). The Fathers generally accept both the belief and the legend which it generated, though the latter sometimes undergoes slight modification, as when Epiphanius groups the LXXII. in pairs (ζύγη ζύγη καὶ οἰκίσκον). Jerome is an honourable exception; he realises that the tale of the cells is inconsistent with the earlier tradition (prol. in Gen. “nescio quis primus auctor LXX cellulas Alexandriam mendacio suo exstruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarint, quum Aristeas...et Josephus nihil tale retulerint”), and rightly protests against the doctrine which was at the root of the absurdity (“aliud est enim vatem, aliud est esse interpretem”).

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

\(^2\) Cf. ib. οὐχ ἐρμηνεῖς ἐκεῖνος ἀλλ' ιεροφάντας καὶ προφήτας προσαγο-ρεύοντες.

\(^3\) The story of the cells is not peculiar to Christian writers; it is echoed by the Talmud (Bab. Talm. Megillah 9a, Jerus. Talm. Meg. c. i.; cf. Sopherim, c. i.).
11. Doubts as to the genuineness of the Aristeas-letter were first expressed by Ludovicus de Vives in his commentary on Aug. de civ. Dei, xviii. 4 (published in 1522), and after him by Joseph Scaliger. Ussher and Voss defended the letter, but its claim to be the work of a contemporary of Philadelphus was finally demolished by Humphry Hody, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford (1698–1706)\(^1\). A few later writers have pleaded in its favour (e.g. Grinfield Apology for the LXX., and Constantinus Oeconomus, op. cit.); but the great majority of modern scholars, and perhaps all living experts, recognise the unhistorical character of much of the story of Aristeas.

Indeed it scarcely needed the massive learning of Hody to convict the letter of Aristeas of being pseudonymous, and to a large extent legendary. The selection of the elders from all the tribes of Israel awakens suspicions; their names are clearly imaginary; the recurrence of the number seventy-two seems to have struck even the writer as open to remark;\(^2\) the letters of Philadelphus and Eleazar are of the same stamp as the confessedly fictitious correspondence between Philadelphus and the Palestinian Jews in 2 and 3 Maccabees. Above all, whereas the letter professes to have been written by a Greek and a pagan, its purpose proclaims it to be the work of a Jew; while it addresses itself to Gentile readers, its obvious aim is to glorify the Jewish race, and to diffuse information about their sacred books. On the other hand, though the story as 'Aristeas' tells it is doubtless a romance, it must not be hastily inferred that it has no historical basis. That the writer was a Jew who lived in Egypt under the Ptolemies seems to be

---

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

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

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

1 See the remarks of Wilcken in Philologus liii. (1894), p. 111 f., and cf. Lumbroso, p. xiii.
2 See Schürer, iii. p. 468 f.
3 Tertullian exaggerates his literary merits (apol. 18 Ptolemaeorum eruditissimus...et omnis litteraturae sagacissimus).
4 Cf. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 164 ff. On the character of Philadelphus see also Droysen, iii., p. 254 f.
5 Mahaffy, pp. 163 f., 170.
Manetho’s Greek history of Egyptian institutions may well have yielded also a translation into Greek of the Hebrew sacred books. The presence of a large Jewish colony at Alexandria could hardly have failed to awaken in the King and his scholars of the Museum an interest in the ancient laws and literature of the Jewish race. For these reasons modern scholars have for the most part shewn no desire to disturb the tradition which assigns the Alexandrian version of the Law to the days of Philadelphus.

One exception must be noted. The late Professor Grätz maintained with much ingenuity that the Greek Pentateuch was a work of the reign of Philometor, thus transferring the inception of the LXX. from the middle of the third century to the middle of the second 1.

His opinion was based partly on the fact that the Jewish colony at Alexandria touched the zenith of its influence under Philometor, partly on internal grounds. Under the latter head he insisted on the translation in Lev. xxiii. 11 of the phrase ἡ ἑπαύριον τῆς πρώτης. The Pharisees understood the word ἡβασιν in that context to refer to the day after the Paschal Sabbath i.e. Nisan 15, while the Sadducees adhered to the usual meaning. Grätz argued with much force that, since the rendering of the LXX. shews evident signs of Pharisaic influence, the version itself must have been later than the rise of the Pharisees. But v. 15 renders the same words by ἀπὸ τῆς ἑπαύριον τοῦ σαββάτου, and as it is not likely that a translator who had of set purpose written τῆς πρώτης in v. 11 would have let τοῦ σαββάτου escape him a little further down, we must suppose that τοῦ ἐκκέν. stood originally in both verses and that τῆς πρώτης is due to a Pharisaic corrector who left his work incomplete. But a partial correction of the passage in the interests of Pharisaism points to the version being pre-Maccabean, a conclusion quite opposite to that which Dr Grätz desired to draw 2.

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

---


S. S.
\( \text{The Alexandrian Greek Version.} \)

The Alexandrian Greek Version of "\( \tau \eta \ 'I\nu\nu\delta\iota\alpha \varepsilon \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\alpha\iota \varepsilon \)" are preserved by Clement (strom. i. 21) and Eusebius (praep. ev. ix. 21, 29). The following specimens may suffice to prove this assertion.

Demetrius.

\[
\text{Genesis (LXX.).} \\
\text{\textit{\'E\nu\underline{\imath}e\nu \mu\eta\lambda\alpha \mu\alpha\nu\partial\alpha\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron.}} \]

\[
\text{\textit{\'A\gamma\gamma\epsilon\omicron \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\varepsilon\omicron \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha \iota \acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha \tau\omicron \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron \upsilon \mu\eta\rho\omicron \tau\omicron \iota \'I\acute{\alpha}k\omicron \omicron.}} \]

\[
\text{\textit{\'I\acute{\alpha}k\omicron \omicron \upsilon \kappa\tau\eta\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron \omicron \alpha\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon.}} \]

As Demetrius carries his chronology no further than the reign of Philopator, it may be assumed that he lived under the fourth Ptolemy\(^1\). He is thus the earliest of the Alexandrian Hellenistic writers; yet equally with the latest he draws his quotations of the Book of Genesis from the LXX. It may fairly be argued that a version, which at the beginning of the third century had won its way to acceptance among the literary Jews of Alexandria, probably saw the light not later than the reign of Philadelphus.

13. Both 'Aristeas' and Aristobulus associate with the inception of the LXX. the name of Demetrius Phalereus\(^2\). Aristobulus merely represents Demetrius as having 'neglected the matter' (\(\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\omicron \nu \tau\alpha \ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota \ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\))\), but Aristeas states that he did so (1) in the capacity of head of the royal library (\(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota \ \tau\iota \ \tau\acute{\eta} \ \tau\omicron \ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\omega\)\), and (2) in the days of Philadelphus, with whom appears to be on intimate terms. Both these particulars are certainly unhistorical. Busch\(^3\) has shewn that the office of librarian was


\(^2\) The \textit{Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila} strangely says: \(\acute{\eta} \nu \ \delta \iota \ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\omicron \ \upsilon \ \Delta\eta\mu\pi\tau\omicron\omicron \ \tau\omicron \ \gamma\acute{e}\nu\epsilon \ \iota \ '\Epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\).\)

filled under Philadelphus by Zenodotus of Ephesus, and on the
decease of Zenodotus by Eratosthenes. Moreover Demetrius,
so far from being intimate with Philadelphus, was sent into
exile soon after the accession of that monarch, and died a
little later on from the bite of an asp, probably administered
at the King's instigation (c. B.C. 283)\textsuperscript{1}. Thus, if Demetrius took
part in the inception of the LXX., he must have done so during
the reign of Soter. This is not in itself improbable. He
had taken refuge in Egypt as early as B.C. 307, and for many
years had been a trusted adviser of the first Ptolemy; and
it is not unlikely that the project of translating the Jewish
Law was discussed between him and the royal founder of the
Alexandrian library, and that the work was really due to his
suggestion\textsuperscript{2}, though his words did not bear fruit until after his
death. The point is of importance to the student of the LXX.
only in so far as it has to do with the question whether the
version was made under official guidance. The breakdown of
the chronology of this part of the story of Aristeas leaves us
free to abandon the hypothesis of direct intervention on the
part of the King, and internal evidence certainly justifies us
in doing so. An official version would assuredly have avoided
such barbarisms as γεωργίας, εἶν, σάββατα\textsuperscript{3}, when such Greek
equivalents as προοφήλυμος, δίχοιν, ἀνάπαυσις, were available.
The whole style of the version is alien from the purpose of a
book intended for literary use, nor is it conceivable that under
such circumstances Jewish translators, Palestinian or Alex-
andrian, would have been left without the advice and help of
experts in the Greek tongue.

Thus everything points to the conclusion that the version

\textsuperscript{1} Diog. Laert. v. 78. The statement rests on the authority of Hermippus
Callimachus (temp. Ptolemy III.).
\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Plutarch, Aposthegm. viii. Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς Πτολεμαῖος τῷ
βασιλεί παρήκει τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτάσθαι καὶ ἀνα-
γενώσκειν.
\textsuperscript{3} Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 8 f.
arose out of the needs of the Alexandrian Jews. Whilst in Palestine the Aramaic-speaking Jews were content with the interpretation of the *Methurgeman*, at Alexandria the Hebrew lesson was gladly exchanged for a lesson read from a Greek translation, and the work of the interpreter was limited to exegesis. In the closing paragraphs of the letter of Aristeas which describe the joy with which the work of the LXXII. was welcomed by the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria, the writer unconsciously reveals the true history of the version, when he represents the Jews as having heard and welcomed the Greek Pentateuch before it was presented to the King. But it is not improbable that the King encouraged the work of translation with the view of promoting the use of the Greek language by the settlers as well as for the purpose of gratifying his own curiosity.

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

1 Cf. Philo ap. Eus. praep. ev. viii. 7 τῶν λεπτῶν δὲ τις παρὼν, ἡ τῶν γεράντων εἷς, ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς λεπτὸς νύμφος αὐτοῖς καὶ καθ' ἐκαστὸν ἐξηγεῖται. But ἐξηγεῖται is ambiguous.

2 The hope of winning converts may have been among the motives which inspired the translators and gained a ready welcome for their work; cf. the proil. to Sirach: οδ ἡμών αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας δὲν ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμωνας γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐκτὸς δύνασθαι τοὺς φιλομαθῶντας χρησίμων εἶναι καὶ λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας—where however the influence of the Jewish Scriptures on pagans is regarded as indirect, and not immediate.

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

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

¹ See Hody, ii. 4; Eichhorn, p. 472; H. H. A. Kennedy, Sources of
³ Evidence of this kind will doubtless accumulate as new volumes of
papyri are issued. The verbal indices which usually accompany such
collections offer a rich field for the Biblical student who will be at the
pains to explore them.
⁴ See however Buhl, p. 124.
The story of the rolls being written in letters of gold and sent to the King by the High Priest may be dismissed at once; it belongs to the picturesque setting of the romance. But there is nothing improbable in the statement that the Hebrew rolls were freshly brought from Jerusalem, for communication between Jerusalem and Alexandria was frequent during the reigns of the earlier Ptolemies. Yet the legend may be intended to represent the loyalty of the colony towards the μητρόπολις, and the conviction of the Alexandrian Jews that in their Greek version they possessed the same sacred texts which their brethren in Judaea read in Hebrew. Nothing was further from their intention than to create an Alexandrian canon, or an Alexandrian type of text. The point is one which it is important to remember.

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

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

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

3 Apol. 18; cf. Justin, apol. i. 31, Chrys. or. 1 adv. Jud., and Épiph.
15. It has been stated that the letter of Aristeas does not profess to describe the origin of any part of the Alexandrian Bible except the Pentateuch. This was evident to Josephus: *ant. i. prooem. 3 οὐδὲ γὰρ πᾶσαν ἐκεῖνος (sc. Πτολεμαῖος ὁ δεύτερος) ἐβάλη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδωσαν οἱ περιβλέπτες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Christian writers, however, failed to notice this limitation; the whole Greek Bible was familiarly known as the version of the LXX., and no misgivings were felt upon the matter except by Jerome, whose intercourse with the Rabbis had opened his eyes on this and other matters about which the Jews were better informed: "tota schola Judaeorum (he writes) quinque tantum libros Moysis a LXX. translatos asserunt." Epiphanius goes so far as to apportion the books of the Hebrew canon among thirty-six pairs of translators. Nevertheless the Jews were unquestionably right; Aristeas has nothing to say about the translation of any books beyond the first five. His silence as to the Prophets and the Hagiographa is entirely consistent with the conditions of the period in which he fixes his story. The canon of the Prophets seems to have scarcely reached completion before the High-Priesthood of Simon II. (219–199 B.C.)

If this was so in Palestine, at Alexandria certainly there would be no recognised body of Prophetic writings in the reign of the second Ptolemy. The Torah alone was ready for translation, for it was complete, and its position as a collection of sacred books was absolutely secure.

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

---

1 In Ezech. v.; cf. in Gen. xxxxi., in Mich. ii. See the Talmudical passages cited by Hody, p. 269.
2 de mens et pond. 3 sq.
of Palestinian recognition, if a bilingual Jew was found ready to undertake the task. A happy accident enables us to estimate roughly the extent to which this process had gone by the sixth or seventh decade of the second century. The writer of the prologue to Sirach, who arrived in Egypt in the 38th year of Euergetes—i.e. in the year 132 B.C. if, as is probable, the Euergetes intended was the second of that name—incidentally uses words which imply that “the Law, the Prophets, and the rest of the books” were already current in a translation (οὐ γὰρ Ἰσοδύναμες αὐτά ἐν ἑαυτῷ Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα, καὶ ὡστε μεταχεῖθ' εἰς ἑτέραν γλώσσαν· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ ἀι προφητείαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν τὴν διαφορὰν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα). This sentence reveals the progress which had been made in the work of translation between the second Ptolemy and the ninth. Under Euergetes II. the Alexandrian Jews possessed, in addition to the original Greek Pentateuch, a collection of prophetic books, and a number of other writings belonging to their national literature which had not as yet formed themselves into a complete group. The latter are doubtless the books which are known as νεαντία or Hagiographa. Since the author of the prologue was a Palestinian Jew, we may perhaps assume that under αἱ προφητείαι and τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων he includes such books of both classes as were already in circulation in Palestine. If this inference is a safe one, it will follow that all the ‘Prophets’ of the Hebrew canon, ‘former’ and ‘latter,’ had been translated before B.C. 132.

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

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

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

3 Cf. Cheyne, Origin of the Psalter, pp. 12, 83.
4 Ryle, Philo and Holy Scripture, p. xxxi. f.
“it may be safely assumed that Ruth and Lamentations were, in Philo’s time, already united to Judges and Jeremiah in the Greek Scriptures”; and Ezekiel, as one of the greater Prophets, had assuredly found its way to Alexandria before A.D. 1. Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Daniel, which “seem to have been among the latest books to be received into the Sacred Canon”, may have been purposely neglected by Philo, as not possessing canonical authority. But it would be precarious to conclude that they had not been as yet translated into Greek; the Book of Esther, as we have seen, was probably current at Alexandria during the second century B.C. Two other Jewish, but not Alexandrian, authorities assist us to ascertain the contents of the Greek Bible in the first century A.D. *(a)* The New Testament shews a knowledge of the LXX. version in most of the books which it quotes, and it quotes all the books of the Old Testament except Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and certain of the Minor Prophets. As in the case of Philo, it is possible, though scarcely probable, that Esther, Ecclesiastes and the Song were passed by as not having received the stamp of canonicity; but the silence of the Apostolic writers about them does not in any case prove that Greek translations of these books were not yet in circulation among Palestinian Jews. *(b)* Josephus, who knew and used the LXX., unfortunately has no explicit statement as to the extent of the Greek version; but his list of the Hebrew books is practically identical with our own, and, as it occurs in a treatise intended for Gentile readers, it is perhaps safe to assume that he speaks of books accessible in a translation; “in other words, that he writes with the LXX. version before him.”

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

---

3 *Ib.* p. 163.
Hebrew canon had been translated and were circulated in a Greek version during the Apostolic age, such a view is not improbable; and it is confirmed by the fact that they are all contained in the canon of the Greek Bible which the Christian Church received from its Jewish predecessors. It is another question whether the versions were all of Alexandrian origin, or the only Greek translations which claimed to represent the corresponding Hebrew books. In a few cases there were certainly rival interpretations or recensions of the same book (e.g. in Judges, Daniel, Tobit). But as a whole the work of translation was doubtless carried out at Alexandria, where it was begun; and the Greek Bible of the Hellenistic Jews and the Catholic Church may rightly be styled the Alexandrian Greek version of the Old Testament.

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

L. Capellus, critica sacra, 1651; J. Pearson, praeefatio parae­netica, 1655; Ussher, Syntagma, 1655; Walton, prolegomena, 1657; Hottinger, dissertationum fasciculus, 1660; I. Voss, de LXX. interpretibus, 1661—1663; J. Morinus, Excercitiones, 1669; R. Simon, histoire critique du Vieux Testament, 1685; H. Hody, de Bibl. textibus originalibus, 1705; H. Owen, Enquiry into the text of the LXX., 1769; Brief account of the LXX., 1787; Stroth, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, v. ff., 1779 ff.; White, Letter to the Bp of London, 1779; Fabricius-Harles, iii. 658 ff., 1793; R. Holmes, Episcopo Dunelm. epistola, 1795; præefatio ad Pentateuchum, 1798; Schleusner, opuscula critica, 1812; Töpler, de Pentateuchi interpretat. Alex. indole, 1830; Dahne, jüd.-alexandr. Philosophie, 1834; Grinfield, Apology for the LXX., 1841; Frankel, Vorstudien zur d. LXX., 1841; über den Einfluss d. paläst. Exegese auf die alexandr. Hermeneutik, 1851; do., über paläst. u. alexandr. Schriftforschung, 1854; Thiersch, de Pentateuchi vers. Alexandr., 1841; Constantinus Oeconomus, περὶ τῶν ο’ ἐρμηνευτῶν, 1849; Churton, The Influence of the LXX. upon the progress of Christianity, 1861; Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 1868; E. Nestle, Septuaginta-Studien, i. 1886, ii. 1896; S. R. Driver, Notes on Samuel (Intro. § 3 f.), 1890; P. de Lagarde, Septuaginta-Studien, i. 1891, ii. 1892;
Buhl, Kanon u. Text der A. T., 1891; A. Loisy, histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible, 1892; Hatch, Essays on Biblical Greek, 1892; W. Robertson Smith, O. T. in the Jewish Church\textsuperscript{2}, 1892; E. Klostermann, Analecta zur LXX\textsuperscript{a}., 1895; Nestle, Urtext u. Übersetzungen der Bibel, 1897. Monographs on special books or particular aspects of the subject will be enumerated elsewhere.

The student should also consult the best Introductions to the O. T., especially those of Eichhorn (1777 ff.), De Wette-Schrader (1869), Bleek-Wellhausen\textsuperscript{6} (1893), König (1893); and the Encyclopedias and Bible Dictionaries, especially the articles on the Septuagint in Smith’s D. B. iii. (Selwyn), the Encyclopedia Britannica\textsuperscript{2} (Wellhausen), and the Real-Encycl. f. prot. Theologie u. Kirche\textsuperscript{3} (Nestle; also published in a separate form, under the title Urtext u. Übersetzungen, &c.).
CHAPTER II.

LATER GREEK VERSIONS.

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

On the question of the use of the LXX. in the synagogues see Hody iii. 1. 1, Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 56 ff., König, Einleitung, p. 105 ff.; the negative is stoutly maintained by J. Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. (add. to 1 Cor. xiv.). If the Ep. to the Hebrews was addressed to the Church of Jerusalem, the preponderating use of the LXX. in its quotations from the O.T. is strong evidence, so far as it goes, for the acceptance of the LXX. by Palestinian Hellenists. Its use by St Paul vouches for the practice of the Hellenists of Asia Minor and Europe; no rival version had gained circulation at Antioch, Ephesus, or Rome. In the next century we have the evidence of Justin (apol. i. 31 ἐμείναν αἱ βιβλίοι [the translated books] καὶ παρ᾽ ἀληθινοῖς μέχρι τοῦ δεύτερο καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίοις; dial. 72 αὐτὴ ἡ περικοπὴ ἡ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τοῦ ἱερείου ἔτι ἐστὶν ἑγγεγραμμένη ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῶν ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ἰουδαίον), Tertullian (apol. 18 “Judaei palam lectitant”), Pseudo-Justin (cohort. ad Gr. 13 τὸ δὲ παρ᾽ Ἰουδαίοις ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὰς τῇ ἡμετέρα θεσσεβείας
2. When the LXX. passed into the hands of the Church and was used in controversy with Jewish antagonists, the Jews not unnaturally began to doubt the accuracy of the Alexandrian version (Justin, dial. 68 τολμώσι Λέγειν τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἤν ἐξήγη-

σαντο οἱ ἐβδομῆκοντα ὑμῶν προσβύτεροι παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων βασιλέως γενόμενοι μὴ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς αληθῇ). The crucial instance was the rendering of πρὶς by παρθένος in Isa. vii. 14, where νεὰνως, it was contended, would have given the true meaning of the Hebrew word (ib. 71, 84; Iren. iii. 21. 1). But the dissatisfaction with which the LXX. was regarded by the Jewish leaders of the second century was perhaps not altogether due to polemical causes. The LXX. “did not suit the newer school of [Jewish] interpretation, it did not correspond with the received text1.” An official text differing considerably from the text accepted in earlier times had received the approval of the Rabbis, and the Alexandrian version, which represented the older text, began to be suspected and to pass into disuse. Attempts were made to provide something better for Greek-speaking Israelites (Justin, dial. 71 αὐτοὶ ἐξήγησαν τειρῶνταί). Of two such fresh translations Irenaeus speaks in terms of reprehension (l.c. οὐχ ὡς ἐνοίς φασίν τῶν νῦν μεθερμηνευέν τολμῶντων τὴν γραφὴν...ὡς Θεοδοτίν...ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλιας ὁ Ποντικός, ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαίοι προσήλυτοι). Origen, who realised the importance of these translations, was able to add to those of Aquila and Theodotion the version of Symmachus and three others which were anonymous2. Of the anonymous versions little remains, but Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus are represented by numerous and in some cases important fragments.

2 Eus. H. E. vi. 16.
3. Aquila. The name had been borne in the Apostolic age by a native of Pontus who was of Jewish birth (Acts xviii. 2 'Ἰουδαίων ὄνοματι Ἀκύλαι, Ποντικῶν τῷ γένει). Aquila the translator was also of Pontus, from the famous sea-port Sinope, which had been constituted by Julius Caesar a Roman colony; but he was of Gentile origin. He lived in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117—138), and was a connexion of the Emperor (πενθερίδης, Epiph., Dial. of Timothy and Aquila; πενθερώς, Ps.-Ath., Chron. Pasch.). Hadrian employed his relative to superintend the building of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem, and while there Aquila was converted to Christianity by Christians who had returned from Pella. Refusing, however, to abandon the pagan practice of astrology, he was excommunicated; upon which he shewed his resentment by submitting to circumcision and attaching himself to the teaching of the Jewish Rabbis. The purpose of his translation was to set aside the interpretation of the Lxx., in so far as it appeared to support the views of the Christian Church.

This is the story of Epiphanius (de mens. et pond. 14 sq.: λαβὼν [sc. ὁ Ἀδριανός] τὸν Ἀκύλαι τοῦτον... Ἐλληνα δύτα καὶ αὐτοῦ πενθερίδην, ἀπὸ Σινοπῆς δὲ τῆς Πόντου ὄρμωμενον, καθίστησιν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε ἐπιστασεῖν τοὺς ἐργοὺς κτλ... πικρανθεὶς δὲ... προσηλυτεῖται καὶ περιτέμνεται Ἰουδαίως καὶ ἐπιστόμως φιλοτιμησάμενος ἐξεδοκεῖν ἑαυτὸν μαθεῖν τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεῖα. τάς τινὶ δὲ ἀγρότας παύδειθες ἠμηρύχεσαν οὐκ ὅρθω λογισμῷ χρησάμενος, ἀλλ' ὅτως διαστρέψῃ τινὰ τῶν ῥητῶν, ἐνοχήγας τῇ τῶν ὀβερημηνεία ἑναὶ τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς μεμαρτυρημένα ἀλλως ἐκδόσει). The same tale is told in substance by the Pseudo-Athanasiian author of Synopsis script. sacr., c. 77, and in the Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila printed in Anecdota Oxon., class. ser. pt viii. According to the writer of the Dialogue Aquila learned Hebrew in his 40th year, and there are other features peculiar to this form of the story which have led the editor, Mr F. C. Conybeare, to conjecture that it is independent of the Epiphanian narrative, though derived from the same source,

1 Ramsay, Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor, p. 27 f.; cf. Hort, Commentary on 1 Peter, p. 172 ff.
which he believes to have been ultimately the history of Ariston of Pella (op. cit. p. xxvi. ff.). An Aquila figures in the Clementine romance (hom. ii. sqq., recogn. ii. sqq.); the name and character were perhaps suggested by some floating memories of the translator. Cf. Lagarde, Clementina, p. 12 f.

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

According to Epiphanius the floruit of Aquila is to be placed in the 12th year of Hadrian (Epiph. de mens. et pond. 13 Ἀδριανὸς ἔτη κα' οὖν ὁ δωδεκάτω ἔτει Ἀκύλας ἐγνωρίζετο...ός εἶναι απὸ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἑρμηνείας τῶν οὗ ἐρμηνευτῶν ἐς Ἀκύλα τοῦ ἑρμηνευτοῦ, ἣγου ἐς δωδεκάτου ἔτους Ἀδριανοῦ, ἔτη ὑπ' καὶ μήνας δ'. The 12th year of Hadrian was A.D. 128—9, the year in which the Emperor began to rebuild Aelia. This date is doubtless approximately correct, if Aquila was a pupil of R. Akiba, who taught from A.D. 95 to A.D. 135, or even of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, who immediately preceded Akiba. It must have taken the Greek proselyte many years to acquire an adequate knowledge of Hebrew and of the Rabbinical methods of interpretation, and under these circumstances his great work could hardly have been completed before the third decade of the second century. When Irenaeus wrote his third book, in

---

1 The name is written Ἐνεκέλας, Ενεκελαῖος, or Ενεκέλας, and in the Bab. Talmud, Ενεκέλε. On the identity of Aquila with Onkelos see Anger de Onkelo Chaldaico (before 1845), Friedmann Onkelos u. Akylas (Wien, 1896); or the brief statement in Buhl, p. 173.

2 Field, Hexapla, prolegg. p. xviii.
the eighth decade, Aquila's translation might still be regarded as comparatively recent (τῶν νῦν μεθερμηνεύειν τολμώντων τῆν γραφήν...ὡς...Ἀκύλας).

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

---

1 Megilla 1. 9: in Πῶδα there is a play upon Πῶδ (cf. Gen. ix. 27).
2 See Dr C. Taylor in the preface to Mr Burkitt's Fragments of Aquila, p. vi.: "Aquila in a sense was not the sole or independent author of the version, its uncompromising literalism being the necessary outcome of his Jewish teachers' system of exegesis.”

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

5. Until the summer of 1897 Aquila’s version was known to students only from the description of ancient writers, chiefly Christian, and the fragments of the Hexapla (c. iii.), which when complete contained the entire work. These sources were used with admirable skill by Dr Field (prolegomena in Hexapla, p. xix. ff.) and Dr C. Taylor (D. C. B. art. Hexapla) to illustrate the purpose and style of Aquila’s work. But an unexpected discovery has now placed at our disposal several larger fragments of the version, emanating from a Jewish source. Among the débris of the Genizah of the Cairo synagogue lately brought to Cambridge through the efforts of Dr Taylor and Dr Schechter, Mr F. C. Burkitt has been so fortunate as to discover some palimpsest scraps which under later Hebrew writing contain in a good uncial hand of the sixth century Aquila’s translation of 1 Kings xx. 9—17 and 2 Kings xxiii. 12—27³. From the same treasure Dr Taylor has recovered Pss. xc. 6—13, xci. 4—10⁴, and a portion of Ps. xxii. The

¹ Ep. ad Afric. 3. Cf. Aug. l. c. ² See p. 31. ³ Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila (Cambridge, 1897). ⁴ See the facsimile and letterpress prefixed to Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (ed. 2, 1897).
student will find below specimens of these discoveries, placed for the purpose of comparison in parallel columns with the version of the LXX.

3 Regn. xxi. (1 Kings xx.) 10—13.

LXX. (Cod. B').

10 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νῖος Ἄδαρ λέγων Τάδε ποιήσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη, εἰ ἐκποιήσει ὁ χοῦς Σαμαρείας ταῖς ἀλώπεξιν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τοῖς πεζοῖς μου. 11 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Ἰκανονύθως μὴ καυχάσηθω ὅ κυρτὸς ὡς ὁ ὄρθος. 12 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον τούτον, πῦνον ἦν αὐτὸς καὶ πάντες βασιλεῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν σκηναῖς καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισιν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ὀικοδομήσατε χάρακα καὶ ἔθεντο χάρακα ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν.

13 καὶ ἵδον προφητὴς εἰς προσήλθεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει Κύριος Εἰ ἕφαρκας τὸν ὄχλον τὸν μέγαν τούτον; ἵδον ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτὸν σήμερον εἰς χείρας σάς, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ Κύριος.

Aquila.

10 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νῖος Ἄδαρ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε ποιήσαι σάν μοι θεοὶ καὶ τάδε προσθείησαν, εἰ ἐξαρκέσει χοῦς Σαμαρίας τοῖς λιχασὼν τοῦ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ὃς ἐν τοσίν μου. 11 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Δαλήσατε Μή καυχάσθω ζωνύμενος ὃς ὁ περιλυμένος. 12 καὶ ἐγένετο ὃς ἦκοσον σὺν τὸ ἤμα τοῦτο, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔπινεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐν συσκιασμοῖς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς δούλους αὐτοῦ Θέτε καὶ ἔθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν.

13 καὶ ἤδον προφήτης εἰς προσήγγισεν πρὸς Ἀδαβ βασιλέα Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει ΖΩΗΑΙ Εἴδες σὺν πάντα τὸν όχλον τὸν μέγαν τούτον; ἤδον ἐγὼ δίδωμι αὐτόν εἰς χεὶρά σου σήμερον, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ ΖΩΗΑΙ.

1 Cod. A is nearer to Aquila, as the following variants shew: 10 ποιήσαι σάν μοι οἱ θεοὶ καὶ τάδε προσθείησαν Ἀ 12 ὅτε] ὡς Ἀ | παντες οἱ β. Ἀ 13 τῷ βασ.] ρᾷ τῷ Ἀχαβ Ἀ | τῶν όχλων] ρᾷ πάντα Ἀ | εἰς χ. σας σήμερον Ἀ.

2 MS. χε[ιλ]αθ[ε]ν; see Burkitt, op. cit. p. 2.
Later Greek Versions.

4 Regn. (2 Kings) xxiii. 21—24.

LXX. (Cod. B1).

21 καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς παντὶ τῷ λαῷ λέγων Ποιήσατε πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης. 22 ὅτι οὐκ ἐγενήθη στὸ πάσχα τούτο ἀφ' ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἔκρυνον τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας βασιλεῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ βασιλεῶν Ἰούδα: 23 ὅτι ἄλλα ἐν τῷ ὀκτώκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλεῶς Ἰωσεία ἐγενήθη στὸ πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 24 καὶ γε τοὺς θελητὰς καὶ τοὺς γνωριστὰς καὶ τὰ θεραφεῖν καὶ τὰ ἐξώλα καὶ πάντα τὰ προσοχθίσματα τὰ γεγονότα ἐν γῇ Ἰούδα καὶ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἔξηρεν Ἰωσείας, ἵνα στήσῃ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τοὺς γεγραμμένους ἐπὶ τῷ βιβλίῳ οὗ εὑρεν Χελκείας ὁ ἴερεὺς ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου.

AQUILA.

21 καὶ ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τῷ λέγων Ποιήσατε φέσα τῷ ΘΕΟΣ θεῷ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ βιβλίου τῆς συνθήκης ταύτης. 22 ὅτι οὐκ ἐποιήθη κατὰ τὸ φέσα τούτο ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν τῶν κριτῶν οἱ ἔκρυναν τὸν Ἰσραήλ καὶ πασῶν ἡμερῶν βασιλεῶν Ἰσραήλ καὶ βασιλεῶν Ἰούδα: 23 ὅτι ἄλλα ἐν ὀκτώκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλεῦς Ἰωσιαν ἐποιήθη τὸ φέσα τούτο τῷ ΘΕΟΣ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 24 καὶ καὶ γε ἐν τοῖς μᾶγοι καὶ σὺν τοὺς γνωριστὰς καὶ σὺν τὰ μορφώματα καὶ σὺν τὰ καθάρματα καὶ σὺν τὰ πάντα προσοχθίσματα ἃ φάθησαν ἐν γῇ Ἰούδα καὶ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπέλεξεν Ἰωσιαν, ὡς ἀναστήσῃ τὰ ἰδίματα τοῦ νόμου τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τῶν βιβλίων [οὗ εὑρεν] Ἔλκισαν ὁ ἴερεὺς οἴκῳ Κυρίου. 2

1 The following variants in Cod. A agree with Aquila: 22 πασῶν ημερῶν A 23 τὸ πασχα] + τοῦτο A
2 MS. KY, at the end of a line: see Burkitt, p. 16.
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Ps. xc. (xci.) 66—13.

LXX. (Cod. B).

απὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαι-
μονίας μεσημβρίνου.

7πεσεῖται ἐκ τοῦ κλίτους σου
χιλιάς,
καὶ μυρίας ἐκ δεξιῶν σου,
πρὸς σὲ δὲ οὐκ ἔγγιει.

8πλὴν τοῖς ὅφθαλμοῖς σου κατα-
νοῆσεις,
καὶ ἀνταπόδοσιν ἀμαρτηλῶν
душ.

9ὅτι σὺ, Κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μου
τὸν ψιστόν ἔθου καταφυγήν
σου.

10οὐ προσελεύσεται πρὸς σὲ κακᾶ,
καὶ μάστιξ οὐκ ἔγγιει τῷ σκη-
νώματί σου.

11ὅτι τοῖς ἁγγείοις αὐτοῦ ἐντε-
λεῖται περὶ σοῦ,
τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν ταῖς
όδοις
dου.

12ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρουσίν σε,
μὴ ποτέ προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον
τὸν πόδα σου.

13ἐπ’ ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλίσκον
ἐπιβήσῃ.

AQUILA.

απὸ δηγμοῦ δαίμ[ονίας με-
σημβρίας].

7πεσεῖται ἀπὸ πλαγίου σ[ον
χιλιάς],
καὶ μυρίας ἀπὸ δεξιῶν σου.
πρὸς σὲ οὐ προσεγγίσεις.

8ἐκτὸς ἐν ὅφθαλμοῖς [σου ἐπι-
βλέψεις,
καὶ ἀπότισιν ἀσβέστῳ ὄψῃ.

9ὅτι σὺ, ἸΩΑΝΝΗΣ, ἐλπίς μου.
ψιστὸν θηκας οἰκητὴρίων
σου.

10οὐ μεταχθῆσεται πρὸς σὲ κακά,
καὶ ἀφῇ οὐκ ἔγγισει ἐν σκέτῃ
σου.

11ὅτι ἁγγείοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεύται
σε,
τοῦ φυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις
όδοις σου.

12ἐπὶ ταρσῶν ἀρουσίν σε,
μὴ ποτὲ προσκόψῃ ἐν λίθῳ
[σου]

13ἐπὶ λέαινα[ν] καὶ ἀσπίδα πατή-
σεις.

1 11 ταῖς όδοις] πρὶ πᾶσαι Α(Β)Τ 2 MS. λεζνά.
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Ps. xci. (xcii.) 5—10.

LXX (Cod. B¹).

5 ὅτι εὐφρανός με, Κύριε, ἐν τῷ ποιήματί σοι,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου ἀγαλλιάζομαι.

6 ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη τὰ ἔργα σου,
Κύριε,
σφόδρα ἐβαρύνθησαν οἱ διαλογισμοί σου.

7 ἀνὴρ ἀφρων οὗ γνώσεται,
καὶ ἀσύνετος οὗ συνήσει ταύτα.

ΑΨΙΛΑ.

5 ὅτι ἡφρανός με, Ὀρ], ἐν κατήργῳ σου,
[ἐν ποιήμασί] χειρῶν σου αἰνέσω.

6 ὡς ἐμεγαλύνθη] ποιήματά σου,
ἀναφέρω,
σφόδρα [ἐβαθύνθησαν] λογισμοί σου.

7 [ἀνήρ] ἀσύνετος οὗ γνώσεται,
καὶ ἀνόητος οὗ συνήσει σὺν ταύτῃ.

8 ἐν τῷ ἀνατείλατοι τους ἀμαρτωλοὺς
ὡς χόρτον
καὶ διέκυψαν πάντες οἱ ἔργα-ζόμενοι τῆν ἀνομίαν,
ὅπως ἂν ἐξολεθρεύσωσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.

9 σὺ δὲ ὡς Ὑψιστὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,
Κύριε.

10 ὅτι ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἀπολύνται,
καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τῆν ἀνομίαν.

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

1 The following variants deserve attention: 6 ἐβαθύνθη. Bᵃᵇᵃⁿᵃᵃ_RTC
10 πρ ὃτι ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἐν ὉΔᵃᵃ_RTC
striking peculiarities will at once be apparent. He will notice especially the following. (1) There are frequent instances of an absolutely literal rendering of the original, e.g. 1 Kings xx. 10 δι εν των υποτιν μου = ὁμιλείν (LXX. τοις πεζοίς μου); 12 θέτει καὶ θηραν = οἰκοδομήσατε χάρακα, καὶ θευντ χάρακα; 2 Kings xxiii. 21 τῷ λέγειν = λένε (LXX. λέγον); 24 ἐ σφάθησαν = ἔσται (LXX. τὰ γεγονότα). (2) Under certain circumstances σοῦ is employed to represent the Hebrew נָא, when it is the sign of the accusative; e.g. 1 Kings xx. 12 σοῦ τῷ ρήμα = ρήμα, 13 σοῦ πάντα τὸν ὄχλον = ὁμιλείτες, 2 Kings xxiii. 21 σοῦ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ (where the dat. is governed by the preceding verb), 24 σοῦ τοῖς μάγοις κτλ. (3) The same Hebrew words are scrupulously rendered by the same Greek, e.g. καὶ καίγε = δοθεῖ occurs thrice in one context (2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19, 24); and in Ps. xcii. 8, ἐ σατεργαζόμενοι ἀνωφελές twice represents ἀνωφέλεια. (4) The transliterations adhere with greater closeness to the Hebrew than in the LXX.; thus נב becomes φέσα, ἵππος Ἰωσαίου, ἵππος Ἑλκαίου. (5) The Tetragrammaton is not transliterated, but written in Hebrew letters, and the characters are of the archaic type (אָלְפָּא, not רָאָי) ; cf. Orig. in Ps. ii., καὶ εν τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων Ἐβραίων χαρακτήρων κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, Ἐβραίως δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν ἄλλα τοῖς ἀρχαιστάτοις—where the ‘most exact copies’ are doubtless those of Aquila’s version, for there is no reason to suppose that any copyists of the Alexandrian version hesitated to write ἐκ or ἐκ for ὑποτιν. (6) That the crudities of Aquila’s

1 For these see Burkitt, Aquila, p. 12.
2 This singular use of σοῦ appears also in the LXX., but only in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, which Freudenthal is disposed to assign to Aquila (p. 65); cf. König, Einleitung, p. 108 n.
3 Aq. does not transliterate ΦΙΠΠΙ (see Burkitt, p. 14).
4 In a few Hexaplaric MSS. (e.g. Q, 86, 88, 243* 8, 264) the Greek letters ΠΠΠΙΙΙΙ are written for ὑποτιν, but the Greek MSS. use it solely in their excerpts from the non-Septuagintal columns of the Hexapla, and only the Hexaplaric Syriac admits ΠΠΠΙΙΙ into the text of the LXX., using it freely for κύριος, even with a preposition (as Κύριε). Ceriani expresses the
style are not due to an insufficient vocabulary is clear from his ready use of words belonging to the classical or the literary type when they appear to him to correspond to the Hebrew more closely than the colloquialisms of the LXX. The following are specimens: 1 Kings xxi. io LXX. ἐκπονήσει, Aq. ἐξαρ­κέσει; LXX. ἀλώτειν, Aq. λιχάσων; 12 LXX. σκηναί, Aq. συνταγμάτωσις; 2 Kings xxi. 21 LXX. διαθήκης, Aq. συνθήκης; 24 LXX. θεραφείν, Aq. μορφώματα; LXX. εἰδωλα, Aq. καθάρ­ματα; Ps. xc. 8 LXX. ἄνταπόδωσις, Aq. ἀπότισις; id. Io LXX. προσελεύσεται, Aq. μεταχθήσεται; LXX. μάστιξ, Aq. ἀφί; xci. 5 LXX. ποιήματι, Aq. κατέργα.

From the fragments which survive in the margins of hexaplaric MSS. it is possible to illustrate certain other characteristic features of Aquila which arise out of his extreme loyalty to the letter of his Hebrew text. (1) Jerome remarks upon his endeavour to represent even the etymological meaning of the Hebrew words (ad Pammach. ii “non solum verba sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est),” and by way of example he cites the rendering of Deut. vii. 13, where Aquila substituted χειμά, ὁπωρισμόν, στιλπνότητα for σῶτον, οἶνον, ἡλαυν in order to reflect more exactly the Hebrew ־־־־־־־־־־—as though, adds Jerome humorously, we were to use in Latin fusio, pomatio, splendentia. Similarly, opinion that the use of ΠΠΠΠΠ is due either to Origen or Eusebius, i.e. one of those fathers substituted ΠΠΠΠΠ for ־־־־־־־־־־ in the non-Septuagintal columns, using the letters to represent the Hebrew characters which were familiar to them. On the whole subject the student may consult Ceriani, Monumenta sacra et profana, ii. p. 106 ff.; Schleusner s. v. πιπτ-, Field, Hexapla ad Esa. i. 2; Hatch and Redpath, Concordance, p. 1135; Z. D. M. G. (1878), 501, 506. Mr Burkitt acutely points out (p. 16) that ־־־־־־־־־־(and doubtless also ΠΠΠΠΠ was read as Κύριος, since in one place in the Aquila fragments where there was no room to write the Hebrew characters “instead of οἶχος ־־־־־־־־־־ we find οἶχο κυ.”

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

2 See Mr Burkitt’s note (p. 26).
Aquila represented שָׁלֵם by ὀστεοῦν, and לִבְנָה by ἐνυστημονίζειν or ἑνυστημονοῦν, and even coined the impossible form ἀφημένος to correspond with שְׁלָם. (2) An attempt is made to represent Hebrew particles, even such as defy translation; thus ἡ local becomes the enclitic δε (e.g. νότονδε = δὲ, Gen. xii. 9, Κυρίνηδε = ἤδη, 2 Kings xvi. 9); and similarly prepositions are accumulated in a manner quite alien from Greek usage (e.g. εἰς δαπὸ μακρὸθεν = εἰς ὥραν, 2 Kings xix. 25).

(3) Other devices are adopted for the purpose of bringing the version into close conformity with the original; a word of complex meaning or form is represented by two Greek words (e.g. παρὰ is converted into τράγος ἀπολύμενος and κυρία into σκιὰ σκιὰ; a Hebrew word is replaced by a Greek word somewhat similar in sound, e.g. for לֶאֱךְ (Deut. xi. 30) Aquila gives αὐλῶν, and for בְּרֵא (1 Sam. xv. 23) θεραπεία.

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

1 The student who wishes to pursue the subject may refer to Field, Prolegg. p. xxii sqq., and Dr Taylor’s article Hexapla in D. C. B. iii. p. 17 ff. Jerome speaks more than once of a second edition of Aquila “quam Hebraei κατ’ ἀκριβείᾳ nominant.” The question is discussed by (prolegg. xxiv. ff.).
2 See Mr Burkitt’s article Aquila in the Jewish Quarterly Review, Jan. 1898, p. 211 ff.
Aquila possesses a value which arises from another consideration. His "high standard of exactitude and rigid consistency give his translation, with all its imperfections, unique worth for the critic." Its importance for the criticism of the Old Testament was fully recognised by the two greatest scholars of ancient Christendom, and there are few things more to be desired by the modern student of Scripture than the complete recovery of this monument of the text and methods of interpretation approved by the chief Jewish teachers of the generation which followed the close of the Apostolic age.

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

Epiph. de mens. et pond. 17 περὶ τὴν τοῦ δευτέρου Κομόδου βασιλείαν τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος μετὰ τῶν προειρημένων Κόμοδου Δούκιον Ἀύρλιον ἐτής ἵδ′, Θεοδοτίων τις Ποντικός ἀπὸ τῆς διαδοχῆς Μαρκίωνος τοῦ αρχάρχου τοῦ Σωσίπου, μηνιῶν καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ αὐτοῦ αἰρέσει καὶ εἰς Ἰουδασμὸν ἀποκλίνας καὶ περιτήρεις καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἐβραίων φωνὴν καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν στοιχεία παθευθεῖς, ἵδιως καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξεσθεκε. Hieron. ep. ad Augustin.: "hominis Judaei atque blasphemi";

1 Dr Taylor, pref. to Fragments of Aquila, p. vii.
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praef. in Job: "Iudaeus Aquila, et Symmachus et Theodotio Judaizantes haeretici"; de virr. ill. 54 "editiones...Aquilae...Pontici proselyti et Theodotionis Hebionaei"; praef. ad Daniel: "Theodotionem, qui utique post adventum Christi incredulus fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Hebionitam qui altero genere Iudaicus est."

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

---

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

2 See Field, Hexapla, p. xxxix.; Hatch, Essays, p. 215; Margoliouth, art. 'Job' in Smith's Bible Dict. (ed. 2).
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the LXX. version disappear in Theodotion. His practice with regard to apocryphal books or additional matter appears not to have been uniform; he followed the LXX. in accepting the additions to Daniel and the supplementary verses in Job\(^1\), and that the book of Baruch found place in his version appears from certain notes in the margin of the Syro-Hexaplar\(^2\); but there is no evidence that he admitted the non-canonical books in general.

8. Specimens of Theodotion's style and manner may be obtained from the large and important fragments of his work which were used by Origen to fill up the lacunae in Jeremiah (LXX.). The following passage, preserved in the margin of Codex Marchalianus, will serve as a specimen of his style and manner\(^3\).


14 Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, φησὶ Κύριος, καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸν λόγον μου τὸν ἁγαθὸν ὅν ἐλάλησα ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰουδα. 15 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνατέλει τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνατολὴν δικαίαν, ποὺ ἰὸν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν τῇ γῇ. 16 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις σωθήσεται ἦ Ἰουδαία καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθήκας καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα διαλέσει αὐτῇν Κύριος δικαιοσύνην ἡμῶν. 17 ὅτι τάδε λέγει Κύριος, ὡς ἐξολοθρευθήσεται τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀνήρ καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνον οἶκον Ἰσραήλ. 18 καὶ τοὺς ἐρευσὶ τοῖς Δευτέραις οὐκ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἄνήρ ἐκ προσώπου μου, ἀνάφερων ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θύμων θυσίαν. 19 καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίων πρὸς Ἰερεμίαν λέγων 20 Τάδε λέγει Κύριος καὶ διασκεδάστε τὴν διαθήκην μου τῷ ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν διαθήκην μου τὴν νύκτα, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῶν. 21 καὶ γέ για τὴ διαθήκη μου διασκεδασθήσεται μετὰ Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου, τοῦ μὴ

---

\(^{1}\) Orig. ep. ad Afric. 3.
\(^{2}\) See art. Theodotion in D. C. B. iv. 978.
\(^{3}\) O. T. in Greek, iii. pp. vii. ff., 320 f.
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eínaí aútoú víañt basileúontα épí tôn brónon aútoú, kai ἡ πρὸς
tous Deúitas tous iereíous tous leitourgouíntas mou. 22 wós ouk
exaríbhtísetai ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ὀὐρανοῦ, οὔτε ἐκμεταρθήσεται ἡ
ἀμμος τῆς βαλάσσης, οὔτως πληθυνώ τὸ σπέρμα Δαυίδ τοῦ
doúlου mou kai tous Deúitas tous leitourgouíntas mou. 23 kai
ἐγένετο λόγος Κύριον πρὸς Ἱερεύμαι λέγων 24 Ἀρά ἦν οὖν ἰδέας
τί ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐλάλησαν λέγοντες Αἱ δύο πατριαὶ ἀσ ἐξελέγατο
Κύριος ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀπώσατο αὐτοὺς; καὶ τὸν λαὸν mou
παρώξυναν τοῦ μὴ eínaí eti ἔθνος ἐνώπιον mou. 25 tāde lέgei
Κύριος Εἰ μὴ τήν διαθήκην mou ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, ἀκριβάσματα
οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, οὔκ ἔταξα, 26 kaiγε τὸ σπέρμα Ἰακώβ καὶ
Δαυίδ τοῦ δούλου mou ἄποδοκιμῶ, τοῦ μὴ λαβέων εκ τοῦ σπέρ-
ματος αὐτοῦ ἀρχοντα πρὸς τὸ σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ
Ἰακώβ· ὅτι ἐπιστρέψω τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω
αὐτοὺς. 1

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

1 Another considerable fragment of Theodotion may be found in Jer.
xlvi. (xxxix.) 4—13, see O. T. in Greek, p. 534 f.
2 Hexapla, prolegg. p. xxxix. "Theodotionis stylus simplex et gravis
est."
3 Cod. A employs ἀκριβάσματος in this sense (Jud. v. 15, 3 Regn. xi. 34,
4 Regn. xvii. 15), but under the influence of Theodotion, at least in the last
two passages; see Field ad loc.
Theodotion is more obscure than Aquila (τὴν διαθήκην τὴν ἡμέραν...τὴν νύκτα, Aq. τῆς ἡμέρας...τῆς νυκτὸς), yet the passage as a whole is a singularly clear and unaffected rendering. His chief defect does not reveal itself in this context; it is a habit of transliterating Hebrew words which could have presented no difficulty to a person moderately acquainted with both languages. Field gives a list of 90 words which are treated by Theodotion in this way without any apparent cause. When among these we find such a word as ἰασι (which is represented by ἱα in Mal. ii. 11), we are compelled to absolve him from the charge of incompetence, for, as has been pertinently asked, how could a man who was unacquainted with so ordinary a word or with its Greek equivalent have produced a version at all? Probably an explanation should be sought in the cautious and conservative temperament of this translator. Field's judgment is here sounder than Montfaucon's; Theodotion is not to be pronounced indocior, or indiligentior, but only "scrupulosior quam operis sui instituto fortasse conveniret."

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

3 Thus in Mal. i. c. he was perhaps unwilling to use θεός in connexion with the phrase ἦν ἴδιος.
4 Jerome on Dan. iv.: "Origenes in nono Stromatum volumine asserit se quae sequuntur ab hoc loco in propheta Daniele non iuxta LXX. interpretes...sed iuxta Theodotionis editionem disserere."
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non legunt, utentes Theodotionis editione”; cf. c. Rufin. ii. 33). Jerome did not know how this happened, but his own words supply a sufficient explanation: “hoc unum affirmare possum quod multum a veritate discordet et recto iudicio repudiata sit.” So universal was the rejection of the LXX. version of Daniel that, though Origen loyally gave it a place in his Hexapla, only one Greek copy has survived¹, Theodotion's version having been substituted in all other extant Greek MSS. of Daniel.

But the use of Theodotion's Daniel in preference to the version which was attributed to the LXX. did not begin with Origen. Clement of Alexandria (as edited) uses Theodotion, with a sprinkling of LXX. readings, in the few places where he quotes Daniel (paed. ii. 8, iii. 3, strom. i. 4. 21). In North Africa both versions seem to have influenced the Latin text of Daniel. The subject has been carefully investigated by Mr F. C. Burkitt⁵, who shews that Tertullian used “a form of the LXX. differing slightly from Origen's edition,” whilst Cyprian quotes from a mixed text, in which Theodotion sometimes predominates. Irenaeus, notwithstanding his reverence for the LXX. and distrust of the later versions, cites Daniel after Theodotion's version³. Further, Theodotion's Daniel appears to be used by writers anterior to the date usually assigned to this translator. Thus Hermas (vis. iv. 2. 4) has a clear reference to Theodotion's rendering of Dan. vi. 22⁴. Justin (dial. 31) gives a long extract from Dan. vii. in which characteristic readings from the two versions occur in almost equal proportions⁶. Clement of Rome (1 Cor. 34) cites a part of the same context,

¹ The Chigi MS. known as Cod. 87 (H. P. 88); see O. T. in Greek, iii. pp. vi., xii., and cf. the subscription printed ib. p. 574.
² Old Latin and Itala, p. 18 ff.
³ An exception in i. 19. 2 (Dan. xii. 9 f.) is due to a Marcosian source.
⁴ See Salmon, Intr. to the N. T. p. 639.
⁵ On the trustworthiness of Justin's text here see Burkitt, op. cit. p. 25 n. (against Hatch, Essays, p. 190).
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with a Theodotionic reading (ἐλευθοῦργων, LXX. ἐθεράπευνον). Barnabas (ἐφ. iv. 5) also refers to Dan. vii., and, though his citation is too loose to be pressed, the words ἐξαναστήσονται ὑπ' αὐτῶν are more likely to be a reminiscence of ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται (Th.) than of μετὰ τούτους στήσεται (LXX.). The Greek version of Baruch (i. 15—18, ii. 11—19) undoubtedly supports Theodotion against the LXX. Still more remarkable is the appearance of Theodotionic renderings in the New Testament. A writer so faithful to the LXX. as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in his only reference to Daniel (Heb. xi. 33 = Dan. vi. 23) agrees with Theodotion against the Chigi version. The Apocalypse, which makes frequent use of Daniel, supports Theodotion on the whole; cf. Apoc. ix. 20 (Dan. v. 23), x. 6 (Dan. xii. 7), xii. 7 (Dan. x. 20), xiii. 7 (Dan. vii. 21), xix. 6 (Dan. x. 6), xx. 4 (Dan. vii. 9), xx. 11 (Dan. ii. 35). Even in the Synoptic Gospels Theodotion's rendering in Dan. vii. 13 (μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν) occurs as well as the LXX. ἐπὶ τῶν ν.; comp. Mc. xiv. 62 with Mt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64.

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

1 Heb. l. c. ἐφαρμαί στόματα λεόντων (Dan. Th., ἐνεφαρμαί τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων: LXX., σέσωκέ με ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων).
2 The references are from Dr Salmon’s Intr. p. 548 f. He adds: “I actually find in the Apocalypse no clear evidence that St John had ever seen the so-called LXX. version.”
3 The N. T. occasionally inclines to Theodotion in citations which are not from Daniel; cf. Jo. xix. 37 (Zech. xii. 10), 1 Cor. xv. 54 (Is. xxv. 8); see Schürer, iii. p. 324, “entweder Th. selbst ist älter als die Apostel, oder es hat einen ‘Th.’ vor Th. gegeben.”
4 D. C. B. art. Theodotion iv. p. 970 ff. Dr Salmon (Intr. p. 547) is disposed to accept this view.
has been regarded as an indication that the Greek Esdras and the Chigi Daniel were the work of the same translator\(^1\). An obvious objection to the hypothesis of two Septuagintal or Alexandrian versions is the entire disappearance of the version which was used \textit{ex hypothesi} not only by the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, but by Theodotion and other writers of the second century. But Theodotion’s revision of Daniel may have differed so little from the stricter Alexandrian version as to have taken its place without remark\(^2\).

\textbf{10. Symmachus.} Of this translator Irenaeus says nothing, and it has been inferred, perhaps too hastily, that he was unknown to the Bishop of Lyons, and of later date. Origen knew and used Symmachus, and had received a copy of his commentary on St Matthew from a wealthy Christian woman named Juliana, to whom it had been given by the author. According to Eusebius, Symmachus was an Ebionite, and this is confirmed by Jerome; a less probable tradition in Epiphanius represents him as a Samaritan who had become a convert to Judaism\(^3\).

\begin{quote}
Eus. \textit{H. E.} vi. 17 τὸν γε μὴν ἐρμηνευτὸν αὐτῶν δὴ τούτων ἱστέον Ἐβισώναυν τὸν Σύμμαχον γεγονέναι...καὶ υπομνήματα δὲ τοῦ Σύμμαχου εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Μαθαῖον ἀποτελείνυμενος εὐαγγέλιον τὴν δειντωμένην αἵρεσιν κρατύνειν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ ὶφραγένης μετὰ καὶ ἄλλον εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἐρμηνεύον τοῦ Σύμμαχου σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τῶν εἰληφέναι, ἢν καὶ φησὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ Σύμμαχον τὰς βιβλίους διαδέχεσθαι. Hieron. \textit{de virr. ill.} 54 “Theodotionis Hebionaei et Symmachi eiusdem dogmatis” (cf. \textit{in Hab.} iii. 13); \textit{praef. in Job:} “Symmachus et Theodotion Judaizantes haeretici.” Epiph. \textit{de mens. et pond.} 15 ἐν τοῖς τῶν Σενήρου χρόνοις Σύμμαχος τὰς Σαμαρεῖτις τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῦ σοφῶν μὴ τιμῆθεις ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου ἔθνους...προσηλυτεῖ καὶ περιτέμνεται δευτέραν περιτομήν...οὕτως τοῖς ὁ Σύμμαχος πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν
\end{quote}


\(^2\) On the whole question of the date of Theodotion, see Schürer, \textit{G. J. V.} iii. 323 f., where the literature of the subject is given.

\(^3\) The name \textit{Σύμμαχος} occurs in the Talmud as that of a disciple of R. Meir, who flourished towards the end of the second or beginning of the third century. Geiger desires to identify our translator with this Symmachus; see Field, \textit{prolegg. ad Hex.} p. xxix.

S. S.
That Symmachus, even if of Jewish or Samaritan birth, became an Ebionite leader is scarcely doubtful, since an Ebionitic commentary on St Matthew bearing his name was still extant in the fourth century; the Symmachians, an Ebionite sect probably named after him, are mentioned by Ambrosiaster (comm. in Gal., prolegg.) and Augustine (c. Faust. xix. 4, c. Crescon. i. 36). His floruit is open to some question. Dr Gwynn has shewn that Epiphanius, who makes Theodotion follow Symmachus, probably placed Symmachus in the reign of Verus, i.e. Marcus Aurelius. Now in the Historia Lausiaca, c. 147, Palladius says that Juliana sheltered Origen during a persecution, i.e. probably during the persecution of the Emperor Maximus (A.D. 235—244). If this was so, the literary activity of Symmachus must have belonged, at the earliest, to the last years of M. Aurelius, and it may be questioned whether Epiphanius has not inverted the order of the two translators, i.e. whether Theodotion ought not to be placed under M. Aurelius and Symmachus under Commodus (A.D. 180—192). The version of Symmachus was in the hands of Origen when he wrote his earliest commentaries, i.e. about A.D. 228; but the interval is long enough to admit of its having reached Alexandria.

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

---

1 Euseb. l. c.
2 Philaстрius, who represents the Symmachiani as holding other views, says (c. 145): "sunt haeretici alii qui Theodotionis et Symmachi itidem interpretationem diverso modo expositam sequuntur." See Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Litt., i. i. p. 212.
4 The Gospel of Peter, which cannot be much later than A.D. 170, and may be fifteen or twenty years earlier, shews some verbal coincidences with Symmachus (Akhmim fragment, pp. xxxiv. 18, 20), but they are not decisive.
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a verbal rendering: “non solet verborum κακοζηλίαν sed inteligentiae ordinem sequi” (in Am. iii. 11). While Aquila endeavoured “verbum de verbo exprimere,” Symmachus made it his business “sensum potius sequi” (praef. in Chron. Eus., cf. praef. in Job). Epiphanius, who believed Symmachus to have been a Samaritan proselyte to Judaism, jumped to the conclusion that his purpose was polemical (πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἐρμηνεῖων ἐρμηνεύσας). But if Symmachus had any antagonist in view, it was probably the literalism and violation of the Greek idiom which made the work of Aquila unacceptable to non-Jewish readers. So far as we can judge from the fragments of his version which survive in Hexaplaric MSS., he wrote with Aquila’s version before him, and in his efforts to recast it made free use of both the LXX. and Theodotion. The following extracts will serve to illustrate this view of his relation to his predecessors.

MALACHI II. 13.

LXX.
καὶ ταύτα ἐ ἐμίσουν ἐποιεῖτε· ἐκαλύπτετε δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσιαστήριον Κυρίου καὶ κλαυθμῷ καὶ στεναγμῷ ἐκ κόπων. ἐτὶ ἄξιον ἐπιβλέψαε εἰς θυσίαν ἂ λαβεῖν δεκτὸν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;

TH.
καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον ἐποιήσατε· ἐκαλύπτετε δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσιαστήριον,
κλαίοντες καὶ στένοντες, ἄπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἑτὶ προσεγγίζοντα τὸ ὀλκαὐτῶμα καὶ λαβεῖν τέλειον ἐκ χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

AQ.
καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον ἐποιεῖτε· ἐκαλύπτετε δάκρυφ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κλαυθμῷ καὶ οἰμωγῇ, ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἑτὶ νεύσαι πρὸς τὸ δῶρον καὶ λαβεῖν εὐδοκίαν ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὑμῶν.

SYMM.
καὶ ταύτα δεύτερον ἐποιεῖτε, καλύπτοντες ἐν δάκρυσιν τὸ θυσιαστήριον,
κλαῖοντες καὶ οἰμώσοντες, ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἑτὶ νεύσαι πρὸς τὸ δῶρον καὶ δέξασθαι τὸ εὐδοκημένον ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὑμῶν.

1 The Hexaplaric renderings are from Cod. 86 (Cod. Barberinus): Field, Hexaplia, ii. p. 1033.
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But it must not be supposed that Symmachus is a mere reviser of earlier versions, or that he follows the lead of Aquila as Theodotion follows the LXX. Again and again he goes his own way in absolute independence of earlier versions, and sometimes at least, it must be confessed, of the original. This is due partly to his desire to produce a good Greek rendering, more or less after the current literary style; partly, as it seems, to dogmatic reasons. The following may serve as specimens of the Greek style of Symmachus when he breaks loose from the influence of his predecessors: Gen. xviii. 25 ὁ πάντα ἀνθρωπον ἀπαιτῶν δικαιοπραγεῖν, ἀκρίτως μὴ τουηηης τωτο; Job xxvi. 14 ὑ ψιθύρουμα τῶν λόγων αὐτῶν ἀκούσμεν, ὅπων βροντὴν δυναστείας αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ἐννοήσει; Ps. xlili. 16 ὁ δὲ θῆλης ἡμέρας ἡ ἀσχημόνης ἰς ἀντικρῶς μου, καὶ ὁ κατασχημωμὸς τοῦ προσώπου μου καλύττει με. Ps. lxvili. ἐβαπτίσθην εἰς ἀπέραντου καταδύσεις, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν στάσις. εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰ βάθη τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ ῥεῖθρον ἐπέκλυσέν με. Eccl. iv. 9 εἰσὶν ἰμείνους δύο ἐνός ἐχουσιν γὰρ κέρδος ἀγαθόν. Isa. xxi. 4 ὑπὸ γῆν ἐδαφισθήσεται ἡ λαλιὰ σου, καὶ ἔσται ὃς ἐγγαστρίμυθος ἡ φωνή σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ λαλιὰ σου ἱοίσεται.

It cannot be said that these renderings approach to excellence, but a comparison with the corresponding LXX. will shew that Symmachus has at least attempted to set himself free from the trammels of the Hebrew idiom and to clothe the thoughts of the Old Testament in the richer drapery of the Greek tongue. It is his custom to use compounds to represent ideas which in Hebrew can be expressed only by two or more words (e.g. יִפְרֹדֵּה, Symm. יִפָּרֹדֵּה, יִפְרֹדֵּה, Symm. ὀφθαλμοφανῶς, ἡμῖν σαντι, Symm. ἀκρογωνιῶς); he converts into a participle the first of two finite verbs connected by a copula (Exod. v. 7 ἀπερχόμενοι καλαμάσθωσαν, 4 Regn. i. 2 σφαλέντες ἐπεσον); he has at his command a large supply of Greek particles (e.g. he renders ἢ ἦ by ἢ ἦ, ὅντως, ἵσως, δι' ὅλου, μόνον, οὕτως, ἀλλ'
More interesting and important is the tendency which Symmachus manifests to soften the anthropomorphic expressions of the Old Testament; e.g. Gen. i. 27, ἐκτισεν ὁ θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρῳ. ὁ ἄρθρον ὁ θεός ἐκτισεν αὐτὸν. Exod. xxiv. 10, εἶδον ὁράματι τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ. Jud. ix. 13 τὸν οἶνον...τὴν εὐφροσύνην τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ps. xliii. 24 ἵνα τί ὦς ὑπνών εἶ, Δέσποτα; In these and other instances Symmachus seems to shew a knowledge of current Jewish exegesis which agrees with the story of his Jewish origin or training.


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

Eus. H. E. vi. 16 τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγητο τῷ Ὀριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκρισμένη ἔξτασις ὡς...καὶ τινας ἑτέρας παρὰ τὰς καθη-μαχευμένας ἐρμηνείας ἐναλλαττούσας,... ἐφευρέων, ὡς οὐκ οἷς ἄλλον ἐκ τινῶν μυχῶν τὸν πάλαι λανθανούσας χρόνον εἰς φῶς ἀνιχνεύσας

1 For other examples see Field, prolegg. p. xxvi. f.; D. C. B. iv. p. 19 f.
2 Reading, perhaps, בָּאֹלֶל אָלָיוֹת; cf. Nestle, Marginalien, p. 40 n.
3 See D. C. B. iii. p. 20.
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προήγαγεν...τίνος ἀρ' εἶνεν οὐκ εἰδός αὐτὸ τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐπεσημάνατο ὡς ἄρα τὴν μὲν εὐροὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ Νικόπολι...ἐπὶ μᾶς αὖθις συστημέναι ὡς ἐν ἤρειχοι εὐρημένης ἐν πίθῳ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ νιῶ Σεβήρου. Ἐπιφ. de mens. et pond. 18 μετὰ τὸν διωγμὸν τοῦ βασιλεῶς Σεβήρου ἡμέρθη ἡ πέμπτη ἐν πίθοις ἐν Ἱερίχῳ κεκρυμμένη ἐν χρόνοις τοῦ νιῶ Σεβήρου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Καράκαλλο τε καὶ Γέτα...ἐν τῷ ἔθνωμα αὐτοῦ ἦν ἡ πύρεθραν καὶ βιβλιοὺς τῆς πέμπτης ἐκδόσεως ἐν πίθοις ἐν Ἱερίχῳ κεκρυμμένης μετὰ ἄλλων βιβλίων Ἑβραίων καὶ Ἑλληνικῶν. τὸν δὲ Καράκαλλον διαδέχεται Ἀντωνίνος ἄτερο...μετὰ τούτων ἐβασιλεύσειν Ἀλέξανδρος,... ἦτη ἡ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν χρόνων τοιῶν ἡμέρα ἐκδοσις, καὶ αὐτή ἐν πίθοις κεκρυμμένη, ἐν Νικόπολει τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ. Pseudo-Ath. syn. sac. sact. 77 πέμπτη ἐρμηνεία ἐστὶν ἐν πίθοις εὐρεθεῖσα κεκρυμμένη ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίνου βασιλεῶς τοῦ Καράκαλλο ἐν Ἱερίχῳ παρὰ τίνος τῶν ἡ ἤρειχολομος σπουδαίων. ἐκτὸς ἐρμηνεία ἐστὶν ἐν πίθοις εὐρεθεῖσα, καὶ αὐτὴ κεκρυμμένη, ἐπὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τοῦ Μαμαίας παιδὸς ἐν Νικόπολει τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ ἐπὶ ὁριένεις ἀγαθοῖς. Hieron. de virr. ill. 54 "quintam et sextam et septimam editionem, quas etiam nos de eius bibliotheca habemus, miro labore repperit et cum ceteris editionibus comparavit": in ep. ad Tit. "nonnulli vero libri, et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versu compositi sunt, tres alias editiones additas habent quam 'quintam' et 'sextam' et 'septimam' translationem vocant, auctori-tatem sine nominibus interpretum consecutas." Cf. in Hab. ii. 11, iii. 13.

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

1 Jerome (prol. in Orig. exp. Cant.) confirms Eusebius.
2 The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila identifies Nicopolis with Emmaus Nicopolis in Palestine.
3 D. of Gk and Lat. Ant. p. 120 2. These πίθοι are said to have been sometimes used instead of cistae or capsae for preserving books.
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Origen was in Palestine A.D. 217, and in Greece A.D. 231, it is natural to connect his discoveries with those years. How long the versions had been buried cannot be determined, for it is impossible to attach any importance to the vague statements of Eusebius (τὸν πάλαι λανθανόσσας χρόνον). The version found at or near Nicopolis may have been a relic of the early Christianity of Epirus, to which there is an indirect allusion in the Pastoral Epistles. The Jericho find, on the other hand, was very possibly a Palestinian work, deposited in the wine jar for the sake of safety during the persecution of Septimius Severus, who was in Palestine A.D. 202, and issued edicts against both the Synagogue and the Church. Of Septima nothing is known, beyond what Eusebius tells us, and the very sparing use of it in the Psalter of some Hexaplaric MSS.; the few instances are so dubious that Field was disposed to conclude either that this version never existed, or that all traces of it have been lost.

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

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

---

1 Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 432.
2 Cf. Eus. H. E. vi. 7; Spartan. in Sev. 17.
3 Prolegg. ad Hexapla, p. xlvi. Ps.-Athanasius strangely calls Lucian the seventh version: ἔβδησεν πάλιν καὶ τελευταὶ ἐρμηνέα τοῦ ἄγιον Δουκιανοῦ.
4 According to Harnack-Preuschen (i. p. 340) the opposite is implied by Eusebius’ use of ἐμαλαττώσσας in reference to these versions: “d. h. die eine war nur für diese, die andere nur für jene Bücher vorhanden.”
but is said to be disposed to paraphrase; Field, while he regards that charge as on the whole 'not proven,' cites a remarkable example of the tendency from Ps. xxxvi. 35, which renders, Εἶδον ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἀναίδη ἀντιποιοῦμενον ἐν σκληρότητι καὶ λέγοντα Εἰμὶ ὃς αὐτόχθων περιπατῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Jerome\(^1\) attributes both versions to 'Jewish translators,' but the Christian origin of Sexta betray itself\(^2\) at Hab. iii. 13 ἔξηλθες τοῦ σώσαι τὸν λαὸν σου διὰ Ἡσοῦ τὸν χριστὸν σου\(^3\).

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

13. The 'GRAECUS VENETUS.' This is a version of the Pentateuch, together with the books of Ruth, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, and Daniel, preserved in St Mark's Library at Venice in a single MS. of cent. xiv.—xv. (cod. Gr. vii.)\(^5\). It was first given to the world by de Villoison (Strassburg, 1784) and C. F. Ammon (Erlangen, 1790—1); a new edition with valuable prolegomena by O. von Gebhardt appeared at Leipzig in 1875\(^6\). This translation has been made directly from the M. T., but the author appears to have occasionally availed himself of earlier Greek versions (LXX.,

---

\(^1\) adv. Rufin.

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

\(^3\) leg. forsi Τησοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ σου.
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Aq., Symm., Theod.)¹. His chief guide however appears to have been David Kimchi, whose interpretations are closely followed². That he was a Jew is clear from incidental renderings (e.g. in Exod. xxiii. 20 he translates ἡ φίλη τοῦ ὄντωτήν³, τοῦ ἐκεῖνοῦ). From the fact of his having undertaken a Greek version Gebhardt infers that he was a proselyte to Christianity, but the argument may be used to support an opposite conclusion; as a Jew he may have been moved by a desire to place before the dominant Orthodox Church a better rendering of the Old Testament than the LXX. Delitzsch wishes to identify him with Elissaeus, a Jewish scholar at the court of Murad I., who flourished in the second half of the 14th century.

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

Gen. vi. 2 f.

² τεθέανται γοῦν οἱ νεῖσς τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς ψυγατέρας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὗτοι καλαὶ ἑτέλουν, καὶ ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὄν εἶλοντο. ³ ἤφη τοῖς δὲ ὄντωτής οὗ κρινεῖ πνεῦμα τούμον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐς αἰώνα, ἐφ' οίς ἔτει πέρ ἐστὶ σάρξ· τελέσωσι δ' αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ἔκατον καὶ εἴκοσιν ἐτη.

Prov. viii. 22 ff.

²² ὁ ὄντωτής ἐκτίσατο με ἄρχην ὅδοι οἱ, πρὸ τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τότε. ²³ ἀπ' αἰῶνοι κέχυμαι, ἀπὸ κρατός, ἀπὸ προλήμματος γῆς. ²⁴ ἐν οὐκ ἄβυσσους πέπλασμα, ἐν οὐ πηγαῖς δεδοξασμένων ὑδάτων. ²⁵ πρὸν δὴ ἐμπαγῆμα, πρὸ τῶν βούνων ὦδίνημαι· ²⁶ ἄχρις οὐκ ἐποίησε γῆν, διόδους καὶ κεφαλῆν κόνεων τῆς οἰκουμένης.

Daniel vii. 13.

¹⁳ ὁ ὅραμν ἐκύρησα ἐν ὁράσεσιν εὐφρόνας, αὐτίκα τε ἐξ' ταῖς

¹ Gebhardt, p. lvii. ff.
² Ib. p. lxiii.
³ ὁντωτής, ὀντουργός, ὀνσωτής are his usual renderings of ἡ φίλη.
Later Greek Versions.

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

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

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

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

Origen was in his 17th year when his father suffered martyrdom (A.D. 202)\(^1\); at eighteen he was already head of the catechetical school of Alexandria\(^2\). The Old Testament from the first engaged his attention, and, rightly judging that it could not be fruitfully studied without a knowledge of the original, he applied himself at once to the study of Hebrew.

Eus. \(H. E.\) vi. 16 τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὀριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκρισμένη ἐξέτασις, ὅσ καὶ τὴν Ἒβραίδα γλώτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τάς τε παρὰ τοῖς λογικοῖς ἐμφερομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἕβραιῶν στοιχείων γραφὰς κτήμα ἰδίων ποιήσασθαι. Hieron. \(de\) virr. ill. 54 "qui autem ignorat quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studii ut etiam Hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret?\(^3\)"

The feat was perhaps without precedent, in the third century, among Christian scholars not of Jewish origin\(^4\); in one so

---

\(^1\) Eus. \(H. E.\) vi. 4.
\(^2\) Hieron. \(de\) virr. ill. 54.
\(^3\) Cf. \(ep.\) ad Paulam.
\(^4\) See \(D. C. B.\) art. \(Hebrew Learning\) (ii. p. 351 ff.).
young it seemed prodigious to a veteran like Jerome. These studies, begun in Egypt, were continued in Palestine at Caesarea, where Origen sought shelter during the storm of persecution which burst upon Alexandria in the reign of Caracalla (A.D. 216—219). On his return to Egypt Origen's period of literary productivity began, and between the years 220 and 250 he gave to the world a succession of commentaries, homilies, or notes on nearly all the books of the Old Testament. In the course of these labours, perhaps from the moment that he began to read the Old Testament in the original, he was impressed with the importance of providing the Church with materials for ascertaining the true text and meaning of the original. The method which he adopted is described by himself in his famous letter to Africanus (c. A.D. 240), and more fully in his commentary on St Matthew (c. A.D. 245).

Orig. ad Afric. 5: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ φημὶ οὐχὶ δικρύ τοῦ ἑρευνᾶν καὶ τὰς κατὰ Ἰουδαίους γραφὰς καὶ πᾶσας τὰς ἡμετέρας ταῖς ἑκείνων συγγράμματι καὶ ὅραν τὰς ἐν αὐταῖς διαφοράς, εἰ μὴ φορτικοῖ γοῦν εἰπεῖν, ἐπὶ πολὺ τοῦτο (ὅση δύναμις) πεποίηκαμεν, γυμνάζοντες αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκδόσεις καὶ ταῖς διαφοράσ αὐτῶν μετὰ τοῦ πόσου μᾶλλον ἀσκεῖν τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῶν ἐξονθηκοῦν... ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ’ ἑκείνοις, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλεγόμενοι μὴ προσφέρομεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συνεχισώμεθα τοῖς συρομένοις παρ’ ἑκείνοις, εἰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κεῖται βιβλίοις. In Mat. xv. 14: τὴν μὲν ὅπων ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφορίαν, θεοῦ διδόστος, εὑρομεν λάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεις τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς ὁ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορίαν, τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων, τὸ συμφόρον ἑκεῖναι ἐφυλάξαμεν· καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὀδηγήσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τολμῶντες αὐτὰ πάντα περιελείν, τινὰ δὲ μετ’ ἀπερίσκοις προσεθήκαμεν· ἵνα δηλοῦν ἢ ὅτι μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφόνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν, καὶ ὁ μὲν βουλομένος προῆται αὐτὰ· ὃ δὲ προσκόπτει το τοιοῦτον, ὃ βούλεται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν ἡ μὴ ποιήσῃ.

2 Cf. Bp Westcott in D. C. B. iv. p. 99: “it was during this period (i.e. before A.D. 215) in all probability that he formed and partly executed his plan of a comparative view of the LXX. in connexion with the other Greek versions.”
2. To attempt a new version was impracticable. It may be doubted whether Origen possessed the requisite knowledge of Hebrew; it is certain that he would have regarded the task as almost impious. Writing to Africanus he defends the apocryphal additions to Daniel and other Septuagintal departures from the Hebrew text on the ground that the Alexandrian Bible had received the sanction of the Church, and that to reject its testimony would be to revolutionise her canon of the Old Testament, and to play into the hands of her Jewish adversaries (ἀθετεῖν τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερόμενα ἀντίγραφα καὶ νομοθετήσαι τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἀποθέσαι μὲν τὰς παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένας βιβλίους, κολακεύειν δὲ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ πείθειν ἵνα μεταδῶσων ἥμιν τῶν καθαρῶν). In this matter it was well, he urged, to bear in mind the precept of Prov. xxii. 28, “Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.” The same reasons prevented him from adopting any of the other versions in place of the Septuagint. On the other hand, Origen held that Christians must be taught frankly to recognise the divergences between the LXX. and the current Hebrew text, and the superiority of Aquila and the other later versions, in so far as they were more faithful to the original; it was unfair to the Jew to quote against him passages from the LXX. which were wanting in his own Bible, and injurious to the Church herself to withhold from her anything in the Hebrew Bible which the LXX. did not represent. Acting under these convictions Origen’s first step was to collect all existing Greek versions of the Old Testament. He then proceeded to transcribe the versions in parallel columns, and to indicate in the column devoted to the Septuagint the relation in which the old Alexandrian version stood to the current Hebrew text.

3. The following specimen, taken from a fragment lately discovered at Milan, will assist the reader to understand the arrangement of the columns, and to realise the general appearance of the Hexapla.
Ps. xlv. (xlvi.) 1—3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEBREW</th>
<th>HEB. TRANSLITERATED</th>
<th>AQUILA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלמהשנה</td>
<td>λαμανασση</td>
<td>τῷ νικοποιῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לבני קרה</td>
<td>Λαβνηκαρ</td>
<td>τῶν νιὼν Καρέ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על טלחוח</td>
<td>αλ. αλμωθ</td>
<td>ἐπὶ νεανιστήτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שיר</td>
<td>σιρ</td>
<td>ἥσμα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אלוהים לו</td>
<td>ελωειμ. λανον*</td>
<td>[ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν (?)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ממעוש וע</td>
<td>μασε. ουοζ</td>
<td>ἄλης καὶ κράτος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ועמה</td>
<td>εξρ</td>
<td>βοηθεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בצרית</td>
<td>βσαρωθ</td>
<td>ἐν θλίψεσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נמצע מארד</td>
<td>νεμσα μωδ</td>
<td>ἐὑρέθη* σφόδρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על בון</td>
<td>αλ. χεν</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τούτῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לא נורה</td>
<td>λω. νυρα</td>
<td>οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בחרור</td>
<td>βααμιρ</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר</td>
<td>ααρσ</td>
<td>γῆν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בכמה</td>
<td>ουβαμωτ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῷ σφάλλεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התים</td>
<td>αρμ</td>
<td>ὧρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בל</td>
<td>βλεβ</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יסוע</td>
<td>ιαμιμ</td>
<td>θαλασσών.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* MS. ἐὑρέθης.

Ps. xlv. (xlvi.) 1—3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmachus</th>
<th>LXX.</th>
<th>Theodotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπινίκιος</td>
<td>εἰς τὸ τέλος*</td>
<td>τῷ νικοποιῇ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν νῦν Κόρε</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν νῦν* Κόρε</td>
<td>τοῖς νῦν Κόρε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰωνίων</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων ψαλμός.</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων ψαλμός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ωθή.</td>
<td>ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν †</td>
<td>ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν θλίψεσιν</td>
<td>καταφυγῇ καὶ δύναμις,</td>
<td>καταφυγῇ καὶ δύναμις,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐρυσκόμενος σφόδρα.</td>
<td>βοηθὸς</td>
<td>βοηθὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο</td>
<td>ἐν θλίψεσι</td>
<td>ἐν θλίψεσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
<td>ταῖς εὐρούςαι ἡμᾶς ‡</td>
<td>εὐρέθη † σφόδρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ* συγχείσθαι</td>
<td>σφόδρα.</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆν</td>
<td></td>
<td>οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ κλίνεσθαι</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀρη</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>τὴν γῆν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
<td>καὶ μετατίθεσθαι</td>
<td>καὶ σαλεύσθαι ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαλασσῶν.</td>
<td>ὀρῆ</td>
<td>ὀρῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* MS. ταῖς.</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
<td>ἐν καρδίᾳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* With interlinear variant τοῖς νῦν.
† MS. ἡμῶν.
‡ With interlinear variant εὐρεθήσεται ἡμῶν.

* With marginal variants, εἰς τὸ τέλος, ψαλμός.
† With interlinear variant ταῖς εὐρούςαι ἡμᾶς.
‡ With interlinear variant μετατίθεσθαι.
The process as a whole is minutely described by Eusebius and Jerome, who had seen the work, and by Epiphanius, whose account is still more explicit but less trustworthy.

Eus. H. E. vi. 16: ταύτας δὲ ἀπάσας [SC. τὰς ἐκδόσεις] ἐπὶ ταύτων συναγαγὼν διελὼν τε πρὸς κάλον καὶ ἀντιπαραθεὶς ἄλληλαις μετὰ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑβραίων σημειώσεως τὰ τῶν λεγομένων Ἑξαπλῶν ἡμῖν ἀντίγραφα καταλέγοντες, ἰδίως τὴν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίων ἐκδοσίν ἀμα τῇ τῶν ἐβδομηκοντα εν τοῖς Τετραπλοῖς ἐπικατασκευάσας. Hieron. in ep. ad Tit.: "ο”: ὀμνες vετερις λεγις λιβρος quos vir doctus Adamantius in Hexapla digesserat de Caesariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenticis emendare, in quibus et ipsa Hebraea propriis sunt characteribus verba descripta et Graecis literis tramite expressa vicio; Ἁκιλα ἐτιαμ et Symmachus, LXX. quoque et Theodotio suam ordinem tenent; nonnulli vero libri et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versus compositi sunt tres alias editiones additas habuit." Cf. his letter to Sunnias and Fretela (ep. 106) and to Augustine (ep. 112) and the preface to the Book of Chronicles. Epiph. de mens. et pond. 7: τὰς γὰρ ἐξ ἑρμηνείας καὶ τὴν Ἑβραίων γραφὴν Ἑβραίκοις στοιχείοις καὶ ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς ἐν σελίδι1 μα συντεθεῖκά, ἄλλην σελίδα ἀντιπαράθεσθον δὲ Ἑλληνικῶν μὲν γραμμάτων Ἑβραίκων δὲ λέξεων πρὸς κατάληγιν τῶν μὴ εἰδότων Ἑβραίκα στοιχεῖα...καὶ οὕτως τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἑξαπλῶς ἡ ὁκταπλοῖς τὰς μὲν δύο Ἑβραίκας σελίδας καὶ τὰς ἐξ ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκ παραλλήλου ἀντιπαραθεῖς μεγάλην ὁφέλειαν γρώσεως ἐδωκέ τοῖς φιλοκάλοις. Ἰο. 19 τὰς δύο Ἑβραίκας πρώτας κειμένας, μετὰ ταύτας δὲ τὴν τοῦ Ἀκύλα τεταγμένην, μεθ’ ἡν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Συμμάχου, ἐπείτα τὴν τῶν ὀβ’, μεθ’ ἀς ἡ τοῦ Θεοδοτίωνος συντετάκτα, καὶ ἐξής η πέμπτη τε καὶ ἐκτη2.

It will be seen that the specimen corroborates ancient testimony in reference to the relative order of the four Greek versions (Aq., Symm., Lxx., Theod.), and illustrates the method of division into corresponding κόλα3 which made comparison easy. With regard to the order, it is clear that Origen did not mean it to be chronological. Epiphanius seeks to account for the position of the Lxx. in the fifth column by the not less

---

2 See also ib. 18 sq.; Hieron. Praef. in Paral., and in ep. ad Tit., c. iii.
3 Used here loosely as =κόμματα, the κόλον being properly a line consisting of a complete clause, and of 8—17 syllables: cf. E. M. Thompson, Gk and Lat. Palaeography, p. 81 f.; J. R. Harris, Stichometry, p. 23 f.
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untenable hypothesis that Origen regarded the LXX. as the standard of accuracy (de mens. et pond. 19: Ὅριγένης πυθόμενος τὴν τῶν οὐ̄ έκδοσιν ἀκριβὴ εἶναι μέσην ταύτην συνέθηκεν, ὅπως τὰς ἐντεύθεν καὶ ἐντεύθεν ἐρμηνείας διελέγχῃ). As we have learned from Origen himself, the fact was the reverse; the other Greek versions were intended to check and correct the LXX. But the remark, though futile in itself, suggests a probable explanation. Aquila is placed next to the Hebrew text because his translation is the most verbally exact, and Symmachus and Theodotion follow Aquila and the LXX. respectively, because Symmachus on the whole is a revision of Aquila, and Theodotion of the LXX. As to the κώλα, it was of course necessary that the lines should be as short as possible when six or more columns had to be presented on each opening; and it will be seen that in the Psalms at least not more than two Hebrew words were included in a line, the corresponding Greek words being at the most three or four. But the claims of the sense are not neglected; indeed it will appear upon inspection that the method adopted serves in a remarkable degree to accentuate the successive steps in the movement of the thought.

4. Besides the Hexapla, Origen compiled a Tetrapla, i.e. a minor edition from which he omitted the first two columns containing the Hebrew text in Hebrew and Greek characters; cf. Eus. l.c. ἰδίως τὴν Ἁκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοσίων έκδοσιν άμα τῆ τῶν ο’ ἐν τοῖς τετραπλοῖς ἐπικατασκευάσας. Epiph. de mens. et pond. 19 τετραπλά γάρ εἰσι τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ ὅταν αἱ τοὺ Ἁκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ τῶν ος καὶ Θεοδοσίων ἐρμηνεῖαι συντεταγμέναι ὅσι. The Tetrapla is occasionally mentioned along with the Hexapla in scholia attached to MSS. of the LXX. Thus in the

1 Ἐπικατασκευάζειν is insuper vel posteas concinnare (Field, proleg. p. xii.); cf. Dio Cass. l. 23 τα σέφη πατεσκεύασε...καὶ ἐν ταύτα πύργους ἐπικατασκεύασε. Oeconomus (iv. 873), who regards the Tetrapla as the earlier work, understands Eusebius to mean only that Origen added to the LXX. the three columns containing ΑΣΘ'.

S. S. 5
Syro-Hexaplaric version at the end of Joshua it is stated that the Greek codex on which the version was based had the note: γράφε ἐκ τοῦ ἔξαπλον, ἐξ ὑπὲρερεθύν ἀντεβλήθη δὲ καὶ πρὸς τῶν τετραπλοῖν. Cod. Q still contains two similar references to the Tetrapla (O. T. in Greek, iii., p. viii., notes).

Mention is also made in the MSS. of an Octapla (cf. the Syro-Hexaplar in Job v. 23, vi. 28, and the Hexaplaric MSS. of the Psalter in Ps. lxxv. 1, lxxxvi. 5, lxxxviii. 43, cxxxi. 4, cxxxvi. 1). The question arises whether the Octapla was a distinct work, or merely another name for the Hexapla in books where the columns were increased to eight by the addition of the Quinta and Sexta. Eusebius appears to support the latter view, for he speaks of the Hexapla of the Psalms as including the Quinta and Sexta (H. E. vi. 16 ἐν γῇ μὴν τοῖς ἔξαπλοῖς τῶν Ψαλμῶν μετὰ τάς ἐπιστήμους τέσσαρας ἔκδοσις οὐ μόνον πέμπτην ἄλλα καὶ ἐκτὴν καὶ ἐβδόμην παραθεῖς ἐρμηνείαν). Epiphanius, on the other hand, seems to limit the Hexapla to the six columns (ἵ. c. τῶν τεσσάρων δὲ τούτων σελίδων ταῖς δυσὶ ταῖς Ἑβραίαις συναφθειῶν ἔξαπλά καλεῖται ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἡ πέμπτη καὶ ἡ ἐκτὴ ἐρμηνεία συναφθῶσιν...ὀκταπλά καλεῖται. But it has been observed that when the scholia in Hexaplaric MSS. mention the Octapla they are silent as to the Hexapla, although the Octapla and the Tetrapla are mentioned together; e.g. in Ps. lxxxvi. 5 we find the following note: ΜΗΤΗΡ ΣΙΩΝ τῷ ἤ κατὰ προσθήκην ἔκειτο εἰς τήν τῶν ὅ ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ (the Tetrapla), ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀκτάσελίδῳ (the Octapla), ΜΗ ΣΙΩΝ ηγοῦν δίχα τοῦ ρ. The inference is that the name ‘Octapla’ sometimes superseded that of ‘Hexapla’ in the Psalms, because in the Psalter of the Hexapla there were two additional columns which received the Quinta and Sexta. Similarly the term ‘Heptapla’ was occasionally used in reference to portions of the Hexapla where a seventh column appeared, but not an eighth².

¹ Field, Hexapla, ii. ad loc.; cf. Hieron. in Psalms (ed. Morin.), p. 66.
² It occurs (e.g.) in the Hexaplaric Syriac at 2 Kings xvi. 2.
'Pentapla' is cited by J. Curterius from cod. Q at Isa. iii. 24, but Field's suspicion that Curterius had read his MS. incorrectly is confirmed by a reference to the photograph, which exhibits ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ. Origen's work, then, existed (as Eusebius' implies) in two forms: (1) the Hexapla, which contained, as a rule, six columns, but sometimes seven or eight, when it was more accurately denominated the Heptapla or Octapla; and (2) the Tetrapla, which contained only four columns answering to the four great Greek versions, excluding the Hebrew and Greek-Hebrew texts on the one hand, and the *Quinta* and *Sexta* on the other.

5. The Hebrew text of the Hexapla was of course that which was current among Origen's Jewish teachers in the third century, and which he took to be truly representative of the original. Portions of the second column, which have been preserved, are of interest as shewing the pronunciation of the Hebrew consonants and the vocalisation which was then in use. From the specimen already given it will be seen that כ = χ, פ = κ, and ד, נ, ו = ι, and that י מ נ נ are without equivalent.

The divergences of the vocalisation from that which is represented by the pointing of the M. T. are more important; see Dr Taylor's remarks in *D. C. B.* iii. p. 15 f.

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

---

1 Cf. the practice of Aquila (Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings acc. to Aquila*, p. 14).
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convinced him that this was impracticable. Let us suppose that there lay before him an Alexandrian or Palestinian MS., containing the 'common' text of the LXX. (ἡ κοινή, or vulgata editio, as Jerome calls it), i.e. the text of the Greek Bible as it was read by the Church of the third century. As the transcription proceeded, it would be seen that every column of the Greek contained clauses which were not in the Hebrew, and omitted clauses which the Hebrew contained. Further, in many places the order of the Greek would be found to depart from that of the Hebrew, the divergence being sometimes limited to a clause or a verse or two, but occasionally extending to several chapters. Lastly, in innumerable places the LXX. would be seen to yield a sense more or less at variance with the current Hebrew, either through misapprehension on the part of the translators or through a difference in the underlying text. These causes combined to render the coordination of the Alexandrian Greek with the existing Hebrew text a task of no ordinary difficulty, and the solution to which Origen was led appeared to him to be little short of an inspiration (θεοῦ δεδόντος εὐρομέν).

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

1 Ep. ad Sunn. et Fret.
2 See Driver, Samuel, p. xlvi.: "he assumed that the original Septuagint was that which agreed most closely with the Hebrew text as he knew it...a step in the wrong direction."
Hebrew. In this manner whole sections changed places in the LXX. text of Exodus, 1 Kings, and Jeremiah; in Proverbs only, for some reason not easy to determine, the two texts were allowed to follow their respective courses, and the divergence of the Greek order from the Hebrew was indicated by certain marks prefixed to the stichoi of the LXX. column. 

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

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

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

---

1 A combination of the asterisk and obelus; see below, p. 71.
2 E.g. at Exod. vi. 16, Τηςσών was substituted by Origen for Γεδσών. Whether his practice in this respect was uniform has not been definitely ascertained.
3 Hieron. Praef. ad Chron.: "quod maioris audaciae est, in editione LXX. Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus ante fuerant, et virgulis quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita." The Book of Job offered the largest field for interpolation: a scholion in cod. 161 says, Ἦβα στίχοι ἀχ' χωρίς ἀστερίσκων, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἀστερίσκων Β."
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222—205), and they appear to have been first employed in connexion with his great edition of Homer¹. Origen selected two of these signs known as the obelus and the asterisk, and adapted them to the use of his edition of the Septuagint. In the Homeric poems, as edited by Aristarchus, the obelus marked passages which the critic wished to censure, while the asterisk was affixed to those which seemed to him to be worthy of special attention; cf. the anecdoton printed by Gardthausen: ὁ δὲ ὁβελός πρὸς τὰ ἄθετομένα ἐπὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἡγοῦν νενοθεμένα ἢ ὑποβεβλημένα: ὁ δὲ ἀστερίσκος...ὡς καλῶν εἰρημένων τῶν ἐπόν. Similarly, in connexion with Platonic dicta, Diogenes Laertius (Platon. iii. 657) used the obelus πρὸς τὴν ἄθετην and the asterisk πρὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων. As employed by Origen in the fifth column of the Hexapla, the obelus was prefixed to words or lines which were wanting in the Hebrew, and therefore, from Origen's point of view, of doubtful authority², whilst the asterisk called attention to words or lines wanting in the LXX., but present in the Hebrew. The close of the context to which the obelus or asterisk was intended to apply was marked by another sign known as the metobelus. When the passage exceeded the length of a single line, the asterisk or obelus was repeated at the beginning of each subsequent line until the metobelus was reached.

Epiph. de mens. et pond. 2, 3 ὁ ἀστερίσκος...σημαίνει τὸ ἐμφερόμενον ῥῆμα ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ κείσθαι...οἱ δὲ οἶβ ἐρμηνευταὶ παρῆκαν καὶ οὐχ ἠρμηνευκαν...ὁβελὸς δὲ...παρετίθη...ταῖς τῆς θείας γραφῆς λέξεων ταῖς παρὰ τοῖς οἶβ ἐρμηνευταῖς κειμέναι, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς περὶ Ἀκίλλαν καὶ Σύμμαχον μὴ ἐμφερομέναι. Schol. ap. Tisch. not. ed. cod. Sin. p. 76 οὖσιν οἱ ὁβελοὶ πρόσκευσαν ῥητοῖς, οὕτως οὐκ ἔκειστο οὐτε παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνεύταῖς οὕτε ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μόνος τοῖς ο’...καὶ οὕσι τοῖς ἀστερισκοῖς πρόσκευσαν ῥητοῖς, οὕτως οὐκ ἐν μὲν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνεύταις ἐφέροντο, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ο’ οὐκέτι.

¹ See a complete list of these in Gardthausen, Griech. Paläographie, p. 288 f.
² On an exceptional case in which he obelised words which stood in the Hebrew text, see Cornill, Ezekiel, p. 386.
Occasionally Origen used asterisk and obelus together, as Aristarchus had done, to denote that the order of the Greek was at fault (anecd. ap. Gardthausen: ὁ δὲ ἀστερίσκος μετὰ ὀβέλου, ὡς ὅντα μὲν τὰ ἔτη τοῦ τουητοῦ, μὴ καλῶς δὲ κείμενα; schol. ap. Tisch. not. ed. Sin. l. c. φέρονται μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ο', φέρονται δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἐβραικῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐρμηνευταῖς, τὴν θέσιν δὲ μόνην παραλλάσσονσιν οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ τὸ Ἐβραικὸν παρὰ τοὺς ο'. ὃθεν ὀβέλισται ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ ἰστέρωσται, ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς: also ap. mon. sacr. ined. iii. p. xvii. τὰ δὲ ἰστερημένα ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ ὀβελισμένα ἱπτά...ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς). The Aristarchian (or as they are usually called by students of the Old Testament, the Hexaplaric) signs are also used by Origen when he attempts to place before the reader of his ἸΣΧ column an exact version of the Hebrew without displacing the ἸΣΧ rendering. Where the ἸΣΧ and the current Hebrew are hopelessly at issue, he occasionally gives two versions, that of one of the later translators distinguished by an asterisk, and that of the ἸΣΧ under an obelus.

The form of the asterisk, obelus, and metobelus varies slightly. The first consists of the letter χ, usually surrounded by four dots (⋆, the χὶ περιπετευμένων); the form ⋆ occurs but seldom, and only, as it seems, in the Syro-Hexaplar. The ὀβέλος, 'spit' or 'spear,' is represented in Epiphanius by ⋆, but in the MSS. of the ἸΣΧ a horizontal straight line (—)¹ has taken the place of the original form, with or without occupying dot or dots (— —); the form — was known as a lemniscus, and the form — as a hypolemniscus. Epiphanius indeed (op. cit., c. 8) fancies that each dot represents a pair of translators, so that the lemniscus means that the word or clause which the ἸΣΧ adds to the Hebrew had the support of two out of the thirty-six pairs which composed the whole body, whilst the hypolemniscus

¹ This sometimes becomes a hook (ʃ).
claims for it the support of only one pair. This explanation, it is scarcely necessary to say, is as baseless as the fiction of the cells on which, in the later Epiphanean form, it rests. Other attempts to assign distinct values to the various forms of the obelus have been shewn by Field to be untenable. The metobelus is usually represented by two dots arranged perpendicularly (:), like a colon; other forms are a sloping line with a dot before it or on either side (/., ·/.,), and in the Syro-Hexaplar and other Syriac versions a mallet (\[\mathbf{\chi}\]). The latter form, as the least ambiguous, is used in Field's great edition of the Hexapla, and in the apparatus which is printed under the text of the LXX. version of Daniel in the Cambridge manual Septuagint.

Certain other signs found in Hexaplaric MSS. are mentioned in the following scholion (Ενθηρίου σχ., one of the σχόλια εἰς τὰς παραμύσις printed in the Notitia ed. cod. Sin., p. 76, from a Patmos MS.; see Robinson, Philocalia, pp. xiii., xvii. ff.): εἰσὶν ὅσα προτεσταγμένον ἔχουσί τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ὅτε· ὅσα Ὁρμηγένην ἐπιγεγραμμένου ἦσε τοῦτο τῷ μονοσυλλάβῳ, φ...ὅσα δὲ περὶ διαφωνίας ῥητῶν τινῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐδαφίῳ ἐκδοσεῖσι ἔστω σχόλια, ἀπερ καὶ κἀτῳ νευκυίαν περιεστιγμένην ἦσε προτεσταγμένην, τῶν ἀντιβεβληκτόντων τὸ βιβλίον ἔστιν· ὅσα δὲ ἀμφιβόλως ἔσον ἀνεμαι ὁ μὴ ἔσο νευκυίαν περιεστιγμένην ἦσε προτεσταγμένην, διὰ τὰ σχόλια προστέθησαν καὶ ἀλήτω τούτῳ μεγάλῳ εἰρηκτῷ διδασκαλίᾳ, ἵνα μὴ δοξῇ κατὰ κενὸ τὸ σχόλιον φέρεσθαι, ἐν τολμώσ μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶν ῥητῶν οὕτως ἔχοντων, ἐν τούτῳ δὲ μὴ οὕτως κειμένων ἡ μὴ δ' ὅλως φερομένων, καὶ διὰ τούτο προστεθέντων.

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

1 Prolegg. p. lix. sq.
2 The vertical bars denote, of course, the length of the lines of Cod. G. The lines of the LXX. column of the Hexapla, if we may judge by the specimen (p. 62 f.), varied in length according to the sense.
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Joshua xi. 10–14 (Cod. Sarravianus).

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

Eusebius in a well-known passage describes the costly and laborious process by which Origen’s commentaries on Scripture were given to the world: 

H. E. vi. 23 ταχυγράφοι γὰρ αὐτῷ πλείους ἦ ἑπά τὸν ἄριθμον παρήσαν ὑπαγορεύοντι, χρόνου τεταγμένοις ἀλλήλους ἀμείβοντες, βιβλιογράφοι τε ὅχι ἦπτος ἄμα καὶ κόραι ἐπὶ τὸ καλλιγράφειν ἠσκήμενοι. ὦν ἀπάντων τῇ δεύοντος τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἀφθονίας περιουσίαν ὦ Ἀβραὰμ παρεστήσατο. Two of these classes of workers, the βιβλιογράφοι and καλλιγράφοι (cf. Gardthausen, Gr. Palaeographie, p. 297), must have found ample employment in the preparation of the Hexapla. The material used was possibly papyrus. Although there are extant fragments of writing on vellum which may be attributed to the second century, “there is every reason to suppose that to the end of the third century papyrus held its own, at any rate in Egypt, as the

1 See the confused and inexact statement of Epiphanius, de mens. et pond. 18.
material on which literary works were written" (Kenyon, *Palaeography of Gk. papyri*, p. 113 f.; on the size of existing papyrus rolls, see p. 16 ff.). This view receives some confirmation from Jerome's statement (ep. 141) that Acacius and Evagrius endeavoured to replace with copies on parchment some of the books in the library at Caesarea which were in a damaged condition ("bibliothecam...ex parte corruptam...in membranis instaurare conati sunt")\(^1\). According to Tischendorf (*prolegg. in cod. Frid. Aug.* § 1) cod. \(\alpha\) was written on skins of antelopes, each of which supplied only two leaves of the MS. The Hexapla, if copied in so costly a way, would have taxed the resources even of Origen's generous \(\epsilonργοδιώκτης\).

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

\(^1\) See Birt, *das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 100, 107 ff.
fuerat emendatum”; in ep. ad Tit.: “nobis curae fuit omnes veteris legis libros quos v. d. Adamantius in Hexapla digeserat de Caesariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authentici­cis emendare.” There also they were consulted by the writers and owners of Biblical MSS.; compare the interesting note attached by a hand of the seventh century to the book of Esther in cod. ν: ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιότατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδομένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος Παμφίλου πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιότατον βιβλίον...ὑποσημείωσις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως. Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ ἔξαπλα ὁ Ρηγενόγς ἔτη ἀγίν᾽ διορθωμένα (O. T. in Greek, ii. p. 780); and the notes prefixed to Isaiah and Ezekiel in Cod. Marchalianus (Q); the second of these notes claims that the copy from which Ezekiel was transcribed bore the subscription Τάγα μετελήμφθη ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐκδόσεις ἐξαπλῶν, καὶ διορθώθη ἀπὸ τῶν ὁ Ρηγενόγς ἔτη τετραπλῶν ἡ ἄτινα καὶ ἀγίν᾽ χειρὶ διορθωτο καὶ ἐκκολογράφητο (ib. iii. p. viii.). The library of Pamphilus was in existence in the 6th century, for Montfauccon (biblioth. Coisl. p. 262) quotes from Coisl. 202, a MS. of that century, a colophon which runs: ἀντεβλήθη δὲ η βίβλος πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καισαρίᾳ ἀντίγραφον τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἀγίου Παμφίλου χειρὶ γεγραμμένον αὐτοῦ. But in 638 Caesarea fell into the hands of the Saracens, and from that time the Library was heard of no more. Even if not destroyed at the moment, it is probable that every vestige of the collection perished during the vicissitudes through which the town passed between the 7th century and the 12th. Had the Hexapla been buried in Egypt, she might have preserved it in her sands; it can scarcely be hoped that the sea-washed and storm-beaten ruins of Kaisariyeh cover a single leaf.

1 See also the note at the end of the Scholia on Proverbs printed in the Notitiae l.c.: μετελήφθησαν ἄφ᾽ ὧν εὑρομεν, καὶ πάλιν αὐτὰ χειρὶ Πάμφιλος καὶ Ἐσσέβιος διορθώσαντο.

2 Ἡραδων, Gregory, p. 140, Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 183 f.

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

8. If the Hexapla as a whole was too vast to be copied, and copies even of particular books were rarely if ever attempted, yet there was nothing to forbid the separate publication of the fifth column, which contained the revised Septuagint. This idea presented itself to Pamphilus and his friend Eusebius, and the result was the wide circulation in Palestine during the fourth century of the Hexaplaric LXX., detached from the Hebrew text and the other Greek versions, but retaining, more or less exactly, the corrections and additions adopted by Origen with the accompanying Hexaplaric signs. "Provinciae Palestine," writes Jerome in his preface to Chronicles, "codices legunt quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebiius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt." Elsewhere he warns his correspondents "aliam esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebiius omnesque Graeciae tractatores kouyv (id est communem) appellant atque vulgatam... aliam LXX. interpretum quae in ἔκαπλος codicibus reperitur... et Ierosoly-
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mae atque in orientis ecclesia decantatur.” The Hexaplaric text receives his unhesitating support: “ea autem quae habetur in ἔκαπλοῖς...ipsa est quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata LXX. interpretum translatio reservatur.”

This edition, sometimes described as τὸ Ἐυσέβιον or τὸ Παλαιστῖναῖον, or simply 'Ὡρ[ɐγένης], is mentioned with great respect in the scholia of MSS. which do not on the whole follow its text. Specimens of such notes have already been given; they usually quote the words in which Pamphilus describes the part borne by himself and his friends respectively in the production of the book. Thus a note quoted by an early hand in cod. x at the end of 2 Esdras says, Ἀντωνῖνος ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διόρθωσα. The subscription to Esther ends Ἀντωνῖνος ὑμολογητῆς ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διορθώσατο [τῷ] τεῦχος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. The scholion prefixed to Ezekiel in Q introduces the name of Eusebius, assigning him another function: Εὐσέβιος ἐγὼ τὰ σχόλια παρέβηκα. Πάμφιλος καὶ Εὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο. In its subscription to 1 Kings the Syro-Hexaplar quotes a note which runs: Εὐσέβιος διορθωσάμην ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἱδνάμην. It would seem as though the work of comparing the copy with the original was committed to the otherwise unknown Antoninus, whilst the more responsible task of making corrections was reserved for Pamphilus and Eusebius². Part of the work at least was done while Pamphilus lay in prison, i.e. between A.D. 307 and 309, but it was probably continued and completed by Eusebius after the martyr’s death.

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

---

1 Adv. Rufin. ii. 27.
2 On ἀντιβάλλειν and διορθοδοθαι, see Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 55.
sible for them to foresee that the actual result of their labours would be to create a recension of the LXX. which was a mischievous mixture of the Alexandrian version with the versions of Aquila and Theodotion. The Hexaplaric signs, intended for the use of scholars, lost their meaning when copied into a text which was no longer confronted with the Hebrew or the later versions based upon it; and there was a natural tendency on the part of scribes to omit them, when their purpose was no longer manifest.

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

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

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

2 See c. v.
Hieron. in praef. ad Paralipp.: “Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem”; cf. adv. Rufin. ii. where the statement is repeated, and praef. in Evangelia, where the revision of Hesychius is represented as having included both Testaments, and his O. T. work is condemned as infelicitous (“nee in V.T. post LXX. interpretes emendare quod licuit”); the Hesychian revision of the Gospels is censured by the Decretum Gelasii, which even denounces them as apocryphal (“evangelia quae falsavit Hesychius, apocrypha”).

It is not easy to ascertain who this Hesychius was. The most conspicuous person of that name is the lexicographer, and he has been identified with the reviser of the Greek Bible. But later researches shew that Hesychius the lexicographer was a pagan who lived in the second half of the fourth century. The author of the Egyptian revision was more probably the martyr Bishop who is mentioned by Eusebius in connexion with Phileas Bishop of Thmuis, Pachymius, and Theodorus (H. E. viii. 13 Φιλέας τε καὶ Ἡσυχίος καὶ Παχύμιος καὶ Θεόδωρος τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοποι). The four names appear together again in a letter addressed to Meletius (Routh, rell. sacr. iv. p. 91 ff.); and Eusebius has preserved a pastoral written by Phileas in prison in view of his approaching martyrdom (H. E. viii. 10). Phileas was a distinguished scholar (H. E. viii. 9 διαπρέπεσαν...ἐν...τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγους, ἵπ τοῦ τῶν ἔξωθεν μαθημάτων ἐνεκα πολλοῖς λόγοις ἡγομον...τού ὡς ἀλήθεις φιλοσοφοῦ...μάρτυρος), and the association of his name with that of Hesychius suggests that he may have shared in the work of Biblical revision. It is pleasant to think of the two episcopal confessors employing their enforced leisure in their Egyptian prison by revising the Scriptures for the use of their flocks, nearly at the same time that Pamphilus and Eusebius

1 Jerome speaks elsewhere (in Esa. lviii. 11) of “exemplaria Alexandrina.”


3 This is however mere conjecture; see Harnack-Preuschen, i. p. 442: “dass dieser Hesychius...identisch ist mit dem etwa gleichzeitigen Bibliokritiker gleichen Namens, ist nicht zu erweisen.”
and Antoninus were working under similar conditions at Caesarea. It is easy to account for the acceptance of the Hesychian revision at Alexandria and in Egypt generally, if it was produced under such circumstances.

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

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

Hieron. praef. in Paralip.: “Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat.” Cf. ad Sunn. et Fret. 2 “[η κοινή]...a plerisque nunc Λουκιανός dicitur.” Ps.-Athan. syn. sacr. script. έβδόμη πάλιν και τελευταία ἐρμηνεία ἦ τοῦ ἁγίου Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀσκητοῦ καὶ μάρτυρος, δότις καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς προγεγραμμένας ἐκδόσεις καὶ τοῖς Ἐβραίοις ἐντυχών καὶ ἐσπερέουσας μετ’ ἀκριβείας τὰ λείποντα ἦ καὶ περιττὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ῥήματα

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

2 Cf. the scholion in cod. M at 3 Regn. iii. 46 ἐντεθεὶς διαφόρως ἔχει τὰ ἀναγομ. βιβλία. The Lucianic text was also known as the ἐκκλησιαστική ἐκδοσις (Oeconomus, iv. 548).
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καὶ διορθωσάμενος ἐν τοῖς οικείοις τῶν γραφῶν τόποις ἐξέδοτο τοῖς χρυστιανοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. ἦτις δὴ καὶ ἐρμηνεία μετὰ τὴν ἄθλησιν καὶ μαρτυριάν τοῦ αὐτοῦ άγιον Δουκιανοῦ τὴν γεγονόντα ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν τυράννων, ἤγον τὸ ἴδιοχερον αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκθέσεως βιβλίον, εὑρίσκε ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνον βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου παρὰ ίουθαίοις ἐν τοῖς ἐπίγειοι πολιτείας περικεχρησμένοι κοινάματε εἰς διαφύλαξιν (cf. the Acts of Lucian in Bolland. i. p. 363). Suidas s.v. οὗτος ταῖς βιβλίοις διασάμενος πολὺ τὸ νόθον εἰσδεδαμενα, τοῦ γε χρόνου λυμνμαίνον πολλὰ τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἁμὴ ἐτέρων εἰς ἐπέραν μεταθέσεως...αὐτὸς ἀπάσας ἀνάλαβὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἐβραίδος ἐπανενώσατο γλώσσης.

Lucian, who was born at Samosata, began his studies at Edessa, whence he passed to Antioch at a time when Malchion was master of the Greek School (Eus. H. E. vii. 29, Hieron. de virr. ill. 71). At Antioch Lucian acquired a great reputation for Biblical learning (Eus. H. E. ix. 6 τοῖς ἱερῴς μαθήμασι συγκεκροσμενός, Suid. s.v. αὐτὴν [sc. τὴν Ἐβραίδα γλώσσαν] ὥς τὰ μάλιστα ἥν ἠκριβωκώς). From some cause not clearly explained Lucian was under a cloud for several years between A.D. 270 and 299 (Theodoret¹, H. E. i. Ξ. ἀποσυναγωγὸς ἔμεινε τριῶν ἑπισκόπων πολυετοὺς χρόνου). On his restoration to communion he was associated with Dorotheus, who was a Hebrew scholar, as well as a student of Greek literature (Eus. H. E. vii. 32 φιλόκαλος δ᾽ οὕτως περὶ τὰ θεία γράμματα καὶ τῆς Ἐβραίων ἐπεμελήθη γλώσσης, ὥς καὶ αὐταίς ταῖς Ἐβραίαίσον γραφαῖς ἐπιστημονώς ἐντυγχάνειν ἥν δὲ οὕτως τῶν μάλιστα ἐλευθερίων, προπαιδείας τε τῆς καθ’ Ἐλληνας οὐκ ἁμοίως. As Pamphilus was assisted by Eusebius, as Phileas and others were probably associated with Hesychius, so (the conjecture may be hazarder) Dorotheus and Lucian worked together at the Antiochian revision of the Greek Bible. If, as Dr Hort thought, “of known names Lucian’s has a better claim than any other to be associated with the early Syrian revision of the New Testament²,” the

¹ Oecconomus refuses to identify this person with the martyr and saint (iv. p. 498 n.).
² Introduction to the N. T. in Greek, p. 138; cf. the Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the N. T., p. 29.

S. S.
Syrian revision of the Old Testament, which called for a knowledge of Hebrew, may have been due more especially to the Hebraist Dorotheus. Lucian, however, has the exclusive credit of the latter, and possibly was the originator of the entire work. If we may believe certain later writers, his revision of the LXX. was on a great scale, and equivalent to a new version of the Hebrew Bible; Pseudo-Athanasius goes so far as to call it the ἐβδομή ἐρμηνεία, placing it on a level with the Greek versions of the Hexapla. But Jerome’s identification of ‘Lucian’ with the κοινή presents quite another view of its character and one which is probably nearer to the truth. It was doubtless an attempt to revise the κοινή in accordance with the principles of criticism which were accepted at Antioch. In the New Testament (to use the words of Dr Hort¹) “the qualities which the authors of the Syrian text seem to have most desired to impress on it are lucidity and completeness... both in matter and in diction the Syrian text is conspicuously a full text.” If the Lucianic revision of the LXX. was made under the influences which guided the Antiochian revision of the New Testament, we may expect to find the same general principles at work², modified to some extent by the relation of the LXX. to a Hebrew original, and by the circumstance that the Hebrew text current in Syria in the third century A.D. differed considerably from the text which lay before the Alexandrian translators.

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

---

¹ Introduction, p. 134 f.
² Cf. F. C. Burkitt, Old Latin and Itala, p. 91, “Lucian’s, recension in fact corresponds in a way to the Antiochian text of the N. T. Both are texts composed out of ancient elements welded together and polished down.”
³ Prolegg. p. lxxxiv. f.
⁴ See c. v.
to indicate Lucianic readings. Turning to the Syro-Hexaplar itself, he found this letter in the margin of 2 Kings (= 4 Regn.) at cc. ix. 9, 28, x. 24, 25, xi. 1, xxiii. 33, 35. But the readings thus marked as Lucianic occur also in the cursive Greek MSS. 19, 82, 93, 108; and further examination shewed that these four MSS. in the Books of Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehe­miah agree with the text of the LXX. offered by the Antiochian fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret, who might have been expected to cite from 'Lucian.' Similar reasoning led Field to regard codd. 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 90, 93, 144, 147, 233, 308 as presenting a more or less Lucianic text in the Prophets. Meanwhile, Lagarde had independently reached nearly the same result, so far as regards the historical books. He satisfied himself that codd. 19, 82, 93, 108, 118, had sprung from a common archetype, the text of which was practically identical with that of the LXX. as quoted by Chrysostom, i.e., with the Antiochian text of the fourth century, which presumably was Lucianic. Lagarde proceeded to construct from these and other sources a provisional text of Lucian, but his lamented death intercepted the work, and only the first volume of his Lucianic LXX. has appeared (Genesis—2 Esdr., Esther).

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

3 Regn. xviii. 22—28.

22καὶ εἶπεν Ἡλίας πρὸς τὸν λαὸν Ἔγώ ύπολείπεμαι προφῆτης κυρίον, προφῆτης μονώτατος, καὶ οἱ προφῆται τοῦ Βααλ τετρακόσιοι καὶ πνεύματα ἄνδρες, καὶ οἱ προφῆται τῶν ἁλσῶν τετρακόσιοι.

23δότων οὖν ἡμῖν δύο βοῶς, καὶ ἐκλεξάσθωσαν ἑαυτοῖς τὸν ἕνα καὶ μελισάτωσαν καὶ ἐπιθέτωσαν ἐπὶ ξύλα καὶ πῦρ μὴ ἐπιθέτωσαν· καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸν βοῦν τὸν ἅλλον, καὶ πῦρ οὐ μὴ ἐπίθω. 24καὶ βοῶτε ἐν ὄνοματι βεδῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὄνοματι κυρίον τοῦ

1 Cf. his Prolegomena to Librorum V. T. Canon. Pars prior graece (Gotting. 1883), p. xiv.
2 Or, as he denotes them, k, f, m, ἄ, p.
A comparison of ‘Lucian’ in this passage with the two great uncials of the LXX. reveals two classes of variants in the former.

(1) Some of the changes appear to be due to a desire to render the version smoother or fuller, e.g. ‘Hexaplaric’ for ‘Lucian’, the repetition of προφήτης before μονάδατος, the substitution of τῶν ἄλογων for τῶν ἄλογος, of ἀπεκρίθη for ἀπεκρίθησαν, and of ἀναγόμενον ἀναγόμενον for καλὸν τὸ ρήμα, and the addition of σήμερον.

(2) Others seem to indicate an attempt to get nearer to the Hebrew, e.g. δόθωσαν o ὁν (.sendRedirect()), βοῦν (\$)); or an adherence to an older reading which the Hexaplaric LXX. had set aside, e.g. the omission of ὥν ἐδοκεῖν αὐτῶν and ἐκ προφήτης ἐως μηπήμβριος. On the other hand Lucian follows the current Hebrew in κατὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν αὐτῶν, though he substitutes the easier ἐθνῶν for Aquila’s κρίμα, which cod. A has taken over from the Hexapla.

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

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

Lucian suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia under Maximin in the year 311 or 312. According to the Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis, his recension of the LXX. was subsequently discovered at Nicomedia, bricked up in a wall. The story may have arisen from a desire to invest the Ἐβδόμη (as 'Lucian' is called by the author of the Synopsis) with the same air of romance that belonged to the Quinta and Sexta, both of which were found, as he asserts, ἐν πιθοῖς. It is more probable that copies were circulated from Antioch in the ordinary way, and that some of these after the persecution reached Nicomedia and Constantinople. The name of Lucian would be enough to guarantee the general acceptance of the work. He died in the peace of the Church, and a martyr; on the other hand his name was in high repute with the Arian leaders, who boasted of being συλλογικὰνωτάται. Moreover, a revision which emanated from Antioch, the "ecclesiastical parent of Constantinople," would naturally take root in the soil of the Greek East. In all dioceses which felt the influences of those two great sees, the Lucianic LXX. doubtless furnished during the fourth and fifth centuries the prevalent text of the Greek Old Testament.

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

1 Mason, Persecution of Diocletian, p. 324.
2 Newman, Arians, p. 6 f.; Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, p. 31 n.
3 Hort, Introd. p. 143.
to the Delta or the valley of the Nile; in Origen’s Hexaplaric edition, if they were residents at Jerusalem or Caesarea. Thus, as the scholar of Bethlehem complains, the Christian world was divided between three opposing texts ("totus...orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat\(^1\)”). To Jerome, as a Palestinian and an admirer of Origen’s critical principles, the remedy was simple; the Hexaplaric text, which had been assimilated to the *Hebraica veritas*, ought everywhere to take the place of the *kouří* represented by Hesychius or Lucian. Fortunately the task was beyond his strength, and MSS. and versions still survive which represent more or less fully the three recensions of the fourth century. But the *trifaria varietas* did not continue to perplex the Church; a fusion of texts arose which affected the greater part of the copies in varying proportions. No one of the rival recensions became dominant and traditional, as in the case of the New Testament\(^2\); among the later MSS. groups may be discerned which answer more or less certainly to this recension or to that, but the greater number of the cursives present a text which appears to be the result of mixture rather than of any conscious attempt to decide between the contending types.

---

1 Praef. in Paralipp.
CHAPTER IV.

ANCIENT VERSIONS BASED UPON THE SEPTUAGINT.

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

1 The evidence is collected by Caspari, Quellen zur Gesch. d. Tauf.-symbols, iii. 267 f., and summarised by Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. lli. ff.
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the Seventy. To the Church of North Africa, on the other hand, the Greek Bible was a sealed book; for Carthage, colonised from Rome before the capital had been flooded by Greek residents, retained the Latin tongue as the language of common life. It was at Carthage, probably, that the earliest daughter-version of the Septuagint, the Old Latin Bible, first saw the light; certainly it is there that the oldest form of the Old Latin Bible first meets us in the writings of Cyprian. Other versions followed as the result of missionary enterprise; and to this latter source we owe the translations of the Old Testament which were made between the second century and the ninth into Egyptian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic. All these versions rest either wholly or in part upon the Septuagint, and therefore possess a special interest for the student of the Greek Bible. One other group has a claim upon his consideration. The earliest of the Syriac versions of the Old Testament is on the whole a translation from the Hebrew, but it shews the influence of the Septuagint in certain books. The rest, which belong to post-Nicene times, are based directly upon the Alexandrian Greek, and one of them forms the most important of extant witnesses to the text of the Hexaplaric recension.

I. LATIN VERSIONS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT.

(1) The Latin Bible before Jerome.

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

1 On the other hand reasons have been produced for suspecting that the Latin version had its origin at Antioch; see Guardian, May 25, 1892, p. 786 ff., and Dr H. A. A. Kennedy in Hastings' D. B. iii p. 54 ff. [This chapter was already in type when Dr Kennedy's article came into my hands. I regret that for this reason I have been unable to make full use of his exhaustive treatment of the Latin versions.]
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This is African testimony, but it belongs to the end of the fourth century, and needs to be verified before it can be unhesitatingly received. Many of the discrepancies to which Augustine refers may be due to the carelessness or officiousness of correctors or transcribers; if, as Jerome tells us, there were towards the end of the fourth century as many types of text as there were MSS. of the Latin Bible ("tot exemplaria quot codices"), it is clearly out of the question to ascribe each of these to a separate translator. A few specimens, taken from Cyprian and extant MSS. of the O. L., will enable the student to form some idea of the extent to which these differences are found in extant texts.

Genesis xlviii. 17 f.

CYPRIAN, testimonia i. 212.

\[\text{ubi vidit autem Ioseph quoniam superposuit pater suus manum dexteram super caput Effraim, grave illi visum est, et adprehendit Ioseph manum patris sui auferre eam a capite Effraim ad caput Manasse.} \]

Lyons Pentateuch.

\[\text{videns autem Ioseph quod misisset pater ipsius dexteram suam super caput Ephrem, grave ei visum est, et adprehendit Ioseph manum patris sui ut auferret eam a capite Ephrem super caput Manassis.} \]

1 To facilitate comparison obvious errors of the MSS. and orthographical peculiarities have been removed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LYONS PENTATEUCH</th>
<th>WÜRZBURG FRAGMENTS</th>
<th>MUNICH FRAGMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exod. xxxii. 21—24.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exod. xxxii. 21—24.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exod. xxxii. 21—24.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit tibi populus hic quia induxisti super eos peccatum magnum?</td>
<td>21 et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit populus hic quia induxisti super eos peccatum magnum?</td>
<td>21 et dixit Moyses ad Aron Quid fecit tibi populus hic quoniam immisisti eis delictum maximum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 et dixit Aron ad Moysen Noli irasci, domine; tu enim scis impetum populi huius.</td>
<td>22 et dixit Aron ad Moysen Noli irasci, domine; tu enim scis impetum populi huius.</td>
<td>22 et dixit Aron ad Moysen Ne irascaris, domine; tu enim scis populi huius impetum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praecant nos; nam Moyses hic homo qui eduxit nos de Aegypto, nescimus quid factum sit ei.</td>
<td>23 dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praecedant nos; nam Moyses hic homo qui eduxit nos ex terra Aegypti, nescimus quid factum sit ei.</td>
<td>23 dixerunt enim mihi Fac nobis deos qui praecedant nos;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 et dixi eis Quicunque habet aurum demat sibi. et dederunt mihi, et misi illud in ignem, et exiit vitulus.</td>
<td>24 et dixi eis Quicunque habet aurum demat sibi. et dederunt mihi, et misi illud in ignem, et exiit vitulus.</td>
<td>24 et dixi eis Si qui habet aurum ............. tollat ad me; et dederunt mihi, et proieci in ignem, et exivit vitulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* cod. demiserunt</td>
<td>† hiatus cod.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LYONS MS.</th>
<th>WÜRZBURG FRAGMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leviticus iv. 27—29.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leviticus iv. 27—29.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 si autem anima deliquerit in prudenter de populo terrae in faciendo vel unum ex omnibus praeceptis Dei quod non faciet, et neglexerit, et cognitum ei fuerit delictum in quo deliquit in eo, et adferet † primitivum de ovibus feminum immaculatum quod deliquit; et imponet manum supra caput eius et occidunt primitivum delicti in loco in quo occidunt holocausta.</td>
<td>27 si autem anima una deliquerit invita de populo in terra eo quod fecit unum ab omnibus praeceptis Domini, quod fieri non debet, et neglexerit, et cognitum fuerit peccatum eius quod peccavit in ipso, et adferet hedillum de capris feminam sine vitio propter delictum quod deliquit; et superponet manum super caput delicti sui et victimabunt hedillum quae est delicti in loco ubi victimabunt holocausta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* cod. delinquit</td>
<td>† cod. adfert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint.

Micah v. 2.

CYPRIAN, testimonia ii. 12.

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

WEINGARTEN FRAGMENTS.


Isaiah xxix. 11, 18.

CYPRIAN, testimonia i. 4.

WÜRZBURG PALIMPSEST.

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

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

1 Burkitt (O. L. and Itala, p. 93) proposes reflectionis.
3 On Augustine's use of this term see F. C. Burkitt, O. L. and Itala, p. 55 ff.
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the MSS. it is more difficult; but we may assume that it will proceed on the same general lines, and that the pre-Hieronymian types of text in the Old Testament as in the New will be found to be mainly two, i.e. the African, and the European, with a possible sub-division of the latter class. In pursuing this enquiry use must be made not only of the surviving fragments of O. L. MSS., but of the numerous quotations of the Latin versions which occur in writings anterior to the final triumph of the Vulgate. As Dr Hort has pointed out, certain of the Latin fathers "constitute a not less important province of Old Latin evidence than the extant MSS., not only furnishing landmarks for the investigation of the history of the version, but preserving numerous verses and passages in texts belonging to various ages and in various stages of modification." These patristic materials were collected with great care and fulness by Sabatier (Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae... opera et studio D. Petri Sabatier O. S. B., Reims, 1743, ’49, Paris, 1751; vols. i. ii. contain the O. T.); but after the lapse of a century and a half his quotations can no longer be accepted without being compared with more recent editions of the Latin fathers, and they often need to be supplemented from sources which were not at his command.

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

---

2 Introduction, p. 83.
3 For this purpose the Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum is the best collection available; but it is still far from complete.
4 A revised Sabatier is promised by the Munich Academy (Archiv, viii. 2, p. 31 ff.).
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the time of Origen. What Mr Burkitt has pointed out¹ in reference to the prophetic books is doubtless true in general; "no...passage [to which the asterisk is prefixed in Hexaplaric MSS.] is found in any form of the African Latin." Thus, as he remarks, "the Old Latin brings us the best independent proof we have that the Hexaplar signs introduced by Origen can be relied on for the reconstruction of the LXX." Again, M. Berger² has called attention to the prominence of Lucianic readings in certain Old Latin texts; and the fact that a Lucianic element is widely distributed in Old Latin MSS. and quotations has also been recognised by Vercellone³ and Ceriani⁴. This element is found even in the African text⁵, and its occurrence there suggests that the Antiochian recension, though it was made at the beginning of the fourth century, has preserved ancient readings which existed also in the African copies of the LXX., though they found no place in our oldest codices.

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

OLD LATIN FRAGMENTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

i. PENTATEUCH.


¹ Rules of Tyconius, p. cxvi. f.
³ Variae lectiones, ii., p. 426.
⁴ Monumenta sacra et profana, i. i., p. xvi.; Le recensioni dei LXX e la versione latina della Ital. (Rendicote, Feb. 18, 1886). See also Driver, Notes on Samuel, p. lxviii. f.; Kennedy, in Hastings¹ D. B., l. c.; Nestle, Einführung², pp. 148 note, 280; Wordsworth-White, p. 654.
⁵ Burkitt, Rules of Tyconius, p. cxvii.
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint.

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


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

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


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

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

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

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

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

1 Leviticus and Numbers formed until recently a separate codex, see Robert, p. vi. f.
2 Deut. xi. 4—xxxiv. 12 belongs to the fragment announced by Delisle but not yet published.
3 Belonging to the Library of the University of Würzburg.
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ii. Historical Books.

Joshua, Judges.
Cod. Lugdunensis (including the new portion announced by Delisle, Découverte &c.).

Ruth.

1—4 Regn.
Fragments of Corbie and St Germain MSS. (Sabatier); fragments from a Verona MS. and a Vatican MS. in Bianchini (Vindiciae, p. cccxli. ff.), from a Vienna MS. in Haupt's vet. antehieron. vers. fragmenta Vindobonensia, 1877, from an Einsiedeln MS. in Notices et Extraits xxxiv. 2, p. 127 ff., and from leaves found at Magdeburg and Quedlinburg¹ printed by W. Schum, 1876, and A. Düning, 1888. A Vienna palimpsest containing considerable fragments of 1—2 Regn. (J. Belsheim, Palimpsestus Vind., 1885). Readings from the margin of Cod. Goth. Legionensis² printed by C. Vercellone, ii. p. 179 ff.; cf. Archiv, viii. 2.

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

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

Esther.
Cod. Pechianus (Sabatier).
Cod. Vallicellanus (Bianchini, Vindiciae, p. ccxciv. ff.).

¹ See V. Schultze, die Quedlinburger Italo-Miniaturen der k. Bibliothek in Berlin (Munich, 1898).
² On these see Berger, Hist. de la Vulgate, p. 18 f., and the caution in O. L. and Itala, p. 9 f.
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Cod. Complutensis (see above under Ruth).

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

1, 2 Maccabees.

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

(See Berger, op. cit.)

iii. Poetical Books.

Psalms.

Cod. Veronensis (in Bianchini).
Cod. Sangermanensis (in Sabatier).
A Reichenau palimpsest described by Mone, l. u. gr. Messen, p. 40.

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

Job.

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

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles.

Readings in a St Gallen MS., see Notices et Extraits, p. 137 ff.

Wisdom, Sirach.

See Lagarde, Mittheilungen i. (Göttingen, 1884).

iv. Prophets.

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

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


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

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


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


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

Fragmenta palimpsesta Vaticana (F. Gustafsson, *Fragmenta V. T. in Latinum conversi a palimpsesto Vatican0 eruta*; Helsingfors, 1881).

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


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

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

Containing Baruch.

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

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

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

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

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

These two revised Latin Psalters were afterwards known as Psalterium Romanum and Psalterium Gallicanum respectively. Both recensions established themselves in the use of the Latin Church, the former in the cursus psallendi, the latter in the

---

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

2 Cf. adv. Rufin. ii. 30 "psalterium...certe emendatissimum iuxta LXX. interpretes nostro labore dudum Roma suscepit"; where, as Westcott says (Smith's D. B. iii. 1698 n.), he seems to include both revisions.
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bibliotheca or Church Bible. At length Pius V. († 1572) ordered the Gallican Psalter to be sung in the daily offices, an exception being made in favour of St Peter's at Rome, St Mark's at Venice, and the churches of the Archdiocese of Milan, which retained the 'Roman' Psalter. In MSS. of the Vulgate a triple Psalter not infrequently appears, shewing Jerome's two Septuagintal revisions side by side with the Psalmterium Hebraicum, his later translation from the Hebrew; but the 'Hebrew' Psalter never succeeded in displacing the Hieronymian revisions of the Old Latin, and the Latin Church still sings and reads a version of the Psalms which is based on the Septuagint. The liturgical Psalter of the Anglican Church "followeth...the Translation of the Great English Bible, set forth and used in the time of King Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth"; i.e. it is on the whole a version of the 'Gallican' Psalter which had passed through Tindale and Coverdale into Cranmer's Bible (1540).

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

**ROMAN.**

12 Dominius dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; 13 rex virtutum dilecti, et speciei domus dividere spolia. 14 si dormiatis in medios cleros, pennae columbae deargentatae, et posteriora dorsi eius in specie auri. [diapsalma]......

**GALLICAN.**

12 Dominius dabit verbum evangelizantibus virtute multa; 13 rex virtutum *dilecti:* et speciei domus dividere spolia. 14 si dormiatis inter medios cleros pennae columbae deargentatae et posteriora *dorsi eius in pallore auri. dia-

**HEBREW.**

12 Domine, dabis sermonem adnuntiaturibus fortitudinis plurimae, 13 reges exercituum foederabuntur, foederabuntur et pulcritudo domus dividet spolia. 14 si dormieritis inter medios terminos, pennae columbae deargentatae et posterioria eis in viore auri......

1 Martene, *de ant. rit.* i. p. 18 f.

7—2
in illis in Sina in sancto. ascendet sancto. ascenderat sancto in altum captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus. et enim non credunt inhabitare. Dominus Deus benedictus; benedictus Dominus de die in diem. prosperum iter faciet nobis Deus salutaris noster. diapsalma. Deus noster deus salvos faciendi, et Domini exitus mortis. verumtamen Deus conquasabit capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli perambulantium in delictis suis. abundantium; Dominus in eis in Sina in sancto. ascenderat in excelsum, captivam duxisti captivitatem, accepisti dona in hominibus. et enim non credentes inhabitare Dominum Deum. benedictus Dominus die quotidian die; prosperum iter faciet nobis Deus salutarium nostrorum. diapsalma. Deus noster, Deus salvos faciendi: et Domini exitus mortis. verumtamen Deus confringet capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli perambulantium in delictis suis.

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

1 Burkitt, O. L. and Ital., pp. 8, 32 f.
2 Praef. in libr. Job: "qui adhuc apud Latinos iacebat in stercore et vermisbe scatebat errorum."
3 ibid. "integrum immaculatumque gaudete."
the difference between the Old Latin version and the new seemed to him to be nothing short of that which separates falsehood from truth. The asterisks shewed that from 700 to 800 lines had been restored to this long mutilated book.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


In any case Jerome’s Hexaplarised version had little or no influence on the text of the Latin Bible, except in the Psalter. Even his translations from the Hebrew did not easily supersede the Old Latin. The familiar version died hard and,
as the list of MSS. will have shewn, parts of it were copied as late as the seventh century. Even at Rome the old version long held its ground by the side of the new; in the last years of the sixth century, Gregory the Great, while basing his great commentary on Job upon the Vulgate, claimed a right to cite the Old Latin when it served his purpose, "quia sedes apostolica utrique nititur 1."

The coexistence of the two versions naturally produced mixture in the MSS. 2, which was not altogether removed by the revisions of the sixth and ninth centuries. Moreover, the Old Latin version continued to hold its place in those books of the Church Bible which had no Semitic original, or of which the Semitic original was no longer current. In the preface to the Salomonic Books Jerome says explicitly: "porro in eo libro qui a plerisque Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur et in Ecclesiastico... calamo temperavi, tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans." The books of Tobit and Judith 3 were afterwards translated by him from the Aramaic (praeff. in librum Tobiae, in librum Judith), and these versions have been incorporated in the Vulgate, but the Vulgate Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1, 2 Maccabees are supplied from ante-Hieronymian sources. Thus to this day a considerable part of the Latin Bible is in greater or less degree an echo of the Septuagint.

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

1 Praef. ad Moralia in Job.
2 Cf. e.g. Berger, op. cit. p. xi.: "les textes des anciennes versions et de la nouvelle sont constamment mêlés et enchevêtrés dans les manuscrits."
3 On the relation of Jerome's Latin Judith to the Septuagint see C. J. Ball in Speaker's Commentary, Apocrypha, p. 257 ff.

2. THE EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

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

1 See Gospel acc. to St Mark, p. xiv. f. The Clementine Homilies (i. 8 ff.) attribute the foundation of the Alexandrian Church to Barnabas. But a yet earlier beginning is possible. In Acts xviii. 24 cod. D reads 'Αλεξανδρεία... δε γαρ κατηχημένοι εν τῇ πατρίδι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου, on which Blass (Acta app. p. 201) remarks: “itaque iam tum (id quod sine testimonio suspicandum erat) in Aegyptum quoque nova religio permanaverat.”

2 Acts ii. 9 f. οἱ κατακωπήται... Αλεξανδρεία. Ib. vi. 9 τινὲς ἐκ τῆς συναγω-γῆς τῆς Λεγεμένης... Ἀλεξανδρείας.

3 Cf. what is said of St Anthony in the Vita Antonii (Migne, P. G. xxvi. 944 sq.).
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writing with characters which are chiefly of Greek origin. This writing, known as Coptic—a corruption of Ἀλγυπτίως—is found with some variations in all MS. fragments of the Egyptian versions of the Old and New Testaments.

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

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

1 Of the 31 letters of the Coptic alphabet 7 only ( , ᘁ, ᘂ, ᘃ, ᘄ, ᘅ, ᘆ) are not from the Greek. On the pre-Christian systems see Clem. Strom. v. 4 οί παρ Ἀλγυπτίως παιδεύμενοι πρώτον μὲν πάντων...εκμαθάνοι τὴν επιστολογραφικὴν καλομεῖνην (the Demotic), δευτέραν δὲ τὴν λεπτικὴν... ὑστάτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν λεπηγυφικήν.

2 Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 97.
3 Intr. to N. T. in Greek, p. 85.
4 Sacr. bibl. fragmenta Copto-Sahidica, i. p. viii.
5 Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 105 f.
6 Hastings, D. B. i. p. 672.
7 The Demotic, as it is known to us, appears to present no dialectic
It was in these popular dialects that the translations of the Bible were made. "Christianity...was in Egypt a great popular movement...the Scriptures were translated, not into the literary language, but into that of the people; and the copies of these translations in each locality reflected the local peculiarities of speech." Fragments of Biblical versions have been found in the Bohairic, Sahidic, and Middle Egyptian dialects. The Bohairic dialect was spoken in Lower, the Sahidic in Upper, Egypt, and the Middle Egyptian in the intermediate province of Memphis. Some authorities speak of two other dialects, the Fayumic and Akhmimic, assigning to them certain Biblical fragments which are regarded by others as belonging to the Middle Egyptian.

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

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

1 Formerly known as the Memphitic, a name which might be more appropriately applied to the form of Middle Egyptian current at Memphis. 'Bohairic' is derived from el-Bohairah, a district S. of Alexandria. 'Sahidic,' also called Thebaic, is from es-sa'id=Upper Egypt. On some characteristics of the several dialects see Hyvernat, p. 431.
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one MS. of Ezekiel; in Sahidic, though few complete MSS. of any Biblical book have survived, there is a large number of extant fragments representing most of the canonical books and certain of the non-canonical (the two Wisdoms, the Ep. of Jeremiah, and the Greek additions to Daniel).

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

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

SAHIDIC. Lagarde, Aegyptiaca, 1883; Ciasca, Sacr. bibl. fragm. Coptosahidica Musei Borgiani, 1885—9; Amélineau, Fragments coptes in Recueil v. (1884), and Fragments de la version thébaine, ib. vii.—x. (1886—9); the same scholar has edited Job in Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch., 1887; O. v. Lemm, Bruchstücke, 1885, Sahidische Bibelfragmente, 1890; Krall, Mittheilungen, 1887; F. Rossi, Papiri Copti, 1889, Un nuovo codice, 1893; Maspero, Fragments de l'Ancien Testament in Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission arch. française au Caire, vi., 1892; E. A. Budge, The earliest known Coptic Psalter, 1898; N. Peters, Die sahidisch-koptische Übersetzung d. Buches Ecclesiasticus...untersucht, 1898.

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

It may reasonably be expected that the Egyptian versions of the Old Testament, when they have been more fully recovered and submitted to examination by experts, will prove...
to be of much importance for the criticism of the text of the LXX. Ceriani\(^1\) has shewn that the Greek text of Cod. Marchalianus agrees generally with that which underlies the Bohairic version of the Prophets, whilst both are in harmony with the text which is quoted by Cyril of Alexandria. A German scholar\(^2\), starting with the Bohairic Prophets, finds that their text is similar to that of the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Marchalianus, a series of cursive Greek MSS., some of which had been recognised by Cornill\(^3\) as Hesychian (22, 23, 26, 36, 40, 42, 49, 51, 62, 86, 91, 95, 97, 106, 114, 130, 147, 153, 185, 228, 233, 238, 240, 310, 311), and the Greek columns of the Complutensian Polyglott. Of the Sahidic fragments, those which belong to the book of Job yield a pre-Origenic text\(^4\), whilst the Sahidic Isaiah is distinctly Hexaplaric, and traces of the influence of the Hexapla are also to be found in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Ezekiel, although in varying degrees. On the whole it is natural to expect the Hesychian recension to be specially reflected in Egyptian versions. But other influences may have been at work\(^5\), and much remains to be done before these versions can be securely used in the work of reconstructing the text of the Greek Old Testament\(^6\).


\(^1\) See *O. T. in Greek*, iii. p. ix.
\(^2\) A. Schulte in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1894-5; see Hyvernat, p. 69.
\(^3\) Eschiel, p. 66 ff.
\(^5\) Hyvernat, p. 71.
\(^6\) See the remarks of F. Robinson in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, i. 673 a.
3. **The Ethiopic Version.**

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

This conclusion is on the whole supported by the character of the version. The Ethiopic Bible presents phenomena which are not easily reconciled with the hypothesis of a Greek origin. These appear, however, to be limited to a certain group of MSS. Dillmann, who at one time had explained the numerous transliterations and other approaches to the Hebrew by assuming that the translators worked upon a Hexaplaric text, ultimately found cause to classify the MSS. under three heads, (1) those which on the whole represent the text of the LXX. on which he supposed the version to have been based; (2) those of a later recension—the most numerous class—corrected by other MSS. of the LXX.; (3) those in which the original version has been revised from the Hebrew. Lagarde suggested that the existing Ethiopic version was translated from the Arabic, as late as the fourteenth century, and maintained that in any case the printed texts of the Ethiopic Old Testament depend upon MSS. which are too late and too bad to furnish a secure basis for the employment of this version in

---

1 Charles (art. *Ethiopic Version*, in Hastings' *D. B.* i. p. 792) states that "the Abyssinians first received Christianity through Aramaean missionaries." But Tyre in the fourth century was as Greek as Alexandria and Antioch.
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the reconstruction of the Septuagint. The latter statement is possibly not far from the truth, but there appears to be no sufficient reason for doubting the influence of the Greek Bible.

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

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

4. THE ARABIC VERSION.

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

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

2 Charles, l. c.: “it is unquestionable that our version was made in the main from the Greek.”
the other poetical books and for the Prophets\(^1\). Some of the MSS. exhibit in certain books a translation which has come from the LXX. through the Coptic; the book of Job in this version has been published by Lagarde (\textit{Psalterium Job Proverbia arabice}, Göttingen, 1876)\(^2\).

The Arabic version directly derived from the LXX. is said to exhibit in the Prophets a text akin to that of Cod. A (Ryssel, in \textit{ZA W.} 1885, p. 192 ff., 158). It shews traces of Hexaplaric influence (H. Hyvernat, in Vigouroux, \textit{D. B.} i. p. 846).

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


\section*{5. THE SYRIAC VERSIONS.}

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

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

\(^2\) Lagarde gives for the Psalter four texts, viz. those published at Rome (1614), Paris (1645), Ruzhayya (1612), Aleppo (1706); for Job, besides the versions mentioned in the text, that of the Paris Polyglott.
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from the Hebrew in the time of King Abgar, and the version made from the Septuagint by Paul, Bishop of Tella. This statement is neither complete nor altogether to be trusted, but it may serve as a convenient point of departure for a summary of the subject.

(1) The origin of the Peshitta is still as obscure as when Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote: ἡμᾶς εἰς μὲν τὴν Ἱσραήλ παρ’ ὅσον δῆποτε, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγνωσαί μέχρι τῆς τῆμερον ἄρτων ὁτὲ ὁμός ἐστιν. That the translation on the whole was made from the Hebrew is the verdict of modern scholars as it was that of Moses bar-Cephas. Yet certain books display the influence of the LXX. While “the Pentateuch follows the Hebrew text and the Jewish exegesis, Isaiah and the twelve Minor Prophets contain much which is from the LXX., and the influence of the Greek version appears to have been felt also in the Psalter.” From the first the Peshitta seems to have included the non-canonical books of the Alexandrian Bible except 1 Esdras and Tobit, “and their diction agrees with that of the canonical books among which they are inserted.”

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

1 Migne, P. G., lxvi. 241; cf. ib. 252 f., 263, 466 ff., 492 ff.
the translation of the entire Greek Bible into Syriac, the New Testament having been undertaken by Thomas, while Paul worked upon the Old. 1

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

The Hexapla, Tetrapla, and occasionally the Heptapla, are

2 Viz., parts of Genesis and Joshua, half of Numbers, nearly the whole of Judges, Ruth, and 3 Kingdoms, and Exodus complete.
mentioned as the sources of the text in the subscriptions to the books of the Syro-Hexaplar. These subscriptions were doubtless translated with the rest of the Greek archetypes, but they shew the character of the copies employed by the translators. The version is servile to such an extent as sometimes to violate the Syriac idiom. It is obvious that this extreme fidelity to the Greek, while it must have hindered the use of the version in the Monophysite churches of Syria, is of vast advantage to the Biblical critic. It places in his hands an exact reflexion of the Hexaplaric LXX. as it was read at Alexandria at the beginning of the 7th century, derived ultimately from the Hexapla and Tetrapla through the recension of Eusebius. Thus it supplements our scanty stock of Greek Hexaplaric MSS., and indeed forms our chief authority for the text of Origen's revision. In the case of one of the canonical books the version of Paul of Tella renders even greater service. One of the Greek texts of Daniel—that which Origen regarded as the true Septuagintal text—has survived only in a single and relatively late MS. The Syro-Hexaplar here supplies another and earlier authority, which enables us to check the testimony of the Chigi Greek.

(3) Other Syriac versions made from the Greek.

(a) Fragments of a Syriac version in the Palestinian dialect have been printed by Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iv. (Leyden, 1875), J. R. Harris, *Biblical Fragments from Mt Sinai* (London, 1890), G. H. Gwilliam, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, i. v., ix. (Oxford, 1893—6), D. S. Margoliouth, *Liturgy of the Nile* (London, 1897), and Mrs Lewis, *Studia Sinaitica*, vi. (London, 1897). This version has been made from the LXX.; in the Books of Kings the text appears to

1 Field, *Prolegg. in Hex.*, p. lxix., where many instances are produced.
2 The fragments in *Studia Sinaitica* are accompanied by critical notes, the work of Dr Nestle, in which they are carefully compared with the Greek text (pp. xl.—lxxiv.).
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be Lucianic (Anecd. Oxon. ix. p. 32); in the Greater Prophets, it is in part at least Origenic (Studia Sinaitica, pp. xvi., lxiii.); Job seems to have contained the interpolations from Theodotion which are found in the extant Greek texts of that book.

The following is a complete list of the Palestinian fragments included in the publications mentioned above: Gen. i. 1—iii. 24, vi. 9—ix. 19, xviii. 1—5, 18—xix. 30, xxii. 1—19; Ex. viii. 22b—xi. 10, xxviii. 1—12a; Num. iv. 46f., 49—v. 2f., 4, 6, 8; Deut. vi. 4—16, vii. 25—26a, x. 12—xi. 28, xii. 28—xiv. 3; 2 Regn. ii. 19—22; 3 Regn. ii. 10b—15a, ix. 4—5a; Pss. viii. 2f., xxi. 2, 19, xxii. 1, 5, xxiv. 1f., xxix. 2, 4, xxx. 2, 6, xxxiv. 1, xiI, xxxvii. 2, 18, xl. 2, 5, 7, xlii. 12—27, xlv.—xlvi., xlviii. 15ff., xlix. 1—9, liv. 2, 22, lv. 7ff., lvi. 1—7, lxiv. 2, 6, lxviii. 2, 3, 22, lxvii. 2, 21, lxvii. 52—65, lxiii., lxviii. 1—10, lxxiv. 2, 8, lxxv. 1, 15f., lxxxii. 2, 5—7, 18, lxxxix. 1—xc. 12, xcvi. 1, 8f., cl. 2f.; Prov. i. 1—19, ix. 1—11; Job xvi. 1—xvii. 16, xxi. 1—34, xxii. 3—12; Sap. ix. 8—11, 14—x. 2; Amos ix. 5—14a, viii. 9—12; Mic. v. 2—5; Joel i. 14—ii. 27, iii. 9—21; Jonah; Zech. ix. 9—15, xi. 11b—14; Isa. iii. 9b—15, vii. 10—16, viii. 8—xi. 16, xii. 1—6, xiv. 28—32, xv. 1—5, xxv. 1—3a, xxxv. 1—10, xl. 1—17, xlii. 5—10, 17—xliii. 21, xlv. 2—7, l. 4—9, lxi. 13—lxxi. 12, lx. 1—22, lxvi. 1—11, lxiii. 1—7; Jer. xi. 18—20a

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

(c) Of Jacobite versions from the LXX. there were several.

(1) Polycarp the chorepiscopus, who in the fifth century laboured upon a translation of the New Testament under the auspices of Philoxenus, the Monophysite Bishop of Mabug, is known to have rendered the Greek Psalter into Syriac. The margin of the Syro-Hexaplar mentions a Philoxenian ‘edition’ of Isaiah,

3 Bickell, Conspectus rei Syr. lit., p. 9; cf. Ebedjesu in Assemani, iii. 71.
4 Field, Hexapla, ii. p. 448.
to which two fragments printed by Ceriani¹ from the British Museum MS. Add. 17106 are believed to belong. The text of these fragments agrees on the whole with that of the Lucianic MSS. of the Prophets. (2) Another Monophysite, Jacob of Edessa, applied himself in 704—5 to the revision of the Syriac Old Testament, using for the purpose the Hexaplaric LXX. ², and the fragments of the other Greek translations. Some books of this revised version exist in MS. at London and Paris³, and a few specimens have been printed⁴.

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

EDITIONS. PESHITTA. Lee, V. T. Syriace (London, 1823); O. and N. T., 1826. A complete Syriac Bible has recently been published by the Dominicans of Mosul (¹1887—91, ²1888—92).


2 Gwynn, D. C. B. iii.
3 ¹ Regn. i. 1—3 Regn. ii. 11, and Isaiah are in the London MSS. lx., lxii. (Wright, Catalogue, p. 37 ff.), and the Pentateuch and Daniel are preserved at Paris.
4 See Ladvocat, Journal des savants, for 1765; Eichhorn, Bibliothek, ii. p. 270; De Sacy, Notices et extraits, iv. p. 648 ff.; Ceriani, Mon. sacr. et prof. v. i. 1.
5 On the other hand see Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 7, note; and Bleek-Wellhausen (1893), p. 560.
Ancient Versions based upon the Septuagint. 117

et profana, ii., and those of the Milan MS. in vol. vii. (1874) of the same series.


6. THE GOTHIC VERSION.

About the year 350 a translation of the Bible into the Gothic tongue was made by Ulfilas (Wulfila), the descendant of a Cappadocian captive who had been brought up among the Goths in Dacia, and was in 341 consecrated Bishop of the Gothic nation, which was then beginning to embrace Arian Christianity. According to Philostorgius he translated the whole of the Old Testament except the books of Kings, which he omitted as likely to inflame the military temper of the Gothic race by their records of wars and conquests (Philostorg. loc. cit.: μετεφρασεν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν φωνήν τὰς γραφὰς ἀπάσας πλῆν γε δὴ τῶν Βασιλείων ἄτε τῶν μὲν πολέμων ἱστορίαν ἧξουσών, τοῦτε ἔθνος ἄντος φιλοσολέμου). Unfortunately only a few scanty fragments of the Gothic Old Testament have been preserved, i.e., some words from Gen. v. 3—30, Ps. lii. 2—3, 2 Esdr. xv. 13—16, xvi. 14—xvii. 3, xvii. 13—45. With the exception of the scrap from Genesis, they are derived from palimpsest fragments belonging to the Ambrosian Library which were discovered by Mai in 1817 and subsequently published at Milan by Mai and Castiglione; and they are printed in the great collection of Gabelentz and Loeb (Ulfilas: V. et N. Testamenti...fragmenta, Lipsiae, 1843) and in Migne P.L. xviii.; a more recent edition is that of Massmann (Ulfilas: die heiligen Schriften alten u. neuen Bundes in gotischer Sprache...Stuttgart, 1895—7).

1 For the Apocryphal books see Lagarde, Libri V. T. apocr. Syriace, and Bensly-Barnes, The fourth book of Maccabees in Syriac (Camb., 1895).
2 Socr. ii. 11, iv. 33, Theodoret iv. 37, Philostorg. ii. 5.
Lagarde (Librorum V. T. canonicorum pars i., p. xiv., 1883) shews by an examination of the Esdras fragments that Ulfilas probably used MSS. of the Lucianic recension, and the same view is held by A. Kisch, Der Septuaginta-Codex des Ulfilas (Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. W. des Judenthums, 1873), and F. Kauffmann, Beiträge zur Quellenkritik d. gothischen Bibelübersetzung (Z. f. d. Phil. 1896). Ulfilas was in Constantinople for some time about 340, and his MSS. of the LXX. were doubtless obtained in that city, which according to Jerome was one of the headquarters of the Lucianic LXX. ("Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat").


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

1 So F. C. Conybeare (Hastings, i. p. 152). In Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 151, he suggests that the earlier books had been rendered previously.
2 On this see Conybeare, Scrivener-Miller, ii. p. 153.
3 See Dr Salmon in D. C. B., iii. p. 908.
is clearly Septuagintal. It fits the Greek of the LXX. "as a glove the hand that wears it"; keeping so close to the Greek that it "has almost the same value for us as the Greek text itself from which (the translator) worked would possess." But, as Lagarde has pointed out, the printed text is untrustworthy, and the collation made for Holmes and Parsons cannot be regarded as satisfactory. A fresh collation will be made for the larger edition of the Cambridge Septuagint.

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

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

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

LITERATURE. R. Holmes, Praef. ad Pent.; F. C. Conybeare in Scrivener-Miller, ii. 148 ff. and in Hastings' D. B., t.c.;

1 Conybeare, op. cit., p. 151 f. He attributes the composite character of the Armenian text (of which he gives instances) to Hexaplaric influences.
2 Genesis Gr., p. 18.
3 Mr McLean, who has collated the greater part of the Octateuch, informs me that "the Armenian shews a typical hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus, agreeing closely with the Syriaco-hexaplar version, and in varying degrees with the MSS. that compose the hexaplar group." "The hexaplar element (he adds) is much less in evidence in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, but again appears strongly in Joshua, Judges, and Ruth."
5 In some MSS. Job precedes the Psalter.
6 See Part ii. c. i.
8. THE GEORGIAN VERSION.

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

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

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

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

9. THE SLAVONIC VERSION.

The Greek Bible was translated into Slavonic by the brothers Cyril and Methodius, from whom in the ninth century the Slavs received the faith. Of the Old Testament the Psalter alone was finished before the death of Cyril, but according to contemporary testimony Methodius brought the work to completion. As a whole this original version no
longer exists, the codices having perished in the Tartar invasion of the thirteenth century; and the fragments of the Old Testament of Cyril and Methodius which are embedded in the present Slavonic Bible are “so mixed up with later versions as to be indistinguishable¹.” The existing version has not been made uniformly from the Greek. Esther was translated from the Hebrew, while Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and certain other books, were rendered from the Latin Vulgate in the fifteenth century. On the other hand the Octateuch, the books of Kingdoms, and the poetical books are from the Greek, and some of them, especially the Octateuch, contain old materials probably due, at least in part, to the work of Cyril and Methodius.

A Psalter in the Glagolitic script, preserved at Sinai, has been edited by Geitler (Agram, 1883); and there is a critical edition of the Slavonic Psalter by Amphilochius (Moscow, 1879).

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

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

CHAPTER V.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

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

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

1 Lagarde's CEHKRSUYZ were unknown to the Oxford editors. Greek capitals have been used in the Cambridge manual LXX. for a few uncialss not mentioned by Lagarde.
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this method of notation for the cursive, excepting in the case of a few groups which are supposed to represent a particular recension: thus Lagarde adopted the symbols  \( \text{\textcopyright} \) for the Lucianic MSS. 82, 93, 118, 44, whilst Cornill with a similar object substituted the small letters of the Greek alphabet for the Arabic numerals. Uniformity in this matter can scarcely be expected until the cursive codices have been thoroughly examined and catalogued; meanwhile it is sufficient to call attention to the variety of practice which exists.

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

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

---

1 Libr. V. T. can. pars i., p. v sq.
2 Ezechiel, p. 19 ff.
3 Cf. Orig. in Ioann. t. xiii. 26, Epiph. de mens. et pond. 4. Pentateuchus occurs in Tertullian adv. Marc. i. 10.
idea of the proportion in which the MSS. of the LXX. were distributed among European countries, Greece excepted, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. But the balance will be considerably disturbed if we add the acquisitions of Tischendorf and other discoverers, and the treasures of the libraries at Athens, Athos, Patmos, Smyrna, Jerusalem, and Mount Sinai, which are now within the reach of the critical student.

I. Uncial MSS.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III A</td>
<td>Alexandrinus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B</td>
<td>Vaticanus</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ephraemi</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I D</td>
<td>Cottonianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>ix—x</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII F</td>
<td>Ambrosianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV + V G</td>
<td>Sarravianus</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Leyden, Paris, St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Petropolitanus</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII = 13 I</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lipsiensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI L</td>
<td>Vindobonensis</td>
<td>v—vi</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X M</td>
<td>Coislinianus</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI N</td>
<td>Basilianus</td>
<td>vii—ix</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 0</td>
<td>Dublinensis</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Q</td>
<td>Marchalianus</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Veronensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S=N</td>
<td>Sinaiticus</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Leipzig, St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 T</td>
<td>Turicensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Londinensis</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 V</td>
<td>Venetus</td>
<td>vii—ix</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 W</td>
<td>Parisiensis</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 X</td>
<td>Vaticanus</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Taurinensis</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Fragmenta Tischendorfiana</td>
<td>viii—ix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>Cryptoferratensis</td>
<td>vii—ix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Bodleianus</td>
<td>iv—v</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>Petropolitanus</td>
<td>vii—ix</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For IX = P see under Cursive MSS. (H.-P. 294).
A (III). **Codex Alexandrinus.** British Museum, Royal, I. D. v.—viii.

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

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

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

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

2 As to these see Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient MSS., p. 129.
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of the LXX. (1707—1720). Baber in 1812 published the Psalter and in 1816—1821 the whole of the O. T. in facsimile type. Finally, an autotype facsimile, which, as Gregory well says, leaves nothing to be desired, was issued in 1881—3 by order of the Trustees of the British Museum under the editorship of Mr (now Sir) E. Maunde Thompson, who has added brief but valuable prolegomena.

The codex is written on leaves of fine vellum, arranged in quires usually of eight. The writing "varies in different parts of the MS., though sufficient uniformity is maintained to make it difficult to decide the exact place where a new hand begins...the style of writing in vol. iii. is for the most part different from that of the other volumes." In a few of the superscriptions and colophons the occurrence of Egyptian forms of the Greek letters has been noted, "proving that the MS., if not absolutely written in Egypt, must have been immediately afterwards removed thither." The leaves measure about 32 centimetres by 26.3; each leaf contains two columns of 49—51 lines, the lines usually consisting of 23—25 letters. Except in the third volume, the commencement of a new section or paragraph is marked by a large initial letter in the margin as well as by paragraph-marks. There are no breathings or accents by the first hand; an apostrophe occasionally separates words or consonants; here and there an asterisk is placed in the margin (e.g. Gen. xli. 19). Punctuation is limited to a single point, generally high. The abbreviations which occur are θc, κc, χc, πηπ, μηπ, γc, ανοc, ογνοc, ιαλ, ιαλμ, πνα, and κ, σ, τ, (και, μου, σου, -ναι, -ται). There are numerous and lengthy erasures, over which a corrector has written the text which he preferred. The earliest corrector (A1) was contemporary with the scribe or nearly so; the second corrector (A2) may have lived a century later; a third and still later hand (A3) has also been at work. But the question of the 'hands' in this MS. remains to be worked out, and calls for the knowledge of an expert in palaeography.

B (II). Codex Vaticanus (Vatican Library, Gr. 1209).

A MS. of the Old and New Testaments, defective at the beginning and in some other places. The O. T. has lost its first 31 leaves, the original hand beginning at Gen. xlvi. 28 (with the words πόλευ εἰς γην 'Ραμεσσήν). Through the tearing of fol. 178 2 Regn. ii. 5—7, 10—13, has also disappeared, and the loss of

1 See c. vi.
2 Proleg. i. p. 358.
3 E. Maunde Thompson, Cod. Alex. i. p. 8 ff. Ibid.
10 leaves after fol. 348 involves a lacuna which extends from Ps. cv. (cvi.) 27 to Ps. cxxvii. (cxxxviii. 6b. The longer gaps have been filled by a recent hand.

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

Of the history of this MS. before the sixteenth century nothing is certainly known. A Vatican collection of Greek MSS. was already in existence in the middle of the fifteenth century, and the greatest treasure in the present library was among its earliest acquisitions. It finds a place in the early catalogues of the Vatican; reference is made to this MS. in letters addressed by the librarian of the Vatican to Erasmus in 1521 and 1533, and it formed the chief authority for the Roman edition of the LXX. in 1587. By this time its importance was already recognised, and it is amazing that an interval of nearly 300 years should have been allowed to pass before the actual text of the MS. was given to the world. A collation of B with the Aldine text was made by Bartolocci in 1669, and is still preserved at Paris in the Bibliothèque Nationale (MS. gr. supplem. 53). With other treasures of the Vatican the codex was carried to Paris by Napoleon, and there it was inspected in 1809 by Hug, whose book De antiquitate codicis Vaticani (Freiburg, 1810) aroused fresh interest in its text. On the restoration of the MS. to the Vatican it was guarded with a natural but unfortunate jealousy which for more than half a century baffled the efforts of Biblical scholars. Neither Tischendorf in 1843 and 1866 nor Tregelles in 1845 was permitted to make a full examination of the codex. Meanwhile the Roman authorities were not unmindful of the duty of publishing these treasures, but the process was slow, and the first results were disappointing. An edition printed by Mai in 1828—38 did not see the light till 1857. It was followed in 1881 by Cozza's more accurate but far from satisfactory volumes in facsimile type. At length in 1890 under the auspices of Leo XIII. the Vatican Press issued a photographic reproduction worthy of this most important of Biblical MSS. 3

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


3 On this work see Nestle, Septuagintast. iii. p. 13 ff.
The codex is written on the finest vellum in a singularly beautiful hand\(^1\) which “may be attributed to the fourth century,” and probably to the middle of the century\(^2\), and bears a resemblance to the hand which is found in papyri of the best Roman period\(^3\). The leaves are arranged in quinions (gatherings of ten pages); each page exhibits three columns of 42 lines with 16–18 letters in each line. There are no breathings or accents in the first hand; a point occurs but rarely; initial letters do not project into the margin. The text is written in two contemporary hands, the transition being made at p. 335. The MS. has been corrected more than once; besides the scribe or contemporary diorthotes (B\(^1\)), we may mention an early corrector denoted as B\(^a\), and a late instaurator, who has gone over the whole text, spoiling its original beauty, and preserving oftentimes the corrections of B\(^a\) rather than the original text.

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

A folio consisting at present of 209 leaves, of which 64 contain portions of the O. T. The fragments are as follows: Prov. i. 2 νομοσ—ii. 8, xv. 29 κρεισσων—xvii. 1, xviii. 11 ἒν δὲ δόξα—xix. 23, xxii. 17 τὴν δὲ σήν—xxiii. 25, xxiv. 22 ἡ δωτρα—56 ἓ γη, xxvi. 23 χειλη λεία—xxviii. 2, xxix. 48—end of book; Eccl. i. 2 ματαιώνης—14, ii. 18 υπὸ τῶν ἡλιον—end of book; Cant. i. 3—iii. 9 Ἐσωμὼν; Job ii. 12 ἰδέαται—iv. 12 ἐν λόγοις σου, ν. 27 σὺ δὲ γνώθι—vii. 7, x. 9—xii. 2 ἀνθρωπον, xiii. 18 οὐδα ἐγό—xviii. 9 παγίδες, xix. 27 σὰ ὀφθαλμὸς—xxii. 14 νεφέλαι, xxiv. 7 γυμνος πολλοὺς—xxx. 1 ἐν μέρει, xxxi. 6—xxxv. 15 ὄργην αὐτοῦ, xxxvii. 9—xxxviii. 17 θανάτου, xl. 20 περιθύσεις—end of book; Sap. viii. 5 ἐργαζόμενως—xii. 10 τῶν μετανοιας, xiv. 19—xvii. 18 ἐμπέλης, xviii. 24 ἐπὶ γάρ—end of book; Sir. prol. 1—vii. 14 πρεσβυτέρων, viii. 15 αὐτῶς γάρ—xi. 17 εὐπρέπεσι, xii. 16 καὶ εὰν—xvi. 1 ἀφηγήσων, xvii. 12—xx. 5 σοφός, xxii. 12—xxii. 19, xvii. 19—xxviii. 25 σταθμόν, xxx. 8—xxxxiv. 22 οὐ μὴ σου, xxx. 25—xxxvi. 22 καὶ ὁ κύριος—xxxiii. 13 Ἰακώβ, xxviii. 11—xxviii. 15, xxxix. 7—xliv. 27 αἰκώμεθα, xlv. 24 ἢν αὐτὸ—xlvii. 23 Ροθσα, xlviii. 11—xlxi. 12 ἤργους ὑίον. The distribution of the leaves is Proverbs 6, Ecclesiastes 8, Cant. 1, Job 19, Wisdom 7, Sirach 23.

---

1 Specimens are given in Sir E. Maunde Thompson’s Greek and Latin Paleography, p. 150; and F. G. Kenyon’s Our Bible &c., p. 136; E. Nestle, Einführung\(^2\), Tafel 4.
2 Sir E. M. Thompson, op. cit. p. 159; WH., Intr. p. 75.
3 F. G. Kenyon, Paleography of Greek papyri, p. 120. See A. Rahlff, Alter u. Heimath der Vat. Bibelhandschrift, in N. G. W., 1899, i. p. 72 ff.
The copy of the Greek Bible of which these fragments have survived unfortunately fell during the middle ages into the hands of a scribe in want of writing materials. Originally, as it seems, a complete Bible, written probably in the fifth century and, as Tischendorf believed, in Egypt, in the twelfth century it was taken to pieces, sponged, and used for other writings. What became of the missing leaves we do not know; those of the Paris volume are covered with the Greek text of certain works of Ephrem the Syrian. The book was probably brought to Florence early in the 16th century by Andreas Lascaris, the agent of Lorenzo de' Medici, and passing into the possession of Catharine de' Medici, accompanied her to France, where it found its way into the Royal Library. Here the value of the underlying text was recognised by Montfaucon, who called attention to it in his Palaeographia Graeca, and gave a specimen from the fragments of the N. T. (p. 213 f.). The O. T. fragments were partly examined by Wetstein and Thilo, but were not given to the world until in 1845 Tischendorf, who had published the N. T. portion in 1843, completed his task by printing the LXX. text.

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

**S = Β. CODEX SINAITICUS. Leipzig and St Petersburg.**

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

---

2. For a list of these see Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs*, p. 2.
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5 eis τὴν γῆν—8, 9 ἰδιαεί—14 καὶ συνει—19 ἐώς ἄν,
25 αὐτῷ—27 τὴν, 30 κατὰποιησα—33 καὶ παίζων, μεταφήσει, ὁ 1 ἐκ τῆς, 41 ἀρχαίας—46 ἀφ’; Num. v. 26 αὐτῆς—30 ποιήσει, vi. 5 ἄγιος—6 τεκελευθερίαν, 11 κεφαλὴν—12 αἱ (2ο), 17 καὶ—18 μαρτυρίαν, 22, 23, 27 Κύριος, vii. 4 Μωσῆν—5 λειτουργία, 12 Ναασσόν—
13 ἑώς, 15 ἑώς (2ο)—20 ἑμιάραμος, 1 Par. ix. 27 το το προφ.—xix. 17, 2 Esdr. ix. 9 Κύριος—end of book; Esther; Tobit; Judith; Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lam. i. 1—ii. 20; i and 4 Mac.

cabees.

The forty-three leaves containing 1 Par. xi. 22—xix. 17, 2 Esdras ix. 9—end, Esther, Tobit i. 1—ii. 2, Jer. x. 25—end, and Lam. i. 1—ii. 20 were found by Tischendorf in a waste-
paper basket at the Convent of St Catharine's, Mount Sinai, in
1844, and published by him in a lithographed facsimile under
the name of Codex Friderico-Augustanus1 (Leipzig, 1846); to
these in Mon. sacr. ined., nov. coll. i. (1855) he was able to add
Isa. lxvi. 12—Jer. i. 7 from a copy made during the same visit to
Sinai. A second visit in 1853 enabled him to print in the next
volume of the Monumenta (1857) two short fragments of Genesis
(xxiv. 9, 10, 41—43). During a third visit to the Convent in 1859,
he was permitted to see the rest of the codex, including 156 leaves
of the Old Testament, and ultimately succeeded in carrying the
whole to St Petersburg for presentation to the Czar Alexander II.
This final success led to the publication in 1862 of the Bibliorum
Codex Sinaicus Petropolitanus, containing a facsimile of the
St Petersburg portion of the Sinaiic MS. Lastly in 1867 Tisch-
dendorf completed his task by printing in his Appendix Codicum
certain fragments of Genesis and Numbers which had been dis-
covered by the Archimandrite Porfirius in the bindings of other
Sinai MSS.2

This great Bible was written on leaves which originally
measured 15 x 13½ inches, and were gathered, with two excep-
tions, into quires of four. Each column contains 48 lines, with
12—14 letters in a line; and in all but the poetical books each
page exhibits four columns, so that eight lie open at a time;3
the poetical books, where the lines are longer, two columns
appear on each page, or four at an opening. The characters are
assigned to the fourth century; they are well-formed and some-
what square, written without break, except when an apostrophe
or a single point intervenes; a breathing prima manu has been

1 So called in honour of Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony.
3 "They have much of the appearance of the successive columns in
a papyrus roll, and it is not at all impossible that it [the MS.] was actually
copied from such a roll." Kenyon, p. 124; cf. Scrivener-Miller, p. 95.
noticed at Tobit vi. 9, but with this exception neither breathings nor accents occur. Tischendorf distinguished four hands in the codex (A, B, C, D), and assigned to A the fragments of Chronicles, 1 Macc., and the last 4½ leaves of 4 Macc., as well as the whole of the N. T.; the fragments of Numbers and the Prophets are ascribed to B; the fragments of the poetical books to C; Tobit and Judith and the rest of 4 Macc. to D, who is identified with the scribe to whom we owe the N. T. of Codex Vaticanus. He also detected traces of five stages in the correction of the MS., which he represented by the symbols \( \text{Na} \), \( \text{Ne.a} \), \( \text{Ne.b} \), \( \text{Ne.c} \), \( \text{Nd} \). The first symbol covers the work of the diorthotes and other nearly contemporary correctors; \( \text{Ne.a} \), \( \text{Ne.b} \), \( \text{Ne.c} \) are three seventh century hands, of which the last appears chiefly in the Book of Job, whilst the later \( \text{Nd} \) has occupied itself with retracing faded writing in the Prophets.

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

No uniform edition or photographic reproduction of this most important MS. has yet appeared\(^2\). The student is still under the necessity of extracting the text of \( \text{N} \) from the five works of Tischendorf mentioned above. A homogeneous edition of the remains of the codex or a photographic reproduction of the text is one of our most urgent needs in the field of Biblical palaeography.

\( \text{N (XI). CODEX BASILIANO-VATICANUS. Vatican Library, Gr. 2106, formerly Basil. 145} \(^3\). \)

\(^1\) Another explanation (suggested by Dr Gwynn) is given by Dr Lupton in Wace's \textit{Apocrypha}, i., p. 2.
\(^2\) A facsimile of 2 Esdr. xviii. 15—xix. 15 may be seen in Stade, \textit{Gesch. d. Volkes Israel}, ii. p. 192.
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Dr E. Klostermann (Analecta, pp. 9 f., 33 f.) has produced good reasons for believing that these two codices originally formed portions of a complete copy of the Greek Old Testament.


The Venice folio measures 16¼ x 11¾ inches, the Vatican at present a little less, but the breadth and length of the columns is identical in the two codices; in both there are two columns of 60 lines. The Venice MS. contains 164 leaves, the Vatican 132. The first leaf of the Venice book begins the 27th quire of the original MS., and on computation it appears that, if to the Vatican leaves were added those which would be required to fill the lacunae of the earlier books and of Job, the entire number would make up 26 quires of the same size. As regards the history of the separated portions, it appears that the Vatican MS. was originally brought to Rome from Calabria by a Basilian monk; the Venice book was once the property of Cardinal Bessarion, by whom it was presented to St Mark's.

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

(B) Octateuch and Historical Books.


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

1 Cf. Deutsche Lit.-Zeit. 1897, p. 1475 f.
2 Klostermann, p. 9.
3 Holmes, Praef. ad Pentateuch.
4 It was the eighth of Bessarion's MSS.; see Schott in Eichhorn's Repert., viii. 181.
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No other uncial codex of the LXX., of which any portion remains, has suffered so lamentable a fate. Brought to England from Philippi\(^1\) in the reign of Henry VIII. by two Orthodox Bishops\(^2\), and presented to the English monarch, it remained in the Royal Library till the reign of Elizabeth, who gave it to her Greek tutor Sir John Fortescue, and from his hands after several vicissitudes it found its way into the Cotton collection. In 1731, while the codex was at Ashburnham House with the rest of that collection, it was reduced by fire to a heap of charred and shrivelled leaves. Even before the fire it had been imperfect\(^3\); the beginning and end of the book had disappeared, and other leaves were defective here and there; yet 165 or 166 leaves remained and 250 miniatures. The existing remains at the British Museum, though collected with the most scrupulous care, consist only of 150 mutilated fragments; to these must be added a smaller series preserved at the Baptist College, Bristol, to which institution they were bequeathed by Dr A. Gifford, formerly an Assistant Librarian at the Museum.

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

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

Lastly, among the Peiresc papers in the Bibliothèque Nationale, transcripts have been found of Gen. i. 13, 14, xviii. 24—26, xliii. 16, which were made from the MS. in 1606. They are printed in Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, liii. pp. 163—172\(^4\). As this discovery was overlooked

\(^1\) Still an episcopal see in the time of Le Quien; see Lightfoot, Philipp­ians, p. 64, note.

\(^2\) They stated that it had once been the property of Origen.

\(^3\) Walton’s statement that Cod. D at one time contained the Pentateuch is however groundless; in the Cotton catalogue of 1621 it is described as “Genesis only.”

\(^4\) I owe the reference to Dr Nestle (Urtext, p. 71).
when the second edition of *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. i., passed through the press in 1895, it may be convenient to the student to have the new fragments placed before him *in extenso*.

Gen. i. 13, 14....

11. xviii. 24—26. 24 εἰῶν δυν ἐπετείκοντα δίκαιοι εὖ τῇ πόλει, ἀπολέσεις αὐτοὺς; οὐκ ἀνήσεις πάντα τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ἐνεκα τῶν πεντήκοντα δικαίων, εἰῶν δυν ἐν αὐτῇ; 25 μηδαμῶς οὐ ποιήσεις ὅς τὸ ῥῆμα τούτῳ, τοῦ ἀποκτείναι δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσέβους, καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσέβης: μηδαμῶς. ὁ κρίνων πάσαν τὴν γῆν, οὐ ποιήσεις κρίσιν; 26 εἰπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος Ἐὰν εὐρῷ ἐν Σο[δόμοις]...

16. xliii. 16...θύματα καὶ ἐτοίμασον μετ' ἐμοῦ γὰρ φάγοντάι οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτω ἄρτους τῆν μεσημβρίαν...

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


The Bodleian volume contains the following fragments of Genesis: i. 1—xiv. 6, xviii. 24 δικαῖον—xx. 14 καὶ ἀπέδωκεν, xxiv. 54 ἐκπαίμψατε—xlii. 11 εἰπεν δὲ αὐ[τοῖς]. Another leaf, now at the Cambridge University Library, contains xlii. 18 [αὐτοῖς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—xliv. 13 τὸν ἐνα καὶ, but the verso, to which xlii. 31—xliv. 13 belongs, is written in (?) contemporary minuscules. It is now known that this text is carried on by more than one cursive MS. The St Petersburg cod. lxii. begins where the Cambridge fragment leaves off (at Gen. xlv. 13 Βενιμίν: ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ), and proceeds, with some lacunae, as far as 3 Regn. xvi. 28 (τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν συμπλοκών). The largest of the lacunae (Jos. xxiv. 27—Ruth, inclusive) is supplied by the British Museum MS. Add. 20002, which once belonged to the same codex as E, the Cambridge fragment, and St Petersburg cod. lxii.
The recent history of this MS. is both curious and instructive. The portions now at Oxford and London were brought from the East by Tischendorf in 1853; the Cambridge leaf and the St Peters burg portion followed in 1859. Tischendorf published the contents of the Bodleian volume in *Monumenta sacra inedita, n. c. ii.* (1857); the Cambridge leaf remained in his possession till his death in 1874, when it was purchased by the Syndics of the University Library. In 1891 it was recognised by the present writer and Mr H. A. Redpath as a continuation of the Bodleian Genesis; and its contents were at once communicated to the *Academy* (June 6, 1891), and were afterwards incorporated in the apparatus of the Cambridge manual *LXX.* (vol. i., ed. 2, 1895). Finally, in 1898, Dr A. Rahlfs of Göttingen proved that the Petersburg and London volumes originally formed a part of the codex to which the Oxford Genesis and the Cambridge leaf belonged. The entire MS. will be used for the apparatus of the larger Cambridge *LXX.*; a description by the Editors (Messrs Brooke and McLean) may be found in the *Classical Review* for May, 1899 (vol. xiii., pp. 209—11).

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

F (VII). **Codex Ambrosianus.** Ambrosian Library, Milan. A. 147 infr.

The remains of this important Codex consist of the following

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


3 "The date of the whole MS., including the uncial part, may very well be the tenth century" (*Class. Review,* l.c.).
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fragments of the Octateuch: Gen. xxxi. 15 [ἀλλοτρία]υ—37 ἡραν
νησας, xlii. 14 ὅτι κατάκοποιοι—21 εἰσηκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ, 28. ἐταρά­
χῆσαν—xlv. 6 τὴν κτῆσιν, xlvii. 16 εἰ ἐκλειστεῖν—xlviii. 3 ὁ θεὸς
μου ὄφθη, xlviii. 21 τῶν πατέρων—li. 14 οἱ ἀδελφοί. Exod. i. 10
γῆς—viii. 19 τῷ [Ψαρᾶ], xii. 31 οἰοὶ—xxx. 29 ὁ ἀπτ. αὐτῶν, xxxi.
18 ἐν τῷ ὑγείᾳ—xxxii. 6 ὑδατ[ίαν], xxi. 13 [πολύπληθος]θυνῶ—xxxvi.
3 προσέκοψας—xxxvii. 10 οἱ βάσεις—end of book. Lev. i. 1—ix.
lacuna). Deut. i. 1—xxviii. 63 ἡφράαν[θη], xxix. 14 καὶ τὴν ἁπάν
—end of book. Jos. i. 1—ii. 9 ἐφ'? [η]μᾶς, ii. 15 αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ τῆς [χει­
—iv. 5 ἐμπροσθεν, iv. 10 [ου]μετέλεσεν—v. 1 Ἰορδάνην, v. 7 Ἰησοῦς
—vi. 23 ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς, vii. 1 Ζαμβρὶ—ix. 27 τῆς σήμερον ἡμ[έρα],
x. 37 ἐν αὐτῇ—xii. 12 βασ. Ἑγγάζια.

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

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

1 The fragments of Malachi and Isaiah, attributed to F in Holmes,
followed by Tischendorf V. T.2, and Kenyon (p. 62), belong to a MS. of
cent. xi.; see Ceriani, Mon. sacr. et prof., praef. p. ix.
2 See Sir E. Maunde Thompson, Greek and Latin Pal., p. 62.
3 Cf. Thompson, op. cit. p. 72, "they were not systematically applied
to Greek texts before the 7th century."
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The Leyden leaves of this MS. are known to have been in the possession of Claude Sarrave, of Paris, who died in 1651. After his death they passed into the hands successively of Jacques Mentel, a Paris physician, who has left his name on the first page, and of Isaac Voss (+1681), from whose heirs they were purchased by the University of Leyden. The Paris leaves had been separated from the rest of the MS. before the end of the 16th century, for they were once in the library of Henri Memme, who died in 1596. With a large part of that collection they were presented to J. B. Colbert in 1732, and thus found their way into the Royal Library at Paris. Among earlier owners of the St Petersburg leaf were F. Pithaeus, Desmarez, Montfacon, and Dubrowsky. The text of the Leyden leaves and the St Petersburg leaf was printed in facsimile type by Tischendorf in the third volume of his Monumenta sacra (Leipzig, 1860); a splendid photographic reproduction of all the known leaves of the codex appeared at Leyden in 1897.

1 Fragments marked * are at Paris; that marked † is at St Petersburg.
The leaves measure 9\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches; the writing is in two columns of 27 lines, each line being made up of 13—15 letters. In Tischendorf's judgement the hand belongs to the end of the fourth or the first years of the fifth century. There are no initial letters; the writing is continuous excepting where it is broken by a point or sign; points, single or double, occur but rarely; a breathing is occasionally added by the first hand, more frequently by an early corrector. Of the seven correctors noticed by Tischendorf three only need be mentioned here,—(A) a contemporary hand, (B) another fifth century hand which has revised Deuteronomy and Judges, and (C) a hand of the sixth century which has been busy in the text of Numbers.

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

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

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

In Tischendorf's judgement the upper writing is not later than the ninth century; the lower writing he ascribes to the sixth; for though the characters are generally such as are found in fifth century MSS., yet there are several indications of a later date, e.g. the numerous *compendia scribendi* and superscribed letters, and the occasional use of oblong forms. Chapters and arguments are noted in the margin—the chapters of Numbers are 207—and at the end of the book the number of *stichi* is
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specified (\(\gamma\phi\lambda\epsilon\)' = 3535); the scribe appends his name—\(\lambda\omega\delta\nu\omega\gamma\ \mu\omega\alpha\chi\omega\gamma\\) \(\sigma\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\).  

K. Fragmenta Lipsiensia. Leipzig, University Library (cod. Tisch. ii.).


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

L (VI). Codex Purpureus Vindobonensis. Vienna, Imperial Library.

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


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

1 On the fragments of Judges see Moore, Judges, p. xlv.
2 On the latter see H. S. Cronin, Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, p. xxiii.

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

This great codex was purchased in the East for M. Seguier, and brought to Paris about the middle of the seventeenth century. It was first described by Montfaucon, who devotes the first 315 pages of his Bibliotheca Coisliniana to a careful description of the contents, dealing specially with the capitulation and the letters prefixed to the sentences. Facsimiles were given by Montfaucon, Bianchini (Evangelium quadruplex), Tischendorf (Monumenta sacr. ined., 1846), and Silvester, and a photograph of f. 125 r., containing Num. xxxv. 33—xxxvi. 13, may be seen in H. Omont's Facsimilés, planche vi. Montfaucon gives a partial collation of the codex with the Roman edition of the LXX., and a collation of the whole was made for Holmes; a complete collation is now being prepared by H. S. Cronin.

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

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

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

1 Other notes occur in a hand of the ninth century and in a late cursive hand.
2 Gregory, i. p. 375; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 134.
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xiii. 4—6, 8—11, 13—17, 20—23, xvi. 31—33, xvii. 1—5, 9—12, 14—17). The upper writing is Armenian, the lower an Egyptian-Greek hand of the 7th century, resembling that of cod. Q (v. infra).

2d. Palimpsest fragment containing 3 Regn. viii. 58—ix. 1, also from the Nitrian MSS. There are two texts over the Greek of which the lower is Coptic, the upper Syriac; the Greek hand belongs to cent. v.

II. Fragmenta Tischendorfiana.

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

(C) Poetical Books.


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

R. Codex Veronensis. Verona, Chapter Library.

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

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

1 See Gregory, i. p. 447; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 172 f.
the second edition of The O. T. in Greek (1896); but it is much
to be wished that the Verona Chapter may find it possible to
have this important Psalter photographed.
The codex consists of 405 leaves, measuring 10½ x 7½ inches;
each page contains 26 lines. The Greek text appears at each
opening on the left-hand page, and the Latin on the right.

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

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

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

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

The text of T agrees generally with that of cod. A, and still
more closely with the hand in cod. in known as N.

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

Thirty leaves of papyrus which contain Ps. x. (xi.) 2 [ε]ισ
φαρέτραυ—xviii. (xix.) 6, xx. (xxi.) 14. εν ταις δυναστείαις σου—
xxxiv. (xxxv.) 6 καταδίωκ[α]ν.

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

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

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

X (258). **Codex Vaticanus Iobi.** Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 749.

A MS. of Job with occasional lacunae; the remaining portions are i. 1—xvii. 13, xvii. 17—xxx. 9, xxx. 23—xxxi. 5, xxxi. 24—xxxiv. 35. There are miniatures, and a catena in an uncial hand surrounding the text. At the beginning of the book Hexaplaric scholia are frequent³.

The text is written in a hand of the ninth century. It was used by Parsons, and its Hexaplaric materials are borrowed by Field⁴.

W (43). **Codex Parisiensis.** Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Gr. 20.

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

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

¹ See Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the British Museum, i. (1881), where there is a photograph of Ps. xxiii. 10 ff., and Dr Kenyon's Palaeography of papyri, p. 116 f.
² Kenyon, loc. cit.
³ See E. Klostermann, Analecta zur Septuaginta, &c., p. 68.
⁴ Hexapla, ii. p. 2.
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Z. See above under (B), p. 140.

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

(D) Prophets.


Eight palimpsest leaves—in the original MS. folded as four—which are now bound up with Codex Z of the Gospels\(^1\) and yield Isa. xxx. 2—xxxi. 7, xxxvi. 19—xxviii. 2.

The original leaves of the Codex measured about 12×9 inches, and each contained 36 lines of 14—17 letters. The writing, which belongs to the early part of the sixth century, appears to be that of an Egyptian scribe, and Ceriani is disposed to connect the text of the fragments with the Hesychian recension\(^2\). They have been printed in facsimile type by Professor T. K. Abbott (Par palimpsestorum Dublinensium, Dublin, 1880), and are used in the apparatus of the Cambridge manual Septuagint.

Q (XII). Codex Marchalianus. Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 2125.

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

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

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

---

1 See Gregory, i. p. 399 f.; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 153.

2 Recensioni dei LXX., p. 6.
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ninth volume of his *Nova Collectio* (1870). Field followed Montfaucon in making large use of the Hexaplaric matter with which the margins of the MS. abound, but was compelled to depend on earlier collations and a partial transcript. The liberality of the Vatican has now placed within the reach of all O.T. students a magnificent heliotype of the entire MS., accompanied (in a separate volume) by a commentary from the pen of Ceriani (1890). This gift is only second in importance to that of the photograph of Codex B, completed in the same year.

Codex Marchalianus at present consists of 416 leaves, but the first twelve contain patristic matter, and did not form a part of the original MS. The leaves measure 11 3⁄4 × 7 inches; the writing is in single columns of 29 lines, each line containing 24—30 letters. The text of the Prophets belongs, according to Ceriani, to the Hesychian recension; but Hexaplaric signs have been freely added, and the margins supply copious extracts from Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the LXX. of the Hexapla. These marginal annotations were added by a hand not much later than that which wrote the text, and to the same hand are due the patristic texts already mentioned, and two important notes 1 from which we learn the sources of the Hexaplaric matter in the margins. The result of its labours has been to render this codex a principal authority for the Hexapla in the Prophetic Books.

**Y. Codex Taurinensis.** Turin, Royal Library, cod. 9.

This codex consists of 135 leaves in quarto, and contains the δωδεκαπρόφητον. The MS. is difficult to read, and there are many lacunae. The text, written according to Stroth 2 in the ninth century, is surrounded by scholia, and prefaced by Theodoret's ἱπτολέιτος to the various books.

The Turin MS. does not appear to have been used hitherto for any edition of the LXX., nor has any transcript or collation been published.

**Zᵇ, c.** See above, under (B), p. 140.

**Zᵇ.** Palimpsest fragments of Isaiah (iii. 8—14, v. 2—14, xxix. 11—23, xlv. 26—xliv. 5). As in Zᵃ, the upper writing is Armenian; the Greek hand belongs apparently to cent. viii.—ix.

**Zᶜ.** Palimpsest fragment of Ezekiel (iv. 16—v. 4) found among the Nitrian leaves at the British Museum. The Greek hand resembles that of Zᵃ, and is probably contemporary with it.

1 Printed in *O. T. in Greek*, iii. 2, p. 8 f.

S. S.
Г. КОДЕКС КРИПТОФЕРАТАНСИС. Басилианский монастырь Гrottта Феррата, код. Е. β. vii.

Этот том состоит в основном из палисостных листов, которые однажды принадлежали великому кодексу Пророков. Сcriptor 13 века написал над Библейским текстом литургический материал сопровожденный музыкальной нотацией. Некоторые части книги были дважды палисостными, использованными сначала для работы Святого Иоанна Дамаскина. Около 130 листов из настоящего литургического кодекса были взяты из Библейского МС, и Библейский текст 85 из этих листов был транскриприрован и опубликован (с многими пропусками, где нижний текст не был расшифрован) в Cozza-Luži's *Sacrorum bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta*, vol. i. (Rome 1867).

Оригинальный кодекс по-видимому содержал 432 листа собранных в трехчастиях по восемь; и листы измеряют примерно 10½ x 8¼ дюйма. Письмо, которое является в склоняющихся рукописях восьмого или девятого века, было расположено в двух колоннах, и каждая колонна содержала 25—28 строк из 13—20 букв.

Нельзя сказать, что транскрипция Коццы, так же как и Библейские исследователи должны быть обязаны ему за это, удовлетворяет нашим потребностям. Рукописи апостолов так мало, что мы ждем графического издания, или хотя бы свежего осмотра и более полного сравнительного исследования этого интересного палисостного.

Δ. ФРАГМЕНТУМ БОДЛЕИАНИУМ. Оксфорд, Бодлианская библиотека, MS. Gr. bibl. d. 2 (P).

Фрагмент Бел в варианте Теодотия (21 γνυακων—41 Δαυιδ). Веллум лист, принесенный из Египта и приобретенный для Бодлея в 1888.

Написан в слоняющихся руках V века, частично над рукописью Домыли в руках vielleicht в четвертом веке.

Следующие слоняющиеся фрагменты не использованы ни для какого издания ЛXX., и остаются без символической буквы или номера.


(2) The vellum fragment containing Lev. xxii. 3—xxiii. 22, originally published by Brugsch (*Neue Bruchstücke des Cod. Sin.*, Leipzig, 1875), who believed it to be a portion of Codex Sinaiticus; a more accurate transcription is given by J. R. Harris, *Biblical Fragments*, no. 15 (cf. Mrs Lewis's *Studia Sin.* i. p. 97 f.). Cent. iv.
(3) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing Num. xxxii. 29, 30 (J. R. Harris, op. cit., no. 1). Cent. vii.

(4) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing a few words of Jud. xx. 24—28 (J. R. Harris, op. cit., no. 2). Cent. iv.

(5) Another Sinaitic fragment, containing Ruth ii. 19—iii. 1, iii. 4—7 (J. R. Harris, op. cit., no. 3). Cent. iv.

(6) Part of a Psalter on papyrus (B. M., pap. cxxx.), containing Ps. xii. 7—xv. 4; see Athenaeum, Sept. 8, 1894, and Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri, pp. 109, 131. Cent. iii.

(7) Part of a Psalter on a Berlin papyrus, containing Ps. xl. 26—xli. 4; see Blass in Z. f. ägypt. Sprache, 1881 (Kenyon, op. cit., p. 131).

(8) Nine fragments of a MS. written in columns of about 25 lines, one on each page. The fragments give the text of Ps. ci. 3, 4, cii. 5—8, cv. 34—43, cvi. 17—34, cviii. 15—21, cxiii. 18—26, cxiv. 3—cxv. 2. J. R. Harris, op. cit., no. 4. Cent. iv.


(10) Fragments discovered by H. A. Redpath at St Mark's, Venice, in the binding of cod. gr. 23, containing the text of Prov. xxiii. 21—xxiv. 35. Published in the Academy, Oct. 22, 1892. A fuller transcript is given by E. Klostermann, Analecta, pp. 34 ff.

(11) Portion of a leaf of a papyrus book, written in large uncials of cent. vii.—viii., exhibiting Cant. i. 6—9. This scrap came from the Fayum and is now in the Bodleian, where it is numbered MS. Gr. bibl. g. 1 (P); see Grenfell, Greek Papyri (Oxford, 1896), pp. 12 f.

(12) Palimpsest fragments of Wisdom and Sirach (cent. vii.—vii.), carried by Tischendorf to St Petersburg and intended for publication in the 8th volume of his Monumenta, which never appeared. See Nestle, Urtext, p. 74.

(13) Two palimpsest leaves of Sirach belonging to cod. 2 in the Patriarchal Library at Jerusalem: cf. Papadopulos, Ἱεροσ. Βιβλ., i. p. 14: τὰ ἀναπληρωτικὰ φύλλα 27 καὶ 56 εἰσὶ παλιμψήτα ὡς ἡ ἀρχικὴ γραφῆ ἀνήκει εἰς τὸν ε ἀιώνα...τὸ παλαίων δὲ αὐτῶν κείμενων ἐστὶ διατηρητικοί, καὶ ἐν ψηλ. 56 διακρίνεται ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ σοφία ἱεσοῦ γιοῦ σιραχ. The leaves contain Sir. prol. i—i. 14, i. 29—iii. 11. Printed by J. R. Harris, op. cit., no. 5.

(14) Part of a Papyrus book which seems to have contained the Minor Prophets. The discovery of this fragment was announced in 1892 by W. H. Heckler, who gave a facsimile of Zach. xii. 2, 3 (‘Times,’ Sept. 7, 1892; Transactions of the Congress of Orientalists, 1892, ii., p. 331 f.). Mr Heckler
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claimed for this papyrus an extravagantly early date, but the hand appears to belong to the seventh century; see Kenyon, *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 118. When last seen, it was in the shop of Th. Graf, a dealer at Vienna (ib., p. 24).

(15) Two leaves of a small vellum book, from the Fayûm, now Bodl. MS. Gr. bibl. e. 4 (P); the handwriting, "in small, fine uncial," yields the text of Zach. xii. 10—12, xiii. 3—5. "About the fifth century" (Grenfell, *Greek papyri*, p. 11 f.).

(16) A Rainer papyrus, assigned to the third century and containing Isa. xxxviii. 3—5, 13—16; see Nestle, *Utext*, p. 74.

(17) A portion of a leaf of a papyrus book, bearing the Greek text of Ezech. v. 12—vi. 3 (Bodl. MS. Gr. bibl. d. 4 (P)); see Grenfell, *Greek papyri*, pp. 9 ff. The text shews Hexaplaric signs; the writing is said to belong to the third century (Kenyon, *Palaeography of papyri*, p. 107).

(18) A fragment of a lead roll on which is engraved Ps. lxxix (lxxx). 1—16, found at Rhodes in 1898. See *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1898 (xxxvii.).

II. CURSIVE MSS.

We proceed to give a list of cursive MSS. of the Greek Old Testament, or of books belonging to it, limiting ourselves to the codices used by Holmes and Parsons, with the addition in the Octateuch of others which have been recently examined or collated by the editors of the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

(A) *The Octateuch.*

16. Octateuch (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 38

1 The arabic numerals are the symbols employed by H. and P. For descriptions of the unnumbered MSS., the writer is indebted to Messrs Brooke and McLean, and Mr Brooke has also assisted him in verifying and correcting the earlier lists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date/Issuer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Octateuch...1</td>
<td>Rome, Chigi R. vi. 38</td>
<td>Bianchini, Vind., p. 279 ff.</td>
<td>Lucianic, Lagarde's h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Genesis (ix)</td>
<td>[Cod. Dorothei i.]</td>
<td>Munich, Stadtbibl.</td>
<td>Field, ii. Auct. p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gen., Ex., ep. Arist., cat. (xi)</td>
<td>Gr. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Octateuch (inc. Gen. xliii. 15) (x)</td>
<td>Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 2</td>
<td>Cf. Lagarde Genesis, p. 6, Septuagintast. i. p. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Octateuch (inc. Gen. xxiv. 13) (xi)</td>
<td>Rome, Casan. 1444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Genesis, cat.(xiv)</td>
<td>Vienna, Theol. Gr. 4</td>
<td>Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pentateuch (xii) [Cod. Eugenii i.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Lectionary (A.D. 1116)</td>
<td>Moscow, Syn. 31, Vlad. 8</td>
<td>Hexaplaric, cf. Field, i. p. 398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Octateuch... (xv) Escurial, Y. 11. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lagarde'sz: see Genesis gr., p. 7 ff. and Libr. V. T. can. i. p. vi.; Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 261; Redpath, Exp. T., May 1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Octateuch... (xv) Zittau, A.1. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Num. (lect.), (xi) Escurial</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.T. exc. Psalter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Octateuch... (xiv) Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fragment of lectionary Oxford, Bodl. Baron. 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lectionary (xiii) Oxford, Bodl. Seld. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Octateuch... ep. Arist., cat. (x) Florence, Laur. Acq. 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Octateuch (A.D. 1439) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Octateuch... (A.D. 1093) Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Lagarde's k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dots in this position shew that the MS. extends beyond the Octateuch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Octateuch (xv)</td>
<td>Glasgow, Univ. BE.</td>
<td>field, i. p. 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Octateuch ... (x)</td>
<td>Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 2</td>
<td>Field, i. p. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Octateuch... (xv)</td>
<td>Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 5</td>
<td>O. and N.T. Scrivener-Miller, i. p. 219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Jos., Jud., Ruth ... (xi)</td>
<td>Munich, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Octateuch...(xiv)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. Acq. 700 (49)</td>
<td>Hesychian (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Octateuch...(xiii)</td>
<td>Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Octateuch, cat. (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Gen., Ex., cat. (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 383</td>
<td>Field, i. p. 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Octateuch... (xii)</td>
<td>Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr.</td>
<td>Lagarde's f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Pentateuch, cat. (xvi)</td>
<td>Lisbon, Archivio da Torre da Tombo 540 &amp;c. (formerly at Evora)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Heptateuch (imperfect.) (x)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1901</td>
<td>Hesychian (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Heptateuch (imperfect.) (xi)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 2058 (formerly Basil. 97)</td>
<td>Field, i. pp. 78, 397 (“praestantissimi codicis”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Ruth... (xiii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2</td>
<td>Lucianic (Lagarde's m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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94 = 131
105. Exod. xiv. 6—26 &c. (xiii—xiv) London, B. M. Burney
106. Octateuch... (xv) Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 187
        Hesychian (?). O. T., N. T. (582 Greg., 451 Scr.). Lagarde,
        Ank. p. 27
        Lagarde, ib.
108. Octateuch... (xiv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 330
        Field, i. p. 5. Lucianic text (Lagarde's d)
118. Octateuch (im-  Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 6
        perf.) (xiii) Venice, St Mark's,  Lucianic (Lagarde's p)
120. Octateuch...(xi) Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 4
121. Octateuch (x) Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 3
122. Octateuch... (xv) Venice, St Mark's, O. and N. T. (Ev. 6
        206) in Latin order. Copy of 68
125. Octateuch...(xv) Moscow, Syn. 30,
        Vlad. 3
        Vlad. 38
127. Octateuch... (x) Moscow, Syn. 31 a,  Field, i. pp. 168, 224
        Vlad. 1
128. Octateuch (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1657,
        formerly Grotta ferrata
129. Octateuch (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1252
130. Octateuch (? xi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 57
        See note to 63
131. Octateuch ...... (x—xi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 23
        See note to 131
        limpsest, xi— 9
        xii)
133. Excerpts from Leyden, Univ.
        MSS. by I. Voss
134. Octateuch... (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 1 Hesychian (?)
135. Gen., Ex. i— Basle, A. N. iii. 13  
    xii. 4, cat. (xi)  
    Field, i. p. 6. Lagarde's r (Genesis, p. 6). Hexaplaric

    Pentateuch 196  
    (A.D. 1043)

    cat. (xii)

    ... (xii)  
    Klostermann, p. 78

237=73  

241. Jos., Jud., Ruth  
    ... (xvii)  
    7522  
    P. Young's copy of Cod. A

246. Octateuch ...... Rome, Vat. Gr. 1238  
    (xiii)  
    Cf. Batiffol, d'un important MS. des Septante, in Bulletin Critique, 15 March, 1889

| Josh.—Ruth (x—xi) | London, B.M. Add. 20002 |
| Octateuch, cat. (xii—xiii) | London, B.M. Add. 35123 |
| Lev.—Ruth, cat. | Lambeth, 1214 |
| Octateuch schol. | Paris, Arsenal 8415 |
| Heptateuch (imp. perf.) (xiii) | Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 184 |
| Lev.—Ruth, cat. (xiii) | Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. 6 |
| Octateuch... (xiv) | Paris, Nat. Suppl. Hesychian (?) |
| Gr. 609 |
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Gen. i.—iii. (?), Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. comm. (palim.) 161
Octateuch... (imperf.) (xi) Escurial Ζ. i. 16
Octateuch, cat. Leyden, 13 (belongs to Voss collection)
Exod.—Deut. Leipzig, Univ. Libr. Hexaplaric readings. Published by Fischer in 1767 = Lips. (H. P.)

Gen., Ex., ep. Munich, Gr. 82
Arist., cat.(xvi) Jos.—Ruth... (x) Munich, Gr. 454 (formerly at Augsburg)
Octateuch, ep. Zurich, Bibl. de la ville, c. 11
Arist., cat. (xiii) Gen. iv.—v, Ex. Basle, O. ii. 17
xii. — xxviii., comm. (xi)
Octateuch, cat. Rome, Barb. Gr. iv. 56
Gen., cat. (xvi) Rome, Barb. Gr. vi. 8
Num.—Ruth ... (xiv—xv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 332
Hexateuch... (x) Grotta Ferrata Y. y. 1
Gen.—Jos. (imperf.)... (x—xi) St Petersburg, Imp. Libr. lxii
Joshua—Ruth... cat. (xii) Athos, Ivér. 15
Octateuch (x) Athos, Pantocr. 24 Hexaplaric readings
Octateuch... (x—xi) Athos, Vatop. 511
Octateuch ... (A.D. 1021) Athos, Vatop. 513
Lev.—Ruth, cat. (xi—xii) Athos, Vatop. 515
Ex.—Ruth ... (xiv) Athos, Vatop. 516 Hexaplaric readings, much faded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of the Septuagint.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pentateuch</strong> (im-perf.), (A.D. 1327)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Octateuch (A.D. 1013) | **Hexaplaric readings**
| Genesis, cat. (?xi) | (a few) |
| Octateuch... cat. | **Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43**
| Octateuch... (xiii) | **Lucianic (?)** |
| Octateuch, cat. | **Smyrna, σχολὴ εὐαγγ.**
| Niceph. (xii) | 1 |
| Pentateuch, cat. | **Patmos, 216**
| Num. — Ruth, cat. (xi) | **Patmos, 217** |
| Heptateuch (im-perf.) (xiii) | **Patmos, 410** |
| Pentateuch, test. xii, patr. (xv) | **Patmos, 411** |
| Octateuch... (x Sinai, 1—xi) | **Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre 2** |
| Pentateuch, cat. (xiv) | **Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre 3** |
| Octateuch... (ix) | **Venice, St Mark’s, Gr. 2** |
| Genesis, cat. (xii) | **Escurial, Y. 1 I. 5** |
| —xiii) | (B) **Historical Books.**

19... 1 Regn., 2 Esdr., Rome, Chigi R. vi. 38
Judith, Esth., 1—3 Macc., &c. (x)

29... 1—4 Regn., 1— Venice, St Mark’s, 3 Macc. (im-perf.), &c. (x)

38... 1 Regn., 2 Regn. Escurial, Y. 1 I. 5
i. 1—xx. 18 (xv)

44... 1 Regn., 2 Esdr., Zittau, A. 1. 1
1—4 Macc., Esth., Judith, Tob., (N. T.) &c. (xv)

1 Dots before the name of the first book quoted indicate that the MS. has already appeared under (A), where fuller information may be sought. This note applies mutatis mutandis to (C) and (D).
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46...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Nat. Coisl. Gr. Esth., Judith, 4
1—4 Macc., Tob...

52...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. Acq. Esth., Judith, 44
1—4 Macc., Tob., schol. (x)

55...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Regin. Judith, Esth., Gr. 1
Tob., 1—4 Macc. (xi)

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

58...1—4 Regn., 1—2 Chron., 1—2 Esdr., Jud., Tob., Esth., &c. (xiii)

60. 1—2 Chron. (?xii) Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Ff. i. 24 Walton, Polygl. vi. 122ff.; J. R. Harris, Origin of Leicester Cod., p. 21

64...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. Esth., Tob., 2
1—2 Macc. (x)

68...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Venice, St Mark’s, Esth., Judith, Gr. 5
Tob., 1—3 Macc.... (xv)

70...1—4 Regn., parts of Chron., Tob. Munich, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg) (xi)

71...2 Esdr., 1—3 Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 1 Macc., Esth., Judith, Tob. (xiii)

74...1—2 Esdr., 1—4 Florence, St Mark’s Macc., Esth., Judith, Tob. (xiv)

76...Esth., Judith, Paris, Nat. Reg. Gr. 4 Tob. (xiii)


92. 1—4 Regn. (x) Paris, Nat. Gr. 8 Field, i. p. 486
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts of the Septuagint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93...1-2 Esdr., Esth., 1-3 Macc. (xiii) London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. 1-4 Regn., 1-2 Chron., cat. Escurial, Σ. 2. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. 1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Venice, St Mark's, 1-4 Macc., Esth. (xi) Gr. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. 1 Regn.-2 Esdr. Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 3 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Historical Bks., Venice, St Mark's, ... (xv) Gr. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. 1-4 Regn. (xi) [Cod. Dorothei v.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Historical Bks., Moscow, Syn. 30, ... (xv) Vlad. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Judith, Tob. (xv) Moscow, Syn. 19, Vlad. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. 1-4 Regn., 1-2 Chron. xxxvi. Moscow, Syn. 31 a, Vlad. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Historical Bks. Vienna, Th. Gr. 23 (exc. 4 Macc.) Vlad. 1 (xi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. 1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Florence, Laur. v. 1 1 Macc. (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236. 1 Regn.-2 Esdr., Rome, Vat. Gr. 331 Esth., Judith, Tob., 1-4 Macc. (xii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242. 1-4 Regn. Vienna, Th. Gr. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243. 1-4 Regn. Paris, Nat. Coisl. 8 Field, i. p. 486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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243* 1-4 Regn. (cat.), Venice, St Mark's, Field, i. p. 486 cod. 16
   1 Chron.—2 Esdr., Esth., Tob., Jud., 1-4 Macc.
244. 1-4 Regn. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 333
245. 1 Regn. (ix-x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 334 Lucianic (Field)
246...1 Regn. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1238
247. 1 Regn. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. Urb. 1

311...Historical Bks. Moscow, Syn. 341
   (xi)
   ...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Esth., Tob.
   ...Judith, 1—3 Macc. (3 M. imperf.) (xi)
   ...1 Regn.—2 Chron. Munich, Gr. 454 (formerly at Augsburg)
   (x)
   ...1 Regn.—3 Regn. St Petersburg, Imp. Libr. lxii.
   xvi. 28 (x or xi)
   ...Tob., Judith, Esth., Ruth (x) Grotta Ferrata, A. y. 1
   ...Tobit (xiv or xv) (catal., 29)
   ...1 Esdr., Tobit Rome, Vat. Gr. 332
   (fragments) (x Leipzig, Univ. Libr. Hexaplaric readings
   or xi) Gr. 361
   ...Esth., Judith, Athos, Vatop. 511
   Tob., 1-4 Regn. (x or xi)
   ...Esth., Tob., Athos, Vatop. 513
   Judith (A.D. 1021)
   ...1-2 Chron. (xiv) Athos, Vatop. 516
   ...1-4 Regn., cat. Athens, Bibl. Nat. 43
   (xi)
   ...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Athens, Bibl. Nat. 44
   Esth., Judith, Tob. (xiii)
   ...1-4 Regn., 1—2 Chron. (xiv)
   ...1 Regn.—2 Esdr., Paris, Arsenal 8415
   Esth., Judith, 609
   Tob. (xiv)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I Regn.—2 Esdr.,</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith, Esth.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob., 1—4 Macc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Poetical Books.

13. = I (see under Uncial MSS.)
(xiii—xiv)
27. Psalms i—lxx Gotha, formerly Lothringen
39. Psalms *imperf.* [Cod. Dorothei ii.]
(ix)
43. = W (see under Uncial MSS.)
Cant., Job, 4
Sap., Sir., θυ-νος τῶν παρ.
ημὼν (xiv)
55...Job, Psalms Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr.
(? xi)
65. Psalms, *cant.* Leipzig
Lat. (xii)
(xvi)
68...Poetical Books Venice, St Mark's
(xv)
(? x)
80. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. A
(xiii—xiv)
81. Psalms (xi) Oxford, Christ Ch. 2
(xii—xiii)
100. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 3
(xii—xiii)
101. Psalms, *cant.* Oxford, Christ Ch. 20

An uncial MS., Lagarde's M<sub>8</sub> (Specimen, p. 27)
An uncial MS., Lagarde's E<sub>8</sub> (Specimen, p. 2)
Lagarde's F<sub>8</sub> (Specimen, p. 2)
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102. Psalms, cant. Oxford, Christ Ch. 1
103. Prov. i.—xix. Vienna, Th. Gr. 25
104. Psalms i.–x. (xvi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 27
107...Job, Prov., Eccl., Cant., Sap., Sir. Ferrara, Bibl. Comm. Gr. 188
...Psalms (xv)
109. Proverbs... (xiii) Vienna, Th. Gr. 26
110. Job, schol. (ix) Vienna, Th. Gr. 9
111. Psalms (ix) Milan, Ambr. P. 65
113. Psalms, comm. Milan, Ambr. B. 106
114...Psalms, comm. Evora, Carthus. 2
115. Psalms, comm. Evora, Carthus. 3
122...Poetical Books Venice, St Mark’s, (xv)
124. Psalms, cant. Vienna, Th. Gr. 21
125...Proverbs (comm. Chrys.), Eccl., Vlad. 3
Cant., Sap. (xv)
131...Poetical Books, &c. (?xii) Vienna, Th. Gr. 23
137. Job, cat. (xi—xii) Milan, Ambr. D. 73 Field, ii. p. 2, and
140. Psalms Basle, B. 10. 33
141. Psalms (A.D. Turin, B. 2. 42
1344)
142. Psalms, comm. Vienna, Th. Gr. 10
143. Psalms, prooem. Vienna, Th. Gr. 19
144=131
145. Psalms, cant. (x) Velletri, Borg.
146. Psalms (x) [Cod. Fr. Xavier]
... (xiii)
149. Job, Prov., Eccl., Vienna, Th. Gr. 7 = 308*H. P. See Geb- Cant., Sap., Salmo’s, p. 15
Pss. Sal., comm. (xi)
150. Psalms (?xiv) Ferrara, Carmelit. 3
152. Psalms (xi) (Cod. Nani)
Manuscripts of the Septuagint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155. Psalms (xii—xiii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetstein, N. T. i. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159. Eccl., Prov. (part), Cant., <em>schol.</em> (xi)</td>
<td>Dresden, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163. Psalms (xii)</td>
<td>Paris, Nat. Colbert. Gr. 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164. Psalms (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165. Psalms (xiv)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168. Psalms (<em>imperf.</em>) (xi—xii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169. Psalms (xii—xiii)</td>
<td>London, B. M. Harl. 5571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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177. Psalms (imperf.) Paris, Nat. Gr. 27
    cant. (xiii)
    (A.D. 1059)
179. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 41
    (xii)
    (xii)
182. Psalms, cant. (xi) Rome, Chigi 4
183. Psalms, cant. Rome, Chigi 5
    (xii)
184. Psalms, comm. Vienna, Th. Gr. 17
    (ix—x)
185. Psalms, comm. Vienna, Th. Gr. 18
    (xi)
186. Psalms, comm. Vienna, Th. Gr. 13
    (xi)
187. Psalms (imperf.) St Germain 10
188. Psalms (imperf.) St Germain 186
    An uncial MS. Largarde's H(PB)
    (Specimen, p. 3). Often agrees with 156
189. Psalms, cant. St Germain 13
190. Psalms (imperf.) St Germain 187
    cant. An uncial MS. Largarde's K(PB)
    (Specimen, p. 3)
191. Psalms, cant. St Germain 188
    cant. (xiii)
193. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 21
    (xii)
    (xii)
    (xii)
196. Psalms (inc. ii. Paris, Nat. Gr. 25
    3), cant. (xii)
197. Psalms, cant. Paris, Nat. Gr. 29
    (xiv)
199. Psalms (xi) Modena, Est. 37
    107
    110

S. S.
   _prayers_ (A.D. C. 41
   1336)
   _schol., prayers_ C. 38
205. Psalms, _cant._ Cambridge, Trin. 
   Coll.
206. Psalms, _cant._ Cambridge, Gonville 
      & Caius Coll. 348
      _prayers_ 
      _Facsimile in Harris, _Leicester codex_"
207. Psalms _imperf._ Tübingen, (cod. 
      _Schnurrer_)
208. Psalms (xiv) [Cod. Demetrii v.]
209. Psalms, _cant._ (xiii)
210. Psalms (xiv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1541 
      (xii)
211. Psalms (xiv) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1542 
      (xii)
212. Psalms (imperf.) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1848 
      (xiii)
213. Psalms (imperf.) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1870 
      (xiii)
214. Psalms, _cant._ Rome, Vat. Gr. 1873 (A.D. 1011)
      _Klostermann, p. 13_ 
      (A.D. 1029)
216. Psalms, _cant._ Rome, Vat. Gr. 341 
      (xii)
217. Psalms, _cant._ Rome, Vat. Gr. 346 
      (xii)
218. Psalms, li.—liii. Vienna, Th. Gr. 20 
      (xiii—xiv)
219. Psalms, _cant._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 196 
      (xiii)
220. Psalms, _ix.—cl., comm._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 13 
221. Psalms, _ix.—cl._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 16 
222. Psalms, _cant._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 21 
223. Psalms, _cant._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 22 
224. Psalms, _cant._ Vienna, Th. Gr. 720 
      (xi)
225. Psalms, _cant._ Rome, Barber. 1 
226. Psalms, _cant._ Rome, Barber. 2 
      _prayers_ (x)
227. Psalms _imperf._ Rome, Barber. 2 
      _schol., prayers_ (x)
228. Job, &c. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1764 
      7522
248. Prov., _Eccl., Cant., Job, 
      Sap., Sir., &c._ Rome, Vat. Gr. 346 
      _Hexaplaric readings. _Field, ii. p. 2
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257. Job, comm. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 743 Klostermann, p. 68
259. Job, schol. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 230
262. Psalms Copenhagen, Royal Lib. Field, l. c.
263. Psalms, cat. Rome, Vat. Gr. 398 Klostermann, p. 68
266. Psalms (imperf.) Rome, Vat. Gr. 294 40
267. Psalms, cant. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 294 Field, ii. p. 84
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Psalms</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comm. (xiii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Psalms, cant. (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>= 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Psalms, cant.</td>
<td>Vienna, Th. Gr. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Psalms (xii—xiii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Psalms, cant. (xiii—xiv)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Psalms (xi)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Psalms (xi)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Psalms (xv)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Psalms (xii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. vi. 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Psalms, cant. (xiii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Psalms, cant. (xiii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Psalms, comm. (xii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Psalms (imperf.)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>comm. (xii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. xi. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Psalms, comm. Thal. (xii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. ix. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Psalms, cant. (xiii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Psalms (xi—xii)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Psalms, cat. (xi)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. vi. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Psalms, metr. paraphr. (xv)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. v. 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Psalms, lxxi. 14, cxxvii. 3—cxxv. 6, cxxxv. 11—cxxxvi. 1, cxxxvii. 4—cxli. 21 (? xiii)</td>
<td>Cambridge, Emmanuel College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lagarde calls it P in Genesis graece, but N in the Specimen. Apparently a copy in a Western hand of an early cursive Psalter; see M. R. James in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1892–3, p. 168 ff.¹

¹ Other Psalters used by Lagarde (Specimen, p. 3 f.) are St Gall 17 (ix) = G; Munich 251 = L; a Bamberg Graeco-Latin MS. and a Cologne MS. closely related to it, which he calls W and Z respectively.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297.</td>
<td>Prov., comm. (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.</td>
<td>Cant., comm. (xii)</td>
<td>[Cod. Eugenii 3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>Prov... (ix) = 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) **Prophetic Books.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Prophets (?xi)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 556</td>
<td>Originally belonged to same codex as Vat. gr. 1153; see Klostermann, p. 11. Cp. notes on 97, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Dan. (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 803</td>
<td>Lucianic (Field). Cornill's ơ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Dan. (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Prophets (xiii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Dodecaprophe-ton (xii)</td>
<td>[Cod. Dorothei iii.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Isa., Jer. (ix—x)</td>
<td>[Cod. Demetrii ii.]</td>
<td>Lucianic (Field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Ezek., Dan. (xi—xii)</td>
<td>[Cod. Demetrii iii.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Prophets (xii)</td>
<td>Rome, Vat. Gr. 1794</td>
<td>Lucianic (Field), Cornill's η. Klostermann, pp. 11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Prophets (xi)</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. xi. 4</td>
<td>Hesychius, Cornill's ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Manuscript Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Prophets (xi) Florence, Laur. x. 8 Lucianic (Field). Cornill's θ On the text of Daniel in this MS. see Klostermann, p. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68...Ezek., Dodecapr. (xv) Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 5 Hesychian. Cornill's μ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70...Prophets (x—xi) Munich, Gr. 372 (formerly at Augsburg) Hesychian. Cornill's μ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Prophets (?ix) Rome, Chigi 2 Hesychian. Cornill's μ. For the relation of 87 to 91 and 96 see Faulhaber Die Propheten-catenen (Freiburg, 1899) 87 in Field (ii. p. 766). O.T. in Greek (iii. p. xiii.). Cf. Klostermann, p. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan. (LXX.) Rome, Chigi 3 Lucianic (Field); in Ezekiel, Hesychian acc. to Cornill: Cornill's λ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Daniel (xi) = 239 Florence, Laur. v. 9 Lucianic (Field); in Ezekiel, Hesychian acc. to Cornill: Cornill's μ. See note on 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan., cat. (xi) Florence, Laur. v. 9 Lucianic (Field); in Ezekiel, Hesychian acc. to Cornill: Cornill's μ. See note on 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93...Isa. (xiv) London, B. M. Reg. i. D. 2 Lucianic (Field)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan. Copenhagen See note on 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Dodecapr., Isa., cat. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153 See note on 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105...Fragments of Prophets, &amp;c. (xiii—xiv) London, B. M. Bur- ney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts of the Septuagint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107... Isa., Jer., Ezek., Dan., Minor Prophets to Micah (xv) Ferrara, Gr. 187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109... Isaiah, cat. = 302 Evora, Carthus. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Dodecaproph., comm. Theod. Mops...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122... Prophets (xv) Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131... Prophets (xi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. Daniel (xii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 2025 Lucianic (Cornill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185... Dodecaproph. (xi) Vienna, Th. Gr. 18 Lucianic (Cornill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228... Prophets (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1764 Hesychian (Cornill, but cf. Klostermann, p. 13f. Cornill's φ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233. Prophets (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 2067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234. Susanna Moscow, Syn. 341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235. Susanna Rome, Vat. Gr. 2048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238. Ezekiel, cat. (x) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239. Prophets (A.D. 1046) = 89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. Dodecapr., cat. Florence, Laur. vi. 22 (A.D. 1286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301. Isaiah (ix) Vienna, Th. Gr. 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302... Isaiah, cat. (xiii) = 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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303. Isaiah, comm. Cyril. Vienna, Th. Gr. 100
304. Isaiah i.—xxv. comm. Basil. Florence, Laur. iv. 2
305. Isaiah (imperf.), cat. (xi) Copenhagen, Reg.
308. Isaiah, comm. Basil. and That. (xiii) Rome, Vat. Gr. 1509 Lucianic (Field)
310. Dodecapr., schol. Moscow, Syn. 209
311...Prophets (xi)= 234
...Prophets (ix, Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre 2

III. Lectionaries.

From the second century the Greek-speaking Churches, following the example of the Hellenistic Synagogue, read the Greek Old Testament in their public assemblies.

Justin, Apol. i. 67 τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγνώσκεται. Const. ap. ii. 57 μέσος δὲ ὁ ἀναγνώστης ἔφε, ὑψηλὸν τοιοῦ ἑστὼς ἀναγινωσκότω τὰ πεσίον καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυή, τὰ τῶν Κριτῶν καὶ τῶν Βασιλείων κ.τ.λ. Ibid. viii. 5 μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Chrys. in Rom. xxiv. 3 ὁ μάρτυς ἐνταῦθα εἰσέλθων, εἰπε τίς προφήτης, τίς ἀπόστολος σήμερον διελέξθη.

At a later time the ἀναγνώσεις or ἀναγινώσματα were copied consecutively for ecclesiastical use. The lectionaries or fragments of lectionaries which survive, although frequently written in large and showy uncialis¹, are rarely earlier than the tenth or eleventh century; but a thorough investigation of their contents would doubtless be of interest, not only from a liturgical

¹ Specimens are given by H. Omont, Facsimiles des plus anciens MSS. Grecs (Paris, 1892), nos. xx.—xxii.
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point of view, but for the light which it would throw on the ecclesiastical distribution of various types of text. Little has been done as yet in this direction, and our information, such as it is, relates chiefly to the N.T.


The following list of MSS. containing lections from the Old Testament has been drawn up from materials previously supplied by Dr E. Nestle. It will be seen that with few exceptions they are limited to those which are bound up with N.T. lections and have been catalogued under the head of N.T. lectionaries by Dr C. F. Gregory and Scrivener-Miller.

London, Sion College, Arc. i. 1 (vi or vii) Gr. p. 720 (234, Scr. 227)
" B. M. Add. 11841 (? xi) Gr. p. 783 (79, Scr. 75)
" B. M. Add. 18212 (xi) Gr. p. 715 (191, Scr. 263)
" B. M. Add. 22744 (xiii) Gr. p. 731 (324, Scr. 272)
" Burdett-Coutts, iii. 42 (xiv) Gr. p. 730 (315, Scr. 253)
" Burdett-Coutts, iii. 44 (xv) Gr. p. 749 (476, Scr. 290)
" Burdett-Coutts, iii. 46 (xiii) Gr. p. 734 (84)
" Burdett-Coutts, iii. 53 (xv) Gr. p. 719 (226, Scr. 249)
Oxford, Christ Church, Wake 14 (xii) Gr. p. 717 (207, Scr. 214)
" Christ Church, Wake 15 (A.D. 1068) Gr. p. 717 (208, Scr. 215)
Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Add. 1879 (? xi) (Gen. xi. 4—9, Prov. xiii. 19—xiv. 6, Sir. xxxvii. 13—xxxviii. 6): a fragment purchased from the executors of Tischendorf
" Christ’s College, F. i. 8 (xi) Gr. p. 714 (185, Scr. 222)
= ZS, WH. 59
Ashburnham, 205 (xii) Gr. p. 720 (237, Scr. 237–8)

1 A few lectionaries have already been mentioned among the H.P. MSS. (37, 61, 132).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Ref.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Ser. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Nat. suppl. Gr. 32</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Vat. Reg. Gr. 59</td>
<td>(xii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Vat. Gr. 168</td>
<td>(xiii or xiv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Vat. Gr. 2012</td>
<td>(xv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Barb. 18</td>
<td>(xiv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotta Ferrata, A' δ' 2</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; A' δ' 4</td>
<td>(xlii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Δ' β' 22</td>
<td>(xviii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, St Mark's, i. 42</td>
<td>(xii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trèves, Bibl. Cath. 143 F</td>
<td>(x or xi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Nat. 86</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonica, 'Ελληνικού γομνασίου τό' (xv or xvi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Patr. Alex. 927 (xv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai, 748 (xv or xvi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 943 (A.D. 1697)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saba, in tower, 16 (xii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem, H. Sepulchre</td>
<td>(xiii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LITERATURE** (on the general subject of this chapter). Stroth, in Eichhorn’s *Repertorium* (vi., viii., xi.); the prolegomena to Grabe, Holmes and Parsons, Tischendorf, and *The Old Testament in Greek*; the prefaces to Lagarde’s *Genesis graece, Libr. V. T. Canon.,* p. i., *Psalterii specimen; Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*; Madan, *Summary,* p. 615 ff. (Holmes MSS., A.D. 1789—1805); Nestle, *Uertext,* p. 71 ff.


**POSTSCRIPT.**

The first part of the *Amherst Papyri*, edited by Messrs Grenfell and Hunt, which has just appeared (October, 1900), makes the following additions to the store of unused uncial fragments enumerated in pp. 146—8:

1. A papyrus leaf containing, with other Biblical matter, Gen. i. 1—5 (LXX. and Aquila). The writing appears to be of the time of Constantine.
3. Fragment of a uncial leaf belonging to a Psalter, containing parts of Ps. lviii., lix., in a hand “dating apparently from about the fifth century.”
CHAPTER VI.

PRINTED TEXTS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The printed texts of the Septuagint fall naturally into two classes, viz. (1) those which contain or were intended to exhibit the whole of the Greek Old Testament; (2) those which are limited to a single book or to a group of books.

I. COMPLETE EDITIONS.

1. The first printed text of the whole Septuagint is that which forms the third column in the Old Testament of the great Complutensian Polyglott. This great Bible was printed at Alcalà (Complutum) in Spain under the auspices of Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo. Ximenes, who, in addition to his ecclesiastical offices, was Regent of Castile, began this undertaking in 1502 in honour of the birth of Charles V. (1500–1558), and lived to see the whole of the sheets pass through the press. He died Nov. 8, 1517, and the fourth volume, which completes the Old Testament and was the last to be printed, bears the date July 10, 1517. But the publication of the Polyglott was delayed for more than four years: the papal sanction attached to the N.T. volume is dated May 22, 1520, and the copy which was intended for the Pope seems not to have found its way into the Vatican Library until Dec. 5, 1521. The title of the complete work (6 vols. folio) is as follows: "Biblia sacra Polyglotta complectentia V.T."
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The O.T. volumes of the Complutensian Bible contain in three columns (1) the Hebrew text with the Targum of Onkelos, (2) the Latin Vulgate, (3) the Septuagint, with an interlinear Latin version—an order which is explained by the editors as intended to give the place of honour to the authorised version of the Western Church¹. The prejudice which their words reveal does not augur well for the character of the Complutensian LXX. Nevertheless we have the assurance of Ximenes that the greatest care was taken in the selection of the MSS. on which his texts were based². Of his own MSS. few remain, and among those which are preserved at Madrid there are only two which contain portions of the Greek Old Testament (Judges—Macc., and a Psalter). But he speaks of Greek MSS. of both Testaments which had been sent to him by the Pope from the Vatican Library³, and it has been shewn that at least two MSS. now in that Library (cod. Vat. gr. 330 = H.P. 108, and cod. Vat. gr. 346 = H.P. 248) were used in the construction of the Complutensian text of the LXX.⁴ There is

¹ Their words are: "medium autem inter has Latinam B. Hieronymi translationem velut inter Synagogam et orientalem ecclesiam posuimus, tanquam duos hinc et inde latrones, medium autem Iesum, hoe est Romanam sive Latinam ecclesiam, collocantes."

² In the dedication to Leo X. he says: "testari possimus...maximi laboris nostri partum in eo praecipeque fuisse versatum ut...castigatissima omni ex parte vetustissimaque exemplaria pro archetypis haberemus."

³ "Ex ista apostolica bibliotheca antiquissimos tum V. tum N. Testamenti codices perquam humane ad nos misisti."

reason to suppose that a Venice MS. (S. Marc. 5 = H.P. 68) was also employed; a copy of this MS. still exists at Madrid.

The editors of the Complutensian Polygott were the Spaniard Antonio de Nebrija, Professor of Rhetoric at Alcalà, and his pupil Ferdinando Núñez de Guzman (Pincianus); Diego Lopez de Zuñiga (Stunica); Juan de Vergara, Professor of Philosophy at Alcalà; a Greek from Crete, by name Demetrius; and three converts from Judaism, to whom the Hebrew text and the Targum were entrusted. The editing of the Greek LXX. text seems to have been left chiefly in the hands of Pincianus, Stunica and Demetrius.

The Complutensian text is followed on the whole in the Septuagint columns of the four great Polyglotts edited by Arias Montanus, Antwerp, 1569—72; Vatablus, Geneva, 1586—7, 1599, 1616; D. Wolder, Hamburg, 1596; Michael Le Jay, Paris, 1645.

2. In February 1518, after the printing of the Complutensian Polyglott but before its publication, Andreas Asolanus1, father-in-law of the elder Aldus, issued from the Aldine press a complete edition of the Greek Bible bearing the title: Πάντα τὰ κατ’ ἔξοχην καλούμενα βιβλία, θείας δηλαδή γραφῆς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ νέας. Sacrae scripturae veteris novaeque omnia. **Colophon:** Venetiis in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri. m.d.xviii., mense Februario.

Like Ximenes, Andreas made it his business to examine the best MSS. within his reach. In the dedication he writes: "ego multis vetustissimis exemplaribus collatis biblia (ut vulgo appellant) graece cuncta descripsi." His words, however, do not suggest an extended search for MSS., such as was instituted by the Spanish Cardinal; and it is probable enough that he was content to use Bessarion's collection of codices, which is still preserved in St Mark's Library at Venice. Traces have

---

2 Cf. Lagarde, *Genesis graece*, p. 6; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 79; Nestle,
been found in his text of three at least of those MSS. (cod. ii = H.P. 29; cod. iii = H.P. 121; cod. v = H.P. 68).

The Aldine text of the LXX. was followed on the whole in the editions of (1) Joh. Lonicerus, Strassburg, 1526—8; (2)? with a preface by Philip Melanchthon, Basle, 1545; (3) H. Guntius, Basle, 1550, 1582; (4) Draconites, in Bibliä Pentaplaä, Wittenburg 1562—5; (5) Francis du Jon (Fr. Junius) or (?) Fr. Sylburg, Frankfort, 1597; (6) Nic. Glycas, Venice, 1687.

3. In 1587 a third great edition of the Greek Old Testament was published at Rome under the auspices of Sixtus V. (editio Sixtina, Romana). It bears the title: Η ΠΑΙΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΘΑΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ ΔΙ ΑΥΘΕΝΤΙΑΣ ΕΥΣΤΟΥ Ε' ΑΚΡΟΥ ΑΡΧΕΙΕΡΟΣ ΕΚΔΟΘΕΙΣ ΒΕΤΟΥΣ ΤΕΣΜΑΝΤΩΝ ΙΒΧΤΑ ΣΕΠΤΥΑΓΙΝΤΑ EX AVCTORITATE SEXTI V. PONT. MAX. | EDITVM | ROMAE EX TYPOGRAPHIA FRANCISCI ZANETTI. M.D.LXXXVI(1) | CVM PRIVILEGIO GEOGIRIO FERRARIO CONESSO.

The volume consists of 783 pages of text, followed by two of addenda and corrigenda, and preceded by three (unnumbered) leaves which contain: (1) a dedicatory letter addressed to Sixtus V. by Cardinal Antonio Carafa, (2) a preface to the reader², and (3) the papal authorisation of the book. These documents are so important for the history of the printed text that they must be given in full.

(1) SIXTO QUINTO PONTIF. MAX. ANTONIUS CARAFA CARDINALIS SANCTAE SEDIS APOSTOLICAE BIBLIOTHECARIUS

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

Urtext, p. 65. On the source of the Psalms in this edition see Nestle, Septuagintastudien, iii., p. 32.

¹ The second i has been added in many copies with the pen. The impression was worked off in 1586, but the work was not published until May 1587.

² "Elle n’est point signée, mais on sait qu’elle fut redigée par Fulvio Orsini. Elle est d’ailleurs très inférieure à la lettre de Carafa." (P. Batiffol, La Vaticane de Paul III. a Paul V., p. 89).
tuaginta Interpretum Biblia, quibus Ecclesia tum Graeca tum Latina iam inde ab Apostolorum temporibus usa est, ad fidem probatissimorum codicum emendarentur. Quod enim Sanctitas V. pro accurata sua in perlegendis divinis scripturis diligentia animadvertisset, infinitos pene locos ex iis non eodem modo ab antiquis sacris scriptoribus afferri quo in vulgatis Bibliorum Graecis editionibus circumferrentur, existimassetque non aliunde eam lectionum varietatem quam e multiplici eaque confusa veterum interpretatione fluxisse; rectissime censuit ad optimae notae exemplaria provocandum esse, ex quibus, quoad fieri posset, ea quae vera et sincera esse Septuaginta Interpretum scriptura eliceretur. Ex quo fit ut vestram non solum pietatem sed etiam sapientiam magnopere admirer; cum videam S. V. de Graecis Bibliis expoliendis idem multos post annos in mentem venisse quod sanctos illos Patres Tridenti congregatos auctoritate ac reverentia ductos verae ac purae Septuaginta interpretationis olim cogitasse cognovi ex actis eius Concilii nondum pervulgatis. Huius autem expolitionis constituendae munus cum mihi demandatum esset a Gregorio XII., cuius cogitationes eo maximme spectabant ut Christiana Religio quam latissime propagaretur, operam dedi ut in celebrioribus Italiæ bibiliorum optima quae exemplaria perquirerentur atque ex iis lectionum varietates descriptae ad me mitterentur. Quibus sane doctorum hominum quos ad id delegeram industria et iudicio clarae memoriae Gulielmi Cardinalis Sirleti (quem propter excellentem doctrinam et multiplicem linguarum peritiam in locis obscurioribus mihi consulendum proposueram) persaepe examinatis et cum vestro Vaticanae bibliothecae (cui me benignitas vestra nuper praefecit) exemplari diligenter collatis; intelleximus cum ex ipsa collatione tum e sacrorum veterum scriptorum consensione, Vaticanum codicem non solum vetustate verum etiam honitate cæteris anteire; quoque caput est, ad ipsam quam quaeramus Septuaginta interpretationem, si non toto libro, maiore certe ex parte, quam proxime accedere. Quod mihi cum multis aliis argumentis constaret, vel ipso etiam libri titulo, qui est καρα τοὺς ἐβδομήκοντα, curavi de consilio et sententia eorum quos supra nominavi, huius libri editionem ad Vaticanum exemplar emendandum; vel potius exemplar ipsum, quod eius valde probaretur auctoritas, de verbo ad verbum repraesentandum, accurate prius sicubi opus fuit recognitum et notationibus etiam auctum. Factum est autem providentia sane divina, ut quod Sanctitate vestra suadente sui Cardinalatus tempore inchoatum est, id variis de causis aliquoties intermissum per ipsa fere initia Pontificatus sui

1 On the genesis of the Sixtine edition the curious reader may consult Nestle, Septuagintastudien, i., ii., where the particulars are collected with the utmost care and fulness.
fuerit absolutum; scilicet ut hoc praeclarum opus, vestro Sanctissimo nomini dicitum, quasi monumentum quoddam perpetuum esset futurum apud omnes bonos et vestrae erga Rempublicam Christianam voluntatis et meae erga Sanctitatem vestram observantiae.

(2) Praefatio ad Lectorem

Qui sunt in sacrosanctis scripturis accuratius versati, fatentur omnes Graecam Septuaginta Interpretum editionem longe aliis omnibus quibus Graeci usi sunt et antiquiorem esse et probatiorem. Constat enim eos Interpretes, natione quidem Iudaeos, doctos vero Graecos, trecentis uno plus annis ante Christi adventum, cum in Aegypto regnaret Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, Spiritu sancto plenos sacra Biblia interpretatos esse, eamque interpretationem a primis Ecclesiæ nascentis temporibus tum publice in Ecclesiis ad legendum propositam fuisse, tum privatim receptam et explanatam ab Ecclesiasticis scriptoribus qui vixerunt ante B. Hieronymum, Latinae vulgatae editionis auctorem. Nam Aquila quidem Sinopensis, qui secundus post Septuaginta eosdem libros ex Hebraeo in Graecum convertit et multo post tempore sub Hadriano principe floruit, et eius interpretationi, (quod ea quae de Christo in scripturis praedita fuerant, ut a Iudaeis gratiam iniret alteriusque Septuaginta vertendo, subdola obscuritate involverit) iamdiu est cum a recte sentientibus, licet in hexaplis haberetur, aliquibus locis non est probata. Hunc vero qui subsequuti sunt, Symmachus et Theodotio, alter Samaritanus sub L. Vero, alter Ephesius sub Imp. Commodo, uterque (quamvis et ipsi in hexaplis circumferentur) parum fidus interpres habitus est: Symmachus, quod Samaritanis offensus, ut placeret Iudaeis, non unum sanctae scripturæ locum perturbato sensu corruperit; Theodotio, quod Marcionis haereticī sectator nonnullis locis perverterit potius quam converterit sacros libros. Fuerunt praeter has apud Graecos aliae duae editiones incertae aucto-ritatīs: altera Antonio Caracalla Imp. apud Hierichuntem, altera apud Nicopolim sub Alexandro Severo in doliis repertae. quae quod in octaplis inter Graecas editiones quintum et sextum locum obtinerent, quintae et sextae editionis nomen retinuerunt. Sed nec hæ satis fidae interpretationes habita sunt. His additur alia quaedam editio sancti Luciani martyrīs, qui vivit sub Diocletiano et Maximiano Imp., valde illa quidem probata, sed quae cum Septuaginta Interpretibus comparari nullo modo possit, vel ipsis etiam Graecis scriptoribus testantibus et Niceta confirmante his plane verbīs in commentario Psalmorum: ἥμεις δὲ καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἔκδοσιν σεβαζόμενοι, τῇ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα προσκείμεθα μάλιστα, ὅτι δηηρημένως τὴν τῆς
Adeo Septuaginta Interpretum editio magni nominis apud omnes fuit; nimirum quae instinctu quodam divinitatis elaborata bono generis humani proderit in lucem. Sed haec etiam ipsa, quod in hexaplis ita primum ab Origene collocata fuerit ut eius e regione aliae editiones quo inter se comparari commodius possent ad legendum propositae essent, deinde vero varietates tantum ex iis ad illam sub obelis et asteriscis notari essent coeptae, factum est ut vetustate notis obliteratis insincera nimis et valde sui dissimilis ad nos pervenerit: quippe quae insertis ubique aliorum interpretationibus, aliquibus autem locis duplici atque etiam triplici eiusdem sententiae interpretatione intrusa, male praeterea a librariis accepta, suum ob id nitorem integritatemque amiserit. Hinc illae lectionum penitus inter se dissidentes varietates et, quod doctissimorum hominum ingenia mentesque diu torsit, ipsae exemplarium non solum inter se sed a veteribus etiam scriptoribus dissensiones. Quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, prinicem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit. Quo nomine dici non potest quantum omnes boni debeant Sixto V. Pont. Max. Is enim quod in sacris litteris, unde sanctissimam haussit doctrinam, aetatem fere totam contriverit, quod malum primo a multis ignoratum, ab aliis postea neglectum, quotidie longius serpens, principem librum, et a quo tota lex divina et Christiana pendent instituta, non levibus maculis inquinavit.
omnibus autem libris qui in manibus fuerunt unus hic prae aliis, quia ex editione Septuaginta si non toto libro certe maiorem partem constare visus est, mirum in modum institutam emendationem adiuvit; post eum vero alii duo qui ad eius vetustatem proximi quidem sed longo proximi intervallo accedunt, unus Venetus ex bibliotheca Bessarionis Cardinalis, et is quoque grandioribus litteris scriptus; alter qui ex Magna Graecia adventus nunc est Carafae Cardinalis: qui liber cum Vaticano codice ita in omnibus consentit ut credi possit ex eodem arche­typo descriptus esse. Praeter hos magno etiam usui fuerunt libri ex Medicea bibliotheca Florentiae collati, qui Vaticanas lectiones multis locis aut confirmarunt aut illustrarunt. Sed libri Vaticani bonitas non tam ex horum codicum miro consensu perspecta est, quam ex iis locis qui partim adducuntur partim explicantur ab antiquis sacris scriptoribus; qui fere nusquam huius exemplaribus lectiones non exhibent ac reponunt, nisi ubi aliorum Interpretum locum aliquem afferunt, non Septuaginta. quorum editio cum esset nova emendatione perploianda, recte ad huius libri normam, qui longe omnium antiquissimus, solus iuxta Septuaginta inscribitur, perpolita est; vel potius rectissime liber ipse ad litteram, quoad fieri potuit per antiquam ortho­graphiam aut per librarii lapsus, est expressus. Nam vetus illa et iam obsoleta eius aetatis scriptura aliquibus locis repraesentata non est; cum tamen in alii omnibus, nisi ubi manifestus apparebat librarii lapsus, ne latum quidem unguem, ut aiunt, ab huius libri auctoritate discessum sit, ne in iis quidem quae si minus mendo, certe suspicione mendi videbantur non carere. satius enim visum est locos vel aliquo modo suspectos (nei­min potest ut in quantumvis expurgato exemplari non aliqua supersit macula) quemadmodum habentur in archetypo relinqui quam eos ex alicuius ingenio aut conjectura emendari: quod multa quae primo vel mendosa vel mutilata in hoc codice videbantur, ea postea cum aliis libris collata vera et sincera reperirentur. Nam in libris Prophetarum, qui maxime in hoc exemplari (uno excepto Daniele) puram Septuaginta editionem respiunt, mirum quam multa non habeantur; quae tamen recte abesse et eorum Interpretum non esse, intellectum est tum ex commentariis veterum scriptorum Graecis et Latinis, tum ex libris manuscriptis in quibus illa addita sunt sub aste­riscis.

Atque haec ratio in notationibus quoque servata est, in quibus cum multa sint ex commentariis Graecis petita quae in codicibus manuscriptis partim mutilata partim varie scripta aliquibus locis circumferuntur, ea non aliter atque in arche­typis exemplaribus reperiuntur descripta sunt, quo uniuscuiusque arbitratu adiuvantibus librarii restitui possint. Nec vero illud omittendum, quod item pertinet ad notaciones; non omnia
in iis praesentata esse quae aut ad confirmandas lectiones Vaticanas e scriptoribus vulgatis, aut ad explenda quae in Septuaginta non habentur, ex aliorum editionibus afferri potuissent, quod in communibus libris cum legantur, inde sibi unusquisque nullo negotio ea parare possit. Quae vero in libris manuscriptis reperta, vel ad indicandas antiquarum tum lectionum tum interpretationum varietates (sub scholii illas nomine, quod ipsis incerta esset auctoritas, nonnunquam relatas) vel ad stabilendam scripturam Vaticanam et eius obscuriores locos illustrandos pertinere visa sunt, ea certe non sunt praetermissa.

Ordo autem librorum in Vaticano exemplari cum idem fere sit cum eo qui apud Graecos circumfertur, a vulgatis tamen editionibus variat in hoc quod primo habet duodecim Prophetas et hos ipsos aliter dispositos; deinde reliquis quattuor, quemadmodum vulgo editi sunt. Atque hunc ordinem verum esse intelligimus ex eo quod illum agnoscent et probant veteres Ecclesiastici scriptores. Et cum toto exemplari nulla capitum divisio sit, (nam in nova editione consultum est legentium commoditati) in libro tamen quattuor Prophetarum distinctio quaedam apparat subobscura, illi paene similis quam descriptit sanctus Dorotheus martyr, qui vixit sub Magno Constantino.

Maccabaeorum libri absunt ab hoc exemplari, atque item liber Genesis fere totus; nam longo aevo consumptis membranis mutilatus est ab initio libri usque ad caput XLVII. et liber item Psalmorum, qui a Psalmo CV. usque ad CXXXVIII. nimia vetustate mancus est. Sed haec ex aliorum codicum collatione emendata sunt.

Quod si aliqua videbuntur in hac editione, ut ait B. Hieronymus, vel lacerata vel inversa, quod ea sub obelis et asteriscis ab Origene supplet et distincta non sint; vel obscura et perturbata, quod cum Latina vulgata non consentiant, et in aliis editionibus apertius et expressius habeantur; eris lector admonendus, non eo spectasse huius expolitionis industriam ut haec edition ex permixtis eornm qui supra nominati interpretationibus (instar eius quam scribit B. Hieronymus a Graecis κουνη, a nostris appellatam Communem) concinnata, Latinae vulgatae editioni, hoc est Hebraeo, ad verbum respondeat; sed ut ad eam quam Septuaginta Interpretis Spiritus sancti auctoritatem sequi, quantum per veteres libros fieri potest, quam proxime accedat. Quam nunc novis emendationibus illustratam et aliorum Interpretum reliquisquae supersunt auctam, non parum profuturam ad Latinae vulgatae intelligentiam, dubitabit nemo qui hanc cum illa accurate comparaverit.

Quae si doctis viris et pie sentientibus, ut aequum est, probabuntur, reliquum erit ut Sixto V. Pont. Max. huius boni auctori gratias agant, et ab omnipotenti Deo publicis votis poscant,
optimum Principem nobis florentem quam diutissime servet. qui cum omnes curas cogitationesque suas in amplificandam ornandamque Ecclesiae dignitatem contulerit, dubitandum non est quin Rep. Christiana optimis legibus et sanctissimis institutis per eum reformata, religione ac pietate, revocatis antiquis ritibus, in suum splendorem restituta, in hoc quoque publicam causam sit adiuturus ut sacri veteres libri, hominum incuria vel improbitate corrupti, pro sua eximia benignitate ab omni labe vindicati, quam emendatissimi pervulgentur.

(3) **SIXTUS PAPA V.**

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Cupientes, quantum in nobis est, commissi nobis gregis saluti quacunque ratione ac via prospicere, ad pastoralem nostram curam pertinere vehementer arbitramur Sacrae Scripturae libros, quibus salutaris doctrina continetur, ab omnibus maculis expurgatos integros purosque pervulgari. Id nos in inferiori gradu constituti, quantum potimus, studio et diligentia nostra praestitimus, et in hac altissima specula a Deo collocati assidue mentis nostrae oculis spectare non desistimus. Cum itaque superioribus annis piae recordationis Gregorius Papa XIII. praedecessor noster, nobis suggerentibus, Graecum Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta Interpretum editionem, qua ipsi etiam Apostoli nonnunquam usi fuerunt, ad emendatissimorum codicum fidem expoliendum mandaverit; eius rei cura dilecto filio nostro Antonio Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Presbytero Cardinali Carafae, et ad id per eum delectis eruditis aliquot viris demandata, et iam expolitio huiusmodi, permultis exemplaribus ex diversis Italie bibliothecis et praecipue ex nostra Vaticana diligentemque examinatis, absoluta sit: Volumus et sancimus ad Dei gloriam et Ecclesiae utilitatem, ut Vetus Graecum Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ita recognitum et expolitum ab omnibus recipiatur ac retineatur, quo potissimum ad Latinae vulgatae editionis et veterum Sanctorum Patrum intelligentiam utantur. Prohibentes ne quis de hac nova Graeca editione audeat in posterum vel addendo vel demendo quicquam immutare. Si quis autem aliter fecerit quam hac nostra sanctione comprehensum est, noverit se in Dei Omnipotentis beatorumque Apostolorum Petri et Pauli indignationem incursurum.


The reader will not fail to note the intelligent appreciation of the Lxx., and the wide outlook over the history of the Greek
versions which are implied by these documents¹. They shew that the Vatican had already learnt the true value of the Alexandrian Old Testament and, as a consequence, had resolved to place in the hands of the scholars of Europe as pure a text as could be obtained of the version which was used by the ancient Church, and was now felt to be essential to a right understanding of the Fathers and of the Latin Vulgate. The inception of the work was due to Pope Sixtus himself, who had suggested it to his predecessor Gregory XIII. in 1578; but the execution was entrusted to Cardinal Antonio Carafa and a little band of Roman scholars including Cardinal Sirleto, Antonio Agelli, and Petrus Morinus. Search was made in the libraries of Italy as well as in the Vatican for MSS. of the LXX., but the result of these enquiries satisfied the editors of the superiority of the great Vatican Codex (B = cod. Vat. gr. 1209) over all other known codices, and it was accordingly taken as the basis of the new edition. Use was made, however, of other MSS., among which were a Venice MS. which has been identified with S. Marc. cod. gr. 1 (H. P. 23, Lag. V); a MS. belonging to Carafa, possibly cod. Vat. gr. 1252 (H. P. 63 + 129, cf. Klostermann, p. 12 f., and Batiffol, Bulletin critique, 15 Mars 1889), and certain Laurentian MSS. of which collations are still preserved in the Vatican Library (Vat. gr. 1241, 1242, 1244; see Batiffol, La Vaticane, p. 90 f.). From these and other sources the editors supplied the large lacunae of Cod. B². But they did not limit themselves to the filling up of gaps or even to the correction of errors, as will appear from a comparison of the Sixtine text with the photographic representation of the Vatican MS. The edition of 1587 is not an exact reproduction of a single codex, even where the selected MS. was available; but it is based as a whole on a great uncial

¹ Cf. Tregelles, An account of the printed text, &c., p. 185.
² According to Nestle (Septuagintastudien, i. p. 9, ii. p. 12) Genesis i. 1—xlvi. 28 are supplied from cod. Chis. R. vi. 38 (H. P. 19, Lag. h).
MS., and it is the first edition of the LXX. which possesses this character. Moreover, criticism has confirmed the judgement of the Roman editors in regard to the selection of their basal MS. It is a fortunate circumstance that the authority of the Vatican was given before the end of the sixteenth century to a text of the LXX. which is approximately pure.

Besides the text the Roman edition contained considerable materials for the criticism of the Greek Old Testament, collected by the labours of Morinus, Agelli, and others. These include readings and scholia from MSS. of the LXX., renderings from Aquila and the other non-Septuagintal Greek versions, and a large assortment of patristic citations.

Editions based upon the Sixtine are very numerous. The following list is abridged from Nestle's *Utext* (p. 65 ff.):


Of the above some are derived from the Sixtine indirectly, whilst others present a Sixtine text more or less modified, or accompanied by variants from other MSS.

4. The example of Rome was followed in the 18th century by England, which had meanwhile acquired an uncial Bible

¹ The *praefatio* was reprinted with Archd. Churton's notes by Prof. W. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1855).
only less ancient, and in the view of some scholars textually more important than the great Vatican MS. The variants of Codex Alexandrinus had been given in Walton’s Polyglott under the Sixtine text, but the honour of producing an edition on the basis of the English codex belongs to a Prussian scholar, John Ernest Grabe, an adopted son of the University of Oxford. This edition appeared ultimately in four folio volumes (1707—20), but only the first and fourth had been published when Grabe died (1712); the second and third were undertaken after his decease by Francis Lee, M.D., and William Wigan, D.D. respectively. Vol. i. (1707) contains the Octateuch, Vol. ii. (1719) the Historical Books, Vol. iii. (1720) the Prophets, Vol. iv. (1709) the Poetical Books. The title to the first volume runs: “Septuaginta interpretum tomus I continens Octateuchum quem ex antiquissimo codice Alexandrino accurate descriptum et ope aliorum exemplarium, ac priscorum scriptorum praesertim vero Hexaplaris editionis Origenianae emendatum atque suppletum additis saepe asteriscorum et obelorum signis summa cura edidit Joannes Ernestus Grabe S.T.P. Oxonii, e theatro Sheldoniano ...MDCCVII.”

This title sufficiently indicates the general principles upon which this great undertaking was based. Like the Sixtine edition, Grabe’s is in the main a presentation of the text exhibited in a single uncial codex; like the Sixtine, but to a greater extent, its text is in fact eclectic and mixed. On the other hand the mixture in Grabe’s Alexandrian text is overt and can be checked at every point. He deals with his codex as Origen dealt with the \( \kappa o u \gamma \), marking with an obelus the words, clauses, or paragraphs in the MS. for which he found no equivalent in the Massoretic Hebrew, and placing an aste-

---

1 Patrick Young had projected a complete edition of cod. A (Walton’s \textit{Prolegomena}, ed. Wrangham, ii. p. 124). His transcript of the MS. is still preserved at the British Museum (Harl. 7522 = Holmes 241; see above, p. 152).
risk before such as he believed to have been derived from
Theodotion or some other non-Septuagintal source. If he
constantly adds to his MS. or relegates its readings to the
margin, such additions and substituted words are distinguished
from the text of cod. A by being printed in a smaller type.
So far as it professes to reproduce the text of the MS., his
dition is substantially accurate. The prolegomena by which
each volume is introduced are full and serviceable; and the
work as a whole, whatever may be thought of the method
adopted by the editors, is creditable to the Biblical scholarship
of the age.

Grabe’s text was reproduced by Breitinger (Zurich, 1730—2),
and Reineccius (in his Biblia sacra quadrilinguia, Leipzig,
1750—1); also in a Greek Bible issued at Moscow in 1821 under
the authority of the Holy Synod. A more important work based
upon this edition is the Septuagint published by the Society for
Promoting Christian Knowledge under the care of Dr Field
(Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX. interpretes. Recens-
sionem Grabianam ad fidem codicis Alexandrini aliorumque
denuo recognovit ... F. Field, Oxonii, 1859). But the purpose
which the Society had in view forbade a critical treatment of the
materials, and whilst the learned editor has removed many of the
imperfections of Grabe’s work, the text remains arbitrary and
mixed, and the arrangement is alien from that of all LXX. MSS.
the non-canonical books being relegated to an appendix as
ἀπόκρυφα.

5. Each of the four great editions of the Septuagint already
described (the Complutensian, Aldine, Sixtine, and Grabian)
endeavoured to supply a text approximately representing either
a group of MSS., or a single uncial of high antiquity. No
attempt had been made as yet to offer an exact reproduction
of a codex, or to provide a full apparatus criticus, the purpose
of the editors in each case being practical rather than critical.
This want was met in some degree in certain of the secondary
editions; thus the Basle reprint of the Aldine text (1545)
gave a short list of variants and conjectural emendations; in
the London Polyglott the readings of Codex Alexandrinus
were printed underneath the Sixtine text, and those of Codex Sarravianus were exhibited in the Septuagint of Lambert Bos. But the first comprehensive effort in this direction was made by Robert Holmes (1748—1805), Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, and, from 1804, Dean of Winchester. The preparations for his great work were begun in 1788. An appeal was made to the liberality of public bodies and private patrons of learning, and the task of collating MSS. was committed to a large number of scholars at home and on the continent, whose names are honourably mentioned in the opening pages of the first volume. From 1789 to 1805 an annual account was printed of the progress of the work, and the Bodleian Library contains 164 volumes of MS. collations (Holmes MSS. A.D. 1789—1805, nos. 16455—16617) which were deposited there during those seventeen years. In 1795 a specimen of the forthcoming work was published together with a transcript of the Vienna Genesis in a letter to the Bishop of Durham (Shute Barrington). Genesis appeared separately in 1798, followed in the same year by the first volume bearing the title: Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. Edidit Robertus Holmes, S.T.P., R.S.S., Aedis Christi Canonicus. Tomus primus. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCcxcvm. This volume, which contains the Pentateuch, with a preface and appendix, was the only one which Holmes lived to complete. He died Nov. 12, 1805, and two years later the editorship was entrusted to James Parsons, under whose care the remaining volumes were issued (Vol. ii., Joshua—2 Chronicles, 1810; Vol. iii., 2 Esdras—Canticles, 1823; Vol. iv., Prophets, 1827; Vol. v., the non-canonical books, 1 Esdras—3 Maccabees, 1827). At the end of Vol. v. there is a list of the Greek MSS. collated

1 Cf. Ch. Q. R., April 1899, p. 102.
3 On Holmes' less distinguished coadjutor see Ch. Q. R. p. 104. Parsons died in 1847 at the age of 85.
Printed Texts of the Septuagint.

for the work. Three hundred and eleven are enumerated (i—

xiii., 14—311); a corrected estimate gives a total of 297 separate
codices, of which 20 are uncial. Besides the readings of this
large number of Greek MSS., the apparatus of Holmes and
Parsons exhibits the evidence of the Old Latin versions so far
as it had been collected by Sabatier, and of the Coptic (Mem-
phitic and Sahidic), Arabic, Slavonic, Armenian and Georgian
versions, obtained partly from MSS., partly from printed texts.
Use was also made of patristic citations and of the four great
editions of the Septuagint, the Sixtine supplying the text, while
the Aldine, Complutensian and Alexandrine (Grabian) are cited
in the notes. In addition to these, Holmes employed the
printed text of the catena of Nicephorus (Leipzig, 1772—3),

The great work of Holmes and Parsons has been severely
criticised by later scholars, especially by Hatch² and Lagarde³.
A vigorous defence of the Oxford editors will be found in a
recent article in the Church Quarterly Review (already quoted).
It appears to be certain that every effort was made by Holmes
to secure the services of the best scholars who were available
for the work of collation.

Among the collators of Greek MSS. employed by the Oxford
editors were Bandini (Florence), C. F. Matthäi (Moscow), F. C.
Alter (Vienna), Schnurrer (Tübingen), Moldenhawer (Copen-
hagen). “The Armenian Version was chiefly collated by Her-
mannus Breden-Kemp (1793) and F. C. Alter (1795—1804), the
latter also taking the Georgian... the Slavonic... Coptic... and
Bohemian Versions. The Arabic Versions were undertaken
by Paulus and Prof. Ford, and the Syriac quotations in the Hor-
reum mysteriorum of Gregorius Bar-Hebraeus... by Dr Holmes”
(F. C. Madan, Summary catalogue, p. 640).

But in so vast an accumulation of the labours of many
workers it was impossible to maintain an uniform standard of
merit; nor are the methods adopted by Holmes and his con-

¹ See above, p. 153. ² Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 132.
tinuator altogether such as would commend themselves at the present day. The work is an almost unequalled monument of industry and learning, and will perhaps never be superseded as a storehouse of materials; but it left abundant room for investigations conducted on other lines and among materials which were not accessible to Holmes and his associates.

6. The next step was taken by A. F. C. von Tischendorf (1815—1874), who in the midst of his researches in Eastern libraries and his work upon the text of the New Testament found leisure to project and carry through four editions (1850, 1856, 1860, 1869) a manual text of the Septuagint. Its plan was simple, but suggestive. His text was a revised Sixtine; underneath it he placed an apparatus limited to the variants of a few great uncials: “eam viam ingressus sum (he writes’) ut textum per tria fere secula probatissimum repeterem, mutatis tantummodo quibus mutatione maxime opus esset, addita vero plena lectionis varietate ex tribus codicibus antiquissimis quos fere solos utpote editos confidenter adhibere licebat.” The three MSS. employed by Tischendorf in his first edition (1850) were A (from Baber’s facsimile), C (from his own facsimile), and FA, the portion of Cod. Sinaiticus which was published in 1846; in the third and fourth editions he was able to make further use of Cod. Sinaiticus, and to take into account Mai’s edition of Cod. B.

Since Tischendorf’s death three more editions of his Septuagint have appeared—a fifth in 1875, a sixth and a seventh in 1880 and 1887 respectively, the last two under the supervision of Dr Eberhard Nestle. Nestle added a Supplementum editionum quae Sixtinam sequuntur omnium in primis Tischendorfanarum, consisting of a collation of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. with the Sixtine text, the Vatican text being obtained from Vercellone and Cozza’s facsimile, and the Sinaitic from Tischendorf’s edition of Ν; an appendix contained a collation of Daniel (LXX.) from Cozza’s edition of the Chigi MS. The Supplementum was reissued in 1887 with various enrichments, of which the most important

1 Prolegg. § viii.
was a collation of cod. A from the London photograph which appeared in 1882—3. With these helps the reader of Tischendorf's Septuagint is able to correct and supplement the apparatus, and to compare the text with that of cod. B so far as it could be ascertained before the publication of the photograph.

7. Another of the great Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century, Paul de Lagarde, commenced an edition of the Greek Old Testament, which was intended to be a definite step towards the reconstruction of the text. Lagarde's general plan was announced in *Symmicta* ii. (1880), p. 137 ff., and in a modified and simpler form by a pamphlet published two years later (*Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen übersetzung des A.T.*, Göttingen, 1882). A beginning was made by the appearance of the first half of the text of the Lucianic recension (*Librorum V.T. canonicorum pars prior Graece Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus edita*, Göttingen, 1883). Lagarde's untimely death in 1891 left this work incomplete, and though his papers are preserved at Göttingen, it is understood that no steps will be taken to carry out the scheme, at least on the same lines. The published volume contains the Octateuch and the Historical Books as far as Esther. Of the last named book two texts are given, with an apparatus, but with this exception the text stands alone, and the reader knows only that it is an attempted reconstruction of Lucian, based upon six MSS. which are denoted @fhmpz (H. P. 108, 82, 19, 93, 118, 44). This is not the place to discuss Lagarde's critical principles, but it may be mentioned here that his attempt to reconstruct the text of Lucian's recension was but one of a series of projected reconstructions through which he hoped ultimately to arrive at a pure text of the Alexandrian version. The conception was a magnificent one, worthy of the great scholar who originated it; but it was beset with practical difficulties, and there is reason to hope that the desired end may be attained by means less complicated and more direct.

8. In the spring of 1883 the Syndics of the Cambridge
University Press issued a notice that they had undertaken “an edition of the Septuagint and Apocrypha with an ample apparatus criticus intended to provide material for a critical determination of the text,” in which it was “proposed to give the variations of all the Greek uncial MSS., of select Greek cursive MSS., of the more important versions, and of the quotations made by Philo and the earlier and more important ecclesiastical writers.” As a preliminary step they announced the preparation of “a portable text...taken from the Vatican MS., where this MS. is not defective, with the variations of two or three other early uncial MSS.” The suggestion was originally due to Dr Scrivener, who submitted it to the Syndics of the Press in the year 1875, but was ultimately prevented by many preoccupations and failing health from carrying his project into execution. After undergoing various modifications it was committed in 1883 to Dr Swete, instructed by a committee consisting of Professors Westcott, Hort, Kirkpatrick, and Bensly; to Dr Hort in particular the editor was largely indebted for counsel in matters of detail. The first edition of the portable text was completed in 1894 (The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, vol. i., Genesis—4 Regn., 1887; vol. ii., 1 Esdr.—Tobit, 1890; vol. iii., Hosea—4 Macc., 1894); a second and revised edition has now been carried through the press (vol. i., 1895; vol. ii., 1896; vol. iii., 1899). The larger Cambridge Septuagint has been entrusted to the joint editorship of the Rev. A. E. Brooke, Fellow of King’s College, and Mr N. McLean, Fellow of Christ’s College; and the Octateuch, which will form the first volume, may be expected in the course of a few years. It will reproduce the text of the manual Septuagint, but the apparatus will embrace, according to the original purpose of the Syndics, the evi-

1 Cambridge University Reporter, March 13, 1883.
2 Much of the labour of revision was generously undertaken by Dr Nestle, and valuable assistance was also rendered by several English scholars; see i. p. xxxiii., ii. p. xiv., iii. p. xviii. f.
vidence of all the uncial MSS., and of a considerable number of cursives "selected after careful investigation with the view of representing the different types of text"; the Old Latin, Egyptian, Syro-Hexaplar, and Armenian versions will also be represented, whilst use will be made of the quotations in Josephus as well as those in Philo and the more important Christian fathers. Such an apparatus will fall far short of that presented by Holmes and Parsons, in regard to the quantity of evidence amassed; but efforts are being made to secure a relatively high degree of accuracy, and the materials will be selected and arranged in such a manner as to enable the reader to study the grouping of the MSS. and other authorities. Thus the work will proceed upon the principle formulated by Lagarde: "editionem Veteris Testamenti Graeci...collatis integris codicum familias esse curandum, nam familias non accedere auctoritatem e codicibus, sed codicibus e familias".

A word may be added with regard to the text which will be common to the manual and the larger edition of the Cambridge Septuagint. It is that of the great Vatican MS., with its lacunae supplied from the uncial MS. which occupies the next place in point of age or importance. For a text formed in this way no more can be claimed than that it represents on the whole the oldest form of the Septuagint to be found in any one of our extant MSS. But it supplies at least an excellent standard of comparison, and until a critical text has been produced, it may fairly be regarded as the most trustworthy presentation of the Septuagint version regarded as a whole.

II. Editions of particular Books, or of Groups or Portions of Books.

The Pentateuch.

G. A. Schumann, 1829; Pentateuchus hebraice et graece, I (Genesis only published).

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

P. A. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1868: *Genesis graece e fide editionis Sixtinae addita scripturae discrepantia e libris manu scriptis a se collatis et edd. Complutensi et Aldina accuratissime enotata.* The MSS. employed are ADEFGS, 29, 31, 44, 122, 130, 135. The text is preceded by useful lists of the available uncial MSS. and VSS. of the LXX.

Deuteronomy.

C. L. F. Hamann, Jena, 1874: *Canticum Moysi ex Psalterio quadruplici...manu scripto quod Bambergae asservatur.*

Joshua.

A. Masius, Antwerp, 1574: *Iosuae imperatoris historiae.* Readings are given from the Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus.

Judges.

J. Ussher, 1655 (in his *Syntagma*, Works, vol. vii.). Two texts in parallel columns (1) "ex codice Romano," (2) "ex codice Alexandrino."

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1867: *liber Iudicium secundum lxx. interpretes.* A specimen had previously appeared (in 1866).

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


Ruth.

Drusius, 1586, 1632.

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

O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1867: "Poio kata tous o'.

Psalms.

Separate editions of the Greek Psalter were published at Milan, 1481 (Bonacursius); Venice, 1486; Venice, before 1498 (Aldus Manutius); Basle, 1516 (in *Hieronymi Opera*, t. viii., ed. Pellicanus); Genoa, 1516 (*Octaplum Psalterium Justiniani*); Cologne, 1518 (*Psalterium in iv. linguis cura Iohannis Potken*). Other known editions bear the dates 1524, 1530 (*Ps. sextuplex*),
Printed Texts of the Septuagint.

1533, 1541, 1543, 1549, 1557, 1559, 1571, 1584, 1602, 1618, 1627, 1632, 1643, 1678 (the Psalter of cod. A), 1737, 1757, 1825, 1852, 1857, 1879 (Ps. tetratgotton, ed. Nestle), 1880, 1887 (Lagarde, Novae psalterii gr. editionis specimen), 1889 (Swete, The Psalms in Greek acc. to the LXX., with the Canticles; 2nd ed. 1896), 1892 (Lagarde, Ps. gr. quinquagena prima).

JOB.

Patrick Young, 1657 (in the Catena of Nicetas).
Franeker, 1663.

ESTHER.


O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich, 1848: Ἠσυχιος. Duplicem libri textum ad opt. Codd. emendavit et cum selecta lectionis varietate edidit. The Greek additions appear also in his Libri apocryphi V. T. (see below).

HOSEA.

J. Philippeaux, Paris, 1636; Hos. i.—iv., after Cod. Q.

AMOS.

Vater, Halle, 1810.

JONAH.

S. Münster, 1524, 1543.

ISAIAH.

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

JEREMIAH.

S. Münster, 1540.

LAMENTATIONS.

Kyper, Basle, 1552: Libri tres de re gramm. Hebr. ling. (Hebr., Gr., Lat.).
Printed Texts of the Septuagint.

EZEKIEL.
'Τεζέκειλ κατὰ τοὺς ὅ', Rome, 1840.

DANIEL (Theod.).
Ph. Melanchthon, 1546. Wells, 1716.

DANIEL (LXX.).
S. de Magistris (?), Rome, 1772: Daniel secundum lxx. ex tetraplīs Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codicē. Reprinted at Göttingen, 1773, 1774 (Michaelis); at Utrecht, 1775 (Segaar); at Milan, 1788 (Bugati); and at Leipzig, 1845 (Hahn). The LXX. text is also given in the editions of Holmes and Parsons, Tischendorf, and Swete.

NON-CANONICAL BOOKS (in general).
J. A. Fabricius, Frankfort and Leipzig, 1691: Liber Tobias, Judith, oratio Manasse, Sapientia, et Ecclesiasticus, gr. et lat., cum prolegomenis. Other complete editions were published at Frankfort on the Main, 1694, and at Leipzig, 1804 and 1837; the best recent edition is that by O. F. Fritzsche, Leipzig, 1871: Libri apocryphi V. T. gr.... accedunt libri V. T. pseudepigraphi selecti [Psalmi Salomonis, 4–5 Esdras, Apocalypse of Baruch, Assumption of Moses]. This edition, besides the usual books, gives 4 Maccabees, and exhibits Esther in two texts, and Tobit in three; there is a serviceable preface and an extensive apparatus criticus.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.
Older editions 1601, 1733, 1827. Rensch, Friburg, 1858: Liber Sapientiae sec. exemplar Vaticamum.
W. J. Deane, Oxford, 1881: The Book of Wisdom, the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate, and the A. V.; with an introduction, critical apparatus, and commentary.

WISDOM OF SIRACH.
Printed Texts of the Septuagint.

**Tobit.**
Reusch, Bonn, 1870: *Libellus Tobit e cod. Sinaitico.*

**Baruch.**
Kneucker, Leipzig, 1879.

**Psalms of Solomon.**
J. L. de la Cerda, in an appendix to his *Adversaria Sacra*, Lyons, 1626.
J. A. Fabricius, in *Codex pseudepigraphus V. T.*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1715.
E. E. Geiger, Augsburg, 1871: *Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben.*
O. F. Fritzsche in *Libri apocryphi V. T. gr.*
B. Pick, Alleghany, Pens., in the *Presbyterian Review*, 1883.
H. E. Ryle and M. R. James, Cambridge, 1891: *Psalms of the Pharisees commonly called the Psalms of Solomon*; the Greek text with an apparatus, notes, indices, and an introduction.
H. B. Swete in *O. T. in Greek*, vol. iii., Cambridge, 1894; 2nd ed. 1899.

**Enoch (the Greek version of).**

**Literature (upon the general subject of this chapter).**
PART II.

THE CONTENTS OF THE ALEXANDRIAN
OLD TESTAMENT.
PART II.

CHAPTER I.

TITLES, GROUPING, NUMBER, AND ORDER OF THE BOOKS.

The Greek Old Testament, as known to us through the few codices which contain it as a whole, and from the lists which appear in the Biblical MSS. or in ancient ecclesiastical writings, differs from the Hebrew Bible in regard to the titles of the books which are common to both, and the principle upon which the books are grouped. The two collections differ yet more materially in the number of the books, the Greek Bible containing several entire writings of which there is no vestige in the Hebrew canon, besides large additions to the contents of more than one of the Hebrew books. These differences are of much interest to the Biblical student, since they express a tradition which, inherited by the Church from the Alexandrian synagogue, has widely influenced Christian opinion upon the extent of the Old Testament Canon, and the character and purpose of the several books.
198 *Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.*

1. The following tables shew (A) the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin titles of the canonical books of the Old Testament; (B) the order and grouping of the books in (1) lists of Jewish origin, (2) the great uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible, (3) patristic and synodical lists of the (a) Eastern, (b) Western Church.

### A. Titles of the Books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Vulgate Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָיוֹת</td>
<td>Ὑφ'σίθ</td>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׁפָתָה</td>
<td>Μήσφατά</td>
<td>Εξόδος</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָחָל</td>
<td>Νάχαλ</td>
<td>Δευτερονόμιον</td>
<td>Deuteronomium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סִפְרֵי</td>
<td>Σφρεί</td>
<td>Ισόσι</td>
<td>Iose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשְׁמָעֵל</td>
<td>Ισμαήλ</td>
<td>Κριτα</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִלְךָ</td>
<td>Μλήκ</td>
<td>Βασιλείων</td>
<td>Regum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִנְשָׁה</td>
<td>'Iνσαά</td>
<td>Ισαι</td>
<td>Isaias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רְמֵים</td>
<td>'R̄eμ̄</td>
<td>'Ιερεμία</td>
<td>Jeremias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּרִית</td>
<td>'B̄rīt</td>
<td>'Ιερεμία</td>
<td>Ezeciel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֵׂעֵד</td>
<td>'Sh̄ęd</td>
<td>Ωσ̄ή</td>
<td>Osee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִנְגָל</td>
<td>Ινγ̄λ</td>
<td>'Ιωή</td>
<td>Ioel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַעְסֵה</td>
<td>'M̄aς̄</td>
<td>Αμω̄ς</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As given by Origen ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25.
2 I.e. הָיָשְׂרִים (first two words of 1 Kings i.), Malachim, Jerome; διαλαξελμ, Epiphanius.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Vulgate Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְוָנָּס</td>
<td>'Iωνᾶς</td>
<td>Ionas</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִיכְהֵּא</td>
<td>Μ[ε]ιχαίας</td>
<td>Michaelaeas</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָאֹו</td>
<td>Ναούμ</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַמְבָּקָז</td>
<td>'Αμβακούμ</td>
<td>Habacuc</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סֹפְרְיוֹנָי</td>
<td>Σοφονιας</td>
<td>Sophonias</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֵגוֹא</td>
<td>'Αγγαῖος</td>
<td>Aggæus</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זָחַרְיא</td>
<td>Ζαχαρίας</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַלָּךְ</td>
<td>Μαλαχίας</td>
<td>Malachias</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סְפָרְ בְּבֶלֶלִי</td>
<td>Ψαλμοί, Ψαλτήριον</td>
<td>Psalmi</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִלְו</td>
<td>Παροιμία</td>
<td>Proverbia</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָבָ</td>
<td>'Iוֹב</td>
<td>Iob</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סִירָ אָסִירִמ</td>
<td>Άσμα, άσματα</td>
<td>Canticum canticorum</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רֵרְ</td>
<td>'Ροῦθ</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָבְיָא</td>
<td>Θρηνοί</td>
<td>Threni, Lamentations</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קֵרל</td>
<td>Εκκλησιαστής</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָסֶר</td>
<td>'Εσθήρ</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָניֵל</td>
<td>Δανιήλ</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶסְרָ</td>
<td>'Εσδρά</td>
<td>Esdras 1, 2</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רְבַרְיָ תְקִיֵי</td>
<td>Παραλείπομένων</td>
<td>Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רְבַרְיָ תְקִיֵי</td>
<td>a', β'</td>
<td>Hebrew Transliteration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 With variants Μεσλῶθ, Μισλῶθ (leg. for. Μσλῶθ). Masaloth, Jerome; ὅμοισαλῶθ, Epiphanius.
2 Origen includes Ruth with Judges under Σαφατελιμ. Justine.
3 Ἐπιφ. l.c.: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη μικρὰ βίβλος ἢ καλεῖται Κινῶ [Mishn. Ἱερεμίαν]. ἦτας ἐρμηνευεται Θρηνοι Ιερεμίου.
### Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

**B (i). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN JEWISH LISTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talmudic</th>
<th>Spanish MSS.</th>
<th>German &amp; French MSS.</th>
<th>Massoretic MSS.</th>
<th>Printed Bibles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Torah</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Neviim</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1, 2 Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>1, 2 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>xii Prophets</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zachariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III Kethubim

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

---

1 This list has been adapted from Ryle, *Canon of the O.T.* (table following p. 280).
### B (2). Order of the Books in Uncial MS. Bibles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex Vaticanus (B)</th>
<th>Codex Sinaiticus (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
<td>Γένεσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἕξοδος</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δευτερονόμιον</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀριθμοί</td>
<td>Ἀριθμοί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ισραήλ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κριτικ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ροῦθ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βασιλείων α'—δ'</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παραλειπομένων α', β'</td>
<td>Παραλειπομένων α', β'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐσδρας α', β'</td>
<td>Ἐσδρας [α'], β'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑσωμοι</td>
<td>Ἑσωμὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παροιμια</td>
<td>Παροιμία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐκκλησιαστὴς</td>
<td>Ἐκκλησιαστὴς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀσίμα</td>
<td>Μακκαβαίων α', δ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωβι</td>
<td>Ἰωβι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφία Σαλωμώνος</td>
<td>Σοφία Σαλωμώνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφία Σειράχ</td>
<td>Θεῆνος Τερεμίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐσωμὸς</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παροιμία</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παροιμία</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμώς</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μειχαλάς</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωβί</td>
<td>Ἰωβί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὀβδειοῦ</td>
<td>Ὀβδειοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωνᾶς</td>
<td>Ἰωνᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ναοὺς</td>
<td>Ναοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀμβακοῦν</td>
<td>Ἀμβακοῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφονία</td>
<td>Σοφονία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγγαίος</td>
<td>Ἀγγαίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζαχαρίας</td>
<td>Ζαχαρίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μαλαχίας</td>
<td>Μαλαχίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἡσαίας</td>
<td>Ψαλμοί Δαδ ρω' (subscr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τερεμίος</td>
<td>Παροιμία [+] Σολομῶντος subscr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βαροῦχ</td>
<td>Ἐκκλησιαστὴς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωβή</td>
<td>Ἰωβή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπιστολὴ Τερεμίου</td>
<td>Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰεζεκηλ</td>
<td>Σοφία Ἰσραήλ νιόυ Σειράχ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δανήλ</td>
<td>Ἰωβή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus (A)</td>
<td>Codex Basiliano-Venetus (N+V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γένεσις κόσμου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εξοδος Αλεξάντου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δευτερογένεσις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δευτερογένεσις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ισόποδος υπὸ Ναυή</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κριταί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ροόθ [ὁμοία βιβλία η']</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βασίλειων α'—δ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παραλειπομένων α', β' [ὁμοία βιβλία 5']</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Προφήται ις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ωσήρα α'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αμώς β'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μιχαηλις γ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιωήλ δ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αδελφόν ε'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιωνᾶς ε'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ναούμ ζ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αμβακούμ η'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αγγαγίος ι'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ζαχαρίας ια'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Μαλαχίας ιβ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ησαίας προφήτης ιγ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιερεμίας προφήτης ιδ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βαροίχ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Οθημις [+ 'Ιερεμίου, subscr.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιερεμίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιεζεκίλιος προφήτης ιε'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαυιδ [+ προφήτης ις', catal.]</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εσθήρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τωσίτ (Τωσιτ, subscr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιονδίδα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εξρας α' δι ιερεύς ('Εξρας α' ιερεύς, catal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εξρας β' ιερεύς ('Εξρας β' ιερεύς catal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μακκαβαίων α'—δ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψαλτήριον (Ψαλμοι του' και ιδιογραφος α' subscr., seq. θ'δων ιερ. Ψαλτήριον μετ' θ'δων catal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιωβ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιερεμίας Σολομώντος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Εκκλησιαστής</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ασματα ('Ασμα subscr.) ϕομάτων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφία Σολομώντος (Σ. Σολομώνων subscr.; + η Πανάρετος, catal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σοφία 'Ισόποδος νυον Σιράχ (Σειράχ, subscr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψαλμοι Σολομώντος, catal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

B (3) (a). ORDER OF THE BOOKS IN PATRISTIC AND SYNODICAL LISTS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.


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

---
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'Tours a φαμάτων

Iωβ

Προφήται

Οἱ διδάκται

'Ησαλας

'Ιερεμίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρούχ, Θερήνοι, Επιστολή

'Ιεζεκιήλ

Δανιήλ

"Εστι καὶ ἄτερα βιβλία τούτων ἐξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοὺς ἀρτι προσερχομένους...

Σοφία Σολομῶντος

Σοφία Σιράχ

'Εσθήρ

'Ιωδίθ

Τωβίλας

---

5*. Epiphanius (haer. 1, i 5).

α'. Γένεσις

β'. 'Εξοδος

γ'. Λευτικῶν

δ'. 'Αρμωνι

e'. Δευτερανόμοιον

ζ'. 'Ιησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῗ

η'. Τῶν Κριτῶν

θ'. Τοῦ 'Ιωβ

ι'. Τὸ Ψαλτήριον

ια'. Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος

ιβ'. 'Εκκλησιαστής

ιγ'. 'Η λάμα τῶν ἰσαμάτων

ιδ'-ιζ'. Βασιλείων a'—δ'

ιτ', ιθ'. Παραλειπόμενων a', β'

κ'. 'Η Δωδεκάπροφητη

κα'. 'Ησαλας ο προφήτης

κβ'. 'Ιερεμίας ο προφήτης, μετὰ τῶν Θρήνων καὶ Επιστολῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ Βαρούχ

κγ'.'Ιεζεκιήλ ο προφήτης

κδ'. Δανιήλ ο προφήτης

κε', κς'. 'Εσθήρ α', β'

κς'. 'Εσθήρ

---

Τὰ δὲ στιχηρά τύγχανε πέντε

'Iωβ

Βιβλος Ψαλμῶν

Παροιμίαι

'Εκκλησιαστής

'Ασμα αἰσμάτων (ἐπτακαθεκατον βιβλίον)

'Eπὶ δὲ τούτοις τὰ προφητικὰ πέντε

Τῶν διδάκτων προφητῶν μία βιβλος

'Ησαλοῦ μία

'Ιερεμίου [μία] μετὰ Βαρούχ καὶ

Θρήνων καὶ Επιστολῆς

'Ιεζεκιήλ

Δανιήλ (εἰκοστὴ δευτέρα βιβλος)

Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἐξω κεῖσθαι ἐν δευ-

τέρῳ

3b. Epiphanius (de mens. et pond. 4).

Πέντε νομίκαι ('ἡ πεντάευχος ἦ καὶ

νομοθεσία)

(Γένεσις—Δευτερονόμον)

Πέντε στιχήρες

('Ιωβ, Ψαλτήριων, Παροιμίαι Σα-

λομῶντος, 'Εκκλησιαστής, 'Ασμα

αἰσμάτων)

"Ἀλλὰ πεντάευχος, τὰ καλούμενα Γρα-

φεία, παρὰ τισι δὲ Ἀγιόγραφα λε-

γόμενα ('Ησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῗ, βιβλος

Κριτῶν μετὰ τῆς 'Ροῦθ, Παραλει-

πομένων a', β', Βασίλειων a', β',

Βασίλειων γ', δ')

'Η προφητικὴ πεντάευχος (τὸ δωδекα-

πρόφητων, 'Ησαλας, 'Ιερεμίας, 'Ιεζε-

κίηλ, Δανιήλ)

'Αλλαὶ δύο (τοῦ 'Εσθήρ δύο, μία λογι-

ζομένη, τῆς 'Εσθήρ)

---

'Η τοῦ Σολομῶντος ἢ Πανάρετος

λειτουργεῖ.

'Η τοῦ 'Ιησοῦ τοῦ υἱὸ τοῦ Σειράχ.
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

5°. Epiphanius (de mens. et pond. 23).

Γένεσις κόσμου
'Εξόδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐξ Αλγύπτου
'Αριθμῶν
Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον
Ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυὴ
Ἡ τοῦ Ἡβ
Ἡ τῶν Κριτῶν
Ἡ τῆς 'Ρούθ
Τὸ Ψαλτήριον
Τῶν Παραλειπομένων α', β'
Βασίλειων α'—δ'
Ἡ Παρουσία
Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστὴς
Τὸ Ἀμα τῶν ἁσμάτων
Τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον
Τοῦ προφήτου Ἰσαίου
Τοῦ Ἰερεμίου
Τοῦ Ἰεζεκίλη
Τοῦ Δανίλη
Τοῦ Ἔσδρα α', β'
Τῆς Ἔσῆρ

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

Βιβλίοι ἱστορικαὶ ἰβ'
(Γένεσις, Ἐξόδος, Δευτικοῦ, Ἀριθμοῦ, Δευτερονόμιον, Ἰησοῦς, Κριταί, Ῥοῦθ, Πράξεις βασιλῆων, Παραλειπόμεναι, Ἔσδρας)

Βιβλίοι στιχηραὶ ε'
(Ἰωβ, Δαυιδ, τρεῖς Σολομωντίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἀσμα, Παροιμίαι)

Βιβλίοι προφητικαὶ ε'
(Οἱ δώδεκα—Ὡσή, Ἀμώς, Μιχαῖλ, Ἰωήλ, Ἰωάν, Ἀβδαίας, Ναούμ, Ἀββακοῦμ, Σοφονίας, Ἀγγαῖος, Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας—Ἡσαίας, Ἰερεμίας, Ἑσεκίλη, Δανιήλου)


Ἡ πεντάτευχος
(Κτίσις, Ἐξόδος, Δευτικοῦ, Ἀριθμοῦ, Δευτερονόμιον)

Ἰσοῦς
Οἱ Κριταί
Ἡ Ῥοῦθ
Βασίλειῶν α'—δ'
Παραλειπομένων α', β'
"Εσδρας α', β'
Στιχηραὶ Βιβλίοι ε'
(Ἰωβ, Ψαλμοί, τρεῖς Σολομῶντος—Παροιμίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστῆς, Ἀσμα ἁσμάτων)
Προφητὴς οἱ δώδεκα
(Ὡσή, Ἀμώς, Μιχαῖλ, Ἰωήλ, Ἀβδαίας, Ιωάν, Ἀμβακοῦμ, Σοφονίας, Ἀγγαῖος, Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας)
Προφητὴς οἱ τέσσαρες
(Ἡσαίας, Ἰερεμίας, Ἑσεκίλη, Δανιήλ)
Τοῦτοι προσεγράψατο τῆν Ἐσδήμων


Τὸ ἱστορικῶν, ὡς
(Ὑς Ἐσδρας)
Τὸ Δευτικόν
Οἱ Ἀριθμοὶ
Τὸ Δευτερονόμιον
Ἡ Ἰσαίας ὁ τοῦ Ναυὴν
Οἱ Κριταί
Ἡ Ῥοῦθ
Ἀἱ Βασίλειαι α'—δ'
"Εσδρας

Τὸ συμβουλευτικὸν, ὡς
Ἀἱ Παροιμίαι
Ἡ τοῦ Σιραχ Σοφία
Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής
Τὰ Ἀσμα ἁσμάτων
Τὸ προφητικὸν, ὡς
Οἱ δώδεκα προφηταὶ
Ῥοῦθ (?)
Δαυιδ
9. Σύνοψις εν ἑντύμῳ αρ. Λαγάρδη, Σεπταγιναστ., ii. p. 60 f.

Τὰ Μωσαϊκά

α’. Γένεσις
β’. Ἑβδομαδικά
γ’. Δευτερικά
δ’. Αριθμοί
ε’. Δευτερονόμιον

Τὰ ἑτερα

§’. Ἡρῴου ὁ τοῦ Ναυτικά
ξ’. Κριταὶ
η’. 'Ροῦθο
Τέλος τῆς ὑκτατεύχου

Τὸ συγχασίειον

θ’. Βασιλείων α’
ι’. Βασιλείων β’
ια’. Βασιλείων γ’
ιβ’. Βασιλείων δ’

ιγ’. Παραλειπόμενα α’
ιδ’. Παραλειπόμενα β’
ιε’. 'Εὐδορᾶ α’
ιζ’. 'Εὐδορᾶ β’
ιη’. 'Εὐδορᾶ τῆς
ιθ’. 'Τωδὶ
ιθ’. 'Ιουδῆθ' 
κ’. 'Ιωβ

Τοῦ Σολομώντος

κα’. Σοφία
κβ’. Παροιμίαι
κγ’. Ἐκκλησιαστῆς
κδ’. Ἀσμα ἄσματων

Οἱ α’ προφήται

κε’. Ὡσῆ
κς’. Ἀμώς
κζ’. Μιχαήλ
κη’. Ἶωήλ
κθ’. Ἀβδοῦν
κχ’. Ἰωάν
κλα’. Ναοῦμ
κλβ’. Αββακοῦμ
κλγ’. Σοφονίας
κλδ’. Λαγαῖοι
κλε’. Ζαχαρίας
κλζ’. Μαλαχίας

Οἱ δ’ μεγάλοι προφήται

λα’. Ἡσάλας
λη’. Ἰερεμίας
λθ’. Ἰεζεκίηλ
λμ’. ∆ανιήλ

Τέλος τῶν ἕξι δέκα προφητῶν

μα’. Σοφία Ἡσοῦ τοῦ Σιφᾶχ

1 Lagarde, l.c.: “ich wiederhole sie, von mir redigiert.”
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**Historia (xvii)**
- Genesis
- Exodus
- Leviticus
- Numeri
- Deuteronomium
- Iesu Nave
- Iudicum
- Ruth
- Regnn. i—iv
  [Adiungunt plures Paralipomenon ii, Iob i, Tobiae i, Esdrae ii, Iudith i, Hester i, Macchabaeorum ii]

**Prophethia (xvii)**
- Psalmorum cl
- Osee
- Esaiae
- Ioei
- Amos
- Abdiae
- Ionae
- Michaeeae
- Naum
- Habacuc
- Sophoniae
- Hieremiae
- Ezechiel
- Daniel
- Aggaei
- Zachariae
- Malachiae

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

**Dogmatica (i)**
- Ecclesiastes


- Génesis
  "'Εξόδος
  'Λευιτικόν
  'Αριθμόν
  Δευτερονόμιον
  'Ησοῦος τὸν Ναοῦ
  'Κρταί
  'Ροῦθ

- Василицов а', β'
- Василицов γ', δ'
- Παραλειπόμενων α', β'
- 'Εσδρας α', β'
- Ψαλτήριων Δαβιδικῶν
- Παροιμίαι Σολομώντος
- Ἑκκλησιαστής τοῦ αὐτοῦ
- 'Ασμα ψαμάτων
- Τώβ

- Ἑξῆς δὲ ἑτεροί τέσσαρες
- 'Ησαλα
- 'Ιερεμίας
- 'Εζεκιήλ
- Δανίηλ

- Ἐκτὸς δὲ τούτων εἰσὶν πάλιν ἑτέρα βιβλία κ.τ.λ. (as in Athanasius, but adding
  Μακκαβαϊκά βιβλία δ'
  Ψαλμοι καὶ ψήφη Σολομόντος
  Σωσάννα)

13. Leontius (de Sectis ii.).

- Τὰ ιστορικά βιβλία (ἱβ')
  (Γένεσις, Ἐξόδος, Ἀριθμός, Λευιτικόν, Δευτερονόμιον, Ἡσοῦος τοῦ Ναοῦ, Κρταί, Ροῦθ, Δόγοι τῶν βασιλείων α'—δ', Παραλειπόμεναι, 'Εσδρας)


- Πρώτη πεντάτευχος, ἡ καὶ νοοθεσία
  (Γένεσις, Ἐξόδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθμός, Δευτερονόμιον)
- Δευτέρα πεντάτευχος, τὰ καλοῖμενα
  Γραφεῖα, παρά τις δὲ Ἀγγέλων (Ἡσοῦος τοῦ Ναοῦ, Κρταί μετά
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Τὰ προφητικά (ε')
("Ἡσιας, Ἰερεμιας, Ἰεζεκιήλ, Δα-νιήλ, τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον)

Τὰ παραγωγικά (δ')
("Ἰωβ, Παρομαια Σολομώντος, Ἐκ-κλησιαστής, τὸ Ἀσμα τῶν ἁσμά-των, τὸ Ψαλτήριον)

15. Nicephorus, Stichometria.

Α. "Οσα εἰσὶ γραφαὶ ἐκκλησιαζόμεναι καὶ κεκανονισμέναι

α'. Γένεσις στίχ. δτ'
β'. Ἑξοδος στίχ. βω'
γ'. Δευτικῶν στίχ. βψ'
δ'. Ἀριθμοὶ στίχ. γψλ'
ε'. Δευτερομόνων στίχ. γρ'
ς'. Ἰησοῦς στίχ. βρ'
ζ'. Κριταὶ καὶ Ἄρμον στίχ. βν'
η'. Βασιλείων α', β' στίχ. βσμ'
θ'. Βασιλείων γ', β' στίχ. βσγ'
ι'. Παραλειπόμενα α', β' στίχ. εφ'
ια'. Ἑσδρας α', β' στίχ. εφ'
ιβ'. Βιβλίος Ψαλμῶν στίχ. ερ'
ιγ'. Παρομαία Σολομώντος στίχ.

αψ'
ιδ'. Ἐκκλησιαστῆς στίχ. ψν'
ιε'. Ἀσμα ἁσμάτων στίχ. σπ'
ις'. Ἰωβ στίχ. αω'
ιζ'. Ἡσιας προφήτης στίχ. γω'
ιη'. Ἰερεμιας προφήτης στίχ. δ'
ιθ'. Βαρούχ στίχ. ψ'
κ'. Ἰεζεκιήλ στίχ. β'
κα'. Δανιήλ στίχ. β'
κβ'. Οἱ Δωδεκα προφήται στίχ. γ'

Ῥοῦθ, Βασιλείων α', β', Βασι-λείων γ', δ', τῶν Παραλειπομένων α', β')

Τρίτη πεντάτευχος, αἱ στιχηραὶ βιβλίοι
tοῦ Ἰωβ, τὸ Ψαλτήριον, Παρο-μαία Σολομώντος, Ἐκκλησιαστής,
tοῦ αὐτοῦ, τὰ Ἀσματα τῶν Ἀσμά-των τοῦ αὐτοῦ)

Τετάρτη πεντάτευχος ἡ προφητικὴ
tὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον, "Ἡσιας, Ἰε-ρεμιας, Ἰεζεκιήλ, Δανιήλ"

"Αλλαὶ δύο
tοῦ Ἑσδρα α', β', ἡ Ἑσδρήρ"

"Ἡ Πανάρετος τ. ἐ. ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Σολο-μώντος

"Ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ"

16. Ebedjesu (catal, libr. Eccl., Assemani, Bibl. Or. iii. 5 f.).

Genesis
Exodus
Liber sacerdotum
Numeri
Deuteronomii
Josue filii Nun
Judicum
Samuel
Regum
Liber Dabariamin
Ruth
Psalmi David Regis
Proverbia Salomonis
Cohellet
Sirat Sirin
Bar-Sira
Sapientia Magna
Iob
Isaias
Hosee
Ioel
Amos
Abdias
Jonas
Michaeas
Nahum
Habacuc
Sophonias
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B. "Ὅσα αὐτιλέγονται καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλησάσασται

α'. Μακκαβαῖκα γ' στίχων. ἧτο'
β'. Σοφία Σολομώντος στίχων. αρ'
γ'. Σοφία τοῦ Σιρὰχ στίχων. βω'
δ'. Ψαλμοὶ καὶ φαβο Ὁσαμώντων στίχων. βρ'
ε'. Ἐσθήρ στίχων. τν'
ζ'. Ἰουδίθ στίχων. αψ'
η'. Σωσάννα στίχων. φ'
η'. Τωβίθ, ὁ καὶ Τωβίθας στίχων. ψ'

17. Laodicene Canons (ix.).

a'. Γένεσις κόσμου
β'. Ἐξόδος ἐξ Ἀλγύττου
γ'. Λευικόν
δ'. Ἁρδυμόν
ε'. Δευτερονόμιον
ζ'. Ἰησοῦς Ναών
η'. Κριταί, 'Ροῦθ
θ'. Βασιλείων α', β'
ι'. Βασιλείων γ', δ'
ια'. Παραλειπομένων α', β'
ιβ'. Ἑσδρας α', β'
ιγ'. Βίβλος Ψαλμών ρω'
ιδ'. Παρομίαι Σολομώντος
ιε'. Ἐκκλησιαστής
ιζ'. Δαμαφράτων
ιη'. Ἰωβ
ιθ'. Δώδεκα προφήται
ιθ'. Ἡσαίος
κ'. Ἰερεμίας καὶ Βαρουχ, Θρήνοι καὶ Ἐπιστολαί
κα'. Ἰεζεκιήλ
κβ'. Δανιήλ

18. Apostolic Canons (lxxxiv.).

Μωσέως πέντε
(Γένεσις, Ἐξόδος, Δευτικόν, Ἀ-μαθμοί, Δευτερονόμιον)
Ἰησοῦς Ναών
Ῥοῦθ
Βασιλείων τέσσαρα
Παραλειπομένων δύο
"Ἐσδρα δύο
"Ἐσθήρ
Μακκαβαίων τρία
Ἰωβ
Ψαλτήριον
Σολομώντων τρία
(Παρομίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστής,
"Ἀμα φασμάτων"
Προφητῶν δεκάδον ἐν
Ἱραλοὶ ἐν
Ἰερεμίαν ἐν
Ἰεζεκιήλ ἐν
Δανιήλ ἐν
"Ἐξωθεν δὲ προσοποπείσθω μανθάνειν ὑμῶν τοὺς νέους τὴν Σοφίαν
tοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Σιραχ

19. List in Codd. Barocc. 206; B.M. Add. 17469; Coisl. 120.

Περὶ τῶν ε' βιβλίων, καὶ ὄσα τοῦτων ηκτὸς

α'. Γένεσις
β'. Ἐξόδος
γ'. Λευικόν
δ'. Ἁρδυμόν

e'. Δευτερονόμιον
ζ'. Ἰησοῦς
η'. Κριταί καὶ Ῥοῦθ
ια'. Βασιλείων α'—δ'
ιβ'. Παραλειπόμενα α', β'
ιγ'. Ἰωβ
Titles, Grouping, Number, and Order of Books.

B (3) (b). Order of the Books in Patristic and Synodical Lists of the Western Church.

   i—v. *Moysi[s] libri quinque*
   vi. *Iesi Naue*
   vii. *Iudicum et Ruth*
   viii. *Regnorum i, ii*
   ix. *Regnorum iii, iv*
   x. *Paralipomenon i, ii*
   xi. *Sermones dierum Esdrae*
   xii. *Liber Psalmorum*
   xiii—xv. *Salomonis Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum*
   xvi. *Duodecim Prophetae*
   xvii—xxii. *Esaias, Jeremias cum Lamentatione et Epistola, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Hester*

   [xxiii—xxiv. Tobias, Judith] ²

2. Ruffinus (*Comm. in symb. 36).*
   *Moysi[s] quinque libri*
   *Iesi Naue*
   *Iudicum, simul cum Ruth*
   *Regnorum iv*
   *Paralipomenon (= Dierum liber) Esdrae ii*
   *Hester*
   *Prophetarum*
   *Esaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, xii Prophetarum liber i)*
   *Iob*
   *Psalmi David*
   *Salomonis iii*
   *Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum*

   *Sapientia Salomonis*
   *Sapiencia Sirach (= Ecclesiasticus)*
   *Tobias*
   *Iudith*
   *Maccabaeorum libri*

¹ The B.M. MS. counts Ruth as a separate book and after Daniel places the numeral λε'.
² "Quibusdam autem visum est additis Tobia et Judith xxiv libros secundum numerum Graecarum literarum connumerare."
3. Augustine *(de doctr. Chr. ii. 13).*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historiae:</th>
<th>Moysi[s] libri quinque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinque Moyses [libri]</td>
<td>(Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iesu Naue</td>
<td>Iesu Naue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iudicum</td>
<td>Iudicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regnorum libri iv</td>
<td>Regnorum libri iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralipomenon libri ii</td>
<td>Paralipomenon libri ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td>Tobias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iudith</td>
<td>Iudith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machabaeorum libri ii</td>
<td>Machabaeorum libri ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esdrae libri ii</td>
<td>Esdrae libri ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prophetae:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prophetae:</th>
<th>Prophetarum xii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David liber Psalmorum</td>
<td>(Osee, Ioel, Amos, Ab-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomonis libri iii</td>
<td>diceas, Ionas, Michaeas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proverbiorum, Canticum Can-</td>
<td>Nahum, Habacuc, So-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ticularum, Ecclesiastes)</td>
<td>phonias, Aggaeus, Za-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus 1</td>
<td>charias, Malachias)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prophetarum xii |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prophetae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Eschiel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Pseudo-Gelasius *decret. de libr.*  

Moysis v libri:  

| Moysis v libri: | Prophetae iv maiorum volu-
|----------------|minum |
| Genesis | (Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Eschiel) |
| Exodus | Prophetae iv maiorum vol-
| Leviticus | minum |
| Numeri | (Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Eschiel) |
| Deuteronomium | Prophetae iv maiorum vol-
| Iesu Naue | minum |
| Iudicum | (Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Eschiel) |
| Ruth | Prophetae iv maiorum vol-
| Regnorum i—iv | minum |

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

Item historiarum:
Iob
Tobias
Hester
Iudith
Macchabaeorum libri ii

Salomonis libri v
(Proverbia, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum)

Prophetae
(Isaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Michaeas, Joel, Abdias, Jonas, Naum, Abacuc, Sofonias, Agaeus, Zacharias, Malechias, qui et Angelus)
Job
Tobias
Esther
Iudith
Machabaeorum libri ii

7. Isidorus (de ord. libr. s. scr).

1. Quinque libri Moyses
2. Iesu Name, Iudicum, Ruth
3. Regnorum i—iv, Paralipomenon i, ii, Tobiae, Esther, Iudith, Esdrae, Machabaeorum libri duo
4. Prophetae: Psalmorum liber i, Salomonis libri iii (Proverborum, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum), Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, libri xvi Propheta-


Libri canonici

Regnorum liber ii ver III
Regnorum liber iii ver III
Regnorum liber iv ver III
Fiunt versus VIII
Paralipomenon liber i ver III
Machabaeorum liber i ver III
Iob ver III
Tobias ver III
Hester ver III

1. The text of Preuschen has been followed; it is based on a St Gall MS. which appears to be less corrupt than the Cheltenham MS. used by Mommsen and others.
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ludit ver MC
Psalmi Davitici cli ver V
Salomonis ver VID
Prophetaemaiores ver XVCCCLXX
numero IIII
Esaias ver IIDLXXX

Versus scribturarum sanctarum
ita Genesis versus IIIID
Exodus versus IIIIDCC
Leviticum versus IIDCCC
Numeri versus IIDDCL
Deuteronomium ver. IIICCC
Iesu Nauve ver. III
Judicium ver. II
Rud ver. CCL
Regnorum ver.
primus liber ver. IIIID
secundus lib. ver. III
tertius lib. ver. IIDC
quartus lib. ver. IIICCCC
Psalmi Davitici ver. V
Proverbia ver. IDC
Aeclesiastes DC
Cantica canticorum CCC
Sapientia vers. I
Sapientia IHU ver. III
XII Profetae ver. IIIICX
Ossee ver. DXXX
Amos ver. CCCCC
Micheas ver. CCCX
Ioel ver. XC
Abdias ver. LXX
Jonas ver. CL
Naum ver. CXL
Ambacum ver. CLX
Sophonias ver. CXL
Aggeus vers. CX
Zacharias ver. DCLX
Malachi ver. CC
Esequias ver. IIDC
Ieremias ver. IIIILXX
Ieremias ver IIIICCCCL
Daniel ver MCCCL
Ezechiel ver IIIICCCXL
Prophetae xii ver IIDCCC
Erunt omnes versus numero
LXVIIIID

10. Liber sacramentorum (Bobbio, cent. vi, vii).
Liber Genesis
Exodum
Leviticum
Numeri
Deuteronomium
Josue
Judicium
Libri mulierum
Ruth
Hester
Judith
Maccabeorum libri duo
Job
Thobias
Regum quattuor
Prophetarum libri xvi
Daviticum v
Solomonis iii
Esdra i
Fiunt libri Veteris numero xliii

Fiunt libri Veteris numero xliii
2. We may now proceed to consider the chief points which these tables illustrate.

(i) The Titles of the Books. It will be seen that the Hebrew titles fall into three classes. They consist of either (1) the first word or words of the book (Genesis—Deuteronomy, Proverbs, Lamentations); or (2) the name of the hero or supposed author (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah and the other Prophets, Job, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, Ezra); or (3) a description of the contents (Psalms, Song of Songs, Chronicles). Titles of the second and third class are generally reproduced in the Greek; there are some variations, as when Samuel and Kings become 'Kingdoms,' and 'Diaries' (Deuteronomium) is changed into 'Omissions' (Paralipomenon), but the system of nomenclature is the same. But titles of the first class disappear in the Greek, and in their place we find descriptive names, suggested in almost every case by words in the ver-

1 Or less correctly Paralipomenon, 'omitted books,' as in some lists.
sion itself. Thus *Genesis* appears to come from Gen. ii. 4 αὕτη η βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, *Exodus* from Ex. xix. 1 τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν νυών Ἰσραήλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, *Numbers* from Num. i. 2 κατὰ ἀριθμόν ἐξ ὀνόματος, *Deuteronomy* from Deut. xvii. 18 γράφει αὕτη τὸ δευτερονόμιον τούτῳ εἰς βιβλίον', *Ecclesiastes* from Eccl. i. 1 ῥήματα ἐκκλησιαστοῦ.

The Greek titles are probably of Alexandrian origin and pre-Christian use. Not only were they familiar to Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25), but they are used in Melito's list, although it came from Palestine. Some of them at least appear to have been known to the writers of the New Testament; cf. Acts ii. 30 ἐν βιβλίῳ ψαλμῶν, xiii. 33 ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ, Rom. ix. 25 ἐν τῷ Ὀσῆ λέγει. Philo uses Γένεσις, Ἑξόδος, Δευτερόνομον ὀρ Λευτική βίβλος, Δευτερονόμιον, Βασιλεία, Παροιμίαι, but his practice is not quite constant; e.g. once or twice he calls Exodus Ἑξιαγωγή; Deuteronomy is sometimes Ἑπνομίς, and Judges ἡ τῶν Κριμάτων βίβλος. Similar titles occur in the Mishna, whether suggested by the Alexandrian Greek, or independently coined by the Palestinian Jews; thus Genesis is יִתְנָה, Numbers יִתְנָהוּ, Proverbs יִתְנָהוּ, Lamentations יִתְנָהוּ.

Through the Old Latin version the Greek titles passed into the Latin Bible, and from the Latin Bible into the later versions of Western Christendom. In three instances, however, the influence of Jerome restored the Hebrew titles; 1, 2 King-

---

1 On this rendering see Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. i. The Massora calls the book יהוּדָה, not יִתְנָהוּ.

2 See also Acts xiii. 20, 33, Rom. x. 16, xv. 11, Heb. xi. 22.

3 See Prof. Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xx. ff.

4 *De migr. Abr.* 3, *Quis rer. div. heres* (ed. Wendland) 4. In the former of these passages Philo ascribes this title to Moses. Yet Ἑξιαγωγή does not like Ἑξόδος occur in the Alexandrian version of the book.

5 Cf. the change from דְּבָרִים to בָּאָשְׁלֵיהוּ.


7 Sometimes in a simple transliteration, as Genesis &c. Tertullian has *Arithmi*, but in Cyprian the Latin Numeri is already used; see Burkitt, *O. L. and Itala*, p. 4.
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doms have become 1, 2 Samuel, and 3, 4 Kingdoms, 1, 2 Kings, whilst ‘Chronicles,’ representing the Hebrew קְרֵי הַנּוֹס, has taken the place of Paralipomenon.

Cf. Hieron. Prol. Gal.: “tertius sequitur Samuel, quem nos Regnorum primum et secundum dicimus; quartus Malachim, id est Regum, qui tertio et quarto Regnorum volumine continetur... septimus Dabre aiamim, id est ‘Verba dierum,’ quod significantius Chronicon totius divinae historiae possimus appellare.”

The Greek titles vary slightly in different codices and lists. Besides the variations of cod. A which appear in Table B (2), the following are mentioned in the apparatus of Holmes and Parsons. Joshua: Ἰσραήλ ο Ναυή, ὁ τού Ναυή, Judges: Κρατα τού Ἰσραήλ, αἱ τῶν κρατῶν πράξεις. Chronicles: Παράληπομένων τῶν βασιλείων Ἰούδα. Psalms: Δαβίδ προφήτου καὶ βασιλέως μέλος. When Nehemiah is separated from Ezra its title is: τὰ περὶ Νεεμίου oder λόγοι Ν. νῦν Ἀχαλία. A few further forms may be gleaned from the patristic lists. As an alternative for Παράληπομένων the Apostolic Canons give τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν ἡμε- ρῶν, while Ezra is known to Hilary as sermones dierum Esdrae. The Psalter is sometimes βιβλος Ψαλμων, liber Psalmorum, or Ψαλτήριον Δαβιδικών, Psalmi David regis, Psalterium Daviti- cum. For Ἀσμα ἀσμάτων we have occasionally ἄσμα ἀσμάτων—a form rejected by Origen (ap. Eus. H.E. vi. 25 οὐ γάρ, ὅσ υπολαμβάνονι των ἀσμάτων), but used by Pseudo-Chrysostom and John of Damascus, and found in cod. A and in several of the Latin lists1; cf. the English Article VI. “Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.” The lesser Prophets are οἱ δώδεκα οὶ δεκαδύο, τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν μία βίβλος, τὸ δώδεκα- προφήτου, prophetae xii; the greater, οἱ τέσσαρες, prophetae iv, prophetae in maiorem voluminum, or simply maiores; when the two collections are merged into one they become οἱ δεκαέξ οἱ ἐκκαίδεκα, τὸ ἐκκαίδεκα προφήτου, prophetae xvi.

(2) THE GROUPING OF THE BOOKS. The methods of grouping adopted in the Hebrew and Alexandrian Greek Bibles differ not less widely than the nomenclature of the books. The Hebrew canon is uniformly tripartite, and “the books belonging to one division are never (by the Jews) transferred to another.” Its three groups are known as the Law

1 The official Vulgate had Canticum, until the plural was adopted by Sixtus V. ; see Nestle, ein Jubiläum der Lat. Bibel, p. 18.
2 Driver, Introd., p. xxvii.
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(טְהוֹן), the Prophets (בְּנֵי-יְהוּדָה), and the Writings (בָּהַנִּים). The Massora recognised, however, certain subdivisions within the second and third groups; the Prophets were classed as Former (רָאוֹזִי), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; and Latter (אֲבָרָהָם), and among the ‘Latter’ the Twelve minor Prophets formed a single collection. Similarly ‘the five Rolls’ (נְפֹלֶטַת), i.e. Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, made a subsection among the Kethubim. The tripartite division of the canon was known at Alexandria in the second century B.C., for the writer of the prologue to Sirach refers to it more than once (1 f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατʼ αὐτούς ἥκολουθηκότων: 6 f. τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων: 14 f. δ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητείαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων). It is also recognised in the New Testament, where the Law and the Prophets are mentioned as authoritative collections, and in one passage the ‘Writings’ are represented by the Psalter (Lc. xxiv. 44 πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ τοῖς προφηταῖς καὶ ψαλμοῖς). But the New Testament has no comprehensive name for the third group, and even Josephus (c. Αρ. i. 8) speaks of four poetical books (probably Psalms, Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) as forming with the Law and the Prophets the entire series of sacred books; the rest of the Hagiographa seem to have been counted by him among the Prophets. At Alexandria the later books were probably attached to the canon by a looser bond. The writer of the De vita contemplativa appears to recognise four groups (§ 3 νόμους, καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν, καὶ ὑμνοὺς, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οῖς ἐπιστήμη καὶ εὐσέβεια συναύξονται καὶ τελειοῦνται).

Only the first of the three Palestinian groups remains undis-

1 So already in Sir. xlix. 10 τῶν ἠβ’ προφητῶν.
2 See Ryle, Canon of the O.T., p. 165 f.
3 Unless we omit the comma after ὑμνοὺς and regard ὑμνοὺς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα as = the Hagiographa; cf. Joseph. c. Αρ. as quoted below, p. 220.
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turbed in the Alexandrian Greek Bible, as it is preserved to us in MSS. and described in Christian lists. When the Law was translated into Greek, it was already a complete collection, hedged round with special sanctions, and in all forms of the Greek Bible it retains its precedence and has resisted any extensive intrusion of foreign matter. It is otherwise with the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Neither of these groups escaped decomposition when it passed into the Greek Bible. The Former Prophets are usually separated from the Latter, the poetical books coming between. The Hagiographa are entirely broken up, the non-poetical books being divided between the histories and the prophets. This distribution is clearly due to the characteristically Alexandrian desire to arrange the books according to their literary character or contents, or their supposed authorship. Histories were made to consort with histories, prophetic and poetical writings with others of their respective kinds. On this principle Daniel is in all Greek codices and catalogues one of the Greater Prophets, while Ruth attaches itself to Judges, and Canticles to Ecclesiastes.

In many of the Greek patristic lists the Alexandrian principle of grouping receives express recognition. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Leontius, divide the books of the Old Testament into (1) historical—12, including the Mosaic Pentateuch; (2) poetical—5; (3) prophetical—5. Epiphanius, followed by John of Damascus, endeavours to combine this grouping with a system of pentateuchs—(1) legal, (2) poetical, (3) historical, (4) pro-

1 Yet even the Torah was not always kept apart in the Greek Bible, as the names Octateuch and Heptateuch witness.
2 Dr Sanday (in Studia Biblica, iii. p. 240) regards this as Palestinian, identifying it with Cyril’s method. But Cyril begins with a dodecad (δώδεκάτη ἡ Ἑσθήρ καὶ τὰ μὲν Ἰστορικὰ ταῦτα).
3 The term γραφεῖα (δογματικά) or ἀγιόγραφα is transferred to this group.
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The relative order of the groups in the Greek Bible, being of literary and not historical origin, is to some extent liable to variation. The 'five books of Moses' always claim precedence, and the 'rest of the histories' follow, but the position of the poetical and prophetical books is less certain. Codex B places the poetical books first, whilst in Codd. Ν and A the prophets precede. But the order of cod. B is supported by the great majority of authorities both Eastern and Western (Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius (1, 3), Gregory, Amphilochius, the Laodicene and 'Apostolic' canons, Nicæphorus, Pseudo-Chrysostom, the Cheltenham list, the African canons of 397, and Augustine). Two reasons may have combined to favour this arrangement. 'David' and 'Solomon' were higher up the stream of time than Hosea and Isaiah. Moreover, it may have seemed fitting that the Prophets should immediately precede the Evangelists.

(3) The Number of the Books. In our printed Hebrew Bibles the books of the Old Testament are 39 (Law, 5; Former Prophets (Joshua—2 Kings), 6; Latter Prophets, 15; Hagiographa, 13). But Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, and

1 So Leontius (τὰ παρανυκτικά), but he classed the Psalter among them.
Chronicles', were originally single books², and the Minor Prophets were also counted as a single book. Thus the number is reduced to 24 (Law, 5; Former Prophets, 4; Latter Prophets, 4; Hagiographa, 11), and this answers to the prevalent Jewish tradition. On the other hand Josephus expressly limits the books to 22 (Law, 5; Prophets, 13; Hymns and moral pieces, 4). He has probably included the historical Hagiographa among the Prophets, and treated Ruth and Lamentations as appendices to Judges and Jeremiah respectively.

Both traditions were inherited by the Church, but the latter was predominant, especially in the East. In some lists indeed the twenty-two books became twenty-seven, the ‘double books’ being broken up into their parts (Epiph. 1)³; in some a similar treatment of the Dodecapropheton raised the number to 34 (the ‘Sixty Books’), and there are other eccentricities of numeration which need not be mentioned here.

Josephus, c. Ap. i. 8: οὗ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνυμφόνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βιβλία...καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἔστι Μονοσέως...οἷς μετὰ Μονοσῆν προφητεῖ...συνεγραφαν ἐν τροφί καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις: αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὑμνοὺς εἰς τὸν θείον καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. Η εἰς τῶν θείων καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκαις τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. He is followed by Origen ap. Eus. l.c. οὐκ ἀγνοητέον δ' εἶναι τὰς ἐνδιαθέκους βιβλίους ὡς 'Εβραίοι παραδίδοσιν, ὡποὶ ὁ ἀριθμός τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς στοιχείων ἔστιν: and Cyril, Hier. catech. iv. 33 ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφὰς, τὰς εἴκοσι δύο βιβλίους τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Similarly Athanasius, ep. fest. 39 (Migne, P.G. xxvi. col. 1437). When another numeration was adopted, efforts were

¹ Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah appears to have been originally a single book. But while Ezra and Nehemiah are still joined in the Greek Bible, Chronicles stands by itself both in א and ג, and in א it follows Nehemiah and forms the last book of the Canon (cf. Mt. xxiii. 35, and see Barnes, Chronicles, in the Cambridge Bible, pp. x.—xiii.).

² The division probably began in the LXX.

³ Jerome, Profl. Gal.: “quinde a plerisque libri duplices aestimantur.” As the twenty-two books answered to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, so these ‘double books’ were thought to correspond to the ‘double letters,’ i.e. those which had two forms (א, ב, כ, ל, ט). The ‘double books’ were not always identical in different lists; see Sanday, op. cit. p. 239.
made to shew that it did not involve a real departure from the
canon of twenty-two; cf. Epiph. haer. i. 1. 8, αὕται εἰσίν αἱ εἰκοσι
ἐπτὰ βιβλία αἱ ἐκ θεοῦ δοθέσαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, εἰκοσὶ δύο δὲ ὡς τὰ
παρ᾿ αὐτοῖς στοιχεία τῶν Ἑβραικῶν γραμμάτων αἰρθομοίμενα διὰ τὸ
διπλωσθαι δίκα βιβλίους εἰς πίντε λεγομένας· διὰl. Tim. et Ag.
(ed. Conybeare, p. 66), αὕται αἱ βιβλία αἱ θεόπνευστοι καὶ εὐναδε-
tου, καὶ μὲν οὖνα, καὶ δὲ αἰρθομοίμενα διὰ τὸ...εξ αὐτῶν διπλωσθαι.

On the other hand the numeration in 4 Esdr. xiv. 44 rests, if
nongenti quatuor be the true reading, on a tradition which
makes the Hebrew books 24. This tradition is supported by
the testimony of the Talmud and the Rabbinical literature, and
the Canon is known in Jewish writings by the name מִיסָּד ד’
“the Twenty-Four Books.” It finds a place in certain Western
Christian writers, e.g. Victorinus of Petru comm. in Apoc.; “sunt
autem libri V.T. qui accipiunt viginti quatuor quos in epitome
Theodori invenies.” Victorinus compares the 24 books to the
24 Elders of Apoc. iv., and the same fancy finds a place in the
Cheltenham list (“ut in apocalypsi Iohannis dictum est Vidi
xxiii seniores mittentes coronas suas ante thronum, maiores
nostri probant hoe libros esse canonicos”). Jerome knows both
traditions, though he favours the former (Pro!. Gal. “quomodo
igitur viginti duo elementa sunt...ita viginti duo volumina sup-
putantur...quamquam nonnulli Ruth et Cinoth inter Hagi-
ographa scriptitent et libros hos in suo putent numero supputan-
dos et per hoc esse priscæ legis libros viginti quatuor”).

Let us now turn to the ecclesiastical lists and see how far
the Hebrew Canon was maintained.

Our earliest Christian list was obtained from Palestine, and
probably represents the contents of the Palestinian Greek
Bible. It is an attempt to answer the question, What is the
ture number and order of the books of the Old Testament? Both the titles and the grouping are obviously Greek, but the books are exclusively those of the Hebrew canon. Esther
does not appear, but the number of the books is twenty-two, if
we are intended to count 1—4 Regn. as two.

2 Zahn offers a suggestion, to which Sanday inclines, that the writer
refers to the Excerpta ex Theodoto which are partly preserved in the works
of Clement of Alexandria.
3 Melito ap. Eus. H. E. iv. 26 ἐπείδη μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων
ἐβουλήθης ἀκρίβειαν, πόσα τὸν ἁρμόδιον καὶ ὅποια τὴν τάξιν ἔτεν...ἀνελθὼν εἰς
τὴν ἀνατολὴν καὶ ἔως τοῦ τόπου ἐκθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπέρθη...ἐπεμψά σοι.
The next list comes from Origen. It belongs to his commentary on the first Psalm, which was written at Alexandria\(^1\), i.e. before A.D. 231. The books included in it are expressly said to be the twenty-two of the Hebrew canon (\(\epsilonι\iota\iota\iota\ \deltaε\ \alpha\iota\iota\iota\ \beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\ \varepsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\)). Yet among them are the first book of Esdras\(^8\) and the Epistle of Jeremiah, which the Jews never recognised. With the addition of Baruch, Origen’s list is repeated by Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius (1), and in the Laodicean canon; Amphilochius mentions two books of Esdras, and it is at least possible that the Esdras of Gregory of Nazianzus is intended to include both books, and that the Epistle, or Baruch and the Epistle, are to be understood as forming part of Jeremiah in the lists both of Gregory and Amphilochius. Thus it appears that an expansion of the Hebrew canon, which involved no addition to the number of the books, was predominant in the East during the fourth century.

The Eastern lists contain other books, but they are definitely placed outside the Canon. This practice seems to have begun with Origen, who after enumerating the twenty-two books adds, \(\epsilon\xi\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ θεν\ \των\ \εστι\ τα\ Μακκαβαϊκα\). Athanasius takes up the expression, but names other books—the two Wisdoms, Esther\(^3\), Judith, and Tobit\(^4\). Palestine was perhaps naturally conservative in this matter; Cyril will not allow his catechumens to go beyond the Canon, and Epiphanius mentions only, and that with some hesitation, the two books of Wisdom (\(\epsilonι\iota\iota\iota\ \deltaε\ \kappaαι\ \αλλαι\ \pa\rho\ \αυτω\iota\ \beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \alpha\mu\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\iota\iota\iota\iota\)).

---

1 Eus. \(H.E\). vi. 24.
2 Already cited freely by Josephus as an authority for the history of the period. Origen, it should be added, regards 1, 2 Esdras as a single volume (‘\(\varepsilon\sigma\delta\tau\alpha\ \pi\rho\iota\tau\eta\,\ \deltaε\υ\tau\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\)).
3 Cf. Melito’s omission of Esther, and the note appended to the list of Amphilochius.
4 The N.T. members of the same class are the Teaching and the Shepherd.
5 \(Haer.\) i. i. 1.
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And this was the prevalent attitude of the East even at a later time. There are exceptions; Pseudo-Chrysostom places Sirach among the Hortatory books of the canon; the Apostolic canons, while excluding Sirach, include three books of Maccabees. But John of Damascus reflects the general opinion of the Greek fathers when, while reckoning both books of Esdras as canonical, he repeats the verdict of Epiphanius upon the two Wisdoms, 'Ενάρετοι μὲν καὶ καλαί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοῦνται.

On the other hand the West, further from the home of the Hebrew canon, and knowing the Old Testament chiefly through the Latin version of the LXX., did not scruple to mingle non-canonical books with the canonical. Hilary and Ruffinus were doubtless checked, the one by the influence of Eastern theologians, the other by the scholarship of Jerome; but Hilary mentions that there were those who wished to raise the number of the canonical books to twenty-four by including Tobit and Judith in the canon. From the end of the fourth century the inclusion of the non-canonical books in Western lists is a matter of course. Even Augustine has no scruples on the subject; he makes the books of the Old Testament forty-four (de doctr. Chr. ii. 13 "his xliv libris Testamenti Veteris terminatur auctoritas"), and among them Tobit, Judith, and two books of Maccabees take rank with the histories; and the two Wisdoms, although he confesses that they were not the work of Solomon, are classed with the

1 De mens. et pond. 4.
2 Like Origen, he explains that they form together but a single book (τοῦ 'Εσδρα αἱ δύο εἰς μιᾶν συναπτόμεναι βιβλίον).
3 The non-canonical books (τὰ ἔξω) are however carefully distinguished from real apocrypha when the latter are mentioned; e.g. in the stichometry of Nicephorus, and in the list of the 'Sixty Books.'
4 In symb. 38 "alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a maiori-bus appellati sunt."
5 Cf. Retract. ii. 4.
Prophets. His judgement was that of his Church (Conc. Carth. iii. can. xlvii. “sunt canonicae scripturae Salomonis libri quinque...Tobias, Judith...Machabaeorum libri duo”). The African Church had probably never known any other canon, and its belief prevailed wherever the Latin Bible was read.

There can be little doubt that, notwithstanding the strict adherence of the Eastern lists to the number of the Hebrew books, the Old Latin canon truly represents the collection of Greek sacred books which came into the hands of the early Christian communities at Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome. When Origen and the Greek fathers who follow him fix the number of the books at twenty-two or twenty-four, they follow, not the earlier tradition of the Church, but the corrected estimate of Christian scholars who had learned it from Jewish teachers. An earlier tradition is represented by the line of Christian writers, beginning with Clement of Rome, who quoted the ‘Apocryphal’ books apparently without suspecting that they were not part of the Canon. Thus Clement of Rome\(^1\) places the story of Judith side by side with that of Esther; the Wisdom of Sirach is cited by Barnabas\(^2\) and the Didache\(^3\), and Tobit by Polycarp\(^4\); Clement of Alexandria\(^5\) and Origen appeal to Tobit and both the Wisdmos, to which Origen adds Judith\(^6\). Our earliest MSS. of the Greek Bible confirm the impression derived from the quotations of the earliest Christian writers. Their canon corresponds not with that of the great writers of the age when they were written, but with that of the Old Latin version of the LXX. Codd. B \& A contain the two Wisdmos, Tobit, and Judith; 1—2 Maccabees are added in \& \(\kappa\), and 1—4 Maccabees in A; cod. C still exhibits the two Wisdmos, and when complete may have contained other books of the same class.

---

\(^1\) 1 Cor. 55.  \(^2\) c. 19. 9.  \(^3\) c. 4.  
\(^4\) Philipp. 10.  \(^5\) Strom. i. 10, v. 14.  
Moreover, the position of the books shews that the scribes of these MSS. or of their archetypes lacked either the power or the will to distinguish them from the books of the Hebrew canon. In the light of the facts already produced, it is clear that the presence of the non-canonical books in Greek Bibles cannot be attributed to the skilled writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. They have but perpetuated an older tradition—a tradition probably inherited from the Alexandrian Jews.

An explanation of the early mixture of non-canonical books with canonical may be found in the form under which the Greek Bible passed into the keeping of the Church. In the first century the material used for literary purposes was still almost exclusively papyrus, and the form was that of the roll. But rolls of papyrus seldom contained more than a single work, and writings of any length, especially if divided into books, were often transcribed into two or more separate rolls. The rolls were kept in boxes (κισταῖ, κάψαι, cistae), which served not only to preserve them, but to collect them in sets. Now while the sanctity of the five books of Moses would protect the cistae which contained them from the intrusion of foreign rolls, no scruple of this kind would deter the owner of a roll of Esther from placing it in the same box with Judith and Tobit; the Wisdoms in like manner naturally found their way into a Salomonic collection; while in a still larger number of instances the two Greek recensions of Esdras consorted together, and Baruch and the Epistle seemed rightly to claim a place with the roll of Jeremiah. More rarely such a writing as the Psalms of Solomon may have found its way into the company of kindred books of the canon. It is not a serious objection to this hypothesis.

1 See Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek papyri, pp. 24, 113 ff.
2 Ib. p. 122: "no papyrus roll of Homer hitherto discovered contains more than two books of the Iliad. Three short orations fill the largest roll of Hyperides."
3 E. M. Thompson, Greek and Latin Palaeography, p. 57.

S. S.
that Philo does not quote the Apocrypha, and has no certain allusion to it. A great scholar would not be deceived by the mixture of heterogeneous rolls, which might nevertheless seriously mislead ordinary readers, and start a false tradition in an unlettered community such as the Christian society of the first century.

(4) The Internal Order of the Groups. Even in Jewish lists of the Hebrew Canon there are variations in the internal order of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. The ‘Great Prophets’ occur in each of the three orders (1) Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; (2) Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah; (3) Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel. The order of the Hagiographa varies more extensively. In the printed Bibles they are arranged in three subdivisions: (1) Psalms, Proverbs, Job; (2) Canticles, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther (the five Megilloth); (3) Daniel, Ezra, Chronicles. The Talmudic order is as follows: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles. The MSS. vary, many agreeing with the printed Bibles; others, especially those of Spanish provenance, following the order: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra.

In the lists of the Greek Bible and the sequence of its MSS. the Law and the ‘Former Prophets’ generally retain their Hebrew order, with the noteworthy exception that Ruth is always attached to Judges. But there are also minor exceptions which are of some interest. Even in the Pentateuch Melito, Leontius, and the Cheltenham list reverse the common order of Leviticus and Numbers. The sequence is broken in some lists after Ruth (Laod., Epiph. 1), or even after Joshua.

(Epiph. 3\(^1\)) or Deuteronomy (Epiph. 2). Occasionally Chronicles, which is an intruder from the Hagiographa, precedes 1—4 Regn. (Epiph. 2, *Dial. Tim. et Aq.*), or drops out altogether (Ps.-Chrys., Junilius, Cod. Clarom.). All these disturbances of the normal order may be ascribed to local or individual influences, and find no support in the uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible. But it is otherwise when we come to the ‘Latter Prophets’ and the Hagiographa. With regard to the Prophets, three questions of order arise.

(1) There is the relative order of the Twelve and the Four. In the majority of patristic lists the Twelve precede (Ath., Cyr., Epiph., Greg., Amph., &c.), and this is also the order of Codd. A, B, N-V. But Cod. \(\alpha\) begins with the Four, and it is supported by other authorities, chiefly Western (Ruff., Chelt., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius, Nicephorus); whilst in a few the subdivisions are mixed (Melito, Junilius, Ebedjesu\(^2\)).

(2) The internal order of the δώδεκαπροφητον in most of the MSS. and catalogues\(^3\) where it is stated differs from the Hebrew order in regard to the relative positions of the prophets in the first half of the group; the Hebrew order being Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, but the Greek, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. The dominant Greek order may perhaps be due to “an attempt to secure greater accuracy in the chronological arrangement\(^4\).”

(3) The

---

\(^1\) Ruth is attached to 1 Regn. in the Cheltenham list, and Augustine inclines to this arrangement (see Sanday, *L.c.*, p. 242). The result was to create a *Heptateuch*; for the word cf. J. E. B. Mayor, *The Latin Heptateuch*, p. xxxvi. R. Peiper’s text of the *Heptateuchos*, to which Prof. Mayor refers (p. xxxiv.), appeared in the Vienna *Corpus scr. eccl. lat.* vol. xxiii. (1895).

\(^2\) For statements by early Mohammedan writers as to the extent of the Jewish and Christian Canons see Margoliouth in *Exp. Times*, Nov. 1899, p. 91.

\(^3\) The chief exceptions are: Cod. v, Hosea, Amos, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah; Greg. Naz. and Cod. Barocc., Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah; Junilius, Ebedjesu, Augustine, the Hebrew order.

Greek order of the Greater Prophets follows the oldest Hebrew tradition (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel), but it appends Lamentations to Jeremiah, and enlarges the group by placing Daniel either before (Melito, Origen, Hilary, Chelt., Augustine), or, more usually, after Ezekiel.

The relative order of the Hagiographa in the LXX. is more perplexing. For Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel we have already accounted; there remain Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, and Ezra. Chronicles, in accordance with the theory enshrined in its Greek name, usually follows Kings. Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, for the most part hold together in that order, as a group of poetical books; but there are many exceptions. ‘David’ sometimes goes with the Prophets (Ps.-Chrys., Juni- lius, Augustine, Isidorus), and the group is then regarded as ‘Salomonic,’ or ‘hortatory.’ Lists which admit the two books of Wisdom usually join them to this subdivision (Ebedjesu, Carth., Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius, Isidorus). The internal order of the Salomonic books varies (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles; Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Proverbs; Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes); the Wisdoms usually follow, but sometimes break the sequence of the three canonical books. Much difficulty seems to have been felt as to the place of Job; the book normally appears in connexion with the poetical books, either last or first, but it is sometimes placed among the histories (Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), or after the Prophets (Origen). The position of Esdras is not less uncertain; its normal place is after Chronicles, but it is also found before or after the Prophets (Melito, Epiph., John of Damascus, Cod. Barocc.), or in connexion with a group of the apocryphal histories (cod. A, Carth., Augustine, &c.). Esther is still more erratic; sometimes it follows the poetical books, sometimes the Prophets, sometimes the
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histories; not a few lists place it among the antilegomena, or omit it altogether. When admitted to a place in the Canon, it is usually to be found at or near the end (Origen, Epiphanius, Amphilocheius, John of Damascus, Hilary, Carth.; Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), and in company with apocryphal books, especially Judith¹ and Tobit (codd. BôRA, Chelt., Carth., Augustine, and the later Latin lists²). It seems as if the doubt which the Jewish authorities felt with regard to this book was inherited by many Christians. On the other hand Cyril, who represents the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, makes it the twelfth of the canonical books, and in the Laodicene list it stands eighth.

Except in cases where an old or well-defined tradition fixed the internal order of groups of books, there was clearly room for every possible variation so long as the books were written on separate rolls. The cista might serve to keep a group together, but it offered no means of fixing the relative order of its contents. In the codex, on the other hand, when it contained more than one writing, the order was necessarily fixed³, and the scribe unconsciously created a tradition which was followed by later copyists. The 'transition to vellum,' and the consequent transition from the roll to the codex, does not seem to have been general before the fourth century, although in the case of Biblical MSS. it may have begun a century earlier⁴; and thus we may regard our earliest uncial codices as prototypes of the variations in order which mark the mass of later MSS. A single instance may suffice. It has been stated that Esther is frequently found in company

¹ The proximity of Esther to Judith in many lists is perhaps due to the circumstance that in both books the central figure is a woman; cf. p. 213 (right-hand column).
⁴ See Kenyon, Palaeography of papyri, p. 119 f.; Sanday, l.c. Papyrus was freely used for codices in Egypt during the third century; cf. Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ii. p. 2.
with Judith and Tobit. But these books occur in varying order in the oldest MSS.; in B we have Esther, Judith, Tobit, but in A, Esther, Tobit, Judith; a favourite Western order is Tobit, Esther, Judith (Chelt., Augustine, Innocent, Gelasius, Cassiodorus, Isidorus); another, sanctioned at Carthage in 397, is apparently more common in MSS. of the Vulgate, viz., Tobit, Judith, Esther. Such variations, resting on no obvious principle, are doubtless ultimately due to the judgement or caprice of a few scribes, whose copies supplied the archetypes of the later Greek MSS. and the daughter-versions of the Septuagint.


1 For the order of the books in Latin MS. Bibles see S. Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, pp. 301–6, 331–9.
CHAPTER II.

BOOKS OF THE HEBREW CANON.

The books which are common to the Hebrew Bible and the Alexandrian Version differ in regard to their contents as well as in their titles and order. Differences of contents may conveniently be considered under two heads, as they affect the sequence or the subject-matter.

(A) Differences of Sequence.

1. The following table shews the principal instances in which the Greek and the Hebrew books are at variance in reference to the order of the contents. The chapters and verses in the left-hand column are those of the Cambridge Septuagint; the right-hand column follows the numeration of the printed Hebrew Bibles.

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

1 Following the order of *The Old Testament in Greek*, these are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-4 Kingdoms (vol. i.), 1-2 Paralipomena, 2 Esdras, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job, Esther (vol. ii.), the Twelve Minor Prophets, the Four Greater Prophets (vol. iii.)—37 in all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exod. xxxvi. 8b—40</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exod. xxxix. 1—31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 1—2</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvi. 1—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 8—6</td>
<td>&quot; 35—38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 7—21</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 9—23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 1—17</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 1—24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 18—20</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvi. 20—34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 21—24</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 1—7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 25</td>
<td>&quot; xxxvii. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 27</td>
<td>&quot; xxl. 30—32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxxix. 1—10</td>
<td>&quot; xxxviii. 24—31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 11</td>
<td>&quot; xxxix. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 13—23</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; 33—43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xl. 6b—8, 10—25, 26, 27</td>
<td>&quot; xl. 8—10, 12—27, 29, 33, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. i. 24—37</td>
<td>Num. i. 26—37, 24—25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 22—26</td>
<td>&quot; vi. 22, 23, 27, 24, 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xxvi. 15—47</td>
<td>&quot; xxvi. 19—27, 15—18, 44—47, 28—43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. ix. 3—33</td>
<td>Josh. viii. 30—33, ix. 3—27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xix. 47—48</td>
<td>&quot; xix. 48, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regn. iv. 17, 18, 19</td>
<td>1 Kings iv. 18, 19, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 20—21, 22—24</td>
<td>&quot; 7—8, 2—4, 9—14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 25—30</td>
<td>&quot; v. 1—16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 2—3</td>
<td>&quot; v. 15—30, 32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vi. 4—5, 6—7, 8, 9—15, 16—34</td>
<td>&quot; vi. 37—38, 2—3, 14, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vii. 1—6, 7, 8—9, 10—11, 12—13</td>
<td>&quot; vii. 13—18, 21, 19—20, 23—24, 26, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; vii. 14—37, 38—50</td>
<td>&quot; vii. 27—51, 1—12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; x. 23—24a, 24b, 25</td>
<td>&quot; ix. 15, 17—19, 20—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26—29</td>
<td>&quot; x. 23—26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30</td>
<td>&quot; v. 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31—33</td>
<td>&quot; x. 27—29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xi. 3—8</td>
<td>&quot; xi. 4, 3, 7, 5, 8, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; xx. xxi</td>
<td>&quot; xx. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms ix. 22—39</td>
<td>Psalms x. 1—18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; x.—cxii</td>
<td>&quot; xi.—cxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiii. 1—8</td>
<td>&quot; cxiv. 1—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiii. 9—12</td>
<td>&quot; cxv. 1—4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxiv</td>
<td>&quot; cxvi. 1—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxv</td>
<td>&quot; cxvi. 10—19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxvi.—cxlvi</td>
<td>&quot; cxvii.—cxlvii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; cxlvii. 1—9</td>
<td>&quot; cxlvii. 12—20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Each of these contexts must be separately examined with the view of discovering the extent and the cause of the divergence. This can be done but briefly here; for further
particulars the student is referred to the commentaries which deal with the several books.

In the following pages $G =$ the Greek text, and $G^A, B, etc.$ = the Greek text as given in cod. A, cod. B, or as the case may be; $\text{M} =$ the Massoretic text as printed in the Hebrew Bibles.

**Gen. xxxi. 46 ff.** The passage is in some confusion; "vv. 45, 47, 51—54 appear to embody E's account... vv. 46, 48—50 the account given by J." $\text{M}$ is loosely put together, and v. 50, which $G$ omits, is hardly consistent with vv. 48, 52. In $G$ the materials seem to have been re-arranged with the view of giving greater consistency to the narrative.

**Gen. xxxv. 16 ff.** The transposition in $G$ appears to be due to a desire to locate Eder ($\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\theta$) between Bethel and Bethlehem; see art. EDER in Hastings' *D. B.* (i. p. 644).

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

**Exod. xxxv.—xl.** is "the sequel to c. xxv.—xxxi., relating the execution of the instructions there communicated to Moses," the correspondence being so close that "in the main, the narrative is repeated verbatim—with the single substitution of past tenses for future." But whilst in c. xxv. ff. the LXX. generally follows the Massoretic order, in the corresponding sections at the end of the book "extraordinary variations occur in the Greek, some verses being omitted altogether, while others are transposed and knocked about with a freedom very unlike the usual manner of the translators of the Pentateuch."

The passage deals with the building and furniture of the Tabernacle, and the attire of the Priesthood. The following rough table will enable the student to see how the details are arranged in the LXX. and Heb. severally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ornaments of the Ministers.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structure of the Tabernacle.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephod (xxxvi. 9—12).</td>
<td>Hangings (xxxvi. 8—19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyx stones (xxxvi. 13—14).</td>
<td>Boards (xxxvi. 20—34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastplate (xxxvi. 15—29).</td>
<td>Veils (xxxvi. 35—38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe of Ephod (xxxvi. 30—34).</td>
<td><strong>Furniture of the Tabernacle and its Court.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen vestments (xxxvi. 35—37).</td>
<td>Ark (xxxvii. 1—9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown plate (xxxvi. 38—40).</td>
<td>Table (xxxvii. 10—16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of the Tabernacle and Court.</strong></td>
<td>Candlestick (xxxvii. 17—24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangings (xxxvii. 1—2).</td>
<td>Altar of incense (xxxvii. 25—29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veils (xxxvii. 3—6).</td>
<td>Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 1—7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court (xxxvii. 7—18).</td>
<td>Laver (xxxviii. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furniture of the Tabernacle, &amp;c.</strong></td>
<td>Court (xxxviii. 9—20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark (xxxviii. 1—8).</td>
<td><strong>Ornaments of the Ministers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table (xxxviii. 9—12).</td>
<td>Ephod (xxxix. 2—5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick (xxxviii. 13—17).</td>
<td>Onyx stones (xxxix. 6—7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar of Burnt-offering (xxxviii. 22—24).</td>
<td>Breastplate (xxxix. 8—21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Incense (xxxviii. 25—26).</td>
<td>Robe of the Ephod (xxxix. 22—26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver (xxxviii. 27).</td>
<td>Linen vestments (xxxix. 27—29).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this comparison that both G and H follow a system, i.e. that the difference of sequence is due to a deliberate rearrangement of the groups. Either the Alexandrian translator has purposely changed their relative order, giving precedence to the ornaments of the priesthood which are subordinated in the M. T. of cc. xxxv.—xl., as well as in both texts of cc. xxv.—xxx.; or he had before him in c. xxxv. ff. another Hebrew text in which the present Greek order was observed. Many O.T. scholars (e.g. Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann) regard cc. xxxv.—xl. as belonging to a "secondary
and posterior stratum of P¹.” Thus it is permissible to suppose that the Hebrew text before the original translators of Exodus did not contain this section, and that it was supplied afterwards from a longer Hebrew recension of the book in which the last six chapters had not yet reached their final form. That the translation of these chapters was not made by the same hand as the rest of Exodus has been gathered from the fact that the Hebrew technical terms which are common to xxv.—xxx. and xxxv.—xl. are in certain cases differently rendered in the two contexts².

NUMBERS i. 24 ff., xxvi. 15 ff. Each of these passages contains a census of the tribes, and in each the order of the tribes is slightly different in G and M. In both lists M places Gad third, and Asher eleventh; whereas according to G Gad is ninth in the first of the two lists, and sixth in the second, and in the second Asher is seventh. The effect of the sequence presented by G is to bring Gad into close proximity to Asher, a position which this tribe occupies in i. 5—15 (G and M). For this there may have been genealogical reasons; see Gen. xxx. 10 ff., xliv. 19.

C. vi. 22 ff. Here M obviously has the simpler and more natural order, and λέγουτες αὐτοῖς at the end of v. 23 seems to shew that the Greek order, though supported by BAK*, is the result of an early accidental displacement in the Greek text.

JOSHUA ix. 3 ff. In the present Hebrew text the ceremony at Ebal and Gerizim follows immediately upon the taking of Ai, but in G it is separated from the latter incident by the hostile gathering of the western kings (ix. 1, 2) and placed immediately before the story of the Gibeonites. M “involves a geographical difficulty, for Ebal lies considerably to the north

of Ai, and until the intervening territory was conquered...it is difficult to understand how Joshua could have advanced thither 1." The situation however is scarcely improved if we adopt the order of G, unless the gathering of the kings is taken to imply a further victory on the Israelite side which opened the way to central Palestine. Dillmann suggests that ix. 2 was once followed by the details of a battle. If so, it is possible that G still preserves the original order, though in common with M it has lost this record.

C. xix. 47—48. On these verses, which exchange places in the Greek, see under (B) 2.

3 Regn. iv. 17 ff.

The change of order in vv. 17—19 needs no discussion; the transposition may be due to an accident of transcription in the archetype of Cod. B, or, like the variations in Num. i., xxvi., to some consideration connected with the placing of the tribes. The real problem of the passage begins at iv. 20. Its nature may best be understood from a table of the contents. These consist of the details of Solomon's personal greatness and public works; the facts are arranged by GB and M respectively as follows:

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

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

1 Driver, Intr. p. 100.

2 Cf. infra, p. 244.
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- Details of the building (vi. 8— vii. 34).
- Work of Hiram the artist (vii. 1—12).
- Building of the royal palaces (vii. 1—51).
- Solomon’s wife’s dowry (ix. 16 f.).

As in the disturbed section at the end of Exodus, it is easy to see that each order follows a system: (1) Whilst Μ places the marriage of Solomon to Pharaoh’s daughter, and the use made by the king of his wife’s marriage portion, in their historical settings, Γ brings the two incidents together, as the finishing strokes to the picture of Solomon’s power. Again, whilst Μ deals with the whole of Solomon’s public works before it describes the skill of Hiram, Γ completes the history of the building of the Temple with the account of Hiram’s labours before it describes the construction of the royal palaces.

The above comparison is necessarily rough; it does not shew the minor differences of order, or the omissions and additions of the Greek text. A closer examination leaves little doubt that Γ has been translated from a recension of the book earlier than that which is preserved in the Massoretic text.

C. x. 23—33. The text of Γ, Luc. here admits two passages which it had passed over in the earlier contexts, where they stand in Μ (c. ix. 15, 17—22, v. 1). Of ix. 10—28 Prof. Driver remarks that it “consists of a series of notices imperfectly connected together,” and that its “literary form... is, for some reason, less complete than that of any other portion of the Books of Kings.” Under these circumstances it is not surprising that some of these notices occupied another

2 Intr. p. 181.
place in the text which was before the Alexandrian trans-
lator. C. v. r, which in the Greek order is x. 30, belongs in
M to another similar collection of loosely-connected para-
graphs. The arrangement followed by G B is perhaps not
materially better, but it probably represents an earlier stage
in the formation of the book.

C. xi. 3—8. Here G B, Luc. presents a text which differs
from G A and M both in order and in form. A comparison of
G B with G A and M will be found to be instructive; the latter
is diffuse and repeats itself unnecessarily (3 ἔκλιναν γυναῖκες
αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ... 4 αὐτοῦ γυναῖκες αὐτοῦ ἔκλιναν τὴν καρδίαν
αὐτοῦ... 5 ἐπορεύθη Σαλωμών ὕπατο τῆς Ἀστάρτης... 7 τότε ὕκοδο-
μασεν Σ. ψηλὸν... τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ); the former presents the facts¹
briefly and in a logical sequence. Here as elsewhere in this
book Cod. A represents the Hexaplaric Greek, and not the
original I.xx.²

Cc. xx., xxi. The relative order of these chapters is reversed
in M, which justifies the change by prefacing the story of
Naboth with the words ἡ εἰρήνη ἡ ἁγιάσμενη. "The dislocation
may have been due to the desire to bring the prophecy of
Ahab's death nearer to the account of its occurrence." Ob-
viously wrong as the present Hebrew order is, Cod. A has
adopted it, interpolating the inapposite ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ἑμματα
ταῦτα, which Origen had borrowed from Aquila; and even
Lucian (if he is here rightly represented by Lagarde) has been
led into the same error, though he seems to retain the true
sequence of the chapters.

PSALMS ix.—cxlvi.

Throughout the greater part of the Psalter G and M

¹ B however omits the important statement of v. 3, which comes "from
the older narrative" (Driver).

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

³ C. F. Burney, l.c.
follow different systems of numeration. This is due to certain consecutive Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter being counted as one in the Greek (ix. + x. Heb. = ix. LXX.; cxiv. + cxv. Heb. = cxiii. LXX.), and certain of the Hebrew Psalms being vice versa divided in the Greek into two (cxvi. Heb. = cxiv. + cxv. LXX.; cxlvii. Heb. = cxlv. + cxlvii. LXX.).

In the Heb. Psalms ix. and x. there are traces of an acrostic system which have been taken to indicate that the two Psalms were originally one. Many Hebrew MSS. join Psalms cxiv., cxv., as in the LXX. For the division of Psalms cxvi. and cxlvii. it is less easy to account, but it may have been due to a desire to make up the number of the Psalms to 150.

PROVERBS xxiv.—xxxvi.

In the first great section of this book (cc. i.—ix.) there is no important difference of order, nor does the second section (x.—xxii. 1) or the third (xxii. 17—xxiv. 22) offer more than an occasional variation in the grouping of proverbs, combined with omissions and additions on either side. But at c. xxiv. 23 we enter upon a series of collections which seem at one time to have formed distinct books or cycles of proverbial teaching, and here G and M differ widely, as a comparison of the contents will shew.

G
Words of Agur (xxiv. 24—37).
Sayings of the Wise (xxiv. 38—49).
Rest of the Words of Agur (xxiv. 50—68).

M
Sayings of the Wise (xxiv. 23—34).
Proverbs of Solomon (xxv. 1—xxix. 21).
Words of Agur (xxx. 1—33).

1 See Cheyne, _Book of Psalms_, p. 228; Bleek-Wellhausen, p. 471. Prof. Kirkpatrick (_Psalms_, l. p. 41) speaks with less confidence.
2 See Kennicott, ii. p. 410. It should be added that in the MSS. Pss. cxvi., cxvii., cxviii. are also often written continuously.
3 "Both in Palestine and in Alexandria great importance seems to have been attached to this number. In Palestine, however, there were some who counted only 147 Psalms" (Cheyne _op. cit._ p. xiv.). See also Lagarde, _nov. Ps. gr. spec._, p. 8.
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G

Words of Lemuel (xxiv. 69—77).
Proverbs of Solomon (xxv. 1—xxix. 27).
Praise of the Virtuous Woman (xxix. 28—49).

M

Words of Lemuel (xxxi. 1—9).
Praise of the Virtuous Woman (xxxi. 10—31).

Evidently the order of this portion of the book had not been finally settled when the Alexandrian translator did his work. Moreover he has failed to understand the headings of the two sections attributed to Agur and Lemuel, and has broken up Agur's collection, the unity of which he seems not to have recognised, placing the Sayings of the Wise between the fragments; unless, indeed, he found them divided in his Hebrew archetype.

Jeremiah xxv.—li. A glance at the table which stands near the beginning of this chapter will shew that the section c. xxv. 15—xliv. 5 (M) answers in a general way to c. xxxii. 1—li. 35 (G), whilst c. xlv. 1—li. 64 (M) is represented, though not without considerable interruptions of the present Hebrew order, by c. xxv. 14—xxxi. 44 (G). Speaking roughly these two sections have exchanged places in the Greek text.

In G the prophecies against the nations precede the parable of the intoxicating cup (xxv. 15 ff. = xxxii. 1 ff.); in M they form the final section of the book, coming immediately before the historical appendix (c. lii.). If these prophecies were circulated in a separate form, the words of c. xxv. 13 might naturally have led an Alexandrian collector to place them where they stand in the LXX., whereas in Palestine they were treated as a postscript to the earlier collections and placed

3 Cf. Origen ad Afric. 4 πολλά δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰερεμίᾳ κατενώθησα-μεν, ἐν θ' ἐκ πολλὴς μετάθεσιν καὶ ἐναλλαγὴν τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευομέ-λουν εὑρομεν.
after xlv. 5. The two texts differ however not only in regard to the place which they assign to the section as a whole, but in the relative order of the prophecies. The order of the nations denounced is in G Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, Moab; but in L, Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon. The prophecies had apparently been grouped in the Alexandrian collection after one manner, and after another in the collection which was current in Palestine.

Ezekiel vii. 3—9. Here the divergence of the LXX. from the Hebrew text was noticed by Jerome, who writes: “in hoc capitulo iuxta LXX. interpretes ordo mutatus est et confusus, ita ut prima novissima sint et novissima vel prima vel media, ipsaque media nunc ad extrema nunc ad principia transferantur.” The transposition, to whichever side it is to be ascribed, may be explained by the genius of the passage which is in “a lyric strain such as is unwonted in Ezekiel.” A full examination of the context may be seen in Cornill, who justly describes it as “eine stark verderbte Stelle,” and finds a solution in the hypothesis of a doublet (cf. vv. 3—4, 7—8).

(B) Differences of Subject-Matter.

1. A further comparison of the LXX. with the Massoretic Hebrew reveals the presence in each text of a considerable number of passages which are not to be found in the other. This fact was known to Origen, and frankly recognised by him (ep. ad African. § 3 καὶ ἐὰν ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς ἁγίοις βιβλίοις εὑρομεν πη μὲν πλείονα παρ’ ἡμῖν κείμενα ἡ παρ’ Ἰσραήλ, τη δὲ λειψοντα); and the Hexapla, as we have seen, was the result of a mistaken endeavour to assimilate the LXX. to the current

1 Driver, Intr. p. 263.
2 Ezekiel, p. 212.
3 Pt. I. c. iii.
Books of the Hebrew Canon.

Hebrew text. Its remains are still invaluable as bearing witness to the condition of both texts in the second and third centuries after Christ. The student who would grasp the nature and extent of the problem must examine them in Field's great edition; in this place we will content ourselves with some notice of additions and omissions which extend to entire verses or paragraphs.

Pentateuch. As a whole, the Law has escaped material changes in either direction. But there are a few important exceptions. In Gen. iv. 8 the LXX. supplies the words of Cain (διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον), which are wanting in the Hebrew Bible. The supplementary chapters of Exodus are on the whole shorter in $G$ than in $M$; the former has nothing to answer to c. xxxv. 8, xxxvii. 25—28, xl. 6—8, 11, and exhibits c. xxxvi. 8—34 in an abridged form. In the Song of Moses the last four distichs are expanded in $G$ into eight, thus:

\[
[εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοὶ, ἀμα αὐτῶ,
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ νῷ θεοῦ.]
εὐφράνθητε, ἐθνῶ, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ,
[καὶ ἐναχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.]
ἐπὶ τὸ αἷμα τῶν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικάται,
[καὶ ἐκδικήσει] καὶ ἀναποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς,
[καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀναποδώσει],
καὶ ἐκκαθαριεί [Κύριος] τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ.
\]

There is nothing in $M$ which corresponds with the bracketed words of the version. Yet they are present in all uncial MSS. of the LXX., and were probably in the earlier copies of Deuteronomy which passed into the possession of the Christian Church. Possibly the Song was circulated in a separate form in more than one translation. The present Greek text seems to be the result of conflation, lines 1 and 3, 2 and 4, 6 and 7, being doublets; line 2 = 4 appears to be an adaptation of Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 7.
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JOSHUA. Besides innumerable smaller variations in this book which shew that it was not regarded by the translators as sharing the peculiar sanctity of the Torah\(^1\), there are in the last four chapters several important contexts in which \(\mathfrak{G}\) and \(\mathfrak{M}\) differ by defect or excess\(^2\).

C. xix. 47—48 (\(\mathfrak{M}\)). The order of these verses is reversed in \(\mathfrak{G}\), so as to bring the words \(\alpha\nu\tau\eta\ \eta\ \kappa\lambda\nu\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\ \kappa\tau\lambda\) into juxtaposition with the list of the Danite towns (vv. 41—46); and to each of the verses which have thus exchanged places the \(\text{LXX.}\) attaches a rider, based apparently upon Judges ii. 34 f., and describing the relations between the new settlers and the Amorites.

C. xx. 4—6. Omitted in \(\mathfrak{G}\). "It is probable that the ch. in its original form (P) has been enlarged by additions from the law of homicide in Dt. (c. 19) at a comparatively late date, so that they were still wanting in the MSS. used by the \(\text{LXX.}\) translators\(^3\)."

C. xxi. 36—37, 42 a—d. The printed Hebrew Bibles omit vv. 36—37, which contain the names of the Levitical cities in the territory of Reuben, and they seem to have been obelised in the Greek by Origen. They are found, however, in the majority of Hebrew MSS.\(^4\), and are necessary to the completeness of the narrative. Vv. 42 a—c are little more than a doublet of c. xix. 50, 51 b; 42 d appears to be based upon c. v. 3.

C. xxiv. 30 a—33 b. V. 30 a continues the story of the flint knives (v. 7, xxi. 42 d). \(\mathfrak{G}\), which omits v. 31, a doublet of Judges ii. 7, adds to the book a postscript, v. 33 a—b, based on v. 33, 1 Sam. iv. 3 ff., Judges ii. 6, 11 ff., iii. 14\(^5\).

\(^1\) See G. A. Smith in Hastings' \textit{D. B.} ii. p. 784.
\(^3\) Driver, \textit{Intr.} p. 105.
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I SAMUEL (I REGN.).

C. ii. 9, 10. The closing stanza of this hymn, like that of the Song of Moses, is presented by G in a modified and expanded form. Vv. 8c, 9a are omitted in G, which substitutes διδως ευχην...δικαιου ("apparently an attempt to accommodate the Song more closely to Hannah's position"), and inserts in the heart of v. 10 a passage from Jerem. ix. 23, 24, taken from the Greek version, but with variations which form an instructive study:

I Regn. ii.  

Jer. ix.

ο φρονιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει...ο δυνατός ἐν τῇ δυνάμει...τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαίωσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.

ο σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ...ο ἱερουργὸς ἐν τῇ ἱεροχυριστῇ...ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

It has been noticed that I Regn. ii. 11a (καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου) probably corresponds to I Sam. i. 28b (καὶ ἄνήρ ἔφθασεν Κυρίῳ). If so, the Song has been inserted in G and M at different points in the narrative; and it seems to be a reasonable inference that it was not in the original draft of the book. Such a hypothesis will account for the freedom with which it has been treated in G.

Cc. xvii—xviii. This is the most important of the contexts in which Ḡ differs from Ḡא M in the way of defect. The omitted verses contain the story of David’s visit to the camp of Israel (xvii. 12—31); David’s interview with Saul and Jonathan (xvii. 55—xviii. 5); Saul’s attempts upon David’s life (xviii. 10—11, 17—19); besides occasional details of less importance (xvii. 41, 50; xviii. 30).

These omissions have been variously explained. According to Wellhausen and Kuenen, the Greek translator, or the scribe of the archetype followed by Cod. B, has deliberately

1 Driver, Samuel, p. 20.
3 Driver, Intr., p. 170; Samuel, p. 116 f.
removed the missing verses, from a desire to harmonise. Certainly the result of their absence is to reduce, if not altogether to remove, the conflict between c. xvi. 14 ff., which represents David as an experienced warrior with whose reputation Saul is already acquainted, and cc. xvii., xviii., where on a later occasion he appears as a shepherd lad of whom the king has as yet heard nothing. But, as Robertson Smith has pointed out, it is difficult to believe that simple omissions made without changing a word of what was left could produce a complete and consecutive narrative such as we find in G. He concludes that the verses omitted by G are "interpolations in the Hebrew text, extracts from a lost biography of David...not found in the text which lay before the LXX. translators." Driver doubts whether the verses can have been interpolated in a strict sense, "for an interpolation would not insert anything at variance with the narrative interpolated." "We seem therefore (he adds) shut up to the conclusion that the verses omitted in the Vat. MS. belong to an independent narrative, which was in parts incorporated with the older account, but not in all MSS. existing when the LXX. translated the book."

The omissions are supplied in G, Luc, but probably from a non-Septuagintal source; the passages are marked with an asterisk in the Hexaplaric MSS. 64, 92.

C. xxiii. 11—12. Here Gb omits by homoeoteleuton the Heb. from יִתְנָה (v. 11) to יִרְיָה (v. 12). But it also omits יִלְכְּבִים יֵבִית (v. 11), and Wellhausen conjectures with probability that εἰ ἀποκλεισθῆσεται was wanting in the original form of the LXX.

1 Kings (3 Regn.).

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

2 1 Samuel, p. 117.
3 Cf. Field ad loc.
4 See H. P. Smith, Samuel, p. 212.
C. ii. 35 a—n, 46 a—I, are summaries of Solomon’s personal history, which have been attached, probably by the accidents of transcription, to the verses which they severally follow. On examination each of these passages proves to be made up partly of translations from verses which are not represented in the true LXX., partly of fragments of the LXX. which occur elsewhere in their true order, partly of brief descriptions gathered from other parts of the book.

Thus ii. 35 a—b=iv. 25—26, c=iv. 31, d=v. 15, e=vii. 10 ff., f—g=ix. 24—25 (א), h=v. 16, i—k=x. 23 ff., l—o=ii. 8—9. Similarly, ii. 46 a=iv. 20 (א), b=v. 2 (א), c=iii. 1 (א), d=ix. 18 (א), e=iv. 22—23, f=iv. 24, g=v. 5 (א), h=2ff., i—k=x. 29—30.

C. viii. 53a is an addition of quite another character and of the highest interest. The true LXX. (א) omits viii. 12, 13, which in cod. 份额 are thus supplied from Aquila¹: τότε εἶπεν Σαλωμῶν Κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ σκηνώσαι ἐν γνώφι. οἰκοδόμησα οἶκον κατοικητήριον σοι, ἔδρασα τῆς καθέδρας σου αἰῶνος. But after v. 53 א gives the substance of these words in a poetical form which is expressly attributed to an older source:

τότε ἐλάλησεν Σ. ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαι αὐτῶν Ἡλιον ἐγνώρισεν (Luc., ἐστησεν) ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος: εἶπεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐκ γνώφου (Ἄ, ἐν γνώφῳ): οἰκοδόμησον οἶκον μου, οἶκον ἐκπρεπή (Ἀ, εὐπρεπή) σαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος. οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς φύσεως;

Though this occurs in cod. 份额 and Lucian, it was wanting in the Hebrew text which was before the translators of the second century A.D., for in the Hexapla it appeared only in the LXX. column². But (as its very errors shew) it is a translation of a Hebrew original, and the βιβλίον τῆς φύσεως from which it came is doubtless none other than the Book of Jashar (ἡμερίαν, ἔχειν τῇ βιβλίῳ τῆς φύσεως). Here א has preserved

¹ Cf. Field ad loc.
² See Field ad loc., who quotes from cod. 243, ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἐξαπλῷ παρὰ μόνῳ φησται τοῖς οὐ.
³ Cf. Driver, Intr., p. 182.
for us a precious relic, which in irebase has been first misplaced and then partly lost.  

C. xii. 24 a—z. The longest interpolation in the book, partly similar to the Greek additions in c. ii., but presenting greater difficulties. After rehearsing the facts connected with the death of Solomon, and summarising the reign of Rehoboam, the interpolator tells the story of the rise of Jeroboam and the revolt of Israel, going over the ground already covered in cc. xi—xii., and anticipating c. xiv. (ב).  

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

But the passage is no mere cento of verses to be found elsewhere either in irebase or irebase; it is a second and distinct recension of the story, resting equally with the first upon a Hebrew original. So different and indeed in some respects contradictory are the accounts that they “cannot possibly have stood from the first in the same volume.” The same action is ascribed in the one “to Shemaiah, at Shechem, in the days of Rehoboam”; and in the other “to Ahijah, at Jerusalem, in the days of Solomon.” In fact, the present Greek version of 1 Kings has preserved two ancient accounts of the dismemberment of the Kingdom of David and Solomon, and though one of these survives also in irebase there is no a priori ground for deciding which of the two is the more trustworthy. It is worthy of notice that cod. B omits the reference to Jeroboam’s residence in Egypt in xii. 2, and the visit of Jeroboam’s wife to Ahijah as it is told in c. xiv. 1—20; though it gives the two irreconcilable accounts of the meeting of Jeroboam with the prophet (xi. 29 ff., xii. 24 o). The whole of the narrative, so far as it exists only in the Greek, is omitted by A and  

1 See the passage discussed in Robertson Smith, O. T. in J. Ch., p. 433.  
2 Robertson Smith, op. cit., p. 118.
the Syro-hexaplar, but it seems to have been retained by Lucian\(^1\).

C. xvi. 28 a–h consists of another recension of the summary of Jehoshaphat's reign which occurs in c. xxii. 41–44, 47–50, where the last four verses are omitted altogether in \(\mathbf{G}\). Lucian, who agrees with \(\mathbf{G}\) in the interpolation at xvi. 28, omits xxii. 40 b–52.

2 Kings (4 Regn.).

C. i. 18 a–d. An addition similar in character to that which follows 3 Regn. xvi. 28. The summary of Joram's reign has attached itself to the beginning as well as to the end of the story of Elijah's ascension, whilst in \(\mathbf{M}\) it finds a place only at the end (iii. 1–3). In this instance, however, \(\mathbf{G}\), Luc. agrees with \(\mathbf{G}\) in repeating the summary, though with some variations. The student will find a comparison instructive.

1 Chronicles i. 10–16, 17 b–23 are wanting in \(\mathbf{G}\), which thus shortens the genealogy by omitting (1) the posterity of Ham, except the Cushites, (2) the longer of two lists of the posterity of Shem. Both passages are supplied (from Gen. x. 13–18, 22–29) by cod. A, in a version which came from Hexaplaric sources (see Field, i. p. 704).

2 Chronicles xxxv. 19 a–d, xxxvi. 2 a–c, 5 a–d, are versions of 2 Kings xxiii. 24–27, 31 b–33, xxiv. 1–4, based apparently upon a recension of the Hebrew which differs from \(\mathbf{M}\), and only in part assimilated to \(\mathbf{G}\).

2 Esdras xxi, xxii. (Neh. xi, xii.). The lists of princes and Levites are much shortened in \(\mathbf{G}\), which omits altogether xxi. 16, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32–35; xxii. 4–6, 9, 15–21, 38, 40, 41.

\(^1\) Lagarde, V. T. Gr. i. ad loc. For a careful treatment of the differences between \(\mathbf{G}\) and \(\mathbf{M}\) in 3 Regn. see Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, ii.
Psalms.

In G many of the Psalms receive titles, or additions to their titles, which are wanting in M. The following is a list of those which occur in the uncial MSS.

x. (xi.) + ψαλμός. So xiii. (xiv.), xxiv. (xxv.), xlii. (xliii.), lxx. (lxxxi.).
xxiii. (xxiv.) + τὴς μᾶς σαββάτου.
xxvi. (xxvii.) + πρὸ τοῦ χροσθήματι.
xxviii. (xxix.) + ἔξοδοι σκηνῆς.
xxix. (xxx.) πρ. εἰς τὸ τέλος.
xxx. (xxxi.) + ἐκστάσεως.
xxxii. (xxxiii.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
xxxvii. (xxxviii.) + περὶ σαββάτου.
xl. (xliii.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δανείδ (cod. A.).
xl. (xliii.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δανείδ.
xlii. (xliii.). Δευτέρα σαββάτου.
lxv. (lxvi.) + ἀναστάσεως.
lxvi. (lxvii.) + τῷ Δανείδ (om. φόρτες).
lxix. (lx.). + εἰς τὸ Σώσας με Κύριον.
lxx. (lxii.). Τῷ Δανείδ, νών ἱωναδᾶβ καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἷκμα-
λωσθέντων.
lxxv. (lxvi.). + πρὸς τὸν 'Ασσύριον.
lxxvi. (lxvii.). + ὕπερ τοῦ 'Ασσύριον.
xc. (xci.). Ἀνὸς φόδης τῷ Δανείδ.
xcii. (xciii.). Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτι κατὰ 
κρινεται ἡ γῆ· αἷνος φόδης τῷ Δανείδ.
xciii. (xciv.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δανείδ, τετράδι σαββάτου.
xciv. (xcv.). Αἷνος φόδης τῷ Δανείδ.
xcv. (xcvi.). Ὅτι ὁ οἴκος οἰκοδομείται μετὰ τὴν αἷκμα-
λωσίαν· φόθη τῷ Δανείδ.
xcvi. (xcvii.). Τῷ Δανείδ, ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται.
xcvii. (xcviii.) + τῷ Δανείδ.
xcviii. (xcix.). Ψαλμός τῷ Δανείδ.
cx. (civ.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
civ. (cv.). 'Αλληλουία: so cv., cxi. (cxi., cxxi.), cxii. (cxiv.,
cxv.), cxiv. (cxvi.), cxv. (cxvi.) 1—9, cxvi. (cxvii.), cxvii. (cxviii.), cxxxv. (cxxxvi.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the
equivalent of a final παλιν in the M.T. of the preceding Psalm].
(cxxxvi.), [but in each of these cases the Greek title is the
equivalent of an opening παλιν in the M.T. of the Psalm].
cxv. (cxvi. 10—19). 'Αλληλουία. So cxvii. (cxix.).
cxxxvi. (cxxxvii.). Τῷ Δανείδ.
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cxxxvii. (cxxxviii.) + Ζαχαρίου A (-πιας τ).  

cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) + Ζαχαρίου (cod. A.) + εν τῇ διασπορά (A ע ת).  

cxlii. (cxliii.) + δι του αυτον δ υιος καταδιώκει (καταδιώκειν A).  

cxliii. (cxliv.) + πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ.  

cxliv. (cxlvi.) 'Αλληλουά' Αγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου (Heb. פֶּאֶן יִשׂ).  

cxlvi. (cxlvi. 1—11). 'Αλληλουά' Αγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου (where 'Αλλ. answers to the first word of the Psalm in מ as in cx. (cxii.)).  

cxlvii. (cxlvi. 10—20). As cxlvi., except that 'Αλλ. is not in מ.  

cxlviii. As cxlvi. but 'Αλλ. is here represented in מ both at the end of the preceding Psalm and at the beginning of Ps. cxlviii.  

cxlx. 'Αλληλουά. In מ at the end of cxlviii. and the beginning of cxlix.  

cl. 'Αλληλουά. As in cxlx.  

On the questions raised by the Greek titles see Neubauer in Studia Bibl. ii. p. 1 ff, Driver, Intr. p. 348 ff., the commentaries, e.g. those of Perowne, Kirkpatrick, and Cheyne, and the last-named author's Origin of the Psalter. Valuable traditions are probably embodied in the liturgical notes which assign certain Psalms to particular days of the week (τῇ μά ςαββάτου, δευτέρα σ., τετάρτα σ., εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πρωσαββάτου (cf. Mc. xv. 42)), and in those which attribute others to the time of the Return (Ζαχαρίου, 'Αγγαίου) or to the Dispersion (ἐν τῇ διασπορά). On the other hand some of the Greek titles appear to be fanciful (πρὸ τοῦ χριστήρα, πρὸς τὸν Γολιάδ), whilst others are obscure (ἐκστάσεως, ἀναστάσεως).  

For the Christian (mystical) interpretation of the Greek titles see Athan. de titulis Psalmorum (Migne, P. G. xxvii. 591 sqq.), the variorum prolegomena in Pitra's Analecta sacra ii. p. 411 sqq., and Corderii exp. patr. Gr. in Psalmos, passim.  

Ps. xiii. (xiv.) 3 a—c. This, the only long interpolation in the Greek Psalter, is found upon examination to be made up of Pss. v. 10 b, cxxxix. (cxl.) 4 b, ix. (x.) 17 a, Isa. lix. 7, 8, Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 1 a, all taken or abridged from the 1xx. version with slight variations. That it never formed a part of the

1 Cf. πεμπτη σαββάτου prefixed to Ps. lxxxi. in the cursive MS. 156 (Urtext, p. 75).
Hebrew Psalm may be safely affirmed, yet it is quoted continuously in Rom. iii. 13—18, where it follows without break upon an abridgement of Ps. xiii. (xiv.) 1—3.

The Greek addition had a place in the κοινή before the time of Origen, who marked it with an obelus (Field, *ad loc.*). Whether it was brought into the text of the LXX. from the Epistle, or was already in the Greek Psalm as known to St Paul, cannot perhaps now be ascertained. But it doubtless had its origin in the Rabbinical practice of stringing together passages excerpted from various books of the Old Testament (Sanday and Headlam on Romans, *l.c.*), and it may have existed under this form in a collection of testimonia used by the Apostle (on such collections see Hatch, *Essays*, p. 203, Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 476 ff.).

Ps. cli. (ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος). The MSS. of the LXX. contain after Ps. cl. a Psalm which bears the title ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος ἐις Δανείδ καὶ ἐξωθεὶν τοῦ ἄριθμοῦ, ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιάδ, O. L., *hic psalmus sibi proprie scriptus est David, extra numerum, cum pugnavit cum Golia[th]*. The letter of Athanasius to Marcellinus, which is incorporated in cod. A, speaks freely of this Psalm as the work of David, and as Ps. cli. (§ 14 οἱ μὲν κανονίσεως τῆς ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀπαγγέλλοντες λόγους εἰς ἐκαί καὶ καὶ, λή...ρα: § 25 τῷ ἐκλεξαμένῳ κυρίῳ δεδομένῳ δόξαν ψάλλει καὶ σὺ τῶν ρνα' ἰδιον ἄντα τοῦ Δανείδ); and it is quoted as a Psalm of David by the author of the pseudonymous letter of Mary to Ignatius (cent. iv.; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, iii. 144, φησίν γάρ ποιν αὐτὸς ὅτι Μικρὸς ἡμῖν, κτλ.). Moreover the scribe of Cod. A regarded it as a part of the Psalter, for his subscription runs ψαλμοὶ ΔΑΔ ὅ. In cod. A, however, it is carefully excluded from the Psalter proper (subscr. ψαλμοὶ ρνα καὶ ἰδιόγραφος ἄ); and the judgement of the Laodicene canon (βιβλιον ψαλμῶν ἐκατὸν πεντηκοντα) is upheld by the title which in all the MSS.
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pronounces this ‘autograph’ (ἰδιώγραφος) work of David to be ἐξωθεν or ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, i.e. τῶν πν ἑαυτοῦ.

This Psalm is clearly based on 1 Kings xvi. 7, 11, 26, 43, 51; 2 Kings vi. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 26; Ps. lxxviii. 70, lxxxix. 20. Its resemblance to the LXX. of those passages is not so close as to suggest a Greek original, but on the other hand there is no evidence that it ever existed in Hebrew. Whether it had a Hebrew or a Greek original, it was probably added to the Greek Psalter after the translation of the fifth book was complete.

For the literature of Ps. cli. see Fabricius-Harles, iii. p. 749, and Fabricius, Cod. pseudepigr. v. 7, p. 905 ff.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CANTICLES.

In certain uncial MSS. and a large proportion of the cursives the Psalms are followed by a collection of liturgical φθάι (cantica). The following table shews the sources and order of those which are given by codd. A, R, T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Deut. xxxii. 1—43.</td>
<td>Deut. xxxiii. 1—44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1 Regn. ii. 1—10.</td>
<td>1 Regn. ii. 1—10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ion. ii. 3—10.</td>
<td>Ion. ii. 3—10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The προσευχὴ Μανασσῆ (so Cod. A; Cod. T. πρ. Μανασσῆ οἰοῦ Ἐξεκλ.) is usually regarded as an attempt by a Hellenistic Jew to re-construct the prayer mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18; see, however Ball.
The nine Odes now sung at Lauds in the Orthodox Church are (following the order of cod. A) nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11 + 13; the Roman Church uses at Lauds on successive days of the week 10, Isa. xii., Isa. xxxviii. 10—20, 3, 1, 6, 2, whilst 13, 11, 12 are recited daily at Lauds, Vespers, and Compline respectively. The Mozarabic Breviary, as printed, provides no fewer than 76 scriptural canticles. Little has been done as yet to examine either the Greek or the Latin Psalters with the view of determining the local distribution of these canticles; but the student may refer to art. Canticles in DCA., and also to Martene, de ant. rit. eccl., p. 25, Neale, Hist. of the H. Eastern Church, ii. p. 834 f., Freeman, Principles of Divine Service, i. p. 124 f.; on the Canticles of the Latin Church he may consult with advantage Thomasius, opp. ii. pp. xv. sqq., 295 sqq.

The text of the O. T. canticles in the Psalter of cod. A differs in places from that which is given by the same MS. where the canticles appear with their context in the books to which they severally belong. Thus we find the following variants: Exod. xv. 14 ἐνεῶν γε-νεῖας, cant. ηθνικήν γε-νεῖας, cant. γε-νεῖας γε-νεῶν: 18 γε-νεῖανα, cant. γε-νεῖανα: 1 Regn. ii. 10 θλονησε, cant. σοφία: 10 ακρα γῆς, cant. +δίκαιος ὄν. But the deviations are not numerous, and the text of the canticles appears on the whole to belong to the same family as that of the body of the MS.

The division of the Psalter into books1 seems to have been already made when it was translated into Greek, for though the Greek codices have nothing to answer to the headings מִשְׁפָּר דֱָאֶשָּׁנָה, etc., which appear in the printed Hebrew Bible, the Doxologies at the end of the first four books appear in the

in Speaker's Comm. (Apocr. ii. 362 ff.). The Greek text appears in Const. Apost. ii. 22 and in the Didascalia, where it follows a reference to Chron. l. c.; in MSS. of the LXX. it finds a place only among the canticles. See Fabricius-Harles, iii. 732, Westcott in Smith's D. B. ii. 226, Schürer2, iii. 337 f.: and for the text with an apparatus, Fritzsche, V. T. Gr. libr. Apocr., pp. xiv. sq., 92 sq. A detailed account of the editions, MSS., and versions and a discussion of the origin of the Prayer will be found in Dr Nestle's Septuagintastudien iii. (Stuttgart, 1899), p. 6 ff.; see also Ryssel in Kautzsch's Apokryphen u. Pseudopigraphen.

1 A pre-Christian arrangement, as Hippolytus already knew (hypothe. in Psalmos, τὸ παλατήριον εἰς πέντε διελθαὶ βιβλία οἱ Ἑβραῖοι). Cf. Robertson Smith, O. T. in Jewish Ch., p. 194 n. In the lists of the Canon "the mention of five Books of Psalms is peculiar to Codex Amiatinum" (Sanday, in Studia Biblica iii. p. 242 ff.).
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Greek as well as in the M. T. (Ps. xl. (xli.) 14, lxxi. (lxxii.) 18—20, lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 5, cv. (cvi.) 48).

Proverbs. The variations of Ζ and Μ in this book are treated by Lagarde in his early book Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverben. There is a considerable number of Greek verses for which Μ offers no Hebrew equivalent, and there are some Hebrew verses or half-verses for which there is no Greek. Of the Greek verses not in Μ some (e.g. iv. 27 a—b, vi. 8 a—c) appear to be of Greek, perhaps early Christian, origin; others have been collected from various contexts (e.g. iii. 16 = Isa. xlv. 23 a + Prov. xxi. 26; xxvi. 11 = Sir. iv. 21), or are fragments of the book which have been accidentally inserted twice (iii. 22 a = iii. 8, 28 c = xxvii. 1); others, again, seem to have arisen from the fusion of two renderings (xv. 18 a, xvi. 17); but there remain not a few which probably represent genuine portions of the original collections, though wanting in the present Hebrew text, e.g. vii. 1 a, viii. 21 a. ix. 12 a—c, 18 a—c, xii. 11 a, 13 a, xvii. 6 a, xviii. 22 a, xxii. 8 a (cited in 2 Cor. ix. 7), xxiv. 22 a—e, xxvii. 20 a, 21 a.

Job. The Lxx. text of Job current in Origen's time is known to have been very much shorter than the Greek text preserved in extant MSS. and the M.T.

Ad African. 4 πλειστά τε ὅσα διὰ μέσου δόλου τοῦ Ἰωάν παρ' Ἐβραίοις μὲν κείται παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ υἱῷ, καὶ πολλάκις μὲν ἐπὶ τέσσαρα ἡ τρία· ἐσοθ ὅτε δὲ καὶ δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δεκαεννέα καὶ δεκαέξ (for. 1. ἐννέα καὶ ἕξ). Cf. Hieron. præf. in Hiob: "cui [sc. libro lob], si ea quae sub asteriscis addita sunt subtraxeris, pars maxima voluminis detruncabitur, et hoc duntaxat apud Graecos. ceterum apud Latinos...septingenti ferme aut octingenti versus desunt."

The asterisks are preserved in certain cursive MSS. of the

1 For this correction see a note by Dr Nestle in Exp. Times, Aug. 1899 (p. 523).
Greek Job¹ and in MSS. of Jerome’s version, while the shorter form is represented by the earliest form of the O.L. and in the Sahidic version. Most of the extant Greek MSS., including the best uncials, offer a text in which the lacunae are supplied (chiefly from Theodotion), but which still falls short of the fulness of the Hexaplaric LXX. and of \( \text{M}^2 \).

Dr Hatch³ in his Essay *On Origen’s revision of the LXX.* text of Job advocates the theory that the LXX. represents a shorter Hebrew text which was afterwards expanded into the longer form. The same view was maintained in the earlier treatise of Bickell *de indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinae in interpretaando libro Iobi* (Marburg, 1862). Recent critics incline to an opposite view. The evident desire of the translator to follow classical models suggests that he was an Alexandrian Hellenist⁴ who intended his version for general reading, rather than for use in the synagogue⁵. Under such circumstances he may have been tempted to reduce the length of his original, especially in passages where it did not lend itself readily to his treatment. On the other hand he has not scrupled here and there to add to the original. Thus in c. ii. 9 he seeks to heighten the effect and at the same time to soften the harshness of the words uttered by Job’s wife (\( \chiρόνον \ldots \piολλοῦ \piροβεβηκότος \ldots λέγων \'Ιδοὺ \δαμένω κτλ. \)).

The two notes at the end of the Greek Job (xlii. 17a, b—e) scarcely profess to belong to the book. The first (\( \gammaεραππαί δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεθαι μεθ’ ὅν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν \)) may be either a Pharisaic or a Christian gloss, intended to balance the \( \text{ἐτελεύτησεν} \; \text{Ἰωβ} \) of the previous hemistich, and arising out of

³ *Essays,* p. 214 ff.
⁴ On the translator’s date cf. Schürer⁵, iii. pp. 311, 356 f.
⁵ Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.,* p. 219: “It was made after Judaism had come into contact with Greek philosophy. It may be presumed to have been intended not only for Greek-speaking Jews, but also for aliens.” The version shews some knowledge of Homer and Aeschylus (cf. Smith, *D. B.*⁶, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 1725).
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xix. 26 ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσαι (υ. 1, ἀναστήσει) τὸ δέρμα μου, to which passage γέγραπται seems to refer. The second note, which professes to come from an Aramaic source (οὗτος ἔρμηνευται έκ τῆς Συριακῆς βιβλίου), confuses Job (63,28) with the Edomite king Jobab (63,2) (Gen. xxxvi. 33 f. = 1 Chron. i. 44 f.), and bases on this identification a pedigree of the patriarch, according to which he was ‘fifth from Abraham,’ and a descendant of Esau. Similar statements occur in a fragment of the Hellenistic writer Aristeas quoted by Polyhistor, and from Polyhistor by Eusebius (praep. ev. ix. 25). From a comparison of this extract with the note attached to Job, Freudenthal was led to ascribe the note to Aristeas. Beyond the geographical description of Uz (ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Αραβίας), and the statements that Job’s wife was an Arab woman and that her son’s name was Ennon or Enon (υ. 1), the note contains nothing new: 17c—d rests upon Gen. xxxvi. 32—35 (LXX.), and 17e on Job ii. 11 (LXX.).

ESTHER. In the Greek Esther we reach the maximum of interpolation. Of 270 verses, 107 are wanting in the present Hebrew text, and probably at no time formed a part of the Hebrew book. The Greek additions are distributed through the book in contexts as long as average chapters. In the Latin Bible they are collected at the end of the canonical book, where they fill several consecutive chapters (x. 4—xi. 5 = F, xi. 2—xii. 6 = A, xiii. 1—7 = B, xiii. 8—xiv. 19 = C, xv. 4—19 = D, xvi. 1—24 = E). This arrangement is due to Jerome, who relegated the Greek interpolations to the end of the canonical book; but it has had the effect of making them unintelligible. In their Greek sequence they form part of a consecutive history; A, which precedes c. i., introduces the story by describing the events which led to the first advancement of Mordecai at the court of Artaxerxes; B and E, which

1 “Εκ τῆς Σ. β. weist doch auf einen Midrasch oder ein Targum hin” (Dillmann, H. s. p. 361).
2 Schürer, iii. p. 311.
3 Cf. Origen, ad Afric. 3 ἐκ τῆς Ἑσσῆ ὄστε ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοκαίου εὐχή οὔτε ἡ τῆς Ἑσσῆ...παρ Εβραίοις φέρονται: ἀλλ’ οὔτε αἱ ἐπιστολαί· ἀλλ’ οὔτε ἡ τῷ Ἀμμαχ ἐπὶ καθαρεύει τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἑθνοὺς γεγραμμένη, οὔτε ἡ τοῦ Μαρδοκαίου.
4 In the Cambridge LXX. they are distinguished by the Roman capitals A—F, a notation suggested by Dr Hort.

S. S.
follow iii. 13 and viii. 12, profess to give copies of the letters of Artaxerxes referred to in those verses; c and d, which come between c. iv. and c. v., contain the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and a description of Esther's approach to the King; f is an epilogue, which completes the story by relating the institution of the feast of Purim. Such Haggadic accretions will not create surprise if it be remembered that Esther was among the latest of the Kethubim, and that its canonicity was matter of dispute in Jewish circles even in the last years of the first century A.D.¹

A note attached to the last of the Greek additions professes to relate the circumstances under which the book was brought to Egypt: "in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said that he was a priest and Levite, and his son Ptolemy, brought the above Letter of Purim², as they called it, which had been translated (so they said) by one Lysimachus, son of Ptolemy, a resident at Jerusalem." As Fritzsche remarks³, no fewer than four Ptolemies married a Cleopatra (Epiphanes, Philometor, Physcon, and Lathyrus), so that the date intended by the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra is by no means certain, though it is perhaps most naturally interpreted as = B.C. 179–8, the fourth year of Philometor⁴. But the historical value of the note is more than doubtful⁵.

The Greek text of Esther exists in two recensions (1) that of ΝΑΒΝ 55, 93 δ, 108 α, 249 αλ., (2) that of 19, 93 α, 108 β; both are exhibited by Ussher (Syntagma), Fritzsche (Ἑβρ, 1848; libri apocryphi, 1871), and Lagarde (libr. canon. V. T. i., 1883). The

¹ See Ryle, Canon, p. 139 f., 203 ff.; and cf. supra, p. 228 f.
² Φουραι (Φουραία Ν.*, Φουρμι Ν.*, cf. c. ix. 26, and Jos. ant. vi. 13 οἱ Ιουδαίοι τάς προσερμήνας ἡμέρας ἐσφάγαζον προσαγορεύοντες αὐτὰς Φουραίας (v. l. Φουραίας, Lat. conservatores). The 'Letter of Purim' seems to be the book of Esther as a whole; cf. c. ix. 20.
³ Handbuch zu d. Apocrypha, i. p. 73.
⁴ Ryssel (in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 212) inclines to B.C. 114, the fourth year of Soter ii (Lathyrus).
⁵ See above, p. 25.
follow iii. 13 and viii. 12, profess to give copies of the letters of Artaxerxes referred to in those verses; c and d, which come between c. iv. and c. v., contain the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and a description of Esther's approach to the King; f is an epilogue, which completes the story by relating the institution of the feast of Purim. Such Haggadic accretions will not create surprise if it be remembered that Esther was among the latest of the Kethubim, and that its canonicity was matter of dispute in Jewish circles even in the last years of the first century A.D.¹

A note attached to the last of the Greek additions professes to relate the circumstances under which the book was brought to Egypt: "in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus; who said that he was a priest and Levite, and his son Ptolemy, brought the above Letter of Purim², as they called it, which had been translated (so they said) by one Lysimachus, son of Ptolemy, a resident at Jerusalem." As Fritzsche remarks³, no fewer than four Ptolemies married a Cleopatra (Epiphanes, Philometor, Physcon, and Lathyrus), so that the date intended by the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra is by no means certain, though it is perhaps most naturally interpreted as = B.C. 179–8, the fourth year of Philometor⁴. But the historical value of the note is more than doubtful⁵.

The Greek text of Esther exists in two recensions (¹) that of ΝΑΒΝ 55, 93 b, 108 a, 249 al., (2) that of 19, 93 a, 108 b; both are exhibited by Ussher (Syntagma), Fritzsche (Ἑβρ., 1848; libri apocryphi, 1871), and Lagarde (libr. canon. V. T. i., 1883). The

¹ See Ryle, Canon, p. 139 f., 203 ff.; and cf. supra, p. 228 f.
² Φωτοπ (Φωτοπαία ἴς, Φωτοπαίμ ἱς), cf. c. ix. 26, and Jos. ant. vi. 13 ὁ Ιουδαίοι τὰς προερημένας ἡμέρας ἑορτάζουσιν προσαγορεύοντες αὐτὰς Φωτοπαίς (v. l. Φωτοπαίας, Lat. conservatores). The ‘Letter of Purim’ seems to be the book of Esther as a whole; cf. c. ix. 20.
³ Handbuch zu d. Apocrypha, i. p. 73.
⁴ Ryssel (in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 212) inclines to B.C. 114, the fourth year of Soter ii (Lathyrus).
⁵ See above, p. 25.
recensions differ considerably in the Greek additions as well as in the version. On the date of the Greek Esther the student may consult Jacob, *Das Buch Esther bei dem LXX.* in *ZATW.*, 1890 (p. 241 ff.).

**Jeremiah.** Besides the extensive transpositions already noticed, the LXX. text of Jeremiah differs widely from M.T. in the way of excess and defect. The subject has received careful treatment from Dr A. W. Streane (*Double Text of Jeremiah*, Cambridge, 1896), whose verdict is on the whole in favour of the LXX. text, especially with regard to its omissions. He points out that “the tendency to diffuseness, characteristic of later Judaism...[and] likely specially to affect the writing of Jeremiah, as a prophet whose memory was of marked interest to the post-exilic Jews...operated much more slightly among Egyptian Jews than with their brethren elsewhere”; and concludes that “the ‘omissions’ to be observed in the LXX. of Jeremiah, speaking generally, exist only in consequence of its nearer approximation to the original form of the Hebrew text.”

The Greek additions, in Jeremiah, rarely exceed a few words in a verse (see the list in Streane, p. 19). Omissions are more numerous, and sometimes extend over several consecutive verses of M.T.; the following are the most noteworthy: viii. 10—12, x. 6, 8, 10, xvii. 1—5*, xxix. (xxxvi., LXX.) 16—20, xxxiii. (xl., LXX.) 14—26, xxxix. (=xlvi., LXX.) 4—13, lii. 28—30. Of these passages viii. 10—12 seems to be based on vi. 12—15, and xxix. 16—20 on xxiv. 8—10; x. 6, 8, 10, xxxix. 4—13 and lii. 28—30 are probably interpolations in the M.T. On the other hand it is possible that the omission of xvii. 1—5* was due to homoeoteleuton, the eye of the translator or the scribe of his archetype having passed from נוֹמֵה (xvi. 21) to נוֹמֵה (xvii. 5*). It is more difficult to account for the absence from δ of the Messianic passage xxxiii. 14—26. Dr Streane thinks that it must have been wanting in the Hebrew text which lay before the translators. Possibly the Messianic hope which it emphasises had less interest for a subject of the Ptolemies than for the Jews of Palestine.

**Lamentations.** The Greek translator has prefixed a heading which connects the book with Jeremiah (*καὶ ἐγένετο...ἐκδόθη ἦρεμίας κλαίων κτλ.*),


17—2
Daniel. Like Esther the Book of Daniel in both its Greek forms contains large contexts which have no equivalent in מ. There are three such passages in the Greek Daniel: (1) the story of Susanna (Σουσάννα, Σωσάννα), which in the version of Theodotion as given by the great uncials precedes Dan. i. 1; (2) the story of Bel and the Dragon (Βηλ καὶ Δράκων) which follows Dan. xii. 13; (3) after Dan. iii. 23 a digression of 67 verses (iii. 24—90, Lxx., Th.), consisting of (a) the prayer of Azarias (24—45), (b) details as to the heating of the furnace and the preservation of Azarias and his friends (46—51), (c) the Song of the Three (52—90). In the Greek MSS. no break or separate title divides these Greek additions from the rest of the text, except that when Daniel is divided into "visions," the first vision is made to begin at i. 1, Susanna being thus excluded from the number; Bel, on the other hand, is treated as the last of the visions (ὁρασεὶς τῇ ΑΘ). Internal evidence appears to shew that both these stories originally had a separate circulation; Susanna does not form a suitable prologue to Dan. i. 2, for v. 6 introduces Daniel as a person hitherto unknown to the reader; and the position of Bel as an epilogue to the prophetic portion of the book is still less appropriate. From the Fathers, however, it is clear that in the earliest Christian copies of the LXX. both Susanna and Bel formed a part of Daniel, to which they are ascribed by Irenaeus and Tertullian, and implicitly by Hippolytus. The remarkable letter of Julius Africanus to Origen which throws doubt on the genuineness of Susanna, calling attention to indications of its Greek origin, forms a solitary exception to the general view; even Origen labours to maintain their canonicity.

Iren. iv. 26. 3 "et audient eas quae sunt a Daniele propheta voces" (Sus. 56, 52 f.), iv. 5. 2 "quern et Daniel propheta...annuntiavit" (Bel 4 f., 25). Tert. de idololatria, 18 (Bel 4 f.). Hippol. in

1 Vide supra, p. 46 ff.
2 Susanna is perhaps made to precede Daniel because it describes events which belong to his early life; cf. v. 44 ff. and v. 62 in a, b (LXX.).
Notwithstanding the objection shrewdly based by Africanus on the paronomasia (σχίνος, σχιζεων) in Sus. 54 f., Ball (Speaker's Comm., Apocrypha, ii. p. 330 f.) has given reasons for believing that both Susanna and Bel once existed in an Aramaic or a new-Hebrew original. The LXX. version represents Bel as a fragment of Habakkuk (cod. 87, Syro-Hex., tit. εκ προφητειας 'Αμβακοῦν νιοῦ 'Ιησοῦ εκ τῆς φυλῆς Δευ), an attribution evidently due to v. 33 ff., but inconsistent with the place of the story in the Gk. MSS.

The addition to Dan. iii. 23 is clearly Midrashic and probably had a Semitic original. The two hymns contained in it found a place, as we have seen, among the Greek ecclesiastical Canticles, where they appear as the προσευχή 'Αζαρίου and the υμνος τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (cod. A) or υ. τῶν τριῶν παιδῶν (cod. T).

Besides these additions, which are common to both texts of Daniel, the text of the LXX. contains a large number of shorter interpolations, especially in c. iii.—vi. where “the original thread of the narrative is often lost in a chaos of accretions, alterations, and displacements.” The student can easily test this statement by comparing the two versions as they stand face to face in the Cambridge LXX., especially in c. iii. i—3, 46, iv. 14 (17), 19 (22), 29—34 (32—37), v. 13—23, vi. 2—5.

2 Ball, l. c., p. 308.
3 Bevan, Daniel, p. 46.
(3—6), 12—14 (13—15), 22 (23). But the whole of this section of the book in the LXX. may be regarded as a paraphrase rather than a translation of a Hebrew text. In Susanna Theodotion has here and there a much shorter text than the LXX. (cf. Sus. 14—27, 42—50), and both in Susanna and Bel the two Greek versions sometimes diverge so widely as to exhibit the story in distinct forms which appear to represent different traditions.
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CHAPTER III.

BOOKS NOT INCLUDED IN THE HEBREW CANON.

The MSS. and many of the lists of the Greek Old Testament include certain books which find no place in the Hebrew Canon. The number of these books varies, as we have seen; but the fullest collections contain the following: 1 Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, i.—iv. Maccabees. We may add the Psalms of Solomon, a book which was sometimes included in MSS. of the Salomonic books, or, in complete Bibles, at the end of the Canon; and the Greek version of Enoch, although by some accident it has been excluded from the Greek Bible, on other grounds claims the attention of every Biblical student. There is also a long list of pseudepigrapha and other apocrypha which lie outside both the Hebrew and the Greek Canons, and of which in many cases only the titles have survived. The present chapter will be occupied by a brief examination of these non-canonical writings of the Greek Old Testament.

1. 1 Esdras. In MSS. of the LXX. the canonical book Ezra-Nehemiah appears under the title "Eσδρας β', "Eσδρας α' being appropriated by another recension of the history of the Captivity and Return.1 The ‘Greek Esdras’ consists of an

1 Cod. A entitles both books [δ] ἱερεύς—perhaps in order to distinguish the canonical Esdras from the ‘Prophet’ = 4 Esdras—“liber Esrae prophetae” (cf. Clem. M. strom. iii. 16 "Eσδρας δ' προφήτης λέγει").
independent and somewhat free version of portions of 2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, broken by a long context which has no parallel in the Hebrew Bible.

Thus 1 Esdr. i. = 2 Chron. xxxv. 1—xxxvi. 21; ii. 1—14 = Ezra i.; ii. 15—25 = Ezra iv. 7—24; iii. 1—v. 6 is original; v. 7—70 = Ezra ii. i.—iv. 5; vi., vii. = Ezra v., vi.; viii. 1—ix. 36 = Ezra vii. 1—x. 44; ix. 37—55 = Neh. vii. 73—viii. 13. The Greek book ends abruptly, in a manner which suggests that something has been lost; cf. ix. 55 καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν with 2 Esdr. xviii. 13 συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχωνες κτλ. The student may compare the ending of the Second Gospel (M. xvi. 8).

The context 1 Esdr. iii. 1—v. 6 is perhaps the most interesting of the contributions made by the Greek Bible to the legendary history of the Captivity and Return. We owe to it the immortal proverb Magna est veritas et praevalet (iv. 41'), and the story which forms the setting of the proverb is worthy of the occasion. But in its present form it is certainly unhistorical; Zerubbabel (iv. 13) belonged to the age of Cyrus, and it was Cyrus and not Darius (iv. 47 f.) who decreed the rebuilding of Jerusalem. It has been suggested that “this story is perhaps the nucleus of the whole (book), round which the rest is grouped.” In the grouping chronological order has been to some extent set aside; the displacement of Ezra iv. 7—24 (= 1 Esdr. ii. 15—25) has thrown the sequence of events into confusion, and the scene is shifted from the court of Artaxerxes to that of Darius, and from Darius back again to Cyrus, with whose reign the history had started. Yet Josephus3, attracted perhaps by the superiority of the Greek style, uses 1 Esdras in preference to the Greek version of the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah, even embodying in his narrative the legend of Zerubbabel4. He evades the difficulty

---

1 The future (praevalet) is without authority. In v. 38 Cod. A gives ἵσχει, but in v. 41 ἰπεράχει is unchallenged. The Latin texts have the present in both verses.
2 H. St J. Thackeray, in Hastings' D. B. i. p. 76.
3 ant. x. 4. 4—xi.
4 ant. xi. 3. 2 sqq.
arising out of the premature reference to Artaxerxes by substituting Cambyses\(^1\). In the early Church the Greek Esdras was accepted without suspicion; cf. e.g. Clem. Alex. *strom.* i. 21; Origen, *in Joann.* t. vi. 1, in *Jos. hom.* ix. 10; Cyprian, *ep.* 74. 9. Jerome, however (*praef. in Ezr.*), discarded the book, and modern editions of the Vulgate relegate it to an appendix where it appears as 3 Esdras, the titles 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras being given to the two parts of the canonical book Ezra-Nehemiah\(^2\).

The relation of the two Greek recensions of Ezra to one another is a problem analogous to that which is presented by the two ‘versions’ of Daniel, and scarcely less perplexing. It has been stated with great care in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible* (i. p. 759 ff.), by Mr H. St J. Thackeray. He distinguishes three views, (1) that 1 Esdras is a compilation from the LXX. version of 2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, (2) that it is based on an earlier Greek version of those books, and (3) that it is an independent translation of an earlier Hebrew text; and while refusing to regard any solution as final, he inclines to the second. The third has recently found a champion in Sir H. Howorth\(^3\), who adds to it the suggestion that 1 Esdras is the true Septuagintal (i.e. the Alexandrian) version, whilst 2 Esdras is later, and probably that of Theodotion. Mr Thackeray is disposed to regard this contention as “so far correct that [1 Esdras] represents the first attempt to present the story of the Return in a Gr[ee]k dress,” 2 Esdras being “a more accurate rendering of the Heb[rew]” which was “subsequently...required and...supplied by what is now called the LXX. version.”

2. WISDOM OF SOLOMON. The Greek title is *Σοφία Σαλωμώνος* (*Σαλωμώντος, Σαλομώντος, Σαλωμών*). But the book

---

\(^1\) *ant. xi.* 2, 1 sqq.
\(^2\) The English Article (vi) follows this numeration.
\(^3\) In the *Academy* for 1893.
was often cited as ἡ Σοφία, ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία, a name which it shared with Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus; see Lightfoot on Clem. i Cor. 55. In the Muratorian fragment it is described as “Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta.” The Latin versions and fathers called the book Sapientia or Sophia Salomonis (Cyprian, O. L.), but also simply liber Sapientiae (Lactantius, Vulg.).

No other book in the Greek Bible is so manifestly Alexandrian in tone and style. Some early Christian writers attributed it to Philo (Hieron. praef. in libros Salomonis: “non-nulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Iudaei Philonis affirmant”), and it has been ingeniously conjectured that this view found a place in the Greek archetype of the Muratorian fragment¹. But though Wisdom has strong points of likeness to the works of Philo, it is free from the allegorizing spirit of that writer, and its conception of the Logos is less developed than his². On the other hand it clearly belongs to a period when the Jewish scholars of Alexandria were abreast of the philosophic doctrines and the literary standards of their Greek contemporaries. The author is acquainted with the Stoic doctrine of the four cardinal virtues (c. viii. 7 εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἄγαπᾶ τις, οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσίν ἀρεταί σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν), and with the Platonic sense of ύλη (c. xi. 17 κτίσασα τὸν νόμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὠλης: cf. Philo, de victim. 13, de mund. opif. 12). His ideas on the subject of preexistence (c. viii. 20), of the relation of the body to the spirit (c. ix. 15), of Wisdom as the soul of the world (vii. 24), are doubtless due to the same source. His language is no less distinctly shaped upon Greek models; “no existing work represents perhaps more completely the style of compo-

¹ Ab amicis suggests ἵνα φιλῶ, and ὑπὸ φιλῶν has been thought to be a corruption of ὑπὸ Φιλωνοῦ. See Tregelles can. Mur., p. 53, and cf. Zahn, Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons, ii. p. 100.
² See this worked out by W. J. Deane, Book of Wisdom, p. 33 f.; C. J. Bigg, Christian Platonists, p. 14 ff.
sition which would be produced by the sophistic school of rhetoric\(^1\)," as it existed under the conditions of Greek life at Alexandria. This remark may be illustrated by the peculiar vocabulary of the book. Unusual words abound, e.g. ἀκηλίδωτος, ἀμβρόσιος, ἔξαλλος, ζωικός, ἰοβόλος, κακόμοχθος, κινητικός, κρυσταλλωτιδής, ὁμοουπάθης, παντεπίσκοπος, πολυμερής, πρωτόπλαστος, ἀγερωξία, ἀπαύγασμα, ἀπόρροια, εἰδέχθεια, ἐνέργεια, εὐδράνεια, ἰμβασμός, συλλογισμός, μετακινών, μεταλλεύειν, προφεστάναι\(^2\). In some of these we can trace the influence of philosophical thought, in others the laboured effort of the writer to use words in harmony with the literary instincts of the age and place to which he belonged.

The object of the book is to protect Hellenistic Jews from the insidious influences of surrounding ungodliness and idolatry, but while its tone is apologetic and even polemical, the point of view is one which would commend itself to non-Jewish readers. The philosophical tendencies and the literary style of Wisdom favour the view that it is earlier than Philo, but not earlier than the middle of the second century B.C. As to the author, the words in which Origen dismissed the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews may be applied to this pre-Christian writing—τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας...τὸ μὲν ἀληθές θείος οἶδεν. It is the solitary survival from the wreck of the earlier works of the philosophical school of Alexandria which culminated in Philo, the contemporary of our Lord.

3. WISDOM OF JESUS, SON OF SIRACH. In cod. B the title of this book is simply Σοφία Σεεράχ\(^3\), but codd. AC give the fuller and more accurate form Σοφία Ἡσοῦ νίου Σεεράχ (cf. c. L. 27 παιδείαν...ἐξάραξα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ Ἡσοῦ νίος.

\(^1\) Westcott in Smith’s B. D. ii. 1780. Cf. Jerome, l. c. “ipse stylos Graecam eloquentiam redolet.”

\(^2\) See Deane, p. 27, Westcott, p. 178, Ryle, Smith’s B. D.\(^2\) i. p. 185.

\(^3\) Σεεράχ = Νηπι. “In the Hebrew Josippon (Pseudo-Josephus) the form Ἱησοῦς is a transliteration from the Latin” (Cowley and Neubauer, Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus, p. ix. n.).
Seirah). Jerome had seen a Hebrew Sirach which shared with the canonical book the title of Proverbs (praef. in libros Salom.: "Hebraicum reperi...Parabolas (םשה) praenotatum"). The later name, Ecclesiasticus, which appears in Cyprian (e.g. testim. ii. 1 "apud Salomonem...in Ecclesiastico"), marks the book as the most important or the most popular of the libri ecclesiastici—the books which the Church used for the purpose of instruction, although they were included in the Jewish canon.

Cf. Rufin. in symb. 38: "alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt, id est, Sapientia quae dicunt Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quae dicunt filii Sirach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur, quo vocabulo non auctor libelli sed scripturae qualitas cognominata est."

The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach was the work of a Palestinian (c. L. 27 Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ἱεροσολυμείτης), and written in Hebrew or Aramaic; the Greek version was made by the grandson of the writer during a visit to Alexandria (prolog., ll. 5, 18 ff.). This visit is said to have begun ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἐτῶν τοῦ Ευεργέτου βασιλέως—words which, simple as they seem, are involved in a double ambiguity, since there were two Ptolemies who bore the name Euergetes, and it is not clear whether the 38th year is to be reckoned from the commencement of the reign of Euergetes or from some other point of departure. But, assuming that the Euergetes intended is Euergetes II., i.e. Physcon, and that the translator is counting from the time when Physcon was associated in the government with his brother and predecessor Philometor, we arrive at B.C. 132 as the terminus a quo of the Greek version, and the original may have been composed some fifty years earlier.

Fragments of the original are preserved in Rabbinic

1 On Ἐλεαζάρ (which follows Seirah in the Greek) see Ryssel in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 253. The newly-discovered Hebrew reads מַשִּׁלְעַ נְבֵא, Ἰούσα βαλοὺρ βα βαρα, on which see Schechter, Wisdom of Ben Sira, p. 65.
literature. These are in the dialect of the Talmud; but recent discoveries have brought to light a large part of the book in classical Hebrew. A comparison of the Greek version with the Hebrew text, so far as it has been printed, reveals considerable differences, especially when the Greek text employed is that of cod. B, which was unfortunately chosen for the purpose by the Oxford editors of the Hebrew fragments. It must be remembered that these fragments come from a MS. of the 11th or 12th century, which may present a corrupt form of the Hebrew text; and on the other hand, that there are considerable variations in the Greek text of Sirach, cod. B differing widely from the majority of the MSS. Much remains to be done before the text of Sirach can be settled with any confidence. Meanwhile Professor Margoliouth has thrown doubt upon the originality of the Hebrew fragments, which he regards as belonging to an eleventh century version made from the Syriac with the help of a Persian translation from the Greek. At present few experts accept this theory, but the question must perhaps be regarded as sub iudice.

In all but one of the known MSS. of the Greek Sirach, there is a remarkable disturbance of the sequence. They pass from c. xxx. 34 to c. xxxiii. 13 b, returning to the omitted passage after xxxvi. 16 a. The error seems to have arisen from a transposition in the common archetype of the pairs of leaves on which these two nearly equal sections were severally written—a fact which is specially instructive in view of the large divergences in the Greek MSS. to which reference has

1 Cf. Hatch, Essays, p. 281. A group of MSS. headed by V = 23 contains a considerable number of verses or stichi omitted by the rest of our Greek authorities; see Smith, D. B2, i. i. p. 842.
2 Origin of the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, 1899. See on this a letter by Prof. Driver in the Guardian, June 28, 1899, and Dr Taylor's remarks in Ben Sira, p. lxx ff.
3 The exception is H-P., 248, a Vatican MS. of the 14th century. On this MS. see Fritzsche, p. xxiii; Zenner in Z. K. Th., 1895.
been made. The true order is preserved in the Old Latin\(^1\), Syriac, and Armenian versions.

4. **Judith** (Ἰουδείθ, -θο, -θη, = יְוֹדֵית), cf. Gen. xxvi. 34, where the same spellings are found in the cursives, though the uncials exhibit Ἰουδείν, Ἰουδίν), an historical romance, of which the scene is laid in the days of Nebuchadnezzar (c. i. 2). The date of its composition is uncertain. A *terminus ad quem* is provided by the fact that Clement of Rome knew the story (1 Cor. 55 Ἰουδείθ ἡ μακαρία...παρέδωκεν Κύριος Ὀλοφέρνην ἐν χειρὶ θηλείας); and the name of Judith's enemy has suggested a *terminus a quo*, for Olophernes\(^3\) appears to be a softened form of Orophernes, the name of a Cappadocian king, c. B.C. 158, who may have been regarded as an enemy of the Jews\(^4\). The religious attitude of the author of Judith is that of the devout Pharisee (cf. e.g. viii. 6, x. 2 ff., xi. 13, xii. 7), and the work may have been a fruit of the patriotic feeling called forth by the Maccabean wars.

Origen's Jewish teachers knew nothing of a Semitic original (cf. ad African. 13: Ἐβραῖοι τῷ Τοβιᾷ οὗ χρώνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουνάθ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχοντι αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις Ἐβραϊστί, ὦς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγνώκαμεν). Jerome, on the other hand, not only says expressly (praef. in Judith): “apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha (v.l. hagiographa) legitur,” but he produced a version or paraphrase from an Aramaic source (“ea quae intellegentia integra ex verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi”)\(^5\). The relation of this Aramaic text to the original of the Greek book remains uncertain.

---

1 On the O.L. of the Wisdoms see above, pt. i. c. IV (pp. 96, 103).
2 See Lightfoot’s note ad loc. and his remarks in Clement i. p. 313 ff.
3 Not Ὀλοφέρνης, as is presupposed by the Latin.
4 Cf. art. Holofernes in Hastings’ *D. B.* ii. p. 402. There were, however, earlier kings of the same name (op. cit. p. 823; cf. Schürer\(^3\), iii. p. 169 f., n. 19).
The Greek Judith is said by Fritzsche to exist in three recensions: (1) that of the Uncials and the majority of the cursives, (2) that of codd. 19, 108, and (3) that which is represented by cod. 58, and is in general agreement with the Old Latin and Syriac versions, which are based upon a Greek text.

5. Tobit (Tωβείτ, Tωβείθ, Tobias, liber Tobiae, utriusque Tobiae), a tale of family life, the scene of which is laid at Nineveh and Ecbatana, the hero being an Israelite of the tribe of Naphtali, who had been carried into captivity by Shalmanezer. The book appears to have been written for Jewish readers, and in Hebrew or Aramaic. The Jews of Origen's time, however, refused to recognise its authority (Orig. de orat. 14 τῇ δὲ του Tωβήτ βίβλῳ ἀντιλέγουσιν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὡς μὴ ἐνδιαθήκῳ), or even to include it among their apocrypha (see above, under Judith); but it was accepted by the Church (ep. ad African. l. c. χρῶνται τῷ Tωβίᾳ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι), and there is abundant evidence of its popularity among Christians (cf. Ps. Clem. 2 Cor. 16. 4, Polyc. ad Smyrn. 10. 2, Clem. Alex. strom. ii. 23, vi. 12, Orig. de orat. 11, in Rom. viii. 11, c. Cels. v. 19, Cypr. testim. iii. 1, 6, 62). Gnostics shared this feeling with Catholics; the Ophites placed Tobit among their prophetical books (Iren. i. 30. 11).

 Jerome translated Tobit as he translated Judith, from a 'Chaldee,' i.e. Aramaic, copy, but with such haste that the whole was completed in a single day (praef. in Tob. "exigitis ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad latinum stylum tradam...feci satis desiderio vestro...et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego

1 Fritzsche, libri apocr. p. xviii sq.; Schürer, iii. p. 172. The text in codd. 19, 108. is said to be Lucianic (Max Löhr in Kautzsch, Apokr., p. 147).
accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui"). Thus, as in the case of Judith, we have two Latin versions, the Old Latin, based upon the Greek, and Jerome's rough and ready version of the Aramaic.

The Greek text itself exists in two principal recensions, represented by the two great uncialgs B and K. In c. vi. 9—xiii. 18 Fritzsche adds a third text supplied by the cursives 44, 106, 107. The relation of the two principal texts to each other has recently been discussed by Nestle (Septuagintastudien, iii.) and by J. Rendel Harris (in the American Journal of Theology, iii. p. 541 ff.). Both, though on different grounds, give preference to the text of K. Harris, however, points out that while K is probably nearer to the original Hebrew, B may exhibit the more trustworthy text of the Alexandrian version of the book.

6. Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah (Barou’x, Ἐπιστολή Ἱερεμίου, [prophetia] Baruch) were regarded by the Church as adjuncts of Jeremiah, much in the same way as Susanna and Bel were attached to Daniel. Baruch and the Epistle occur in lists which rigorously exclude the non-canonical books; they are cited as 'Jeremiah' (Iren. v. 35. 1, Tert. scorp. 8, Clem. Alex. paed. i. 10, Cypr. testim. ii. 6); with Lamentations they form a kind of trilogy supplementary to the prophecy (Athan. ep. 39 Ἱερεμίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρούχ, Ὡρήνω, Ἐπιστολή, Cyril. Hier. catech. iv. 33 Ἱερεμίου μετὰ Βαρούχ καὶ Ὡρήνων καὶ Ἐπιστολῆς). In some Greek MSS. the Epistle follows Baruch without break, and in the Latin and English Bibles it forms the sixth and last chapter of that book.

1 A Chaldee text, corresponding in some respects to Jerome's Latin, is preserved in the Bodleian, and has been edited by Neubauer (Oxford, 1878).
2 Origen, while omitting Baruch, includes the Epistle in a formal list of the Hebrew canon (Eus. H. E. vi. 25 Ἱερεμίας σὺν Ὡρήνω καὶ τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑν).
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The Epistle (ἀντίγραφον ἐπιστολῆς ἣς ἀπέστειλεν Ἱερεμίας πρὸς τοὺς ἀχθησιούνους [ὑπὸ ἀπαχθηντα] αἰχαλώτους εἰς Βαβυλῶνα) seems to have been suggested by Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) 1 (cf. 2 Kings xxv. 20 ff.). It is generally recognised that this little work was written in Greek by a Hellenist who was perhaps anterior to the writer of 2 Maccabees (cf. 2 Macc. ii. 1 ff.)

The problem presented by Baruch is less simple. This book is evidently a complex work consisting of two main sections (i. i.—iii. 8, iii. 9—v. 9), each of which may be subdivided (i. 1—14, historical preface; i. 15—iii. 8, confession and prayer; iii. 9—iv. 4, exhortation; iv. 5—v. 9, encouragement). Of these subsections the first two shew traces of a Hebrew original; cf. e.g. i. 10 μάννα = Νάφ, ii. 3 ἄνθρωπον = άη, iii. 4 τῶν τεθνηκότων = Νέφ (for Νέφ); the third has been held to rest on an Aramaic document, whilst the fourth is manifestly Hellenistic.

An investigation by Professor Ryle and Dr James into the relation between the Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon and the Greek Baruch, led them to the conclusion that Baruch was reduced to its present form after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; and the tone of Bar. v. 30 seems certainly to point to that period. On the other hand it is difficult to understand the unhesitating acceptance of the book by Christian writers from Athenagoras (suppl. 9) until the time of

---

2 In the first section the Divine Name is Κύριος or Κ. θεός, while in the second it is either θεός or ἀλώνιος, ἀγιος. See Dr Gifford in Speaker's Comm., Apoc., ii. f. 253.
3 “On the margin of the Syro-hexaplar text of Baruch there are three notes by a scribe stating that certain words in i. 17 and ii. 3 are ‘not found in the Hebrew.’” (A. A. Bevan in Encycl. Biblica, i. 494.)
5 Psalms of the Pharisees, pref., esp. p. lxvii.
Jerome, and its practical inclusion in the canon, if the Greek version in its present form proceeded from a Palestinian Jew, and was the work of the last quarter of the first century A.D.\textsuperscript{1} As to its use by the Jews there are contradictory statements in early Christian writers, for while the *Apostolical Constitutions*\textsuperscript{2} inform us that the Jews read Baruch publicly on the Day of Atonement, Jerome says expressly that they neither read it nor had it in their possession, and his statement is confirmed by Epiphanius.


7. **Books of Maccabees** (Μακκαβαίων α’, β’, γ’, δ’, Μακκαβαίων ἱστορίαν). The four books differ widely in origin, character, and literary value; the bond which unites them is merely their common connexion with the events of the age which produced the heroes of the Hasmonaeans or Maccabean\textsuperscript{3} family.

**1 Maccabees.** This book seems to have been used by Josephus (\textit{ant.} xii. 6 sqq.), but it is doubtful whether he was acquainted with its Greek form. On the other hand, the Greek 1 Macc. was undoubtedly known to the Christian school of Alexandria; cf. Clem. Alex. \textit{strom.} i. § 123 τὸ τῶν

\textsuperscript{1} Dr Nestle points out that Baruch and Jeremiah seem to have been translated by the same hand, unless the translator of Baruch deliberately copied the translator of Jeremiah. Certain unusual words are common to the two books in similar contexts, e.g. ἄβατος, ἀποστολή, δεσμώτης, πενώσα.

\textsuperscript{2} v. 20. But the reference to Baruch is wanting in the Syriac Didascalia (Smith, \textit{D. B.} i. p. 359).

\textsuperscript{3} For the name Μακκαβαίων see Schürer, \textit{E. T.} i. p. 212 f. n.; it belonged primarily to Judas, cf. 1 Macc. i. 4 ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ καλοῦμενος Μ.; Joseph. \textit{ant.} xii. 6 Ἰούδας ὁ καλ. Μ.
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Μακκαβαϊκῶν, Origen ap. Eus. l.c. τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ ἀπερ ἐπιγε-γραπταὶ Σαρβηθ ζαβαναιλ (v.l. Σ. ζαβανὲ ἢ). Whatever may be the meaning of this title¹, it is clearly Semitic, and may be taken as evidence that the book was circulated in a Semitic original. Jerome appears to have seen a copy of this Hebrew or Aramaic text (prol. gal. “Maccabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum repperi”), but it has long disappeared, and the book is now extant only in versions. The Latin and Syriac versions are based upon the Greek; the Old Latin exists in two recensions, one of which has taken its place in the Latin Bible, whilst the other is preserved in a St Germain’s and a Madrid MS.; a Lyons MS. gives a text in which the two are mixed².

The history of 1 Macc. covers about 40 years (B.C. 175—132). There are indications that the writer was removed by at least a generation from the end of his period (cf. c. xiii. 30, xvi. 23 f.). He was doubtless a Palestinian Jew, but his work would soon have found its way to Alexandria, and if it had not already been translated into Greek, it doubtless received its Greek dress there shortly after its arrival.

2 MACCABEES. The existence of a book bearing this title is implied by Hippolytus, who quotes 1 Macc. with the formula ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βιβλῳ τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἀναγέγραπταί, and by Origen, if we may trust the Latin interpretation (in ep. ad Rom., t. viii. 1 “in primo libro Machabaeorum scriptum est”); the title itself occurs in Eus. praef. ev. viii. 9 (ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαϊῶν). But the evidence goes further back. Philo shews some knowledge of the book in Quod omnis probus liber, § 13, and the author of the Ep. to the Hebrews has a clear reminiscence of its Greek (Heb. xi. 31 ἀλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανισθησαν κτλ., cf. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 30).

¹ For various attempts to interpret it see Ryle, Canon, p. 185.
² Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, pp. 62, 68.
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The writer is described by Clement of Alexandria (strom. v. 14) as δὲ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομήν. This is precisely what he claims to do (c. ii. 23 ὑπὸ Ἰάσωνος τοῦ Κυρηναίου δεδηλωμένα διὰ τέντε βιβλίων, πειρασόμεθα δι ἐνὸς συντάγματος ἐπιτεμεύων). The work of the Cyrenian has perished, whilst the Alexandrian epitome survives. For Alexandrian the epitomist probably was; “the characteristics of the style and language are essentially Alexandrian...the form of the allusion to Jason shews clearly that the compiler was not his fellow countryman.” “The style is extremely uneven; at times it is elaborately ornate (iii. 15—39, v. 20, vi. 12—16, 23—28, vii. &c.) and again, it is so rude and broken as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition” (xiii. 19—26); indeed it is difficult to believe that such a passage as the one last cited can have been intended to go forth in its present form. That the work never had a Semitic original was apparent to Jerome (prol. gal. “secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest”). The vocabulary is extraordinarily rich in words of the later literary Greek, and the book betrays scarcely any disposition to Hebraise.

The second book of Maccabees presents a striking contrast to the first. Covering a part of the same period (B.C. 175 —160), it deals with the events in a manner wholly different. In 1 Maccabees we have a plain and usually trustworthy history; in 2 Maccabees a partly independent but rhetorical and inaccurate and to some extent mythical panegyric of the patriotic revolt.


1 Westcott in Smith’s D. B. ii. p. 175.
2 See the list of words given by Westcott, l. c. i. and in Smith’s D. B. i. and Apocrypha.
3 So Luther, in his preface to 2 Macc: “so billig das erste Buch sollte in die Zahl der heiligen Schrift genommen sein, so billig ist dies andere Buch herausgeworfen, obwohl etwas Gutes darinner steht.”
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in some Eastern lists (can. Apost., Niceph. stichom.). A Greek book under that title is found in codd. AV and a few cursives. There is a Syriac version, but no Latin, nor is the book mentioned in any Western list, although the stichometry of Cod. Claromontanus implies a knowledge of its existence, for it mentions a fourth book. Similarly cod. Ν passes from the first book to the fourth, whether the omission of the second and third is due to the deliberate judgement of the scribe or to his want of an archetype.

A more exact description of 3 Maccabees would be that which it seems to have borne in some circles—the Ptolemaica. The story belongs to the reigns of Ptolemy Philopator (B.C. 222—205), and the scene is laid at Alexandria. The king, infuriated by the refusal of the Jerusalem priesthood to admit him to the Holy of Holies, returns to Egypt with the intention of avenging himself on the Alexandrian Jews; but by the interposition of Providence his plans are defeated, and he becomes, like Darius in Daniel and Artaxerxes in Esther, the patron of the people he had purposed to destroy.

There are reasons for believing that this romance rests upon some historical basis. "The author...evidently has good knowledge of the king and his history...the feast kept by the Egyptian Jews at a fixed date [c. vii. 11] cannot be an invention...that Philopator in some way injured the condition of the Jews, and that they were concerned in the insurrection of the nation, seems very probable." Moreover Josephus has a somewhat similar tale drawn from another source, and con-

1 Fritzschke has used codd. 19, 44, 55, 62, 64, 71, 74, 93.
2 In the Pseudo-Athanasian synopsis where the MSS. give Μακκαβαϊκά δ', Πτολεμαϊκά. Credner proposed to read Μ. καλ (γ) Πτολ. An explanation of the existing reading attempted by Fabricius, cod. pseud. epigr. V. T. i. p. 1164, is hardly to be considered satisfactory. Zahn (Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons, ii. p. 317) suggests πολέμικά, but this is more ingenious than convincing.
3 Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 267 ff.
connected with another reign\(^1\) (c. Ap. ii. 5). The present book is doubtless Alexandrian, and of relatively late origin, as its inflated style, "loaded with rhetorical ornament\(^2\)," sufficiently testifies. Some critics (Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss\(^3\)) would place it in the reign of Caligula, but the knowledge of earlier Alexandrian life which it displays points to an earlier date, perhaps the first century B.C.

4 MACCABEES. According to Eusebius and Jerome this book was the work of Josephus\(^4\).

Eus. H. E., iii. 10 πεπόνηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ὤν ἀγεννεσ σπού-
δασμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ (sc. Ἰουσήφῳ) περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ, οὐ τινὲς
Μακκαβαίων ἐπέγραψαν τῷ τούς ἁγώνας τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐτω καλο-
μένοις Μακκαβαίοις συγγράμμασιν ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἐνσεβείας
ἀνδρισαμένων Ἐβραίων περίεχειν. Hieron. de virr. ill. 13 "αλίου
quoque libro eius qui inscribitur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ
valde elegans habetur, in quo et Maccabeorum digesta martyria"
(cf. c. Pelag. ii. 5).

The book is a philosophical treatise upon the question, εἰ αὐτοδέσποτος ἑστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ ἐνσεβής λογισμός. But the greater part of it\(^5\) is occupied by a rhetorical panegyric upon the Jewish martyrs, Eleazar, and the seven brothers and their mother, who perished in the Maccabean troubles. This portion appears to be based on 3 Macc. vi. 18, vii. 42, which it amplifies with an extraordinary wealth of language and a terribly realistic picture of the martyrs' sufferings. The rhetoric of the writer, however, is subordinated to his passion for religious philosophy. In philosophy he is a pupil of the Stoics; like the author of the Wisdom of Solomon he holds fast by the doctrine of the four cardinal Virtues (i. 18 τῆς δὲ σοφίας εἰδεῖα καθιστῶσιν φρόνησις καὶ δικαιοσύνη

---

1 That of Euergetes II. (Physcon); cf. Mahaffy, p. 381.
2 Westcott in Smith’s D. B. ii. p. 179.
3 Schürer\(^3\), iii. p. 365.
4 The same belief is expressed by the fact that the book is found in some MSS. of Josephus. See Fabricius-Harles, v. 26 f.
5 Viz. c. III. 19, to the end.
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kai ἀνδρία καὶ σωφροσύνη), and he sternly demands that the πάθη shall be kept under restraint by the power of Reason. In religion he is a legalist with Pharisaic tendencies; he believes in future punishment (ix. 9, xiii. 15), in the eternal life which awaits the righteous (xv. 3, xvii. 5, xviii. 23), and in the atonement for sin which is made by voluntary sacrifice (vi. 29, xxii. 22).

The style of 4 Macc. abounds in false ornament and laboured periods. But on the whole it is "truly Greek," and approaches nearer than that of any other book in the Greek Bible to the models of Hellenic philosophy and rhetoric. It does not, however, resemble the style of Josephus, and is more probably a product of Alexandrian Judaism during the century before the fall of Jerusalem.

8. To the books of the Hebrew canon (τὰ ἐνδιάθηκα, τὰ εἰκοσιδύο) and the 'external' books (τὰ ἔξω), which on the authority of Jerome the reformed Churches of the West have been accustomed to call the Apocrypha, some of the ancient lists add certain apocrypha properly so named. Thus the catalogue of the 'Sixty Books,' after reciting the canonical books of the O. and N. Testaments, and τὰ περὶ (λέγ. πέρα) τούτων ἔξω (the two Wisdoms, i—4 Maccabees, Esther, Judith, Tobit), continues: Καὶ ὅσα ἀπόκρυφα: Ἀδάμ, Ἐνώχ, Δάμεχ, Πατριάρχαι, Προσευχῇ Ἰωσήφ, Ἐλδαΐ, Διαθήκη Μουσέως, Ἀνάληψις Μουσέως, Ψαλμοὶ Σολομώνως, Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἡσαίου δρασις, Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις, Ἐσδρα ἀποκάλυψις. The Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis and the Stichometry of Nicephorus count among the ἀπόκρυφα τῆς παλαιᾶς, together with certain of the above, Ἀβραάμ...Βαρούχ, Ἀββακοῦ, Ἐζεκηλ, καὶ Δανηλ, ψευδεπιγραφα. Ebed Jesu mentions also a book called Traditions of the Elders, the History of Asenath, and

1 Westcott in Smith's D. B. ii. p. 181.
2 On this list see Zahn, Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons, ii. p. 289 ff. and M. R. James, Testament of Abraham, p. 7 ff. (in Texts and Studies, ii. 2).
even the Fables of Aesop disguised under the title Proverbs of Josephus. Besides these writings the following are censured in the Gelasian notitia liberorum apocryphorum: Liber de filiabus Adae Leptogenesis, Poenitentia Adae, Liber de Vegia nomine gigante, qui post diluvium cum dracone...pugnasse perhibetur, Testamentum Iob, Poenitentia Iambre et Mambre, Solomonis interdictio.

Though the great majority of these writings at one time existed in Greek, they were not admitted into collections of canonical books. A partial exception was made in favour of the Psalms of Solomon. This book is mentioned among the ἀντιλεγόμενα of the O.T. in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and in the Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis. An earlier authority, the compiler of the catalogue at the beginning of Codex Alexandrinus, allows it a place in his list, although after the final summary of the books of the Old and New Testaments. If the Codex itself contained these Psalms, they have perished together with a portion of Ps. Clem. ad Cor. ii., the book which in the list immediately precedes them. It has been conjectured that they once had a place in Cod. Sinaiticus, which like Cod. A has lost some leaves at the end of the N.T. Their absence from the other great uncials and from the earlier cursives may be due to the influence of the Laodicean canon (lix.), οτι ου δει ἱδιωτικῶς ψαλμοῖς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οἶδε ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. Happily the Psalms survived in private collections, and find a place in a few relatively

1 The catalogue ends ομογ βιβλια... | and below, ψαλμοι σολο-

2 By Dr J. R. Harris, who points out (Johns Hopkins Univ. Circular, March 1884) that the six missing leaves in Ρ between Barnabas and Hermas correspond with fair accuracy to the space which would be required for the Psalms of Solomon.

3 Cf. Bahr. ἀρ. Beveregii Synod. p. 480 εὑρίσκωνται τινὲς ψαλμοὶ πέρα τοῦ μὲν ψαλμὸς τοῦ Δαβὶδ λεγόμενοι τοῦ Σολωμονος...τούτων οὗν ὀνομά-
σαντες αἱ πατέρες ἱδιωτικῶς.
late cursive of the poetical and the Sapiential books of the O.T., where they follow the Davidic Psalter or take their place among the writings attributed to Solomon.

The Psalms of Solomon are shown by their teaching and spirit to be the work of the Pharisaic school, and internal evidence connects them with the age of Pompey, whose death appears to be described in Ps. ii. 30 ff. The question of the date of the Greek version turns upon the nature of the relation which exists between the Greek Psalms and the Greek Book of Baruch. Professor Ryle and Dr James, who regard Baruch iv. 36—v. 9 (Greek) as based on the Greek of Ps. Sol. xi., are disposed to assign the version of the Psalms to the last decade of the first century B.C. They observe that the Messianic passages contain "no trace of Christian influence at work." On the other hand there are interesting coincidences between the Greek phraseology of the Psalter and that of the Magnificat and other Lucan canticles.

One other apocryphon of the Greek Old Testament claims attention here. The Book of Enoch has since 1838 been in the hands of scholars in the form of an Ethiopic version based upon the Greek. But until 1892 the Greek version was known only through a few fragments—the verse quoted by St Jude (cf. 14 f.), a brief tachygraphic extract in cod. Vat. gr. 1809, published in facsimile by Mai (patr. nov. biblioth. ii.), and deciphered by Gildemeister (ZDMG., 1855, p. 622 ff.), and the excerpts in the Chronographia of Georgius Syncellus. But in 1886 a small vellum book was found in

1 In the latter case they go with the two Wisdoms in the order Sap., Ps. Sol., Sir. or (in one instance) Sap., Sir., Ps. Sol.  
2 Ryle and James, Psalms of the Pharisees, p. xl ff., xliv ff. Schürer, iii. p. 152 f.  
3 Ryle and James, p. lxxii ff. On the date see W. Frankenberg, die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos (Giessen, 1896).  
4 Ryle and James, p. xc ff.  
5 These may be conveniently consulted in the Corpus historiae Byzantinae, t. 1, where they are edited by W. Dindorf.
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a Christian grave in Akhmîm (Panopolis), in Upper Egypt, which contained inter alia the first thirty-two chapters of Enoch in Greek—nearly the whole of the first section of the book. This large fragment was published by M. Bouriant in the ninth volume of Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique Française au Caire (Paris, 1er fasc. 1892; 3e fasc. 1893).

The newly recovered Greek belongs to the oldest part of Enoch, which may be regarded as in the main a Palestinian work of the second century B.C. The Greek version is the parent of the Ethiopic, and of pre-Christian date, since it was in the hands of St Jude. Thus it possesses a strong claim upon the attention of the student of Biblical Greek, while the book itself possesses an almost unique value as an exposition of Jewish eschatology.

The Greek version of Enoch seems to have been circulated in the ancient Church; cf. Barn. 4. 16; Clem. Alex. ecl. proph. 2; Orig. de princ. i. 3. 3, iv. 35, hom. in Num. 28. 2. The book was not accepted by authority (Orig. c. Cels. v. 54 ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεία τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία: in Ioann. t. vi. 25 ἐὰν τῷ φίλῳ παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον. Hieron. de virr. ill. 4 “apocryphus est”), but opinion was divided, and Tertullian was prepared to admit the claims of a writing which had been quoted in a Catholic Epistle (de cult. faem. i. 3 “scio scripturam Enoch... non recipi a quibusdam quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur... a nobis quidem nihil omnino reiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos... eo accedit quod E. apud Iudam apostolum testimonium possidet”). In the end, however, it appears to have been discredited both in East and West, and, if we may judge by the almost total disappearance of the Greek version, it was rarely copied by Catholics even for private

1 See Schürer³, iii. p. 196 ff.
study. A mere chance has thrown into our hands an excerpt made in the eighth or ninth century, and it is significant that in the Akhmim book Enoch is found in company with fragments of a pseudonymous Gospel and Apocalypse¹.

**Literature of the non-canonical Books.**


¹ A collection of Greek O. T. apocrypha might perhaps include, amongst other remains of this literature, the *Rest of the Words of Baruch* (ed. J. Rendel Harris), the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (ed. M. R. James), the *Testament of Abraham* (ed. M. R. James), parts of the *Oracula Sibyllina* (ed. A. Rzach), the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (ed. Sinker), the Latin *Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. O. von Gebhardt; with the new Greek fragments), and perhaps also the Latin versions of certain important books which no longer survive in the Greek, e.g. 4 Esdras (ed. R. L. Bensly), the *Assumption of Moses* (ed. R. H. Charles), the *Book of Jubilees*, ἦ λεπτη Πένες (ed. R. H. Charles).
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(Munster, 1877); Scholz, Commentar z. Buche Tobias (1889); Rosenmann, Studien z. Buche Tobit (Berlin, 1894); J. M. Fuller in Speaker's Comm., Apocr., i.; Löhri, in Kautzsch, Apokryphen, p. 135 ff. Cf. E. Nestle, Septuagintastudien, iii. (Stuttgart, 1899); J. R. Harris in American Journal of Theology, July, 1899.


PSEUDEPIGRAPHA. The student will find fuller information on this subject in Fabricius, Codex pseudapigraphus V. T. (Hamburg, 1722): Herzog-Plitt, xii. p. 341 ff. (art. by Dillmann on Pseudapigrapha des A. T.); Deane, Pseudepigrapha (Edinburgh, 1891); J. H. Thompson, a critical review of apocalyptic Jewish literature (N. Y., 1891); Smith's and Hastings' Bible Dictionaries; Schürer3, iii. pp. 150 ff., 190 ff.; the works of Credner and Zahn; M. R. James, Testament of Abraham in Texts and Studies (II. ii. p. 7 ff.); Encyclopaedia Biblica, artt. Apo-

1 A collation of the Syriac 4 Macc. with the Greek has been contributed by Dr Barnes to O. T. in Greek2, vol. iii. (p. 900 ff.).
c.alyptic Literature and Apocrypha (i. 213–58). For the literature of the several writings he may refer to Strack, Einleitung, p. 230 ff. In Kautzsch's Apokr. u. Pseudepigraphen the following O. T. pseudepigrapha are included: Martyrdom of Isaiah (Beer), Sibylline Oracles, iii.—v., and proem. (Blass), Ascension of Moses (Clemen), Apocalypse of Moses (Fuchs), Apocalypse of Esdras (Gunkel), Testament of Naphtali, Heb. (Kautzsch), Book of Jubilees (Littmann), Apocalypse of Baruch (Ryssel), Testaments of XII Patriarchs (Schnapp). On the eschatology of this literature see Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian (London, 1899).

PSALMS OF SOLOMON. Fabricius, Cod. pseudepigr. V.T., i. p. 914 ff.; Fritzsche, libr. apocr. V. T. gr., pp. xxv ff., 569 ff.; Ryle and James, Psalms of the Pharisees (Cambridge, 1891); O. v. Gebhardt, die Psalmen Salomo's (Leipzig, 1895); Old Testament in Greek 2 (Cambridge, 1899). Ryle and James' edition is specially valuable for its full Introduction, and Gebhardt's for its investigation into the pedigree and relative value of the MSS. On the date see Frankenberg, die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos (Giessen, 1896). An introduction and German version by Dr R. Kittel will be found in Kautzsch, Pseudepigraphen, p. 127 ff.

BOOK OF Enoch. Laurence, Libri Enoch versio aethiopica (Oxford, 1838); Dillmann, Liber Henoch aethiopice (Leipzig, 1851); Bouriant, Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Énoch...in Mémoires, &c. (see above); Lods, le livre d'Énoch (Paris, 1892); Dillmann, über den neugefundenen gr. Text des Henoch-Buches (Berlin, 1892); Charles, the Book of Enoch (Oxford, 1893), and art. in Hastings' D.B. i. p. 705 ff.; Old Testament in Greek, iii. 1 (Cambridge, 1899). For a fragment of a Latin version see James, Apocr. anecdota in Texts and Studies, ii. 3, p. 146 ff. An introduction and German version by Dr G. Beer will be found in Kautzsch, Pseudepigraphen, p. 217 ff.

1 The text in the Cambridge manual LXX., which is that of cod. Vat. gr. 336, and is accompanied by an apparatus and a brief description of the MSS., can be had, together with the text of Enoch, in a separate form.
CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

1. No thorough treatment of the Greek idiom of the LXX. is known to exist. Two ancient treatises upon the dialect of Alexandria, by Irenaeus (Minutius Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion, have unhappily disappeared. In modern times the ground has been broken by Sturz and Thiersch, and within the last few years Deissmann has used the recently discovered papyri of Egypt to illustrate the connotation or the form of a number of Septuagint nouns and verbs. Much has also been done by Dr H. A. A. Kennedy and the Abbé J. Viteau in the way of determining the relation of Septuagint Greek to the classical and later usage, and to the Greek of the N.T.; and the N.T. grammars of Winer-Moulton, Winer-Schmiedel, and Blass contain incidental references to the linguistic characteristics of the Alexandrian version. But a separate grammar of the Greek Old Testament is still a real want, and the time has almost come for attempting to supply it. Biblical scholars have now at

1 See Fabricius-Harles, vi. p. 193 f. Both writezs lived in the time of Augustus.
2 Sturz's treatment of the dialect of Alexandria and Egypt needs to be checked by more recent researches, but it is still the most complete work upon the subject. Thiersch deals directly with the Greek of the LXX., but he limits himself to the Pentateuch.
3 *Bibelstudien* (1895), and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897).
4 *Sources of N.T. Greek* (1895).
5 *Étude sur le Grec du N.T.* (1896).
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their disposal a store of trustworthy materials in the Oxford Concordance, and the larger Cambridge Septuagint will supply an accurate and sufficient textual guide. On the basis of these two works it ought to be possible for the workers of the twentieth century to prepare a satisfactory grammar and lexicon. Meanwhile in this chapter nothing more can be attempted than to set before the beginner some of the linguistic problems presented by the Greek of the Septuagint, and to point out the chief features which distinguish it from other forms of the language.

2. The student who enters upon this subject with some knowledge of the Greek New Testament must begin by reminding himself of the different conditions under which the two parts of the Greek Bible were produced. The Greek Old Testament was not like the New Testament the work of a single generation, nor are its books as homogeneous in their general character. The Septuagint is a collection of translations interspersed with original Greek works, the translations belonging partly to the third century B.C., partly to the second and first, and the original works chiefly to the end of this period. Even in the case of the Pentateuch we are not at liberty to assume that the translators worked at the same time or under the same circumstances. These considerations complicate our enquiry, and lead us to expect in the LXX. great varieties of manner and language. In the earlier work we shall meet with the colloquial Greek which the Jews learnt to speak shortly after their settlement in Egypt. Later translations will approximate to the literary style of the second century, except in cases where this tendency has been kept in check by a desire to follow the manner of the older

1 A lexicon was planned in 1895 by a Cambridge Committee, but the work is suspended for the present. There is some reason to hope that a Grammar may before long be undertaken by a competent scholar.
books. Lastly, in the original writings, many of which are relatively late, and in which the writers were free from the limitations that beset the translator, the Greek will be nearly identical with that which was written by the Jewish-Alexandrian historians and philosophers of the time.

3. We begin by investigating the literary conditions under which both the translators and the writers lived at Alexandria.

In the middle of the second century B.C. Polybius¹ found Alexandria inhabited by three races, the native Egyptians, who occupied the site of the old seaport Rhacôtis, the mercenary class (τὸ μισθοφορικόν), who may be roughly identified with the Jews, and the Greeks of the Brucheion, a mixed multitude claiming Hellenic descent and wedded to Hellenic traditions (ἐὰν μιγᾶτες, Ἑλληνες ὁμοί ἀνέκαθεν ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμέμηντο τοῦ καίνου τῶν Ἑλλήνων θους). This fusion of various elements in the Greek population of the city must have existed from the first. The original colony was largely made up of the veterans of Alexander's Macedonian army, volunteers from every part of Greece, and mercenaries from the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, and from Syria. Even in the villages of the Fayûm, as we now know, by the side of the Macedonians there were settlers from Libya, Caria, Thrace, Illyria, and even Italy², and Alexandria presented without doubt a similar medley of Hellenic types. Each class brought with it a dialect or idiom of its own. The Macedonian dialect, e.g., is said to have been marked by certain phonetic changes³, and the use of barbarous terms such as

¹ 1 ap. Strab. 797.
² Mahaffy in Flinders Petrie Papyri, i. p. 42. Cf. Empire of the Ptolemyes, p. 178 f.
³ As the change of φ into β (Βεξεβικη for Φεξεβικη, &c.), cf. Sturz, de dial. Mac., p. 51, n.
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Some of these passed into the speech of Alexandria, and with them were echoes of the older dialects—Doric, Ionic, Aeolic—and other less known local varieties of Greek. A mongrel patois, ἡ 'Αλεξανδρείαν διάλεκτος, as it was called in the title of the treatise of Demetrius Ixion, arose out of this confusion of tongues.

No monument of the Alexandrian 'dialect' remains, unless we may seek it in the earlier books of the Alexandrian Greek Bible. We have indeed another source from which light is thrown on the popular Greek of Egypt under the earlier Ptolemies. A series of epistolary and testamentary papyri has recently been recovered from the Fayûm, and given to the world under the auspices of the Royal Irish Academy; a similar collection has been issued at Berlin. The Greek of these documents is singularly free from dialectic forms, owing perhaps to local circumstances, as Professor Mahaffy suggests; but the vocabulary has, in common with the lxx., many striking words and forms, some of which are rare elsewhere.

The following list has been formed from the indices to the Flinders Petrie collection: ἀναθευράς, ἀναφύλακτος, ἀναφάλαντος, ἄρχεσωματοφύλακας, ἄρχεστεκτονείν, ἄχρονον, βασιλεύσα, γένημα, διώρυξ, ἔπιγυνη, ἔργοδικτής, εὐλάβος, ἐφίδειν, ἐφορεῖν, θέριστρον, ὀλυγοψυχεῖν, ὑχυρωμα, ὀψώνιον, παίδιον, παραδείσα, παρεπίδημος, περιδέξιον, περιοδεύειν, πράκτωρ, πρεσβύτερος, στενοχωρεῖν, χώρα. The Berlin papyri yield many other such words, e.g. ἀναμέτρησαι, γλύμμα, δικαίωμα, ἰεροφάλτης, ἰματισμός, καταλοχισμός, κτηνοτρόφος, μισοπονηρία, ὀλοσχερῆς, συμπλήρωσις, ὑπομνηματισμός.

1 A list of these words, collected from Hesychius and other lexicographers, may be seen in Sturz, p. 34 ff.
2 From Q. Curtius (De rebus gestis Alexandri M., vi. 9. 36) it appears that the Macedonian and the native Greeks understood one another with difficulty.
3 In the Cunningham Memoirs for 1891,'93, edited by Prof. Mahaffy.
4 Ἁγινήτισικε Ορκούκκνα δέν κόηγίλ. Μυζέν τοι Βερλίν. Χριστιανικής Ορκ. Ι. ΙІ. (1895). Further contemporary illustrations of Alexandrian Greek may be found in Wilcken's Griechische Ostraka (1899).
The following letter of the time of Philadelphus will serve to shew the style of these documents, and at the same time the use in them of certain Septuagint words. It is addressed by the foremen (δεκάταρχοι) of a gang engaged in a stone quarry to the engineer of the works (ἀρχιτέκτων):

Κλέωνι χαίρειν. οἱ δεκάταρχοι τῶν ἐλευθέρων λατόμων ἀδικοῦμεθα. τὰ γὰρ ὁμολογήθεντα ὕπο τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ διωκτοῦ οὐθέν γίνεται ἡμῖν, ἐχει ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν Διώτιμος. σπουδάσων οὐν ὑπὸ καθὰ ἐξειληφαμένη ἡμῖν, ὑπὸ Διονυσίου καὶ Διοτίμου χρηματισθη ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ τὰ ἔργα ἐνελεύθην, καθὰ καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐγένετο. εἶν γὰρ αἰσθανταί οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι οὐθέν ἡμᾶς εἰληφότας τὸν σιδηρὸν ἐνέχυρα θησούσιν.

4. Simultaneously with the growth of the colloquial mixed dialect, a deliberate attempt was made at Alexandria to revive the glories of classical Greek. The first Ptolemy, who had been the companion of Alexander’s early days, retained throughout his life a passion for literature and learning. Prompted, perhaps, by Demetrius of Phalerum, Soter founded at Alexandria the famous Museum, with its cloisters and lecture rooms and dining hall where scholars lived a common life under a warden appointed by the King. To Soter is also attributed the establishment of the great library which is said to have contained 400,000 codices. Under his successor the Museum and Library became a centre of literary activity, and the age to which the inception of the Greek Bible is usually ascribed produced Aratus, Callimachus, Herondas, Lycothron, and Theocritus. There is however no reason to suppose that the Jewish translators were officially connected with the Museum, or that the classical revival under Soter and Ptolemy affected them directly. Such traces of a literary style as we find in the Greek Pentateuch are probably

1 Flinders Petrie Papyri, II. xiii. (p. 33). The reader will notice several LXX. words (δεκάταρχος = LXX. δεκάδ., διωκτή, χρηματίσθαι, ἐνέχυρον). Sometimes these papyri afford illustrations of the LXX. which are not merely verbal; cf. II. xiv. 2 ἐσ τα ἔχυρα πρὸς τὴν πληθυν. 2 Strabo, 794; cf. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 91 ff. 3 Joseph., ant. xii. 2. Seneca, de tranquil. animae 9. Cf. Susemihl, Gesch. d. griech. Litteratur in d. Alexandrinerzeit, i. 336.
due not to the influence of the scholars of the Royal Library, but to the traditions of Greek writing which had floated down from the classical period and were already shaping themselves under altered conditions into a type of Greek which became the common property of the new Hellenism.

5. The later Greek, the κοινή or Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος—the dialect in general use among Greek-speaking peoples from the fourth century onwards—was based on Attic Greek, but embraced elements drawn from all Hellenic dialects. It was the literary language of the cosmopolitan Hellas created by the genius of Alexander. The change had begun indeed before Alexander. Even Xenophon allows himself to make free use of words of provincial origin, and to employ Attic words with a new connotation; and the writings of Aristotle mark the opening of a new era in the history of the Greek language. But the golden age of the κοινή begins in the second century with Polybius (c. B.C. 145), and extends a century or two beyond the Christian era, producing such writers as Diodorus Siculus (B.C. 40), Strabo (A.D. 10), Plutarch (A.D. 90), and Pausanias (A.D. 160). The language used by the writers of the Greek Diaspora may be regarded as belonging to a subsection of an early stage of the κοινή, although, since the time of Scaliger, it has been distinguished from the latter by the term 'Hellenistic.' A 'Hellenist' is properly a foreigner who affects Greek manners and speaks the Greek tongue. Thus the Jewish Greek spoken in Palestine was 'Hellenistic' in the strictest sense. The word is often used to describe the Greek of such thoroughly Hellen-
ised writers as Philo and Josephus, and the post-apostolic teachers of the ancient Church; but it is applied with special appropriateness to the Alexandrian Bible and the writings of the New Testament, which approach most nearly to the colloquial Greek of Alexandria and Palestine.

6. Such were the local types of Greek upon which the Jewish translators of the O.T. would naturally mould their work. While the colloquial Greek of Alexandria was their chief resource, they were also influenced, in a less degree, by the rise of the later literary style which was afterwards known as the κοινή.

We are now prepared to begin our examination of the vocabulary and grammar of the Alexandrian Bible, and we may commence by testing the vocabulary in the translated books. Let us select for this purpose the first three chapters of Exodus, 1 Kingdoms, 2 Chronicles, Proverbs, and Jeremiah, books which are, perhaps, fairly representative of the translation as a whole. Reading these contexts in the Cambridge manual edition, and underlining words which are not to be found in the Greek prose of the best period, we obtain the following results. In Exod. i.—iii. there are 19 such words; in 1 Regn. i.—iii., 39; in 2 Chron. i.—iii., 27; in Prov. i.—iii., 16; in Jer. i.—iii., 34; making a total of 135 later words in 15 chapters, or nine to a chapter. Of these words 52—considerably more than a third—appear to be peculiar to the LXX., or to have been used there for the first time in extant literature.

The following are the Septuagintal words observed in the above-named passages. Verbs: ἀνδριοῦν, δευτεροῦν, διωδεύειν, ἔνευλογείσθαι, ἔξολεθρεύειν, ἔξοδουν, ἔνοδον, κατακληρονομεῖν, κατασκοπεύειν, κατεμβλέπειν, κατοδυω, ὀλεθρεύειν, ὀρθοτείμες, ὀρθρίζειν, πνευματοφορεῖσθαι, πτωχίζειν, σκοτεύειν, συνεδριάζειν, τριετίζειν, τροφεύειν, φιλεχθράν. Nouns: ἀγάπη, ἀσύνθεσις, ἀσφαλότοινα, βδέλυγμα, γένημα, δόμα, ἑργοδιώκτης, θλιμός, καταπέτασμα, κρίμα, λατόμος, μέθυμα, ὀλοκαυτώμα, ὀλοκαινώσις, ὀρόφωμα, παντοκράτωρ,
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προσήλυτος, πρὸσκομμα, ροῦσκος, σύντριμμα. Foreign words (a) with Greek terminations: ἀβρα, βῆθις, σῖκλος. (b) transliterated: αἰλάρι, δαβειρ, ἐφούδ βάρ, νέβελ, ἔλαι σαβαωθ, οἰφι, σερσέρεθ, χερονβειμ.

A similar experiment has been made by Dr H. A. A. Kennedy in reference to one of the books of the Pentateuch. Of 110 late words and forms observed in Deut. i.—x. he found that 66 belonged to Biblical Greek, 16 of these being peculiar to the LXX.; of 313 such words in the entire book, 152 proved to be Biblical, and 36 peculiar to the Old Testament; nearly half belonged to the κοινή, and more than a fourth had been used by the writers of tragedy and comedy.

A complete list of the late words in the LXX. is still a desideratum. Lists which have been made for the N.T. shew that out of 950 post-Aristotelian words about 314—just under one third—occur also in the Greek O.T. But the writers of the N.T. have taken over only a part—perhaps a relatively small part—of the vocabulary of the LXX. As Dr T. K. Abbott has pointed out, the 51st Psalm alone yields four important words (ἀγαθόνευν, ἀκοντίζειν, ἀνόμημα, ἀνταναρεῖν) which find no place in the N.T. This fact is suggestive, for the Psalm is doctrinally important, and the words are such as would have lent themselves readily to N.T. use.

The following LXX. words are condemned by Phrynichus as non-Attic: αἰχμαλώτιζεσθαι, ἀποσπώτεραι, βασιλισσα, βουνός, βρέχειν (in the sense of ὑεν), γρηγορεῖν, ἐλεύσεσθαι, ἐξάδελφος, κατόρθωμα, μεγιστάν, μέθυσος, οἰκοδομή, παιδίσκη, πάπυρος, παρεμβολή, πεποίθησις, πληζιμα, ρύμη, σκορπίζεσθαι, σύνσημον. Some of these words are said to be provincialisms; e.g. βουνός is Sicilian, σκορπίζεσθαι is Ionic, παρεμβολή and ρύμη are Macedonian.

As our knowledge of Alexandrian Greek increases, it may be that the greater part of the words which have been regarded as peculiar to the LXX. will prove to belong to the usage of Egyptian

1 Kennedy, op. cit., p. 62. Cf. the lists in the appendix to Grimm-Thayer’s Lexicon of N. T. Greek (p. 691 ff.).
2 Essays, p. 69.
3 See above, p. 292.
Greek. Deissmann has already shewn that many well-known Septuagintal words find a place in the Greek papyri of the Ptolemaic period, and therefore presumably belonged to the language of business and conversation at Alexandria. Thus γογγυζεῖν occurs in a papyrus of 241—239 B.C.; ἐργοδιώκτης, 255 B.C.; παρεπίδημος, 225 B.C.; forms such as ήλθα, ἐπῆλθοσαν, γέγοναν, οἶδες, can be quoted from the papyri passim; ἀναστρέφθηναι and ἀναστροφή in an ethical sense, λειτουργεῖν in reference to the service of a deity, περιστέρεας of circumcision, πρεσβύτερος of an official, are shewn to have been in use in Egypt under the Ptolemies. In many cases however words receive a new connotation, when they pass into Biblical Greek and come into contact with Hebrew associations. As examples the following may suffice: ἀγγέλος, γραμματεύς, διάβολος, εἴδωλον, ἔθνη, ἐκκλησία, παντοκράτορ, πεντηκοστή, προσήλυτος, χριστός.

The forms of many words have undergone a change since the age of classical Greek. A few specimens may be given from the pages of Phrynichus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attic Greek</th>
<th>Greek of the LXX</th>
<th>Attic Greek</th>
<th>Greek of the LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκτείνασθαι</td>
<td>ἀποκτείναθαι</td>
<td>μαρὸς</td>
<td>μειρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφείλετο</td>
<td>ἀφείλετο</td>
<td>μόχλος</td>
<td>μόκλος (MSS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄχρι, μέχρι</td>
<td>ἄχρις, μέχρις</td>
<td>νεοσσός, -σία</td>
<td>νοσσός, -σία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενέσθαι</td>
<td>γενέσθαι</td>
<td>νομηνία</td>
<td>νομηνία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλωσσοκομεῖον</td>
<td>γλώσσοκομον</td>
<td>ὅρθρος</td>
<td>ὅρθρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διψήν</td>
<td>διψῶν</td>
<td>σῦδες</td>
<td>σῦδες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύναι</td>
<td>δύναι</td>
<td>πεινῶν</td>
<td>πεινῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐδέιτο</td>
<td>ἐδέετο</td>
<td>πῆχεων</td>
<td>πηχῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐρήμα</td>
<td>εὐρῆμα</td>
<td>ποδατός</td>
<td>ποτατός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθά</td>
<td>καθός</td>
<td>τάχυτερον</td>
<td>τάχιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταμύειν</td>
<td>καταμύειν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. But the vocabulary of the LXX. is not its most characteristic feature. With no other vocabulary than that of the Alexandrian translators, it might be possible to produce a fairly good piece of Greek prose in the style of the later prose writers. It is in its manner, in the construction of the sentences and the disposition of the words, that the Greek of the LXX. is unique, and not only or chiefly in its lexical eccentricities. This may perhaps be brought home to the student most effectually by a comparison of the Greek Bible with two great Hellenistic writers of the first century A.D. (a) In the works of Philo we have a cultured Hellenist's commentary on
the earlier books of the LXX., and as he quotes his text verbatim, the student can discern at a glance the gulf which divides its simple manner, half Semitic, half colloquial, from the easy command of idiomatic Greek manifested by the Alexandrian exegete. We will give two brief specimens.

Philo de opif. mundi 7: φησι δ' ὡς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὴν γῆν· τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαμβάνων, οὐχ ὡς ὅμοια τινες τὴν κατὰ χρόνον, χρόνος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν πρὸ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἦ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦ μετ' αὐτοῦ. ἐπεὶ γὰρ διάστημα τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευάζω ἡ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ, προτέρα δὲ τοῦ κινουμένου κινήσεως οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὴν ἦ ύστερον ἦ αμα συνιστάται, ἀναγκαῖοι αὐτὰ καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἢ ἑστικά κόσμου γεγονέναι ή νέστερον ἐκείνων· προσβλέτερον δ' ἀποφαίνεσθαι τολμᾶν ἀφιλόσοφοιν. Οὐ γάρ ἄν οὐκ ἦν ἀρχή, οὐκ ἦν ἀρχή, οὐκ ἦν ἀρχή, οὐκ ἦν ἀρχή, ἦ ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρχην ἄρ χρόνον ἢ ἑστικά κόσμου γεγονέναι ή νέστερον ἐκείνων· προσβλέτερον δ' ἀποφαίνεσθαι τολμᾶν ἀφιλόσοφοιν. 

(b) Josephus is not a commentator, but a historian who uses the LXX. as an authority, and states the facts in his own words. We will contrast a few passages of the Greek Bible with the corresponding contexts in the Antiquities.

Exod. ii. 2—4.

ἔσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μὴνα τρεῖς . . . ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ βιβίων, καὶ κατέχρισεν αὐτὴν ἀσφαλτοπίσση καὶ ἔνεβαλεν τὸ παιδίον εἰς αὐτὴν... καὶ κατεφόρησεν ἡ ἀδελφή αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν μαθεῖν τι ὡς ἄρρηστον αὐτῷ...

1 Regn. i. 1—4.

ἀνδροτες ἦν ἐξ 'Αρμαθάμ... εξ ὀρους Ἐφράμ... καὶ τούτῳ δύο γυναίκες δώον ημεῖς ημᾶς Ἄννα καὶ ἡ μα Φενάνα, καὶ ἦν η Ἄννα καὶ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ ημᾶς καὶ τῇ Ἰερουσαλήμ ημᾶς παίδια, καὶ τῇ Αννα οὐκ ἦν παιδίον . . . πλὴν ὅτι τὴν Ἰταν 'Ανναν ἡγάπα Ἑλκαν ὑπὲρ ταύτην.

Joseph. ant. ii. 9. 4.

τρεῖς μὲν μήνα παρ' αὐτοῖς τρέφοντες λαυμάντες... μηχανώνται πλέγμα βιβλίων... ὑπείκα χρίσαντες ἀσφάλτῳ... ἐντιθέσαι τὸ παιδίον... Μαριάμ δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀδελφῆς... αὐτὶ παρέξει περιέμονον ὅποι χορηγῇς ὀφομένη τὸ πλέγμα.

Joseph. ant. v. 10. 2.

ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ πολιτῶν τῆς Ἐφραίμ κληρονόμοις Ῥαμαθαν πόλιν κατοικίαν ἑγάμα δύο γυναῖκας Ἄνναν τε καὶ Φιλιάν. ἐκ δὲ ταύτης καὶ παίδες αὐτῷ γίνονται, ἥν δὲ ἔτεραν ἀτέκνον οὐσαν ἀγαπῶν διετέλει.
2 Chron. iii. 1—2.  
καὶ ἦρατο Σαλωμών τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου.  
καὶ ἦρατο οἰκοδομῆν ἐν τῷ μνήμι  
τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ τῇ τετάρτᾳ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ.

Isa. xxxix. 6—7.  
ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα ἔρχονται καὶ  
λήψεται πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ  
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου διὰ  
γεννήσεις λήψεται καὶ ποιήσεσθαι στάθησαι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ  
tοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Βαβυλώνων.

Joseph. ant. viii. 3. 1.  
τῆς δὲ οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ  
Σαλωμών ἦρατο τέσσαραν ἔτος ἦδη  
tῆς βασιλείας ἐξὼν μνήμι δευτέρῳ.

Joseph. ant. x. 2. 2.  
ἰσθι οὖ μετ' ὀλίγων χρόνων εἰς  
Βαβυλῶνα σου τούτων μετατεθησόμενον τῶν πλοίων καὶ τοὺς ἐκ-  
γόνους εὐνοχισθησόμενον καὶ  
ἀπολέσαντας τὸ ἄνδρας εἶναι, τῷ  
Βαβυλωνίῳ δουλεύσαντας βασίλεις.

Josephus, it will be seen, has rewritten each passage, and  
in doing so, has not only modified the vocabulary, but revo­  
lutionised the style. On turning from the left hand to the  
right hand column we pass from a literal translation of Semitic  
texts to an imitation of classical Greek. But the contrast is  
not entirely due to the circumstance that the passages taken  
from the Septuagint are translations, while the Antiquities  
is an original work. Translations, however faithful, may be  
in the manner of the language into which they render their  
original. But the manner of the LXX. is not Greek, and does  
not even aim at being so. It is that of a book written by  
men of Semitic descent, who have carried their habits of  
thought into their adopted tongue. The translators write  
Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it; they possess a  
plentiful vocabulary and are at no loss for a word, but they  
are almost indifferent to idiom, and seem to have no sense  
of rhythm. Hebrew constructions and Semitic arrangements  
of the words are at times employed, even when not directly  
suggested by the original. These remarks apply especially  
to the earlier books, but they are true to a great extent in  
regard to the translations of the second century; the manner  
of the older translations naturally became a standard to which
later translators thought it right to conform themselves. Thus the grandson of Jesus son of Sirach writes his prologue in the literary style of the Alexandrian Jews of the time of Euergetes, but in the body of the work he drops into the Biblical manner, and his translation differs little in general character from that of the Greek version of Proverbs.

8. From the general view of the subject we proceed to a detailed account of some of the more characteristic features of the language of the LXX. They fall under three heads—orthography, accidence, syntax. Under the second head a full list of examples from the Pentateuch will be given, with the view of familiarising the beginner with the vocabulary of the earlier books.

I. Orthography.

In the best MSS. of the LXX. as of the N.T. a large number of peculiar spellings occur, of which only a part can be assigned to itacism and other forms of clerical error. In many of the instances where the great uncial MSS. of the Greek Bible persistently depart from the ordinary orthography they have the support of inscriptions contemporary with the translators, and it is manifest that we have before us specimens of a system which was prevalent at Alexandria¹ and other centres of Greek life² during the third and second centuries before Christ.

To a considerable extent the orthography of the MSS. is the same in the LXX. and the N.T. The student may find ample information with regard to the N.T. in the Notes on Orthography appended to Westcott and Hort's Introduction, and in the best N.T. grammars (Ph. Buttmann, Winer- ¹ Cf. Sturz, de dial. Maced., p. 111 ff.
² See (e.g.) K. Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften (Berlin, 1885); Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, Marburg, 1897. E. Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, i. Teil, Leipzig, 1898 (Progr. des Gymn. Heilbronn).
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Moulton, Winer-Schmiedel, Blass). But even in MSS. which like ΝΒΑΣ originally contained the whole of the Greek Scriptures, the Greek Old Testament possesses an orthography which is in part peculiar to itself, and certain features which are common to both Old and New Testaments are found with greater frequency and with a wider application in the LXX. than in the N.T. The reader of the Cambridge manual LXX., who is interested in this question, can readily work out the details from the apparatus criticus, and more especially from the appendix, where he will find all the spellings of the uncial MSS. employed which were not thought worthy of a place in the footnotes to the text. For those to whom orthography is of little interest the specimens given below will probably suffice.

Consonants. Assimilation neglected in compounds: ἐγναστηρίμυθος, συνκατακληρονομείων, συνσεισμός, ἐνκαίνια, ἐνχειρίδιον. Assimilation where there is no composition: ἐμ μέσῳ, ἐγ γαστρί. Use of ν ἐφελκνυστικῶν before consonants (omission is rare, except in a few cases such as πᾶσι before the art.); use of the final ν in ἄχρις, μέχρις, οὕτως, ἀντικρός. Retention of the μ in fut. and aor. pass. of λαμβάνειν (λήμψομαι, ἑλμφθην), and in words formed from it, e.g. πρόσλημμις, προσωπολημμεῖ. Οὐθείς, μηθείς for οἴθείς, μηθείς. Τ dropped in the middle of a word between vowels, as κρανή, ὀλίς, φεύγει (especially in cod. Ν). Τ not doubled in compounds, e.g. ἐπιραντίζειν, κολοβώμις, κατάκρατος), and reduplicated in the augment (μεραντιμένων): σο for ττ in έλάσσων, ἤσσων, and ρο for ρρ in ἄρανη, θαρσίν. In some verbal forms consonants are doubled, e.g. βέννειν, κτέννειν, χύννειν. Rough and smooth consonants are occasionally exchanged, e.g. κύβρα (1 Regn. ii. 14, B) for χύτρα.

Vowels. Ει for ι in syllables where ι is long, e.g. Semitic words such as Δενεί, Δενεῖτς, Δανείδ, Δειών, and Greek words as τραπεζητής, γείνεσθαι, γειώσκειν. Also (perhaps by itacism) in innumerable instances of ι: e.g. κεινεῖν, καθείσαι, κλείνῃ, κρεινεῖν. Ι for ει, e.g. τίχος, λιτούργειν, ἀλφάειν, ἀλιμμα, κατελύθην, παράδιγμα, δανίζειν, ὀθωλείς, αύγιος, and esp. in nouns in -εία, εία, e.g. ἀπολία, είδία, παιδία, Σαμαρία, στρατία, and those in είναι, as δάναον, εἰδώλιον. Α for ε, as ἐραυνάν; ε for α, as ἐκαθερισθην, μερός, τεσσεράκοντα.

1 Especially in cod. B (Ο.Τ. in Greek, 1. p. xiii.).
Omission of a syllable consisting of ɛ, as in πεῦν, ταμεῖν. Prefixing of a vowel, as in ἔγθες.


Abnormal spellings such as these occur on every page of an uncial MS. of the LXX. and sometimes cause great perplexity to an editor of the text. So far as they correctly represent the written or spoken Greek of the period, their retention is, generally speaking, desirable. In some cases the MSS. are unanimous, or each MS. is fairly persistent in its practice; in others, the spelling fluctuates considerably. The Cambridge manual LXX. usually adopts a spelling which is persistently given by the MS. whose text it prints, and on the same principle follows the fluctuations of its MS. where they are of any special interest. But the whole question of orthography is far from having reached a settlement.

II. Accidence. We will deal with (i.) the formation of words, (ii.) the declension of nouns, (iii.) the conjugation of verbs.

(i.) Formation of words.

(a) Words formed by termination:

Verbs. In -ον from nouns in -ος: ἀμαυρόν, ἀποδεκατοῦν, ἀπολυτρόν, ἀποτυφλοῦν, ἀσφαλτοῦν, διαβιοῦν, ἑκτυποῦν, ἑλαττοῦν, ἑπὶ-διπλοῦν, ἑπισεπτοῦν, ἑρμηδανοῦν, εὐάδον, καταχρυσοῦν, κυροῦν, παλαιοῦν, παραχλοῦν, περικυκλοῦν, συγκυροῦν. In -ίζειν, -άζειν, -άξειν, -ύζειν: ἀγάζειν, ἀφτίζειν, ἀκοτίζειν, ἀναβίβαζειν, ἀναθεσάζειν, ἀπογαλακτίζειν, αὐγάζειν, ἀφαγνίζειν, ἀφανίζειν, ἀφορίζειν, βαδίζειν, γελοιάζειν, γρύζειν, δανίζειν, διαγγυγίζειν, διασκεδάζειν, διασκορπίζειν, διαχωρίζειν, ἐκδηρίζειν, ἐκκλησάζειν, ἐκμελείζειν, ἐκπερματίζειν, ἐκτοκίζειν, ἐνταφίαζειν, ἐνυπνάζει, ἐνωτίζεισθα, ἐξεικονίζειν, ἐξεταζειν, ἐξοπλίζειν, ἐξογραφίζειν, ἐπικλίζειν, ἐπικαταβάζειν, ἐπιστομάζειν, ἐπισφημίζειν, θυσίας, καταβίβαζειν, κατασκιάζειν, κυτασοφίζειν, κληδονίζειν, κομίζειν, κουφίζειν, λεπίζειν, λευκαλίζειν, μακάριζειν, μελίζειν, οἰνονίζειν, ωναίρειν, ὅπταζειν, ῥηρίζειν, παραδειγματίζειν, παραδοξάζειν, παραλογίζειν, περισπί-
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Nouns.

In -µ.a, from verbs: ἀγίασμα, ἀγνόσμα, ἀδίκημα, ἀνιγμα, ἀδλαγμα, ἀνάστημα, ἀνόμημα, ἀνταπώδεμα, ἀπόδομα, ἀσέβημα, ἀδάκαμα, ἀφαίρεμα, θεδελμα, διήγημα, δικαίωμα, διόργυμα, διχοτόμημα, δόμα, ἐγκατάλημμα, ἐδεσμα, ἐκκαλαμμα, ἐκτύπωμα, ἐπίθεμα, ἐπικαλύμμα, ἐπίστευμα, ἐψήμα, ἡμίσευμα, θήρευμα, θυσιασμα, ἱεράτευμα, κάρτωμα, κατάκαμα, καταπέτασμα, καύχημα, κλεμμα, λέτισμα, ὀλοκαύτωμα, ὄραμα, ὄφειλημα, ὄχυρωμα, παράδειγμα, παράδειμμα, περίψωμα, προσόχθισμα, πρώταγμα, πρωτογένημα, στερεώμα, συναντήμα, συνκαλύμμα, σύντημα, τάγμα, τίμημα, τόξευμα, φαλάκρωμα, φύλαγμα, φύραμα, χόρτασμα, χώνευμα.

In μός, from verbs: ἀφαινόμος, γογγυσμός, ἐνδεχομίστως, ἐνπρισμός, ἐξιλασμός, ἐπιστισμός, ἰματισμός, καθαρισμός, μηρυκισμός, οἰωνισμός, ὀρισμός, ὀρκισμός, παροξυσμός, πειραμός, σταθμός, στεναγμός, φραγμός, χωρισμός.

In -σις, from verbs: ἀναίρεσις, ἀνάμνησις, ἀποκείμενης, ἀφεσις, βεβαιώσις, γόγγυσις, γύμνωσις, δήλωσις, διάβασις, διασάσπισις, ἐκδικησις, ἐκτατισις, ἐκχυσις, ἐπερώτησις, κατακάρπωσις, κατάλεψις, κατάσχεσις, κατοίκησις, ὀλοκάρπωσις, ὀλοκάύτωσις, ὀμοίωσις, πλήρωσις, πόρευσις, πράσις, σύγκρασις, συνάντησις, συντήρησις, σύστασις, ταπείνωσις, ὑπερόρασις, ὑπεροψία, ὑπόστασις, φανίς, χαράκως, χήρευσις.

In -η, from verbs: ἀλοιφή, ἀναγκή, ἀποσκευή, ἀποστολή, ἀποστροφή, ἀφή, διασκεύη, δυχή, ἐκτριβή, ἐντολή, ἐπαγωγή, ἐπισκοπή, καταφυγή, δική, παραβολή, προνοιά, προφυλαγή, συναγωγή, τροπή.

In τῆς, from verbs (m.): αἰνιγματιστής, ἐνταφιαστής, ἐγερηγής, ἐπιθυμητής, ἐρμηνευτής, πολεμιστής, ραβδιευτής, σκεπαστής, σχολαστής.

Adjectives.

In -ως: δειλίως, δερμάτινος, καρύνως, ὀστράκινος, πράσινως, στυράκινος, φλάγινος.

In -ός: ἐναντίως, ὀμομυρίος, πολυχρόνως, ὑποχείρως.

In -ικός: ἀρσενικός, εἰρημικός, λαμπηρικός, λιθουργικός, μυριβικός, πατρικός, ποικιλικός, πολεμικός, προφανιστικός.

In -τός: ἀκατακείμενος, ἀλυσιδωτός, ἀόρατος, ἀπερικάθαρος, ἐπικατάρατος, εὐλογιτός, λάζευτος, μυσθωτός, ὀνομαστός, πλεοναστός, φορολογιστός.

(d) Words formed by composition:

Verbs compounded with two prepositions: ἀνθυφαίρεῖν, ἀνταποδοῦναι, ἀποκαθιστᾶν, ἐνκαταλεῖπεν, ἐνεπιτατείν, ἐξαναστέλλειν,
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Nouns. Compounded with nouns: ἄσβαλτόποισα, δασύτων, ἐτερόγυνος, καμηλοπάρδαλις, κολοβόρις, μακροήρεος, μακροχρόνιος, μικρόθυμος, ὀλόκληρος, ὀλοπάρφυρος, πολυέλεος, πολυχρώνιος, σκληροτράχηλος, χωρογρύλλιον.

Compounded with a prefix or preposition: ἀντιπρόσωπος, Ἀντιλίβανος, ἄρχιδεσμοφύλαξ, ἀρχιδεμπότης, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιμάγειρος, ἀρχιοικός, ἀρχισυντοίοις, ἐπισπευτός, εὐπρόσωπος, κατάλοπος, κατάξιος, παράλοις, παρεπίδημος, περιέξιον, περιλύσιον, περίχωρος, ὑπανδρός, ὑπερμύχης.

Compounded with a verb stem, and forming a fresh noun or a verb: ἀνεμοφθόρος, γλωσσότυμος, ἑργοδίκτης, θανατηφόρος, θηραλώτως, θηροβρῶτος, ἵπποδρόμως, ἴδιονόφως, κτιστορόφος, νυμφαγωγός, στιοτόπος, σφυροκόπος, τελεσφόρος, χαροποιός, δι-χοσμείη, ζωογονεῖ, κλοποφορεῖ, κρεανοεῖ, λιβαδολεῖ, λιμαγχοεῖ, νευροκοπεῖ, ὄρυθοσκοπεῖ, συμβολοκοπεῖ, τεκνοποιεῖ, ψωμαγραῖ.

(ii.) Declension of nouns:

Declension 1. Nouns in -ρα, -εία, form gen. in ἅς, as μαχαίρης Gen. xxvii. 40, Exod. xv. 9 (“vielfach bei A, bes. in Jerem.,” W.-Schm.), κυνωμής Exod. viii. 17, ἐπιβεβηκής i Regn. xxv. 20.

Declension 2. Certain nouns in -ός end also in -ος, e.g. χειμαρρος, αἰδελδώς. The Attic form in -εός disappears; e.g. λαός and ναός are written for λέως and νεός—the latter however occurs in 2 Macc. (A). Nouns in -αρχον pass occasionally into the first declension, e.g. τοπάρχης Gen. xli. 34, κωμάρχης Esth. ii. 3, γενεσίάρχης Sap. xiii. 3.

Declension 3. Uncontracted forms are frequent, as βαβέα Job xii. 22, δοτέα, πῆχεων, χειλεών, and in the plural nom. and acc. of neuters in -ας, as κέρατα, πέρατα. Γήρας makes gen. γήρους dat. γῆρη. Metaplasmos occurs in some words, e.g. δῦο, δυσί, παν with masc. noun, πῦλη, πύλεων (3 Regn. xxii. 11, A), σάββασιν, τέσσαρες, τεσσάροις, χείρ, χείραν.

Proper nouns. Many are mere transliterations and indeclinable, e.g. Ἀδὰμ, Ἀβραὰμ, Ἡσαίας, Ἑρέμιας; while some are found in both forms, e.g. we have both Ἡλειοῦ and Ἡλείου, Ἐλεσσαία, Δανίηλ. On the other hand some well-known names receive Greek terminations and are declined, as Μωσῆς or Μωσής, Ἰσάξας, Ἡκάς, Ἑρεμίας; while some are found in both forms, e.g. we have both Ἡλειοῦ and Ἡλείου, Μανναςθή and Μανασσής, Σολομών indecl. and Σολομών gen. -μῶνος or -μάντος. But in the translated books the indeclinable forms prevail, and there is no appearance of the forms Ἀβραμος, Ἡσαήλος, Ἡσάης,
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which are familiar to the reader of Josephus. In the case of local names transliteration is usual, e.g. 'ἰερουσαλήμ, Βηθλεὲμ, Βαβδήλ, Σειῶν. A few however have Greek terminations, as Σαμάρεα or Σαμαρία, Ἰσραήλ, and some names of foreign localities are Hellenised, as Βαβυλὼν, Συρία, ἡ ἑρυθρὰ βάλασσα, ἠδουμαία, Λιγυπτίου, and the two Egyptian towns Ἡρώων πόλις (Gen. xlvi. 28), Ἡλίου πόλις (Exod. i. 11). The declension of the Hellenised names presents some irregularities; thus we find Μωυσῆς, -ση, -σει, -σην. Ἰσσοῦς, -σοῦ, -σοί, -σοῦν. Μανάσσης, -ση.

(iii.) Conjugation of verbs.

Augments. Doubled, as in κεκαθαράνται Num. xxii. 9, ἀπεκατέστησεν Gen. xxiii. 16, παρεσπυβλήθη Ps. xli. 13, 21 (A). Prefixed to prepositions, e.g. ἐπρονόμευσαν Num. xxi. 1, Deut. ii. 35, ἐπροβήτευσαν Num. xi. 25 f., ἡνωτίαντο 2 Esdr. xix. 30 (B). Lengthened, as ἦμελλον Sap. xviii. 4, ἡβουλομένη Isa. i. 29, xiii. 9, ἠθονθήνην, ἡδουσάθην, 2 Chr. xx. 37, Jer. v. 4. Omitted, as in ἀνέθη Jud. viii. 3, ἀφέθη Isa. xxxiii. 24, αὐτάρκησεν Deut. xxxii. 10, ἐξολοθρευθήν 1 Chr. xxi. 15, ἔδων Gen. i. 4, κατορθώθη 2 Chr. xxxv. 10.

Tenses and Persons. (1) Verbs in -ω. New presents, as ἀμφιάω, γηγορῶ, βέβαιον, κτένω. Futures and aorists with reduplication: κεκαθαράματι (Job vi. 5), ἐκεκραβά (Num. xi. 2), ἐπεπούθησα (Jud. ix. 26 A). Contracted futures in -ὁ from -άω: ἑργά Ἰερ. iv. 2, ἄρπα Lev. xix. 13, ἡκικάταυ Deut. xxxii. 43, ἐγκαύχα Ps. li. 3, συμβιβά Isa. xl. 13, ἀποδοκιμάω Jer. xxxviii. 37. Irregular futures: ἐδομαί, φάγομαι, ἥψω (Exod. iv. 9). Second aor. forms with termination in -ά: ἐδαμέν 1 Regn. x. 14, ἐφυγαν 2 Regn. x. 14, ἐφάγαμεν 2 Regn. xix. 42, ἐθάτω Esth. v. 4. Person endings: 2nd p. s. pres. pass. or middle in -ας: πίεσα, φάγεσα (Ezech. xiii. 18, Ruth ii. 9, 14), ἀπεξενοῦσα 3 Regn. xiv. 6. 3rd p. pl. imperf. and aor. act. in -ος: ἐγεννών 1 Gen. vi. 4, ἠθίδοναν Exod. xv. 27, κατελίτσουσαν Exod. xvi. 24, κατενενόωσαν Exod. xxxii. 8, ἠρυμενόωσαν Ezech. xxii. 11; cf. the opt. οἰδώσασαν Gen. xlii. 3, ἐλθώσαν Deut. xxii. 16. 3rd p. pl. aor. mid. in -εντο: ἐπελάθεντο Jud. iii. 7 (A), Hos. xiii. 6 (B), Jer. xviii. 15 (B* A), &c. 3rd p. pl. perf. act. in -αν: ἐώρακαν Deut. xi. 7; πέτοιμαν, Judith vii. 10. 2nd p. s. perf. act. in -ες: ἀπέταλκες Exod. v. 22; ἐδοκες, 2 Esdr. xix. 10, Ezech. xvi. 21. (2) Verbs in -μ. From εἴμι we have ἤμην, ἤσθα. From κάθημαι, κάθων Ps. cix. (ck.) i. From ἵστημι, ἐστηκέναι, ἐστηκώς. From δίδωμι, ἐδίδετο Exod. v. 13 (A), Jer. xii. 34; δοῖ, Ps. xli. 3 (B), 2 Regn. iii. 39 (A).

III. Syntax.

Many of the irregularities which fall under this head are
due to the influence of the Hebrew text or of Semitic habits of thought. These will be treated in the next section. In this place we shall limit ourselves to constructions which appear to be characteristic of the Greek idiom used by the translators.

**Cases and Numbers.** Nom. for voc., e.g. δ θεός for θείος, Ps. xxi. 2, esp. in the phrase Κύριε δ θεός; θυγατήρ = θυγατέρ, Ruth ii. 2, 22, iii. 1, &c. Disuse of the Dual.

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

**Numerals.** ἐπτά = ἐπτάκις, Gen. iv. 24. Omission of καί when numbers are coupled, e.g. δέκα δύο, δέκα ἕξ, δέκα πέντε, &c.

**Verbs.** Rarity of the optative mood, and disappearance of that mood in dependent clauses. Periphrasis with εἰμί, e.g. πέποικος ἔσομαι, 2 Regn. xxi. 3; ἦσθι πεποικός, Prov. iii. 5. Indicative with ἄν: imperf. and aor., ὅταν εἰσήρχετο, Gen. xxxviii. 9; ὅταν ἔπηρεν, Exod. xvii. 11; ὅταν κατέβη, Num. xi. 9; ἡνίκα ἄν εἰσεπορεύετο, Jud. vi. 3; ἔδω ἐσπειρα, Jud. vi. 2. Coordination of indicative with conjunctive: Exod. viii. 8 ἔκαστο οὖν αὐτός, καὶ θύσω, Lev. vi. 2 ὑψη ἔδω ἀμάρτη καὶ...παρίδη...καὶ ψεύστη, ἦ ἡδίκησεν...ἐδέρεν...καὶ ψεύστηκα...καὶ ὁμός κτλ. Use of infinitive, with or without the article, to express object, purpose, subject, or result: e.g. (a) εἶπεν ἄνελειν, Exod. ii. 15; ἡρξατο τοῦ οἴκονδεμεν, 2 Chr. iii. 1; (b) παραγινεται βοσθίγω, 2 Regn. viii. 5; ἀπέστειλεν τοῦ ἰδείν, Gen. viii. 7; (c) συνέβη κρεμασθήναι, Gen. xli. 13; τὸ προσκολλάσθαι ἅγιον Ps. lixxii. 28; (d) ὁ θεός ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατώσαι καὶ ζωωποίσαι, 4 Regn. v. 7.

**Connexion of the sentence.** Use of gen. abs. in reference to the subject of the verb: e.g. πορευομένου σου...δρα, Exod. iv. 21. Anacoluthon: ἵδιν δὲ Φαραώ...ἐβαρύνθη ἦ καρδία Φαραώ, Exod. ix. 7. Use of the finite verb where the classical language prefers to employ a participle.

9. Besides the non-classical forms and constructions which may fairly be placed to the credit of Alexandrian Greek, the translated books of the Greek Bible naturally exhibit a large

---

I follow mainly the classification of C. W. Votau in his excellent thesis on the subject (Chicago, 1896). Votau has shewn that in the translated books of the O. T. there is almost an equal number of cases of the anarthrous and the articular inf., whereas in the N. T. the articular inf. is seldom found except in St Luke.
number of irregularities which are of Semitic origin. The following are examples.

(a) Lexical.

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

2. Words coined or adopted to express Semitic ideas, as ἀκροβυστία, ἀναθεματίζειν, δολωτώμα, προσωπολυμπτεῖν, σκανδαλίζειν, σπλαγχνίζειν.

3. Phrases answering to the Hebrew idiom: e.g. ἀρτον φαγεῖν = μὴ λείψῃ, ἔλεος ποιεῖν μετά τινος = μὴ ἱπεῖ σήπε, ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου = θηέει ψυχήν, ὁσιὰ σωτηρίου = μὴ χρεῖ σάρξ, πάσα σάρξ = ἔσται, λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον = μὴ λαβεῖς, πιάσα σάρξ = μὴ πιάσῃς, νῦν τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἐνός ἐνιαυτῶν = καὶ παραπλεῦσαι.

4. Words with a new connotation: ἄγιος, ἀμαρτωλός, ἀρετή, ἀφόρισμα, ἀφόρων, διάθηκη, δικαστήριον, εἰκήσεως, ἐξελασμός, καρδία, Κύριος ὁ κύριος, λειτουργεῖν, ματαιώσης, διηύθυς, πειράζειν, προφήτης, πτωχός, σάρξ, φυγαδευτήριον.

(b) Grammatical.

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

Pronouns. Otiose use, e.g. Gen. xxx. 1 τελευτήσῃ εγὼ (ἡμών ἡμᾶς); Exod. ii. 14 σὺ θέλεις (ἡμῖν ἡμᾶς); Exod. xxxvi. 4 αὐτός, αὐτοί. To Semitic influence is also due the wearisome iteration of the oblique cases of personal pronouns answering to the Hebrew suffixes, e.g. Jer. ii. 26 αὐτοί καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀρχινισταὶ αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ λεπέλεις αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ προφητεῖς αὐτῶν. The fem. αὐτή is occasionally used for τούτῳ after the manner of the Heb. הָנִּי, as in Gen. xxxiv. 17, 27, xxxvi. 1, Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 23; see Driver on 1 Sam. iv. 7. To the circumstance that the Hebrew relative is indeclinable we owe the pleonastic use of the pronoun after the Greek relative in such passages as Gen. xxviii. 13, ἐφ' ἡς...ἐπ' αὐτῆς (ἡμῖν...ἡμᾶς); Deut. i. 22 δι' ἡς...ἐν αὐτῇ.

1 On this head see esp. Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 132 ff.; Thiersch, de Pental. vers. Alex., p. iii ff.
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Verbs. The following Hebraisms may be specially noted. Various phrases used to represent the Heb. inf. abs. when prefixed to a finite verb, e.g. Exod. iii. 7, ἢδὲν ἢδόν (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν); Deut. xxi. 18, ἀποστρέφῃ ἀποστρέψω (Ῥωμαίοι Ἀρσεν). Also the Heb. idiom ἡρέμη: e.g. Exod. xiv. 13, οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἐκεῖ ἰδεῖν, 1 Regn. iii. 6 προσέθητο καὶ ἐκάλεσεν (cf. v. 8 προσέθη καλέσαι, Job xxix. 1 προσέθη ἐπεν (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν)). Constructions with prepositions contrary to the Greek idiom: βδελύσεσθαι ἀπό (Ῥωμαίοι Ἀρσεν), Exod. i. 12; φείδησθαι ἐπί, Deut. vii. 16; ἐπερωτάν ἐν Κυρίῳ (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν), 1 Regn. x. 22; εὐδοκεῖν ἐν or ἐπί (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν). Hebrew forms of adjuration as 1 Regn. iii. 14 εἰ (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν) ἐξελάσσησται, ib. 17 τάδε ποιήσει σοι ὁ θεὸς, εἰν... A question standing for the expression of a wish: Num. xi. 29 καὶ τίς δῷ πάντα τὸν λαὸν Κυρίῳ...; Ps. lii. (liii.) 6 τις δώσει ἐκ Σείων τῷ σωτῆρι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; 'Εγὼ εἰμι followed by an ind. (Jud. vii. 18 'Εγὼ εἰμι καθόσομαι, 2 Regn. ii. 2 ἑγὼ εἰμι πορεύσομαι—a construction limited in B to Judges, Ruth, 2—4 Regn. Periphrases such as ἐσομαι διδόναι (Tob. v. 15, BA). Pleonastic use of λέγων = Ῥωμαίοι, often solocastically: e.g. Gen. xv. 1 ἐγεννήθη ἡμὰ Κυρίῳ...λέγων, xlv. 16 διεβόθη ἡ φωνή...λέγοντες.

Particles. Pleonastic use of καὶ and δε, (1) in an apodosis, e.g. Num. xv. 14, εἰν...προσεγίνηται,...καὶ ποιήσει κάρπωμα; Prov. i. 28, ἐσται διὰ...ἐγὼ δέ...; (2) after a participle: Num. xxi. 11, καὶ ἐξῆλθαν...καὶ παρενεβαλον. Use of καὶ in a coordinated clause, where a dependent clause might have been expected: e.g. Num. xxxv. 2, συντάξεις τοὺς νῦν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ δώσουσιν κτλ.

Prepositions. See under Verbs. Peculiar uses of the Heb. prepositions are often reflected in the Greek; e.g. 1 Regn. i. 24, ἀνέβη ἐν μόσχῳ (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν); Lev. xxi. 10, ὁ μέγας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (Ῥωμαίοι Ἄρσεν). A number of new prepositions or prepositional phrases are used to express the Hebrew בָּעַל, e.g. ἐναντι.; ἀπεναιτε; κατεναιτε; ἐνώπιον; κατενώπιον; ἀπό; ἐπί; πρό; προσώπον. Similarly ὀπίσω represents ἐνώπιος; ἐν μέσῳ; ἀνά μέσον; διὰ μέσου = ἐνώπιος; ἀπο (ἐκ) μέσου = ἐνώπιος; διὰ χειρός; εἰς χειρός; ἐκ χειρός = ἐπί; ἐπί; ὀδόν = ἐνώπιος. The use of σῶν to express the prefix ἐνώπιος, which is characteristic of Aquila, occurs in codex A six times in 3 Regn., once in Esther (where it probably came from the Hexapla), and frequently in Ecclesiastes, where even
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1. Both the vocabulary and the syntax of the LXX. exhibit remarkable affinities with the modern language. Mr Geldart (Modern Greek Language, p. 101 f.) urges the study of modern Greek upon Biblical students on the ground that "the Greek of the present day affords a better commentary on the language of the LXX. and of the N.T. than the writings of contemporary historians, rhetoricians, grammarians and philosophers." He adds: "The phraseology of the LXX. is modern to an extent which is quite marvellous...let me mention a few well-known words common to the LXX. and modern Greek: ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἀποκρίνομαι, ἐπιστρέφω, προσκυνῶ, ἐνώπιων, πρόσκομμα, πειράξω, ἀκολούθω, κοιμῶμαι, ἀλος, κατοικῶ, καθίζω, καθίζω, τὰ ἴματα, ὑπάγω... The Greek of the N.T....is by no means so vulgar, so merely a vernacular, as that of the LXX." This estimate is perhaps overdone; certainly there are considerations which suggest caution in the use of modern Greek usage as a key to the meaning of the LXX. But the general similarity of the Alexandrian vocabulary and, to a less extent, of the Alexandrian syntax to those of the spoken language indicates a common affinity to the old colloquial Greek, which ultimately triumphed over the classical standards. That the resemblance is less marked in the case of the New Testament is due to the different circumstances under which it was written. Bilingual Palestinian writers of the first century naturally possessed a more limited vocabulary and employed a more chastened style than Alexandrian translators of the time of Philadelphus and Euergetes, who had been born in the heart of a great Greek city teeming with a cosmopolitan population.

1 See above, p. 39, n. 2.

2 Cf. Prof. Jebb in Vincent and Dickson, p. 289: "modern Greek has inherited, not only the ancient literature, but also an oral tradition which preceded that literature, which co-existed with it, and which has survived it."
11. Some of the non-canonical books of the Greek Old Testament, which were either (a) loosely translated or paraphrased from a Hebrew original, or (b) originally written in Greek, need separate treatment in regard to their lexical and grammatical character. Such are (a) 1 Esdras, Daniel (LXX.), (b) Wisdom, 2—4 Maccabees.

The lexicography of the ‘Apocrypha’ has been separately treated by C. A. Wahl (Clavis libr. V. T. apocryphorum philologica, Leipzig, 1853), and with the help of the Oxford Concordance it may be studied independently. But, for the sake of the student who has not the necessary leisure to examine the subject in detail, it is desirable to notice here the more conspicuous words in each of the books referred to above.

1 Esdras.

δικαλονθῶς = κατά, dat. (2 Esdr., 2 Macc.)

ἀναγνώστης = γραμματεύς, 2 Esdr.

ἀναμφισβήτητος

ἀναπλήρωσις (Dan.)

ἀνεροῦν (3 Macc.)

ἀντίγραφον (Esth., Ep.-Jer., 1, 2 Macc.)

ἀντιπαρατάσσειν

ἀπευκτικομεν (2 Macc.)

ἀποστασίς (2 Esdr.)

βιβλιοφυλάκιον

δημαγογεῖν, -για

διάδημα (Esth., Sap., 2, 4 Macc.)

δοματίζειν (Esth., Dan., 2, 3 Macc.)

δυνατείχεια, -βημα (2 Macc.)

ἐδωκειν (Dan., 1 Macc.)

ἐμφυσοῦν

ἐπακοουστός

ἐπιδίκως

ἐπιστεύουσι (Esth., Prov.)

ἐρωμένη, ἡ (cod. B)

ἐυθαρσίας (1, 2 Macc.)

ἐυπρεπῶς (Sap.)

ἐὐφυής (Sap., 2 Macc.)

ἱερόδουλος

ἱεροψάλτης

ἱστορεῖν

καταλοχισμός (1, 2 Chr.)

κολακεύειν (Job, Sap.)

ληστεύειν

λωποδυτεῖν

μανική (Dan.)

μεγαλειότης

μεριδαρχία

μεταγενέστερος

ὄνοματογραφία

ὀρκωμοσία (Ez.)

πειθαρχεῖν (Jer., Dan.)

προκαθηγεύεισθαι (cod. B)

προπομπή

προσκέφαλων (Ez.)

συνβαθέειν

σωματοφύλαξ (Judith, 2 Macc.)

ὑπομνηματίζειν

φορολογία (1 Macc.)

χαμανετής

χάσκειν

χρηματιστήριον

χρυσοχάλινος (2 Macc.)
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Daniel.

ἀποθαναμάξειν (Sir.)
ἀποτυμπανίζειν (3 Macc.)
ἀρχιεἰσνουχος
ἀρχιπατρώτης (Jos. 1)
dαμάζειν
dημεύειν
dιαμελίζειν
dιάπυρος (3 Macc.)
dιωκήτης (2 Esdr., Tob.)
ἐγκύκλιος
eποργίζεσθαι (2 Macc.)
ἐστιατορία (4 Regn.)
eὐκαταφρόνητος
eὐνήμος
θερμαία (Jer. 1)
κηλιδοῖσθαι (Jer.)
κονίαμα
κοπανίζειν (3 Regn.)
μανιάκης (1 Esdr. 1)
μεγαλειώτης (1 Esdr., Jer. 1)
πρόσοψις (2 Macc.)
σαμβύκη
σοφιστής (Exod. 1)
συναλοῦν
συνμολύνεσθαι
σύριγξ
ὑπερανετός
ὑπερένδοξος
ὑπερμεγεθής (1 Chr.)
ὑπερνυφῶν (Ps. 2)
ὑπερφερής
φιλόσοφος (4 Macc.)

Wisdom.

This book contains an unusually large vocabulary, consisting in great part of compound words. The following list, taken from c. i.—vi., will suffice to shew its lexical character*.

ἀγερωχία (2, 3 Macc.)
ἀδίαπτωτος
ἀδανασία (4 Macc.)
ἀκαταμάχος
ἀκηλίδωτος (Ps. 1)
ἀκοίμος
ἀλαξοκεφαλεύεσθαι (Ps. 1)
ἀμάραντος
ἀμολυντός
ἀναποδισμός
ἀνεκπίθης
ἀνεξικακία
ἀνυπόκριτος
ἀπίμαντος
ἀπολογία
ἀπότομος, ἀποτόμως
ἀπέλευθος
ἀτίμητος (3 Macc.)
ἀυτοσχεδίως
ἀφθόνως
βασκανία (4 Macc.)
δεκαμηνιάος
διορθωτής
dύσχρηστος (Isa. 1)
ἐπισφαλῶς
ἐπιτήθεως (1 Chr., 1—3 Macc.)
ἐπιφημίζειν (Deut. 1)
ἐργατεία
eὐκλείς (Jer. 1)
eὐκυκλος
εὐμορφία (3 Macc.)
eὔστοχος
θυμήρης
ἰδιότης (3 Macc.)
κακοπραγία
κακόσεχνος

* Cf. supra, p. 268 f., for some interesting examples from other parts of the book.
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katadapantai
katálypos
katákreos
makrobóios (Isa.1)
muonómeros
ómuoipathës (4 Macc.)
óptopoeiv
parádoxos (Judith, Sir., 2, 4 Macc.)
paramvidion

polýgyvos (4 Macc.)
pompteün
prwtóplastos
stefainphorëin
syggynostós
syullogismos (Ex.1)
tekhmiwv (3 Macc.)
filánvrwv
xrsimwv (Sir.)

In 2—4 Maccabees the reader finds himself at length face to face with the full richness of the Alexandrian literary style, as it was written by cultured Hellenists of the second and first centuries B.C. The writers, especially the writer of 4 Maccabees, may be said to revel in the use of compound words, many of which may have been of their own coinage. Specimens follow.

2 Maccabees.

agorantia
evatanptos
akari vos
theomacwv
akropólos
thorakismwv
akrothriáxein
catevbdkev
állosfylásmos
karpódwv
ánalmpéteos
lalwotwv
ánepetanitiein
lalwóvavtein
aráxynéttis
polémorpefein
ástwia
polupsarwmonwv
aútháretos
prosanañegvthai
bárbarów
proswtopwmmhsekew
deilandryw
spblachwnsmwv
devterológeinein
sýmmiosponýrein
diástalwos
sýnekkeifi
dóxiw
teratoteiv
duspethma
pnyxhagwia
épetulabéiswvai

3 Maccabees.

d洛gístia
ánékantos
ánwparkwikia
ánwphn
ánepistrepwos
baryxhé
barmh
bustrepheis
The Greek of the Septuagint.

γραφικός νεανικός
δημοτικής πανόδυρτος
dυσκολίτης παρανάγωνωσκεῖν
dυσαίακτος πολύδακρυς
eύκαταλλακτος προκατακκυριών
κισσόφυλλον σιδηρόδεσμος
λαογραφία ύπομοναστιάος
λιβανοῦν υπόφρυκος
μεγαλοκράτωρ φοβερειδής
μεγαλομερής χαρτηρία
μεροφαγία χειρονομία
μίσυβρις ψυχούλκειν

4 Maccabees.

αἰμοβόρος ιεροπρεπῆς
ἀναμοχλεύειν ἵστοπαλις
ἀποσκυθεῖν καλλίστα
ἀρδεμβόλος κηρογονία
ἀσθενῶνεχως μαλακοψυχεῖν
ἀσυρῆς ἕφηφορὸς
ἀυτοδέσποτος ὀροφοιτεῖν
γαλακτοποιεῖν παθοκρατεῖσθαι, -τία
γαλακτοτροφία παθοχαρακτήρ
εἴδωλωτος πηδαλούχειν
ἐναγκάλισμα προσπεκτατεῖνειν
ἐναποσφραγίζειν συμπάθεια
ἐπιρωγολογεῖσθαι συναγελάζειν
ἐπταμήτωρ φιλομήτωρ
εὐλογιστία φιλοστοργία
θανατηφόρος φωταγωγεῖν

In the style of the originally Greek books there is little to remind us of the Semitic origin of the writers. The Wisdom of Solomon follows generally the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry, and its language is moulded to some extent by the LXX. of the Psalms and of Proverbs. In 2—4 Maccabees the influence of the canonical books appears in the retention of transliterated names such as Ἀββραάμ, Ἰσραήλ, Δανιήλ. But Ἰερουσαλήμ has become Ἰεροσόλυμα, and Eleazar is usually Ἑλεάζαρος. Of Hebrew constructions or modes of thought there is only an occasional instance, whilst it is obvious
that the writers lose no opportunity of exhibiting their skill in the literary style of contemporary Alexandrian Greek.


Much information on points of grammar and orthography may also be gleaned from the N.T. grammars—A. Buttmann, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Sprachgebrauchs* (Berlin, 1859); Winer-Moulton, *Treatise on the Greek of the N.T.* (1877); Winer-Schmiedel, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Sprachidioms*, Theil i.—ii. (1894—8); F. Blass, *Grammatik d. NTlichen Griechisch* (1896, or the same translated by H. St J. Thackeray, 1898); A. R. Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar* (1897); and from the Introduction and Appendix to Westcott and Hort's *N. T. in Greek* (Intr., pp. 302—313, App., pp. 148—180). The Gramm. Untersuchungen über die biblische Gräcität of K. H. A. Lipsius is limited to such matters as accentuation, punctuation, and the abbreviations used in Biblical Greek MSS.; but within its own scope it is a serviceable book.
CHAPTER V.

THE SEPTUAGINT AS A VERSION.

The purpose of this chapter is to prepare the beginner for grappling with the problems presented by the Septuagint when it is regarded as a translation of the Hebrew Bible. Almost at the outset of his study of the Alexandrian version he will find himself confronted by difficulties which can only be met by a study of the general purpose and character of the work, the limitations by which the translators were beset, and the principles which guided them in the performance of their task.

I. The reader of the Septuagint must begin by placing before his mind the conditions under which it was produced, and the relation of the original work to our present texts, Hebrew and Greek.

1. (a) Strictly speaking the Alexandrian Bible is not a single version, but a series of versions produced at various times and by translators whose ideals were not altogether alike. Internal evidence\(^1\) of this fact may be found in the varying standards of excellence which appear in different books or groups of books. The Pentateuch is on the whole a close and serviceable translation; the Psalms\(^2\) and more especially

---

\(^1\) The external evidence has been briefly stated in Part i. c. i. (p. 23 ff.).

\(^2\) Cf. R. Sinker, *Some remarks on the LXX. Version of the Psalms*, p. 9 ff.
the Book of Isaiah shew obvious signs of incompetence. The translator of Job was perhaps more familiar with Greek pagan literature than with Semitic poetry; the translator of Daniel indulges at times in a Midrashic paraphrase. The version of Judges which appears in our oldest Greek uncial MS. has been suspected by a recent critic of being a work of the 4th century A.D.; the Greek Ecclesiastes savours of the school of Aquila.

When we come to details, the evidence in favour of a plurality of translators is no less decisive. A comparison of certain passages which occur in separate contexts distinctly reveals the presence of different hands. The reader can readily form a judgement upon this point if he will place side by side in the Hebrew and the Greek 2 Regn. xxii. 2 ff. and Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 3 ff., 4 Regn. xviii. 17—xx. 19 and Isa. xxxvi. 1—xxxix. 8, or Mic. iv. and Isa. ii.

A single specimen may be given from Ps. xvii. compared with 2 Regn. xxiii.

Ps. xvii. 3—6.

3 Κύριος στερέωμα μου καὶ καταφυγὴ μου καὶ ῥύσης μου; ο θεὸς μου βοηθῶς καὶ ἐλπίδι ἐπ’ αὐτῶν..............

4 αἰῶν ἐπικάλεσομαι Κύριον, καὶ εκ τῶν ἑχθρῶν μου σωθήσομαι.

5 περιέσχομεν με ὁδίνες βανάτου, καὶ χείμαρροι ἀνομίας ἐξετάραξάν με. 6 ὁδίνες ἄδου περιεκκυλώσαν με, προεφθασάν με παγίδες βανάτου.

7 καὶ ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι με ἐπικαλεσάμην τὸν κύριον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μου ἐκέκραξα· ἥκουσεν εκ ναοῦ ἀγίου αὐτοῦ φωνὴς μου, καὶ ἡ κραυγὴ μου [ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ εἰσελεύσεται] εἰς τὰ δεῦρα αὐτοῦ.

2 Regn. xxii. 2—6.

2 Κύριε πέτρα μου καὶ ὄχυρωμα μου καὶ ἔξαιρούμενός με ἐμοὶ. 3 ο θεὸς μου φύλαξ ἐσται μου, πεποιθὼς ἐσομαι ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ......... λαῖνετον ἐπικάλεσομαι Κύριον, καὶ εκ τῶν ἑχθρῶν μου σωθήσομαι.

5 ὃς περιέσχον με συντρίμμοι βανάτου, χείμαρροι ἀνομίας ἐθάμβησάν με. 6 ὁδίνες βανάτου ἐκύκλωσάν με, προεφθασάν με σκληρότητας θανάτου. 7 ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι με ἐπικάλεσομαι Κύριον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μου βοήθοσοι, καὶ ἐπακούσεται εκ ναοῦ αὐτοῦ φωνὴς μου, καὶ ἡ κραυγὴ μου ἐν τοῖς ὡσίν αὐτοῦ.

1 Cf. e.g. Job ix. 9, xlii. 14; from the latter passage Theodore of Mopsuestia argued the pagan origin of the book (D. C. B. iv. p. 939).
2 Moore, Judges, p. xlii.
One of these versions has doubtless influenced the other, but that they are the work of separate hands seems to be clear from the differences of method which appear e.g. in the renderings of

\[\text{in the first verse, and the use of the aorist and the future in vv. 6, 7.}\]

If further proof is needed it may be found in the diverse renderings of the same Hebrew words in different parts of the Canon. This argument must be used with caution, for (as we shall presently see) such diversities are to be found not only in the same book but in the same context. But after making allowance for variations of this kind, there remain abundant instances in which the diversity can only be attributed to a change of hand. Thus \(\text{is uniformly represented in the}\)

\[\text{by } \Phi \nu \iota \omega \upsilon \iota \varepsilon \iota \mu, \text{ but in Judges and the later books by}\]

\[\text{in Chronicles}\) and Jeremiah\), but \(\text{in all other books; }\)

\[\text{in the Pentateuch, but in Ezra-Nehemiah } \phi \omega \iota \iota \zeta \nu \tau \varepsilon \zeta \varepsilon \nu \tau \varepsilon \nu; \text{ in }\]

\[\text{in Exodus, but in } \text{ and in Isaiah }\]

\[\text{is } \sigma \varphi \beta \alpha \omega \theta \text{ more than } 50 \text{ times, whilst } \pi \alpha \tau \kappa \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \omega \rho, \text{ which in other books is the almost uniform rendering of the word when it is used as a title of Deity, does not once occur; }\]

\[\text{is } \sigma \nu \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \eta \gamma \eta \text{ in Gen., Exod., Lev., Num., and again in the Prophets, but } \varepsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \gamma \sigma \tau \iota \text{ in Deuteronomy (with one exception) and onwards to the end of the historical books. The singular phrase }\]

\[\text{is limited to Judges, Ruth, and 1—4 Regn.; }\]

\[\text{of the object occurs in the true LXX. only in Ecclesiastes; }\]

\[\text{is peculiar to Chronicles and Ezra, other books which contain the Heb. word (Num., Deut., 1 Regn., Psalms, Jer.) preferring }\]

\[\text{Similar results may be obtained from a comparison of the forms assumed by the same proper names in different books. Elijah ( }\]

\[\text{is } \text{ in the Books of Kings, but } \text{ in Malachi and Sirach. The lists in}\]

\[\text{use the Hebrew form of Gentile names ( }\]

\[\text{where other books adopt the Greek ( }\]
'Ἀναθωθείτης, &c.). In Ezra 试验区 becomes Ἄσσούηρος, but Ἀρταξερξης is substituted by the translator of Esther, and Ἑρφης by the LXX. translator of Daniel (ix. 1) 1. It is difficult to resist the force of this cumulative evidence in support of a plurality of translators, especially when it is confirmed by what we know of the external history of the Septuagint.

(b) Further it is clear that the purpose of the version in the later books is not altogether that which the translators of the Pentateuch had in view. The Greek Pentateuch, as we have seen, was intended to supply the wants of the Alexandrian Synagogue. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, and the three major Prophets, were probably translated with the same general purpose, but under a diminished sense of responsibility, since the Prophets, even after their admission to the Canon, were not regarded as sharing the peculiar sanctity of the Law. But the Hagiographa, excepting perhaps the Psalter, stood on a much lower level, and such books as Job, Esther, and Daniel were perhaps viewed by the Alexandrians as national literature 2 which was not yet classical and might be treated with the freedom allowed by custom in such cases to the interpreter and the scribe. Our estimate of the translator’s work must clearly take account of his attitude towards the book upon which he is engaged.

(c) It is important also to bear in mind the peculiar difficulties which beset the translators in their attempts to render the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. To translate a Semitic book into the language of the West was a new venture when it was undertaken at Alexandria; the Greek Pentateuch “was the work of pioneers and necessarily had the defects of such work.” 3 No wonder if even in the later books the Hebrew

---

1 Theod. has Ἄσσούηρον in Daniel.
2 Cf. prol. to Sirach: τῶν διάλων πατρίων βιβλίων.
idiom refused to lend itself to the forms even of Hellenistic Greek without losing to some extent its identity, as the translator of Sirach complains. Moreover the majority of the translators had probably learnt the sacred language in Egypt from imperfectly instructed teachers, and had few opportunities of making themselves acquainted with the traditional interpretation of obscure words and contexts which guided the Palestinian Jew. The want of a sound tradition is especially manifest in poetical passages and books, and it makes itself felt in the numerous transliterations, and in faulty readings and renderings of the text. Such things may well make the reader smile at the claim of inspiration which was set up for the LXX., but they ought neither to mislead his judgement, nor to lessen his admiration for the courage and the general success of the Alexandrian translators.

2. The student must also endeavour to realise the condition of the Hebrew text which lay before the Alexandrian translators.

(a) The text of the Hebrew Bible has undergone no material change since the beginning of the second century A.D. A vast store of various readings has been collected from the MSS. by the diligence of Kennicott and De Rossi, but few among them appear to be more than the omissions or corruptions which spring from the accidents of transcription. All existing MSS. belong to one type of text, and it is, in the main, the type which was known to Jerome, to Origen, and to Aquila, and which is reflected in the Targums and the Talmud.

1 Prol. οὐ γὰρ ἴσωναμεί κτλ.
2 Even in Palestine "before the Christian era...the exegetical tradition was still in a rudimentary stage" (Kirkpatrick, Divine Library, p. 69).
3 Dr Nestle points out that the mistakes of the LXX. are sometimes due to Aramaic or Arabic colloquialisms, and gives the following examples: Aramaic: Num. xxiv. 7 ἔζεκεσανα. Ps. cxl. 4 προφασίζεσθαι. Hos. i. 6 ἠλεμένη, vi. 5 ἀκριβία, ὁ-ἀκριβείαν. Isa. iv. 2 ἐπιλάμψει, liii. 10 καθαρίας. Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 13 χαρῆσονται. Arabic: Isa. vii. 6 συναλήσται.
But it is not that which was possessed by the Alexandrians of the third and second centuries, B.C. At some time between the age of the LXX. and that of Aquila a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible must have taken place, probably under official direction; and the evidence seems to point to the Rabbinical school which had its centre at Jamnia in the years that followed the fall of Jerusalem as the source from which this revision proceeded\(^1\). The subject, as a whole, will be treated in a later chapter; meanwhile it is sufficient to warn the beginner that in the LXX. he has before him the version of an early text which often differed materially from the text of the printed Hebrew Bible and of all existing Hebrew MSS.

\((b)\) The palaeographical character of the MSS. employed by the translators requires consideration. It will be remembered that the newly discovered fragments of Aquila present the Tetragrammaton in archaic letters\(^2\). These letters belong to the old Semitic alphabet which was common to the Hebrew, Moabite, Aramaic, and Phoenician languages, and which appears on the Moabite stone and in the Siloam inscription and, with some modifications, in MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and on coins of the Maccabean period. The transition from this ancient character to the square letters\(^3\) which are used in existing Hebrew MSS. and in the printed Bibles must have been practically complete in our Lord's time, since He refers to the \textit{yodh} as the smallest letter, and to the \textit{kipéau} which are peculiar to the square alphabet (Mt. v. 18). That the change had begun


\(^2\) See pp. 39 f.

\(^3\) \ת"ח, or, as the Talmud calls it, \ת"ח; see Driver, \textit{Samuel}, pp. ix. ff.
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in the MSS. employed by the Alexandrian translators¹ may be gathered from the fact that they repeatedly confuse letters which are similar in the square character but not in the archaic. Professor Driver holds that the alphabet of their MSS. was a transitional one, in which א וה and מ מ and מ, as well as 벌 and 벌, were more or less difficult to distinguish.

A few examples may be given from Driver’s list. (1) 1 Regn. ii. 29 δφθαλαμφ (גנ, for ג); xii. 3 ἀποκρίθητε κατ’ ἐμοῦ (גנ, for ג); Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 17 ὀρυζόν ( subsidi, for subst); Isa. xxix. 13 μάτην δὲ σέβονται με (חר, for חר). (2) 1 Regn. vi. 20 δεκάθειν (לע, for לע); Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 25 †ων εἰς αὐτής (נה for ננה); 1 Regn. iv. 10 ταγματῶν (נה for ננה), xxii. 7 Δωσὼ σὺ ἱεροὺς (די for בה), for רד מ and מ רד.

Another cause of confusion was the scriptio defectiva in the case of א and א where they represent long vowels, e.g. 1 Regn. xii. 8 καὶ κατήκισεν αὐτὸς (ஸ); Ps. v. tit. ὑπερ τῆς κληρονομούσης (ל, for לה), Job xix. 18 εἰς τὸν αἰώνα (לע, for לע); Jer. vi. 23 ὁς πῦρ (_MAKE, for MAKE). Abbreviations, also, probably gave rise to misunderstandings; see the instances in Driver, op. cit., pp. lxiii. f., lxx. note 2, and others collected from Jeremiah by Streane, Double Text, p. 20.

In the case of numerals errors appear to have arisen from the use of similar letters as numerical signs: e.g. 2 Regn. xxiv. 13 τρια ἑτη, פ (seven years,) where 아이 has been read for 아이. Here פ has the support of the Chronicler (1 Chron. xxi. 12): see König in Hastings’ D.B., iii. p. 562.

Further, in the MSS. used by the LXX. the words seem not to have been separated by any system of punctuation or spacing. On the Moabite stone⁴ and in the Siloam inscription⁵ a point has been used for this purpose, but the Phoeni-

¹ Except perhaps those which lay before the translators of the Pentateuch; see Driver, loc.
² A specimen of such a script, but of much later date, may be seen in Driver, op. cit., p. lxxv.
³ Cf. Streane ad loc. and on Jer. xx. 17.
⁴ See Driver, op. cit., p. lxxxvi., or Hastings’ D.B. iii. art. Moab.
⁵ Driver, op. cit., p. xv.
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cian inscriptions are without punctuation, and so were probably the early Biblical rolls. The division adopted by the LXX. is frequently at variance with that of the Massoretic text, and is sometimes preferable to the latter, sometimes inferior; but the differences witness to the absence of divisions in the Hebrew MSS. and the non-employment of the final letters το έν.

Thus Gen. xlix. 19, 20 αὐτῶν κατὰ πόδας. Ἀσηρ... = αἰσχρ (א, מ UPPER, נ); Deut. xxvi. 5 Συριαν ἀντιβαλεν = א, מ, ב UPPER (א, מ, נ); 1 Regn. i. 1 εν Νασεὶβ = א, מ UPPER (א, מ, נ); Ps. xliii. (xliiv.) 5 ο θεως μου ο ἐντελλόμενος = א, מ UPPER άλλης Μάρα (א, מ, נ); Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 15 δια τι ἔφυγεν απὸ σου ο Ρατίς = מ UPPER wurden (א, מ, נ); Zech. xi. 7 εἰς τὴν Χαναανίτην = מ UPPER בונוער (א, מ, נ).

Lastly, almost every page of the LXX. yields evidence that the Hebrew text was as yet unpointed. Vocalisation was in fact only traditional until the days of the Massora, and the tradition which is enshrined in the Massoretic points differs, often very widely, from that which was inherited or originated by the Alexandrian translators¹.

A few examples may suffice: Gen. xv. 11 καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοίς = א, מ UPPER ביב (א, מ, נ); Num. xvi. 5 επέσκεπται = א, מ UPPER ביב (א, מ, נ); 1 Regn. xii. 2 καθῆσομαι = א, מ UPPER ביב (א, מ, נ); Nah. iii. 8 μερίδα Λυμών = א, מ UPPER ביב (א, מ, נ); Isa. ix. 8 θάνατον = א, מ UPPER ביב (א, מ, נ); 1 άπεστειλεν Κύριος = א, מ UPPER ιακώβ. In proper names the differences of the vocalisation are still more frequent and apparent, e.g. Μαδιάμ (מ, נ); Βαλαάμ (מ, נ), Γόμορρα (מ, נ), Χοδολογόμορ (מ, נ), Φασγά (מ, נ), Σαμψών (מ, נ).

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

¹ Jerome in the last years of the 4th century knows nothing of a system of vowel points; see Nowack, Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die ATliche Textkritik (Göttingen, 1875).
oldest of our uncial MSS., and the greater number of Greek codices are more or less influenced by the Hexapla. The Lucianic text, if free from this vice, is subject to another, the Antiochian passion for fulness, which encouraged the blending or the accumulation of various renderings and thus created doublets. Besides these recensional errors there are the mistakes, itacistic or other, which are incident to the transmission of ancient books. The state of the Greek text has been touched upon already, and will form the subject of a chapter in the third part of this book. Here it is sufficient to notice the presence of mixture and corruption as a factor in the problem which the student of the LXX. must keep in view.

II. We are now prepared to deal with those features of the version which are not incidental but characteristic of the translators' principles and methods.

1. The reader of the Alexandrian Greek Bible is continually reminded that he has before him a translation of a Semitic writing.

(a) As a whole the version aims at fidelity, and often pursues this aim to the extent of sacrificing the Greek idiom. The first chapter of Genesis will supply instances of extreme literalness, e.g. v. 4 ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους: v. 5 ἐγένετο ἐσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα μία: v. 20 ἐρπετὰ ψυχῶν ξωσῶν. As we proceed, we are still conscious of moving in an atmosphere which is Hebrew and not Greek. Hebrew constructions meet us everywhere; such phrases as ἄφικέσθαι ἐως πρὸς τινα, παρασυναπαν ἀπὸ τινας, προστιθέναι (τοῦ) ποιεῖν, λαλεῖν ἐν χειρὶ τινος, ἐχθές καὶ τρίτην, ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς (ἐως γενεάς καὶ γενεάς, εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν), may be found in the Prophets and Hagiographa as well as in the Pentateuch. Occasionally the translators set the sense at defiance in their

1 Cf. Driver, op. cit., p. lviii.
desire to be true to what they conceive to be the meaning of the Hebrew, as when in 1 Regn. i. 26 they render 'יו (dē'ōma) by ἐν ἐμοί. In some books, especially perhaps in the Psalms and in Isaiah, entire sentences are unintelligible from this cause. Even when the Alexandrians have rightly understood their original they have generally been content to render it into Greek with little regard for rhythm or style, or the requirements of the Greek tongue.

(b) To the same spirit of loyalty may be ascribed in part the disposition to transliterate words which present unusual difficulty. The number of transliterations other than those of proper names is considerable, and they are to be found in nearly all the translated books. In some cases they are due to misunderstanding, as in Jud. i. 19 'Ῥῆκαβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς where Ἱ[name] seems to have been read as Ἰ[name], and consequently treated as a proper name; in others, the Hebrew form is purposely maintained (e.g. ἀλληλοναί, ἀμήν). But in the majority of instances transliteration may be taken for a frank confession of ignorance or doubt; it is clearly such, for example, in Jud. viii. 7 ἐν ταῖς ἀβαρκνείν, 4 Regn. ii. 14 ἀφω (Ἀφω), Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 40 πάντες ἀσαρημωθ ἐως νάχαλ Κεδρῶν. As in the first and third of these specimens, the article is often included; and when a proper name is transliterated, the name is sometimes for this reason not easily recognised; thus Ramathaim (1 Regn. i. 1) becomes Ἀρμαθάμ (Ἀρμαθάμ)². Similarly the π local is taken over in the transliteration, as in Gen. xxxv. 6 εἰς Δοὺζα=Θοῦζ. Sometimes two words are rolled into one, as in Οὐλαμμαῦς = Ἄλαμμα (Gen.

1 Thus Hatch and Redpath take note of 39 transliterations, exclusive of proper names, under A alone. They are thus distributed: Pentateuch, 4; Histories, 26; Psalms &c., 3; Prophets, 6. The principles by which the LXX. appear to have been guided in these transliterations of Hebrew consonants and vowel-sounds are expounded by Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 107 ff.

2 Unless the α is here prothetic, which is however less probable.
xxviii. 19)¹. A doublet is occasionally created by adding a translation to the transliterated Hebrew, e.g. in 1 Regn. vii. 4 ἀλογὴ Ἄσταρωθ, xxiii. 14 ἐν Μασεφέμ ἐν τοῖς στενοῖς. In the case of a significant proper name, where it is necessary for the reader to be made aware of its meaning, the LXX. sometimes translate without transliterating, e.g. Gen. iii. 20 ἑκάλεσεν Ἄδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωῆ (יננה); xi. 9 ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Σύγχυσις (םוקם); xiv. 13 ἀπήγγειλεν Ἀβράμ τῷ περάτῳ (>.ירש).  

2. The Alexandrian translators, however, while loyal to their original, sometimes even to a fault, manifest nothing like the slavish adherence to the letter with which Aquila has been charged. They often amplify and occasionally omit; they interpret, qualify or refine; they render the same Hebrew words by more than one Greek equivalent, even in the same context; they introduce metaphors or grammatical constructions which have no place in the Hebrew text and probably at no time had a place there, or they abandon figures of speech where they exist in the original.

(a) Slight amplifications, which are probably not to be ascribed to a fuller text, occur frequently in all parts of the LXX.; e.g. the insertion of λέγων before a quotation, or of pronouns which are not expressed in the Hebrew, or of single words added in order to bring out the sense, as in Gen. xxxiv. 10 ἰδοὺ γὰρ πλατεῖα ἐναντίον ὑμῶν, xl. 17 ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γεννήματων ὅν ὁ βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ ἔσθείε. Deut. vii. 16 φάγῃ πάντα τὰ σκῦλα τῶν ἔθνων (Heb. 'thou shalt eat all the nations'). The translators frequently manifest a desire to supply what the original had omitted or to clear up what was ambiguous: they name the subject or object when the Hebrew leaves it
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to be understood (Gen. xxix. 9 αὐτῇ γὰρ ἐβοσκεν τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς, Heb. 'fed them'; xxxiv. 14 καὶ ἔπαυαν αὐτοῖς Ἀμμεων καὶ Δεινὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Δείνας νιώε ἔδε Δείας, Heb. ‘and they said unto them’), or they add a clause which seems to follow as a necessary consequence (2 Regn. xii. 21 ἀνέστης καὶ ἐφαγε ὀρτὸν καὶ περιωκας; xvi. 10 καὶ ἀφέτε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐτως καταράσθω = ἐρμής (Ὶ ἄλοι β), or they make good an apophasis (Exod. xxxii. 32 εἰ μὲν ἀφείς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν ἀφεῖς). Less frequently they insert a whole sentence which is of the nature of a gloss, as in Gen. i. 9 καὶ συνήθη τὸ ὑδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ὄφθη ἡ ἐγερά, which is merely an expansion of καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως in the terms of the preceding command συναχθῆτω κτλ.; or 1 Regn. i. 5 ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῇ παιδίων, a reminiscence of ν. 2 τῇ Ἀννῇ οὐκ ἦν παιδίων. On the other hand the LXX. not uncommonly present a shorter text, as compared with M.T., e.g. Gen. xxxi. 21 καὶ διέβη τὸν ποταμόν (Heb. ‘he rose up and passed over’), ib. 31 εἰπα γὰρ Μὴ ποτε κτλ. (Heb. ‘Because I was afraid, for I said...’); 1 Regn. i. 9 μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν Σηλώ (Heb. ‘after they had eaten in Shiloh and after they had drunk’).

(β) The translators frequently interpret words which call for explanation. Hebraisms are converted into Greek phraseology, e.g. ἀριθμός becomes ἀλογονής (Exod. xii. 43), and ἀναίτιος (Num. vii. 15); ἐνυπηρετησεν is rendered by ἔγα γε ἀλογὸς εἴμι (Exod. vi. 12). A difficult word or phrase is exchanged for one more intelligible to a Greek reader; thus ἡ ἔρημος is used for ἡ βάσις (Gen. xii. 9); ‘Urim and Thummim’ become ἡ δηλωσις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια (Exod. xxviii. 26); in the Psalms ἀντελημπτωρ is written for ἔναρ (Ps. iii. 4), βοιθὸς for ἄνθρω (xvii. = xvii. 3), and γλώσσα for τῶν (Ps. xv. = xvi. 9); similarly in Jer. ii. 23 τὸ πολυανδρίων ‘the cemetery’ stands for ἥφαι, i.e. the valley of Hinnom. An effort is made to represent Hebrew money by its nearest Greek equivalent; thus for μένων we have διδραχμων (Gen.
The Septuagint as a Version.

xxiii. 15, Deut. xxii. 29, 2 Esdr. xv. 15) as well as σίκλος, and for ἄξωμα ὀβδολός. Occasionally a whole clause is interpreted rather than translated; e.g. Gen. i. 2 ἣ δὲ γῆ ἡν ἀόρατος καὶ ἄκατα-
σκεύαστος, Exod. iii. 14 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὅν, Ps. xl. (xxxix.) 7 σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. A dogmatic interest has been detected in some of these paraphrastic renderings, chiefly where the LXX. have endeavoured to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the original; examples are most frequent in the Pentateuch, e.g. Gen. xviii. 25 μηδαμῶς σὺ ποιῆσαι (Heb. 'that be far from thee'); Exod. iv. 16 σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρόσ τὸν θεόν (μηκέσα); xxiv. 10 εἶδον τὸν τόπον ὡς ἐισήκει εἰς θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Heb. 'they saw the God of Israel,' Aq. εἶδον τὸν θεόν Ἰσραήλ); ib. 11 ἐν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσ-
ραήλ ὡς διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἷς; Num. xii. 8 τὴν δόξαν (τὴν) Κυρίου εἶδεν; Exod. xv. 3 Κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους (ἡγ.; ἤλεγχος); Deut. xiv. 23 ὁ τόπος δὲν ἀν ἐκλέξηται Κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐπικληθήναι (ὁμίη) τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ; Jos. iv. 24 ἡ δύναμις τοῦ κυρίου (ἡ ἡμέρα). Such renderings manifest the same spirit of reverence which led the LXX. to write δ ὁ κύριος or the anarthrous Κύριος, or not infrequently ὁ θεός, for the Tetragrammaton, just as their Palestinian brethren read for it בְּרוֹא or בְּרוֹאָל. In other places the LXX. appear to be guided by the Jewish Halacha, e.g. Gen. ii. 2 συνετέλεσεν δ θεός ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ (ὕπερτι, Aq. τῇ ἑβδομῇ); Lev. xxiv. 7 ἐπιθύμησεν ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἀλα; xix. 7 ἐὰν δὲ βρῶσει βρωθῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ, ἀθυτῶν ἐστιν (Heb. 'an abomination'). Of Haggada also there are clear traces, as in Exod. xii. 40 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῇ Χανάαν, i Regn. i. 14 ἐλπεν αὐτῷ τὸ παιδάριον Ἡλεί')

1 See W. R. Smith, O. T. in J. Church, p. 77. Aquila, as we gather from Origen and now know from his published fragments (p. 39 f.), wrote the word in archaic Hebrew characters, which however were read as Κύριος.

2 “Because salt as well as frankincense was used in the actual ritual of their period” (W. R. Smith, op. cit., p. 77).

3 On xxiii. 11 see p. 17.

4 “An evident attempt to shield the priest from the charge of harshness” (H. P. Smith, Samuel, p. 10).
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καὶ μέσον τῆς χώρας αὕτης ἀνεφύησαν μῦς, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγχυσις θανάτου μεγάλη ἐν τῇ πόλει.

(c) The LXX. render the same Hebrew word by more than one Greek equivalent, sometimes even in the same context. In some cases the change appears to be either arbitrary, or due to the desire of avoiding monotony; e.g. in Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 

is translated by ἀμαρτωλός in vv. 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 32, 40, but by ἀσεβής in vv. 28, 35, 38. In many others it may be ascribed to the circumstance that certain common Hebrew words take a special colouring from the contexts in which they occur, and must be rendered accordingly. Thus ἔποιην, 'give,' which belongs to this class has received in the LXX. more than 30 different renderings; sometimes it is translated by a paraphrase, e.g. Jos. xiv. 12 αἰτοῦμαι σε (Ὑπνήμ), Deut. xxi. 8 ἢνα μὴ γένηται (Ὑπνήμ ΝΗ); when it is rendered directly, the following Greek verbs (besides δίδωμι and its compounds) are used to represent it: ἀγεῖν, ἀποστέλλειν, ἀποτίνειν, ἀφιέναι, δεικνύεις, διωρείσθαι, εἶν, ἐκτιθέναι, ἐκτίνειν, ἐκχέειν, ἐλεῖν, ἐμβάλλειν, ἐγκαταλείπειν, ἐπαίρειν, ἐπιβάλλειν, ἐπιτιθέναι, ἐπιχέειν, ἐφιστάναι, ἱστάναι, καταβάλλειν, καθιστάναι, κατατάσσειν, κρεμάζειν, παρατιθέναι, περιτιθέναι, ποιεῖν, προεκφέρειν, προσιέναι, προστιθέναι, στηρίζειν, συνάγειν, φέρειν. This is a somewhat extreme instance, but a glance at Hatch and Redpath will show that there are many which do not fall far behind it, and that in the majority of cases the ordinary words of the Hebrew Bible have more than one equivalent in the Greek of the LXX. The Alexandrian translators have evidently made an honest endeavour to distinguish between the several connotations of the Hebrew words. Thus, to take a few examples: ἔστι is variously rendered by ἀκρον, ἀρχή, κλίτος, μέρος, πέρας, τάξις,

1 The example is suggested by Dr Hatch (Essays, p. 18), who gives many of the passages at length. The index Hebraeus at the end of Trom will enable the student to add other instances (besides δίδωμι and its compounds).
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χρόνος; among the equivalents of רֶquite are ἀπόκρωσις, ἑπερώτησις, κρίμα, πράγμα, τρόπος, φωνή; for בָּל we have not only καρδία, ψυχή, φρήν, νοῦς, διάνοια, στόμα, φρώνησις, but στήθος and even σάρξ; for ἡμ, ἀριθμεῖν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, ἔταξεν, ἐκδικεῖν; for ἠλίθιν, δικαιοσύνη, ἐλεημοσύνη, εὐφροσύνη. Conversely, the same Greek word often serves for several Hebrew words. Thus διαθήκη, which is generally the LXX. rendering of נִרְאֶה, stands also for תְּרוּם (Exod. xxvii. 21, xxxi. 7), הָרָקַש (Dan. ix. 13, LXX.) and even רְבָּעָה (Deut. ix. 5); ἐξαρεῖν, λυτροῦν, ὀνειδισθαι are all used to represent לְהָמָה; ἐξωλον appears in different contexts for בָּשׂ, דְּבָשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ בָּשׂ, כָּלַב, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, בָּשׂ, б. Even in the same context or verse this sometimes occurs. Thus in Gen. i.—iii. γῆ translates מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה, מְנַחֵה; in Exod. xii. 23 and מְנַחֵה are both represented by παρέρχεσθαι; in Num. xv. 4 f. θυσία is used both for מִןַחֵה and מִןַחֵה. In such cases it is difficult to acquit the translators of carelessness; but they are far less frequent than instances of the opposite kind. On the whole the LXX. even in the Pentateuch shews no poverty of words, and considerable skill in the handling of synonyms.


(e) Lastly, the reader of the Septuagint must expect to find a large number of actual blunders, due in part perhaps to
a faulty archetype, but chiefly to the misreading or misunderstanding of the archetype by the translators. Letters or clauses have often been transposed; omissions occur which may be explained by homoioteleuton; still more frequently the translation has suffered through an insufficient knowledge of Hebrew or a failure to grasp the sense of the context. It follows that the student must be constantly on his guard against errors which may easily result from too ready an acceptance of the evidence offered by the Alexandrian version. Taken as a whole, and judged in the light of the circumstances under which it was produced, it is a monument of the piety, the skill, and the knowledge of the Egyptian Jews who lived under the Ptolemies, and it is an invaluable witness to the pre-Christian text of the Old Testament. But whether for textual or for hermeneutical purposes it must be used with caution and reserve, as the experience of the Ancient Church shews. With this subject we shall deal in a future chapter; it is sufficient to note the fact here.

III. The beginner, for whose use this chapter is chiefly intended, will now be prepared to open his Septuagint and his Hebrew Bible, and to compare the two in some familiar contexts. The following notes may assist him in a first effort to grapple with the problems which present themselves.

**GEN. xv. 1—6.**

1. Τὰ ῥῆματα...ῥῆμα, Heb. רְחֵבָה...רְחֵבָה. Λέγων = ἀλήθεια; cf. v. 4, where, as elsewhere, Aq. renders, τὸ λέγειν. Ὑπερασπίζω σου, Heb. 'am a shield to thee'; cf. Deut. xxxiii. 29, Prov. ii. 7, al. 'Ὁ μοσθός σου πολὺς. Vulg., A.V., R.V. connect Heb. with the foregoing, supplying 1. 2. Δεσπότης = βασιλεύς, as in v. 8, and not infrequently in Jer. and Dan. (LXX.). Ἀπολύομαι ἄπεκκριτός—an interpretation rather than a literal rendering of יָדַעַת הָרִחֹם. יִדֵּשׁ מάσק τῆς οἰκογενείας μου = בַּן מְשֵׁךְ בַּת בִּיתָי: cf. Hieron. quaeest.

1 Philo has ἀπελεύσομαι (see below).
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in Gen. “ubi nos habemus Et filius Masec vernaculae meae, in Hebraeo scriptum est 'ה现代物流 על, quod Aquila transtulit ὁ νῦς τοῦ ποτίζοντος οἰκίαν μου...Theodotio vero καὶ νῦς τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας μου.” Ἀδαμάσκος 'Ελείσερ, a literal rendering of the Heb., leaving the difficulty unsolved. 3. 'Επειδὴ = ἢν, and so in xviii. 31, xix. 19; did LXX. read ἢν? Οἰκογένεσις here = ἡ οἰκία μου. Κληρονομήσει με—a Hebraism, = κληρονόμος μου ἔσται. 4. Καὶ εὕδος...ἐγένετο = ἡ οἰκία. Φωνή = λῆμβ, as in xi. 1, but apparently not elsewhere. "Οὐ...οὖτος, ἄλλα...οὖτος. 'Εκ σοῦ, euphemism for Heb. οὐκησεν, unless the LXX. read μὴν. 5. Πρὸς αὐτόν, ἤ Ἰσραὴλ. 6. Καὶ ἐπίστευσεν...οἰκία (cf. Haupt ad loc.). 'Αβραὰμ, ἢ Ἰσραὴλ. Τῷ θεῷ = γῇ, ἡ οἰκία. 'Ελεοσύνη...εἰς δικ., Heb. ‘he counted it...for righteousness’; possibly the LXX. read as in Ps. cvi. 31 (M.T.), where they have the same rendering. The N.T. follows LXX. here (Jas. ii. 23, Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6).

Exod. xix. 16—24.

16. Ἐγένετο δὲ...καὶ ἐγένετο = ἡ οἰκία...οὐκησεν. Γεννήθητος πρὸς ὥρθον = λῆμβ ἡ οἰκία. 'Εσπόρον Σεινᾶ, Ἰσραὴλ. ‘on the mountain.’ Φωνή, cod. F with ἠνίκητον καὶ. 17. 'Υπὸ τὸ ὥρον Σ. (om. Σ. ΑΦ), Ἰσραὴλ. ‘at the nether part (ἡ οἰκία) of the mountain.’ 18. Δαὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι, an idiom rendering of ἴσων οἰκίας ἐν τῷ θεῷ. Τῶν θεῶν = γῇ, cf. 21. ‘Ο καπνὸς, Ἰσραὴλ. ‘the smoke of it.’ 'Εξέστη, Ἰσραὴλ. as n. 16 where LXX. renders ἐπτομῆ. ‘Ο λαός = ἡ οἰκία; M.T., ἡ οἰκία. 19. Προβαίνουσαι ἵπποι δίσερεῖται = μὴν, ἢ μὴν. 20. Ἐξάλεσεν...Μωσῆ, Ἰσραὴλ. οὖτος; the φ after ΑΦ is dropt in accordance with Greek idiom. 21. 'Αγγέλου, ἢ Ἰσραὴλ. 'Εγγίστων, a softening of the Heb. ‘break forth’ (ἡ οἰκία); in the next verse ἐγγίζειν = ἴσων, n. 22. καὶ, Ἰσραὴλ. ‘and also’ (ἡ οἰκία), usually καὶ γε, Α. καὶ καὶ γε (Burkitt, Aquila, p. 13). 'Αριστοπροσοπεία, a double rendering of γῇ, ἡ οἰκία. ‘Απαλλάξη...ἀπ' αὐτῶν; another instance of euphemism: Ἰσραὴλ ‘break forth upon them’ (Aq. διακόψῃ ἐν αὐτοῖς). 23. Προσαναβηκαί: the double compound occurs six times in Jos. xi.—xix. 'Αφόρισται: the verb is here as in n. 12 the equivalent of ἴσων οἰκία. ‘enclose,’ but with the added thought of consecration which is latent in ἀφοριζεν, ἀφορίσμα, ἀφορίσμος (cf. Exod. xxix.

1 Or, as Dr Nestle suggests, it may have been taken as introducing the acc., as in later Hebrew or in Aramaic.
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26, Ezech. xx. 40). 24. Ἀπολέσῃ, euphemistic, as ἀπαλλάξῃ in v. 22; Aq. again, διακόψῃ.

NUM. xxiii. 7—10.

7. Παραβολήν: here for the first time = יִשְׁר. Lyons Pent., parabula. Μεσοποταμίας, i.e. בּוֹז בּוֹז (Gen. xxiv. 10), or בּוֹז בּוֹז (Gen. xxv. 20): here an interpretation of the simple בּוֹז. 'Ap', λέγον, Λ Heb. 'Επικατάρασαι μοι, and καταράσωμαί in v. 8, represent בּוֹז, whilst ἀφάρου answers to רְיִין, and ἀφάρουμαί (v. 8) to בּוֹז, an unusual instance of carelessness or poverty of language on the part of the translator; ὅρεκα (v. 9) is equally unfortunate as a rendering of בּוֹז, while on the other hand ὑπόμαθε, προσνόθωσο ἔρημον fairly represent the Heb. Προσνοήν renders ὅρασιν again in Job xx. 8, xxiv. 15. 10. ἔξακριβζέσθαι (Num.1, Job1, Dan. LXX.1), a late form for ἔξακριβζον in LXX. and Jos. Τὸ σπέρμα, Heb. 'the dust': did LXX. read ὅρασιν, or have they glossed ὅρασιν? Καὶ τὸ ἔξακριβζότα, reading ὅρασιν, Ἰσραήλ, Heb. 'the fourth part of Israel' (Aq. τοῦ τετάρτου I.). 'Ἡ ψυχή μου, as Heb., whilst the next word is sacrificed to an alliteration (ψυχή, ψυχαῖς). Τὸ σπέρμα μου is a gloss on Ἰσραήλ (cf. Brown, Heb. and Eng. Lex., p. 31); ὅς τὸ σπέρμα τοῦτον, Heb. 'as he.'

This passage illustrates both the greater freedom which the Greek translators allowed themselves in poetical contexts, and their comparative incompetence to deal with them.

DEUT. vii. 1—9.

1. λέγεις ἡμῶν, Heb. 'this is the commandment.' 'Ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, Heb. 'your God.' οὐτως, Λ Heb. Εἰσπροεύθετη, Heb. 'go over'; the Greek has lost the local reference, as in iv. 14, 4 Regn. iv. 8. 2. ἠναφοβησθε...ὑμῶν, Heb. 2nd pers. sing. Σήμερον, Λ Ἠ. ὁ νῦι κτλ., Heb. 'thy son and thy son's son,' ἵνα μακροπερεύσῃ, Heb. 'and that thy days may be prolonged'; μακροπερεύεται (μακροπερεύεται γίνεσθαι) represents this or a similar phrase in iv. 40, v. 39, xii. 9, 21, xxxii. 47; μακροχρόνως, μακροχρονίζεται also occur in iv. 40, v. 16, xvii. 20, xxxii. 27. The group is not found elsewhere in the LXX. except in Exod.1, Jud.1, and in Sirach. 3. δοῦναι Λ Μ.Τ.; perhaps added to complete the sense of the Greek; yet see v. 10 (ἤ ἄντι). 4. Καὶ ταῦτα...Αἰγύπτου Λ Heb; perhaps repeated from iv. 45 to form an introduction to Ἀκουε κτλ. 5. Διανοίας...ψυχῆς...δυνάμεως. The readings vary; for διανοίας AF Luc. read καρδίας, and the text of B is here superrasuram; for δυνάμεως some texts give ἵσχυος. The N.T. citations (Mt. xxii. 37 = Mc. xii. 29 ff.,
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Le. x. 27) present much diversity, giving both renderings of 
and both of 
; cf. Dittmar, V. T. in Novo, p. 50f.
6. καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου, Ἡ Heb.; for ‘in thy heart’ Heb. has ‘upon,’ ‘as it were imprinted there (Jer. xxxi. 33)’.
7. Προβιβάσεις, Heb. ‘shalt impress them upon’; Aq. δευτερώσεις, as if the root were ἐνν. ‘Εν αὐτοῖς ἔσεσθαι, Καθήμενος κτλ., Heb. ‘in thy sitting &c.’; ἐν οἴκῳ, ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ are inexact, Heb. ‘in thy house,’ ‘in the way.’
8. Ἀσάλευτον (F, Ἀσάλευτα) = Ῥάμπης, ‘for frontlets,’ circlets or tires for the head: Lyons Pent. (reading σαλευτᾶ), mobilis. Ἀσάλευτον occurs in the same phrase in Exod. xiii. 16, Deut. xi. 18. Aq. seems to have rendered the Heb. here and in Exod. by νακτά, i.e. ‘compressed,’ ‘tight,’ which Field (Hexapla, i. 103) explains as the “thecas in quas schedulae membraneae...inferciabantur.” The LXX. rendering may be an Alexandrian name for the φυλακτήριον, but the whole subject is obscure.
9. Φλιαὶς = Νῆας, as in Exod. xii. 7 ff.

Jos. x. 12—14.

12. Ἡ ἡμέρα παρέδωκεν...ὑποχείριον—idiomatic rendering of ἡμέρας...τὴν νύκτα. The words that follow (ἡνίκα...Ἁρπαλὴ) seem to be a gloss derived from v. 10. Καὶ εἰπεν ἤρπος, Ἡ Heb. ‘and he said in the eyes of Israel.’ Στήτω, Ἡ Heb. ‘be still.’ Γάβαθων, ἡ ‘Gibeon.’ Διλὼν, ἡ ‘Aijalon’ (Ἱλycling); cf. 2 Chron. xi. 10 A, Διλὼν. 13. Ἐν στάσει=νύκτα, which is thus distinguished from the verb represented by ἐστή. ὁ θεὸς, Ἡ Heb., Aq. τὸ ἑθνὸς. Unless a primary error is to be suspected here, the LXX. has glossed its original, from motives of piety. After the stanza ἡ inserts a reference to the Book of Jashar, which is wanting in non-Hexaplaric texts of the LXX.; cod. G adds, * οὐχὶ τούτῳ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ βιβλίων τοῦ εὐθείας τ. Οὐ προεροτευτο κτλ., a loose rendering of Ἡ Hebrew. ἡμέρα ἡ ἡμέρα του ωδὲ τὸ πρότερον ωδὲ τὸ ἑκάτασιν, a good example of a conscientious compromise between idiomatic and literal modes of rendering (cf. Heb.). Ἄνθρωπον, ΞΗΠΑΣ Ἐν εὐνοεῖται τῷ Ἐ., Ἡ Heb. ‘fought for Israel.’

JUD. v. 28—30.

28. Ἠ here omits the difficult word ὕππολυτον (Ἀ, καὶ καταμάν-
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θανεν). Ἐκτὸς τοῦ τοξικοῦ, 'forth from the loophole'; cf. Symm. in Ezek. xl. 16 θυρίδες τοξικαί: A διὰ τῆς δικτυωτῆς, 'through the lattice' (cf. 4 Regn. i. 2, Ezek. xli. 16). Ἐπιβλέπουσα...Συσφαί in A appears to be a supplementary gloss. Ἡσυχύνθη (B) confuses παλιὰθι with παλιὰ καλ; the general sense of the former is given by ἡσυχάτως Α. For ἐσχάτης cf. 1 Macc. v. 53; has it been suggested here by its similarity to the word used in B? Πόδες: A more literally ἵχνη, but ποὺς represents ὅψιν elsewhere, e.g.

Ps. lvi. (lvii.) 6, Prov. xxix. 5. 29. Αἱ σοφαι ἀρχουσαι: A, again aiming at a literal rendering, σοφαί ἀρχουσών. On the other hand B's ἀπεστρέφεν λόγους αὐτῆς ἑαυτῆς is close and yet idiomatic, while A's ἀπεκρίνατο ἐν ῥήμασιν αὐτῆς goes too far afield; the latter appears to be a Hexaplaric correction (Field, ad loc.).

30. Οὖν ἐφύροσσον αὐτὸν διαμερίζοντα σκίλα; so ΣΒΑ; Heb. 'are they not finding, [are they not] dividing booty?' LXX. seem to have read πλημμὺν for πλῆμν. Οικτείρμων οικτείρθησει B, ψιλιδίων φλάος A; both, while labouring to keep up the alliteration of the Heb., miss its point through ignorance of a rare use of πλημμύρ; for ψιλιδίων cf. xiv. 20 B, 2 Chron. xix. 2. Ποικιλτῶν (A, ποικίλων) misses the dual 'embroidery on both sides' (R. V.), or 'a couple of pieces,' "precisely as διαμερίζοντα σκίλα of above" (Moore). Βαθή in A seems to be an error for βαφή, which is found in several cursives; see Field, ad loc., and Lagarde's Lucian. Τῷ πραγματω ἄυτον σκίλα = apparently ἑλεομάκρυνσι; M.T. 'for the necks of the spoil.' A substitutes the usual ἀναστολή for the spirited and literal rendering of B (cf. Ps. xviii. = xix. 7), and appears to have read ἔνθρεως; cf. Ps. xix. (xx.) 7.

This passage is a severe test of the translator's knowledge and skill, and shews him perhaps at his worst.

1 Regn. xvii. 37—43.

37. Μ. begins μᾶλις, A, Luc. καὶ εἶπεν Δ. Ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ λέοντος...τῆς ἄρκου, an exact rendering; cf. Gen. ix. 5 ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν θηρίων. Luc., Th., ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λ. καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῆς ἄρκου. Τοῦ ἀπερευμένου, repeated from v. 36 (λ Μ. 38. μαν- διαν (Jud. iii. 16, 2 Regn. x. 4): + αὐτοῦ, A, with Μ. Περικεφα- λαίαν χ. περὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ: Luc. (A), with Μ, π. ζ. ἐπὶ κτλ., adding, καὶ ἐνέδουσεν αὐτῷ δόρρακα. 39. Ἐξωσεν τὸν Δαυΐδ, sc. Σαωύλ (cf. v. 38); Luc., A, follow Heb. in making David the object of the verb (ἐξώσεντος Δαυΐδ). Ἐκστασεν περι- πατήσας (A, περιπατήσας) ἀπαξ καὶ δίς, 'more than once he wearied

1 "Of the versions only [Vulg.] comes near the true sense" (Moore). Jerome renders pulcherrima feminarum.
himself with walking (strove to walk) in them,' reading ἀπελθα, as in Gen. xix. 11 אֶלְבִּיה, LXX. παρελθησαν (Wellhausen, Driver, H. P. Smith). "Ἀπαξ καὶ δίς occurs also in Deut. ix. 13 (where, as here, there is nothing in the Heb. to correspond), and in Neh. xiii. 20, where it represents לֶבֶנֶת צֵלֶנֶת. 'Αφαροῦσων αὐτὰ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, reading the verb probably as ἀπελθα, and omitting ὅλος.

40. Λύθος τελείους in B is obviously wrong, and A scarcely mends matters by omitting the adjective. Correct, with Lucian, λίθοις τελείους. 'Ἐν τῷ καθιὼ ποιμενικῷ: καθιὼν = καθισκός, here only in LXX., and perhaps unknown elsewhere: ποιμενικός (ποιμα'), again in Zach. xi. 15. Εἰς συλλογὴν, apparently for ποιμᾷν (ὅπερ ἰπαμ, Aq. καὶ εἰς ἀναλεκτηρίῳ). 41 is wanting in ᾿Εβ, and probably belongs to the same recension of the story which has supplied the great gaps vv. 12—31, 55—xviii. 5. 42. Heb. 'looked and saw'; so Α, Luc. Πυρράκης. cf. xvi. 12, Gen. xxv. 25. 43. Ὀσεί, added by the translators to soften the opprobrious κῶνων. 'Ἐν πάδωρ καὶ λιθοῖς, ᾿Εβ 'in (with) staves'; καὶ λίθοις is probably intended to make the question correspond to the statement of v. 40. The next words in the LXX. καὶ έἰσπένθανε θεία, ἀλλ' ἡ χείρω[ν] κυνός are evidently of the same character—"a singularly vivid reply" (Driver).

4 REGN. ii. 11—18.

11. Αὐτῶν πορευομένων ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἐλάλον—an interesting attempt to combine Greek idiom with some reminiscence of the Heb. phrase; Lucian abandons the Heb., and corrects, αὐτῶν πορευομένων καὶ λαλοῦντων. "Πάπος πυρός, Heb. 'horses of fire'; cf. ἐπίπεδος, Heb. 'horsemen,' v. 12. 'Ανά μέσον (᾿αὐτοῦ), cf. Gen. i. 7 διεχώρισεν...ἀνά μέσον. 'Ἀνελήμφηθη, Heb. 'went up'; the Greek verb is apparently repeated from vv. 9, 10, where it = ἦν. From this passage it has been borrowed by the translator of Sirach (xliv. 9, 14, xlix. 14, B), and by two writers in the N.T. ('Mc.' xvi. 19, Acts i. 2, 11); on its symbolical use see the writer's Aposiles' Creed, p. 70 f. 'Ὄς, Ἀ Ἰθ., cf. i Regn. xvii. 43 (above).

12. Πάτερ πάτερ, Heb. 'my father' δίς. Διερρήκεν...ῥήματα, after the Heb.: Lucian omits the noun, probably because of the harshness of the assonance. 13. Καὶ ὄψον = ὅποι; Luc., καὶ ἀνειλατο. Ἐγνώρὴν, 'sheepskin,' an interpretation of παλί (Vulg. pallium) wherever it is used of Elijah's characteristic raiment (3 Regn. xix. 13, 19, 4 Regn. ii. 8 ff.); cf. Heb. xi. 37 περιήλθον ἐν μητρώαις. Ἐπάνωθεν, sc. αὐτοῦ (Heb., Luc.). Ἐλειωάτε, Ἀ Ἰθ., καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν. Ἐλειωάτε is Hexaplaric, and wanting in Β*, but
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supplied by Bab A Luc. 14. 'O theos, ἄρι η ἀμβού. Ἀφθώ, a transliteration answering to ἀμφήνον (Ἄφθώ); in x. io the same form = Ἀφθώ, which was perhaps the reading before the LXX. in this place. Aq. καίπερ αὐτός, but Symm. καί νῦν, whence Jerome eliam nunc. 15. καί οἱ ἐν τετελευτω: καί A Luc. with ἄρι. 16. ὁ is not represented by ἀριβ; Luc. adds εἰς ι. Ὡ οι δυνάμεως, ἃν ἐν Ἐκ τοῦ Ἴωρδάνη, Ἐλεουσάη, Ἀ Ηβ, Luc. 18. In A Luc. Aq. Th. ἄρι the verse begins 'And they returned to him'; cf. v. 13.

Ps. cix. (cx.) 1—4.

1. ['Ο] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, ἄλλης ἡ θύσις; Ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ. ὑποσόφων τῶν ποδῶν σου: ὑποστῆπον is the reading of the best authorities in Mt. xxii. 44, Mc. xii. 36, but ὑποστῆπον keeps its place in Lc. ex. act., Hebrews. 2. καὶ κατατυπεύει = γράφει apparently. 3. Ἑράξει seems to point to a reading ἡ μονή τῶν ὑδάτων (cf. Job xxx. 15, Isa. xxxii. 8); τῶν ἁγίων (σου) = ἀριστέρα (ἅριστον); Symm. ἐν ὀρθών (ἵσταται for ἵσταται) ἁγίων. Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐκσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε, though not quoted in the N.T., had an important place in post-apostolic Christian teaching from Justin onwards (cf. Justin, Tryph. cc. 63, 76, 83; Tert. adv. Marc. v. 9; Cypr. test. 17, ep. 63); in the Arian age it was commonly cited on the Catholic side —see e.g. Cyril. Hierus., catech. vii. 2, xi. 5; Athan. or. c. Arian. iv. 27 sq.; de decr. 3, &c.; Hilar. de trin. vi. 16, xii. 8. The O.L. seems to have rendered uniformly ex utero ante luciferum genuit te, with the variant generavi in Tert. l.c.; Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter reads with ἄρι quasi de vulva orientur tibi ros adolescentiae. The LXX. appear to have read their Heb. text as ἄρι κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, ἄλλης ἡ θύσις, perhaps dropping ἅλλης un unintelligible. 4. Κατὰ τῆν τάξιν, ἄλλης ἡ θύσις, Aq. Symm. κατὰ λόγον. Cf. Heb. v. 6 ff., vii. 11, 15 (κατὰ τῆν ὅμοιότητα). The translator probably had before him the LXX. of Gen. xiv. 18; he transliterates the unique name πρῶτος in the same way.

Prov. viii. 22—25, 30—31.

22. ἐκτότεν με. So ἀριβ illicit. O.L. (condidit, creavit); codd. 23= V, 252, with Aq. Symm. Th. Vulg. (possedit), give ἐκτόσαρo—both possible meanings of ἄρι. The former rendering supplied the Arians with one of their stock arguments (cf. Athan. or. c. Arian. ii. 44 sqq.). Eis ἑπί σα κατα τῆν ὁμοιότητα, a loose and partial translation, probably a confession of inability to understand the Heb.; Th.
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23. 'Εθεμελίωσεν με, reading apparently ἀνώτερον, where Μ has ἐνώτερον; cf. Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 69. Ἡπό τοῦ τῆς γῆς ποιήσαυ, a poor rendering of Heb., probably adopted to bring this clause into line with v. 24 with which the LXX. seem to have connected it. 24. LXX. overlook ἡ γῆ and ἡ οὐδέτερη, unless they intend to convey the general sense by ποιήσαυ and προελθεῖν. 25. Πάντων, Μ. Γεννᾶς ἐνεπο Μ 'I was brought forth.' 30. ἀρµοζονσα = ἀνακρίβει, the word being referred by the translator to εὐθεία; similarly Symm. Th., ἐστηριγμένη. 'Η προσέχαρεν implies the reading ἀρµοζονσα; ῥόμ ὃς is connected by LXX. with the next clause. 31. Ὄτε...συνερέωσα: Heb. 'rejoicing in the world of his earth.' LXX. seem to have read λαβὼν τοῦ καθέληλι, as Lagarde suggests; had שולח בִּר ו stood in their text, ὁκουμένη would have been ready at hand as a rendering (cf. 2 Regn. xxii. 16, Ps. ix. 9, &c.). Εὐφραίνωσα, reading εὐφραίνω. Υἱὸν ἀνθρώπων = ἐνεπο ἡμῖν; cf. viovs 'Αδάμ, Deut. xxxii. 8; ἐνεπ ο is translated by this phrase in Ps. x. (xi.) 4, and repeatedly in the poetical books.

Job xix. 23—27.

23. Τίς γὰρ ἀν δόη; See above p. 308; the phrase is repeated in the Hebrew, but the translator contents himself with using it once. ᾿Ιανει is ignored; its usual equivalent in the LXX. is νῦν or οὖν, unless it is transliterated (p. 324). Εἰς τὸν ἀλώνα seems to represent Ἀνεκ, which in Μ belongs to the next verse; Th. translates it εἰς μαρτύρων, reading the word as Ἀνεκ. 24. B* omits ἐν πέτραις ἐγκληφῆναι which appears to be necessary to the sense; in supplying it BAbNA prefix ζ, a manifest gloss. 25. Ἀέναος ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλεύει με μελλων, a paraphrase of Heb. 'my Goel lives'; ἀνανιος in the LXX. elsewhere = ἀνατέναι, and ᾿Ιαυὶ is ἀγχαστέους (Ruth iii. 9, etc.), or λυτρωθής (Ps. xviii. 14, lxxvii. 35). 25—26. Ἑπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσει or ἀναστήσει appears to correspond with ἐν φλί (Ruth iii. 9, and ἐν φλί ἁμαρτειν, 2 Macc. vii. 14, xii. 43); as cited by Clem. R. 1 Cor. 26 (ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην τὴν ἀναστήσεσαν ταύτα πάντα), the words are brought into still nearer agreement with the faith of the

S. S. 22
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Church; see Apostles' Creed, p. 89 f. Παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου...συντελεσθῇ corresponds in position with words which Μιχ. divides and points as ἡ γὰρ Κυρίου τὰ ἁγία, but seems to be partly borrowed from the next verse. Στ. suggests ἡ γὰρ Κυρίου τὰ ἁγία, which blends Μιχ. v. 1b, 3a. It will be observed that cod. A reads ἡγούμενος with Mt.

1. Ἐμφαραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφραγμός, i.e. ἡ γὰρ Κυρίου. Τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ: LXX. read 'ος καταστήσει for 'ος καταστάσει. 2. Βῃθ-λέεμ οἶκος Ἐφράδα: did LXX. read οἴκῳ ἃ ἄντων; Ἀλιγγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἴναι 'art little to be,' as Heb. The passage is quoted in Mt. ii. 6 in a Greek paraphrase which substitutes οὐδαμὸς ελαχίστη for 'little to be,' and τοῖς ἠγέμονιν (ὑπό) for 'thousands' (ὑπάρχειν).

3. Ἐως καὶ τοῦ τικτούσης τέξτεται, apparently for εἰς καὶ τοῦ τικτούσῃ τὸ τέξτεται. 4. Καὶ ὤψεται, τὸ ποίμνων αὐτῶν were obelised in Hex. and find no place in Μιχ.; the former has perhaps originated in a misreading of ἔφη as ἔφη, so that καὶ ὁ ὡς καὶ ποιμανεῖ is in fact a doublet. Κύριος, subject; Heb. 'in the strength of J.,' the subject being the same as in v. 1. 'Ὑπάρχουσιν, ὑπάρχειν; the LXX. read ἔστιν, connecting the verb with the previous words; for ὑπάρχειν cf. Ps. liv. (iv.) 20 ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων.

JEREM. xxxviii. 31—37 (xxxvi. 30—36).

Vv. 31—34 are cited in Heb. viii. 8—12, q.v. 31. Διαθήκημα, in Hebrews συντελέσω, cf. Jer. xli. (xxivv.) 8 συντελέσαι (ὃρα) διαθήκην, and ib. 15. Τῷ οίκῳ βίος, in Hebrews ἐπί τῶν οίκων. 32. Διεβέμι, in Hebrews ἐποίησα: the writer appears to dislike the repeated alliteration in διατίθεθαι διαθήκην. Ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβομένου μου, for the more usual τοῦ ἐπιλαβέσθαι με οτε ὅτε (ẏ) ἐπιλαβόμην. Ὁτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν εἰς...Heb. 'which...they broke'; ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, reading θείους for θείου. 33. ἡ διαθήκη μου, Heb. 'the covenant.' Δίδωσι Δώσω, a Hebraism not represented in Μιχ.; in Hebrews δίδωσι appears without δώσω, and so ΑQ in Jer. Εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, Heb. 'in their inward parts.' 34. Ἡ ἡ γὰρ Κυρίου τὰ ἁγία, which blends Μιχ. v. 1b, 3a. It will be observed that cod. A reads ἡγούμενος with Mt.
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with an Alexandrian version. Ἀπὸ...δὲν, ἠμαρτίαν... 

ἡμᾶς, 'iniquity,' 'sin.' 35—37. In א ב, 36, 37 precede 35—

35. Φθόνος Κύριος, Heb. 'thus saith J.' (at the beg. of the verse). ἡμῶν, ἡμᾶς, 'the 

ordinances of the moon' (but cf. ἰονᾶθα in v. 35, Heb.). Κραγγῆν, 

reading perhaps πλην or περὶ for ἀπὸ. 37. Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ 

τὰς ἀνθρώπους, as almost invariably in the Prophets1 from Hosea 

xii. 5 (6) onwards, with the exception of Isaiah, who transliterates 

τὰς ἀνθρώπους (Κύριος σαβαὼθ, Isa. i. 9, al.).

DAN. xii. 1—4.

1. Χῶραν (LXX.), probably a corruption for ὁραν (cf. Bevan, 
p. 48); παρελεύσεται (LXX.), reading ἀναίη for ἀναίη (ἀναστήσεται, 
Th.). ὁ ἄγγελος (LXX.), a gloss; Th. literally, ἄρχων. Ἐπὶ 
τοὺς νιόσ (LXX., Th.), ἵνα ἔσται 

καὶ ρόδος ἠμῶν; Th. is again more literal than LXX. Ἁλίφις οἱ οὐ 

γέγονεν (cf. Mt. xxiv. 21, Mc. xiii. 19). Th. repeats the subject 
with the view of preventing ambiguity; in the sequel LXX. (as 
handed down to us) overlook ἥ, while Th. adds ἐν τῇ γῇ or ἐπὶ τῆς 

γῆς. ἡμῶν, ἡμᾶς; Bevan suggests a corruption for ἐκσωθήσεται 
or some other compound of σωθήσεται; but ὅσις may be a gloss 
upon the tamer word which stood in the original. Th. rightly, 

σωθήσεται. ὁς ἐν ἑυφραν, ἠρώτηται—overlooked by Th., unless we 
accept the reading of AQ, ἐν ἑυφραν [ὁ] γεγραμμένος. 2. ἐν τῷ 

πλάτει τῆς γῆς, LXX.; ἐν γῆς χώματι Th., Heb. 'in the ground of 
dust' (but see Bevan, p. 201 f.). Διασποράν καὶ ἀστερίαν, LXX.; 

θραύστησεν, for the word see Deut. xxiv., 22. 3. Οἱ φωστήρες τοῦ ὁμονοῦ, LXX., a reminiscence of Gen. i. 14 
(LXX.); cf. Sap. xiii. 2. Οἱ κατισχύσαντες τοὺς λόγους LXX., reading 

τὰ θεοτύπα μοι καὶ τὸν κύριον ὁ θεὸς; Th. translates 

τὰ θεοτύπα μοι καὶ τὸν κύριον ὁ θεὸς; LXX., the ordinary Biblical phrase, used 
in iii. 36, 63; Heb., Th. have 'the stars.' 4. Ἀπομανώσων (LXX.), 

διαφήμωσω (Th.). Both senses have been found in the Heb.; 

cf. Bevan, ad loc. Πλησθῇ ἥ γῆ ἀδικίας, LXX., reading πλην or 

πλην for πλην.

1 Zech. xiii. 2, Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) are the only exceptions, and in both 
cases the MSS. are divided.
The student who has gone through these extracts, or who is able to dispense with help of this kind, is recommended to begin the careful study of some one book or group of books. For several reasons the Books of Samuel (1—2 Regn.) offer a promising field for work of this kind. They are on the whole the part of the Old Testament in which the value of the Septuagint is most manifest and most generally recognised, and invaluable help in the study of both the Hebrew text and the versions is at hand in the commentaries of Wellhausen, Driver, and H. P. Smith. But whatever book may be selected, the method and the aims of the reader will be the same. He will read the Greek in the first place as a version, and he will use all the means at his disposal for ascertaining the original text which lay behind it. But he will read it also as a monument of early Hellenistic Greek, and mark with growing interest its use of words and phrases which, originating at Alexandria in connexion with the work of translating the Hebrew Scriptures, eventually became the vehicle of a fuller revelation in the writings of the Apostolic age.

LITERATURE on the general subject of this chapter: Pearsoni praefatio paraenetica (Cambridge, 1665; cum notulis E. Churton, 1865); Hody, De Bibli. textibus originalibus (Oxford, 1705); Thiersch, De Pent. vers. Alexandrina (Erlangen, 1841); Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig, 1841); Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alex. Hermeneutik, 1857; Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften, iv. 73 ff. (Berlin, 1875—8); Selwyn, art. Septuagint in Smith's D. B. ii. (London, 1863); Wellhausen, do. in Encyclopaedia Britannica (London, 1886); W. R. Smith, Old Testament in Jewish Church (1881, ed. 2, 1892); Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford, 1889); Driver, Notes on the Books of Samuel, 1itr. (Oxford, 1890); Buhl,

1 W. R. Smith, O. T. in J. Church, p. 83.
2 If the student prefers to begin with Genesis, he will learn much as to the LXX. version from Spurrell's Notes (ed. 2, 1898). For more advanced study Proverbs will form a suitable subject, and here he may seek help from Lagarde's Anmerkungen, and Professor Toy's recent commentary in the 'International Critical' series.
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Kanon u. Text des O. T. (Leipzig, 1891); Nestle, *Marginalien* (Tübingen, 1893); Streane, *Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge, 1896); the various Introductions to the Old Testament; Commentaries on particular books, esp. those of Dillmann and Spurrell (Genesis), Driver (Deuteronomy), Moore (Judges), Wellhausen, Driver, and H. P. Smith (Samuel), Toy (Proverbs), Ryssel (Micah), Cornill (Ezekiel). A complete commentary on the LXX., or on any of the groups of books which compose it, is still a desideratum.

On the Semitic style of the LXX. the reader may consult the Ἐλσαγώγη of Adrianus (Migne, *P. G.* xciii.).
CHAPTER VI.

TEXT-DIVISIONS: STICHI, CHAPTERS, LECTIONS, CATENAE.

The Greek Old Testament, as it appears in the editions of the last three centuries, is divided into chapters and verses which correspond generally with those of the printed Hebrew Bible.

The traditional text-divisions of the Hebrew and the Greek Bible are not absolutely identical. Besides the more serious differences described in Part II. c.l., it not unfrequently happens that a Greek chapter is longer or shorter than the corresponding chapter of the Hebrew by a verse or more, and that as a consequence there are two systems of verse-numeration throughout the succeeding chapter\(^1\).

A system of verse-division\(^2\) is mentioned in the Mishnah (Meg. 4. 4, Kidd. 30. 1). The Massorets noted the number of verses (פֶּסוּקִים) at the end of each book and portion of the canon; thus Deuteronomy is stated to consist of 955 pesukim, and the entire Torah of 5888. Of chapter-divisions in the Hebrew Bible there are three kinds. (a) There is a pre-Talmudic division of the canon into sections known as פָּרָשִׁים. The parashahs are of two kinds, open and closed, i.e. para-

---

\(^1\) In such cases both systems are represented in the Cambridge edition of the LXX. (see O. T. in Greek, i. p. xiv.).
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graphs, which begin a new line, and sub-paragraphs\(^1\), which are preceded only by a space. They are still registered in the printed Bibles by the א (for הפתח, ‘open’) and נ (for הנפתח, ‘closed’) which occur at intervals throughout the Torah\(^*\). (b) A second system of parashahs breaks up the text into longer sections for the use of the synagogue. The Law was divided into 54 Sabbath lessons according to the Babylonian tradition, but into 154 according to the tradition of Palestine. With few exceptions\(^2\) the beginning of a lesson coincides with that of an open or closed parashah; the coincidence is marked in the Torah by a thrice repeated א or נ. The Prophets were similarly divided for synagogue reading, but the prophetic lections were known as haphtaroth (חפרות) and were not, like the liturgical parashahs, distinguished by signs inserted in the text. (c) Lastly, the printed Hebrew Bibles are divided into chapters nearly identical with those of the English versions. This system of capitulation is relatively modern, and was applied first to the Latin Vulgate in the thirteenth century, probably by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury († 1228)\(^4\). It was adapted to the Hebrew Bible in R. Isaac Nathan’s Concordance, a work of the fifteenth century, in which use was also made of the older division into verses or pesukim.

Of printed editions the Bomberg Hebrew Bible of 1521 was the first to employ the mediaeval system of chapters; the verse-division found a place in the Latin version of Pagnini (1528), and the Latin Vulgate of Robert Stephen (1555), and finally in the Hebrew Bible of Athias (1661). Both chapters

---

1 A similar system of paragraphing has been adopted in the English Revised Version, and in the Cambridge l.xx.; see R.V. Preface, and O.T. in Greek, i. p. xv.
2 In Baer’s edition they are given throughout the Bible.
3 In the Pentateuch there is only one, the lesson (12) which begins at Gen. xlvi. 28 (Ryle, p. 236).
4 See Gregory, prolegg. p. 167 ff.
and verses were applied to the text of the Septuagint before the sixteenth century; the capitulation appeared in the Complutensian Polyglott and in the Aldine edition of 1518, and the verse-numeration in the Frankfort edition of the Aldine text.

Neither the verses nor the chapters of the existing text-division occur in MSS. of the Greek Old Testament, except in relatively later copies\(^2\), or in older MSS. where the numerals have been supplied by a recent hand. But the student who examines MSS. of the LXX. or their facsimiles finds himself confronted by other systems which are both interesting and in some respects important. To these the present chapter will be devoted.

1. We begin with the shorter divisions, known as \(\sigma\tau\dot{i}\chi\omega\iota\), \(\kappa\omega\lambda\alpha\), or \(\kappa\omicron\mu\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\).

(a) \(\Sigma\tau\dot{i}\chi\omega\oslash\), Lat. \textit{versus}, is properly a series of objects placed in a row. The word is used in the LXX. of the stones in the High Priest’s breastplate (\(\sigma\tau\dot{i}\chi\omega\ \lambda\iota\dot{b}\omega\nu\), Exod. xxviii. 17 ff.), the pomegranates wrought upon the capitals of the pillars in the Temple (\(\sigma\tau\dot{o}\chi\omega\iota\ \rho\omega\nu\), 3 Regn. vii. 6), and the rows of cedar-wood shafts (\(\tau\rho\mu\dot{\omega}\ \sigma\tau\dot{i}\chi\omega\iota\ \sigma\tau\i\lambda\omicron\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\delta\rho\i\nu\i\nu\), \textit{ib.} 9). When applied to the art of writing, the word signifies a continuous line of letters or syllables. The extent of an author’s literary work was measured by the \textit{stichi} he had written; cf. e.g. Diogenes Laertius iv. 24, \textit{Kραντωρ κατέληυεν υπομνήματα εἰς μυριάδας στίχων τρεῖς}: Dionysius Halicarn. vi. 1126 \textit{πέντε ἡ ἕκ μυριάδας στίχων τοῦ ἀνδρος (sc. Δημοσθένους) καταλελοιπότος}. The ‘line’ might be measured in various ways, as by the limits imposed upon the scribe by the breadth of his papyrus, or in the case of poetry by the number of feet in the metre; or again it might be fixed in each instance by the requirements of

\(^1\) It prints the verse-numbers in the margin, and begins every verse with a capital letter.

\(^2\) E.g. H.-P. 38 (xv.), 122 (xv.), where the modern chapters are marked.
the sense; or it might depend upon a purely conventional standard. Evidence has been produced to shew that the last of these methods was adopted in the copying of Greek prose writings, and that the length of the prose *stichus* was determined by that of the Homeric hexameter, i.e. it was normally a line of sixteen syllables; in some instances the Iambic trimeter seems to have been the standard preferred, and the line consisted of twelve syllables. The number of letters in the *stichus* was on the average 37—38 in the one case, and 28—29 in the other. Such a system served more than one useful purpose. Besides facilitating reference, it regulated the pay of the scribe, and consequently the price of the book. The number of the lines in a book once determined, it might be written in any form without affecting the cost. The compiler of the Cheltenham list explains that dishonest scribes at Rome and elsewhere purposely suppressed or mutilated the stichometry. Thus the careful entry of the *στίχοι* in the margins of ancient books, or the computation at the end of the number of *στίχοι* contained in them, was not due to mere custom or sentiment, but served an important practical end.

(b) Besides this conventional measurement there existed another system which regulated the length of the line by the sense. Sense-divisions were commonly known as *κώλα* or *κόμματα*. The *colon*, according to Suidas, is a line which forms a complete clause (ὁ ἀπηρτοιμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος); the *comma* is a shorter *colon*.

This arrangement was originally used in transcribing poetry, but before Jerome's time it had been applied to the great prose

---

2 J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, pp. 8, 15.
4 "Indiculum versuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi avariciae causa non habent integrum."
authors; cf. Hieron. praef. ad Isa. 1: “nemo cum prophetas versibus viderit esse descriptos, metro eos aestimet apud Hebraeos ligari, et aliquid simile habere de Psalmis vel operibus Salomonis; sed quod in Demosthene et Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scribantur et commata, qui utique prosa et non versibus conscripserunt, nos quoque, utilitati legiscentum providentes, interpretationem novam scribendi genere distinximus”; praef. in Ezek. 2: “legite igitur et hunc iuxta translationem nostram, quoniam per cola scriptus et commata manifesto legiscentibus sensum tribuit.” Cf. Cassiod. de inst. div. litt., praef. Hesychius of Jerusalem († c. 433) treated the Greek text of the Dodecapropheton in the same way 3: ἕστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τούτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπούδασμα στιχε-δόν, ὡς τὰ πολλὰ, πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετώμενων σαφήνειαν τὰς προφη-τείας ἐκτίθεσθαι. οὕτω τουγαροῖν δύσει μὲν τὸν Δαβίδ κυβαρίζωντα, τὸν Παρομοιασθῆν τὰς παραβολὰς καὶ τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν τὰς προ-φητείας ἐκθέμενον, οὕτω συγγραφεῖαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰωβ βιβλίον, οὕτω μερισθέντα τοῖς στίχοις τὰ τῶν Ἀσμάτων ἄσματα...οὐ μάθην ἐν ταῖς δώδεκα βιβλίοις τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἕκολούθησα.

Specimens of colometry may be seen in Codd. Ν B, where the poetical books are written in cola of such length that the scribe has been compelled to limit himself in this part of his work to two columns instead of dividing his page into three or four.

Among the lists of the books of the O.T. canon printed in an earlier chapter of this book (Part II. c. i.) there are three which are accompanied by a stichometry. We will now collect their measurements and exhibit them in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Stichometry of Nicephorus</th>
<th>Stichometry of Cod. Clarom.</th>
<th>Stichometry of Mommsen's list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>3530</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>{ 2450 }</td>
<td>{ 2000 }</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>{ 250 }</td>
<td>{ 250 }</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Migne, P. L. xxviii. 771.
2 Migne, P. L. xxviii. 938.
3 Migne, P. G. xxiii. 1339 sq.
4 Total of first 7 books, '18000.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Stichometry of Nicephorus</th>
<th>Stichometry of Cod. Clarom.</th>
<th>Stichometry of Mommsen’s list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralip.</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralip.</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esdras</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dodecapropheton)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>[2970]</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4070</td>
<td>4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>2000^2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In Mommsen’s list the following totals are also given: Ruth and 1—4 Kingdoms, 9500; Salomonic books, 6500; Major Prophets, 15370; the whole canon, 69500.

2 Susanna is calculated separately (500).
The figures given above correspond to those in the lists printed in c. i., which follow the text of Preuschen (Analecta, pp. 156f., 142ff., 138f.). Some variants and suggested rectifications may be seen in Zahn, Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons, ii., pp. 295 ff., 143 ff., and Sanday, Studia Biblica, iii., pp. 266 ff.

Many MSS. of the Greek Bible contain more or less complete stichometries of the several books of the canon. Either the total number of *stichi* is registered at the end of the book, or a record is kept throughout the book by placing a figure or figures in the margin at the end of each centenary of lines. Some of our oldest MSS. reproduce in this form the stichometry of their archetypes; in other cases, a stichometry which has been copied into the margin by a second or later hand. Thus in Cod. B, the margins of 1—4 Regn. and Isaiah present a nearly complete record¹ of *stichi* written *prima manu*, and doubtless transcribed from the MSS. to which the scribe owed his copy of those books. A marginal register of *stichoi* is also found in part of Cod. F, beginning with Deuteronomy, and in Cod. Q, where it is due to the hand which has added the Hexaplaric matter. The entries in B and Q agree generally in Isaiah; in both MSS. the last entry occurs at Isa. lxv. 19, where the number of *stichoi* reaches 3500. But the famous Chigi MS. of the Prophets (Cod. 87) counts 3820 *stichoi* in Isaiah². This approaches the number given by Nicephorus, whilst the total number of *stichoi* in BQ, 3600, agrees with the computation of the Claromontane list. The addition of 200 *stichoi* in Nicephorus and Cod. 87 is due, Ceriani suggests, to the greater length of the Hexaplaric and Lucianic texts³. There is a similar disparity between the stichometry of Nicephorus and the reckoning of Cod. F in Deuteronomy,

¹ It is printed by Harris, Stichometry, p. 59 ff.
² οὐκ, or as Allatius read the MS., ἐκάθισι (3808); see Cozza, Sacr. bibl. vet. fragm. iii. p. xv.
³ De cod. March., p. 23 ff.
where in F the stichi are 3000, but in Nicephorus 3100. On the other hand the later uncial K makes the stichi of Numbers to be 3535, which comes very near to the reckoning of Nicephorus.

Stichometrical variation is doubtless chiefly or largely due to divergent types of text. But other causes of disparity were at work. It was easy for scribes to misread the letters which represented the number of the lines, especially when they were mechanically copied from an archetype. The older signs may have been sometimes misunderstood, or those which were intelligible may have been confused by careless copying. A glance at the comparative table on p. 346f. will shew that several of the larger discrepancies can only be explained in some such way.

The following stichometry is derived chiefly from Dr E. Klostermann's *Analecta*, giving the result of his researches among cursive MSS., with some additions supplied by the Editors of the larger LXX.

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

1 The symbol used is $\theta$, which occurs also in B. On this symbol, see J. Woisin, *De Graecorum notis numeratis*, n. 67 (Kiel, 1886).
2 The numeration of the stichi in the poetical books ascribed to the greater uncials in the Cambridge manual LXX. is derived from Dr Nestle's *Supplementum* (Leipzig, 1887), and rests on an actual counting of the lines, and not on statements in the MSS. themselves.
3 Cf. J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 31.
4 See p. 44 ff.
5 4400 in H.-P. 54.
6 3530 in H.-P. 54.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>21001</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; 2156, Paris, Reg. gr. 2; Athos, Pantocr. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Paris, Reg. gr. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36 (500, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; 2042, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kingdoms</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralip.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; 5000, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralip.</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; 3100, Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esdras</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>H.-P. 161, 248; Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>(including asterisked lines, 1600 without them) H.-P. 161 (?), 248;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36; Ven. Marc. gr. xvi, Ven. gr. i. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>H.-P. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>H.-P. 86; 776, H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>H.-P. 86; 204, H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>H.-P. 231; 3820, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>H.-P. 231; 3800, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>H.-P. 231; 350, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Π, (?), H.-P. 231; 860, Barb. iii. 36 (including asterisked lines, 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.of Jeremiah</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>H.-P. 231; 4000, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>H.-P. 231; 1720, Barb. iii. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>H.-P. 231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2450 in H. P. 54.
2. Ecclesiastical Canticles, 600, Barb. iii. 36.
3. Total of Minor Prophets variously calculated at 3750, 3600, 3300 (Barb. iii. 36).
4. Possibly a corruption of ΠΠε (see next page).
2. No complete system of capitulation is found in any of our existing uncial MSS. of the Greek Old Testament. Yet even the Vatican MS., which is written continuously except in the poetical books, bears traces of a system of chapter-divisions which is older than itself\(^1\). It begins with Proverbs, and from that book onwards chapter-numbers appear in the margin of the canonical writings, whilst in some instances there is a double capitulation, as the following table will shew.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>85(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep. of Jeremiah</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>21(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the left-hand column are *prima manu*; those on the right are in a hand of perhaps the eleventh century (? that of 'Clement the Monk,' the industrious *instaurator* who has left his name on pp. 238 and 264 of the MS.\(^4\)). In Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song the capitulation of the later hand differs widely, as will be observed, from the system which the original scribe reproduced from his archetype. But in the Prophets the corrector seems simply to have followed the numbers inscribed in the margin by B\(^*\); the latter can be detected here and there under the large coarse characters of the later hand, and towards the end of Jeremiah and throughout

---

\(^1\) Tischendorf (*Mon. sacr. ined. n. c.*, i. prolegg., p. xxvii.) points out that Tertullian recognises a system of chapters in Numbers.

\(^2\) In this book the chapter-numbers correspond to the divisions indicated in the original by the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and in the recension by transliteration of the Hebrew alphabetic names.

\(^3\) This number includes the Greek additions.

\(^4\) See the pref. to Fabiani and Cozza’s facsimile, p. xvii. sqq.
Daniel the two sets of numbers are distinctly visible. In Jeremiah the *instaurator* here and there breaks away from the guidance of the first hand, and the totals are slightly different. But the difference is probably accidental, and it is certainly slight; whereas in the Salomonic books another system is followed, in which the chapters are three or four times as long as those of the older capitulation.

Cod. A is broken into paragraphs throughout the prose books, the beginning of each paragraph being indicated not only by paragraph-marks, but by the use of a capital letter which projects into the margin. Besides the paragraphing certain books—Deuteronomy, Joshua, 3—4 Kingdoms, Isaiah—retain traces of a capitulation imperfectly copied from the archetype. In Deuteronomy chapter-marks occur at cc. i. 1, 9, 19, 40; ii. 1, 7, 14; in Joshua they begin at ix. 1 (ιΒ) and proceed regularly (x. 1, 16, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38; xi. 1, &c.) down to xix. 17 (λη); in 3 Regn. the first numeral occurs at c. viii. 22 (κβ), and the last at xxi. 17 (θβ); 4 Regn. returns only one or two numbers (e.g. θ stands opposite to c. iii. 20). In Isaiah, again, the entries are few and irregular; Β appears at c. ii. 1, and θ at xxi. 1.

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

Jeremiah, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are capitulated in cod. Q, and in the two last-named books the capitulation of Q agrees with that of B. In Jeremiah, where the agreement is less complete, the chapters in Q do not proceed beyond c. xxiv., a circumstance which suggests a Hexaplaric origin.

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

---

1 Tischendorf, notes to facsimile, p. v.
one of which is accompanied by brief headings corresponding in general character to the τίτλοι of the Gospels. The two capitulations, which are represented with more or less of completeness in the Hexateuch and in 1–3 Kingdoms¹, differ considerably, as the following table will shew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginal Capitulation</th>
<th>Capitulation accompanied by titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>65²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cod. Sin. I. (x.) is divided into κεφάλαια which number as follows: Genesis, 150; Exodus, 88; Leviticus, 63; Deuteronomy, 69; Joshua, 30; 1 Regn., 66; 2 Regn., 63⁴.

A list of sections quoted by Dr Klostermann⁵ from the cursive MS. cod. Barberini iii, 36 (cent. xi.) exhibits another widely different scheme⁶:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>3 Kingdoms</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Habakkuk</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 Kingdoms</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kingdoms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingdoms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Another Coislin MS. (Coisl. gr. 8) gives the following capitulation for some of the later histories: 1 Chron. 83, 2 Chron. 86, Tobit 21, Judith 34, 1 Esdr. 109, 2 Esdr. 80, Esther 55.
² Beginning at c. iv. 41.
³ In Judges there is no capitulation, but the periods of bondage are distinguished as ΔΟΤΛΕΙΔ Ε, B, &c., and the exploits of the successive judges by ΚΡΙΤΙΩΕ Ε, B, and so forth.
⁴ Cf. the numbers in B. M. Add. MS. 35123: Gen., 148; Exod., 84; Lev., 62; Num., 61; Deut., 69; Josh., 30; Jud., 33.
⁵ Analecta, p. 83 ff.
⁶ Interesting traces of another old capitulation are to be found in the ἔκλογη τοῦ νόμου printed in Cotelerii Eccl. Gr. Mon. i. p. 1. The chapters here are shorter and therefore more numerous than in any of the lists given.
It is clear that no induction can be drawn from the facts which are at present within our reach; nor can the various systems of capitulation be safely classified until some scholar has collected and tabulated the chapter-divisions of a large number of MSS. of varying ages and provenance. It is probable, however, that the systems, which at present seem to be nearly as numerous as the capitulated copies of the LXX., will prove to be reducible to a few types reproduced by the scribes with many variations in detail.

The 'titles' deserve separate consideration. In the few instances where we are able to institute a comparison these headings seem to be independent. In Numbers, e.g., the following table shews little correspondence between those in codd. K, M, even when the chapters coincide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Cod. K</th>
<th>Cod. M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii. 10.</td>
<td>Τὰ δῶρα τῶν ἄρχοντων.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν δῶρων ὧν προσήνεγκαν οἱ [κ] άρχοντες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 5.</td>
<td>Περί τοῦ ἄγνισμοῦ τῶν Λευ[τόν].</td>
<td>'Αφορισμὸς τῶν Λευετών εἰς τὸ λειτουργεῖν Κυρίῳ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 16.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ληψομένων ἁ πνευμα.</td>
<td>Περὶ ο’ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προφητευσάντων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

above, e.g. Exod. xxii. 1—27 forms part of the 68th chapter and Deut. xxv. 11 ff. of the 93rd in their several books, while Leviticus apparently contains 150 chapters and Numbers 140.

1 Paragraphs or sections marked by capitals protruding into the margin or written in red ink, or (less frequently) distinguished by numbers, occur perhaps in the majority of cursives; the following list of cursives thus divided is taken from descriptions of MSS. collated for the use of the Editors of the larger LXX.: H.-P. x. xii., 16, 17, 18, 29, 38, 46, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 64 (double system of capitulation), 68, 70, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79 (in Gen. χία), 83, 84, 93, 108, 118, 120, 121, 123, 126, 127, 128 (contemporary numbers), 130, 131, 134; B. M. Add. 35123; Lambeth 1214; Paris Ars. 8415; Esc. Ω. i. 13, Σ. i. 16; Munich gr. 454; Grotta Ferrata A. γ. 1; Leipzig gr. 361; Athens, Pantocr. 24 (double system of capitulation, τίτλοι), Vatop. 513, 516; Laur. 112 (both chapters and στίχοι numbered); Athens, nat. gr. 44; Sinai 1, Jerusalem, H. Sep. 2.

2 Tischendorf (Mon. sacr. ined. n. c. i. p. 78) prints ἀγωμένων.
Text-divisions: Stichi, Chapters, Lections, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Cod. K.</th>
<th>Cod. M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xii. 1.</td>
<td>'Αρων καὶ Μαρία κατὰ Μωσῆν.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς λέπρας Μαρία ἡ ἐσχεν ύβρισασά τὴν γυναῖκα Μωσῆ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 1.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν κατασκευαζόντων τὴν γῆν.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων κατασκοπήσαι τὴν γῆν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 23.</td>
<td>Περὶ Χαλεβ] νίου [Ἰε-φωνῇ].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 34.</td>
<td>Ἰτι ὡς ἡμέρας κατ-</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς ἐπαναστάσεως τῆς κατὰ Μωσῆν παρὰ τοῦ Κάρε συναγωγῆς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εσκέψασα τὴν γῆν,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοσοῦτο ἐκ ἑποίησαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 1.</td>
<td>Περὶ Κάρε καὶ Δαύδ καὶ</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς ἐπαναστάσεως τῆς κατὰ Μωσῆν παρὰ τοῦ Κάρε συναγωγῆς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Αβιρών καὶ Αβνάν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 1.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῆς ῥάβδου ’Αρων</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων πρὸς Σήων, καὶ πὼς ἐνίκησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰσραήλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῆς βλαστησάσης.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi. 21.</td>
<td>Περὶ Σήων βασιλέως ’Α-</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων πρὸς Σήων, καὶ πὼς ἐνίκησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰσραήλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μορραίων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii. 1.</td>
<td>&quot;Επαρεῖς καὶ σταθμοὶ τῶν</td>
<td>Πῶς διώδευσαν οἱ νῦν Ἰσραήλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νιῶν Ἰσραήλ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii. 3.</td>
<td>Περὶ τοῦ νυχθῆµερον.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv. 9.</td>
<td>Περὶ τῶν πόλεων τῶν</td>
<td>Περὶ φονεῶς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φυγαδευτηρίων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following τίτλοι for Exod. ii.—viii. are taken from a Vienna MS. (Th. gr. 3):

- a. περὶ τῆς γεννῆσεως Μωσέως.
- β. πρώτη ὅπτασια πρὸς Μωσῆν ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.
- γ. περὶ τῆς συναντησιος μετ’ (?) ’Αρων.
- δ. εἰσοδος (?) Μωσέως καὶ ’Αρων πρὸς Φαραώ.
- ε. περὶ τῶν μαστιγωθέντων γραμματέων.
- σ. περὶ τῆς ῥάβδου τῆς στραφείσης εἰς δόξων.
- ζ. πρώτη πληγὴ μεταστροφῆ τοῦ οὐδατος εἰς αίμα.
- η. δευτέρα πληγή τῶν βατράχων.
- θ. τρίτη πληγή τῶν σκνυτῶν. Κτλ.

Examples occur of longer headings, which aim at giving a comprehensive summary or a brief interpretation. (a) The preface to Hesychius’s colometrical arrangement of the Minor Prophets is followed by a complete set of τίτλοι for the Twelve Prophets and Isaiah. The numbers are as follows: Hosea

---

1 Migne, P.G. xciii., 1345 sqq. The titles for Isaiah with a collection
20, Joel 10, Obadiah 3, Jonah 4, Micah 13, Nahum 5, Habakkuk 4, Zephaniah 7, Haggai 5, Zechariah 32, Malachi 10, Isaiah 88. The titles are with scarcely an exception polemical or dogmatic in character, e.g. Hosea: δ. Εἰκὼν τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς, ἐξ Ἡ Ἐκκλησίας τὸ κατὰ σάρκα τίκτεται, καὶ λαοῦ τὸ μὲν ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ ἐμενεν, τὸ δὲ υποτερον ἐπιστρέφει καὶ σωζέται. (b) The Syro-hexaplaric Daniel is divided into ten chapters, each headed by a full summary of its contents¹.

3. One class of sections calls for separate treatment. In Part i. c. v. (p. 168 f.) some account has been given of MSS. which consist of lessons taken from the Old Testament. Few of these lectionaries are older than the eleventh century, and only one goes back to the sixth or seventh. But the choice of passages for public reading in the services of the Church must have begun at a much earlier period. The public reading of the O. T. Scriptures was an institution inherited by the Church from the Synagogue (Lc. iv. 16 ff., Acts xiii. 15, xv. 21; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 13), and there is evidence that it was prevalent in Christian communities of the second and third centuries². At one great Christian centre provision was made for the liturgical reading of the Bible on certain week-days as well as on Sunday. "At Alexandria (writes Socrates) on Wednesdays and Fridays the Scriptures are read and the clergy expound them...and this is at Alexandria a practice of long standing, for it was on these occasions that Origen appears to have given most of his instructions in the Church³." Turning to Origen’s homilies on the Old Testament of glosses, apparently by the same author, have been edited by M. Faulhaber from cod. Vat. Gr. 347 (Hesychii Hieros. interpretatio Isaiae, Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1899).

¹ Bugati, Daniel, p. 1. See also the περιοχαί (or ὑποθέσεις) εἰς τοὺς ψαλμοὺς ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea, which precede the Psalter in Cod. A (printed in Migne, P. G. xxiii. 67 sqq.).

² See above, p. 168.

³ H. S. v. 22 ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λέγομένῃ παρασκευῇ γραφαί
we find allusions which shew that they were usually based on
the lesson for the day, and we get light upon the length of the
selected passages.

In Hom. in Num. xv. Origen apologises to his hearers for not
keeping strictly to the lesson for the day: “licet non ordo lectio-
num quae recitantur de illis dicere magis exigat quae lector
explicuit, tamen quoniam nonnulli fratum deposcunt ea potius
quae de prophetia Balaam scripta sunt ad sermonem disputatio-
nis adduci, non ita ordini lectionum satisfacere aequum credidi
ut desideriis auditorum.” This homily probably belongs to Ori-
gen’s life at Caesarea¹, and if so, it is clear that at Caesarea as
well as at Alexandria there was a well-defined order of Church
lessons before the middle of the third century. In another
homily, on the Witch of Endor (in 1 Sam. hom. iii.), Origen
complains that the O.T. lesson for the day was too long to be
expounded at a single sitting: τὰ ἀναγνωσθέντα πλείονά ἐστιν· καὶ
ἐπεὶ χρή ἑπταεπόμενον εἰπεῖν, δυσὶ περικοπαῖς ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ περὶ
Ναβαλ...εἰτα μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἱστορία ἡ περὶ τοῦ κεκρύθθαι τὸν Δαυίδ...
εἰτα τὰ ἔξης ἡ ἱστορία ἡν τρίτη, ὅτε κατέφυγεν πρὸς Ἀχάρ...ἐξῆς τού-
του ἡ ἱστορία ἡ διαβοήστου ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑγγαστριμύθου...τεσσάρων
οὐσῶν περικοπῶν...ὅτι ποτὲ βούλεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος προσευχῆτω. On
this occasion the O.T. lesson seems to have extended from
1 Regn. xxv. 1 to xxviii. 25, including four περικοπαί or shorter
sections, which, judging from the description, corresponded in
length very nearly to our own chapters².

The lections to which Origen refers were doubtless those
which were read in the pre-anaphoral portion of the Liturgy in
the hearing of the catechumens as well as the faithful. In the
liturgy of Apost. Const. ii., the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, the
Kingdoms, the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, the Salomonic
books, and the sixteen Prophets, are all mentioned as books
from which the Old Testament lection might be taken; i.e.
all the books of the Hebrew Canon, with the exception of the

¹ D. C. B. iv. p. 104.
² Cf. the τίτλοι in the Coislin MS. (M), where μη', μθ', ν' are nearly
identical with cc. xxxi., xxxii., xxxiii. respectively (Montfaucon, Bibl. Coisl.,
p. 28).
Psalter and perhaps the Book of Esther, were employed for this purpose. The order in Book viii. names only the Law and the Prophets, but probably the scope is the same. The 'Prophet,' i.e. the Old Testament lesson, preceded the 'Apostle' (the Epistle) in the liturgy of Antioch as known to St Chrysostom at the end of the fourth century, and it held its place in the East generally till the seventh. In the West the 'prophecy' was read by the North African Church of St Augustine's time, and it still holds its ground in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites. In Egypt, as John Cassian tells us, the monastic communities read two lessons from Scripture both at Nocturns and Vespers, and (Saturdays and Sundays excepted) one of the two lessons was from the Old Testament; and the West generally adopted the custom of reading both the Old and the New Testament in the daily offices.

Before the formation of Lectionaries the liturgical lessons were marked in the margins of Church Bibles by the words ἀρχὴ, τέλος, written opposite to the beginning and end of the περικοπή. Such traces of adaptation to liturgical use are found even in cod. B, though not prima manu. Whether any of the larger chapters which appear in certain MSS. (e.g. the later system in cod. B) are of the nature of lections, must remain doubtful until the whole subject has received the fuller treatment which it demands.

The Psalter obviously needed no capitulation, nor was it ever read by the ἀναγνωστη in the lessons for the day. But special Psalms were recited or sung in the Church, as they had

1 Brightman, Eastern Liturgies, pp. 479, 476, 527, 580. See Chrys. in Rom. xxiv. 3 (cited above, p. 168).
2 D. C. A., Prophecy, Liturgical (ii. 173 ff.).
3 De inst. coenob. ii. 6.
4 On this word see Suicer, Thesaurus, ii. 673 sqq. It is used by Justin, Dial. 78 and Clem. Al., Strom. iii. 38. In Origen (quoted above) the περι­κοπή is merely a section; at a later time it was used for the ἀναγνωστή.
5 Fabiani and Cozza, prolegm., p. xix.
been in the Synagogue\(^1\), and in some early monastic communities arrangements were made for a regular recitation of the Psalter both in public and private\(^2\). The scribe of cod. A has copied into his MS. a list of Psalms for daily use, in which three are appointed to be said at each of the two public services, and one is selected for private use at each hour of the day and night. It is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Κανώνες ημερινῶν ψαλμῶν.} & & \text{Κ. νυκτερινοὶ τῶν ψαλμῶν.} \\
\text{Ὁρθρώνοι}^3 & \text{Δυναμικὸς}^4 & \text{Ώρα}[\alpha] \\
\gamma' & \xi' & \alpha' & \rho \mu' & \eta' & \beta' & \kappa\theta' & \rho\kappa' & \iota' & \beta' \\
\alpha' & \kappa\theta' & \rho \mu' & \eta' & \beta' & \kappa\theta' & \rho\kappa' & \iota' & \beta' \\
\theta' & \mu\alpha' & \gamma' & \delta' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' \\
\varepsilon' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' \\
\gamma' & \alpha' & \theta' & \mu\alpha' & \gamma' & \alpha' & \theta' & \mu\alpha' & \gamma' & \alpha' \\
\delta' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' \\
\iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' \\
\rho\mu' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' \\
\rho\kappa' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' & \pi' & \iota' & \psi' & \nu \delta' \\
\end{array}
\]

The existing order of the Orthodox Eastern Church divides the Psalter into 20 sections known as καθίσματα, each of which is broken by the recitation of a Gloria into three στάσεις. The larger sections are i.—viii., ix.—xvi., xvii.—xxiii., xxiv.—xxx., xxxi.—xxxvi., xxxii.—xxxvi., xxxviii.—xlvi., xlvi.—liv., lv.—lxiii., lxiv.—lxix., lxx.—lxxvi., lxxvii.—lxxxiv., lxxxv.—xc., xci.—c., ci.—civ., cv.—cviii., cix.—cxvi., cxvii., cxviii.—cxxx., cxxxii.—cxl., cxxxii.—cl. In the later liturgical Greek Psalter the cathismata are divided by an ornamental band or some other mark of separation, and the staseis by a marginal ɔ (δοξα, i.e. the Doxology, which was repeated at the end of each)\(^5\).

---

\(^1\) See p. 251.

\(^2\) Cf. Cassian, Inst. iii. 289.

\(^3\) Cf. Const. viii. 37, μετὰ τὸ ἡσθήναι τὸν ὀρθρόνων.

\(^4\) Cf. Const. viii. 34, τὸν ἐπιλυχυκὸν ψαλμὸν.

\(^5\) Cf. O. T. in Gr., ii. p. xi.
(1) A few other text-divisions, peculiar to certain contexts or books, may be specified here. In Isaiah it was not unusual to mark in the margin the place where each of the books of Origen's commentary ended (τόμος α'—λα', cf. Eus. H.E. vi. 36). Both in Isaiah and in Daniel certain prophetic ὑπαρξεις were distinguished. Thus cod. Qmag places ὑπαρξις α' opposite to Isa. vii. 1, and ὑπαρξις η' at c. xvii. 1. In Daniel cod. A marks 12 ὑπαρξεις, which begin respectively at Sus. 1, Dan. i. 1, ii. 1, iii. 1, iii. 98, v. 1, v. 30, vii. 1, viii. 1, ix. 1, xi. 1, Bel i, and the same method of division is used in codd. QG. In Lamentations each stanza is preceded by a representation of the Hebrew letter with which it begins, e.g. α'λεφ (άλφ, αλφα'), βηθ, γιμηλ (γιμλ), δελθ (δελθ, δελτ, δελθ), and so forth. In the analogous case of Psalm cxviii. (cxix.), there are no signs of this treatment, except in the Graeco-Latin Psalters RT.

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

Small departures from the continuous or slightly paragraphed writing of the oldest MSS. are found in a few contexts which lend themselves to division. Thus even in cod. B the blessings of the tribes in Gen. xlix. 3—27 are separated and numbered α.—ιβ. A similar treatment but without marginal enumeration is accorded to Deut. xiv. 1—18 and i Paral. i. 51—54, Eccl. iii. 1—8. The ten words of the Decalogue are numbered in the margins of codd. BA, but not prima manu; and the systems of numeration differ to some extent. Thus according to Bα, α' = prologue, β' = i + ii, γ' = iii, δ' = iv, ε' = v, ζ' = vii, η' = vi, θ' = ix, ι' = x, while A1 makes γ'= iv, δ' = v, ε' = vi; the other numbers in A are effaced, or were never appended.

(2) It would be interesting, if sufficient materials were available, to pursue the subject of text-division with reference to the daughter-versions of the LXX. On the stichometry and capitulation of the Latin Bible much information has been brought together by M. Berger (Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 307 ff.) and Wordsworth-White (Epilogus, p. 733 ff.); for the stichometry see also Dr Sanday in Studia Biblica, iii. p. 264 f. But it remains

---

1 The variations in the MSS. are interesting and instructive.
2 Greek numerals are sometimes added in the margin; see above, p. 351.
3 In cod. V = 23 these become sometimes lengthy τίτλοι, e.g. at v. 7 ἔξηθηνεν μὴ εύροσα τῶν νυμφίων ἡ νύμφη καὶ ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ εὑρεθείσα ἀπὸ τῶν φυλακῶν τὴν πόλεως τραυματίζεται, καὶ αἴρουσιν αὐτῆς τὸ θέρωστρον οἱ τεκχο-φυλακοῦντες.
doubtful whether these divisions of the Latin Bible belonged originally to Jerome's version or were transferred to it from the Old Latin; or, supposing the latter view to be correct, whether they came from the MSS. of the LXX. which were used by the early African or Italian translators. In referring to the N.T. Tertullian speaks of capitula not seldom (ad uxor. ii. 2, de monog. 11, de virg. vel. 4, de praescr. 5, adv. Prax. 20); but it is not clear that he uses the word to connote definitely marked sections.


4. In connexion with the subject of text-division it will be convenient to mention the expositions which accompany and often break up the text in MSS. of the Greek Bible. The student will have observed that many of the codices enumerated in Part i. c. v. (pp. 148—168) contain commentaries, either original (comm.), or compiled (cat.). Of the Greek commentators something will be said when we come to consider the use of the LXX. by the Greek fathers; in this place we will limit ourselves to the relatively late compilations which are based on the exegetical works of earlier writers.

Such expositions were formerly described as ἐκλογαὶ or παραγραφαὶ, or as ἐπιτομαὶ ἐρμηνείων, or ἐξηγήσεις ἑρμηνεύσαι ἀπὸ διαφόρων πατέρων, or συνόψεις σχολικαὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ὑπομνημάτων συλλέχθεισαί, or by some similar periphrasis. The use of the technical term catena (σεῖρα) is of comparatively modern date. Catena aurea is a secondary title of the great

---

1 Cf. Sanday, op. cit., p. 272.
2 Ch. Q. R. 99, p. 34: "the process of drawing up Catenae goes on from the fifth to the fourteenth or fifteenth century."
compendium of comments on the Four Gospels brought together by Thomas Aquinas, and a Greek MS. Psalter of the 16th century (Vat. Gr. 2240) adopts the phrase, translating it by χρυσὴ ἄλωσις. Σειρά is used in this sense by the editor of the Greek catena of Nicephorus, which bears the title Σειρά ἐνὸς καὶ πεντήκοντα ὑπομνήματων εἰς τὴν Ὄκταευχὸν καὶ τὰ τῶν Βασιλεῶν. The metaphor so happily expresses the principle on which such commentaries are constructed, that books of this description are now universally known as catenae or σειραῖ. They are 'chains' in which each link is supplied by some ancient author, scraps of exegesis threaded together by the ingenuity or industry of a collector who usually elects to be anonymous.

The catenists drew their materials from all sources within their reach. They laid under contribution Jewish writers such as Philo and Josephus, heretics like Basileides, Valentinus, and Marcion, suspects like Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as the accepted teachers and Saints of the Catholic Church. Their range extended from the first century to the fifth or sixth, and they had access to a number of writers whose works have since disappeared. Hence their value in the eyes of patristic scholars and editors. But they are not without importance for the purposes of the biblical student. The text embedded in the commentary may be late, but the commentary itself often preserves the witness of early writers to an old and valuable type.

The catena is usually written in the broad margins which surround the text, or it embodies the text, which in that case is usually distinguished from it by being written in uncialss or in coloured ink, or enclosed within marks of quotation. The names of the authors who have been pressed into the service of the catenist are commonly inserted in the margin at the

1 See, however, the facts collected in Ch. Q. R. 1, 99, p. 46 f.
place where their contributions begin: thus χρυσ[οτόμογ], ὠφ[ρένογ], εὐ[εβίογ], θεολ[ῶρογ], ἀντ[ιοξέογ], ἑρη[οφιογ], κυρ[ίλλογ]. If a second passage from the same author occurs in the same context it is introduced as τογ αγρόγ; an anonymous writer is ἀλλος. Unfortunately in the copying of catenae such attributions have often been omitted or misplaced, or even erroneously inserted, and as to this particular the student must be on his guard against a too unsuspecting acquiescence in the witness of his MS. Nor can he place implicit confidence in the verbal accuracy of the excerpts. The catenists evidently regarded themselves as free, while retaining the substance, to abbreviate and otherwise modify the language of their authors.

The following is a list of the chief Greek catenae of the Old Testament which have appeared in type. Octateuch, Historical books: the Catena of Nicephorus, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1772—3; Psalms: B. Corderii expositio Graecorum patrum, 3 vols., Antwerp, 1643; Proverbs: Commentary of Procopius first printed by Mai, and in Migne, P. G. lxxxvii.; Song: Commentary ascribed to Eusebius and Polychronius (Meursius, Leyden, 1617); Job: Catena of Nicetas of Serrae (P. Junius, i.e. Patrick Young, London, 1636); Isaiah: Commentary of Procopius (J. Curterius, Paris, 1580); Jeremiah, with Lamentations and Baruch: Catena published by M. Ghisler, 3 vols., Leyden, 1623; Daniel: Catena published by A. Mai in Script. vet. nov. coll. 1. On these see Ch. Q. R. f. 99, pp. 36—42.

The nineteenth century has added little to our collection of printed Greek catenae on the Old Testament, and the earlier editions do not always adequately represent the witness of the best MSS. Meanwhile a great store of MS. catenae awaits the examination of Biblical scholars. Some of these are at Athos, Athens, Smyrna and Jerusalem, but there is an abundant supply in libraries more accessible to Western students, at St Petersburg, Rome, Paris, and London. Perhaps no corner of the field of Biblical and patristic research offers so much virgin soil, with so good a prospect of securing useful if not brilliant results.
The following LXX. MSS. amongst others contain catenae on one or more of the books which form their text: H.-P. 14, 17, 24, 25, 31, 33, 52, 57, 73, 77, 78, 79, 83, 87, 90, 91, 97, 98, 99, 109, 112, 128, 135, 147, 181, 209, 238, 240, 243, 264, 272, 292, 302, 309; London B.M. Add. 35123, Lambeth 1214; Paris, Coisl. gr. 5, 7, Reg. gr. 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 161; Zurich c. 11; Basle gr. iv. 56, vi. 8; Esc. Σ. i. 16; Leyden, 13; Munich gr. 82; Athos Vatop. 15, Ivér. 15; Athens, nat. 43; Constantinople 224; Smyrna, Ev. sch. 1; Patmos, 216, 217; Sinai 2; Jerusalem H. Sep. 3. Scholia are to be found in H.-P. 14, 16, 38, 52, 56, 64, 70, 77, 79, 93, 128, 130, 131, 135, 159, 256, 310; Paris Ars. 8415, Coisl. gr. 184.

On the Paris O.T. catenae see H. Lietzmann, Catenen, p. 37 ff. Some of the Vatican catenae are handled by Pitra, analecta sacra II, Klostermann, analecta, passim; a full and valuable account of Roman MS. catenae on the Prophets is given by Faulhaber (die Propheten-Catenen). For lists of the catenae in the great libraries of Europe and the East, the student must consult the published catalogues, e.g. Montfaucon, Omont (Paris), Stephenson (Vatican), Lambeckius (Vienna), Lambros (Athos), Papadopoulos (Jerusalem). The more important MSS. are enumerated by Harnack-Preuschen, and Heinrici, and in the older work of Fabricius-Harles.

5. Besides catenae and detached scholia the margins of LXX. MSS. frequently contain notes of various kinds, written oftentimes in perplexing abbreviations. Lists of abbreviations are given by the principal palaeographical authorities, such as Montfaucon's Palaeographia Graeca, Gardthausen's Griechische Paläographie, and Sir E. Maunde Thompson's Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography; but the subject can only be mastered by working upon the MSS. themselves or their facsimiles. It may be useful, however, to print here a few of the abbreviated notes and symbols which occur in the apparatus of the Cambridge manual LXX., or are of frequent occurrence in the principal codices.

\[\delta \equiv \text{'Aκύλας}. \quad \zeta, \gamma = \Sigmaύμμαχος. \quad \theta, \theta \epsilon' \equiv \Thetaεσθιτων.\]

\[\omega' \kappa' \pi' \varepsilon \beta' = \text{où kei'tai par' 'Εβραίous. oś oγ} \quad \text{oν kei'tai par' 'Εβραίous. om' toic o'} \quad \text{omoiów tois evdômíkonta. oś r = oś treís, i.e. Aquila, Sym-}\]
machus, Theodotion. π′ = πάντες. λ = Δουκιανός (Field, Hexapla, i. lxxxv.). οι λ = οἱ λαυποὶ. μονός = ομοίων, ο = οἱ or ο = Ώριγένης. For πιτι see above, p. 39 f.

θ = σημείωσαν, σημειώσερν, σημείων. γρ = γράφων or γράφεσαι.

αρχ. τέλος. ετ = ετίχος. θείος = καθερίσμα. ανάγνωσμα. ανάγνωσμα. δισορθώται (i.e. ‘corrected thus far’), a mark inserted by the δισορθώται usually at the end of a book. For further particulars see Field, op. cit., p. xciv. sqq.
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Catenae.

T. Ittig, De bibliothecis et catenis patrum (Leipzig, 1707); J. C. Wolf, De catenis Gr. patrum (Wittenberg, 1742); Fabricius-
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PART III.

CHAPTER I.

LITERARY USE OF THE LXX. BY NON-CHRISTIAN HELLENISTS.

1. A HAPPY accident has preserved fragments of the lost literature produced by the Hellenised Jews of Alexandria between the inception of the Alexandrian Version and the Christian era. The Greek historiographer, Alexander Cornelius—better known as Polyhistor (ὁ πολιτικὸς), from his encyclopaedic learning—wrote a treatise On the Jews which contained extracts from Jewish and Samaritan Hellenistic writings¹. Of these a few were copied from Polyhistor’s book by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea, in whose pages they may still be read. They consist of fragments of the historians Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, and Aristeas, the poets Philo, Theodotus, and Ezekiel, the philosopher Aristobulus, and Cleodemus or Malchas. There is reason to believe that Demetrius flourished c. B.C. 200; for the other writers the date of Polyhistor (c. B.C. 50) supplies a terminus ad quem, if we may assume² that he wrote the work attributed to him by Clement and Eusebius.

¹ Cf. Joseph., ant. i. 15, Clem. Al. strom. i. 130, Eus. pr. ev. ix. 17.
² See Schürer³, iii. p. 347 f.

Several of these fragments bear traces of a knowledge and use of the Greek Bible, and this evidence is not the less convincing because, with one exception, the purpose of the writers has kept them from actual quotation. They wished to represent their national history in a form more acceptable to their pagan neighbours; but while avoiding the uncouth phraseology of the Greek Bible they frequently betray its influence. A few extracts will make this plain.

Demetrius: (a) τὸν θεὸν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ προστάξαι Ἰσαὰκ τὸν γῆν ὀλοκαρπῶσαι αὐτῷ· τὸν δὲ ἀναγαγόντα τὸν παιὰ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρος πυρὰν νῦσαι καὶ ἐπιθεῖναι τὸν Ἰσαὰκ· σφάζειν δὲ μελλοντά κωλυθῆναι ὑπὸ ἄγελον κρίον αὐτῶ πρὸς τὴν κάρπωσιν παραστήσαστος. (b) ἐκείθεν δὲ ἐλθέιν εἰς Χαφράθα, ἐνθὲ παραγενέαθαι εἰς Ἐφράθα, ἐν εἰς βυθλεέμ...καὶ τελευτησαὶ Ῥαχῆλ τεκούσαν τὸν Βεναμίν. (c) φησι γὰρ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ παίδας πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἐπὶ κατοκίαν τείμαται· διὰ τούτο δὲ καὶ Ἀδρὼν καὶ Μαριὰμ εἰπεῖν ἐν Ἀσηρῳ Ἡσοῦν Ἁλισπίδα γῆμαι γυναῖκα. (d) μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὕδωρ εἰκεί γυλκὺ ἄλλα πικρόν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντος, ἡλιός τι ἐμβαλέσκειν εἰς τὴν πηγήν, καὶ γενέαθαι γυλκὺ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Ἐλείμ ἐλθεῖν, καὶ εἰφὼν ἐκεί δώδεκα μὲν πηγὰς ὕδατων, ἐβδομήκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων. (For other coincidences, see above, p. 18.)

Eupolemus: εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς δὲ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν γῆν ἐκτισεν, δὲ εἰλετο ἀνθρωπον χρηστὸν ἐκ χρηστοῦ ἀνδρὸς...καὶ ἀρχιτέκτονα σοι Ἀπέσταλκα ἀνθρωπὸν Τύριον ἐκ μητρὸς Ιουδαίας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Δάν.

---

1 Cf. Gen. xxii. 1 ff.
2 Cf. Gen. xxxv. 16.
3 Cf. Gen. xxv. 6; Num. xi. 34—xii. 1.
4 Cf. Exod. xv. 23 ff.
5 Cf. 2 Chron. ii. 12 ff.
Aristeas: τὸν 'Ησαύ γῆμαντα Βασσάραν ἐν ἝΔωμ γεννήσαι Ἰωβ· κατοικεῖν δὲ τοῦτον ἐν τῇ Αἴγυπτι διὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ῥήμασι τῆς Ιαογμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας· γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν Δίκαιον καὶ πολύκτητον, κτήσασθαι γὰρ αὐτὸν πρόβατα μὲν ἐπτακισχίλια, καμήλους δὲ τρισιλίας, ζεῦγν Βοῶν πεντακόσια, ὅπως θελέας νομάδας πεντακόσιας. 

Ezekiel (in his tragedy Ἡ Ἐξαγωγή):

Μαρίαμ δ’ ἀδελφὴ μου κατώπτευν πέλας· κάπετα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως Ἀβραίως ὤμοι κατῆλθε λουτροίς, Χρόνα φανδύναι νέον. Ἡδονα δ’ εὐθύς καὶ λαβοῦσ’ ἀνεῦλετο, ἔγινο δ’ Ἑβραίων δυνα· καὶ λέγει τάδε

Μαρίαμ ἀδελφή προσδραμοῦσα βασιλείδι· Θέλεις τροφάνι σου παιδὶ τῷ δ’ εὐρω ταχῦν ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων· ἣ δ’ ἐπέσπευσεν κόρην· μολούσα δ’ εἴπε μητρὶ, καὶ παρὰ ταχῦν αὐτὴ τέ μήτηρ καλαβέν μ’ ἐς ἀγκάλιας, εἴπεν δὲ θυγάτηρ βασιλέως Τούτον, γύναι, τρόφευε, κάτῳ μισθὸν ἀποδώσω σεθέν.

* * * * *

οὐκ εὖ λογος πέφυκα, γῆλοσα δ’ ἐστὶ μου δύσφραστος, ἱσχύοφωμος, δ’ ἀπὸ μὴ λόγους εἰμοι γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἑναντίον.

Aristobulus: (a) ἐν χειρὶ κραταὶ δ’ ἐξῆγαγεν ὁ θεός σε ἐξ Ἁλγύπτου. (b) Ἰαοῦ χείρ Κυρίου ἐκταί ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσιν σοι καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις θάνατος μέγας.

2. Besides these fragments, some complete books have survived the wreck of the pre-Christian literature of the Jewish colony at Alexandria. They are included in the Alexandrian Greek Bible, but may be employed as separate witnesses of the literary use of the canonical translations. And the evidence supplied by them is abundant. Thus the writer of Wisdom knows and uses not only Exodus (Sap. xvi. 22—Exod. ix. 24, 24—2

1 Cf. Job xlii. 17 b, c, i. 1 ff. Pseudo-Aristeas ad Philocratem makes abundant use of the Greek Pentateuch, as the reader may see by referring to the Appendix, where LXX. words and phrases are indicated by the use of small uncials.

2 Cf. Exod. ii. 4 ff.; iv. 10, where οὐκ εὖ λογος is read by cod. F.

3 Exod. xiii. 9.

4 Exod. ix. 3. Ἐστατις Α., ἐπέστατις B. Καὶ ἐν πᾶσι, which is wanting in our MSS., may be due to a slip of memory, or it is a short way of expressing what follows in the text (ἐν τε τοῖς ἐπποι κτλ.).
and perhaps also Sap. xii. 8 = Exod. xxiii. 28) and Deuteronomy (Sap. vi. 7 = Deut. i. 17, Sap. xi. 4 = Deut. viii. 15), but Isaiah (Sap. ii. 12 = Isa. iii. 10, Sap. xv. 10 = Isa. xlv. 20). The translator of Sirach not only recognises the existence of the Greek Pentateuch and Prophets and ‘the other books,’ but shews everywhere the influence of the Greek phraseology of the LXX. In 2 Maccabees vii. 6 we have a verbatim quotation from Deut. xxxii. 36, and in 4 Maccabees xviii. 14 ff. a catena of references to the Greek Bible, including direct citations of Isa. xliii. 2, Ps. xxxiii. 19, Prov. iii. 18, Ezek. xxxvii. 4, Deut. xxxii. 39, xxx. 20—all from the LXX. The picture which the last-named passage draws of a Jewish father reading and teaching his children out of the Greek Bible (cf. 2 Tim. iii. 15) is a suggestive one, but the book, it must be remembered, is of uncertain date, possibly as late as the time of Josephus, to whom it was at one time ascribed.

3. The Jewish portions of the Sibyllines, notwithstanding the epic form in which they are cast, exhibit clear signs of the influence of the LXX. Thus in Sibyll. iii. 310 ἐκείνας is a reminiscence of Ps. lxxviii. 3, LXX.; ib. 606 χειροποίητα...ἐν σχημαίς πετρών κατακρύψαντες is borrowed from Isa. ii. 19 ff., LXX.; ib. 708 ff. is probably modelled on the Greek of Isa. xi. 6 ff.

4. There remains one Alexandrian Jewish writer, the greatest of the succession, whose extant works happily are numerous and throw abundant light on the literary use of the Septuagint at Alexandria.

Philo’s literary life probably coincided as nearly as possible with the first forty or five and forty years of the first century

---

1 See Edersheim in Wace’s Apocr. ii. p. 26.
2 Cf. A. Deissmann in Kautzsch, Pseudepigraphen, p. 150: "als Abfassungszeit wird man den Zeitraum von Pompeius bis Vespasian annehmen dürfen."
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A.D.; in 40 A.D. he could speak of himself as already an old
man1, but his literary activity was not yet at an end, as ap­
pears from his account of the embassy to Rome in that year.
Thus the evidence of his writings belongs to a period just
antecedent to the rise of the earliest Christian literature, and
his numerous quotations enable us to form a fair idea of the
condition of the text of the LXX. in Alexandrian copies shortly
before it passed into the hands of the Church.

The following list of Philo’s works may be useful for refer­
ence. Cohn and Wendland’s order is followed so far as their
edition has been published.

A. Exegetical works. De obficio mundi (Gen. i.). Legum
allegoriae (ii. 1—iii. 19). De Cherubin etc. (iii. 24—iv. 1). De
sacrificiis Abelis et Caini (iv. 2 f.). Quod deterius potiori
insidiari soleat (iv. 3—15). De posteritate Caini (iv. 16—26).
De gigantibus (vi. 1—4). Quod Deus sit immutabilis (vi. 4—12).
De agricultura (ix. 20). De plantatione Noe (ix. 20). De
ebrietate (ix. 21—23). De sobrietate (ix. 24). De confusione
linguarum (xi. 1—9). De migratione Abrahami (xii. 1—6).
Quis rerum divinarum heres (xv.). De congressu quaerendae
eruditionis gratia (xvi. i—6). De fuga et inventione (xvi. 6—
14). De mutatione nominum (xvii. i—22). De somniis i., ii.
(xxviii. 12 ff., xxxi. 11—13, xxxvii., xl., xli.). De Abraamo. De
De monarchia. De praemiis sacerdotum. De victimis. De
victimas offrentibus. De mercede meretricis. De specialibus
legibus (3rd—10th commandments of the Decalogue). De
iudice. De iustitia. De creatione principum. De tribus vir­
tutibus. De poenitentia. De praemiis et poenis. De execra­
tionibus. Quaestiones et solutiones (1) in Genesim, (2) in
Exodum2. B. Philosophical works. De nobilitate. Quod
omnis probus liber sit. De vita contemplativa. De incorrupti­
bilitate mundi. De providentia. De ratione animalium. De
mundo. C. Political works. In Flaccum. De legatione ad
Caïum.

In his exegetical writings Philo quotes the LXX. directly,
announcing each citation by a formula such as φησίν, εἰπέν,
λέγει, λέγεται, γέγραπται, or some more elaborate phrase\(^1\). In this way he reproduces a considerable portion of the Greek text of the Pentateuch, as well as a few passages from Joshua, Judges, 1, 3 Kingdoms, 1 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and some of the minor Prophets. His Greek is, on the whole, clearly that of the Alexandrian version, which he regarded as the work of men divinely qualified for their task\(^2\). Nevertheless his quotations often differ from the Greek of the LXX., as it is found in our extant MSS., or in the oldest and best of them.

5. The task of comparing Philo's quotations with the LXX. has been undertaken in Germany by C. F. Hornemann and C. Siegfried, and in England more recently by Professor Ryle; and from these investigations the student may derive a general acquaintance with the subject, although even the latest of them will need revision when the critical edition of Philo's works, now in course of being published, has reached completion. The following specimens will shew the extent to which Philo departs from the LXX.

Gen. ii. 7 εἰς ψυχὴν τῆς (LXX. εἰς ψ. ζωόν)\(^3\). iv. 21 οὗτος εἰσὶν πατὴρ ὁ καταδείξας ψυχήν καὶ κυθαράν (LXX., ἤν ο θεόν). vi. 14 νοσσιάς νοσσιάς ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν (νοσσιάς semel LXX.). ix. 25 παῖς οἰκέτης δούλος δούλων ἐσται (LXX. π. οἰκέτης ἐσται, and so Philo, ii. 225. 20). xv. 18 ἐως τοῦ ποταμοῦ, τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου (LXX. om. ποταμοῦ ἐοί). xvi. 25 οὐκ ἐστὶν τὸν νῦν (LXX. omit τὸ εὐδ. and so Philo once, iii. 184. 28). Exod. iv. 10 οὐκ εἰμὶ εὐλογός (so Philo, apparently\(^6\): LXX. οὐκ ἰκανός εἰμι). xv. 17 ἐδρασμα εἰς καθέδραν σου κατεργάσω (LXX. εἰς καθέδραν κατακτήτριών σου ο θεόν). xx. 23 μετ’ ἐμοὶ (LXX., ἐμίν αὐτοίς). xxiii. 2 μετὰ πολλῶν (LXX., μετὰ πελεὺν). Lev. xix. 23 ζύλον βρώσεως (LXX., ξ. βρώσιμον, and so Philo ii. 152. 8). Deut. viii. 18 ἀλλὰ μνεία μνησθήσεται (LXX. καὶ μνησθῆ). xxi. 16 κατακληρονομή Β, κατακληρονομή ΑΓ, and these readings are found as variants in Phil. i. 209. 4).

\(^3\) On this see Nestle, *Zur neuen Philo-Ausgabe in Philologus*, 1900, p. 259. Dr Nestle informs me that cod. 75 often agrees with Philo.
\(^4\) See Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
\(^5\) See above, p. 371.
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The student who is at the pains to examine the readings given above, will find that while some of them may be merely recensional, or even due to slips of memory, the greater part imply a different rendering of the Hebrew, or even in some cases a different Hebrew text from that which is presupposed by the LXX. (Gen. vi. 14, Deut. viii. 18), whilst in others we seem to have a conflation of two renderings (Gen. iv. 21, ix. 25), one of which is preserved in all extant MSS. of the LXX., while the other agrees more nearly with the Hebrew. When the MSS. of the LXX. are at variance, Philo inclines on the whole to Cod. B\(^1\), but the preponderance is not strongly marked. Thus in Exodus—Deuteronomy, he agrees with B against one or more of the other uncials sixty times, while in fifty-two places he takes sides against B. It has been observed that in several instances where Philo opposes the combined witness of the uncials, he goes with Lucian; e.g. Lev. xviii. 5 ὅ των ἕσσεται; Deut. xii. 8 δοσι, xxxii. 4 + ἔν αὔτῷ.

Besides substantial variants, Philo's quotations shew many departures from the LXX. which may be ascribed to inaccuracy, defects of memory, or the writer's method of citing. Thus (a) he omits certain words with the view of abbreviating; (b) he substitutes for a portion of his text a gloss or other explanatory matter of his own; (c) he exchanges Hebraisms and words or phrases which offend him for others in accordance with a correct literary style; (d) he forms a fresh sentence out of two or more different contexts.

E.g. (a) Gen. xxiv. 20 καὶ δραμοῦσα ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ὑδρεύσατο ταῖς καμήλαις (LXX., καὶ ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ καὶ ὑδρ. πάσαις ταῖς καμήλαις). (b) Num. v. 2 ἐξαποστειλάτωσαν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίου ψυχῆς (LXX. ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς) πάντα λεπρῶν. (c) Gen. xxviii. 13 ἢ γῆ (v. 1. τὴν γῆν) ἐφ' ἤς σὺ καθεύδεις (+ ἐπ', αὐτῆς LXX.)

\(^1\) In Genesis i.—xlv. 27, where B is wanting, Philo shews on the whole a similar preference for the text represented by D. The figures, which are Dr Ryle's, are based on Mangey's text, but the new edition, so far as examined, gives very similar results.
The majority of Philo's quotations from the LXX. are modified in one or other of these ways. Philo entertained the highest veneration for the Jewish canon, especially for the law, which he regarded as a body of Divine oracles; and his respect for the Alexandrian Version was at least as great as that with which the Authorised Version is regarded in England, and Luther's Version in Germany. Nevertheless he did not scruple to quote his text freely, changing words at pleasure, and sometimes mingling interpretation with citation. This method of dealing with a source, however high its authority, was probably not peculiar to Philo, but a literary habit which he shared with other Jewish writers of his age. We shall have occasion to observe it again when we consider the use of the LXX. by the writers of the New Testament.

6. The Alexandrian Version was also used by the Palestinian Jew, Flavius Josephus, who represents Jewish Hellenistic literature in the generation which followed Philo. He was born at Jerusalem within the lifetime of the great Alexandrian (A.D. 37—8). He was descended from a priestly family; his early education familiarised him with the learning of the Rabbis, and the opinions of the great schools of Jewish thought; in his nineteenth year he was enrolled a member of the sect of the Pharisees. His earliest work, on the Jewish War, was written in Aramaic, and when he desired to translate it into Greek, he was constrained to seek assistance (c. Ap. i. 9 χρησάμενος τις πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν). But the Antiquities of the Jews (αἱ Ἰωσὴπον ἱστορίαι τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας),
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which appear to have been completed in A.D. 93-4, form an original Greek work which, so far as we know, was composed without material help. In it Josephus professes to interpret the Hebrew records for the benefit of Hellenic readers: Ant. i. proem. I ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἑνεστῶσαν ἐγκεχείρισμα πραγματείαν, νομίζων ἂπασι φανείσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησίων ἠξίων σπουδῆς· μὲλλει γὰρ περιέξειν ἂπασαν τὴν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτείματος ἐκ τῶν Ἐβραίκων μεθηρμηνευμένην γραμμάτων. His chief source, therefore, was the Hebrew Bible, with which he was doubtless acquainted from boyhood. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence in the Antiquities that the writer knew and, for the purpose of his work, used the Alexandrian Greek version. He does not, indeed, like Philo, quote formally either from the Hebrew or from the Greek, but he shews a knowledge of both.

His indebtedness to the LXX. appears in a variety of ways. (a) He interprets proper names as they are interpreted by the LXX. e.g. Ant. i. 1. 2 ἐὰν...σημαίνει...πάντων μητέρα (Gen. iii. 20); i. 2. 1 Καίσ...κτίσων (v. 1. κτίσιν) σημαίνει (Gen. iv. 1); iii. 1. 6 καλοῦσι δὲ Ἑβραίοι τὸ βρώμα τούτο μάνα· τὸ γὰρ μᾶν ἐπερώτησε...τὶ τούτῃ ἑστὶν ἀνακρίνουσα (Exod. xvi. 15); v. 10. 3 Σαμουήλ...θεαίτητον ἂν τις εἰπο (I Regn. i. 20). (b) His narrative frequently follows a Heb. text different from the M.T., but represented by the LXX.; e.g. Ant. vi. 4. 1 ἦσαν ἐβδομή-κοντα τὸν ἄρμαθον (I Regn. ix. 22, Μ Ἐνυπάρχει); vi. 11. 4 ὑποθέτοντα τοῖς ἐπιβολαιοις ἤτα (לָלָי) αἰγός (I Regn. xix. 13, מ לְבָך); vi. 12. 4 Δώρος δὲ ὁ Σὺρος ὁ τᾶς ἡμιόνους αὐτοῦ βόσκων (I Regn. xxii. 9, מ לָלָי מִּזָּה מִּזָּה הָאָבָא מִּזָּה לָלָי מִּזָּה בָּרָא); vii. 2. 1 μόνον εὑρόντες...τὸν Ἰσσωβόνα καὶ μὴτε τοὺς φύλακας παρόντας μὴτε τὴν θυρωρῶν ἐγγραφοῦναν (cf. 2 Regn. iv. 6 LXX. καὶ ἵδον ἡ θυρωρῶν ἐνύσταζεν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν); vii. 5. 3 ὑστερον δὲ τῶν

1 He possessed a copy of the sacred books which Titus granted him from the spoils of the Temple: Vit. 75 τὴν αἰτησιν ἐποιομην Τιτου...βιβλίων λειψων [καὶ] ἔλαβον χαρισαμένου Τιτου.
Whilst retailing in his own words the story of the Hebrew records, he falls from time to time into the peculiar phraseology of the Alexandrian version. A few examples will make this evident. *Ant. i. 1* (Gen. i. 1 ff.), *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐκτισεν ο θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν... γενέσθαι φῶς ἐκέλευσεν ο θεός... διεκόμησε τὸ τε φῶς καὶ τὸ σκότος... καὶ αὐτὴ μὲν ἁν εἶπ θρόνη ἡμέρα, Μωυσῆς δ' αὐτὴν μιᾶν εἰπε... τὸν τετραπόδων γένος ἀρρεν καὶ θῆλυ ποιήσας. *i. 10. 3* (Gen. xv. 9 f.) δάμαλιν τριετίζοναν καὶ αἵγα τριετίζοναν καὶ κριῶν ὤμοις τριτή καὶ τρυγόνα καὶ περιστερὰν κελεύσαντος διειλέ, τῶν ὄρνεων οὐδὲν διελών. *i. 18. 7* (Gen. xxvii. 30) παρὴν Ἡσαίου ἀπὸ τῆς θῆρας. *i. 20. 2* (Gen. xxxii. 23 f.) χειμάρρουν τῶν Ἰαβακχον λεγόμενον διαβεβηκότων Ἰάκωβος ὑπολειειμένος... διεστάλαεβίν. *ii. 4. 1* (Gen. xxxix. 1) ἦσσηθον δὲ πωλούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμπόρων ὑγναίμενος Πετεφρῆς ἀνήρ Αἰγύπτιος ἐπὶ τῶν Ψαραόνου μαγείρων. *ii. 6. 1* (Gen. xli. 45) προσηγόρευσεν αὐτὸν Ὀυνθονφάνχηχον... ἀγεται γὰρ καὶ Πετεφρὸν θυγατέρα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἡλιούπολεί ιερέων... Ἀσέννηθιν ὀνόματι. *ii. 7. 5* (Gen. xlii. 28) ἀπαντησόμενον ἐξεισι καὶ καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν αὐτῷ συνέβαλεν. *(d)* There is evidence to shew that Josephus used 1 Esdras, which is known only in a Greek form, and the Book of Esther with the Greek additions. *i Esdras. Ant. xi. 1.* (1 Esdr. ii. 3 f.) Κύρος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγει Ἐπεί με ο θεός ο μέγιστος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπέδειξε βασιλέα, τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομήσω ἐν Ἰεροσολύμως ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ χώρᾳ. *xi. 2. 2* (1 Esdr. ii. 21, cf. 2 Esdr. iv. 17) βασιλεὺς Καμβύς Ὀραθόμῳ τῷ γράφοντι τα προσπίπτοντα καὶ Βεέλζέῳ καὶ Σεμελίῳ γράμματε καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς συντασσόμενοι καὶ οἰκοδυνοῦν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ τάδε λέγει. *xi. 3. 2—8 = i Esdr. iii.—iv. Esther. Ant. xi. 6. 6 = Esth. B; xi. 6. 8 ff. = C, D; xi. 6. 12 f. = E. The first Book of Maccabees

1 For some of these instances I am indebted to a collation made by Mr C. G. Wright for the Editors of the larger LXX.
was also known to Josephus in its Greek form¹, which underlies his account of the Maccabean wars, just as the Greek translation of the canonical books is used in the earlier books of the Antiquities.

A recent examination, by A. Mez, of Basle², into the Biblical text presupposed by Josephus' history in Ant. v.—vii. has led to the following results, which are important for the criticism of the LXX. (1) The Josephus text of the LXX. has no affinity with the characteristic text of cod. B. (2) In Joshua it generally approximates to the text of Μ. (3) In Judges it is frequently, but not constantly, Lucianic; in 1, 2 Kingdoms it agrees with Lucian so closely as to fall into the same omissions and misconceptions; only in four instances, other than proper names, does it contravene a Lucianic reading, and three of these are numerical differences, whilst in the fourth 'Lucian' appears to have undergone correction, and the reading of Josephus survives in cod. A. These investigations, so far as they go, point to a probability that in these books the Greek Bible of Palestine during the second half of the first century presented a text not very remote from that of the recension which emanated from Antioch early in the fourth. While Philo the Alexandrian supports on the whole the text of our oldest uncial cod. B, Josephus the Palestinian seems to have followed that of an 'Urlucian.'


¹ Bloch, Die Quellen d. Fl. Josephus, p. 8 ff.
² Die Bibel des Josephus, p. 79 ff.
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CHAPTER II.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE LXX. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. The writings of the New Testament were the work of some nine authors, of different nationalities and antecedents. Six of them, according to the traditional belief, were Palestinian Jews; a seventh, though 'a Hebrew of Hebrew parentage,' belonged by birth to the Dispersion of Asia Minor; of the remaining two, one was possibly a Gentile from Antioch, and the other a 'Hellenist with Alexandrian proclivities.' Some diversity of practice as to the literary use of the Greek Old Testament may reasonably be expected in a collection of books having so complex an origin.

With few exceptions, the books of the New Testament abound in references to the Old Testament and in quotations from it. An exhaustive list of these may be seen at the end of Westcott and Hort's New Testament in Greek (Text, p. 581 ff.), and in their text the corresponding passages are distinguished by the use of a small uncial type. But this device, though otherwise admirable\(^1\), does not enable the student to distinguish direct citations from mere allusions and reminiscences; and as the distinction is important for our present purpose, we will begin by placing before him a table of passages in the Old Testament which are formally quoted by New Testament writers.

\(^1\) See below, p. 403.
Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.

By passages formally cited we understand (1) those which are cited with an introductory formula, such as τοῦτο γέγονεν ἢν πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν (Mt.), οὕτως ως καθὼς γέγραπται, or γέγραπται simply (Mt., Mc., Lc., Paul), γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν (Jo.), Μωυσῆς (Δαυεὶδ) λέγει or εἶπεν, λέγει or εἶπεν ἡ γραφῇ (Jo., Paul), or τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα (Hebrews); (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the O. T.

Table of O.T. passages quoted in the N.T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 27</td>
<td>xix. 4</td>
<td>Mc. x. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 2</td>
<td>Heb. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mt. 1 Cor. xv. 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>xix. 5 f.</td>
<td>Mc. x. 7 f.</td>
<td>i Cor. vi. 16, Eph. v. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 24</td>
<td>Heb. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 1</td>
<td>Acts 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b (xxii. 18)</td>
<td>iii. 25</td>
<td>Gal. iii. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 5</td>
<td>Rom. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jas. ii. 23</td>
<td>Rom. iv. 3</td>
<td>Gal. iii. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 f.</td>
<td>Acts 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 10, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>xxii. 16 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Rom. ix. 17 |
| ii. 14 |
| iii. 5 ff. |
| ix. 16 |
| xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxxiii. 20) |
| xiii. 12 |
| xvi. 4, 15 (Ps. lxvii. 24) |
| 18 |
| xix. 13 |
| xx. 12—17 (Deut. v. 16 ff.) |

xxi. 16 (17) | xv. 4, Mc. vii. 10
### Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod. xxi. 24 (Lev. xxiv. 20, Deut. xix. 21)</td>
<td>Mt. v. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 28</td>
<td>Acts xxiii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 8</td>
<td>Heb. ix. 19 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 40</td>
<td>viii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx. 1</td>
<td>Acts vii. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii. 19</td>
<td>1 Cor. x. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. xi. 44 f. (xix. 2, xx. 26)</td>
<td>Rom. ix. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 6, 8</td>
<td>1 Pet. i. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii. 5 (2 Esdr. xix. 29)</td>
<td>Lc. ii. 22 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 18</td>
<td>Rom. x. 5, Gal. iii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. xvi. 5</td>
<td>Mt. v. 43, xix. 19, xxii. 39, M. xii. 31, Lc. x. 27, James ii. 8, Rom. xiii. 9, Gal. v. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. iv. 35</td>
<td>2 Cor. vi. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 4 f.</td>
<td>2 Tim. ii. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mc. xii. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xxii. 37 f., Mc. xii. 29—33, Lc. x. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 7, 10, Lc. iv. 8, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 4, Lc. iv. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heb. xii. 21 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acts iii. 22 f., vii. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xviii. 16, Jo. viii. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gal. iii. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. v. 31, xix. 7, Mc. x. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor. ix. 9, 1 Tim. v. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gal. iii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. xi. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heb. xii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. x. 6—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heb. xii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. x. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heb. x. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor. vii. 18, Heb. i. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. xi. 3 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acts iv. 25 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xxi. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor. xv. 27, Heb. ii. 6—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. iii. 10—18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>xv. 8—11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xviii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiii. 1 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxii. 13—17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxiv. 19 (lxviii. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxix. 7—9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xl. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xli. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xliiv. 7 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>li. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>liv. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lxvii. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lxvii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lxxvii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lxxxi. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lxxxviiii. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xc. 11 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xciii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xciv. 8—11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ci. 26—28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ciii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cviii. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cix. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cxi. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cv. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cvvi. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cvxii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>i. 11 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxy. 21 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxvii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>v. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>i. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>ii. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 9</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 14</td>
<td>i Cor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 15</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 11 f.</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>v. 25, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 11 f.</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic.</td>
<td>vi. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>xi. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 28—32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>i. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 3 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>iii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 9</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 13</td>
<td>xxvii. 9 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 10</td>
<td>Jo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 7</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>i. 2 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 1</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>i. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 9 f.</td>
<td>Rom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 14</td>
<td>i. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 1 f.</td>
<td>Rom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 22 f.</td>
<td>Heb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 10</td>
<td>Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii. 13</td>
<td>Rom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv. 8</td>
<td>xv. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxviii. 11 f.</td>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl. 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liii. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Nah. i. 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>O. T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>lii. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. xv. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liii. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jo. xii. 38, Rom. x. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. viii. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pet. ii. 24 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts viii. 32 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mc. xv. 28, Lc. xxii. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liv.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gal. iv. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jo. vi. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts xiii. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xxi. 13, Mc. xi. 17, Lc. xix. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lix.</td>
<td>20 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. xi. 26 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxi.</td>
<td>1 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lc. iv. 18 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxiv.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor. ii. 9 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxv.</td>
<td>1 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rom. x. 20 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mc. ix. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>vii. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xxi. 13, Mc. xi. 17, Lc. xix. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 23 f. (I Regn. ii. 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cor. i. 31, 2 Cor. x. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxviii. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. ii. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heb. viii. 8–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>xii. 11 (ix. 27, xi. 31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. xxiv. 15, Mc. xiii. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus upon a rough estimate the passages directly quoted from the Old Testament by writers of the New Testament are 160. Of these 51 belong to the Pentateuch, 46 to the Poetical Books, and 61 to the Prophets. Among single books the Psalter supplies 40 and Isaiah 38; i.e. nearly half of the passages expressly cited in the N.T. come from one or other of these two sources.

2. The table already given shews the extent to which the Old Testament is directly cited in the New. In that which follows the comparison is inverted, and the student will be able to see at a glance how the quotations are distributed among the several groups of writings of which the New Testament is made up.

(1) Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt.</th>
<th>Mc.</th>
<th>Lc.</th>
<th>O. T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. vii. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exod. xiii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>Mc.</td>
<td>Lc.</td>
<td>O. T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mic. v. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>i. 3</td>
<td>Hos. xi. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jer. xxxviii. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i. 3</td>
<td>Isa. xl. 3—5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>iv. 4</td>
<td>Deut. viii. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10f.</td>
<td>Ps. xc. 11 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deut. vii. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exod. xx. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. xxiv. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. xxx. 3 (cf. Deut. xxiii. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exod. xxi. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev. xix. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. liii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>13 (xii. 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hos. vi. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>i. 2</td>
<td>Mal. iii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hos. vi. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18—21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. xlii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>14 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 9 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps. lxxvii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 18 f.</td>
<td>Isa. lxi. 1 ff. + lviii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>vii. 10</td>
<td>Exod. xx. 12, xxi. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. xxix. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 48</td>
<td>lxvi. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>5 f.</td>
<td>x. 6—8</td>
<td>Gen. i. 27 + ii. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 f.</td>
<td>x. 19</td>
<td>xviii. 20 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>4 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exod. xx. 12—17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xi. 17</td>
<td>Zech. ix. 9 + Isa. lxii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>xix. 46</td>
<td>Isa. lvi. 7 + Jer. vii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>xii. 10</td>
<td>Ps. viii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>cvii. 22 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Deut. xxv. 5 (cf. Gen. xxxviii. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Exod. iii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29 f.</td>
<td>x. 27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Deut. vi. 4 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lev. xix. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xx. 42 f.</td>
<td>Ps. cix. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Deut. vi. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>iv. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>xiii. 14</td>
<td>Dan. xii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxii. 37</td>
<td>Isa. liii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>xiv. 27</td>
<td>Zech. xiii. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>xi. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii.</td>
<td>9 f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>xv. 34</td>
<td>Ps. xxi. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(2) **Quotations in the Fourth Gospel.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jo.</th>
<th>Isa.</th>
<th>Exod.</th>
<th>Ps.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 23</td>
<td>xl. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lxviii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>lxxvii. 24f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td></td>
<td>lxi. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 34</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td></td>
<td>lxxxii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>ix. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td></td>
<td>liii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 25</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxxiv. 19 (lxviii. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 24</td>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxi. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 46 (Num. ix. 12, Ps. xxxiii. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>xii. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Quotations in the Acts.**

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

(4) Quotations in the Catholic Epistles.

| James | ii. 8                          | Lev.  | xix. 18                      |
|       | 11                             | Exod. | xx. 13 f.                    |
|       | 23                             | Gen.  | xv. 6                        |
|       | iv. 6                          | Prov. | iii. 34                      |
| 1 Peter | i. 24 f.                    |       |                              |
|       | ii. 6                          |        |                              |
|       | iii. 10—12                     |        |                              |
|       | iv. 18                         |        |                              |
|       | v. 7                           |        |                              |
| 2 Peter | ii. 22                        |        |                              |
| Jude  | 9                              |        |                              |

(5) Quotations in the Epistles of St Paul.

| Rom. | i. 17                          | Hab.  | ii. 4                        |
|      | ii. 24                         |       | lli. 5                       |
|      | iii. 4                         |       | l. 6                         |
|      | 10—18                          |       | xiii. 1—3 f.                 |
|      | 20                             |       | cxlii. 2                     |
|      | iv. 3, 22                      |       | Gen.  | xv. 6                        |
|      | 7 f.                           |       | Ps.  | xxxi. 1 f.                   |
|      | 17                             |       | Gen.  | xvii. 5                      |
|      | 18                             |       |       | xv. 5                        |
|      | vii. 7                         |       | Exod. | xx. 14, 17                   |
|      | viii. 36                       |       | Ps.  | x111. 23                     |
|      | ix. 7                          |       | Gen.  | xxii. 12                     |
|      | 9                              |       |       | xviii. 10                    |
|      | 12                             |       | Mal.  | i. 2 f.                      |
|      | 13                             |       | Exod. | xxxiii. 19                   |
|      | 15                             |       |       | ix. 16                       |
|      | 17                             |       | Hos.  | i. 10                        |
|      | 26                             |       |       | x. 22 f.                     |
|      | 27                             |       |       | i. 9                         |
|      | 29                             |       |       | viii. 14 + xxviii. 16        |
|      | 33                             |       | Deut. | xxx. 11—14                   |
|      | x. 6—9                         |       |       | lli. 7 (Nah. i. 15)          |
|      | 15                             |       |       | lii. 1                       |
|      | 16                             |       | Ps.  | xviii. 5                     |
|      | 18                             |       | Deut. | xxxii. 21                     |
|      | 19                             |       |       | lxxv. 1 f.                   |
|      | 20 f.                          |       |       |                              |

1 See above, p. 251 f.
Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.

Rom. xi. 1 f.
3 f.
8
9
26 f.
34 f.
xii. 20 f.
xiii. 9
xiv. 11
xv. 3
9
10
11
12
21
1 Cor. i. 19
31
ii. 9
iii. 19
20
vi. 16
ix. 9
x. 7
26
xiv. 21
xv. 32
45
54 f.
2 Cor. iv. 13
vi. 2
16 ff.
viii. 15
ix. 9
x. 17
Gal. ii. 16
iii. 6
8
10
11
12
13
iv. 27
30
v. 14
Eph. iv. 8
25
Ps. xciii. 14
3 Regn. xix. 10, 14, 18
Isa. xxix. 10 + Deut. xxix. 4
Ps. lxviii. 23 f. + xxxiv. 8
Isa. lix. 20 + xxvii. 9
xl. 13
Prov. xxv. 21 f.
Exod. xx. 13 ff., Lev. xix. 18
Isa. xliv. 23
Ps. lxviii. 10
xvii. 50 (2 Regn. xxii. 50)
Deut. xxxii. 43
Ps. cxvi. 1
Isa. lii. 10
liii. 15
xxix. 14
Jer. ix. 24
Isa. lxiv. 4 + lxv. 17 (?)
Job v. 13
Ps. xciii. 11
Gen. ii. 24
Deut. xxv. 4
Exod. xxxii. 6
Ps. xxiii. 1
Isa. xxviii. 11 f.
Gen. ii. 7
Isa. xxv. 8 + Hos. xiii. 14
Ps. cxv. 1
Isa. xlix. 8
Ezek. xxxvii. 27 + Isa. lii. 11
Exod. xvi. 18
Ps. cxxi. 9
Jer. ix. 24
Ps. cxlii. 2
Gen. xv. 6
Gen. xii. 3
Deut. xxvii. 26
Hab. ii. 4
Lev. xvii. 5
Deut. xxi. 23
Isa. liv. 1
Gen. xxi. 10
Lev. xix. 18
Ps. lxvii. 19
Zech. viii. 16
### Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. 26</td>
<td>iv. 5</td>
<td>ii. 24</td>
<td>xx. 12</td>
<td>xcv. 4</td>
<td>xvi. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim. v. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim. ii. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (6) Quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

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

Some interesting results follow from an inspection of these lists. (1) The Synoptic Gospels have 46 distinct quotations (Mt. 40, Mc. 19, Lc. 17), of which 18 are peculiar to Mt., 3 to Mc., 3 to Lc. There are 10 which are common to the three, 3 common to Mt. and Mc., 4 to Mt. and Lc., but none
which are shared by Mc. and Lc. to the exclusion of Mt.
(2) Of the 12 quotations in the Fourth Gospel, 3 only are also
in the Synoptists. (3) The 23 quotations in the Acts occur
almost exclusively in the speeches. (4) The Johannine Epistles
do not quote the O. T. at all, and the other Catholic Epistles
contain few direct citations. (5) Of 78 quotations in St Paul,
71 are in the four first Epistles (Romans 42, 1—2 Corinthians
19, Galatians 10); there are none in the Epistles of the Roman
captivity, with the exception of Ephesians, which has five.
(6) The Epistle to the Hebrews quotes 28 passages, of which
21 are not cited in any other N. T. writing. (7) The Apoca­
lypse does not quote, but its language is full of O. T. phrase­
ology to an extent unparalleled in the other books.

3. Hitherto no account has been taken of the relation
which the N. T. quotations bear to the Alexandrian version,
although for the sake of convenience the references to the
O. T. have been given according to the order and numeration
of the Greek Bible. We may now address ourselves to this
further question; and it may at once be said that every part of
the N. T. affords evidence of a knowledge of the LXX., and
that a great majority of the passages cited from the O. T. are
in general agreement with the Greek version. It is calculated
by one writer on the subject that, while the N. T. differs from
the Massoretic text in 212 citations, it departs from the LXX.
in 185; and by another that "not more than fifty" of the
citations "materially differ from the LXX." On either estimate
the LXX. is the principal source from which the writers of the
N. T. derived their O. T. quotations.

More may be learnt by patiently examining the details of
the evidence. This cannot be done here in full, but we may

1 Westcott, Hebrews, p. 473.
2 Turpie, O.T. in the N., p. 267.
3 Grinfield, Apology for the LXX., p. 37.
point out the method to be pursued in such an investigation, and its chief results.

Each group of the N. T. writings must be interrogated separately. (a) Beginning with the Synoptic Gospels, we observe that the quotations partly occur in narratives or dialogue which are common to the Synoptists or to two of them, and are partly due to the individual writer. Between these two classes of quotations there is a marked contrast. Citations belonging to the common narrative, or to sayings reported by all the Synoptists, or to two of them, with few exceptions adhere closely to the LXX., the differences being only textual or in the way of omission.

Some examples will make this clear. (1) Citations common to Mt., Mc., Lc. Mt. xxi. 13 = Mc. xi. 17 = Lc. xix. 46 = LXX., Mc. alone completing the verse. Mt. xxi. 42 = Mc. xii. 10 = Lc. xx. 17 = LXX., Lc. omitting παρὰ Κυρίου κτλ. Mt. xxii. 37 = Mc. xii. 29 f. = Lc. x. 27a = LXX., with variants1. Mt. xxii. 39 = Mc. xii. 31 = Lc. x. 27b = LXX. Mt. xxii. 44 = Mc. xii. 36 = Lc. xx. 42 f. = LXX. with the variant ὑποκύπτω in Mt., Mc. (2) Citations common to Mt., Mc. Mt. xv. 4 = Mc. vii. 10 = LXX., cod. A. Mt. xv. 8 f. = Mc. vii. 6 = LXX., with variants2. Mt. xix. 5 f. = Mc. x. 6 ff. = LXX., Mc. omitting προσκολληθησοντα κτλ. Mt. xxiv. 15 = Mc. xiii. 14 = LXX. and Th. Mt. xxvi. 31 = Mc. xiv. 27 (omitting τῆς ποιμνῆς) = LXX., cod. A, with one important variant not found in any MS. of the LXX.; cod. B has quite a different text3. (3) Citations common to Mt., Lc. Mt. iv. 4 = Lc. iv. 4 = LXX., Lc. omitting the second half of the quotation. Mt. iv. 6 = Lc. iv. 10 f. = LXX., except that the clause τοῦ διαφυλάξαντος is omitted by Mt. and in part by Lc. Mt. iv. 7 = Lc. iv. 12 = LXX. Mt. iv. 10 = Lc. iv. 8 = LXX., cod. A.

Thus it appears that of 14 quotations which belong to this class only two (Mt. xv. 8 f., xxvi. 31) depart widely from the LXX. But when we turn from the quotations which belong to the common narrative to those which are peculiar to one of the Synoptists, the results are very different.

1 On these see Hatch, Essays, p. 104, and the writer’s St Mark, p. 255.
2 Hatch, op. cit., p. 177 f.
3 St Mark, p. 318 f.
In Mt. there are 16 quotations which are not to be found in Mc. or Lc. (Mt. i. 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, iv. 15 f., v. 33, 38, 43, viii. 17, ix. 13=xii. 7, xii. 18 ff., xiii. 14 f., 35, xxi. 4 f., 16, xxvii. 9 f.). Of these 4 (v. 38, ix. 13, xiii. 14 f., xxi. 16) are in the words of the LXX. with slight variants; 4 exhibit important variants, and the remaining 7 bear little or no resemblance to the Alexandrian Greek\(^1\). Neither Mc. nor Lc. has any series of independent quotations; Mc. ix. 48, xii. 32 are from the LXX., but shew affinities to the text of cod. A; Lc. iv. 18 f. differs from the LXX. in important particulars.

It may be asked whether the quotations in the Synoptists which do not agree with our present text of the LXX., or with its relatively oldest type, imply the use of another Greek version. Before an answer to this question can be attempted, it is necessary to distinguish carefully between the causes which have produced variation. It may be due to (a) loose citation, or to (b) the substitution of a gloss for the precise words which the writer professes to quote, or to (c) a desire to adapt a prophetic context to the circumstances under which it was thought to have been fulfilled, or to (d) the fusing together of passages drawn from different contexts. Of the variations which cannot be ascribed to one or other of these causes, some are (e) recensional, whilst others are (f) translational, and imply an independent use of the original, whether by the Evangelist, or by the author of some collection of excerpts which he employed.

The following may be taken as specimens of these types of variation. (a) Mt. ii. 18, xxi. 4 f.; (b) Mt. ii. 6, xxvii. 9 f.; (c) Mt. ii. 15; (d) Lc. iv. 18 f.; (e) Mt. xii. 18 ff., Mc. xii. 29 f.; (f) Mt. xiii. 35\(^b\). But more than one cause of divergence may have been at work in the same quotation, and it is not always easy to decide which is paramount; e.g. in Mt. ii. 15 the substitution of τῶν νῦν μου for τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς may be due either to the Evangelist's desire to adapt the prophecy to the event, or to a correction of the LXX. from the Heb. (יִשְׂרָאֵל).

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

---
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(1) A few of the Synoptic quotations are manifestly composite. E.g. Mt. xxi. 4 f., which is mainly from Zech. ix. 9, opens with a clause from Isa. lxii. 11 (ἐπιτε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σων Ἰδοῦ κτλ.). Lc. iv. 18 f., which is professedly an extract from a synagogue lesson Isa. lxi. 1 ff., inserts in the heart of that context a clause from Isa. lviii. 6 (ἀποστείλας τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει). Still more remarkable is the fusion in Mc. i. 2 f., where, under the heading καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἱσαία τῷ προφήτῃ, we find Mal. iii. 1 + Isa. xl. 3.1 Here the parallel passages in Mt., Lc., quote Isaiah only, using Malachi in another context (Mt. xi. 10, Lc. vii. 27).

(2) There is a considerable weight of evidence in favour of the belief that the Evangelists employed a recension of the LXX. which came nearer to the text of cod. A than to that of our oldest uncial B. This point has been recently handled in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie2, by Dr W. Staerk, who shews that the witness of the N. T. almost invariably goes with codds. ΑΠ and Lucian against the Vatican MS., and that its agreement with cod. A is especially close3. It may of course be argued that the text of these authorities has been influenced by the N. T.4; but the fact that a similar tendency is noticeable in Josephus, and to a less extent in Philo, goes far to discount this objection. Still more remarkable is the occasional tendency in N. T. quotations to support Theodotion against the LXX.5 Some instances have been given already; we may add here Mt. xii. 18 = Isa. xlii. i:

Mt. Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἦρέτισα, ὃς ἀγαπητός μου ὃν ἐνδοκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου.
I.XX. Ἰακὼβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψωμαι αὐτοῦ ἀντιλήψωμαι αὐτοῦ Ἰσραήλ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου ὃν μου, προσεδέξατο ἐνδοκησεν ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ ἡ ψυχὴ μου.
Th. 1 St Mark, p. 2. 2 In nos. xxxv., xxxvi., xxxviii., xl. 3 xxxvi., p. 97 f. 4 Cf. Zahn, Einleitung, ii. p. 314 ff. 5 Cf. p. 48.
Such coincidences lend some probability to the supposition that Theodotion’s version bears a relation to the recension of the Alexandrian Greek which was in the hands of the early Palestinian Church.

(3) Certain quotations in the First Gospel are either independent of the LXX., or have been but slightly influenced by it. These require to be studied separately, and, as they are but few, they are printed below and confronted with the LXX.

Mt. ii. 6
καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεέμ, γῇ 'Ιούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόνιν 'Ιούδα. Εἴς σοῦ γὰρ ἔξελεύσεται ἤγουμενος, ὡσις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραηλ.

Mt. iv. 15 f.
γῇ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῇ Νεφθαλείμ, ὡδὸν βαθάσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλειδαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκοτίᾳ φοῖς εἶδεν μέγα· καὶ τοῖς καθήμενοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.

Mt. iv. 15 f.
οἱ καθήμενοι D | καὶ σκιὰ om καὶ D*
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Here Mt. differs widely both from LXX. and M. T., yet he has points of agreement with both. The influence of LXX. is seen in γῆς ζ., Γ. τῶν ἔθνων, χώρας [καί] σκιᾶ. On the other hand ὡδὸν θαλάσσης, εἰδεν, αὐτοὶς agree with M.T. The writer quotes from memory, or from a collection of loosely cited testimonia.

Mt. viii. 17                Isa. liii. 4
αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἰμῶν
ἐλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν.

οὖτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἰμῶν
φέρει καὶ περὶ ἰμῶν ὀδυνᾶται.

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

Mt. xiii. 35                Ps. lxxviii. 2
ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ
στόμα μου· ἐρεύζομαι κεκρυμ-
μένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.
καταβολῆς] + κοσμοῦ Ν*CD

V. 35a in Mt. follows the LXX. verbatim, while 35b is an independent rendering of the Heb. The departure from the LXX. in the second half of the text is not altogether for the sake of exactness; if ἐρεύζομαι is nearer to ἐρεύζη than φθέγξομαι, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς introduces a conception which has no place in ἔρευζη, and in this sense the Greek phrase is practically limited to the N. T. (see Hort on 1 Pet. i. 20).

Mt. xxvii. 9 f.1            Zach. xi. 13
καὶ ἔλαβον...τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ
tετειμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ
νιὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτά
εἰς τὸν ἄγρον τοῦ κεραμεῶς,
kαθὰ συνετάξεν μοι Κύριος.

καὶ εἰπεν Κύριος πρὸς μὲ
Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωσεντήριον
καὶ σκέψομαι εἰ δοκιμὸν ἔστιν,
ὅν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθη ὑπὲρ
αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον...καὶ ἐνε-
βαλὼν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον Κυ-
ρίου εἰς τὸ χωσεντήριον.

ἐδώκειν Α*vid ἔδωκα Κ
ἐδοκιμασθῆν Β*fortK

Mt. has re-arranged this passage, and given its sense, without regard to the order or construction of the original. In doing this he has abandoned the LXX. altogether, and approximates to the Heb.; cf. Aq. ἦ τιμὴ ἤν ἐτιμήθην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

Mt. ascribes this prophecy to Jeremiah: τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρήθεν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου. The slip is probably due to a confusion between Zach. l. c. and Jer. xviii. 2.

1 Mt. ascribes this prophecy to Jeremiah: τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρήθεν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου. The slip is probably due to a confusion between Zach. l. c. and Jer. xviii. 2.
In these five passages the compiler of the first Gospel has more or less distinctly thrown off the yoke of the Alexandrian version and substituted for it a paraphrase, or an independent rendering from the Hebrew. But our evidence does not encourage the belief that the Evangelist used or knew another complete Greek version of the Old Testament, or of any particular book. It is to be observed that he uses this liberty only in quotations which proceed from himself, if we except the references to the O. T. in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43) which are hardly of the nature of strict citations; the formula ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις distinguishes them from that class, and suggests that they purport only to give the general sense.

(b) The Fourth Gospel quotes the LXX. verbatim, or with slight variants, in cc. ii. 17, x. 34, xii. 38, xix. 24, 36; and more freely in vi. 31, 45, xv. 25. In other places the author takes a more or less independent course: e.g. in i. 23, quoting Isa. xl. 3 he writes εἰθύνατε τὴν ὅδον Κυρίου for ἐτοιμάσατε τ. ο. Κ., εἰθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (cf. Mt. iii. 3, Mc. i. 3, Lc. iii. 4); in xii. 40, Isa. vi. 9, 10 is paraphrased τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώφρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, which agrees neither with the LXX. nor with M.T.; in xix. 37 ὄφονται εἰς δὲ ἐξεκέντησαν is a non-Septuagintal rendering of Zach. xii. 10, which was perhaps current in Palestine, since εἰς δὲ ἐξεκέντησαν appears also in Theodotion (cf. Aq., Symm., and Apoc. i. 7).

(c) The quotations from the O. T. in the Acts are taken from the LXX. exclusively. With the exception of the περιοχή in c. viii. 32, they occur only in the speeches. A few points deserve special notice. In vii. 43 (= Amos v. 26) the LXX. is followed against M.T. (Ῥαμφάν) or Ῥαμφάν, Ἱς ἵστ.). Similarly in xiii. 34 (= Isa. lv. 3) τὰ σῶμα Δαυείδ is read with the LXX. for ἤλπις ὁ λόγος. C. xiii. 22 is a conflation of Ps. lxxxviii. 32. An exact citation, with one or two variants of the A type.
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21 + lxxi. 20 + l Regn. xiii. 14 + Isa. xliv. 28. C. xv. 16 ff., which is introduced by the formula τοῦτο συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται, presents a remarkable instance of free citation accompanied by conflation, which calls for separate study.

Acts xv. 16 ff.

μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυείδ τὴν πεπτωκυίαν, καὶ τὰ κατεστραμμένα αὐτής ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτὴν, ὅπως ἄν ἐκχύσησων οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν κυρίων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐθνη ἐφ᾽ οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιών ταῦτα. 1

κατεστραμμένα] κατεσκαμ-μενα ACD

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

μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψω ... ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυείδ τὴν πεπτωκυίαν καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὅπως ἐκχύσησων οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐθνη ἐφ᾽ οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιών ταῦτα.

κατεσκαμμένα] κατεστραμ-μένα AÒ*

ὅπως[+av A | ἀνθρωπον]+ τὸν κυρίον A

The combination in this quotation of looseness with close adherence to the LXX. even where it is furthest from the Heb. (e.g. in ὅπως ἐκχύσησών κτλ.) is significant, especially when it is remembered that the speaker is St James of Jerusalem.

(d) The Catholic Epistles use the LXX. when they quote the O.T. expressly, and with some exceptions keep fairly close to the Alexandrian Greek. Thus Jas. ii. 8, 11, 23, iv. 6, 1 Pet. i. 24 3, iv. 18, v. 5, are substantially exact. 1 Pet. ii. 6 differs from the LXX. of Isa. xxviii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 10 ff., an unacknowledged extract from Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff., is adapted to the context by a slight change in the construction, but otherwise generally follows the LXX.: θέλων ζωῆν ἀγαπῶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς for θέλων ζ., ἀγαπῶν ἰδ. ἡμ. ἀγαθάς is probably

1 On this reading see W. H. 2, Notes on select readings, p. 96.
2 Cf. Mc. x. 19, Le. xviii. 20.
3 On the few variants in this passage see Hort, St Peter, p. 93.
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a slip, shewing that the writer was quoting from memory. In 2 Pet. ii. 22 (=Prov. xxvi. 11) κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἰδίον ἔξοραμα is nearer to the Heb. than κ. ὅταν ἐπέληγ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐαυτοῦ ἐμετόν, and appears to be an independent rendering.

(e) More than half of the direct quotations from the O.T. in the Epistles of St Paul are taken from the LXX. without material change (Rom. i. 17, ii. 24, iii. 4, iv. 7 f., 18, vii. 7, viii. 36, ix. 7, 12, 13, 15, 26, x. 6 ff., 16, 18, 19, 20 f., xi. 26 f., 34 f., xii. 20 f., xiii. 9, xv. 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20, vi. 16, x. 7, 26, xv. 32; 2 Cor. iv. 13, vi. 2, viii. 15, ix. 9; Gal. iii. 6, 11, 12, iv. 27, v. 14; Eph. iv. 26; 2 Tim. ii. 19). A smaller proportion shew important variants (Rom. iii. 20 = Gal. ii. 16 πᾶσα σάρξ for πᾶς ζών LXX.; ix. 9 κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτου ἑλέουσαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάραᾳ νῦν for ἦσο...κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτου...καὶ ἔξει νῦν Σάρα LXX.; ix. 17 εἰς αὐτὸ τούτο ἔξηγερά σε for ἐνεκεν τούτου διεσπάθης, and δύναμιν for ἵσχυς Ι. X. 1; ix. 27 ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν νεῶν Ἡ., ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; xiv. 11 ζῶ ἐγώ for κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ δομών, ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ for ὅμειται τὸν θεόν LXX.; 1 Cor. i. 19 ἄδετήσω for κρύσω LXX.; Gal. iii. 8 πάντα τὰ ἐθνη for πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς LXX.; iii. 13 ἐπικατάρατος (cf. v. 20) for κεκαταραμένος LXX.; Eph. iv. 8 ἐδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for ἔδαβες δ. ἐν ἀνθρώπῃ LXX.; iv. 25 μετὰ τοῦ πλησίουν for πρὸς τὸν πλ. LXX.; v. 31 ἀντὶ τούτου for ἐνεκέν τ., om. αὐτοῦ 1º, 2º; cf. Mt. xix. 5 f., Mc. x. 7 f.; vi. 3 καὶ ἐσθη μακροχρόνιος for κ. ἰνα μακροχρ. γένη).

In other passages St Paul departs still further from the LXX., quoting freely, or paraphrasing, or fusing two distinct passages into a single citation, or occasionally deserting the Alexandrian version altogether. Examples of loose quotations or of paraphrases will be found in Rom. ix. 27, xi. 3, 4, i Cor. xv. 45, Gal. iv. 30; conflation occurs in Rom. iii. 10 ff., ix. 33, xi. 8, 9, 26 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 54 f., 2 Cor. vi. 16 ff.

1 B reads δύναμιν.
2 ἀπὸς B*.N.R*.
3 On this passage, see above, p. 251 f.
The following instances will shew how far reconstruction is carried in cases of conflation.

Rom. ix. 33 ἵδου τίθημι ἐν Σίων λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπὶ αὐτῷ ὁ κατασχυνθήσεται.1

Rom. xi. 8 ἠδοκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνείμα κατανύξεως, ὄβθαλμος τοῦ μὴ βλέπεις καὶ ὥστα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούεις, ἐως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

1 Cor. ii. 9 ὁ ὄβθαλμος ὁκ εἶδεν καὶ ὁδὶς ὁκ ἦκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ὁκ ἀνέβη, ὅτα ἦτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπώσιν αὐτῶν.3 ἀναγωσιν] ὑπομενουσιν Clem. R. i. 34, 8.

1 Cor. xv. 54 f. κατεπόθη ὁ βάνατος εἰς νῖκος1 ποῦ σου, βάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, βάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;2

In some cases a wide departure from the LXX. is probably to be explained by the supposition that the Apostle quotes from memory; e.g.:

Rom. xi. 2 ff. ὃς ὁδηγᾷ ἐν Ἁλεία τι λέγει ἡ γραφή...Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ διαστήματα σου κατείχαν, καὶ τὴν ὑπελείψθης μοῦ, καὶ ἤγιον τὴν γυνῆν μου, καὶ ἠλπινότερον τὸ λέγεις αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; Κατελίπθην ἐμαυτῷ ὑπεκαυχήσιον ἀνδρας, ὡς ὁκ ἦκαμης γάνω τῇ Βαάλ.

1 Aq. καὶ ἐλς στερεῶν σκανδάλου. 2 Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8 (Hort). 3 On this passage see Resch, Agrapha, p. 154 ff. 4 So Theodotion.
The following quotation also is probably from memory, but the Apostle's knowledge of the original has enabled him to improve upon the faulty rendering of the LXX.

1 Cor. xiv. 21

\[
\text{ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι }
\text{διὰ φαυλίσμων χειλέων, διὰ}
\text{Ἐν ἐπερουλώσοις καὶ ἐν χει-
\text{λεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ}
\text{τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσ-
\text{ακούσονται μοι, λέγει Κύριος.}
\]

Isa. xxviii. 11 f.

\[
\text{ἡθέλησαν ἀκούειν.}
\text{Ἰσλ. χωρὶς ἁλαξίας ἐτέρας ὅτι λαλήσου-
\text{σιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ...καὶ οὐκ}
\text{διὰ φαυλίσμων χειλέων, διὰ}
\text{Ἐν ἐπερουλώσοις καὶ ἐν χει-
\text{λεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ}
\text{τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσ-
\text{ακούσονται μοι, λέγει Κύριος.}
\]

Jerome, quoting these words from St Paul, rightly adds, "Quod mihi videtur iuxta Hebraicum de praesenti sumptum capitulo." Aquila’s rendering is remarkably similar, ἡθέλησαν ἀκούειν. Theodotion unfortunately is wanting.

(f) The Ep. to the Hebrews is in great part a catena of quotations from the LXX. "The text of the quotations agrees in the main with some form of the present text of the LXX." A considerable number of the passages are cited exactly, or with only slight variation (i. 5, 8 f., i3; ii. 6 ff., i3; iv. 4, v. 6, vi. 13 f., viii. 5, xi. 5, 18, 21; xii. 5 f., xiii. 6). The writer usually follows the LXX. even when they differ materially from the Heb. (viii. 5 ff., x. 5 ff., σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, 37 ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, xi. 21 ῥάβδον, xii. 5 μαστιγοί). But he sometimes deserts both version and original, substituting a free paraphrase, or apparently citing from memory (i. 6, ix. 20 ἐνετείλατο, x. 30, xii. 19 f., 26). Some of his readings are interesting: in i. 7 we have πυρὸς φλόγα for πῦρ φλέγου; in i. 12 ὡς ἰμάτιον seems to be a doublet of ὦσεὶ περιβόλαιον. Notice also ii. 12 ἀπαγγελῶ for διηγήσομαι (perhaps after Ps. xxi. 31 f.); iii. 9 ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ for ἐδοκιμασαν (ἐδοκιμασία for ἐδοκιμασᾶ), and iii. 10 τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη. διὸ προσώπῳ ἡμας for

1 As εν τῷ νόμῳ seems to indicate.
2 Westcott, Hebrews, p. 476.
3 Cf. p. 338.
4 Yet "he nowhere shews any immediate knowledge of the Hebrew text" (Westcott, op. cit., p. 479).
5 Cf. Rom. xii. 19. Apparently a stock quotation, current in this form.
6 Α has πυρὸς φλέγα (sic) in Ps. ciii. 4.
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In the Epistles, as in the Gospels, the text of the LXX. which is employed inclines to cod. A rather than to cod. B. But its agreement with the A text is not without exception; and there are other elements in the problem which must not be overlooked. As in the Gospels, again, we notice from time to time a preference for Lucianic readings, or for the readings of Theodotion. It has been reasonably conjectured that the writers of the N.T. used a recension which was current in Palestine, possibly also in Asia Minor, and which afterwards supplied materials to Theodotion, and left traces in the Antiochian Bible, and in the text represented by cod. A. We shall revert to this subject in a later chapter; for the present it is enough to notice the direction to which the evidence of the N.T. seems to point.

4. We have dealt so far with direct quotations. But in estimating the influence of the LXX. upon the N.T. it must not be forgotten that it contains almost innumerable references of a less formal character. These are in many cases likely to escape notice, and it is not the least of the debts which we owe to the Westcott and Hort text, that attention is called to them by the use of uncial type. They will be found chiefly (a) in the words of our Lord (e.g. Mt. vii. 23=Lc. xiii. 27, Mc. x. 21, 35 f.=Lc. xii. 52 f., xi. 5=Lc. vii. 22, xi. 21, 23=Lc. x. 15, 28 f., xiii. 32=Mc. iv. 32=Lc. xiii. 19, xvii. 17=Lc. ix. 41, xviii. 16, xxi. 33=Mc. xiii. 1=Lc. xx. 9, xxiv. 29 ff.=Mc. xiii. 24 ff.=Lc. xxi. 25 ff., xxiv. 39=Lc. xvii. 27, xxvi. 64=Mc. xiv. 62=Lc. xxii. 69; Mc. iv. 29, vi. 23, ix. 48, xvi. 19; Lc. xiii. 53, xxi. 22, 24, xxiii. 30, 46); (b) in the canticles of Lc. i.—ii.; (c) in St Stephen's speech, and, though more sparsely, in the other speeches of the Acts; (d) in the Epistle...
of St James and the First Epistle of St Peter; (e) in the Epistles of St Paul; where, though not so numerous as the citations, the allusions to the LXX. are more widely distributed, occurring in 1, 2 Thessalonians, Philippians and Colossians, as well as in the great dogmatic Epistles; (f) in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 16, iii. 5 f., vi. 7 f., 19 f., vii. 1 ff., x. 29 f., xi. 12 f., 17 f., 28, xii. 12—21, xiii. 11, 20); and especially (g) in the Apocalypse, where references to the Greek Old Testament abound in every chapter.

5. This summary by no means represents the extent of the influence exerted upon the N.T. by the Alexandrian Version. The careful student of the Gospels and of St Paul is met at every turn by words and phrases which cannot be fully understood without reference to their earlier use in the Greek Old Testament. Books which are not quoted in the N.T., e.g. the non-canonical books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees, find echoes there, and not a few of the great theological words which meet us in the Apostolic writings seem to have been prepared for their Christian connotation by employment in the Alexandrian appendix to the Canon.

Not the Old Testament only, but the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, has left its mark on every part of the New Testament, even in chapters and books where it is not directly cited. It is not too much to say that in its literary form and expression the New Testament would have been a widely different book had it been written by authors who knew the Old Testament only in the original, or who knew it in a Greek version other than that of the LXX.

LITERATURE. F. Junius, Sacrorum Parallelorum libri iii. (Heidelberg, 1588); J. Drusius, Parallela Sacra (Franeker,

---

1 See Mayor, St James, pp. lxviii. ff., cxxix.
2 The facts are collected by Dr Ryle in Smith's D.B. art. Apocrypha (i. pp. 183, 185).
3 See below, c. iv.
Quotations from the LXX. in the New Testament. 405

1594); H. Hody, De Bibl. textibus, p. 243 ff. (Oxford, 1705); W. Surenhusius, Μετάφρασις του δέκατου Βιβλίου του Παλαιού Τεσταμέντου (Amsterdam, 1713); H. Owen, Modes of quotation used by the Evangelical writers explained and vindicated (London, 1789); H. Gough, N. T. Quotations (London, 1855); A. Tholuck, Das A. T. in N. T.—erste Beilage (Gotha, 1836); D. M'C. Turpie, The Old Testament in the New (London, 1868); The New Testament view of the Old (London, 1872); Kautzsch, De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo ap. allegatis (Leipzig, 1869); C. Taylor, The Gospel in the Law (Cambridge, 1869); H. Monnet, Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul (Lausanne, 1874); Böhl, Die ATlichen Citate im N.T. (Vienna, 1878); C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York, 1884); E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 131 ff. (Oxford, 1889); W. Staerk, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie, xxxv.—xl.: A. Clemens, Der Gebrauch des A.T. in den NTlichen Schriften (Gütersloh, 1895); H. Volkmar, Die ATlichen Citate bei Paulus (Freiburg in B., 1895); J. C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, pp. 123 ff. (Oxford, 1899); W. Dittmar, Vetus Testamentum in Novo i. (Göttingen, 1899); Th. Zahn, Einleitung in das N.T., ii. p. 313 ff., and elsewhere (see Sachregister s. ATliche Citate) (Leipzig, 1899); E. Hühn, Die ATlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im N.T. (Tübingen, 1900). See also the commentaries on particular books of the N.T., e.g. Bp Westcott, Hebrews, p. 469 ff.; J. B. Mayor, St James, p. lxviii. ff.; H. B. Swete, St Mark, p. lxx. ff.
CHAPTER III.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE LXX. IN EARLY
CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

"The quotations from the LXX. in the Greek Fathers are
an almost unworked field." So wrote Dr Hatch in 1889, and
the remark is still true. Indeed, this field can hardly be
worked with satisfactory results until the editor has gone
before, or a competent collator has employed himself upon
the MSS. of the author whose quotations are to be examined.
The 'Apostolic Fathers' can already be used with confidence
in the editions of Lightfoot and Gebhardt-Harnack; the minor
Greek Apologists have been well edited in Texte und Unter­
suchungen, and it may be hoped that the Berlin edition of the
earlier Greek Fathers 2 will eventually supply the investigator
with trustworthy materials for the Ante-Nicene period as a
whole. But for the present the evidence of many Ante-Nicene
and of nearly all later Greek Church-writers must be employed
with some reserve. In this chapter we shall limit ourselves to
the more representative Christian writers before Origen.

i. The earliest of non-canonical Christian writings, the
letter addressed c. A.D. 96 by the Church of Rome to the
Church of Corinth, abounds in quotations from the O.T.; and
more than half of these are given substantially in the words of
the LXX. with or without variants.

1 Biblical Essays, p. 133.
2 Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahr­
hunderte (Hinrichs, Leipzig). The volumes already published contain
part of Hippolytus and an instalment of Origen.
The following is a list of the exact or nearly exact quotations of the LXX. in Clem. R. ad Cor. Gen. ii. 23 (vi. 3), iv. 3 ff. (iv. 1 ff.), xii. 1 ff. (x. 3), xiii. 14 ff. (x. 4 f.), xv. 5 (x. 6), xviii. 27 (xvii. 2); Exod. ii. 14 (iv. 9); Deut. xxxii. 8 f. (xxix. 2); Ps. ii. 7 f. (xxxvi. 4), xi. 5 f. (xv. 5), xvii. 26 f. (xlv. 2), xviii. 2 ff. (xxvii. 7), xxi. 7 ff. (xvi. 15 f.), xxii. 1 (liv. 3), xxx. 19 (xv. 5), xxxi. 1 f. (l. 6), io (xxii. 8), xxxii. 12—20 (xxii. 1 ff.), xxxvi. 35 f. (xiv. 5), xlix. 16 ff. (xxvii. 7 ff.), l. 3 ff. (xviii. 2 ff.), lxii. 5 (xv. 3), lxxvii. 36 (xxv. 4), lxxviii. 21 (xviii. 1), ci. 4 (xxxvi. 3), cix. 1 (xxxvi. 5), cxvii. 18 (liv. 3), 19 f. (xl. 2), cxxvii. 7 f. (xxvii. 3), cxl. 5 (lvi. 5); Prov. i. 23 ff. (lvii. 3 ff.), ii. 21 f. (xiv. 4), iii. 12 (lvi. 3 f.), 34 (xxx. 2), xx. 21 (xvi. 2); Job iv. 16 ff. (xxxix. 3 ff.), v. 17 ff. (lvi. 6 ff.), xi. 2 f. (xxx. 4), xiv. 26 (xxvi. 2); Sap. xii. 12-14 (xvii. 3); Mal. i. 1 (xxii. 5); Isa. v. 2 (xxiv. 6), xiii. 22 (xxv. 5), xxix. 13 (xv. 2), lii. 1 ff. (xvi. 3 ff.), lx. 17 (xli. 5), lxii. 2 (xiii. 3); Jer. ix. 23 f. (xiii. 1); Ezech. xxxiii. 11 (viii. 2); Dan. vii. 10, Th. (xxxiv. 6).

The variants are often of much interest, as shewing affinities to certain types of LXX. text. The following are specially worthy of notice: Ps. xxi. 7 ἐξουθένημα, ΝΑΡ; xxxi. 1 f. οὐ, Ν*ΒΑ (ag. Ν*α); xxxiii. 14 χείλη τοῦ, Ν*α-ΑΡ; 16 om. ὅτι, Ν*α-ΑΡ; xxxvi. 36 ἐξειζήτησα (H. P. 99, 183); xlix. 21 ἀνομέ, Ν*; 22 ἀρπ. ὦς λέων, R; l. 17 ἃ στόμα...τά χείλη; lxxxviii. 21 ἐλέει, Β*; Prov. ii. 21 χρηστοὶ ἐσνοῦται ὀλιγήτροι γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθέονται επ᾿ αὐτῆς, cf. Ν*α-A—A doublet wanting in B, whose reading “appears to shew the hand of an Alexandrian reviser” (Toy, cf. Lagarde); iii. 12 παιδεύει, ΝΑ; xx. 21 (27) λύχνος, a reading found in A as a doublet (φῶ... ἀ ἤ λύχνος); Job iv. 21 ἐπελεύσασα (for ἐξηράνθησαν), A; v. 17 ff. is without the additions of the A text, and nearly as in B; Isa. i. 17 χήρα, B*, ag. BαβανΑ, δεῦτε καὶ διελεγχθ. (διαλεψ. Τ. π.); iii. 5 ἀμαρτίας...ἀνομίας tr., ΝΑ; 6 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν; 8 ἄκινοι, Qmag, 62, 90 al., Syrohex. mag.; 9 εὑρέθη δόλος, Ν*α-Α—Q see Lightfoot’s note); τῆς πληγῆς, B (A, ἀπὸ τ. π.); lx. 17 ἀρχόντας] ἐπισκόπους [ἐπισκόπους] διακόνους; Ezech. xxxiii. 11 ἀμαρτουλοῦ, A (B, ἀσεβοῦς); Dan. viii. 10 ἐλευθέρωγον, Th. (LXX. ἔθεράπευνον).1

1 On Clement’s quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah, see Hatch, Essays, pp. 175—9.
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(a) A few readings imply correction from the Hebrew, or rather perhaps a Greek text with affinities to the translations of the second century; e.g. Ps. cxxxviii. 8 ἐὰν καταστρώσω, Ἄ. Σ. ἐὰν στρώσω (LXX. ἐὰν καταβῶ); Isa. lxvi. 2 πρῶν, Ἄ. (LXX. ταπείνων). Others seem to be due to the imperfect memory of the writer, who has not verified his quotations by referring to his papyrus, e.g. Ps. lxxxviii. 21 ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ: Mal. iii. 1 ὁ ἄγιος¹ for ὁ ἄγγελος.

(b) A large proportion of Clement’s quotations are composite²; sixteen passages may be thus described. Some of these consist of citations accurately given from the LXX. and strung together, with or without a formula citandi (e.g. lvi. 3—14 = Ps. cxvii. 18 + Prov. iii. 12 + Ps. cxl. 5 (φσοίν) + Job v. 17—26 (καὶ πάλιν λέγει)). In other cases one of the citations is correctly given, and another quoted loosely (e.g. xiv. 4 = Prov. ii. 21 f. (A) + Ps. xxxvi. 38, confused with 21b). But more commonly in Clement’s conflate quotations, texts are fused together without regard to verbal accuracy; cf. e.g. xxvi. 20 λέγει γάρ ποι Καὶ ἔξαναστήσεις με καὶ ἔξομολογήσομαι σοι καὶ ἐκομήθη καὶ ὑπνώσα· ἐξηγήρθην, ὅτι σὺ μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔφη, where fragments of Pss. xxvii. 7, iii. 5, xxii. 4 are blended into an arabesque. Except in this class of quotations Clement is not often guilty of citing loosely; see however xx. 7 (Job xxxviii. 11), xxviii. 3 (Ps. cxxxviii. 7), xxxii. 3 (Gen. xv. 5), xlii. 5 (Isa. lx. 17).

(c) Special interest attaches to Clement’s quotations of passages which are also quoted in the N.T. The following are the most instructive instances: (1) Gen. xii. 1 = Acts vii. 3 = Clem. x. 3: Clem. reads ἀπελθε for ἔξελθε (LXX. and Acts), but rejects καὶ δεόρῳ with A.D against Acts and cod. E.

¹ The Latin version supports the MSS. of the Greek text of Clement in both cases, so that with our present knowledge we are not at liberty to assume a transcriptional error.
² On ‘composite’ quotations from the LXX. see Hatch, op. cit. p. 203 ff.
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(2) Exod. ii. 14 = Acts vii. 27 = Clem. iv. 11: Clem. reads κριτήν for ἀρχοντα—"perhaps from confusion with Lc. xii. 14" (Lightfoot). (3) Jer. ix. 23 f. (1 Regn. ii. 10) = 1 Cor. i. 31, (2 Cor. x. 17) = Clem. xiii. 1; here the relation of Clement to the Biblical texts is best shewn by juxtaposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer. l.c.</th>
<th>1 Regn. l.c.*</th>
<th>Clem. l.c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ ἱσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ; ἄλλ' ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχόμενος, συνιεῖ καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὑτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνάμει αὑτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὑτοῦ· ἄλλ' ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχόμενος, συνιεῖ καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ ἱσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ· ἄλλ' ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκκεντεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cf. p. 245.

(4) Ps. xxi. 9 = Matt. xxvii. 43 = Clem. xvi. 15; Clem. agrees with lxx., Mt. substitutes πέποιθεν for ἠλπίσεν, τὸν θεὸν for Κύριον, and εἰ for ὅτι. (5) Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff. = 1 Pet. iii. 10 ff. = Clem. xxii. 1 ff.; Clem. agrees with lxx. against St Peter, who changes the construction (ὅθελων...παντατοῦ κτῆ.). (6) Ps. cix. 1 = Mt. xxii. 44 (Mc., Lc.), Acts ii. 34 f. Heb. i. 13 = Clem. xxxvi. 5: Clem. reads ὑποσκότων with Lc., Acts, Hebr., against ὑποκάτω Mt., Mc. (BD). (7) Prov. iii. 12 = Heb. xii. 6 = Clem. lvi. 4: see above, p. 402. (8) Prov. iii. 34 = Jas. iv. 6, 1 Pet. v. 5 = Clem. xxx. 2: Θεὸς (ὁ θ. Jas., Pet.) against Κύριος lxx.; M.T. ἐνν, but with reference to κρίμα in v. 33. (9) Isa. xxix. 13 = Mt. xv. 8, Mc. vii. 6 = Clem. xv. 1; again the passages must be printed in full:

1 See Hatch, op. cit., p. 177 f.
Through constant citation, the context has taken more than one type; Clement's is close to that of the Evangelists, but has not been borrowed from them in their present form, as ἀπεστίν shews. (10) Isa. liii. 1—12 = Clem. xvi. 3—14; cf. Jo. xii. 38 (Rom. x. 16), Mt. viii. 17, Acts viii. 32 (, l Pet. ii. 22, Mc. xv. 28.

The general result of this examination is to shew (a) that Clement's text of the Lxx. inclines in places to that which appears in the N.T., and yet presents sufficient evidence of independence; (b) that as between the texts of the LXX. represented by B and A, while often supporting A, it is less constantly opposed to B than is the New Testament; and (c) that it displays an occasional tendency to agree with Theodotion and even with Aquila against the LXX. It seems in fact to be a more mixed text than that which was in the hands of the Palestinian writers of the N.T. These conclusions harmonise on the whole with what we know of the circumstances under which Clement wrote. The early Roman Church was largely composed of Greek-speaking Jews, the freedmen of Roman families; and Clement himself, as Lightfoot has suggested, was probably of Jewish descent and a freedman or the son of a freedman of Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian. Under these circumstances it was natural that the text of Clement's copies of Old Testament books,

1 Clement of Rome, p. 61. Dr Nestle (Z. f. die NTliche Wissenschaft, i. 2) points out the Semitic style which reveals itself in Clement, e.g. v. 6 ἐπτάκεις, xii. 5 γινώσκονσα γινώσκω.
while derived from Palestinian archetypes, should contain readings brought to the capital by Jewish-Greek visitors from other lands.

2. Whatever the history of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, whether it is of Roman or of Corinthian origin, like the genuine Epistle it makes extensive use of the Greek Old Testament. The following quotations occur: Gen. i. 27 (xiv. 2); Mal. iv. 1 (xvi. 3); Isa. xxix. 13 (iii. 5), xxxiv. 4 (xvi. 3), lii. 5 (xiii. 2), liv. 1 (ii. 1), lviii. 9 (xv. 3), lxvi. 18 (xvii. 4 f.), 24 (vii. 6, xvii. 24); Jer. vii. 11 (xiv. 1), Ezech. xiv. 14, 18, 20 (vi. 8). The last of these passages is cited very freely or rather summarised, although introduced by the words λέγει η γραφή ἐν τῷ Ἑζεκηλ. The writer follows Clement in the form of several of his quotations (iii. 5 = Clem. i Cor. xv. 2, xiv. 2 = Clem. i Cor. xxxiii. 5; in xiii. 2 he quotes Isa. lii. 5 as it is quoted by Polycarp (see below)).

3. Another second century document, indisputably Roman, the Shepherd of Hermas, contains no quotation from the LXX. But Ps. ciii. 15 LXX. has supplied the writer with a phrase in Mand. xii. 3. 4, and Vis. iv. 2. 4 supplies evidence that he knew and read a version of Daniel which was akin to Theodotion’s. The passage runs: ὁ κύριος ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν θηρίων ὄντα, οὐ τὸ ὄνομα ἔστιν †Σεγρί’1, καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ σε λυμάνῃ. Compare Dan. vi. 22 (23) Ἐθ., ὁ θεός μου ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὰ στόματα τῶν ἁλοντων (LXX. σέσωκέ με ὁ θεός ἀπὸ τῶν λεόντων), καὶ οὐκ ἐλυμήναντό με2.

4. The Old Testament is quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas even more profusely than in the Epistle of Clement,

---

1 The acute conjecture of Dr J. Rendel Harris, who saw that the name, which appears in the MSS. as Θεγρί or the like, must be an attempt to reproduce the verb Ἱδο (Dan. l. c.).

2 See above, p. 47, n. 4.
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but with less precision. The writer is fairly exact in well-known contexts belonging to the Psalter or the Book of Isaiah\(^1\), but elsewhere he appears to trust to memory, and not to concern himself greatly about the words of his author. Even when preceded by a *formula citandi* his citations often wander far from the LXX., although they are clearly based upon it; e.g. Exod. xxxiii. 1—3 is quoted in Barn. vi. 8 after this manner: τί λέγει ὁ ἄλλος προφήτης Μωυσῆς αυτός; Ἡδον τάδε λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεός Εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἁγαθὴν, ἢν ὤμοσαν Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ κατακληρονομήσατε αυτήν, γῆν ῥεόνταν γάλα καὶ μέλι. Similar liberties are taken even when the writer mentions the book which he is quoting: 2 Μωυσῆς...λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Δευτερονόμῳ Καὶ διαβῆσομαι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τούτον τὰ δικαιώματά μου—a sentence which, though it has all the notes of a strict quotation, proves to be a mere summary of Deut. iv. 1—23.

The following analysis of the quotations in Barnabas may be found useful. (a) Exact or nearly exact: Gen. i. 28 (Barn. vi. 12), Exod. xx. 14 (xix. 4), Deut. x. 16 (ix. 5), Ps. i. 1, 3—6 (x. 1, xi. 6 f.), xvii. 45 (ix. 1), xxi. 17, 19 (vi. 6), cxvii. 12, 22 (vi. 4, 6), Prov. i. 17 (v. 4), Isa. i. 2, 10 f. (ii. 5, 3, xv. 8), iii. 9 f. (vi. 7), v. 21 (iv. 11), xxviii. 16 (vi. 2 f.), xxxiii. 13 (ix. 1), 16 (xi. 4 f.), xl. 12 (xvi. 2), xliii. 6 f. (xiv. 7), xliv. 2 f. (xi. 4), xlix. 6 f. (xiv. 8), liii. 5, 7 (v. 2), lxii. 1 f. (xiv. 9), lxvii. 1 f. (xvi. 2). (b) Partly exact, partly free: Gen. xxv. 21 ff. (xii. 2), lxviii. 9—11, 14 ff. (xiii. 4 f.), Isa. xxviii. 16 (vi. 2), lviii. 4 ff. (iii. 1 f.), Jer. ii. 12 f. (xi. 2). (c) Free: Gen. i. 26 (vi. 12), 28 (vi. 18), Lev. xxiii. 29 (vii. 3), Deut. ix. 12 (iv. 8), x. 16 (ix. 5), Ps. xxi. 21, cxviii. 120, xxi. 17 (v. 13), Zech. xiii. 7 (v. 12), xvi. 1 f. (xi. 3), xl. 3 (ix. 3), 'Isa. i. 6 ff. (v. 14, vi. 1), lxv. 2 (xii. 4), Jer. iv. 3 (ix. 5), vii. 2 (ix. 2), ix. 26 (ix. 5), Ezek. xix. 19, xxxvi. 26 (vi. 14). (d) Free, with fusion: Gen. xvii. 23 + xiv. 14 (ix. 8), Exod. xx. 8 + Ps. xxiii. 4 (xv. 1), Exod. xxxii. 7 + Deut. ix. 12 (iv. 8), xxxiv. 28 + xxxi. 18 (iv. 7), Ps. xli. 3 + xii. 23 (vi. 15), I. 19 + apocryphon (ii. 10), Jer. vii. 22 f. + Zech. vii. 10, viii. 17 (ix. 7 f.). (e) Free summary: Lev. xi., Deut. xiv. (x. 1), Deut. iv. 10 ff. (x. 2), Ezek. xvii. (xi. 10). (f) Very loose citation: Gen. ii. 2 (xv. 3), xvii. 5 (xii. 6), Exod. xvii. 14 (xii. 9), xxiv. 18 + xxxi. 18 (xiv. 2), xxxiii. 1 ff. (vi. 8), Lev. xvi. 7 ff.
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(vii. 6), Deut. xxvii. 15 (xii. 6), Ps. xxxii. 13 (ix. 2), Sir. iv. 31 (xix. 9), Isa. xlix. 17 (xvi. 3), Dan. vii. 7 f., 24 (iv. 4), ix. 24 (xvi. 6).

As the Epistle of Barnabas is not improbably a relic of the earliest Alexandrian Christianity, it is important to interrogate its witness to the text of the LXX. This can best be done, as we have seen, by examining its quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah.

Ps. i. 1 ἐπὶ καθέδραν, ΒΧ (ag. ἐ. καθέδρα AR), 5 οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, ἄμαρτωλοι, B (ag. ἀσεβεῖς, οἱ ἄμ. Α.). xvii. 45 ὑπήκουσαν, Ν* | μον, Ν.α. RU (ag. μον 10 ΒΧΑ). xxi. 17 περιέσχεν, Ἦ. P. 81, 206. cix. 1 Κύριος, R | ὑποπόδιον (ag. ὑποκάτω, Μc. xii. 36, BD). Isa. iii. 9 ὅτι, ΑΓ; v. 21 ἐλαύνω, AQ; xxviii. 16 ἐμπάλω, ΝΑQ; xlii. 7 καὶ ἐξαγαγείν | δεδεμένους] πεπεδημένους (as Justin, Dial. 26, 65, 122). xlix. 6 τεδεικα, ΝΑQ* (ag. δέδωκα ΒQμεγ), 7 λυτρωσάμενος (for ρυσά-μενος); iii. 5 ἀνομίας, ἀμαρτίας, ΝΑQ, 7 τοῦ κείματος αὐτοῦ, Ν.α. ΑQ; lviii. 5 λέγει Κύριος, Q, 6 ἵδον αὕτη ἡ μητεία ἤν; lxii. 1 τα-πεινώις, Ν*; lxvi. 1 ἢ δὲ γη, ΝΑQ | ἢ (for καὶ 20), ΝΑ.

The leaning in Isaiah towards the text of Q, especially when found in company with A or ΝΑ, is noteworthy, and it is worth mentioning that in Zech. xiii. 7, where the text of Barnabas does not seem to have been influenced by the Gospels, it agrees with A in adding τῆς ποίμνης. Occasionally the text used by Barnabas seems to have been revised from the Heb.; e.g. in Jer. ii. 12 ἐξέστη, ἐφριξεν become ἐκστηθη, φριξάω in accordance with M.T.; in Gen. ii. 2 Barnabas has with M.T. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐβδομής where the LXX. read ἐ. τ. τῇ ἑκτη.

5. The Asiatic Christian writers of the second century, Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of Smyrna, afford a striking contrast to Clement of Rome and Barnabas of Alexandria, in the rarity of their appeals to the Old Testament. (a) The genuine Epistles of Ignatius quote it only twice with a formula citandi (Prov. iii. 34 = Eph. v. 3, xviii. 17 = Magn. xii. 1);

1 For further details see Hatch, op. cit. p. 180 ff.
two or three allusions (Ps. xxxii. 9 = Eph. xv. 1, Isa. v. 26 = Smyrn. i. 2, lii. 5 = Trall. viii. 2) complete the instances of a direct use of the LXX. by this writer. When he quotes or alludes, he is fairly close to the LXX., unless we may except the last instance, where δι' οὖσα διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν appears to be changed into οὐδ' ἐπὶ ματαιότητι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπὶ τινων βλασφημεῖται—a form which occurs also in Pseudo-Clement (2 Cor. xiii. 2) and Polycarp (Phil. x. 3) 1. (b) The Bishop of Smyrna is no less sparing in his references to the O. T. than the Bishop of Antioch. He quotes only Isa. lii. 5 1 (x. 3), Tob. iv. 10 = xii. 9 (x. 2), Ps. iv. 5 (xii. 1)—the last-named passage perhaps indirectly, from Eph. iv. 26—and Prov. iii. 4 (vi. 1). In Phil. vi. 1 there is an allusion to Ezech. xxxiv. 4, from which it may be gathered that Polycarp read there ἐπιστρέψατε, with cod. A.

6. Irenaeus may be taken next, for though he belonged to the next generation and his literary activity was connected with the West, his copies of the Old Testament writings were doubtless of Asiatic provenance. His method of quotation however differs widely from that of the earlier writers. He is a theologian and a controversialist, and he quotes the Scriptures to refute an antagonist or to support the traditional faith. Accordingly his citations are, with few exceptions, either exact extracts, or but slightly abridged and adapted, and he is almost wholly free from the habit of loose paraphrase. How copiously he cites, especially in Adv. haereses iii. iv., will appear from the following list 2.

Gen. i. 3 (iv. 32. 1), 5 (v. 23. 2), 26 (iii. 23. 2, iv. 20. 1, v. 1. 3); ii. 1 ff. (v. 28. 3), 5 (iii. 21. 10), 7 (ii. 34. 4, iv. 20. 1, v. 7. 1, v. 15. 2), 8 (iv. 5. 1), 16 ff. (v. 23. 1), 23 (iii. 22. 4); iii. 1 ff. (v. 23. 1), 8 (v. 17. 1), 9 (v. 15. 4), 13 (iii. 23. 5), 14 (iii. 23. 3), 15 (iv. 40. 3, v. 21. 1), 19 (v. 16. 1); iv. 7 (iv. 18. 3), 9 (iii. 23. 4), 10 (v. 14. 1);

1 On this quotation, however, see Nestle in Exp. Times, ix., p. 14f.
2 The chapters and sections are those of Stieren.
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ix. 5 f. (v. 14. 1); xiii. 14 f., 27 (v. 32. 2); xiv. 22 (iv. 5. 5); xv. 18 (v. 32. 2); xvii. 9 ffl. (iv. 16. 1); xix. 24 (iii. 6. 1), 31 ff. (iv. 31. 1); xxvii. 27 ff. (v. 33. 3); xlix. 10 ff. (iv. 10. 2), 18 (iii. 10. 3). Exod. i. 13 f. (iv. 30. 2); iii. 7 f. (iv. 7. 4), 8, 14 (iii. 6. 2), 19 (iv. 29. 2); xiii. 2 (i. 3. 4); xx. 3, 5 (i. 29. 4), 12 (iv. 9. 3); xxiii. 20 (iv. 20. 5); xxv. 40 (iv. 14. 3); xxxvi. 16 (ii. 24. 3); xxxii. 13 (iv. 16. 1); xxxiii. 2 f. (iv. 15. 1), 20 (i. 19. 1), 21 ff. (iv. 20. 9); xxxiv. 6 f. (iv. 20. 8). Num. xvi. 15 (iv. 26. 4); xvii. 20 (iv. 8. 3); xxv. 17 (iii. 9. 2). Deut. iv. 14 (iv. 16. 5), 19 (iii. 6. 5); v. 2 f. (iv. 16. 2), 8 (iii. 6. 5), 22 (iv. 15. 1, 4); vi. 4 ff. (iv. 2. 2, v. 22. 1); viii. 3 (iv. 16. 3); x. 12 (iv. 16. 4), 16 (iv. 16. 1); xvi. 5 f. (iv. 10. 1), 16 (iv. 18. 1); xvii. 8 (iv. 8. 3); xxxvi. 66 (iv. 10. 2, v. 18. 3); xxx. 19 f. (iv. 16. 4); xxxii. 1 (iv. 2. 1), 4 (iii. 18. 7), 6 (iv. 10. 2, 31. 2), 8 f. (iii. 12. 9); xxxiii. 9 (iv. 8. 3). 1 Regn. xii. 2 f. (iv. 26. 4); xxv. 22 (iv. 17. 1). 2 Regn. xi. 27, xii. 1 f. (iv. 27. 1). 3 Regn. viii. 27 (iv. 27. 1); xi. 1 ff. (iv. 27. 1); xviii. 21, 34, 36 (iii. 6. 3); xix. 11 f. (iv. 20. 10). Ps. ii. 8 (iv. 21. 3); iii. 6 (iv. 31. 1); vii. 11 (iii. 10. 4); viii. 3 (i. 14. 8); xiii. 3 (i. 19. 1); xvii. 2 (i. 14. 8), 7 (iv. 33. 13); xx. 5 (i. 34. 3); xxxvi. 4 f. (v. 31. 2); xxxii. 1 (iv. 36. 6); xxxi. 1 f. (v. 17. 3); xxxii. 6 (i. 22. 1; iii. 8. 2), 9 (ii. 2. 5, iii. 8. 2); xxxiii. 13 ff. (iv. 17. 3, 36. 2), 17 (iv. 28. 1); xxxiv. 9 (iv. 11. 3); xxxix. 7 (iv. 17. 1); xlviii. 3 ff. (iv. 33. 11), 7 (iii. 6. 1); xlvi. 13 (iv. 4. 3), 21 (iv. 41. 3), 23 (v. 7. 2); xlix. 1 (iii. 6. 1), 3 f. (v. 18. 3), 9 ff. (iv. 17. 1); li. 14 (iii. 17. 2), 18 ff. (iv. 17. 1); lv. 4 ff. (iii. 10. 1, iv. 41. 3); lxviii. 27 (iii. 22. 2); lxx. 2 (iii. 9. 2), 3 (iv. 33. 11); lxxvii. 5 ff. (iii. 16. 3); lxxix. 1 (iii. 11. 8); lxxxvi. 1, 6 ff. (iii. 6. 1, iii. 19. 1); lxxxiv. 12 (iii. 5. 1); lxxvii. 13 (v. 31. 1); xc. 13 (iii. 23. 7); xcvi. 4 ff. (iii. 10. 4); xcv. 1 (iv. 9. 1), 5 (iii. 6. 3); xcvi. 2 (iii. 10. 3); xcvi. 1 (iv. 33. 13); cl. 26 ff. (iv. 3. 1); citii. 30 (v. 33. 1); clxx. 1 (ii. 28. 7, iii. 6. 1); clxx. 10 (iii. 23. 5); cxixii. 11 (iii. 8. 3); cxxxi. 10 f. (iii. 9. 2); cxxv. 6 (i. 10. 1); cxxvii. 5 f. (ii. 34. 2, iv. 41. 1). Prov. i. 20 f. (v. 20. 1); iii. 19 f. (iv. 20. 3); v. 22 (iii. 9. 3); viii. 15 (v. 24. 1), 22 ff., 27 (iv. 20. 3); xix. 17 (iv. 18. 6); xxii. 1 (v. 24. 1). Sap. vi. 19 (iv. 38. 3). Hos. iv. 1 (i. 19. 1); xiii. 10 (iii. 12, 13, iv. 20. 6). Amos i. 2 (iii. 20. 4); viii. 9 f. (iv. 33. 12). Mic. vii. 19 (iii. 20. 4). Joel iii. 16 (iv. 33. 11). Jon. i. 9, ii. 3, iii. 8 f. (ii. 20. 1). Hab. iii. 2 (iii. 16. 7), 3 ff. (iii. 20. 4, iv. 33. 11). Zech. vii. 9 ff. (iv. 17. 3, iv. 36. 2); viii. 16 f. (iv. 17. 3), 17 (iv. 36. 2); xii. 10 (iv. 33. 11). Mal. i. 10 f. (iv. 17. 5), ii. 10 (iv. 20. 2); iv. 1 (iv. 4. 3). Isa. i. 2 (iv. 2. 1, iv. 41. 2), 3 (i. 19. 1), 8 f. (iv. 4. 2, iv. 33. 13), 11 (iv. 17. 1), 16 (iv. 17. 1, iv. 36. 2, iv. 41. 3), 22 (iv. 12. 1), 23 (iv. 2. 6); ii. 3 f. (iv. 34. 4), 17 (iv. 33. 13); v. 6 (iii. 17. 3), 12 (ii. 22. 2, iv. 2. 4); vi. 5 (iv. 20. 8), 11 f. (v. 34. 2, v. 35. 1); vii. 10 ff. (iii. 21. 4); viii. 3 f. (iii. 16. 4, iv. 33. 11); ix. 6 (iii. 16. 3, iv. 33. 11); xi. 1 ff. (iii. 9. 3), 6 ff. (v. 33. 4); xii. 2 (iii. 10. 3); xiii. 9 (v. 35. 1); xxv. 8 (v. 12. 1), 9 (iv. 9. 2); xxvi. 10 (v. 35. 1), 19 (iv. 33. 11, v. 15. 1, v. 34. 1); xxviii. 6 (iv. 4. 1); xxviii. 16 (ii. 21. 7);
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xxix. 13 (iv. 12. 4); xxx. 1 (iv. 18. 3), 25 f. (v. 34. 2); xxxi. 9 (v. 34. 4); xxxii. 1 (v. 34. 4): xxxiii. 20 (iii. 20. 4); xxxv. 3 f. (iii. 20. 3, iv. 33. 11); xl. 15, 17 (v. 29. 1); xli. 4 (iv. 5. 1); xlii. 5 (iv. 2. 1, v. 12. 2), 10 ff. (iv. 9. 1); xliii. 5 ff. (iv. 14. 1), 10 (iii. 6. 2, iv. 5. 1), 18 (iv. 33. 14), 23 (iv. 17. 3), xlv. 7 (iv. 40. 1); xlvi. 9 (v. 3. 4), xlvii. 22 (i. 16. 3); xlviii. 16 (v. 35. 2); li. 6 (iv. 3. 1), lii. 4 (iv. 33. 11), 8 (ii. 28. 5); liv. 11 ff. (v. 34. 4); lvii. 10 (iv. 34. 4), 16 (v. 12. 2); lviii. 6 ff. (iv. 17. 3), 14 (v. 34. 2); lx. 17; lxi. 1 ff. (iii. 9. 3); lxiii. 9 (iii. 20. 4); lxv. 1 (iii. 6. 1), 17 ff. (iv. 26. 4, v. 35. 2, 34. 4), 21 (v. 35. 1), 22 (v. 15. 1), 25 (v. 33. 4), lxvi. 1 (iv. 2. 5), 2 (iv. 17. 3), 3 (iv. 18. 3), 22 (v. 36. 1). Jer. i. 5 (v. 15. 3); ii. 29 (iv. 37. 7); iv. 22 (iv. 2. 1); v. 8 (iv. 41. 3, v. 7. 2); vi. 17 ff. (iv. 36. 2), 20 (iv. 17. 2); vii. 2 f. (iv. 17. 2), 3 (iv. 36. 2), 21 (iv. 17. 3), 25 (iv. 36. 5), 29 f. (iv. 36. 2); viii. 16 (v. 30. 2); ix. 2 (iv. 25. 3), 24 f. (iv. 17. 3); x. 11 (iii. 6. 3); xi. 15 (iv. 17. 3); xiv. 9 (iv. 33. 12), xvi. 9 (iii. 18. 3, iv. 33. 11); xxii. 17 (iv. 18. 3, iii. 21. 9); xxiii. 7 f. (v. 34. 1), 20 (iv. 26. 1), 23 (iv. 19. 2), 29 (v. 17. 4); xxx. 10 ff. (v. 34. 3), 26 (iv. 31. 1); xxxv. 15 (iv. 36. 5); xxxvi. 30 f. (iii. 21. 9); xxxviii. 11 (iii. 8. 21). Lam. iv. 20 (iii. 20. 3). Bar. iv. 36—v. fin. (v. 35. 1). Ezek. ii. 1 (iv. 20. 10); xx. 12 (iv. 16. 1), 23 f. (iv. 15. 1); xxviii. 25 f. (v. 34. 1); xxxvi. 26 (iv. 23. 4); xxxvii. 1 ff. (v. 15. 1), 12 (v. 34. 1). Dan. ii. 23 ff., 41 ff. (v. 26. 1); iii. 24 ff. (v. 5. 2); vii. 8 (v. 25. 33), 10 (ii. 7. 4), 14 (iv. 20. 11), 20 ff. (v. 25. 3), 27 (v. 34. 2); viii. 11 f., 23 ff. (v. 25. 4); ix. 7 (v. 25. 4); xiii. 3 f., 7 (iv. 26. 1), 9 f. (i. 19. 2), xii. 13 (v. 34. 2). Sus. 52 f., 56 (iv. 26. 3). Bel 3 f., 24 (iv. 5. 2).

The Latin version, in which the greater part of these quotations are clothed, appears to be exact where it can be tested (cf. e.g. Isa. xlvii. 9 (i. 5. 4), xlviii. 22 (i. 16. 3), Dan. xii. 9 (i. 19. 2)). Assuming that it is so throughout, it is obvious that in Irenaeus we have an important witness to the LXX. text of the second century. The following variants taken from Books iii., iv., will shew the general tendencies of his text:

Gen. xlix. 10 cui repositum est (M [M 6] ἀπόκειται); 18 in salutem tuam sustinui te, Domine (cf. F corr ing ap. Field). Exod. xxv. 40 facies omnia (F ποιήσεις πάντα, Luc.) secundum typum eorum quae vidisti. Num. xxiv. 17 surget dux in Israel (cf. Heb. ὄγος, Σ. σκηπτρον; LXX. ἀνθρωπός εἰς 'έν). Deut. v. 22 (19) scripsit ea in duabus tabulis lapideis (+λιβίνας Bb A Luc.); xxxii. 6

1 Cf. Justin, Dial. 120.
et fecit te et creavit te (+καὶ ἐκτυσέν σε AF, +καὶ ἐπλασέν σε Luc.). i Regn. xv. 22 auditus bonus super sacrificium (ἀγαθή Luc.). Ps. xxxix. 7 aures autem per fecisti mihi (possibly a correction from the Gallican Psalter, but a few cursives read after the Heb. ὀσία or ὀνα); xli. 17 facti sunt tibi filii (Bbart εἰκόνιθνηθησαν, ag. B*κεν εἰκόνι); xlii. 10 bestiae terrae (ἄγρος N*αλος, ὑπνοῦ BN*), 15 in die tribulationis tuae (θείας σου N*αλος AR); ci. 27 mutabii eos (ἀλλαξεις N*, ἔληξες B N*AR(T)); cix. 1 suppedaneum pedum tuorum (ὑποπόδιον, not ὑποκάτω); cxiii. 11 om. εν τοῖς οὖρανοῖς (with N*AT). Mic. vii. 19 ἵπσε (αὐτός AQ)...proiciet (ἀπορρίψει Α(Q), ἀπορριφήσοντα B), om. πάσας. Hab. iii. 3 pedes eius (οἱ πόδες AQ, κατὰ πόδας B). Isa. i. 17 iustificasti viduam (χύμαν B alta*UαΓ ag. χύμα B*Q*); xi. 4 arguet gloriros terrae (τοὺς ἐνδόξους NQ*στ, ag. τ. ταπεινοὺς BAQ*); xxv. 9 om. καὶ σώτηρ ἡμῶν...ὑπεμείναμεν αὐτῷ (with NQ*, a hexaplaric addition, cf. Field, ad loc.); xxix. 13 populus hic labis me honorat (om. with NQ εν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐ); xxiii. 23 non servisti mihi in sacrificiis=οἱ[δί] ἐδούλευσας μοι εν ταῖς θυσίαις [σου] N*αλος (ΔΓ), fecisti in (cf. A* εποιήσασθε); lxv. 1 qui me non quierunt (ζητοῦσι NQ, ag. ἔρεσθάμει B). Jer. xiii. 31 inferam super eos (αὐτοὺς NQ*, ag. αὐτόν BQ*στ), locutus sum super eos (ἐπ αὐτοὺς AQ, πρὸς αὐτ. BN). Bar. v. 2 laetitiae (LXX. δικαιοσύνης).

A special interest attaches to Irenaeus' extracts from Daniel1. For the most part they follow the version of Theodotion quite closely, even in the Greek additions. Two exceptions are worth noting: Dan. vii. 10 is quoted by Irenaeus as it is by Clement of Rome, in a form which agrees with neither LXX. nor Th.; Dan. xii. 9 is cited in the form Ἀπότρεψῃ Δαυίδ αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἱ λόγοι ἐμπεφραγμένοι εἰσίν, ἐως οἱ συνεῖς συνείσι καὶ οἱ λευκοὶ λευκάνθωσι, where ἀπότρεξῃ is a LXX. reading, whilst ἐμπεφραγμένοι is from Th. and the rest of the sentence seems to be suggested by his version (cf. ἐως...ἐκλευκάνθωσιν, Th.). This quotation however is professedly taken from a Valentinian source, which may account for its freedom.

7. Like Irenaeus, Justin quotes profusely, and his aim as an apologist and a controversialist compels him to cite his documents with some regard to verbal accuracy. For the criticism of the LXX. his writings afford even richer materials

---

1 See above, p. 47.
than those of Irenaeus, since his subject leads him, especially in the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, to quote long extracts without break or interpolated matter; more than once an entire Psalm, or a passage exceeding in length one of our modern chapters, is copied into his pages, presumably as it stood in his text of the Greek Old Testament.

In the following list of Justin's quotations from the LXX. account has been taken only of his undoubted writings. \(A.\) = the First Apology, \(D.\) = the Dialogue; the Second Apology contains nothing to our purpose.

Gen. i. 1 ff. (\(A.\) 59, 64), 26 ff. \((D.\) 62); iii. 15 \((D.\) 102), 22 \((D.\) 62); ix. 24—27 \((D.\) 139); xi. 6 \((D.\) 102); xv. 6 \((D.\) 92); xvii. 14 \((D.\) 23); xviii. 2 ff. \((D.\) 126), 13 ff. \((D.\) 56); xix. 1 ff. \((D.\) 56), 23—25 \((D.\) 56), 27 f. \((D.\) 56); xxvi. 4 \((D.\) 120); xxviii. 10—19 \((D.\) 58, 120); xxxi. 10—13 \((D.\) 58); xxxii. 22—30 \((D.\) 58, 126); xxxv. 6—10 \((D.\) 58); xl. 8—12 \((A.\) 32, 54; \(D.\) 52, 120). Exod. ii. 23 \((D.\) 59); iii. 2—4 \((D.\) 60), 3 ff. \((A.\) 63); vi. 2—4 \((D.\) 126); xvii. 16 \((D.\) 49); xx. 22 \((D.\) 75); xxiii. 20 ff. \((D.\) 75); xxxii. 6 \((D.\) 20). Lev. xxvi. 40 ff. \((D.\) 16). Num. xi. 23 \((D.\) 126); xxi. 8 ff. \((A.\) 60); xxiv. 17 \((A.\) 32, 106). Deut. x. 16 ff. \((D.\) 16); xxi. 23 \((D.\) 96); xxvii. 26 \((D.\) 95); xxxii. 2 f. \((D.\) 126), 16—18 \((D.\) 74); xxxiii. 7—9 \((D.\) 131), 15 \((D.\) 20), 16—23 \((D.\) 119), 20 \((D.\) 27, 123), 22 \((A.\) 60), 43 \((D.\) 130); xxxiii. 13—17 \((D.\) 91). Jos. v. 2 \((D.\) 24); v. 13—vi. 2 \((D.\) 62). 2 Regn. vii. 14—16 \((D.\) 118). 3 Regn. xix. 10, 18 \((D.\) 39). Ps. i. \((A.\) 40); ii. \((A.\) 40); ii. 7 ff. \((D.\) 122); iii. 5 ff. \((A.\) 38, \(D.\) 97); vii. 3 \((D.\) 114); xiv. 2 ff. \((D.\) 27); xvii. 44 ff. \((D.\) 28); xvii. 3 ff. \((A.\) 40, \(D.\) 64); xxi. 1—24 \((D.\) 18), 8 f. \((A.\) 38), 17 ff. \((A.\) 35, 38, \(D.\) 97); xxiii. \((D.\) 36); xxiii. 7 \((A.\) 51, 85); xxxii. 2 \((D.\) 141); xlv. \((D.\) 38); xlv. 7 ff. \((D.\) 56, 63); xlv. 6—9 \((D.\) 37); xlv. \((D.\) 22); lxvii. 19 \((D.\) 39); lxxi. 1—19 \((D.\) 34, 64, 121); lxxi. 17—19 \((D.\) 64); lxxi. \((D.\) 124); xcvi. 1 ff. \((A.\) 41), 5 \((D.\) 79), 10 \((D.\) 73); xcvi. \((D.\) 37); xcvi. 1—7 \((D.\) 64); cxi. \((D.\) 32); cxi. \((A.\) 45, \(D.\) 50); 3 ff. \((D.\) 63), 4 \((D.\) 118); cxxviii. 3 \((D.\) 110); cxxviii. 1 ff. \((D.\) 85). Prov. viii. 21—29 \((D.\) 129), 24—36 \((D.\) 61). Job i. 6 \((D.\) 79). Hos. x. 6 \((D.\) 103). Amos v. 18—vi. 7 \((D.\) 22). Mic. iv. 1—7 \((D.\) 109); v. 2 \((A.\) 34). Joel ii. 28 ff. \((D.\) 87). Jon. iv. 4 ff. \((D.\) 107). Zech. ii. 6 \((A.\) 52), 11 \((D.\) 119), 10—ii. 2 \((D.\) 115); iii. 1 ff. \((D.\) 79); vi. 12 \((D.\) 121); ix. 9 \((A.\) 35, \(D.\) 53); xii. 10—12 \((A.\) 52), 12 \((D.\) 121); xiii. 7 \((D.\) 53). Mal. i. 10—12 \((D.\) 28, 41). Isa. i. 3 \((A.\) 63), 7 \((A.\) 47), 9 \((A.\) 53, \(D.\) 140), 11 ff. \((A.\) 37), 16 ff. \((A.\) 44, 61), 23 ff. \((D.\) 27, 82); ii. 3 ff. \((A.\) 39), 5 ff. \((D.\) 24, 135); iii. 9 \((D.\) 136), 9—11 \((D.\) 17), 9—15 \((D.\) 133), 16 \((D.\) 27); v. 18—25 \((D.\) 17, 133), 20 \((A.\) 49); vi. 10 \((D.\) 12); vii. 10—16
From the circumstances of Justin’s life we are prepared to find in his writings an eclectic text of the LXX. Of Palestinian birth but of Greek parentage, he seems to have divided his maturer life between Ephesus and Rome; and each of these associations may have supplied textual peculiarities. The general result may be gathered from a few specimens of the readings exhibited by Justin’s longer extracts from the O.T.
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αὐνάων] pr καὶ ποταμῶν 16 καθ’ ὄραν] καρπῶν | τῇ βάτῳ | ἐτ’
ἐν. AF 17 τῆς γῆς, AF Jos. v. 13—vi. 2. 13 om καὶ 20
[ἐν] ὄρα | ἐναντίον] κατανάλω | ὁμ. καὶ ἡ ῥομαία…αὐτοῦ | ὁ ἵππος
14 ὁ δὲ] καὶ 15 τὸ ὑπόθεμα ἐκ] τὰ ὑπόθεµατα | ἐφ’ ὦ | om νῦν
(so A, but adding ὑ) | ἀγνοὶ | ἕτ’ ἀυτῆς ἐξεταστ. | om
οὐδὲ ἐστὶν | 2 om ἐνυ. Ps. xxi. 1—24. 4 τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
Nc.aU 7 ἀνδρῶν, NRU | ἔσονθηµα, NAR 8 καὶ (NU)
ἐλάλησαν κείλεσιν 11 ἀπὸ γαστρός, Nc-a 12 βοσθῶν] + μοι,
Nc.aR* 14 ὁ ἀρπάζων] om ὁ, RU 15 ἑσεχύνη, Nc.aR
16 ὑστε] ὑς, NRU 17 πόδας] + μον, Nc.aARU Ps. xlix.
I om καὶ 20, Nc.aRT 3 ἐναντίον] ἐνόπτων, RT 4 διακρίνων
pr τοῦ, Nc.aART 6 ὁ βασιλεὺς, NRT 7 διαμαρτυροῦµαι, Nc-aT
10 ὄρμον] ὄργον, Nc-aA 16 ἐκδίψη, Nc-aAT 19 δολοπήσας,
Nc.aR 21 + τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, BcNc.aT 22 om μή, Nc-aRT
23 τοῦ θεοῦ] μον, Nc-aT. Prov. viii. 21—36. 24 τὰς
πηγάς προελθέν (but in D. 129 πρ. τ. πηγάς) 25 τῶν
βουνῶν (but D. 129 omits art.) 26 ὁ βασιλεὺς 28 καὶ ὡς (1°)
ἡνίκα, NA 29 καὶ ὡς] ἡνίκα 35 ὡς ἡμισται 36 ἀσεβοῦσιν
+ εἰς, Nc-aA. Amos v. 18—vi. 7. 18 τοῦ κυρίου 19 εἰς φύγην
ὅταν ἐκφύγη, Α | ἄρκτος | ὁ ὄφις 20 αὐτός 22 τὰ ὀλο-
καυτῶματα, Α | τὰς θυσίας | προσδέξοµαι] + αὐτά, AQ* | σωτηρίου,
Α 23 ἀπόστησαι | ἡχοῦ] πλήθος | ψαλμῶν ὄργανον 25 om
μ’ ἑτα] + ἠγεῖ Κύριος, AQ 26 Ραβὰν | om αὐτών, AQ* | vi.
1 ἀπετριγγησάν] pr οἱ ἀνασμάσειςν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀρχηγοῖς (a doublet for
the Greek which follows, ascribed to Symmachus by SH) | om
καὶ 20 | αὐτῶν | ἑαυτῶς, QA | τοῦ Ἰςρ.] om τοῦ
+ ἔστιν Χαλανήν, 22, 36, 42; Heb. | διεύθυτε | πορευθήτε | Ἔμαθ Ῥαββα | Ἀμάθ τὴν
μεγάλην (ἡν μεγ., Symm. "20, 36, 51 al.") | ἀλλοφύλων | pr τῶν
πλείου, Α | om. ἐστίν | ψυχές] ὁρίων ὁρίων 3 κα-
κη] ποιημάτων 4 καθεύδοντες | κοιμώμενον | ἐφίδιον] ἀρνία
5 ἑστάτα, AQ 6 τῶν δυναµίνων (a doublet) | ev φίλας (Heb.)
7. δυναστῶν] + τῶν ἀποκεκουμένων καὶ μεταστραφήσεται οἰκίµα
κακοῦρσίν (a doublet of κακοῦρσίν) | om καὶ εὐαγγ. κτλ.).
Zach. ii. 10—iii. 2. 10 τέρπουν] χαίρε (cf. Eus. d.e., p. 252) | ὡτι, N
11 κατακεφαλεύονται | κατακεφαλεύονται | ἐπιγνώστη | γνώστηται |
| ἐπιγνώστη | γνώστηται | Παντοκράτωρ] τῶν δυνάµεων | ἀπέσταλκε
12 τῇ μερίδι] καὶ τῆν μερίδα, Nc-aA, and, without καὶ, N*QG | ἀπετριγγησάν] "36
in textu ex alió videlicet interprete" (Field). iii. 1 om Κύριος,
Κυρίου | τοῦ Ἰσραήλ] om τῶν, AQG | ὁ διάβολος | om ὡτι
2 om καὶ 3 om Κύριος,
Mal. i. 10—12. 10 ἑβδοµά | οὐ | τᾶς θυσίας ὑμῶν] 11 ἀπό, ΑΓ | om καὶ 19,
AQ | προσφέρεται] προσφέρεται | διάτι µέγα] ὡτι τιµᾶται | ὡτι µέγα
D. 41) | om Παντοκράτωρ. Isa. i. 16—20. 17 χρήσαν,
BbNAR 18 δεύτερον] + καὶ, NAQG | διαλεξοµεν 1 | ῥώπα, ἑρευν | ἑρευν, χιώνα
19 (Α. 61 omits καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε...φάγεσθε.)

1 See above, p. 407.
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To shew Justin's relation to the two recensions of Daniel, it is necessary to place some verses side by side with the corresponding contexts of the LXX. and Theodotion 1.

Justin, Dial. 31. ἐθεσαυροῦν ἐώς ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς ἦμερῶν ἐκάθητο ἐκτόθων περιβόλου ὥσει χιώνα λευκή, καὶ τῷ τρίχῳ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἤρων καθαρόν, ὁ ἄριστος αὐτοῦ ὥσει φλόξ πυρός, οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον. ποταμὸς πυρὸς ἑλκεν ἐκπρέπειόν τε ἐκ προσώπων αὐτοῦ ἡ χιλιάδες χιλιάδοις θεοτόργοιν αὐτῷ καὶ μυριάς μυριάδες παρεστηκείσαν αὐτῷ. βιβλίοι ἀνεβάλησαν καὶ κριτήριον ἐκάθισαν. ἐθεσαυροῦν τότε τῇ φωνῇ

Dan. vii. 9—14, lxx. ἐθεσαυροῦν ἐώς ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν, καὶ παλαιὸς ἦμερῶν ἐκάθητο ἐξων περιβόλου ὥσει χιώνα, καὶ τῷ τρίχῳ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὥσει ἤρων λευκὸν καθαρὸν. ὁ ἄριστος ωσεὶ φλόξ πυρὸς, τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ καιμομένου. ποταμὸς πυρὸς ἑλκεν, καὶ ἐξεπρέπετο κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ποταμὸς πυρὸς. χιλιάδες χιλιάδες ἐθεσαυροῦν αὐτῷ καὶ μυριάς μυριάδες παρεστηκείσαν αὐτῷ. κριτήριον ἐκάθισεν καὶ βιβλίοις ἑνεφάγησαν. ἐθεσαυροῦν τότε ἀπὸ φωνῆς τῶν λόγων τῶν μεγάλων ἄνω τὸ

1 Words common to Justin and lxx. but not in Th. are printed in small uncials; those common to Justin and Th. but not to lxx., in thick cursive. Most of the remaining words are to be found in the three texts.
Justin, Dial. 31.  
	The student will notice that Justin’s O.T. text is a mixed one.  
(a) In Genesis it contains many readings of D or DE where those later uncials depart from A; (b) in Deuteronomy it occasionally supports A or AF against B, and (c) in the Psalms the group ART, with the concurrence sometimes of \text{*}, sometimes of \text{ca}; (d) in the Prophets it not seldom agrees with Q (AQ, NAQ). In the Minor Prophets it is startling to find in Justin more than one rendering which is attributed to Symmachus; and as it is in the highest degree improbable that

Dan. vii. 9—14, LXX.  
	Ibid., Th.
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his text has been altered from the text of Symmachus, or at a later time from a Hexaplaric copy of the LXX., we are led to the conclusion that these readings belong to an older version or recension from which both Justin and Symmachus drew. It is at least possible that many of the readings in which Justin appears to stand alone may be attributable to the same origin.

Justin’s Daniel text requires separate notice. It will be seen to be in fundamental agreement with the LXX., but not without a fair number of Theodotion’s readings. Ἕλειτο ὑγρόνυν meets us here, as in Clement of Rome, and the phrases τὰ λοιπὰ θηρία μετεστάθη τῆς ἀρχῆς, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν ἐρχόμενος, ἦς τὸ παλαιὸν, προσήγαγον αὐτὸν, are undoubtedly due to Theodotion, or rather to the version on which he worked. On the other hand ἔχουν περιβολὴν, τὸ τρίχωμα, τῦρ φλέγον, ἀπετυμπανίσθη, χρόνος ζωῆς, οἱ παρεστηκότες, and the whole of v. 14 as clearly belong to the Chigi text. That this mixture is not due to an eclectic taste or a fickle memory is clear from the fact that the same text meets us in the Latin version of the passage as given by Tertullian1.

In a few instances Justin shews a disposition to criticise the LXX. reading. E.g. in Ps. lxxxi. (lxxxii.) 7, he probably proposed to read ὡς ἄνθρωπος (Ὣνη) for ὡς ἄνθρωποι2. Similarly in Deut. xxxii. 8 he realises that the LXX. has substituted ἀγγέλων θεοῦ for ἡ χήμαρα3. He maintains that in Gen. xlix. 10 the reading of the LXX. is ἦς ἄν ἐλθη ἤ ἀπόκειναι, though according to the Jewish interpreters of his time the words should rather be rendered ἦς ἄν ἐ. τὰ ἀποκείμενα αἰτῶ. His text of the LXX. contained some remarkable interpolations; thus he quotes Ps. xcv. (xcvi.) 10 in the form δ κύριος

1 Burkitt, Old Latin and Itala, p. 23 ff.
2 Dial. 124. In the editions ἄνθρωποι occurs twice, but the context appears to shew that the singular should stand in the quotation.
3 Dial. 13 f.
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and ascribes to Jeremiah the words 

eπασπελευςεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου\(^1\), and ascribes to Jeremiah the words ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κεκοιμημένου εἰς γῆν χωμάτος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ\(^2\). He cites also some words which appear to have found a place in his copy after 2 Esdr. vi. 21: καὶ ἔπει τῷ λαῷ Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, καὶ εἶνεν διανοθήκη καὶ ἀναβῆ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν ὅτι Μέλλομεν αὐτοῖς ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπίσωμεν (? ἐλπίσητε) ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ ἐρημωθῇ ὁ τόπος οὗτος εἰς ἄπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ θεός τῶν δυνάμεων· εἶνεν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε αὐτῷ μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἐσεσθε ἐπίγαρμα τοῖς ἐθνεσι\(^3\). These passages appear to be of Christian origin, yet Justin is so sure of their genuineness that he accuses the Jews of having removed them from their copies.

8. Hippolytus of Portus, as we learn from the inscription on the chair of his statue and from other ancient sources, was the author of a large number of Biblical commentaries\(^4\). These included works on the Hexaemeron and its sequel (τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἔξαψημερον); on Exodus, and portions of Numbers and Samuel; on the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs; on Zechariah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, parts of Ezekiel, and the Book of Daniel. Of these exegetical works there remains only the commentary on Daniel\(^5\),

\(^1\) Ap. i. 41, Dial. 73. Cf. Tert. c. Marc. iii. 19, adv. Jud. 10. No existing Greek MS. of the Psalter is known to contain the words except cod. 156 (see p. 160), which gives them in the suspicious form ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλῳ. A ligno is found in the Latin of R and in some other O.L. texts. Cf. the hymn Vexilla regis: “impleta sunt quae concepit | David fideli carmine | dicendo nationibus | Regnavit a ligno Deus” (for the literature see Julian, Dict. of Hymnology, p. 1220).

\(^2\) Dial. 72. The same Apocryphon is quoted by Irenaeus (iii. 20. 4, iv. 22. 1, 33. 1, 12, v. 31. 1) and attributed by him to Jeremiah (iv. 31. 1) or to Isaiah (iii. 20. 4). Cf. Lightfoot, Clement, ii. p. 40, and the writer’s Apostles’ Creed\(^3\), p. 58 f.

\(^3\) On his works see Lightfoot, Clement of Rome, ii. pp. 388 ff., 419 ff.

\(^4\) Edited by G. W. Bonwetsch and H. Achselis in the new Berlin Corpus (Hippolytus’ Werke, i., Leipzig, 1897).
with fragments of most of the rest. The great treatise *Adversus omnes haereses* yields but little in the way of Scriptural quotations, but the minor theological works collected by Lagarde supply a considerable number of fairly long extracts from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets. The text of the LXX. which is exhibited in these passages is often of much interest, as a few specimens will shew.


The text of Hippolytus, it will be seen, like most of the patristic texts, leans slightly to AF in the Pentateuch, Ν* or Ν[ν][ε][α] in the poetical books, and ΑΩ in the Prophets. At the

1 The references in the *Index locorum* of Duncker and Schneidewin's edition (Göttingen, 1859) direct the reader for the most part to mere allusions, or citations of only a few consecutive words.

2 In *Hippolyti Romani quae feruntur omnia Graece* (Leipzig, 1858).
same time it is full of surprises, and often stands quite alone among existing witnesses.

9. Our last witness is Clement of Alexandria. Clement had learnt the Christian faith during his early travels in Asia Minor and Magna Graecia, and he may have received copies of O.T. writings from his first Christian masters. Hence it must not be too hastily assumed that the text of his O.T. quotations is purely Alexandrian. On the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that during the period of his literary activity he was familiar with the Alexandrian text and used it when he quoted from his MS. On the whole therefore we may expect his quotations to be fairly representative of the Biblical text current at Alexandria during the generation preceding the compilation of the Hexapla.

Clement quotes both the Jewish and the Christian scriptures profusely, but his extracts seldom extend beyond two or three verses, and are often broken by comments or copied with considerable freedom. His purpose was didactic and not polemical; even in the λόγος προτερητικός he aims to persuade rather than to compel assent, whilst the Paedagogus and the Stromateis are addressed exclusively to persons under instruction, to whom the Scriptures were a familiar text-book. Hence he is exact only when verbal precision is necessary; often it is sufficient for his purpose to work into his argument a few words from a Scriptural context, giving the sense of the rest in his own words. Still it is possible even in these broken references to catch glimpses of the text which lay before him, and in the dearth of early Christian literature emanating from Alexandria, these are of no little value to the student of the Greek Bible. A generally full and accurate index of Clement’s

1 Clement’s text of the Gospels has been examined by Mr P. M. Barnard (Biblical texts of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts, Cambridge, 1899) with some interesting and important results. His text
Biblical quotations will be found in the edition of Potter; here it must suffice to give some specimens of the text which they exhibit in the Pentateuch, the poetical books, and the Prophets.

(a) Gen. i. 26 (strom. v. 29) κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὄμοιοιν ἥμετέραν (elsewhere Cl. reads ὑμῶν, or omits the pronoun). xxxvii. 24 (strom. v. 54) ὅ δὲ λάκκος κενὸς, DE. Exod. xx. 13 ff. (protrept. 108, strom. ii. 33) οὐ φωνεῦσις οὐ μοιχεύσις...οὐ κλέψις οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, AF.

Lev. xviii. 1 ff. (strom. ii. 46). 3 εἴν αὑτή (ἐπ' αὐτή B*, ἐπ' αὑτῆς Bᵃᵇ.AF) οὐ ποιήσετε (πουθήσεται B*) 4 πορεύεσθε Α 5 ὅ ποιήσας αὐτά. Deut. xxxii. 23 ff. (paed. i. 68) 23 συντελέσει (συντελέσεις ΑΦ, συντελεσίσα, B) 24 ἐπαποστελῶ, Α | τῆς γῆς, Α (F) 41 ff. ἀνταποδώσω, AF 42 + καὶ ἡ μάχαιρα μου φαίηται κρέα ἀπὸ ἀματος τραυματῶν, AF (b) Ps. xxxiii. 12 ff. (strom. iv. 111). 13 ἡμέρας ἔδει, ΝΑΡ 14 χείλη σου, Νʷ⁺AR. xcv. 5 (protrept. 62) δαμαυών εἰσιν εἴδωλα (cf. Iren.). cii. 14 (paed. i. 62) μνήσθητι, B⁎ Th. cxi. 5 (paed. i. 79) ἔλεγχέτω με δίκαιον καὶ παιδεύσατο. cl. 4 ὄργανον, BNRT. Prov. i. 25 (paed. i. 85) ὑπηκούτε, ΝΑ | οὐ προσέχετε, ΝΑCc (ἡπειθήσατε, Β). iii. 5 ff. (strom. ii. 4). 6 ἐν πάσαις, Α | ταῖς ὅδοις σου]+δ ὅ ὅ τοῦ σου οὐ μὴ προσκόπτῃ (cf. Νcw: SH pr ⊥ 12 παιδεύει, ΝΑ (ἐλέγχει, Β). xxiii. 13 μὴ ἀπόσχον (ἀπόσχη LXX.) νήπιον παιδεύων (Α; παιδεύειν, Β). Sir. i. 18 (paed. i. 68) +φόβος γὰρ Κυρίον ἀπωθέτει ἀμαρτήματα (so far 248), ἀφηθος δ’ οὐ δυνηται δικαίωθαι, O.L. ix. 9 (paed. ii. 54) μὴ συμβολοκοπησῃς] μὴ συμματακληθῆς ἐπ’ ἀγκῶνα, O.L. xxxiv. 25 (paed. ii. 31) ἀπώλεσεν] ήρεμίωσε. xxxvi. 6 (paed. i. 42) ὅς φιλο μύκος] ὁ φιλήδονος καὶ μοίχος (cf. ὃς φιλιμοιχος, 55, 254). xxxviii. 1 (paed. ii. 68) om. τιμαίς, 106, 290, O.L. xxxix. 13 (paed. ii. 76) ἅγιον (ὑγρον ΝΑCc] ὕδατων. 18 (paed. ii. 44) δὲ ἔλαττώσει] ἐλάττωσε εἰς, Heb. (c) Am. iv. 13 (protrept. 79) ἵδον ἐγὼ, BᵃᵇAQ (om B*). Nah. iii. 4 (paed. i. 81) ἐπιγαρίς, BᵃᵇQ. Mal. i. 10 ff. (strom. v. 137). 11 om. καὶ ἰο, ΑQ | ἑρμιάμα θυνία | προσάγεται] προσφέρεται (cf. Justin). Isa. ix. 6 (paed. ii. 24) νίκος καὶ ἐδόθη, ΝΑQΓ | ομ ἐγεννήθη, Γ | ἐκλήθη (καλείται, BNQΓ, καλέσει, A) | +θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος (Νc⁺A) θεὸς δυναστῆς πατὴρ αἰώνιος ἀρχον εἰρήνης (Νcw⁺A). 7 μεγαλὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ] +τῷ πληθυνον τὴν παιδειάν, Th. | ὄριον] πέρασ, Th., Symm. xi. 1 ff. (paed. i. 61). xi. 4 ἐλέγξει τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς τῆς γῆς (cf. Iren.). xxix. 13 (paed. i. 76) ὅ λάδος οὕτως τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσι με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἐστίν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκων of the LXX. is not likely to be equally instructive, but it ought to reward a patient investigator.
This examination has been but partial, even within the narrow field to which it was limited. It has dealt only with direct quotations, and in the case of Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria, only with a few of these. Moreover, the student who wishes to examine the whole of the evidence must not limit himself to the few great writers who have been named. Even if he adds the writings of Aristides, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the anonymous Teaching and Epistle to Diognetus, there will still remain the fragments collected in the Relliquiae Sacrae and by the researches of Pitra, and the Pseudo-Clementine, apocryphal, and Gnostic literature of the second century. Still more important help may be obtained from Latin Christian writers who quote the O.T. in the Old Latin version, e.g. Cyprian, Lucifer, Vigilius of Thapsus, the Donatist Tyconius, and the author of the Speculum. This part of the evidence was collected for Holmes and Parsons, and will be presented in a more permanent form, if not at so much length, in the apparatus of the larger Septuagint.

Much useful and interesting work might be done by following the lines of Dr Hatch's attempt to collect and compare the early evidence in reference to particular texts and con-
stantly recurring extracts from the LXX.\(^1\) Perhaps however it would be expedient to limit such an investigation to post-apostolic Christian writers, and to carry it beyond Justin. Moreover, Dr Hatch's proposal to estimate the value of MSS., "according as they do or do not agree with such early quotations," seems to be at least precarious. It is conceivable and even probable that the peculiarities of early patristic quotations may be partly due to corruption incident upon the process of citing, whether from memory or from a MS.; and for various other reasons the text of a fourth century MS. may on the whole present a purer text than that which appears in a second century writing. This point, however, must be reserved for fuller consideration in a later chapter\(^2\).

II. With Origen the science of Christian Biblical criticism and hermeneutics may be said to have begun. In the Old Testament his interest was peculiarly strong; it supplied him with the amplest opportunities of exercising his skill in allegorical interpretation; and his knowledge both of the original and of the Greek versions prepared him to deal with the difficulties of his text. Unhappily there is no class of his writings which has suffered so severely. Of his great commentaries on the Old Testament, only fragments have survived; and the Homilies, with the exception of one on the Witch of Endor, and nineteen on the book of Jeremiah, have reached us only in the Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome. But even fragments and versions of Origen are precious, and the following list of his O.T. remains\(^3\) may be of service to the student of the LXX.

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

---

\(^1\) *Essays*, i. p. 129 ff. ("On Early Quotations from the Septuagint.")

\(^2\) See Part III. c. vi.

\(^3\) They are collected in Migne, *P. G.* xi.—xvii.
It is impossible within the limits of an Introduction to enumerate all the ecclesiastical writers who during the golden age of patristic literature quoted or commented upon the Greek Old Testament. But the student who is not a specialist in this field may be glad to have before him the names and dates of the principal Greek Fathers, with some notice of such of their extant works as are concerned with O.T. exegesis. The Roman numerals in brackets direct him to the volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, in which the authors are to be found; in the case of a few writings which are not included in the *Patrologia* and some others, references are given to other editions.

Acacius of Caesarea, †366. Fragments in catenae.
Ammonius of Alexandria, c. 460. Fragments on Genesis and Daniel. (lxxxv.)
Anastasius of Antioch, †598. (lxxxix.)
Anastasius of Sinai, cent. vi.—vii. (lxxxix.)
Apollinarius of Laodicea (the younger), †c. 393. (xxxiii., cf. Dräseke's edition in *Texte u. Unters.* vii.)
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Apostolical Constitutions, cent. iii.—iv. (ed. Lagarde).

Asterius of Amasea, c. 400. (xl.)

Athanasius of Alexandria, †373. On the Psalms; Titles of the Psalms, fragments in the catenae. (xxv.—xxviii.)

Basil of Caesarea, †379. Homilies on the Hexaemeron, the Psalms and Isaiah i.—xvi. (xxix.—xxxii.)

Basil of Seleucia, c. 450. Homilies on the O.T. (lxxxv.)

Cosmas Indicopleustes, c. 550. (lxxxviii.)

Cyril of Alexandria, †444. Works on the Pentateuch (περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως, and γλαυφρά), comm. on Isaiah, comm. on the xii. Prophets; fragments on Kingdoms, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and the minor Prophets. (lxviii.—lxxvii.)

Cyril of Jerusalem, †386. (xxxiii.)

Didymus of Alexandria, †395. Fragments on the Psalms and in the catenae. (xxxix.)

Diodorus of Tarsus, †c. 390. Fragments from the catenae. (xlii.)

Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, cent. v. (iii.—iv.)

Dorotheus the Archimandrite, cent. vi.—vii. (lxxxviii.)

Ephraem the Syrian, †373. Fragments of Commentaries on the Pentateuch, the historical and the poetical books. (Rome, 1732 ff.)

Epiphanius of Salamis, †403. (xli.—xlii.)

Eusebius of Caesarea, †339. Commentary on the Psalms; notes on Isaiah; fragments of other O.T. commentaries; books περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὄνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ and περὶ τῆς τῶν βιβλίων τῶν προφητῶν ὄνομασίας.

Eusebius of Emesa, †359. Fragments in the catenae of a comm. on Genesis. (lxxxv.)

Eustathius of Antioch, †337. On the Witch of Endor, ag. Origen. (xviii.)

Evagrius of Pontus, †398. Fragments in catenae.

Gennadius of Constantinople, †471. Fragments on Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms &c. (lxxv.)

Gregory of Nazianzus, †389. (xxxv.—xxxvii.)

Gregory of Neoicaesarea, †c. 270. (x.)

Gregory of Nyssa, †395. (xliv.—xlvi.)

Hesychius of Jerusalem, †c. 438. (xciii.)

Isidore of Pelusium, †c. 450. (lxxviii.)

John Chrysostom, †407. Homilies on 1 Regn., Psalms (iii.—xii., xliv.—xlix., cvii.—cxl.); a commentary on Isa. i.—viii. 11; various hands. (xlvi.—lxiv.)

John of Damascus, †c. 760. (xciv.—xcv.)

Julianus of Halicarnassus, †536. Fragments in catenae.


Maximus Confessor, †662. (xc.—xcii.)
Methodios of Olympus, cent. iii.—iv. (xviii.)
Nilus of Sinai, †c. 430. (lxxix.)
Olympiodorus of Alexandria, † cent. vi. (xciii.)
Peter of Alexandria, † 311. (xviii.)
Philo of Carpassia, c. 380. Commentary on Canticles. (xl.)
Photius of Constantinople, †c. 891. (cl.—civ.)
Polychronius of Apamea, † 430. Fragments on the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, and Daniel; comm. on Ezekiel.
Procopius of Gaza, cent. vi. Commentaries on Genesis—Judges, 1 Regn.—4 Chr., Prov., Cant., Isaiah. (lxxvii.)
Severianus of Gabala, †c. 420. Fragments of commentaries in the catenae. (lxv.)
Severus of Antioch, †c. 539. Fragments in the catenae.
Theodore of Heraclea, †c. 355. Fragments of comm. on Isaiah. (xviii.)
Theodore of Mopsuestia, † 428. Fragments of commentaries on Genesis (Syriac and Latin), the rest of the Pentateuch and the historical books: comm. on the Psalms in Syriac and large fragments in Greek: a commentary on the xii. Prophets. (lxvi.)
Theodoret of Cyrrhus, †c. 458. Eis ta ἁπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς, questions on the Pentateuch and historical books. Commentaries on the Psalms, Canticles, the xii. Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah (including Baruch and Lam.), Ezekiel, Daniel. (lxxx.—lxxxiv.)
Titus of Bostra, †c. 370. (xviii.)
Victor of Antioch, cent. v.—vi. (?)  

CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK VERSIONS AS AIDS TO BIBLICAL STUDY.

I. No question can arise as to the greatness of the place occupied by the Alexandrian Version in the religious life of the first six centuries of its history. The Septuagint was the Bible of the Hellenistic Jew, not only in Egypt and Palestine, but throughout Western Asia and Europe. It created a language of religion which lent itself readily to the service of Christianity and became one of the most important allies of the Gospel. It provided the Greek-speaking Church with an authorised translation of the Old Testament, and when Christian missions advanced beyond the limits of Hellenism, it served as a basis for fresh translations into the vernacular.

The Septuagint has long ceased to fulfil these or any similar functions. In the West, after the fourth century, its influence receded before the spread of the Latin Vulgate; in the East, where it is still recited by the Orthodox Church in the ecclesiastical offices, it lost much of its influence over the thought and life of the people. On the other hand, this most ancient of Biblical versions possesses a new and increasing importance in the field of Biblical study. It is seen to be valuable alike to the textual critic and to the expositor, and its services are welcomed by students both of the Old Testament and of the New.

1 See Part I., c. iv.
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The Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study.

A. As the oldest version of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuaugint claims especial attention from Old Testament scholars. It represents a text and, to some extent, an interpretation earlier than any which can be obtained from other sources.

1. (a) The printed Hebrew Bibles give on the whole the Massoretic text, i.e. a text which has passed through the hands of the Massorets, a succession of Jewish scholars who endeavoured to give permanence to the traditional type.

Massora (מַסּוֹרָה, traditio) is already mentioned in the saying of R. Akiba, Pirqe Aboth, iii. 20 מַסּוֹרָה מִיִּי לָהוָה, 'tradition is a fence to the Law'; but the word is used there in reference to halachic rather than to textual tradition. It is probable, however, that Akiba and his contemporaries were concerned with the settling of the text which later generations protected by the 'Massora' technically so called. The work of the Massorets (מַסּוֹרֵי המסורה), who flourished from the sixth century to the tenth, consisted chiefly in reducing to a system of rules the pronunciation of the text which had been fixed by their predecessors. The Massora\(^2\) embodies the readings which tradition substituted for the written text (יִסַּהְבּ, קָבָר), the corrections known as the מַסּוֹרֶה הַמָּסָּרֶה, and observations on the text tending to stereotype its interpretation in minute points. To the Massorets we also owe the perfecting of the system of vowel-points and accents. The labours of the Massorets culminated in the Western text of R. Ben Asher (cent. x.), and that which appeared about the same time in the East under the auspices of R. Ben Naphtali. The former has been repeated with minor variations in all Western MSS.

The attitude of Christian scholars towards the Jewish traditional text has varied with the progress of Biblical learning.

\(^1\) See Schürer, E. T. II. i. p. 329 n.; Dr C. Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, p. 54 f.
\(^2\) For the text see the great work of C. D. Ginsburg, The Massorah, compiled from MSS., alphabetically and lexically arranged, 3 vols. (London, 1880–5), or the Bible of S. Baer; and for the Massorets and their work, cf. Buxtorf, Tiberias, Ginsburg's Introduction (London, 1897), and his edition of the Massoreth ha-massoreth of Elias Levita, or the brief statements in Buhl, Kanon u. Text (p. 96 ff.), and in Utext (p. 20 ff.).
\(^3\) On these see Dr W. E. Barnes in J. Th. St., April 1900.
The question of its relation to the text presupposed by the Septuagint was, scarcely present to the minds of Christian writers before the time of Origen. Origen, when the problem forced itself upon him, adopted, as we have seen, a middle course between the alternatives of rejecting the LXX. and refusing to accept the testimony of his Jewish teachers. Jerome took a bolder line; his new Latin version was based on the 'original Hebrew,' and on textual questions he appealed with confidence to the verdict of contemporary Jewish opinion: *prol. gal.* "quanquam mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quidpiam de Hebraica veritate...interroga quelibet Hebraeorum cui magis accommodare debas fidem." Like Origen he indignantly, and on the whole doubtless with justice, repudiated the charge which was laid by some Christians against the Jews of having falsified their MSS. But neither Origen nor Jerome entertained a suspicion that the Jewish official text had, whether by accident or design, departed from the archetype.

Mediaeval Europe knew the Old Testament almost exclusively through Jerome's Latin, as the Ancient Church had known it through the LXX. When at length the long reign of the Vulgate in Western Europe was broken by the forces of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the attention of scholars was once more drawn to that which purported to be the original text of the Old Testament. The printing of the Hebrew text commenced among the Jews with the Psalter of 1477; the *editio princeps* of the Hebrew Bible as a whole appeared in

---

2 Above, p. 60 ff.
3 See his comm. on Isaiah vi. 9 (Migne, *P. L.* xxiv. 99).
4 A few mediaeval scholars had access to the Hebrew, e.g. the Englishmen Stephen Harding (+1134), Robert Grosseteste (+1253), Roger Bacon (+1292), the Spaniard Raymundus Martini (+1286), and especially the Norman Jew, Nicolaus de Lyra (+1340). On Lyra see Siegfried in Merx, *Archiv*, i. p. 428, ii. p. 28.
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1488, and three editions followed before the end of the fifteenth century. Meanwhile Christian scholars had once more begun to learn the Hebrew language from Jewish teachers, and in 1506 the publication of John Reuchlin’s *Rudiments* placed the elements of Hebrew learning within the reach of the theologians of Europe. Under the circumstances it was not strange that the earlier Reformers, who owed their Hebrew Bible and their knowledge of the language to the Rabbis, should have, like Jerome, regarded the traditional text as a faithful reproduction of the inspired original. In the next century a beginning was made in the criticism of the Hebrew text by the Protestant divine Louis Cappelle (L. Cappellus, †1658), and the Oratorian Jean Morin (J. Morinus, †1659), who pressed the claims of the LXX. and the Samaritan Pentateuch. A furious controversy ensued, in the course of which the Swiss Reformed Churches committed themselves to an absolute acceptance not only of the consonantal text, but of the vowel points. This extreme position was occupied not only by theologians, but by experts such as the two Buxtorfs of Basle (††1629, 1664), who maintained that the Massoretic text in its present state had come down unchanged from the days of Ezra and the ‘Great Synagogue.’


1 See De Wette-Schrader, *Lehrbuch*, p. 217 f.
verba θεότυπου...ad cuius normam...universae quae extant versiones...exigendae et, sicubi deflectunt, revocandae sunt. Eorum proinde sententiam probare neutiquam possumus, qui lectionem quam Hebraicus codex exhibet humano tantum arbitrio constitutam esse definiunt, quique lectionem Hebraicam quam minus commodam iudicant configere eamque ex LXX. seniorum aliorumque versionibus Graecis...emendare religioni neutiquam ducunt.

Reference has been made to the place occupied by the Samaritan Pentateuch in this controversy. A Samaritan recension of the Law was known to Origen, who quoted it in the Hexapla (Num. xiii. 1 ἄ καὶ ἄντα ἐκ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν Ἐβραίκον μετέβαλομεν, xxii. 13 ἄ ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν εὑρομεν: see Field, *Hex.* i. p. lxxxii. f.), and Jerome (*prol. gal., comm. in Gal.* iii. 10); reference is made to it also by Eusebius (*Chron.* i. xvi. 7 ff.), and by so late a writer as Georgius Syncellus (cent. viii.), who attaches a high value to its testimony (*Chronogr.* p. 83 διαφωνοῦτα τὰ Εβραϊκὰ ἀντίγραφα πρὸς τὸ Σαμαρειτῶν ἀρχαιότατον καὶ χαρακτηρις διαλλάττων ὁ καὶ ἄλλης εἶναι καὶ πρῶτον Ἐβραίοι καθομολογοῦσιν). In the seventeenth century, after a long oblivion, this recension was recovered by a traveller in the East and published in the Paris Polyglott of 1645. The rising school of textual criticism represented by Morin at once recognised its importance as concurring with the Septuagint in its witness against the originality of the Massoretic text. Few questions, however, have been more hotly discussed than the relation of the Samaritan to the Alexandrian Pentateuch. Scholars such as Selden, Hottinger, and Eichhorn contended that the Greek Pentateuch was based upon Samaritan MSS. Samaritans were undoubtedly to be found among the early Palestinian settlers in Egypt. Of the first Ptolemy Josephus writes: πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρειτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν Γαριζεῖν, κατύκισεν ἄπαντας εἰς Ἀγιοπτον ἀγαγῶν. It is significant that Σαμάρεια occurs among
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the names of villages in the Fayûm, and a letter ascribed to Hadrian, and certainly not earlier than his reign, mentions Samaritans as resident at Alexandria. On the other hand the traditional account of the origin of the LXX. directly contradicts this hypothesis, nor is it probable that the Jews of Alexandria would have had recourse to the Samaritans for MSS. of the Law, or that they would have accepted a version which had originated in this manner. Moreover the agreement of the Greek and Samaritan Pentateuchs is very far from being complete. A careful analysis of the Samaritan text led Gesenius to the conclusion, which is now generally accepted, that the fact of the two Pentateuchs often making common cause against the printed Hebrew Bibles indicates a common origin earlier than the fixing of the Massoretic text, whilst their dissensions shew that the text of the Law existed in more than one recension before it had been reduced to a rigid uniformity.


The prevalent belief in the originality of the Massoretic text appeared to receive confirmation from the researches of Kennicott¹ and De Rossi², which revealed an extraordinary agreement in all existing MSS. of the Hebrew Bible. But as no MS. of the Hebrew Bible has come down to us which is

earlier than the beginning of the tenth century\textsuperscript{1}, this evidence merely shews the complete success of the Massorets and the Sopherim who preceded them in preserving the traditional text, and the question remains to be answered at what period the tradition was created. It may be traced in the fourth century, when Jerome received substantially the same text from his Jewish teachers in Palestine; and in the third, for Origen’s Hebrew text did not differ materially from that of Jerome or of the Massorets. We can go yet another step further back; the version of Aquila, of which considerable fragments have now been recovered, reveals very few points in which the consonantal text of the second century differed from that of our printed Bibles\textsuperscript{2}. Other witnesses can be produced to shew that, even if Hebrew MSS. of a much earlier date had been preserved, they would have thrown but little light on textual questions\textsuperscript{3}. On the whole, modern research has left no room for doubting that the printed Hebrew Bible represents a textus receptus which was already practically fixed before the middle of the second century. But it is equally clear that no official text held undisputed possession in the first century, or was recognised by the writers of the New Testament. Thus we are driven to the conclusion that the transition from a fluctuating to a relatively fixed text took effect during the interval between the Fall of Jerusalem and the completion of Aquila’s version. The time was one of great activity in Palestinian Jewish circles. In the last days of Jerusalem a school had been founded at Jamnia (Jabneh, Yebohna)\textsuperscript{4}, near the Philistine seaboard, by R. Jochanan ben Zaccai. To this

\textsuperscript{1} “The earliest MS. of which the age is certainly known bears date A.D. 916” (Pref. to the R.V. of the O.T. p. ix. 2).
\textsuperscript{2} Cf. F. C. Burkitt, Aquila, p. 16 f.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. S. R. Driver, Samuel, p. xxxix.: “Quotations in the Mishnah and Gemara exhibit no material variants... the Targums also pre-suppose a text which deviates from (the M. T.) but slightly.”
\textsuperscript{4} Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 73 f.
centred the representatives of Judaism flocked after the destruction of the city, and here, until the fresh troubles of the war of Bar-Cochba (A.D. 132—5), Biblical studies were prosecuted with new ardour under a succession of eminent Rabbis. At Jamnia about A.D. 90 a synod was held which discussed various questions connected with the settlement of the Canon. At Jamnia also traditionalism reached its zenith under the teaching of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, R. Joshua ben Chananya, and their more famous pupil R. Akiba ben Joseph, the author of the dogma that every word, particle and letter in the Hebrew Bible has a meaning, and serves some purpose which can be expressed by hermeneutical methods. From this canon of interpretation to the establishment of an official text is but a single step; a book of which the very letters possess a divine authority cannot be left to the unauthorised revision of scribes or editors. Whether the result was reached by a selection of approved readings, or by the suppression of MSS. which were not in agreement with an official copy, or whether it was due to an individual Rabbi or the work of a generation, is matter of conjecture. But it seems to be clear that in one way or another the age which followed the fall of Jerusalem witnessed the creation of a standard text not materially different from that which the Massorets stereotyped and which all MSS. and editions have reproduced.

(b) It is the business of the textual critic to get behind this official text, and to recover so far as he can the various recensions which it has displaced. In this work he is aided by the Ancient Versions, but especially by the Septuagint. Of the Versions the Septuagint alone is actually earlier than the fixing of the Hebrew text. In point of age, indeed, it must yield to the Samaritan Pentateuch, the archetype of

---

which may have been in the hands of the Samaritans in the
days of Nehemiah (c. B.C. 432); but the polemical bias of
that people, and the relatively late date of the MSS. on which
the printed text depends, detract largely from the value of its
evidence, which is moreover limited to the Torah.

Some of the difficulties which beset the use of the LXX. as
a guide to the criticism of the text have been stated already
when its character as a version was discussed; others,
arising out of the present condition of the version, will be
noticed in the last chapter of this book. “The use of the
Ancient Versions (as Prof. Driver writes) is not...always such a
simple matter as might be inferred.... In the use of an Ancient
Version for the purposes of textual criticism, there are three
precautions which must always be observed: we must reason­
ablely assure ourselves that we possess the Version itself in its
original integrity; we must eliminate such variants as have the
appearance of originating merely with the translator; the
remainder, which will be those that are due to a difference of
text in the MS. (or MSS.) used by the translator, we must then
compare carefully, in the light of the considerations just stated,
with the existing Hebrew text, in order to determine on which
side the superiority lies.” “In dealing with the LXX. (Prof.
Kirkpatrick reminds us) we have to remember...that the LXX.
is not a homogeneous work, but differs very considerably in
its character in different books, if not in parts of books.”
Moreover in the case of the LXX. the task of the textual critic
is complicated by the existence of more than one distinct
recension of the Greek. He has before him in many contexts
a choice of readings which represent a plurality of Hebrew
archetypes.

1 See Ryle, Canon, p. 91 f.
2 Pt. II., c. v., p. 315 ff.
3 Samuel, p. xxxix. f.
4 Expositor v. iii., p. 273.
5 See H. P. Smith, Samuel, p. 397 f., and the remarks that follow.
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The following list of passages in which the LXX. reflects a Hebrew text different from the Hebrew text different from אבות will enable the student to practise himself in the critical use of the Version.

**Gen. iv. 8** אבות does not give the words of Cain, though אבות leads the reader to expect them. אבות supplies דְּלוֹּחַמָּן עֹיְּשָׁנָא עֶלְיוֹן (יִבְנֵי), and this is supported by Sam., Targ. Jer., Pesh., Vulg. xxxi. 29, אבות (עַבְרֵי), אבות (עַבְרֵי בָּאָה). so Sam., cf. v. 30. xli. 56 אבות פְּתַתּוֹנָהוֹנָא אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב אֲפֵיִיוֹתָוֹר), cf. Sam., אבות. xlix. 10 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב), אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב... אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר). xlv. 25 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). xxx. 6 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר... אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). **Exod. v. 9** אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב), אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). xiv. 25 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). Lev. xiii. 31 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). xiv. 23 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). Num. xxiv. 23 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). xvi. 20, 21. Deut. iv. 37 אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). Est. xvi. 15 אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). אבות, as the context seems to require, אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב); but see Moore in Haupt, Sacred Books, ad loc. xvi. 13 אבות supplies a long lacuna in אבות (אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר) caused by homoioteleuton; on the two Greek renderings of the passage see Moore in Haupt, Sacred Books, ad loc. xix. 18 אבות אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב). The final letter of אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר (יֵרֶב) has probably been taken by אבות for an abbreviation of אבות. 1 Sam. i. 24 אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִיוּתָוֹר אֲפֵיִי

1 Lagarde (Symmicta i., p. 57) suggests a form אבות.
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v. 6. For ἵνα ἔχως τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς ἀνεφύτησαν μόνοι. Cf. vi. 4 f.; and see Driver and Budde (in Haupt's Sacred Books) ad loc. H. P. Smith would strike out the reference to mice in both contexts.

vi. 19 Ἵναι αὐτὴν καὶ οὐκ ἑσπερίωσαν οἱ νυμφίοι ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσις Βασιλείας, where the first six words represent an original of which Μ preserves only three letters. Restoration is complicated by the fact that ἀνεφύτησαν is ἀπ. λεγ. in the LXX. Klostermann suggests ἁλονταί, more in harmony with the context, καὶ διέστρωσαν τὸ Σαουλ (Ἰωάννης Ἱερουσαλημίτης) ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματι, καὶ ἐκομίζηθη (ὑπερβάλλον). x. 21 Ἑ + καὶ προσάγοντος τὴν φυλήν Ματαρεί ἐις ἀνδρῶν, a clause necessary to the sense. xii. 3 Ἰδ. Ἀπλὴ τῆς πεποίησες, ἀποκρίθηκε καὶ ἐμοὶ (ὑπερμετέρως). With Ἑ compare Sir. xlv. 19 χρήματα καὶ ἐως ὑποδημάτων...οὐκ ἐξήφυλα, where for ὑπόδημα the newly recovered Hebrew has ἀπλαύω 'a secret gift,' leg. fort. ὑπερμετέρως 'a pair of sandals'; see, however, Wisdom of Ben Sira, p. lxvii. xii. 8 Ἑ supplies καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτοὺς Αἴγυπτος, omitted by Μ through homoioteleuton.

xiv. 18 Ἑ ἐπροσάγαγε τὸ ἐφούδ. "The Ephod, not the ark, was the organ of divination" (Driver). xiv. 41 f. Μ ἐπιπέδω οὕτως. ΜLuc, supplying the lacuna, ἔτει ὁτι οὐκ ἀπεκρίθης τῷ δούλῳ σου ἰχμεροῦν; εἰ εν ἐμοὶ ἐν Ἰωάννην τῷ νῦν μου ἡ ἁδίκαια; Κύριε ὁ Θεός Ἰσραήλ, δός ἡλίους (ὁρίζοντος). καὶ εἰ τάδε εἰσὶν ἐπὶ τῷ λαῷ ἡ ἁδίκαια, δός ὀσίστην (ὁμιλείτω). Similarly in v. 42 Μ preserves the words δόν ἀν κατακληρώσῃ τα...τού νῦν αὐτοῦ, which Ἑ has lost through homoioteleuton. See the note in Field, Hexapla, i. p. 510. xx. 19 Ἑ ἐπαρά τὸ ἐργάζεται ἐκεῖνονότι τῇ Μέταναυμάτης, 'beside yonder cairn.' Similarly v. 41 Ἑ ἐπο τοῦ ἐργάζεται = ἐκεῖνον τῇ Μέταναυμάτης. 2 Sam. iv. 6. For the somewhat incoherent sentence in Μ, Ἑ substitutes καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ θυρώδες τοῦ οἰκου ἐκαθαρεύν πυροῦς, καὶ ἐνυόστατεν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν—words which explain the incident that follows. xvii. 3 Ἑ ἐν τρόπον ἐπιστρέφει ἡ νύμφη πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα αὐτῆς· πλὴν ψυχὴν ἐνός ἀνδρὸς σὺ ζήτεις. In the archetype of Μ the eye of the scribe has passed from ἦν to ἦν, and the sentence thus mutilated has been re-arranged.

xxiv. 6 Ἑ ἐπιπέδω οὕτως. No 'land of Tahtim Hodshi' is known. ΜLuc here preserves the true text, εἰς γῆν Χεστιείμ Καδής
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The last word Ewald, followed by H. P. Smith, preferred ἐκ Θεσβητῆς ἐκ Θεσβητῶν τῆς Γαλαάδ (‘to Hermon’). 1 Kings xvi. 1

For the last word Ewald, followed by H. P. Smith, preferred οὐ κἂν, ‘to Hermon.’ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19

For the last word Ewald, followed by H. P. Smith, preferred οὐ κἂν, ‘to Hermon.’ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19

Neh. ix. 17 «εἰν Αἴγυπτῳ (‘in Egypt’). Ps. xvi. (xv.) 2

G ιπα (‘Arabia’) is manifestly right, and has been admitted into the text by the English Revisers. xxii. 16

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5
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(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5
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(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5
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(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

(xxvi.) 13 δὲ (so Μ is apparently read by G as δὲ, and then connected with the previous verse. See Cheyne, Book of Psalms, p. 379, and Abbott, Essays, p. 25. Wellhausen (Haupt, ad loc.) would retain ἌΑ without the puncta extraordinaria. xlii. 5

In dealing with such differences between the Greek version and the traditional Hebrew text the student will not start with the assumption that the version has preserved the true reading. It may have been preserved by the official Hebrew or its archetype, and lost in the MSS. which were followed by the translators: or it may have been lost by both. Nor will he assume that the Greek, when it differs from the
The Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study.

Hebrew, represents in all cases another Hebrew text; for the difference may be due to the failure of the translators to understand their Hebrew, or to interpret it aright. His first business is to decide whether the Greek variant involves a different Hebrew text, or is simply another expression for the text which lies before him in the printed Hebrew Bible. If the former of these alternatives is accepted, he has still to consider whether the text represented by the LXX. is preferable to that of the Hebrew Bible and probably original. There is a presumption in favour of readings in which \( \text{G} \) and \( \text{M} \) agree, but, as we have said, not an absolute certainty that they are correct, since they may both be affected by a deep-seated corruption which goes back to the age of the Ptolemies. When they differ, \( \text{G} \) will usually deserve to be preferred when it \((a)\) fills up a lacuna which can be traced to homoioteleuton in the Hebrew, or \((b)\) removes an apparent interpolation, or \((c)\) appears to represent a \textit{bona fide} variant in the original, which makes better sense than the existing text. Its claims in these cases are strengthened if it has the support of other early and probably independent witnesses such as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Targum, or of Hebrew variants which survive in existing MSS. of the Massoretic text, or in the Q'ri\(^1\).


2. In the field of O.T. interpretation the witness of the LXX. must be received with even greater caution. It is evident that Greek-speaking Jews, whose knowledge of Hebrew

\(^1\) On the relation of the LXX. to the Q'ri, see Frankel, \textit{Vorstudien}, p. 219 ff.
was probably acquired at Alexandria from teachers of very moderate attainments, possess no prescriptive right to act as guides to the meaning of obscure Hebrew words or sentences. Transliterations, doublets, confused and scarcely intelligible renderings, reveal the fact that in difficult passages they were often reduced to mere conjecture. But their guesses may at times be right; and in much that seems to be guesswork they may have been led by gleams of a true tradition. Thus it is never safe to neglect their interpretation, even if in the harder contexts it is seldom to be trusted. Indirectly at least much may be learned from them; and their wildest exegesis belongs to the history of hermeneutics, and has influenced thought and language to a remarkable degree.

(a) The following specimens will serve to illustrate the exegesis of the LXX. in the historical books.

Gen. iv. 1 έκτεσθαις άνθρωπον δια του θεου. iv. 7 ουκ έαν ορθως προσενέγκης ορθως δε μη διέλης, ήματες; ήσύχασον. vi. 3 ου μη καταμείη το πνεύμα μου εν τοις άνθρώποις τούτοις εις τον αϊώνα δια το ειναι αυτούς σάρκας. xxx. 11 και είπεν Λεία Εν τυχει και επωνόμασεν το όνομα αυτού Γάδ. xxxvii. 3 έποίησεν δε αυτω χιτώνα πουκάλω (cf. 2 Regn. xiii. 18). xli. 43 έκηρυξεν εμπροσθεν αυτού κύριος. xliv. 31 προσεκύνησεν Ισραήλ επί το άκρον της ράβδου αυτως. lviii. 14 έναλλαξ [D έναλλάξας] τας χειρας. xlix. 6 ενευροκόπησαν ταύτων. 19 Γάδ, πειρατήριον πειρατεύσει αυτως αυτως δε πειρατεύσει αυτως κατα πόδας. Exod. i. 16 και δειω πρός το τίκτευν. i. 14 εγώ είμι ο δων. xvi. 15 είπαν έτερος το έτερον Τι εστω τοιτο; xvii. 15 επωνόμασεν το όνομα αυτου Κύριος καταφυγη υ μου. xxi. 6 πρός το κρήτηριον του θεου. xxxii. 32 και ναι ει μεν αφεις αυτοις την άμαρτια αυτων, αφες. Lev. xxiii. 3 τη ημέρα τη έβδομη σάββατα ανάπαυσις κλητη άγια τω κυριω. Num. xxiii. 10η αποθανου η ψυχη μου εν ψυχαις δικαιων και γενοιτο το σπέρμα μου ως το σπέρμα τουτων. xxiv. 24 και κακώσωσιν Εβραίους. Deut. xx. 19 μη άνθρωπος το έξυλον το εν τω άγρω εισειλθει...εις τον χάρακα; xxxii. 8 έστησεν όρα έδυναν κατα άριθμον όγγελων θεου. 15 απελάκτισεν ό ηγατημένος. Jos. v. 2 ποίησον σεαυτοι μαχαίρας πετρίνας εκ πέτρας άκροτομο. Jud. i. 35 ερησον ο Αμορραιος κατοικειν εν τω ορει τω ουστρακώδει (Α του μυριωνων), εν αι άρκου και εν δ αι αλωπεκες, εν τω μυριωνων και εν Θαλαβειν (Α ομ. εν τω μ. κ. εν Θ.). viii. 13 επιστρεψεν Γεθεων...απο έπανωθεν της παρατάξεως Αρες (Α ο ο Πολεμου απο άναβασεος Αρες). xii. 6 και είπαν αυτω ΕΙσιν δη Στάχυς (Α Σύνθημα). xv. 14 ου διδακεν ες Σιαγώνος...και ευθεν
The translated titles of the Psalms form a special and interesting study. The details are collected below, and can be studied with the help of the commentaries, or of Neubauer's article in *Studia Biblica* ii. p. 1 ff.

(a) The titles which are given in the LXX. but are wanting in $\mathfrak{M}$, have been enumerated in Pt. II. c. ii. (p. 250 ff.).
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Ἐν ὑμνοῖς, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. vi., liii., liv., lx., lxvi., lxxv.).

Ἐν ὑπάλμοις, ἡγούμενοι (Ps. iv.).

Ὑπὲρ τῆς κληρονομούσης, (?) ἡγούμενοι (Ps. v.). Aq. ἀπὸ κληρονομίας, Symm. ὑπὲρ κληρονομίας.

Ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁγδόεις, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. vi., xi.).

Ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων Χουσεί νιόο Ἴμενεί, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. viii., lxxx., lxxxvi.). Aq., Symm., Th. ἐπὶ, κτλ.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν ληψῶν, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. viii., lxxx., lxxxiii.). Aq., Th. ὑπὲρ τῆς γενεάς.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφῶν τοῦ νιῶν, ἡγούμενοι (Ps. ix.; cf. xlv.). Aq. ὑπὲρ νεανιστῶν τοῦ νιῶν, Th. ὑπὲρ ἀκμῆς τοῦ νιῶν, Symm. ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου τοῦ νιῶν.

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου τῆς ἑωθοείς, ἡγούμενοι (Ps. xxii.). Aq. ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλάφου τῆς ὀρθομείας. Symm. ὑπὲρ τῆς βοηθείας τῆς ὀρθομείας.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλωθησομένων, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. xlvii., lx., lxviii., lxxvi.). Aq. ἐπὶ τοῖς κρίνοις, Symm. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθῶν, Th. ὑπὲρ τῶν κρίνων.

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ (φίλος), ἡγούμενοι (Ps. xlvii.). Aq. ἅσμα προσφυγίας, Symm. ἅσμα εἰς τὸν ἀγαπητόν, Th. τοῖς ἡγαπημένοις.

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων μεμακρυμμένου, ἡγούμενοι (Ps. lv.). Aq. ὑπὲρ περιστερᾶς ἀλάλου μακρυμμένου. Symm. ὑπὲρ τῆς περιστερᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ φίλου αὐτοῦ ἀπωσμένου. Ἐ. ὑπὲρ τῆς π. τῆς μογγυλαλίου κεκρυμμένων.

Ὑπὲρ Ἰδιωτῶν, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. xxxvii., lx., lxxvi.).

Ὑπὲρ μαλεθή (τοῦ ἀποκριθηματος), ἡγούμενοι (Pss. liii., lxxxvii.). Aq. ἐπὶ χορεία (Symm. διὰ χοροῦ) τοῦ ἐξάρχεον.

Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. xxxvii., lxix.).

Εἰς ἐξομολόγησιν, ἡγούμενοι (Ps. xcix.). Aq. εἰς εὐχαριστίαν.

Εἰς σύνεσιν, συνεσεώς, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. xxxi., xli.—xliv., li.—liii., lxxiii., lxxxxvii., lxxxviii., cxxi.). Aq. ἐπιστήμων, ἐπιστήμης, ἐπιστήμουν.

Μὴ διαφθείρης, ἡγούμενοι (Pss. lvi.—lvi., lxxv.). Symm. (Ps. lxxiv.) ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίας.
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Toii εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ ὀφείλον, Ζήσας εἰς τὰς εὐκαιρίας (Ps. xxix.)
Tῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, Ζήσας (Ps. cxix.—cxviii.). Aq., Symm., Th.
tῶν ἀναβάσεων, εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις.

It may be added that ἐλήμ (Pss. iii. 3, 5, iv. 3, 5, vii. 6, &c., &c.) is uniformly διάφανα in the LXX.; Aq. renders it ἄει, Symm. and Th. agree with the LXX. except that in Ps. ix. 17 ἄει is attributed to Th. In the Psalm of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 3) Symm. renders εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Th. εἰς τέλος, and in v. 13 εἰς τέλος has found its way into copies of the LXX. (cf. ἑκατομμύρια, and Jerome: “ipsi LXX. rerum necessitate compulsi...nunc transtulerunt in finem”).

(c) Exegetical help is sometimes to be obtained from a guarded use of the interpretation affixed by the LXX. (1) to obscure words, especially ἀπάξ λεγόμενα, and (2) to certain proper names. Some examples of both are given below.

(1) Gen. i. 2 ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκέυαστος. 6 στερέωμα. iii. 8 τὸ δειλινόν. 15 τηρήσεις...τηρήσεις. vi. 2 οἱ ἀγγέλοι τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Deut. xxxii. 8, Job i. 6, ii. 1). 4 οἱ γίγαντες. viii. 21 διανοηθεῖς. xxii. 2 τῶν ἀγαπητῶν. xlix. 10 ἡγούμενος.
Exod. vi. 12 ἄλογος. viii. 21 κυνόμια. xii. 22 ὑσσωτερικός. xxv. 29 ἄρτοι ἐνόπτειοι (cf. ά. προκείμενοι xxxix. 18=36, α. τοῦ προσωπικοῦ 1 Regn. xxi. 6). xxviii. 15 λόγιον, Vulg. rationale. Exod. xxxiv. 13 τὰ θαύμα Vulg. luci, A.V. groves. Lev. vii. 8 ff. ὁ ἀποστολαῖος, ἡ ἀποστολὴ. Deut. x. 16 σκηνοκαρδία. Jud. xix. 22 νἱοὶ παρανομῶν (cf. νἱοὶ λοιποὶ 1 Regn. ii. 12, and other renderings, which employ ἀνομία, ἀνώματα, ἀποστασία, ἀπεβίωσις, ἀφρον). 2 Regn. i. 18 τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ εὐθύου. 3 Regn. x. 11 ἡξα πελεκητή (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 8, ix. 10f. Ε. πεύκινα). Ps. viii. 6 παρ' ἄγγελοις. xv. 9 ἡ γλώσσα σαμων. xvi. 8 κόρα ὀφθαλμοῦ. i. 14 πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικὸν. cxxxviii. 15 ἡ ὑπόστασις μου. 16 τὸ ἀκατέργαστον σου. Prov. ii. 18 παρὰ τῷ ἄδη μετὰ τῶν γηγενῶν (a doublet). Job ix. 9 Πλευδά καὶ Ἠσπερών καὶ Ἀρκτοῦρον (cf. cxxxviii. 31). Zeph. i. 10 ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας (cf. 4 Regn. xxii. 14). Isa. xxxviii. 8 (4 Regn. xxii.) τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμοὺς. Ezek. xiii. 18 προσκεφάλαια, ἐπιβόλαια.

(2) Abarim, mountains of, Ζήσας εἰς τὰς εὐκαιρίας, τὸ ὀφείλει τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν, Num. xxvii. 12 (cf. xxi. 11, xxxiii. 44). Agagite, Bougaíos, Esth. iii. 1, A 17 (xii. 6); Μακεδων, E (xvi.) 10. Ararat, land of, 'Αρμενία, Isa. xxxvii. 38. Ashtoreth Ζήσας, 'Αστάρτη

1 On this word see an article by C. A. Briggs, in the Journal of Biblical Literature, 1899, p. 132 ff.
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B. "The Septuagint is not less indispensable to the study of the New Testament than to that of the Old. But its importance in the former field is more often overlooked, since its connexion with the N. T. is less direct and obvious, except in the case of express quotations from the Alexandrian version¹. These, as we have seen, are so numerous that in the Synoptic Gospels and in some of the Pauline Epistles they form a considerable part of the text. But the New Testament has been yet more widely and more deeply influenced by the version through the subtler forces which shew themselves in countless allusions, lying oftentimes below the surface of the words, and in the use of a vocabulary derived from it, and in many cases prepared by it for the higher service of the Gospel."

¹ On the quotations see above p. 392 ff.
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1. The influence of the LXX. over the writings of the N.T. is continually shewn in combinations of words or in trains of thought which point to the presence of the version in the background of the writer's mind, even when he may not consciously allude to it.

This occurs frequently (α) in the sayings of our Lord, where, if He spoke in Aramaic, the reference to the LXX. is due to the translator: e.g. Mt. v. 3ff. μακάρωι οἱ πῖστεοι...οἱ πενθοῦντες... οἱ πραεῖς (Isa. lxii. 1 ff., Ps. xxxvi. 11). vi. 6 εἰσελθείς εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον σου (Isa. xxvi. 20). x. 21, 35 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα εἰς γονεῖς... ὡρὰ διασάζω... δυνατέρας κατὰ τὴν μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νυσφήν κτλ. (Mic. vii. 6). xxi. 33 ἄδρωπος ἐφύτευεν ἀμπελώνα καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέβηκεν κτλ. (Isa. v. 2). Mc. ix. 48 βλαθήσετε εἰς γένναν ὅπου ὁ σκῶλης αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται (Isa. lxvi. 24). Jo. i. 51 ὃς ἀκούει τὸν ὄρανον ἀνεφόροντες καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας (Gen. xxviii. 12). (β) in the translated evangelical record: Mc. vii. 32 φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφόν καὶ μογιάλον... καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς κτλ. (Isa. xxxv. 5 f., xliii. 7). xv. 29 οἱ παραπρευμόνες ἐξασφάλισαν αὐτῶν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλάς: cf. Lc. xxiii. 35 οὐσίων ὁ λαὸς ἑθερόν· ἐξεμπραγμένον δὲ κτλ. (Ps. xxi. 8, Isa. li. 23, Lam. ii. 15). (γ) in the original Greek writings of the N.T., where allusions of this kind are even more abundant; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ὃς ἔχει ἐκ γένους ἑκκλήσιαν, βασιλεῖαν ἐλεύθερα, ἔθνος ἁγίον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγεγέρθησαν κτλ. (Exod. xix. 5 f., xxii. 22 f., Isa. xliii. 20). iii. 14 τὸν δὲ φῶβον αὐτῶν ὡς φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἀγίασατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (Isa. viii. 12 f.). Rom. xii. 17 προσνομοῦντες καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων: cf. 2 Cor. viii. 21 προσνομοῦν πάρα καλὰ ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἄλλα καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων (Prov. iii. 4; in Rom. i. c. this allusion is preceded by another to Prov. iii. 7). 2 Cor. iii. 3ff.: Exod. xxxii., xxxiv. (LXX.) are in view throughout this context. Eph. ii. 17 εὐγενείασεν τοῖς ἐγγένεσιν ζῶν τοῖς μακάριοι καὶ εἰρήνη τοῖς ἐγγύσις (Isa. li. 19, cf. iii. 7, lxii. 1). Phil. i. 19 oδὴ γὰρ ὅτι τούτῳ μοι ἀποβῆσται εἰς σοφίαν (Job xiii. 16). Heb. vi. 8 ἕκφερονα... ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους... κατάρας ἐγγύσις (Gen. iii. 17).

These are but a few illustrations of a mental habit everywhere to be observed in the writers of the N.T., which shews them to have been not only familiar with the LXX., but saturated with its language. They used it as Englishmen use
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the Authorised Version of the Bible, working it into the texture of their thoughts and utterances. It is impossible to do justice to their writings unless this fact is recognised, i.e., unless the reader is on the watch for unsuspected references to the Greek O.T., and able to appreciate its influence upon his author's mind.

2. To what extent the vocabulary of the N.T. has been influenced by the LXX. is matter of keen controversy. In a weighty essay On the Value and Use of the Septuagint Dr Hatch has maintained that "the great majority of N.T. words are words which, though for the most part common to Biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their Biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and which must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the LXX." This statement, which has been hotly contested, may conveniently form the basis of our discussion of the subject.

(a) "The great majority of N.T. words are...common to Biblical and contemporary secular Greek." This is certainly true. Thus Dr H. A. D. Kennedy enumerates about 150 words out of over 4800 in the N.T. which are "strictly peculiar to the LXX. and N.T." The list is as follows:

άγαθοποιεῖν, ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀγαλλιάσθαι, ἀγαλλιάσις, ἀγιάζειν, ἅγιοσμός, ἅγιωσύνη, ἀίνεις, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, αἰχμαλωτευέων, ἀλεγγυμα, ἀλληλωνία, ἀλλογενής, ἀμένοςεσος, ἀμήν, ἀμφίαζειν, ἀναζωνυνειν, ἀναθεματίζειν, ἀνεβίβαστος, ἀνθρώπαρεγκος, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀποδεκατοῦν, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποκεφαλίζειν, ἀποφθέγματα, βάτος, βδέλυγμα, βεβηλοῦν, βροχή, γέννα, γεώστη, γογγύζειν, γυμνός, δεκατοῦν, δεκτός, διαγωγύζειν, δολίον, δότης, δυναμοῦν, ἐβδομηκοντάκι, εἱρποποιεῖν, ἐκζητεῖν, ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, ἐκποτερεύειν, ἐκριζοῦν, ἐλεγόμος, ἐλεγξίς, ἐμπαιγμός, ἐμπαίκτης, ἐναντί, ἐνδιδύσκεων, ἐνδομαζέων, ἐνευλογεῖν, ἐνικαίνεις, ἐνταλμα, ἐνταφίζειν, ἐνώπιον, ἐνωτίζεσθαι, ἔκάπινα, ἔκαστρατευεῖν, ἐκδικηθρεύειν, ἐξοδευοῦν, ἐξουσία, ἐπαυρμόν, ἐπισκοπή, ἐπαναπαύειν, ἐπιγαμβρεύειν, ἐπιφανείκες, ἐρήμωσις, εὐδοκία, εὐημερία, ἤπτημα,

1 Essays, p. 34.  
2 Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 88.
Since the publication of Dr Kennedy's book some of these words (e.g. *γογγύς*, *λειτουργικός*) have been detected in early papyri, and as fresh documents are discovered and examined, the number of 'Biblical' Greek words will doubtless be still further diminished. Indeed the existence of such a class of words may be almost entirely due to accidental causes, such as the loss of contemporary Hellenistic literature.

(b) On the other hand it must not be forgotten that the Greek vocabulary of Palestinian Greek-speaking Jews in the first century A.D. was probably derived in great part from their use of the Greek Old Testament. Even in the case of writers such as St Luke, St Paul, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the LXX. has no doubt largely regulated the choice of words. A very considerable number of the words of the N.T. seem to have been suggested by that version, or in any case may be elucidated from it.

E.g.: *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *ἀγαλλιάσθαι*, *ἀγνίζειν*, *ἀγνυτειν*, *ἀνίγμα*, *αἰρετίζειν*, *ἀλαζονεύσθαι*, *ἀλλογενής*, *ἀδιαλείπτως*, *ἀμάραντος*, *ἀμέρμανος*, *ἀμφίβλητρον*, *ἀμφίδονος*, *ἀπελπίζειν*, *ἀπερίτμητος*, *ἀπλότης*, *ἀπόκρυφος*, *Βδέλυγμα*, *γλωσσοκομοῦν*, *γνωρίζειν*, *διάθεμα*, *διδαχή*, *διστομὸς*, *δισλίς*, *δωρεάν*, *ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι*, *ἐνταφαίζειν*, *ἐνωτίζεσθαι*, *ἐφράζειν*, *ἐξέφυσις*, *ἐξουσιώνων*, *ἐξωκολοσία*, *ἐυδοκία*, *ἐφεύλον*, *ἐσωτικία*, *ἰκανοῦ*, *ἰκανός*, *ιστορέας*, *καμμία*, *κατάγειν*, *καταθλιπτέειν*, *κατακλυσμός*, *καταπτυστέειν*, *καταφίλειν*, *κανθάσθαι*, *κλάσμα*, *κοράσιον*, *κόψων*, *λιθόστρωτος*, *λεκμόν*, *μεσονύκτιον*, *μογιλάλος*, *μυκητήριες*, *νεόμηνια*, *νίκος*, *νυστάζειν*, *οἰκουμενία* (ἡ), *ὀμοθυμα-
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(c) The influence of the LXX. is still more clearly seen in the N.T. employment of religious words and phrases which occur in the LXX. at an earlier stage in the history of their use. The following list will supply illustrations of these:

...
The non-canonical books have their full share in the contribution which the Septuagint makes to the vocabulary of the N.T. Many Biblical words occur for the first time in the O.T. "Apocrypha," or reach there a further stage in the history of their use, or appear in new combinations. The following examples will repay examination: αἰών, ἀπαθισμα, ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποστολή, ἀσύνετος, ἄφεσις, ἁπατίζειν, βασιλεία (τοῦ θεοῦ), δαμόνων, διακονία, διαπονείσθαι, δικαίων, ἐκβασίς, ἐκλεκτός, ἐμβατέως, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιστροφή, ἐπιτιμία, ἐπιφάνεια, εὐσπλαγχνος, εὐχαριστία, ἴδιος, ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον, κανών, κλήρος, κληρον, κοινός, κοινόν, κόσμος, κτίσις, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, μυστήριον (τοῦ θεοῦ), νόμος, παρουσία, πεντηκοστή, σημεία καὶ τέρατα, σκάνδαλιζειν, συμπάθεια, συμπαθεῖν, σωτήρ, χάρις καὶ ἔλεος, χριστός.

(d) "The great majority of N.T. words and phrases express...the conceptions of a Semitic race, and...must consequently be examined by the light of...the LXX." But the connotation will usually be found to have undergone considerable changes, both in ordinary words and in those which are used in a religious sense. In order to trace the process by which the transition has been effected the N.T. student must begin with an investigation into the practice of the LXX. Such an enquiry may be of service in determining the precise meaning which is to be given to the word in the N.T., but it will more frequently illustrate the growth of religious thought or of social life which has led to a change of signification. Dr Hatch indeed laid down as "almost self-evident" canons the two propositions (1) that "a word which is used uniformly, or with few and intelligible exceptions, as the translation of the same Hebrew word, must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word"); and (2) that "words which are used interchangeably as translations of the same Hebrew word, or group of cognate words, must be 'held to have in Biblical Greek an allied or virtually identical meaning'." These principles led him to

1 Essays, p. 35.
some remarkable departures from the traditional interpretation of N.T. words (e.g. ἄρετή = ἐννέα or ἡ ἐκείνη = δόξα, ἐπαύων; διάβολος = ἔφινος = 'enemy'; ὁμοθυμαδόν = ἡ ἄνοιξ = 'together'; πτωχόι = πέντης = πραῖς = ταπευοί = 'fellahin'; πονηρός, malicious, mischievous; ὑποκριτής, the equivalent of πονηρός, πανούργος, and the like). A searching examination of these views will be found in Dr T. K. Abbott's essay *On N.T. Lexicography*. The πρῶτον ψευδός of Dr Hatch's canons lies in his use of the term 'Biblical Greek' as inclusive of the pre-Christian Greek of the Alexandrian translators, and the Palestinian Greek of the Apostolic age. While it is evident that the writers of the N.T. were largely indebted to the Alexandrian version for their Greek vocabulary, we cannot safely assume that they attached to the Greek words and phrases which they borrowed from it the precise significance that belonged to them in the older book. Allowance must be made for altered circumstances, and in particular for the influence of the Gospel, which threw new meaning into the speech as well as the life of men. One or two instances will shew the truth of this remark. 'Ἁγάπη' in the LXX. rarely rises above the lower sense of the sexual passion, or at best the affection of human friendship; the exceptions are limited to the Greek Book of Wisdom (Sap. iii. 9, vi. 18). But in the N.T., where the word is far more frequent, it is used only of the love of God for men, or of men for God or Christ, or for the children of God as such. 'Ἐκκλησία' in the LXX. is the congregation of Israel; in the N.T., except perhaps in Mt. xviii. 17, it is the new community founded by Christ, viewed in different aspects and with many shades of meaning. Ἐξαγ-γέλιον in the LXX. occurs only in the plural, and perhaps only

1 *Essays*, p. 65 ff.
2 'Ἁγάπη' occurs in the sense of Divine love (Hos. xi. 4, Zeph. iii. 17, Jer. xxxi. 3).
in the classical sense of ‘a reward for good tidings’ (2 Regn. iv. 10); in the N.T. it is from the first appropriated to the Messianic good tidings (Mc. i. 1, 14), probably deriving this new meaning from the use of εὐαγγελίζωνθαι in Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, lx. 6, lxi. 1.

Thus on the whole it is clear that caution must be used in employing the practice of the LXX. to determine the connotation of N.T. words. On the one hand the interpreter ought not to be led astray by visions of the solidarity of ‘Biblical Greek,’ for the Greek of the N.T., though in fact largely derived from the Greek of the LXX., has in not a few instances cast off the traditions of its source under the inspiration of another age. On the other hand, the student of the N.T. will make the LXX. his starting-point in examining the sense of all words and phrases which, though they may have been used in classical Greek or by the κοινή, passed into Palestinian use through the Greek Old Testament, and in their passage received the impress of Semitic thought and life. Bishop Pearson’s judgement on this point is still fully justified: ‘LXXviralis versio...ad Novum Instrumentum recte intelligendum et accurate explicandum perquam necessaria est...in illam enim omnes idiotismi veteris linguae Hebraicae erant transfusi...multa itaque Graeca sunt in Novo Foedere vocabula quae ex usu Graecae linguae intelligi non possunt, ex collatione autem Hebraea et ex usu LXX. interpretum facile intelliguntur.’

II. The Greek versions of the second century A.D. are in many respects of less importance to the Biblical student than the Septuagint. Not only are they later by two to four centuries, but they exist only in a fragmentary state, and the text of the fragments is often insecure. But there are services which they can render when rightly employed, and which the careful student will not forget to demand.

1 Praef. paraen., ed. E. Churton, p. 22 f.
1. Each of these versions has characteristics of its own, which must be taken into account in estimating its value.

(a) Aquila represents the official Hebrew text in its earliest stage, and his extreme literalness and habit of translating ἐπιμολογικῶς render it easy to recover the text which lay before him. In the large fragments of 3 and 4 Regn. published by Mr Burkitt, Aquila's Hebrew text differs from that of the printed Bibles only in thirteen readings, an average of one variant in every second verse. Still more important is Aquila's reflection of the exegetical tradition of the school of Jamnia. Here as in his text he is often in direct opposition to the LXX., and serves as a useful makeweight against the influence of the Alexandrian interpretation. Especially is this the case in regard to the meaning of obscure words, which Aquila translates with a full knowledge of both languages and of other Semitic tongues, whilst the LXX. too often depended upon guess-work. This merit of Aquila was recognised by Jerome, who makes use of his interpretations in the Vulgate. Moreover the influence which his work has exercised over the text of the LXX. renders it important to the textual critic of the older Greek version. (b) The paraphrasing manner of Symmachus hinders the free use of his version either for textual or hermeneutical purposes. But it is often interesting as revealing the exegetical tendencies of his school, and its fulness serves to correct the extreme literalness of Aquila. Jerome used it for his Vulgate even more freely than he used Aquila; cf. Field, Hexapla, i, p. xxxiv. "quem tam presse secutus est magnus ille interpres Latinus...ut aliquando, nobis successerit ex Hieronymi Latinis Symmachij Graeca...satis probabiliter extricare." (c) Theodotion, besides contributing a whole book to the textus

1 See above, p. 40.
2 Cf. Aquila, p. 16 f.
3 Field, Hexapla, i, p. xxiv.
5 See Burkitt, Aquila, p. 18 ff.
The Greek Versions as aids to Biblical Study.

459

receptus of the Greek Old Testament, preserves in his text of the other books traces of a recension of the LXX. which seems at one time to have had a wide circulation, since Theodotionic readings occur in the LXX. quotations of the N.T. and in those of other Christian writers before A.D. 150.

2. All the post-Christian translators of the O.T., but especially Aquila, Symmachus, and the author of the Quinta, appear to have been not only competent Hebraists, but possessed of a more or less extensive knowledge of Greek literature. These qualifications render them valuable allies to the interpreter whether of the New or of the Old Testament. (a) In the case of the O.T. they serve to confirm or correct the LXX. renderings, or to illustrate their meaning. The renderings of the earlier version are not infrequently retained, e.g. Gen. i. 2 ο' ἐπεφέρετο, 'Α.Σ.Θ. ἐπιφερόμενον. 6 'Εργά, Ο' Α.Σ.Θ. στερέωμα. 10 ὑπενθύμιζες, Ο' Σ.Θ. τὰ συντέματα (συντήματα) τῶν ὑδάτων. More often they are set aside in favour of other words which do not materially differ in signification, but seem to have been preferred as more exact, or as better Greek, e.g. Gen. xlix. 19 ἐκέλευσεν, 'Α. εὑρήκατα, Σ. λόγος. Exod. v. 13 ἀποδίδασκα, Ο' εὐρόδωκτα, 'Α. οἱ εὐστράκαται. Jud. v. 16 ἐξετασμοὶ καρδίας, 'Α. ἀκριβολογία κ., Σ. ἐξειδικευμοί κ. Ps. lxxxviii. 8 τιμήθης ἐν χερσίν σος ο' ο θεὸς δοξαλομένος ἐν βουλή ἀγίων, 'Α. Ἰσχυρὸς κατασχορεύομενος ἐν ἀποθήκῃ ἀ, Σ. θεὸς ἀνταπτητε ἐν ὀμιλίᾳ α. At other times their rendering lies far apart from that of the LXX., manifesting complete dissent from the Alexandrian version, e.g. Gen. xlvii. 31 ἐστίν ο' τῆς πάρδου, 'Α.Σ. τῆς κλίνης. Num. xxiii. 21 (τοῦ) μετατρέπει ο' τὰ ἐνδοξάζει, 'Α. ἀλαλαγμός, Σ. σημασία, Θ. σαλπτισμός. i Regn. xiii. 20 ἐστίν, Ο' το θέρσιτρον ('Α.Θ. ἀφορτον, Σ. ὴνιν) αἰτοῦ. Ps. ii. 12, ἕκαστον ο' δράσασθε παρεδέας, Α. καταφιλήσατε ἐκλεκτῶς,

1 See pp. 47 ff., 395 f., 403, 417 etc.
2 On the excellence of his Greek scholarship see Field, op. cit. p. xlv.
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Σ. προσκυνήσατε καθαρῶς. To these instances may be added others where the later translators substitute a literal rendering for a paraphrase or a gloss; e.g. in Deut. x. 16 Α. has ἀκροβυστίαν καρδίας for the euphemistic σκληροκαρδίαν of the LXX.; in Ps. xv. 9 Α.Σ.Θ. restore δόξα for the interpretative γλώσσα.

(β) Dr Hatch points out¹ that “in a large number of instances the word which one or other of the translators substitutes for the LXX. word is itself used in other passages of the LXX. as the translation of the same Hebrew word”; and he draws the conclusion that “the words which are so interchanged are practically synonymous.” But his inference must be received with reserve, for the interchange may not be so free as appears at first sight; so careful a translator as Aquila (e.g.) has probably regulated his use of words which are generally synonymous with a view to the requirements of the particular context.

(ε) Many of the words of the N.T. which are not to be found in the LXX. occur in the fragments of the later Greek versions, and receive important illustration from their use of them. Indeed, in not a few instances these versions supply the only or the best explanation of rarer words or connotations. The following are examples. 'Αθημονέν, 'Α. Job xviii. 20, Σ. Ps. ix. 3, cxv. 3, Eccl. vii. 17, Ezech. iii. 15; ἀποκαραδοκία, cf. 'Α. Ps. xxxvi. 7 (ἀποκαραδόκει); δαιμονίζειν, 'Α. Ps. xc. 6. ἔνκακεν, ‘to faint, Σ. Gen. xxvii. 46; ἐμβριμάσθαι, 'Α. Ps. vii. 12, Σ. Isa. xvii. 13; ἐνθύμησις, ‘thought,’ Σ. Job xxi. 27, Ezech. xi. 21; ἐπίβλημα, ‘patch,’ Σ. Jos. ix. 5; θεομάχος, Σ. Prov. ix. 18, xxi. 16, Job xxvi. 5; καταφέρεσθαι, ‘to drop asleep,’ 'Α. Ps. lxxv. 7; μορφοῦν, 'Α. Isa. xlv. 13.² Even where the unusual word and meaning occur in the LXX., it will often

¹ Essays, p. 28.
² These instances are chiefly from Hatch (Essays, p. 25). They might easily be multiplied by an inspection of the Oxford Concordance or of the Lexicon and Hexapla at the end of Trom.
be found that the later versions supply more abundant or more appropriate illustrations. Thus after the Septuagint these fragments, which are happily receiving continual additions from Hexaplaric MSS., offer the most promising field for the investigation of N.T. lexicography and one, moreover, which has been little worked.

On the whole, perhaps, no sounder advice could be given to a student of the language of the N.T., than to keep continually at hand the Septuagint, the remains of the Hexapla as edited by Field, and the Oxford Concordance which forms a complete index to both. It is only when he has made some way with the evidence of the Greek versions of the Old Testament that he will be in a position to extend his researches to non-Biblical literature, such as the papyri, the remains of the Hellenistic writers, and the great monuments of the later Greek.

CHAPTER V.

INFLUENCE OF THE LXX. ON CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

1. The Church inherited from the Hellenistic Synagogue an entire confidence in the work of the Alexandrian translators. It was a treasure common to Jew and Christian, the authorised Greek Bible to which at first both appealed. When after the beginning of the second century a distrust of the LXX. sprang up among the Jews, Christian teachers and writers not unnaturally clung to the old version with a growing devotion. They pleaded its venerable age and its use by the Evangelists and Apostles; they accepted and often embellished the legend of its birth, and, following in the steps of Philo, claimed for it an inspiration not inferior to that of the original. When the divergences of the Septuagint from the current Hebrew text became apparent, it was argued that the errors of the Greek text were due to accidents of transmission, or that they were not actual errors, but Divine adaptations of the original to the use of the future Church.

Iren. iii. 21. 3 "quum...Deus...servavit nobis simplices scripturas in Aegypto...in qua et Dominus noster servatus est...et haec earum scripturarum interpretatio priusquam Dominus noster descenderet facta sit et antequam Christiani ostenderentur interpretata sit...vere impudorati et audaces ostenduntur qui nunc volunt aliter interpretationes facere, quando ex ipsis

1 See above, p. 30 f.
2 See above, p. 13 f.
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scripturis arguantur a nobis...et enim apostoli quum sint his omnibus vetustiores, consonant praedictae interpretationi, et interpretatio consonat apostolicae traditioni. et enim Petrus et Ioannes et Matthaeus et Paulus et reliqui deinceps et horum sectatores prophetica omnia ita annuntiaverunt quemadmodum Seniorum interpretatio continet. unus enim et idem Spiritus Dei qui in prophetis quidem praecognit...in Senioribus autem interpretatus est bene quaec bene prophetae fuerant. Cyril. Hieros. cat. iv. 33 f.: ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφὰς, τὰς εἰκοσὶ διὸν βιβλίων τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης ταύτας, τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα δύο ἐρμηνευτῶν ἐρμηνευθείσας...οὗ γὰρ εὐρεσιλογία καὶ κατασκευὴ σοφισμάτων ἀνθρωπίνων ἦν τὸ γνώμενον, ἀλλ' ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἢ τῶν ἁγίων πνεύματι λαλθεισῶν θείων γραφῶν ἐρμηνεία συντελεῖτο. Chrys. in Matt. hom. v. τῶν ἁλλών μᾶλλον ἀπάντων τὸ ᾧδόπιστὸν τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα ἔχουσιν ἄν δικαίως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν ἠμαρτονει, καὶ δικαίως ἀν ὑποπτεύοντο ἀτέ ἀνεχθείς μᾶλλον ἐρημότεις, καὶ τὰς προφητειὰς συνκαίροντες ἐπίτηδες: οἱ δὲ ἐβδομήκοντα πρὸ ἐκάτον ἢ καὶ πλειόνων ἐτῶν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐθάντες καὶ τοσοῦτοι διότι ταὐτής ἠμαρτειν ὑπὸ ποίησα ἀπελαγμένου. καὶ διὰ τῶν χρόνων καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ διὰ τὴν συμφωνίαν μᾶλλον ἐὰν εἶν πιστεύσει δίκαιον. Hieron. ep. xxxiii. (ad Pammach.): "iure LXX. editio obtinuit in ecclesiis vel quia prima fuit et ante Christi facta adventum, vel quia ab Apostolis... usurpata"; praef. in Paralip. "si LXX. interpretum pura et ut ab eis in Graecum versa est editio permaneret, superflue me... impelleres ut Hebraea volumina Latino sermone transferrem." Aug. de doctr. Chr. 22 "qui (LXX. interpretes) iam per omnes peritiores ecclesias tanta praesentia Sancti Spiritus interpretati esse dicuntur ut os unum tot hominum fuisse...quamobrem, etiamsi aliquid aliter in Hebraeis exemplaribus inventur quam isti posuerunt, cedendum esse arbitror divinae dispositioni quae per eos facta est...itaque fieri potest ut sic illi interpretati sint quemadmodum congruere Gentibus ille qui eos agebat... Spiritus S. indicavit." (Cf. quaeest. in Hept. i. 169, vi. 19; in Ps. cxxxv.; de civ. Dei viii. 44.)

2. Under these circumstances the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament necessarily influenced the literature and thought of the Ancient Church in no ordinary degree. How largely it is quoted by Greek Christian writers of the first four centuries has already been shewn. But they were not content to cite it as the best available version of the Old

1 See above, p. 219 ff.
2 Part III. c. 3.
Testament; they adopted without suspicion and with tenacity its least defensible renderings, and pressed them into the service of controversy, dogma, and devotion. This remark applies also in effect to the Latin Christian writers before Jerome, who were generally dependent on a literal translation based upon the Greek Bible. To Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as to Clement and Barnabas, Justin and Irenaeus, the Septuagint was the Old Testament authorised by the Church, and no appeal lay either to any other version or to the original. Nor was this tradition readily abandoned by the few who attained to some knowledge of Hebrew. Origen, while recognising the divergence of the LXX. from the Hebrew, and endeavouring to reconcile the two by means of the Hexapla, was accustomed to preach and comment upon the ordinary Greek text. He even builds his system of interpretation on the LXX. rendering of Prov. xxii. 20. Jerome was long in reaching his resolve to adopt the Hebrew text as the basis of his new Latin version, and when at length he did so, his decision exposed him to obloquy. Augustine, while sympathising with Jerome's purpose, thought it a doubtful policy to unsettle the laity by lowering the authority of the LXX.

The following examples of Christian interpretation based upon the LXX. will shew how largely that version influenced the

1 See above, p. 87 ff.
2 Justin occasionally adopts a rendering preferred by his Jewish antagonists, or does not press the rendering of the LXX. But he makes this concession only where the alternative does not affect his argument; see Dial. 124, 131.
3 See above, p. 60 ff.
4 Comm. in Cant. i. 344, "tamen nos LXX. interpretum scripta per omnia custodimus, certi quod Spiritus Sanctus mysteriorum formas obiectas inesse voluit in scripturis divinis."
5 See below, p. 468.
6 See his Preface to the Gospels, addressed to Damasus.
7 Aug. Ep. ii. 82, § 35. He deprecates the change of cucurbita into hedera in Jon. iii. 6 ff. on the ground that the LXX. doubtless had good reasons for translating the Hebrew word by κολόκυτα: "non enim frustra hoc puto LXX. posuisse, nisi quia et huic simile sciebant."
hermeneutics of the Ancient Church. The exegesis is often obviously wrong, and sometimes it is even grotesque; but it illustrates the extent to which the authority of the LXX. became a factor in the thought and life of the Church both in ante-Nicene and early post-Nicene times. A careful study of these passages will place in the hands of the young student of patristic literature a key which may unlock many of his difficulties.

Gen. i. 2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος. Iren. i. 18. 1 τὸν ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀπόκρυφον αὐτὸς μηνύοντα εἰπεῖν Ἡ δὲ γῆ κτλ. Tert. ἡμείς 3 “(aqua) plurima suppetit, et quidem a primordio... terra autem erat invisibilis et incomposita... solus liquor dignum vectarulum Deo subiecibat.” ii. 2 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐκτη. Iren. v. 28. 3 ἑνεργοῦν οὖν ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια αὐτῶν τὸ 5 ἔτος ἐστὶ. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐάν ὥρθας προσενέγκης κτλ. Iren. iii. 23. 4 “Cain quum accepisset consilium a Deo uti quiesceret in eo quod non recte divisisset earn quae erat fratem erat communicationem...non solum non acquievit, sed adiecit peccatum super peccatum” ; cf. iv. 18. 3. xiv. 14 ἡριμέσαν...δέκα καὶ ὅκτω καὶ τριακοσίους (cod. D). Barn. 9. 8 μᾶθετε ὅτι τοὺς δεκακατών πρώτως, καὶ διάστημα ποιήσας λέγει τριακοσίους τὸ δεκακατών (Η) ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Τ ἡμελεῖν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν λέγει καὶ τριακοσίους (Τ). Cf. Clem. Al. Strom. vi. 11. Hil. syn. 86. Ambr. de fide i. prol. xxxi. 13 εὖ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὁδηγεῖν σοι ἐν τῷ θεοῦ (Dιηθ). Just. Dial. 58 (cf. 60). xlviii. 14 ἐπέβαλεν...ἐναλλὰς τὰς χεῖρας. Tert. ἡμείς 8 “sed est hoc quoque de vetere sacramento quo nepotes suos...intermutatus manibus benedixerit et quidem ita transversim obliquatis in se, ut Christum deformantes iam tunc portenderent benedictionem...et invenierit non aliun nisi Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum annuntiatam.” xlix. 10 οὐκ ἐκλειφθείει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰουδα καὶ ἢγνώμενος κτλ. Justin Dial. 52 οὐδὲπτερεν ἐν τῷ γενεῖ υἱῶν ἐπαύσατο ὡστε προφήτης οὕτω ἄρχον...μέχρις οὖν οὕτως Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἐπαθεν (cf. ιβ. 120). Iren. iv. 10. 2 “inquirant enim...id tempus in quo defecit princeps et dux ex Iuda et qui est gentium spes...et invenierit non aliun nisi Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum annuntiatum.” Cypr. test. i. 21. Eus. dem. ev. i. 4. Cyril. H. xii. 17 σημεῖον οὖν ἐδωκε τῷ Χριστῷ παρουσίας τὸ πανταγον τῇ ἁρχῇ τῶν ἱουδαίων. εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὕπερ Ἡρῴδας εἰσίν, οὔτω ἤλθεν ὁ Χριστός εἰ ἔχουσι τὸν ἐκ γένους Ἰουδα καὶ τῷ Δαβίδ, οὔτω ἤλθεν ὁ προσδοκώμενος.

Exod. xvi. 36 τὸ δὲ γὰρ ὅταν τὸ δέκατον τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν. Clem. Al. Strom. ii. 11 ἐν ἡμῖν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τριὰ μέτρα, τριὰ κρητῆρα μηνύεται, αἰτθήσεις...λόγοι...νοῦς. xvi. 16 ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαῖα πολέμει Κύριος ἐπὶ Ἀμαλήκ ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς. Just. Dial. 49 νοήσαι δύνασθε ὅτι κρυφαὶ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ γέγονε τὸ σταυρωθέντι Χριστῷ. Iren. iii. 16. 4 “occulte quidem sed potenter manifestans, quoniam abscensa manu expugnabat Dominus Amalech.” xliii. 19 καλέσω ἐπὶ τῷ ὅνωματι Κυρίου ἐναντίον σου (AF). Amb. 

S. S.
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de Sp. s. i. 13 "Dominus ergo dixit quia in nomine suo vocabit Dominum; Dominus ergo et Patris est nomen et Filii."

**Lev. iv. 5** ó ierες ό χριστός. Tert. bapτ. 7 “Aaron a Moyse unctus est, unde Christus dicitur a chrismate, quod est unctio, quae Domino nomen accommodavit.”

**Num. xxiii. 19** εν χ ως ἀνθρώπως ό θέος διαρτηθήναι οὐδὲ ως υδὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀπελθήθηναι. Cypr. test. i. 20 [under the heading “Quod cruci illum fixuri essent Iudaei”]. **xxiv. 17** ἀνατελεῖ ἀστρον ἐκ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἀνθρώπως ἐξ Ἰσραήλ. Eus. dem. ev. i. 3, 6. Cypr. test. ii. 10 [under the heading, “Quod et homo et Deus Christus,” &c.].

**Deut. xxviii. 66** ἦσται ἡ ζωή σου κρεμαμένη ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου...καὶ οὐ πιστεύεσθαι τῇ ζωή σου. Tert. (Jud. 11) quotes this as “Erit vita tua pendens in ligno ante oculos tuos; et non credes vitae tuae,” explaining the words of the “signa sacramentum...in quo vita hominibus praestrebutur, in quo Iudaei non essent credituri.” Cf. Cyril H. xiii. 19 ὅτι ἡ ζωή ἦν ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔξων κρεμασθείσα Μωσῆς ἀποκλαίμενοι φροντὶ κτλ. **xxiii. 8** ἐστησθεν ὀρια ἐνων κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. Justin (diaλ. 131) cites the last three words as κ. ἀριθμοὶ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, adding οἱ ἐθημομένοι ἐξήγησαν ότι Ἐστησθεν δ. εὕροι κ. ἀριθμὸν ἀγγ. θεοῦ· ἀλλ’ ἐπει καὶ ἐκ τούτων πάλιν οὐδὲν μοι ἀλατοῦσα ὁ λόγος, τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐξήγησαν εἰπών. Iren. iii. 12, 9, quoting the I.XX., comments: “populum autem qui credit Deo iam non esse sub angelorum potestate.”

**Jos. v. 3** ἐτοιμαζον Ἰσραήλ παχαίρας πετρίνας ἀκροτόμους καὶ περίτεμπεν τοὺς νιοῦς Ἰσραήλ. Tert. Jud. 9 “circumcisi nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi praecipit (petra enim Christus multis modis et figuris praedicatus est).”

**3 Regn. xxii. 38** ἀπένυσαν τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην Σαμαρείας... καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐλουσαντο ἐν τῷ αἰματι. Amb. de Sp. s. 1.16 “fidelis ad putum (Gen. xxiv. 62), infidelis ad lacum (Jer. ii. 13)...meretrices in lacu Jezabel se cruore laverunt.”

**Ps. ii. 12** δράσασθε πανδείας. Cypr. test. iii. 66 “adprehendite disciplinam” [under the heading “Disciplinam Dei in ecclesiasticas praeceptis observandum”]. **iv. 7** ἐτησεωθῇ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσωπόν σου. Amb. de Sp. i. 14 "quod est ergo lumen signatum nisi illius signaculi spiritualis in quo credentes signati (inquit) estis Spiritu promissionis sancto." **vi. 6** ἐν δὲ τῷ ἁγίῳ τίς ἐξομολογηθῆσαι σοι; Cypr. test. iii. 114 [under the heading “Dum in carne est quis, exhomologesin (cf. Stud. Bibl. iv. 282, 290 n.) facere debere”]. **ix. tit.** εἰς τὸ τέλος. Hil. ad loc. “intellegendum quotiens qui titulos habent in fine, non praesentia in his sed ultima contineri.” **θ.** ὑπέρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ νιόυ. Orig. ad loc. κρύφια ἦστι γνώσις ἀπόρρητος τῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀλη-

1 Eph. i. 13.
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Bivov BEov µ.v<trJplov. Athan. ad loc. legi ei 'Υπερ των ἀκαταλήπτων 

μυστηριων του ναιον. xxi. 7. See under Hab. ii. 11. 30 και ἡ 

ψυχή μου αὐτῷ ἔγ. Iren. v. 7. i "tamquam immortali sub-

stantia eius existente." xxi. 6 τῷ λόγῳ του κυρίου...τῷ πνευ-

ματι του στόματος αυτοῦ. See Iren. iii. 8. 3, Tert. Prax. 7,

Cypr. test. ii. 3, Ambr. de Sp. s. iii. 11, Hil. trin. xii. 39.

xliv. i ἐξερεύνατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν. Tert. Prax. 7 

"solus ex Deo genitus, propri de vulca cordis ipsius secundum 

quod et Pater ipse testatur Eructavit cor meum sermonem 

optimum." Marc. ii. 4 "adhibet operi bono optimum etiam 

ministrum, serinem suum." Cf. Cypr. test. ii. 3. lxxv. 4 

μυθήσομαι Ραββ. Cyril. H. ii. 9 ὧ μεγάλης του θεοῦ φιλανθρω-

πίας και πορνών μημονεύοντης εν γραφάις (the LXX. having 

transliterated ραββ and ραβ alike). Cf. Hieron. comm. in Ps. 

ad loc. lbb. 5 Μὴ τινὶ Σεκών ερει ἀνθρωπος, και ἀνθρωπος ἡγε-

νθη ἐν αὐτῇ, και Αὐτος ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν ὁ θεος. Tert. Prax. 

27 "invenimus illum directo et Deum et hominem expositum, 

ipso hoc psalmo sugerente quoniam Deus homo natus est in 

illa, aedificavit eam voluntate Patris"; cf. Marc. iv. 13 "'Mater 

Sion' dicet homo, et 'homo factus est in illa' (quoniam Deus 

homo natus est)...aedificaturus ecclesiam ex voluntate patris," 

Hieron. comm. in Pss. (ed. G. Morin) ad loc.: "pro 'mater Sion' 

LXX. interpretes transtulerunt: 'numquid Sion (µ.;, τῇ ...) 

dicat homo?...'sed vitiose P litera graeca addita fecit errem." Jerome 

however retains the interpretation 'homo Christus,' which depends 

on the LXX. reading ἀνθρωπος. lxxvii. 6 ἐν νεκροῖς εἰλεύθερος. 

Cyril. H. x. 4 οὐκ ἀπομείνας ἐν νεκροῖς, ὡς πάντες ἐν ἄδη, ἀλλὰ 

μόνος ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος. xci. 13 δίκαιος ὁ φοίνιξ ἀνθήσεις. Tert. 

res. carn. 13 "id est de morte, de funere, uti credas de ignibus 

quoque substantiam corporis exigi posse" (cf. Clem. R. I Cor. 25, 

Lightfoot, p. 85 n.). xciv. 5 πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἰατρία. 

Just. dial. 55 οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν...ἐδώλα δαμασφίων εἰσίν, ἀλλ' οἱ 


iii. 59. lbb. 10 ὁ κυριος ἐβασιλεύει [ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον]. Just. 

apol. i. 41, Dial. 73 f. Tert. Marc. iii. 19; Jud. 10 "age 

nunc, si legisti penes prophetam in psalmis: Deus regnavit a 

ligno, expecto quid intelligas, ne forte lignarium aliquem regem 

significari putetis et non Christum." ib. 13 "unde et ipse David 

regnaturum ex ligno dominum dicebat." Auctor de montibus 

Sina et Sion 9 "Christus autem in montem sanctum ascendit 

lignum regni sui." Cf. Barn. 8 ἡ βασιλεία Ἱησοῦ ἐπὶ εἴλον. 

xcviii. 5 προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. Ambr. de Sp. 

s. iii. 11 "per scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram autem 

caro Christi quam hodieque in mysteriis adoramus, et quam Apostoli 

in Domino Jesu...adorarunt." Cf. Aug. ad loc. cvi. 20 ἀπέτει-
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λευ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ λάσατο αὐτοῦς. Cypr. test. ii. 3 [under the heading “Quod Christus idem sit sermo Dei”].

Tert. Marc. v. 9 “nos edimus evangelia...nocturna nativitate declarantia Dominum ut hoc sit ante luciferum...nec generavit te edixisset Deus nisi filio vero...cur autem adiecit ex utero...nisi quia curiosius voluit intellegi in Christum ex utero generavit te, id est, ex solo utero sine viri semine?”

Cyril. H. vii. 2 ἀπερ ἐπὶ ἀνθρωπῶν ἀναφέρειν πάσης ἀγνωστικῆς ἀνάπλεων. xi. 5 τὸ ‘σήμερον’ (Ps. ii. 7) ἀχρονον, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἐωσφόρον κτλ. Cf. Athan. or. c. Ar. iv. 27f.

Prov. viii. 22 Κύριος ἐκτισεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. Just. dial. 61. Iren. iv. 20. 3. Tert. Prax. 7. Cypr. test. ii. 1 [under the heading Christum...esse sapientiam Dei, per quam omnia facta sunt]. Hil. trin. xii. 45 “quaerendum est quid sit naturum ante saecula Deum rursum in initium viarum Dei et in opera creari.” Cf. Athan. or. in Ar. ii. 16 ff. xxii. 20 καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ τρισώσῃ. Orig. Philoc. i. 11 (de princ. iv.) ὑμνοῦ τριχός ἀπογράφεσθαι δεὶ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῷ ψυχήν τὰ τῶν ἁγίων γραμμάτων νόημα.


Hos. xii. 4 (A) ἐν τῷ ὄνομα μου εὔροσάν με. Tert. Marc. iv. 39 “per diem in templo docebat ut qui per Osee praedixerat,” &c. (For the reading of B, cf. Orig. Philoc. viii. 1.)

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

Hab. ii. 11 λίθος ἐκ τοίχου βοήσεται καὶ κάνθαρος ἐκ ξύλου φθεγξεται αὐτά. Ambr. in Luc. xxiii. “bonus vermis qui haesit in ligno (Ps. xxi. 7), bonus scarabaeus qui clamavit e ligno...clamavit quasi scarabaeus Deus Deus meus”;

Tert. Marc. iv. 22 “in medio duo animalium cognosceris, Moysi et Eliae.” Eus. dem. ev. vi. 15 δύο κατικατ (reading κατικατ in text) τοῦ προφητευμένου δηλοῦσθαι ἐφαμεν, μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐνθεον, διητέραν δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπινήν.

Zach. vi. 12 ἰδού ἀνήρ, Ἀρσενικὴ ὄνομα αὐτῶ. Just. dial. 106, 121. Tert. Valent. 3 “aman figura Spiritus sancti orientem, Christi figuram.”

Isa. i. 22 οἱ κατηλοί σου μίσησαν τὸν οἶχον ὑδατὶ. Iren. iv. 12. 1 “ostendens quod austero Dei praecipito miscerent seniores aquatam traditionem.”
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"qui Angelus Dei dictus est, idem Dominus et Deus est; est autem secundum prophetam Filius Dei magni consilii angelus." x. 23 λόγον συντετριμένον ποιήσει Κύριος. Tert. Marc. iv. 4

"compendiatum est enim novum testamentum et a legis laciniosis oneribus expeditum" (cf. iv. 16). xxi. 4 οτι εἰσίν εν Τάνει ἄρχηγοι ἄγγελοι πονηροί. Just. dial. 79 πονηροὺς ἄγγελους κατακρικέναι καὶ κατοικεῖν λέγει καὶ ἐν Τάνει, τῇ Λαμπττίᾳ χώρᾳ. xiv. 1 οὗτος λέγει Κύριος ὁ θεός τῷ χριστῷ μου Κύριον [read as κύριον]. Barn. xii. 11, Tert. Prax. 28, Jud. 7, Cypr. test. i. 21. Ib. 14 καὶ εν οἷς προσευχόνται. Ambr. de Sp. s. ii. 8 "in Christo orare nos debere Deus Pater dicit." iii. 3 ἀνθρωπος εν πληγῇ ὄν. Tert. de carne Chr. 15. Ib. 8 τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διαγινήσεται; Eus. h. e. i. 2. liv. 15 προσήλυτοι προσελέωσονται σοι δι’ ἐμοί. Ambr. de Sp. s. ii. 9 "Deus Pater ad Filium dicit: Ecce proselyti venient ad te per me.” lx. 17 δῶσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου εν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου εν δικαιοσύνῃ. Iren. iv. 26. 5 τοιουτος προσβιτέρους ἀνατρέψῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία, περὶ ὄν καὶ προφήτης φησὶν Δώσω κτλ. Cf. Clem. R. 1 Cor. 42. lxiii. 1 ἐρύθμα ιματίων ἐκ Βοσρος. Hieron. comm. in Isa. ad loc. "quod multi pro errore lapsi putant de carne (ὡς) Domini intelligi.” Ib. 9 οὗ πρέσβυ ποιθὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ’ αὐτός ἐσωσεν αὐτοὺς. Iren. iii. 20. 4 "quoniam neque homo tantum erit qui salvat nos neque sine carne (sine carne enim angelii sunt).” Tert. Marc. iv. 22 “non legatus, inquit Esaias, nec nuncius, sed ipsae Deus salvos eos faciet, ipsae iam praedicans et implens legem et prophetas.”

Jer. xi. 19 δὲ εὐτέρα καὶ ἐμβαλὼμεν ἐξόλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ. Tert. Marc. iii. 19 "utique 'in corpus...sic enim Deus in evangelio...revelavit, panem corpus suum appellantas.” Cypr. test. ii. 20. xvii. 9 ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστιν, καὶ τίς γνώσεται αὐτόν; Iren. iii. 18. 3, 19. 2, iv. 33. 11; Tert. carn. Chr. 15, Jud. 14.

Bar. iii. 38 μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὡφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη. Cyril. H. xi. 15 βλέπεις θεὸν μετὰ τὴν Μωσῆς νομοθετοῦν ἐνανθρωπίσαντα;

Lam. iv. 20 πνεύμα προσώπων ἡμῶν χριστὸς Κύριος συνελήμφη ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις αὑτῶν. Just. apol. i. 55. Iren. iii. 10. 11. Tert. Marc. iii. 6 "Christum, spiritum scilicet creatoris, sicut prophetae testatur” &c. Prax. 14 "ergo si Christus personae paternae spiritus est, merito spiritus cuius persona erat (id est Patris) eum faciēm suam ex unitate scilicet pronuntiavit.” Cyril. H. xiii. 7. Ambr. de Sp. s. i. 9 "et Christus spiritus dicitur quia Ieremias dixit,” &c.
From these specimens it is clear that the Ancient Church was profoundly influenced by the Greek Old Testament in a variety of ways. Two may be mentioned here. (1) The Alexandrian Greek with its daughter-version, the Old Latin, supplied the basis of a practical interpretation which, notwithstanding numerous errors of text and of treatment, ministered to the religious life of the Christian Society. It was from the LXX. version and not from the official Hebrew of the Synagogue that the pre-Hieronymian Church derived her devotional use of the Old Testament, as it is on the whole the Greek and not the Hebrew Bible which still supplies the Roman Breviary and the Anglican Prayer-book with the substance of their liturgical Psalters. The Alexandrian School based its exegetical work upon the LXX., and the errors and obscurities of the version often yielded materials peculiarly adapted to the requirements of the allegorists; whilst the School of Antioch was no less whole-hearted in its devotion to the old Alexandrian version. This spirit of loyalty to the LXX. continued to the age of the later Greek expositors; it is reflected in the catenae, and it fundamentally affects the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament throughout the orthodox East. Even in the West, through the spread of the Greek exegesis, and the use of the Old Latin version by the earlier Latin fathers, it has acquired a predominant influence. Thus, for good or for evil, the popular interpretation of the O.T. has been moulded by the LXX. rather than by the Hebrew text. (2) The LXX. supplied the Ancient Church with controversial weapons at two great crises in her history—during the early struggle with the rival forces of Monotheism, Judaism, Marcionism, and the various schools of Gnosticism, and in the long conflict with Arianism. Arians
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as well as Catholics appealed to the Alexandrian version. Thus Arius did not hesitate to argue from Joel ii. 25, LXX. (ἡ ἄκρις καὶ...ἡ καμπτη ἡ δύναμις μου ἡ μεγάλη) that the Son is the Power of God in no higher sense than any other agency by which great effects are wrought upon the face of nature1. Both parties had recourse to Prov. viii. 22, where the LXX. rendering of ἕκτωσεν με seemed to Arius to justify the statement that the Logos Himself had a beginning of existence, like the created universe2. Unconvincing as such arguments are now, they had an overwhelming weight in the fourth century, and Hilary speaks as if the cause of orthodoxy might be saved by wresting this crucial passage out of the hands of the Arians (de Trin. xii. "hic hiemis eorum maximus fluctus est, haec tortuosa turbinis gravis unda est, quae expecta a nobis et securo navigio infracta, usque ad ipsum nos tutissimum portum optati litoris prosequetur"). Neither the controversies of the second nor those of the fourth century can be fully understood without an appreciation of the place which the Greek Old Testament occupied in the thought and language of the Ancient Church.

3. Familiarity with the LXX. is not less essential to the student of the devotional life of the Early Church. The Greek Liturgies, especially perhaps in the oldest parts, are steeped in the language of the Greek Old Testament. (a) The prayers of the Psalter are worked into their text, often with little or no change; e.g. St Clement (B. 5)3 δῶς αὐτοῖς καρδίαν καυὴν καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθεῖα ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτων αὐτῶν (Ps. 1. 12); ib. (B. 8) καὶ ἀποδώσῃ αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν τοῦ σωτηρίου καὶ πνεύματι ἴγμονικοί στηρίσῃ αὐτοῖς (Ps. 1. 14); St James (B. 37) σώσου δ’ θεός τὸν λαὸν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου

1 Fragment of the Thalia, in Athan. or. c. Ar. i. 6.
2 Ib. ἄρχην τοῦ κτίσεωα ἰσαὶ καὶ αὐτός.
3 The references are to the pages of Mr Brightman’s Liturgies, Eastern and Western, i. (Oxford, 1896).
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(Ps. xxvii. 9); ib. (B. 55) ἐπιλαβοῦ ὁπλοῦ καὶ θυρεοῦ καὶ ἀνάστηθε εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου (Ps. xxxiv. 2); St Mark (B. 117) ἐξαπάστευτον τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀληθείαν σου (Ps. xlii. 3) ... καὶ ταχὺ προκαταλαβέτωσαν ἡμᾶς οἱ οἰκτειροί σου, Κύριε (Ps. lxxviii. 8). (b) Many of their magnificent addresses to God and to Christ are from the LXX. e.g. St Clement (B. 12) Ἀγγέλῳ παντοκράτῳ, ὕψιστε, ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν, ἀγίε ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομενε, ἀναρχε, μόναρχε (Isa. lvii. 15 + 3 Macc. ii. 2); ib. (B. 24) δὲ μέγας, δὲ μεγαλώνυμος (Jer. xxxix. 19); St James (B. 44) ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ ἐφορῶν (Ps. cxii. 5 f.); St Mark (B. 137) ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουθῶν (Ps. lxxix. 6); Sarapion (J. Th. St. i.) θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας (Ps. xxx. 6); τῶν δυνάμεων (Ps. lvi. 6); τῶν πνευμάτων (Num. xvi. 22). (c) Passing allusions are made to the LXX., sometimes difficult to explain without its aid, e.g. St Clement (B. 6) τὸν ἀνθρωποκότονον ὅφιν δεσμώτην παραδόσει ἡμῖν ὡς στροφήν παιδίων (cf. Job xl. 14); ib. (B. 15) λόγον θεοῦ ... ἄγγελον τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς σου (Isa. ix. 6); St James (B. 55) τῶν τὸ ἁγίον σου θυσιαστήριον κυκλούτων διακόνων (Ps. xxv. 6); ib. (B. 57) ἐν χώρᾳ ζώντων (Ps. cxiv. 9); St Mark (B. 126) εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους ἡμῶν ἐν πάθῃ εἰρήνῃ κατακόσμησον (1 Regn. xxix. 6: Ps. cxx. 8); ib. (B. 133) ἐς ἐτούχῳ κατοικητηρίῳ σου (Exod. xv. 17; 3 Regn. viii. 39 ff.); St Basil (B. 335) ἔλπις τῶν ἀπελπισμένων (Judith ix. 11); Sarapion: ὁ θανάτῳ καὶ ζωγογοῦν (1 Regn. ii. 6). (d) Much of the technical phraseology of the Liturgies is from the LXX.: e.g. τὰ ἀγία (Lev. xxii. 2), ἀναφορά (Num. iv. 19), δῶρα (Gen. iv. 4), θυσία (Gen. iv. 3), λειτουργία (Exod. xxxvii. 19), θυσία (Gen. iv. 3), πρόθεσις (Exod. xxxix. 18), προκέμενα (Lev. xxiv. 7), προσφορά (3 Regn. vii. 34), τελείων (Exod. xxix. 9). (e) The same is true with regard to some of the oldest Eucharistic formulae, e.g. the Preface and Sanctus² which are based on

---

1 Cf. St Basil (B. 311).
2 The composite quotation in Clem. R. 1 Cor. xxxiv. (Dan. vii. 10+)
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Isa. vi. 2—3, the Kyrie eleison (Psalms, passim), the Gustate (Cyril H. myst. v. 20).¹

4. The Greek terminology of Christian Doctrine is largely indebted to the Alexandrian translators. It is true that in this case most of the technical language of theology has passed through the New Testament and received there a fuller preparation for the use of the Church; and the influence of Greek philosophy and of Gnostic speculation must also be borne in mind by the student of the language of dogma. But it is perhaps even more important that he should trace it back to its source in the Greek Old Testament, which was far more familiar to Christian teachers of the first three centuries than the writings of Plato or of the schools of Basileides and Valentinus. The patristic use of such terms as ἡδης, ἀνάστασις, εἰκών, ἐκκλησία, ἐφόδιον, θυσία, θυσιαστήριον, Κύριος, λόγος, μονογενής, ἐύλον, οὐσία, παντοκράτωρ, παντοδύναμος, παράδεισος, πνεῦμα ἄγιον, πίστις, προσφορά, σάρξ, σοφία, ὑπόστασις, φύσις, φῶς, χάρις, can best be understood by the student who begins by investigating their use in the Septuagint.

Indirectly, but not less extensively, the earliest Latin theology drew a store of theological language from the LXX. Such words as aeternalis, altare, benedictio, congregatio, converti, daemonium, eleemosyna, exomologesis, glorificare, hostia, iustitia, misericordia, oblatio, propitiatio, sacerdos, sacrificium, salvare, testamentum, unicus, viaticum, are examples which might easily be multiplied. In the case of some of these terms (e.g. sacerdos = episcopus, sacrificium = eucharistia) the choice contributed largely to the development of doctrine, and it is reasonable to suppose that they entered the vocabulary Isa. vi. 3) is probably an echo of an early Roman Preface. A reference to Dan. l.c. in the same connexion is not uncommon; cf. St Clement (B. 18), St Mark (B. 131), Sarapion (J. Th. St. i. 1, p. 105).

¹ To these may perhaps be added the "Α ὁφθαλμος ὁν εἶδε (cf. Clem. R. l.c.). On Kyrie eleison see a paper by Mr Edm. Bishop, in the Downside Review, 1899—1900 (published separately by Walters, Weston-super-mare).
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of the Western Church through the Latin version of the Septuagint, and not directly from Pagan use. It is noteworthy that Cyprian, whose own style has been said to shew "small respect for the language of the Latin Bible¹," persistently used these O.T. words in reference to the Christian ministry and the Eucharistic offering.

5. One great monument of ancient Christianity, which still exercises a direct influence over the vast Latin communion, seemed at one time likely to serve as a counteracting force to the Septuagint. It was the deliberate purpose of Jerome to set aside in the West the authority of a daughter-version of the LXX., and to establish in its place, by means of his new Latin Bible, that of the official Hebrew text. Nevertheless, through a variety of causes, the Vulgate, as it is now read by the Latin Church, perpetuates many of the characteristic features of the LXX. (a) The Psalter of the Vulgate, as we have seen, is taken from Jerome's second revision of the Old Latin, and not from his Psalterium Hebraicum, or translation of the Hebrew text; and the books of Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, and 1, 2 Maccabees, are given in the Old Latin forms ². (b) The rest of the Old Testament retains, in the Clementine Vulgate, numerous traces of Septuagint readings and renderings. A few examples may be given: Gen. iii. 15 "tu insidiaberis (τὴν ήσεις) calcaneo eius"; iv. 8 "dixite Cain ad Abel fratrem eius Egridiamus foras" (διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέδιον); vi. 5 "non permanebit (οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ) Spiritus meus in homine"; xlix. 10 "ipse erit expectatio (προσδοκία) gentium"; Num. xxiv. 24 "vastabuntque Hebraeos"; Isa. vii. 14 "ecce virgo concipiet"; Lam. iv. 20 "Spiritus oris nostri Christus dominus"; Zech. iii. 8 "adducam servum meum Orientem" (Ἀνατολὴν). It must indeed

¹ E. W. Watson, in Studia Biblica, p. 194 f.
² See above, pp. 98 f., 103.
be remembered that loans from the LXX. are not always of Jerome's borrowing; some of them have made their way into the text of the Vulgate during the course of its transmission (see Vercellone, *Variae lectiones vulgatae Latinae bibliorum editionum*, II. p. viii sqq.). But they hold their place in the authorised Latin Bible of the West, and represent there to this day the influence of the Alexandrian Greek version. (c) Many of the words of the Vulgate are more or less complete transliterations of the Greek words used by the LXX. in the same contexts, survivals in great part from the O. L., where they had familiarised themselves to Latin ears. Thus we have *arceuthinus* (2 Chr. ii. 8), *azyma, azymi* (Gen. xix. 3, Exod. xii. 8), *blasphemare* (Lev. xxiv. 11), *cartallus* (Deut. xxvi. 2), *cataplasmare* (Isa. xxxviii. 21), *cauma* (Job xxx. 30), *choerogryllus* (Lev. xi. 5), *christus* (1 Regn. ii. 10), *chytropus* (Lev. vii. 35), *cidaris* (Lev. xvi. 4), *creagra* (2 Chr. iv. 11), *doma* (Jer. xix. 13), *ecclesia* (1 Regn. xvii. 47), *gasophylacium* (Ezech. xl. 17), *holocaustum* (Lev. i. 3), *laganum* (Exod. xxix. 23), *latomus* (3 Regn. v. 15), *luter* (3 Regn. vii. 17 = 30), *naulum* (Jon. i. 3), *nycticorax* (Deut. xiv. 17), *sabbatum* (Exod. xvi. 23), *synagoga* (Num. xxvii. 21), *theristrum* (Gen. xxxviii. 14), *thymiama* (Exod. xxx. 1), *zelotes* (Exod. xx. 5), *zelotypia* (Num. v. 15). If we turn to the books which are directly derived from the O. L., such forms are of course even more numerous; it is enough to specify *acediari* (Sir. vi. 26), *acharis* (Sir. xx. 19 = 21), *allophyli* (Ps. lv. 1), *artaba* (Bel 2), *decachordus* (Ps. xci. 4), *diplois* (Ps. cviii. 29), *eleemosyna* (Tob. xi. 14 = 22), *Judaismus* (2 Macc. viii. 1), *neomenia* (Ps. lxxx. 4), *palatha* (Judith x. 5), *pentapolis* (Sap. x. 6), *poderis* (Sap. xviii. 24), *rhomphaea* (Sir. xxi. 4), *tympanistria* (Ps. lxvii. 26), *zelare* (Ps. lxxii. 3). Several of these words belong to ordinary post-Augustan Latin, but their use in the Vulgate may fairly be

ascribed to the influence of the LXX., usually through the O. L. The same may be said of many Vulgate reproductions of Hebrew names, e.g. Moyses, Balaam, Gomorrha, Gabaon, Jerusalem, Pharao, where the LXX. spelling or pronunciation has been retained, no doubt because of its familiarity.

The influence of the other Greek versions over Jerome’s great work, if less subtle and widely diffused, has been more direct, and in the matter of interpretation more important. Thus it was from Aquila that Jerome borrowed the following readings¹: Exod. ii. 5 in papyroine (‘A. ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παπυρεῶν); Deut. xxxiii. 12 quasi in thalamo morabitur (‘A. παστώσει); Job xiv. 12 donec alteratur caelum (‘A. ξως δὲν κατατρίβῃ οὐ φανός); Amos ii. 13 ego stridebo subter vos, sicut stridet plaustrum (‘A. τριζήσω...τρίζει); Jer. xlix. (xxix.) 19 ad pulcritudinem robustam (‘A. πρὸς εὐπρέπειαν στερεάν). His debts to Symmachus are still more numerous, and only a few can be given here²; Num. xxv. 8 in lupanar (Σ. εἰς τὸ πορνεῖον); Jos. x. 42 uno cepit impetu (Σ. ἡχομαλώτευσεν μὲν ὁμφαῖ); Jud. xv. 19 molarem dentem (Σ. τὴν μύλην); 1 Regn. ix. 24 quia de industria servatum est tibi (Σ. διὶ ἑπίτηθες τετήρηται σοι); 4 Regn. ii. 14 ubi est Dominus deus Eliae etiam nunc? (Σ. καὶ νῦν); Isa. liv. 8 in momento indignationis (Σ. ἐν ἀτόμῳ ὀργῆς); Ezek. viii. 10 in circuitu per totum (Σ. κύκλῳ διόλου). It may be added that not a few of the Greek words retained in the Vulgate are from the later versions and not from the LXX.; e.g. grabatus (Amos iii. 12, ’A.), laicus (1 Regn. xxi. 4, ’A. Σ. Θ.), lecythus (3 Regn. xvii. 12 ff.), tristegum (Gen. vi. 16, Σ.).

The subject is too large to be adequately handled in a single chapter. But enough has been said to indicate the nature and extent of the influence which the Greek versions and the Septuagint in particular have exercised over Christian thought and letters, both in East and West, and the conse-

¹ Field, Hexapla, i., p. xxiv.
² For other exx. see Field, op. cit., p. xxxiv.
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quent importance of these translations for the student of ecclesiastical history and literature. Bishop Pearson’s judgement as to the serviceableness of the LXX. to patristic students will always remain true: “si Graecos patres consulueris, quis eos de rebus divinis disserentes intelliget, qui normam quam semper in animo dum scriberent habuere non ante cognitam atque perspectam habeat?...sed ad Latinos patres non minus quam Graecos recte intelligendos LXX. viralis versio frequens utilis est, imo necessaria." He might have added that in the Latin Christendom of to-day the influence of the Greek versions is not extinct; the echoes of their text, their renderings, and their interpretations are still to be heard in the Bible, the worship, and the theology of the Western Church.


1 Praef. paraen., ed. E. Churton, p. 25 f.
CHAPTER VI.

TEXTUAL CONDITION OF THE LXX., AND
PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF IT.

1. When the work of the Seventy-two had been accomplished, the Jews of Alexandria (so the legend goes) were bidden to invoke curses, after their manner, upon any who should dare to add to the version or take from it, or alter it in other ways (Aristeas ad fin.: ἐκέλευσαν διαφανείᾳ, καθὼς ἦσος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν, εἰ τις διασκευάζει προστιθείς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιοῦμενος ἀφαίρεσιν). The imprecation, it has been acutely observed, may point to an early deterioration of the text of the Greek Pentateuch, which the Pseudo-Aristeas desired to check. This inference is insecure, for the story is sufficiently explained by a reference to such passages as Deut. iv. 2, xii. 321; but it is certain that textual corruption began before the Christian era. There are traces of it in the writings of Philo, which cannot be due to blunders in Philo’s own text.

E.g. in quis rer. div. her. 56 Philo quotes Gen. xv. 15 in the form now universal in MSS. of the LXX. (μετ᾽ εἰρήνης τραφείς ἐν γῇρῃ καλῷ), adding the comment: οὐκοῦν...τὸ τέλειον γένος... εἰρήνη καὶ ἐλευθερία βεβαιώση ἐντρεφόμενον κτλ. This is perhaps the most convincing example, but we may add Gen. xvi. 14 Βαράθ = ἐν κακοῖς (de fug. 38), i.e. Βαράκ (Luc.); xxi. 6 οὐ χαρεῖται μοι (de mut. nom. 24, where however, as in legg. all. ii. 21, iii. 78, quod det. pot. insid. sol. 33, Cohn and Wendland read συνγχ. μοι with cod. Aphil); Exod. xvii. 6 ἐστηκα πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας ἐγχωρεῖν (de somni. ii. 32, cf. B πρὸ τοῦ σε...ἐν

1 Cf. Apoc. xxii. 18 f.
Justin, as we have seen\(^5\), charges his Jewish contemporaries with the deliberate excision of numerous passages in the LXX. which were favourable to their Christian antagonists (\textit{diai. 71} πῶλας γραφᾶς τέλειον περείκουν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξεγήσεων τῶν γεγενημένων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαῖω γεγενημένων πρεσβυτέρων)\(^6\). But of the four passages produced in proof of his assertion three are mere glosses, probably of Christian origin; while the fourth, a genuine part of the book of Jeremiah (xi. 19), is now found in all MSS. of the LXX. The charge, though made in good faith, seems to have rested on no better foundation than a natural distrust of the Jews, who in Justin’s time were active and bitter opponents of the Church. It is equally improbable that the Greek O.T. was wilfully interpolated by Christians, or that, if they attempted this, the existing text has been affected by it to any appreciable extent. A few traces may be found of the accidental influence of N. T. citations, e.g. the interpolation in Ps. xiii. 3, and perhaps also the reading σῶμα in Ps. xxxix.; but apart from these, the Septuagint, during the first two centuries after Christ, suffered little from Christian hands beyond errors of transcription. What Dr Hort has written in reference to the N.T. is doubtless true also of the LXX.: “accusations of wilful tampering with the text are...

\(^{1}\) \textit{Eis σπέρμα} occurs in H. P. 71, which, as Dr Nestle informs me, shews other signs of affinity to the LXX. text of Philo.

\(^{2}\) It may be added that double renderings already appear in Philo. E.g. in citing Deut. xix. 14 his MSS. give \textit{οἱ πατέρες σου} (B) in \textit{de post. Caini} 25, but \textit{οἱ ποτέροι σου} (A) in \textit{de justitia} 3.

\(^{3}\) As in all our MSS. of Ps. xxxix.

\(^{4}\) See codd. B*AF* in Deut. i.c.

\(^{5}\) Above, p. 424.

\(^{6}\) Cf. \textit{diai. 120}; Iren. iii. 21. 1, 5; Eus. \textit{dem. ev.} vi. p. 257 c, d.
not unfrequent in Christian antiquity...but with a single exception, wherever they can be verified, they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text."

Accidental corruptions, however, and variations of reading and rendering grew apace, and in the third century Origen complains of the uncertainty of the Biblical text in both its parts (comm. in Matt. t. xv. 14 δηλονότι πολλή γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἰτε ἀπὸ βαθμίας τινῶν γραφέων εἰτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων εἰτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦτα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἡ ἀφαίρεσις). Besides intentional changes he notices elsewhere (1) double renderings: hom. in 1 Regn., i. 4 "non me latet...quod in aliquibus exemplaribus habetur erat vir quidam (ἀνθρωπός τις ἣν, codd. M, 44, &c.), sed in his exemplaribus quae emendatiora probavimus ita habetur, erat vir unus (A, ἐγένετο ἀνθρωπός εἰς)"; (2) transpositions: on Jer. xlvii. 4 he has the note ἥ τῶν ο' ἐν τοῖς τόποις μετατέθεισα ώστε τὰ πρῶτα υστερα καὶ τὰ υστερα πρῶτα γενέσθαι; (3) errors of transcription: in Jer. xv. 10, where most of his copies read, as ours do now, ὑφέλησα, ὑφέλησεν, he maintains that this reading is a γραφικὸν

---

1 Intr. to N.T. in Greek, p. 283. The one exception which Dr Hort mentions in connexion with the N.T., the excision practised by Marcion, finds no parallel in the Christian history of the Greek O.T.

2 A good example of corruption in the Greek is to be found in Num. iii. 24, where all Greek MSS. and the O.L. (Lyons Pentateuch) read Δαδὶ for Δαὰὴ (¹Ν). The name of Joshua's father in the LXX. is Ναὔη (O. L. Ναζε), probably in the first instance an error for Ναῦη (ΝΑΤΗ for NATN) = Νι. Another well-known instance is the A text of Jud. v. 8 σκέπη υπαίθρων σινομαστῶν ἄνήφθη καὶ σιμομάστης, which, as Ewald pointed out, conceals the doublet (1) σκέπη ἐὰν ἰδω καὶ σιμομάστης, (2) σκέπη ἐὰν ὀφθη καὶ σιμομάστης.

3 Though he is referring especially to MSS. of the N.T. his next words shew that the remark is meant to include the LXX.: τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνούσαν κτλ. (see, for the rest, above, p. 60).

4 The gravest instance of ἀφαίρεσις was found in the book of Job; see above, p. 255.
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ἀμάρτημα for ὡφείλθησα ὡφείλθησεν. Such faults were specially common in the case of proper names: in Ioann. t. vi. 41 τὸ δ' ὄμοιον 1 περὶ τὰ ὁνόματα σφάλμα πολλαγέω τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἐστιν ἰδεῖν, ὡς ἡκριβώσαμεν ἀπὸ Ἑβραίων μαθόντες, καὶ τῶν ἀντιγράφων αὐτῶν τὰ ἡμέτερα συγκρίναντες.

In these criticisms Origen makes no attempt to distinguish between supposed errors which are properly textual, and those which belong to the translation itself. His sole criterion of error was divergence from the official Hebrew, and he assumed that all divergences were textual only, the translation having been originally exact. Nevertheless there can be little doubt that in the course of four centuries many actual corruptions such as he describes must have accumulated in the MSS. of the LXX. The κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, as the uncorrected MSS. were called, needed revision, and the literary activity of the third century endeavoured to supply it. At Caesarea in Palestine, at Antioch, in Egypt, independent attempts were made to restore the Septuagint to its primitive purity. But the remedies which were adopted unhappily increased the disease. “The Hexapla, from its very nature, encouraged the formation of mixed texts 2”; the Hexaplaric recension, divorced from the rest of the work, accentuated this tendency, and the other recensions had a similar effect, although they aimed at the simpler task of correcting the errors of the κοινὴ.

2. Of the Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Hesychian recensions some account has been given already 3. In this place we have only to consider how far it is possible to employ them in the criticism of the text. Their importance to the critic of the LXX. lies in the fact that they were based upon copies of the κοινὴ, as it was read in Palestine, Syria, and Egypt during the

---

1 In the context Origen refers to the apparent confusion of Γάδαρα and Πέργεσα in the Gospels.
2 Driver, Samuel, p. xlvii.
3 See above, Part i. c. iii.
third century. But in order to recover from them this un-
revised text, two preliminary tasks have to be undertaken.
The recensions themselves must first, as far as possible, be
restored from existing materials, and we must then proceed
to eliminate from them such elements as are recensional, or
are due to the reviser's hand.

As to the first of these processes, the materials from
which it is proposed to recover the recensions are fairly
abundant and varied, but there is much uncertainty as to the
attribution of some of them, whilst others present a particular
recension only in certain books or portions of books, or with
more or less of mixture. The principal authorities for each
recension have already been mentioned, but it may be well
to collect them here in a compact form.

**Hexaplaric**\(^1\). Codd. G, M, Q; 15, 22, 38, 58, 72, 86, 88, 135, 137,
138, 139, 161, 248, 249, 250, 252, 255, 256, 258, 259, 264, 268, 273;
Paris Nat. Reg. gr. 129, 131, 132, Ars. 8415, Escurial Σ. 1. 16,
Leipzig gr. 301, Zurich c. 11, Athos Vatop. 516, Pantocr. 24,
Protaton. 53, Laur. γ. 112. Versions: Sahidic (in part), Arme­
nian (in part), Syro-hexaplar.

**Lucianic**\(^2\). Codd. 19, 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 82, 90, 93, 95, 108, 118,
144, 147, 153, 185, 231, 233, 306; Paris Coisl. gr. 184, Athens bibl.
nat. 44. Versions: Old'Latin, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Arme­
nian (in part), Slavonic. Fathers: Chrysostom, and other writers
of the School of Antioch\(^3\).

**Hesychian**\(^4\). Codd. Q, 26, 44, 49, 68, 74, 84, 87, 90, 91, 106,
107, 134, 198, 228, 238, 306. Paris suppl. gr. 609. Versions:
Bohairic, Armenian (in part). Cyril of Alexandria; other Egyp­
tian writers.

The fragments of the Hexapla have been collected by the
labours of a succession of scholars such as P. Morinus, Drusius,
Montfaucon, and especially Field, in whose *Origenis Hexa­
plorum quae supersunt* may be found all the remains of

\(^1\) For fuller information see pp. 78, 112 ff., 118 ff., 137 f., 140, 148 ff.
\(^2\) See pp. 82 ff., 93, 116 ff., 148 ff.
\(^3\) Lagarde would add (*Ankündigung*, p. 27) the writings of the Em­
peror Julian.
\(^4\) See pp. 80, 107 ff., 145, 148 ff., and on the recensions generally cf.
Origen's works which were available in 1875. These editions do not aim at restoring the text of the Hexaplaric LXX. in a connected form. Such a restoration, however, has been attempted in the case of Lucian's recension by Lagarde, who desired to see a similar work accomplished for the recension of Hesychius, and an edition in which the two texts should appear facing one another on opposite pages. When this had been done, he proposed (1) to eliminate from these any Hexaplaric matter, by comparing them with the fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; and (2) to collect the readings which departed most widely from the M. T. By this process he hoped that a point of departure would be reached from which the reconstruction of the LXX. might begin.

This scheme is worthy of the great scholar who initiated it, and it was the first serious effort to grasp the problem of scientific reconstruction. But its progress has been checked and perhaps finally stopped by its author's premature death, and its successful accomplishment under any circumstances was at least problematical. So long as no MS. or version presents an unmixed text of either Lucian or Hesychius, and much uncertainty remains as to the exact sources from which they are to be recovered, restorations of this kind cannot be regarded as more than tentative or provisional. Meanwhile, such attempts are not free from danger. Since the publication of Lagarde's edition, there has been a tendency on the part of Biblical students to cite it as 'Lucian,' without reserve. Lagarde himself is careful not to claim finality for his work; he describes it as "editionem...in gravioribus omnibus satis fidam," and looks forward to a more exact

1 See above, p. 83 f.
2 An earlier scheme is set forth in Genesis Graece, p. 21: "primum molior librum e codicum uncialium qui hexaplares non sunt...consensu haud raro certa coniectura emendando edendum...deinceps propositum est...editionem hexaplarem curare...tertio loco...adparatum criticum integrum adiungere cogito."
representation of Lucian's text: "conlatis codicibus versionibusque eam praebentibus et patrum ea utentibus excussis efficiendum erit ut etiam in minutioribus accurate edita dici merito possit." But this hope has not been fulfilled, and an edition of Lucian which falls short of exactness in smaller details cannot be directly used for the critical editing of the LXX. It has rendered valuable services in other departments of Biblical study, exhibiting sufficiently the characteristics of this recension, and repeatedly offering, especially in the four books of Kingdoms, renderings of a Hebrew text distinct from $\Xi$. But in the delicate task of reconstructing the Greek text, recourse must be had to the actual evidence which lies behind Lagarde's work. For this purpose it would seem to be more important to provide texts based upon groups of MSS., somewhat after the manner of the Collection of four important M.S.S. (the Ferrar-group) published by Dr T. K. Abbott. Doubtless such groups would mainly follow the lines of the ancient recensions, but the identification would not be complete, and the student would have before him not only the general result, but the whole of the evidence upon which it was based.

3. Perhaps a more lasting service was rendered to the textual criticism of the Septuagint by the axioms and principles which Lagarde's long study of the problem enabled him to lay down for the guidance of the student and the future editors. His early book Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbieng (1863) starts with the following axioms: (1) Since the MSS. of the LXX. are all directly or indirectly the result of an eclectic process, any attempt to restore the original text must also proceed on eclectic principles; and the critic must chiefly depend upon (a) his acquaintance with the style of the

1 Praef. xv.
several translators and (b) his faculty of referring readings to a Semitic original or, when they are not of Semitic origin, recognising them as corruptions of the Greek archetype. (2) Where the critic has to make choice between two readings, he will do well to prefer (a) a free translation to one which is slavishly exact, and (b) a translation based upon another Hebrew text to one which represents the M.T. In the preface to his Lucianic Septuagint, published twenty years later, three principles are asserted: (1) A critical text of the Greek O.T. cannot be based on the authority of any one MS. or without regard to the grouping of MSS.; (2) the restoration of the text common to any one family must not be regarded as more than a step forward in the right direction; (3) even a critical text, when reached by these or other means, will not be free from the element of uncertainty.

Lagarde's own words are as follows: Anmerkungen, p. 3: "nur drei axiome schicke ich voraus: I. die manuscripte der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments sind alle entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens: darum muss, wer den echten text wiederfinden will, ebenfalls eklektiker sein. Sein maasstab kann nur die kenntniss des styles der einzelnen übersetzer, sein haupthilfsmittel muss die fähigkeit sein, die ihm vorkommenden lesarten auf ihr semitisches original zurückzuführen oder aber als original-griechische verderbnisse zu erkennen. II. wenn ein vers oder verstheil in einer freien und in einer sklavisch treuen übertragung vorliegt, gilt die erstere als die echte. III. wenn sich zwei lesarten nebeneinander finden, von denen die eine den masoretischen text ausdrückt, die andre nur aus einer von ihm abweichenden urschrift erklärt werden kann, so ist die letztere für ursprünglich zu halten." Libr. V.T. can. i. p. xvi.: "tenenda tria esse aio: [1] editionem veteris testamenti graeci curari non posse ad unius alicuius codicis auctoritatem, sed conlatis integris codicum familiis esse curandum: nam familiis non accedere auctoritatem a codicibus, sed codicibus a familis: [2] unius alicuius familiae editionem nihil esse nisi procedendi ulterior adominiculum: [3] errare qui si quando ipsa manus veterum interpretum inventa sit, in ea legenda adquiesci debere perhibeant, quum conlatis vetera emendandi periculis omnibus indagandum sit quae explicationis veteris testamenti per quatuor saecula fata
fuerint, ut tandem aliquando pateat quam incerta in hoc litera-
rum genere omnia sint, et quam multa nulla alia re nisi coniec-
tura nitantur sciorum, superstitionis, desperantium."

4. These principles have been stated at length, because they are fruitful in themselves, and they mark an important step in the progress of LXX. textual criticism. But it is obvious that they do not form a complete and coherent code of critical canons. Indeed, Lagarde's later axioms to some extent limit and correct the earlier, for the recognition of the principle of grouping the MSS. and taking their evidence according to families evidently serves as a check upon the extreme eclecticism recommended in the first axiom of 1863. Nevertheless the series forms an excellent starting-point for a brief discussion of the problems which lie before the future critical editor of the LXX. and the principles by which he must be guided.

By a singular accident the first two printed editions of the Greek Old Testament exhibit on the whole the Lucianic and Hesychian texts respectively¹, whilst the Roman edition of 1587 and the Oxford edition of 1707—20 are roughly representative of the two great uncial codices, B and A. Thus the earlier editors anticipated, though imperfectly and (in the case of the Complutensian and Aldine Septuagints) unwittingly, the two methods of editing the Greek O. T. which are still in use. Of the advantages and disadvantages of the recensional method, enough has been said. The other, which consists of printing the text of a single MS., with or without an apparatus criticus, is clearly desirable only in the case of a MS. which sufficiently represents an important type of text, and may thus be profitably used as a standard of comparison. Such are the two great uncials already mentioned.

Cod. B, as was pointed out by Dr Hort², "on the whole

¹ Cornill, Ezechiel, p. 79: "ein wunderbar glücklicher Zufall hätte uns somit in der Aldine im Großen und Ganzen den Hesych gegeben, wie die Complutensis im Großen und Ganzen den Lucian darstellt."

² See O.T. in Greek, p. xi. f.
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presents the version of the Septuagint in its relatively oldest form.” Taken as a whole, it is neutral in its relation to the recensions of the third and fourth centuries; its text is neither predominantly Lucianic nor Hesychian nor Hexaplaric. Cornill, indeed, was at one time led by certain appearances in the B text of Ezekiel to believe that in that prophet at least the scribe of B had extracted his text from the fifth column of the Hexapla, or rather, from the edition of Eusebius and Pamphilus. Lagarde, however, at once pointed out the difficulties which beset Cornill’s theory, and Hort, in a letter to the Academy (Dec. 24, 1887), dismissed it with the remark, “What Cornill does seem to me to have proved is that in Ezekiel B and the LXX. text of the Hexapla have an element in common at variance with most other texts”; adding, “The facts suggest that B in the Septuagint was copied from a MS. or MSS. partially akin in text to the MS. or MSS. from which Origen took the fundamental text for the LXX. column of his Hexapla.” Eventually Cornill withdrew his suggestion, observing that the forms of the proper names in B shew no sign of having been influenced by Origen’s corrections.

If we accept Dr Hort’s view, which at present holds the field, the Vatican MS. in the O. T. as a whole carries us back to the third century text known to Origen, and possibly to one much earlier. In other words, not only is the Vatican MS. our oldest MS. of the Greek Bible, but it contains, speaking quite generally, the oldest text. But it would be an error to suppose that this is true in regard to every context or even every book,

---

1 See his Ezechiel, pp. 84, 95. The theory was suggested by an early hypothesis of Lagarde (Anmerkungen, p. 3) that the text of B was extracted from a glossed codex.

2 In Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen, 1886 (reprinted in Mittheilungen, ii. p. 49 ff.).


4 Gött. gelehrte Nachrichten, xxx. (1888, p. 194 ff.).
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and a still graver error to treat the text of B as necessarily representing everywhere the original Septuagint. As Mr Burkitt has pointed out, "the O.L. and the Hexaplar text convict B here and there of interpolation, especially in Isaiah." "Certainly (he writes in another place) in the books of Kings it is free from some of the gross interpolations which have befallen most other MSS. But it cannot claim to transmit to us an unrevised text of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. Many of its readings shew marks of irregular revision and the hand of an editor. As a result of this critical process, B sometimes tends to agree with the Massoretic text where other LXX authorities represent a widely different underlying Hebrew. B also contains a certain number of widely spread corruptions that are of purely Greek origin, which are absent from earlier forms of the LXX such as the Old Latin. In certain books the general character of B breaks down altogether, i.e. the archetype of B in those books was of another kind. Thus in Judges B was formerly suspected of representing the Hesychian recension, whilst a living scholar has hinted that it may give the text of a translation not earlier than the fourth century A.D. The Cambridge editors of the A text of Judges wisely content themselves with "the surmise that [as regards B and A in this book] the true text of the Septuagint is probably contained neither in the one nor in the other exclusively, but must be sought for by comparing in detail, verse by verse, and word by word, the two recensions, in the light of all other available evidence,

1 Tyconius, p. cxvii.
2 Aquila, p. 19.
3 An interesting and plausible specimen of this class of errors occurs in 4 Regn. iii. 21 B, καὶ εἶπον "Ω (A, with Ἰκαὶ ἐπέλαθεν). The process of corruption is evident (ἐπιταγοῦ, εἰπταγοῦ, εἰπτονῶ). In Sirach instances are especially abundant, e.g. xliii. 17 ὑπειδίκτα (A, ὁδίκτα); 23 ὑψωτευσαν αὐτὴν Ἰσραήλ (H. P. 248 ἐφ. ἐν αὐτῇ νησίοις); 26 εὐωδίᾳ τέλος (248 εὐδοκεῖ ὁ ἄγγελος).
4 Grabe, ep. ad Millium (1705).
5 Moore, Judges, p. xliii.
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and especially of the extant remains of the Hexapla\(^1\)—a remark which is capable of a much wider application\(^2\).

Cod. A, the great rival of cod. B, "exhibits a text which has been systematically corrected so as to agree more closely with the Hebrew\(^3\)." "In all four books of Kings and in some other parts A has been conformed to the Hexaplar text...In fact A is often little more than a transcript of the fourth column of the Hexapla, but without the critical signs by which Origen's additions were marked off from the rest\(^4\)." In other words, adaptation to the Hebrew has been effected not by direct use of the official Hebrew text, but through the medium of Origen's work. Thus, if B represents in part the text which lay before Origen when he began his task, A, at least in the historical books, answers roughly to the result at which he arrived.

Yet A is very far from being, even in the earlier books, a mere reproduction of the Eusebian recension. It has been extensively hexaplarised, but it possesses a large element of ancient readings which are not Hexaplaric, and which it shares, to a great extent, with the Lucianic family. Moreover, as we have already seen, the citations of the LXX. in the N. T. and by Christian writers of the first three centuries, often support the readings of A with a remarkable unanimity\(^5\). These phenomena point to the presence in A of an underlying text of great antiquity, possibly a pre-Christian recension made in Syria\(^6\). It must be observed, however, that the text of this MS. is not

---

2 On the B text of Sirach and Tobit see above, pp. 271, 274.
3 Driver, Samuel, p. 1.
5 Above, pp. 395 f., 403, 413, 422.
6 It is, however, possible that the readings in B, which have no such support and are indeed almost unique, belong to a still earlier text of the LXX., which had not received Palestinian revision. Cf. p. 429.
homogeneous throughout. The Psalms are evidently copied from a Psalter written for ecclesiastical use, and it is interesting to notice how constantly A here appears in company with the later liturgical Psalters R and T, and with the seventh century corrector of $N$ known as $N^{c-a}$. In the Prophets $N^{AQT}$ are in frequent coalition against B, and in agreement with the group which is believed to be representative of the Hesychian recension.

As to cod. $N$ it is more difficult to form a judgement. We are still dependent for its text on Tischendorf's facsimiles. Moreover, with the exception of a few fragments of Genesis and Numbers, larger portions of 1 Chronicles and 2 Esdras, and the Books of Esther, Judith and Tobit, 1 and 4 Maccabees, this MS. is known to us only in the poetical and prophetical books. Notes at the end of 2 Esdras and Esther claim for the MS. that in those books it was corrected by the aid of a copy of the Hexaplaric text written under the supervision of Pamphilus. But the first hand of $N$ often agrees with A against B, and the combinations $N^{ART}$ in the Psalms, $N^{AC}$ in the other poetical books, and $N^{AQ}$ in the Prophets, are not uncommon. In Tobit, as we have seen, $N$ follows a recension which differs widely from B. On the whole, however, it comes nearer to B than any of the other uncials, often confirming its characteristic or otherwise unique readings. Cod. C is yet more fragmentary and its fragments are limited to the poetical books which follow the Psalter.

Thus if a single uncial MS. is to be adopted as a standard of comparison, it is obvious that either A or B must be chosen for the purpose, and B is to be preferred as being freer from Hexaplaric interpolations and offering generally a more neutral text. The latter MS. has therefore been employed by recent editors, and this course is probably the best that can be

1 See above, p. 75.
followed. But the method of editing the text of a single MS. leaves much to be desired, for, as Lagarde rightly insists, no single MS. and no single family of MSS. can be regarded as a trustworthy or sufficient representative of the original LXX.

5. There remains the alternative of constructing a critical text. This can only be done by the scientific use of all existing materials. The task which lies before the critical editor of the LXX. is partly similar to that of the N. T. editor, and partly sui generis. The general principles which will guide him are those which have been expounded by Dr Hort in the second part of Introduction to the N. T. in Greek. The documents moreover fall into the same three classes: (1) MSS., (2) versions, (3) literary citations; although in the case of the LXX., the versions are 'daughter-versions' and not based upon an original text, and the citations are not limited to post-apostolic Christian writers, but may be gathered also from Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament. But in the application of the principles of criticism to these documents the critic of the LXX. must strike out a path for himself. Here his course will partly be shaped by the fact that he is dealing with a version and not with an original text, and by the history of the transmission of the version, which is only to a limited extent identical with that of the transmission of the Greek New Testament.

(a) The first business of the critic of the LXX. is to review the documentary evidence which is available for his use. This has been already described at some length (MSS., pp. 122—170; Versions, pp. 87—121; Citations, pp. 369—432). The preliminary work of preparing these materials for use is still in progress. We now have access to photographic reproductions

2 Ed. 2 (1896), pp. 19—72.
3 The original text may be regarded as the primary document for the text of the version.
of codd. ABGLQ, facsimiles or printed texts of NCDEFGKO RTUZTII, and collations of the remaining uncials, and of a large number of the cursive. But the facsimiles are more or less inadequate, and the older collations of unpublished MSS. need careful verification. To turn to the versions, the fragments of the Old Latin are now for the most part accessible in carefully edited but scattered texts, and the more important of the Egyptian and Syriac versions have received much attention; but the Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Georgian and Slavonic are still but partially explored. Good progress is being made in the editing of Philo, Josephus, and the Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin. Thus, while much remains to be done in the way of perfecting the apparatus criticus of the Greek O.T., there is an abundance of materials ready for immediate use, and every prospect that in a few years the store will be largely increased.

(b) When an editor has been found who is competent to undertake reconstruction, he will probably desire to limit himself to that one task, after the example of the editors of the New Testament in Greek\(^1\), and his resources, if not as abundant as those of the N.T. editors, will be both sufficient and trustworthy. But with the materials thus ready to his hand, how is he to proceed? As in the case of the New Testament, he will begin by interrogating the history of his text. Here there are certain landmarks to guide him at starting. As we have seen, the three recensions which in the fourth century had a well-defined local distribution, have been connected with groups of extant documents—two of them quite definitely, the third with some probability. Other groups representing less clearly recognised families have emerged from recent enquiries, such as that which yields the text characteristic of the catenae (H. P. 14, 16, 28, 52, 57, 73, 73).

\(^1\) Cf. Hort, Intr.\(^2\), p. 90.
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77, Paris Reg. Gr. 128, and many others), the pair H. P. 54, 75, with which 59 may also to some extent be classed, and the codices which correspond more or less closely with cod. A and cod. B respectively. It is probable that as the collation and examination of MSS., versions, and fathers proceed, other groups, or other members of the groups already mentioned, will come to light, leaving an ever diminishing number of documents which present a text either too mixed or too peculiar to be classified.

(c) In operating upon the groups thus obtained the critical editor will possess two chief aids towards the discrimination of ancient elements from those which are later or recensional. (1) While the East in Jerome's time was divided between the Lucianic, Hesychian, and Hexaplaric texts, the great Western dioceses, Carthage, Milan, and Rome, read the LXX. under the guise of a Latin version, beneath which originally lay a Greek text anterior to the Hexapla itself. Consequently, the Old Latin, in its purest types, carries us behind all our existing MSS., and is sometimes nearer to the Septuagint, as the Church received that version from the Synagogue, than the oldest of our uncial MSS. Readings which have disappeared from every known Greek MS. are here and there preserved by the daughter-version, and in such cases the O.L. becomes a primary authority for the Greek text. But besides these occasional contributions of a direct nature, this version is of the highest value as enabling the critical editor to detect pre-Origenic readings and to distinguish them from those which are later or recensional. In regard to the latter point the test is not an absolute one, because it is always possible that the reading on which an O.L. rendering is based was one of two or more that were both current in the \textit{kouvē} before Origen's time. (2) But the O.L. is not our only witness to the read-

\footnote{Burkitt, \textit{Tyconius}, p. cxvii. f.}
ings of the κοινή. Its evidence may often be checked and confirmed by that of the Syro-Hexaplar and the fragments of the Hexaplaric Greek, where the obeli and asterisks distinguish readings which existed in Origen’s MSS. from those which were interpolated from other sources, or rewritten with their aid.

(d) By such means the critic may often satisfy himself that he has reached the text of the Septuagint as it was found in Christian MSS. of the third, perhaps even of the second century. It is another question how far the κοινή έκδοσις of the Christian Church was identical with the pre-Christian text or texts of Alexandria and Jerusalem. Early citations from the LXX. suggest a diversity of readings and possibly the existence of two or more recensions in the first century, and lead us to believe that many of the variations of our MSS. have come down from sources older than the Christian era.

Here our documentary evidence fails us, and we have to fall back upon the ‘internal evidence of readings.’ The variants which remain after eliminating Hexaplaric matter, and recensional changes later than the Hexapla, resolve themselves into two classes; viz. (1) readings which affect merely the Greek text, such as (a) corruptions obvious or possible, or (b) doublets, whether brought together in a conflate text, or existing in different MSS.; and (2) readings which presuppose a difference in the original. In dealing with both classes much help may be obtained from Lagarde’s earlier axioms.

In detecting corruptions the student must chiefly depend on his faculty of recognising a Semitic original under Greek which does not directly suggest it; in deciding between double renderings, he will set aside that which bears marks of correction or of assimilation to the official Hebrew or to later Greek versions based

1 On this point see Burkitt, Aquila, p. 33 f.
2 Above, p. 484 f.
upon it, choosing that which is freer, less exact, and perhaps less grammatical, as being probably nearer to the work of the original translator. Lastly, when the variants imply divergent Hebrew texts, he will prefer, ceteris paribus, that which departs from the Massoretic text. The application of these rules, however, calls for knowledge and judgement of no ordinary kind.

6. It cannot be doubted that the future will produce a school of critics competent to deal with the whole question of Septuagint reconstruction, and that a critical edition of the Old Testament in Greek will hereafter take its place on the shelves of the scholar's library by the side of the present New Testament in Greek or its successor. Meanwhile some immediate wants may be mentioned here. (1) Several important uncial MSS. still need to be reproduced by photography, particularly codd. θ, F, R, V, T; and the process might well be extended to some of the weightier cursives. (2) Texts of which photographs have been published, or of which verified transcripts or collations exist, deserve in some cases detailed examination, with the view of determining their precise character in the several books or groups of books, and their relation to one another and to a common standard, such as the text of B. (3) The stores of fresh Hexaplaric matter which have accumulated during the quarter of a century since the publication of Field's great book, will soon be sufficient to form a supplementary volume, which might also contain the corrections supplied by photography and by the more exact collation of Hexaplaric MSS. (4) Is it too much to hope that the University which has the honour of having issued from its Press the Septuagint of Holmes and Parsons

---

1 On the scope for conjecture where evidence fails, see Hatch, Essays, p. 281, where some other remarks are to be found which deserve attention but need sifting and safeguarding.

2 These will be digested in the second fasciculus of Mr Redpath's Supplement to the Oxford Concordance.
may see fit to reprint at least the apparatus of that monumental work with such emendations and abbreviations as it may be possible to adopt without seriously interfering with the scope and method of the edition? It is improbable that a collection of all the evidence on so vast a scale will ever be attempted again, and until this has been done, Holmes and Parsons cannot be superseded as a storehouse of facts. (5) A proposal was made by Dr Nestle at the London Oriental Congress of 1892 to compile a ‘Variorum Septuagint,’ giving the text of B with marginal variants sufficient to correct the errors of that MS. There can be little doubt that such an edition would be serviceable, especially if the scheme could be so far extended as to include a selection from all the variants, after the manner of the English ‘Variorum Bible.’ (6) Every student of the Old Testament will wish success to the undertaking which is now in progress at the Cambridge Press. Although the text of the Larger Septuagint will be simply that of the standard MS. employed in the manual edition, its apparatus will for the first time present to the critical scholar the essential documentary evidence, verified with scrupulous care, and arranged in a form at once compendious and helpful to research.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

Page 3, note 1, read Ἑλεάζη.

6, line 4. On the Ptolemies consult, in addition to books cited, J. P. Mahaffy, History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic dynasty (1900).

17. See also Willrich, Juden u. Griechen, vor der makkabäischen Erhebung (Göttingen, 1895).

27, line 19, read L. Cappellus.

105, note 6. See also Brightman, in J. Th. St. 1. ii., p. 254.

140, line 18 f., for a complete collation, read an edition.

150, line 1. Add Hexaplaric.

169, line 10. Add M. Faulhaber, Die Propheten-catenen nach röm. Handschriften (Freiburg i. B., 1899).


271, note 3. An edition of Sirach as given by cod. 248 will shortly be published by the Cambridge University Press.

282, note 3, for Babr. read Bals.

286. To the literature on Sirach add H. Herkenne, De veteris latinæ Ecclesiastici capitibus i.—xliii. (Leipzig, 1899).


319, note 3, for Hos. i. 6 ἣλ. read Hos. ii. 23 (25) ἡγαπημένη, and dele ἠ χ οὐ. Also for Isa. vii. 6 συνλ. read Ps. lxxxiii. 7 δῶς εἰ, Dan. vii. 22 (LXX.) εὖθη.

380. To the literature on Philo add L. Massebieau, Le classement des œuvres de Philon (in Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, i. pp. 1—91).

449, line 29, read πνεῦμα.

472, line 29, add θυσία ἀνάσεως (Lev. vii. 3 f., Ps. xlix. 14, 23).
APPENDIX.

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS
ADDENDA

The following are noteworthy emendations and readings adopted in the edition of Wendland and Mendelssohn, which appeared too late for any use to be made of it in constructing the present text.

519. 3 υπομιμησεων conj Diels | 10 διακεi. Την προαιρεσwν εχοντες |
523. 6 τοιουτο Του βασιλεως προσταξων, οοιoi | 24 παντε και | 524. 8 αυτo] |
autos cum Jos | 527. 24 κατα πολλοις τροπoις (cf πολυμερωs Jos) | 529. 18 |
eπι τα της] επιταγης bene conj Mend. (cf 537. 20) | 531. 3 ομιωσ <κατω |
ta> κατα την | 4 διαγλυψης ωστε και κατ αμφοτερα | 6 om ωστε | 532. 2 |
evαργωs | 3 προηγημενα | 533. 14 εατηκη | 534. 21 συμμετρωs εχουαν | 24 το |
kλιμα των λειτουργωνων ωρεωn conj Mend. | 536. 11 ωστε υπολαμβανεν |
recte ut vid | 537. 28 αυτην την προς φυλακην | 538. 16 παντα μετα δαιμο-
λειαs | 539. 23 υπεβησαν | 24 εκατονταρουεοι (Mahaffy, Class. Rev. VIII. |
349) | 541. 2 και εκενωs αυτος χωρις (sine punct) | 4 παισαι] και ημας |
Mend. | 5 ευ φρονισεωs | 542. 3 παντελωs δεισιδαιμωνωs | 545. 10 τω σημει-
ουσθαι | 548. 14 κεχρημενoυ | 550. 14 o de αρχεδεατρος (conj Letrone: Jos |
hab o de επι της των ξενων αποδοχης τεταγμενοι) | 17 πολεις εθεσων ιδιωs |
συγχρωναται | 552. 2 εκαστα <καλλιστα> πρατταi | 556. 12 η πολειρ] περι-
πολειw | 557. 25 παρ εαυτoν | 560. 14 ανυποτηδη] | 15 ην | 562. 5 το de |
eπιδεσθαι παιδια σωφρ. | 8 ξενητεια | 563. 22 ευ ξενητεια | 566. 3 οραται] ορ-
μαται conj Mend. | 568. 17 γινομεναι βιω συμφορον και καθηκον | 569. 2 ut] |
eπ Mend. | 570. 3 ειπα πελονα κα] ει πεπλευνακα bene conj Mend. | |
16 ημερας <ωρας > ο βασι. | 21 παντων] παρα των conj Wendland | 573. 16 |
pολυωριας (cf 565 fin: Mahaffy, Class. Rev. VIII. 349).

CORRIGENDA

532. 16 text. et app. crit. Pro χρυσωι lege χρυσως | 542. 25 app. crit. |
Pro θεος ειη cor} Wendland] lege θεος ειη ex conj] θεωθειη conj Wendland |
561. 2 app. crit. Pro θεων conj Wendland lege δεων θεων conj Mend.
INTRODUCTION.

The so-called letter of Aristeas to Philocrates appeared first in print in a Latin translation by Matthias Palmerius of Pisa (Rome, 1471). The editio princeps of the Greek text was not published until 1561, when Simon Schard brought out at Basle a text based apparently on an Italian MS., with a few readings taken from a second (Vatican) MS. The particular MS. which was followed in this earliest edition the present writer has not been able to discover. But there exists in the Library at Basle (MS. O. IV. 1o, no. 21 in Omont's Catalogue of Swiss MSS.) a MS. presented to it by Schard, which is beyond a doubt a copy of the Vatican MS. denoted by K in the present text; and a list of readings appended to Schard's edition under the heading 'castigationes in Aristeam juxta exemplar Vaticanae' appears to be a scanty selection of the readings of K. Schard's edition was followed by others in the seventeenth century based upon his work; but it does not appear that any fresh collation of MSS. was undertaken. Until 1870 the latest edition of the text was that which Hody prefixed to his work De Bibliorum Textibus, published at Oxford in 1705. This was merely a reprint of the text of Schard, Hody naively confessing in his preface that he did not consider the work of collating MSS. of a work of such doubtful authenticity to be worth the trouble. 'Non me fugit servari in Bibliotheca Regia Parisina, alisque quibusdam, exemplaria istius MSS. Sed de tali opusculo, quod tanquam foetum supposititium penitus rejicio, Amicos solici­tare, et in Partes longinquas mittere, vix operae pretium existimavi. Eas curas relinquo illis, quibus tanti esse res videbitur.'

The first step towards a critical edition of the text was taken by Moriz Schmidt, who in 1870 brought out in Merx's Archiv (Band 1.) a text based on a complete collation of two Paris MSS., which he denoted by B and C, and a partial collation of a third, A, which was used to supply the opening of the letter which was missing in B and C. Schmidt's edition, though a valuable begin­ning, is far from satisfactory. A full use was not made of the evidence for the text afforded by the paraphrase of Josephus and the extracts of Eusebius. Moreover a large number of MSS. of the letter is now known to exist; and fresh light has been thrown on the language by the papyri of the Ptolemaic period which have at various times been discovered in Egypt.

The valuable help which these papyri offer as an illustration of the letter, shewing that the writer possessed an accurate knowledge

1 The earlier editions are enumerated by Schmidt in his preface to the text (Merx, Archiv, Bd. 1. 1870).
of the official titles and phraseology of the Ptolemaic court, was first pointed out by Prof. Lumbroso. He says¹, 'Depuis quarante ans, un rayon de lumière inattendu a jailli des inscriptions et des papyrus, qui jette sur elle un jour nouveau; chose frappante: il n'est pas un titre de cour, une institution, une loi, une magistrature, une charge, un terme technique, une formule, un tour de langue remarquable dans cette lettre, il n'est pas un témoignage d'Aristée concernant l'histoire civile de l'époque, qui ne se trouve enregistré dans les papyrus ou les inscriptions et confirmé par eux². A close examination of the larger evidence from the papyri now available will probably corroborate the opinion, to which other evidence seems to point, that the letter was written under some one of the later Ptolemies. In any case the evidence of the papyri is an important factor to be taken into account in establishing a text.

Another illustration of the text is afforded by a kindred work, also dealing with the history of the Jews of Egypt under the Ptolemaic rule, the third Book of Maccabees³.

Prof. Lumbroso further supplemented Schmidt's work upon the text by collating the Paris MS. A throughout, and also a MS. in the British Museum (F), and one at Venice (G); he also indicated the existence of five MSS. in the Vatican, but it does not appear that he has published any collations of these Roman MSS.

In 1893 the want of an edition of the letter was represented to the present writer, and in a journey to Italy in the autumn of that year he collated the five Vatican MSS. mentioned by Lumbroso (HKLM), and one in the library of the Barberini palace (P), and revised the collations which had already been made of the MSS. at Venice (G) and Paris (ABC); at Paris he also collated the fragment Q and the MS. D, so far as was necessary to establish the fact that it was a copy of A. He has since collated a MS. at Florence (T) and another at Zurich (Z). On his learning subsequently that Prof. Mendelssohn of Dorpat had for many years been preparing an edition of the letter, which was nearly ready, the work which he had begun was put aside. Prof. Mendelssohn's death postponed the appearance of the expected German edition; a fragment only, consisting of the text of about

¹ Recherches sur l'Économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides, par G. Lumbroso (Turin, 1870), p. xiii.
² Some instances are the titles ἀρχισωματοφύλακες, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χρεών, χρηματισται, οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν ταγμάτων (cf. ταγματικὸς ὑπηρέταις Wilcken, Actenstücke Pap. VIII.), the position assigned to the ἀρχισωματοφύλακας Nicanor as a major domo (cf. Peyron, Turin Papyri 1. 2. 25, the position of ὁ βασιλικὸς ἱερός), the phrase ἐὰν φαίνεται, the correct use of εὐτύχει at the close of a petition from a subordinate to a higher official, the words ἐκατοντάραυροι and παρείρεσις, the phrase παραγένεσθαί εἰς τῶν τότων.
³ Cf. especially 3 Maccabees iii. 25—28 (προστετάχαμεν—διειλήφαμεν—μηδενὶ δὲ τῶν βουλόμενον) with Ar. p. 523. 23 ff. (προστετάχαμεν—διειλήφαμεν—τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον προσαγγέλλειν).
a fifth of the letter with commentary but without introduction, was published soon after his death\. The remainder of his work, it is understood, has been put into the hands of Prof. Wendland, whose edition has been expected for some time past. Wendland has already brought out a German translation of the letter in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, which has been used in constructing the present text. The German edition not however having appeared, the present writer was entrusted by Dr Swete with the preparation of a text of the letter, to form an Appendix to his Introduction to the Septuagint. Although there are doubtless more MSS. in existence than those which have been used, and although the text in several passages still remains uncertain, it is hoped that the work which has been done may be of some service in grouping the MSS. and preparing the way for a final edition.

The following genealogical table will show approximately how the MSS. are related to each other.

```
    Ω
     |
    a
     |
    β
     |
    γ δ
     |
    H G I T
     |
    1000 1100 1200 1300 1400 1500 1600
```

\[1\] *Aristaeae quae fertur ad Philocratem epistulae initium*, ed. L. Mendelssohn et M. Krascheninnikov (Dorpat, 1897).

\[2\] It has appeared in the Teubner series of Greek and Latin writers (Leipzig, 1900) as the present sheets were being passed through the press.
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The MSS. denoted in the above table are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Vat. 747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Paris 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Paris 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. Burney 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Vat. 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Vat. 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Basle O. iv. 10 (Omont 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Venice 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Palat. 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ottobon. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Paris 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Florence Laur. Acquisti 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Paris 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Paris 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Barberini iv. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Vat. 1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Zurich Bibl. de la Ville C. 11 (Omont 169)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that the MSS. fall into two main groups, which may for convenience be described as the A and B groups, the A group again falling into two smaller groups HKA and GIM, and the B group into two smaller groups TB and CPSZ. The real problem in fixing the text is to determine the relative value of the A and B groups. An examination of the readings shows, in the opinion of the present writer, that the B group, which was followed by Schmidt, while presenting a specious text, is in reality based on a recension, although in a few passages it has kept the original readings; in the A group no correction has taken place, and though the text which has here been handed down is not altogether free from corruption, yet the true reading is in most cases rather to be looked for here than in the revised B text.

The group HA(DFL)K(R).


12. Letter of Theodoret to Hypatius. καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν φιλομαθεὶς ἄνδρεσ—εἰς προοίμων τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς.

13. Catena of Theodoret and other patristic writers on the Octateuch.

259. τόσαι παραδόσεις εἰσὶ τῆς θελας γραφῆς.

260. ποσάκις καὶ ποτε ἐπορθήθησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.

A beautiful MS., in clearly written cursive characters, which hang from ruled lines, containing coloured illustrations throughout (five in the Aristeas portion), ornamental red head-pieces and red initial letters in the margin. Single column, 48 lines in a page: size of page $14 \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $11\frac{1}{4} \times 7 \frac{3}{4}$ in.

The Catena is apparently by the same hand as the Aristeas, the LXX. text being in the same size of writing as the Aristeas, and the marginal Catena in smaller writing (80 lines in a page). There is one large omission in the Aristeas, two leaves of the MS. apparently having been lost. The verso of fol. 3 ends with τὴν τραπέζαν (p. 530. 8), and λέιπει is written in an early hand at the foot of the page; fol. 4 begins with μὲν πεδινῶν (538. 11) and $\div$ is written in the margin.
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fol. 1. Aristeas.
29. Theodoret to Hypatius.
19vo. Catena on Genesis.

Size of page 12½ x 9 in., of writing 10½ x 7¼ in.: 38 lines in a page. The leaves at the beginning are soiled and worm-eaten. The words hang from ruled lines: the right-hand margin is irregular, the writing going beyond the perpendicular line in places. The writing is upright with very thick strokes, clear, but rather untidy.

R, CODEX BASILEENSIS. Basle. Codd. Gr. O. IV. 10 (Omont 21). This MS., written in the sixteenth century, apparently for Schard's edition, but only very sparingly used by him in an appendix of readings, is clearly a direct transcript of the preceding MS. This may be shown by the following instances out of many:


26. Theodoret to Hypatius.
27. Preface to Genesis from Gregory of Nyssa, inc. ἐπειδὴ περ ελπιδογιμου πρὸς θεογνωσιαν...
28. Catena on the Octateuch.
608. On the versions of Holy Scripture, the names of God, etc.

Single column: words hang from ruled lines, 47 lines in a page: a neat writing in brown ink, initial letters in crimson: size of page 14½ x 10½ in., of writing 11 x 7 in. A hand of the fourteenth century (Lumbroso 2) has added some marginal notes (on Theopompus and Theodectes, a saying of Alexander the Great, etc.), many of which are rubbed and almost illegible, but they may be read in D which has copied them. Montfaucon (Bibl. Bibliothecarum, II. 725) mentions this MS., and describes it as written 'manu XII. circiter saeculi.' On p. 610 is written a note, + ιουν ευ (?) ταντα εις δοξαν [θὺ καὶ τῆς αγίας τριαδός φιλα [ψ φιλλα] τριακοσια γ ητω (?)] + .

1 Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse (Leipzig, 1886).
Descendants of A (DFL).


1. Aristeas.
26vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.
27. Gregory of Nyssa’s Preface.
28. Catena on Genesis and Exodus, 1—12.

The rest of the Catena and the remaining matter contained in A are to be found in MS. Paris 132, written by the same hand as D. Omont’s Catalogue describes the MS. as ‘copied by George Gregoropoulos’; Omont takes this apparently from the 1740 catalogue which says ‘videtur a Gregoropulo exaratus’; the name of the scribe does not seem to occur in the MS. A clearly written MS. in a hand similar to that of M (of the same century). Page 13½ × 9½ in. writing 9 × 5½ in. Another hand has underlined in red ink passages where there are clerical errors and has corrected the text to that of A. This MS. was not collated throughout, as it appeared certain from an examination of a few passages that it was a copy of A (see below).


Same contents as A, viz.

21. Theodoret to Hypatius.
22. Passages from Gregory of Nyssa’s book on the six days of creation.
25. Catena on the Octateuch.
643. πῶσαν παραδόσεις κ.τ.λ.
644. ποσάκις καὶ ποτὲ ἑπορθήθησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ.
644. Evagrius Scitensis on the ten names of God.
645. Three chronological notes.
645. On the works of God in the six days.


1. Aristeas.
12. Theodoret to Hypatius.
13. Catena on Genesis and Exodus.

The portion of the MS. containing the Catena is certainly old (eleventh or twelfth century) and possibly a copy of H or of an ancestor of H. There are the same illustrations of O.T. history as in H, better preserved but not so beautifully painted. The writing too is rougher, not so neat as in H, but in the same style. The Aristeas (together with the letter to Hypatius and the first page of the Catena) is supplied by a much later hand on white shiny unruled parchment, the Catena being on a browner parchment, and the letters there hanging from ruled lines. The Aristeas is written in a single column: size of page
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13 x 11 in., of writing 11⅝ x 8⅝ in., the number of lines in a page varying from 21 to 43. It is written apparently in two different hands; pp. 1—3 are written rather diffusely; from eisai δὲ πρῶτης φυλής (p. 528. 10) the writing becomes more compact and neat, with more lines in a page; with the words τὰ συμβαινόντα τοῖς φίλοις (p. 565. 14) the diffuse writing comes in again. The beginning of the Aristeas is lost; the MS. begins with ματων ο βασιλευ (p. 521. 24). It ends with ρωτας ἐλκρατεί (sic). This ending marks a peculiarity of the MS.; the rubricator has omitted to fill in the initial capital letters, hence we find ai for καὶ, pos for προσ, ἀμβανεῖν for λαμβανεῖν, etc.

HKA. It is clear from their general agreement in readings that these MSS. form one group. Notice the omissions which they have in common:

1. p. 564. 1. προς τουτ—πωςεσειν επιτελοι (50 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.

2. p. 566. 10. εστιν επιτελεια—διατηρεις την (53 letters) om HKA(DFL) ins GIM and B group.


From the first two of these omissions it appears that HKA must be derived from an original (γ) which omitted these lines, an ancestor of γ having probably had lines of the length of 50 letters; from the evidence of GIM we deduce that this group, while connected with the HKA group, is not derived from γ. H and A are more closely connected than H and K; notice 551. 18 αναπτω (σιν suplin) H αναπτω A*; 562. 20 απαν H (τ suprascr ΗAnn) απαν A.

ADFL. That these MSS. form a united group within the HKA group is shown by their almost universal agreement. Notice e.g. the readings 536. 1 χρόμενοι ADFL (συγχρόμενοι cett.), 537. 4 εισελήνυθαι ADFL (ειληθεθαν εις cett.), 547. 3 ευλογιας ADFL (λογιας cett.), 569. 21 επαυπανσατο (sic) ADFL, and the omissions which they have in common:

539. 27. ουτως δε εξεσιν—Αξωτιων χωραν
550. 21. γαρ ον ανθρωπος—συνεστρωσε δε παντα} om ADFL.
554. 8. προς ευφροσυνην—εινθη τη δε

That D is a direct transcript of A is proved by its omitting exactly a line of A, so that on p. 558. 9 it reads μεταδοριμενα (sic) σοι διαμενη, where the lines in A are divided thus: μεταδο|τικος ων και μεγαλομερης ουθεστ αν απολιποι δοξης ινα δε τα προειρημενα σοι διαμενη. Moreover, certain marginal notes in A, which are there almost illegible, have been copied by D, where they are all clear: e.g. on 553. 25 δ και Ἀλεξανδρος εἰπεν ἐρωτηθεὶς πῶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ
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At 541. 11 συμβουλευοντω of A (the stroke over the ω being very faint) has become συμβουλευοντα in D. That F is a direct transcript of A is proved by its repeating a line of A twice over, reading at 550. 16 a μεν ετι και νυν εκαστον αποτελειν τη γαρ ενω διατεταγμενον υπο του βασιλεως α μεν ετι και νυν ορας· οσα γαρ κ.τ.λ. The lines in A are arranged thus: εκελευε την εταιμασιαν εις | εκαστον αποτελειν τη γαρ ενω διατεταγμενον υπο του βασιλεως α μεν ετι και νυν | ορας· οσα γαρ κ.τ.λ. Lastly, that L is a direct transcript of A appears from 529. 21, where L omits the words συνιδειν πραγματων· καλλονην εκελευε which form exactly a line in A. Just below (530. 1) L negligently inserts in the text (where it is quite unsuitable) after του χρυσου a gloss which occurs in the margin of A, and which is quoted in the apparatus criticus.

These cases appear to put the parentage of these three MSS. beyond a doubt, and their evidence has therefore not been recorded in the apparatus. The few deviations from their parent MS. which they exhibit may be neglected.

The group GIM(Q).

This group presents few substantial variants from the HKA text. It differs chiefly from that text in matters of orthography, the frequent use of itacisms, etc. Its retention of two lines which are omitted by HKA (see above) proves that it is not derived from the immediate parent of those MSS., while its omission of another line in common with HKA is proof that both groups go back to a common ancestor rather higher up in the line.


fol. 1. Aristeas.
  6vo. Theodoret to Hypatius.
  7. Catena on the Octateuch.
  296. πόσαι παραδόσεις εἰσὶν τῆς θελας γραφῆς.

Size of page 12\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{3}{4} in., of writing 9\frac{3}{4} \times 7 in. It is written in minuscules hanging from ruled lines in one column containing 67 closely packed and closely written lines, the whole of the Aristeas being compressed into 54 leaves. The Aristeas with the Theodoret seems to have been tacked on to the MS. later, as there is a second numbering of pages (a, β, γ, etc.) beginning on fol. 7, but it is by the same hand as that which wrote, at any rate, the first few lines of the Catena; the text of the Septuagint appears to have been the work of several hands. The Aristeas is very much stained and blotted, especially the first leaf, which has been in parts rewritten, but in places the writing is utterly illegible. In the Venice Catalogue it is placed first in an 'Appendix Graecorum Codicum ex legato Jacobi Contareni, Io. Bapt.
Introduction to the letter of Aristeas.

Recanati Aliorumque; a note in the catalogue adds 'catenam hanc in Bibliotheca Julii Justiniani D. M. Procuratoris vidit Montfauconius et descripsit in Diario Italico'.


*fol. 1.* Aristeas.
22. Theodoret to Hypatius.
23vo. Catena on Genesis and Exodus.
304vo. ends in the middle of Exodus. At the end is written 'deest unum et alterum folium.'

It is written in double columns, the words hanging from ruled lines: the size of page being $14\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $11\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ in. The Aristeas and the Catena are by the same hand. The bookplate (apparently common to all the Palatine collection) has the words 'Sum de bibliotheca, quam Heidelberga capta spolium fecit et P. M. Gregorio XV trophaeum misit Maximilianus utriusque Bavariae Dux etc. S. R. I. Archidapifer et Princeps Elector, anno Christi MDCXXIX.'


*fol. 1—14.* Παλλαδίου περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἱνδιας ἑθνῶν καὶ τῶν Βραγμάντων.
15, 16. blank.
17—27. τοῦ φιλοσόφου Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸ ἐπιλογὸν τῆς φυσικῆς ἀκρο-
άσεως.
28. blank.
29—44. τοῦ φιλοσοφητάτου καὶ ῥητορικώτατον Κύρου Θεοδωροῦ τον προδρόμου.
45—70vo. Ἄριστεας Φιλοκράτης.

Size of page $14\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ in., of writing $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; the writing is in single column, bounded by two vertical lines, but no horizontal lines are visible. The contents are all written by the same neat hand in which the tall τ is the chief characteristic; the Aristeas sheets are rather broader than the rest. On the first leaf is written a list of the contents and the name of a former owner of the MS.: 'Anonymi Geographia, Philosophia anonym., Palladius de rebus et moribus Índicis, Aristeas. Ex codicibus Ioannis Angeli Ducis ab Altaemps'.

1 See Montfaucon, *Diar. Ital.* (Paris, 1702), 433 ff., where a list of the MSS. in Justinian's library is given, including a Catena on the Octateuch of the eleventh century. This is apparently the MS. referred to in the Venice Catalogue; but Montfaucon does not appear to mention that it contained Aristeas.

2 The library of Colonna was bought by Jean Ange duc d’Altemps in 1611; in 1689 part of the collection was transferred to the Ottobonian palace. See Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V.* (Paris, 1890), pp. 57—59.
GIM agree in almost all cases, including omissions such as 528. 10 om ἀσφαλῶς GIM, mistakes such as 529. 14 καταθηκοῦσας GIM (καθηκ. cett.), 534. 1 μεγαλοῖς GIM (μεγαλοι cett.), 552. 26 δυναμενων GIM (δυναμεων cett.), and peculiarities of spelling and vocalization. They almost always insert ν ἐφελκυστικῶν before consonants, write iota adscript, interchange o and ω (προτευουσα, πασχομεν [=πασχομεν], μεταφερον [=ων]) and i and η (τιλικος, δαψηλως, τινικαυτα, προδιλως), and use itacisms such as βουλεσθε for βουλεσθαι, αρεν for ερεν.

It appears that G and I are copied from one and the same MS.; their contemporary date and a few cases where they are at variance (e.g. 520. 12 η παιδεia αυτη G, η παιδειας διαγωγη I) make it improbable that either is a transcript of the other.

M is undoubtedly a direct copy of I. With the exception of some slight corrections or blunders on the part of M, they are in entire agreement. Notice e.g. 531. 5 προς την χρησαν την τραπεζαν IM (την τραπ. προς την χρ. cett.), 540. 7 μετα IM (μεταλλα cett.), 541. 3 γεγραφαι IM (γεγραφαι cett.), 543. 25 βροσων IM (βροσων cett.), 571. 24 γραφης IM (μεταγραφης cett.). At 573. 21 M omits the words και τα ακολουθα παντα, which form exactly a line in the double-column MS. I. The readings of M have therefore not been recorded in the apparatus.

To this group appears also to belong:


This MS. contains a very miscellaneous collection of fragments beginning with (p. i) an anonymous fragment on the resurrection, (p. 2) a fragment of Athanasius on the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and including (p. 111) a fragment on the ten feasts of the Jews, and (p. 217) an anonymous work on the measurement of the earth. On p. 341 occur the letters of Abgarus and Christ, on p. 343 a fragment of Photius, ‘de termino vitae et de Spiritus Sancti processione,’ on pp. 351—371 the fragments of Aristeas, followed on p. 371 by the treatise already included περι των δεκα ἑορτῶν (here given at greater length), and other fragments which need not be enumerated. The Aristeas fragments are not a sixth part of the letter; they are (p. 351) 520. 15 inc. κατασταθες επι της—521. 9 ὑποξειρα παιουμενος, and (p. 353) 529. 24 inc. δυο πηχεων το μηκος—537. 21 προκαθημενου προς θεωριαν. They are introduced by the heading επισταλης Αριστεως προς Φιλοκρατην εκφρασις. χρωσης τραπεζης την εποιησην ο βασιλεις Πτωλωμαιος και απεστελεν εις Ἱερουσαλημ προς τον τοτε αρχηγη Ελαζαρον. Omont’s catalogue merely calls the fragments ‘De Ptolemaeo rege et lege mosaica’; the folio catalogue of 1740 more correctly describes them as ‘fragmenta ex Aristeae.’

There are 24 lines in a page; the writing is rough and untidy with thick strokes, and very rough red initial capitals. Its readings and spellings connect it with the GIM group, e.g. 532. 28 λιαν (for λειαν), 534. 8 αναστασιν (for ανατασιν), 535. 4 σμην (for σμηξιν).
The group TBCPSZ.

We now come to a group which presents considerable variations from those which we have considered. The readings of this group are at first sight attractive and have the appearance of representing a purer text. A closer examination will however, show that a certain amount of revision must have gone on here, not only in some common ancestor of the group, but also in the individual members of it. We find that various members of the group have sometimes corrected the text in different ways, that even where they are consistent in their readings, they seldom have the support of Eusebius, who has introduced other slight alterations of his own into the text, and again we find that in places the reading of the HKA and GI groups, which the B text has rejected, is corroborated by the usage of Alexandrian papyri which are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the pseudo-Aristeas. While, then, in some places it is possible that the B text has retained or has successfully restored the right reading, the text of this group is usually to be regarded with suspicion, as an ingenious attempt to remove the obscurities of a Greek which had become unintelligible. The group is here spoken of as the B group, because the MS. B is that on which Schmidt's text was based, and it is also the MS. which exhibits the greatest number of variants; but a far older member of the group and one which exhibits the Aristeas text entire has now come to light, namely the Florence MS. T, which we will describe first.


According to the Catalogue of Rostagno the date of the Aristeas, Pentateuch and Catena is the tenth century, of Joshua and the remaining books about the thirteenth. It seems doubtful whether the former part is earlier than the eleventh century. The material is parchment: number of leaves 384: size of page $14\frac{3}{4}$ x 12 in. There are quires of 8 leaves with signatures of the (?) thirteenth century. To the end of the Pentateuch the writing is in single column with 46 lines in a page; in the latter part there are two columns with 65 lines to a page. The writing hangs from ruled lines.

fol. 1. Aristeas to Philocrates.

11vo. Introduction to O.T. books: τὰ ἐν τῇ παροῦσῃ βιβλῳ ἀναγεγραμμένα τείχη....διάτι ἑκατον τούτων ὄντως καλείται καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους τῇ περιέχει ἑκαστον...

14vo. Theodoret, εἰς τὰ ἀποτελεῖ τῆς θείας γραφῆς.

15. Pentateuch with Catena.

311. Joshua—Chronicles, Esdras 1—3, Esther, Judith, Maccabees 1—4, Tobit (to 3. 15).
Introduction to the letter of Aristeas.

2. Fragment of Aristeas inc. (538. 10) πωσησαντες της γαρ χωρας expl. (568. 1) περιβαλλοντας το γην ως (note leupei).

10. Catena on the Octateuch.

224. Catena on the Apocalypse inc. δηλει (sic) τον της συντελεφα καιρον.

It is written in double columns in a very minute upright and neat hand, with about 60 lines packed into a column, the words hanging from ruled lines; the size of page is 6 x 7 in., of writing 8½ x 3¼ in. At the bottom of fol. 1 is written ‘Caroli Strozze Thomaie filii 1635.’


It is written in single column, with 29 lines in a page, the size of page being 12½ x 8½ in., and the writing hanging from ruled lines; there are quires of 8 leaves.

fol. 1—37vo. Aristeas (complete).
37vo.—358. Catena on Genesis.

On the recto of the first leaf is the note ‘Emptus ex libris illmi Lelii Ruini ep' Balneoregien. 1622.’

This MS. escaped notice when the other Roman MSS. were examined and has consequently not been collated in full; but some collations of selected passages kindly made by Mr N. McLean, Fellow of Christ’s College, are sufficient to show that it belongs to this group.

Z, CODEX TURICENSIS. Zurich. Stadtbibliothek C. 11 (169 Omont’s catalogue), saec. xiii. bombyc., 736 pagg. 1

p. 669. Ιερονυμου εκπτολη προς Δεξιρον επικρον πραξει απου ρωμαιε εις ελληνικα μεταβληθεια (‘S. Hieronymi liber de viris illustribus a Sophronio graece versus,’ Omont). It is written in single column, the size of page being 13¾ x 9 in., and the writing hangs from ruled lines. The Aristeas portion is badly preserved; a hole passes through the twenty pages which contain it, causing lacunae. There are several marginal readings, some of which are obviously conjectural (e.g. ιως φιλοφρονεται, ιως μαλλον). The Jerome is not by the hand which has written the remainder of the MS.

That the above MSS. form a single group appears primarily from their omissions. The following lines are omitted by all 2 the

1 The greater part of this MS. was collated from the original. The collation of the last few pages has been made from photographs, for which the writer is indebted to the courtesy of the Librarian, Dr Hermann Escher.

2 S omits (1), (3), and (7). It has not been tested for the other passages.
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It contains the inscription, 'Codicem e Liguria adventum propone­nte A. M. Bandinio comparavit Ferdinandus III magnus dux Etruriae et Bibl. Laurent. donavit die 3 Aug. MDCCXCVIII.'


15. Catena on the Octateuch.

It is written in double columns: size of page 13½ x 9½ in., of writing 10¼ x 3½ in.; the writing is enclosed by vertical lines, but there are no horizontal lines except at the top and bottom of the page. The Aristeas is in bad condition, being torn and stained. There are a few plain red initial letters. The writing is rather sloping, and fairly large and clear. Schmidt says, 'This MS. has been subsequently collated most carefully with its original by the rubricator, when the writer himself had already performed this duty quite conscientiously. Hence all corrections of the rubricator and of the first hand are equivalent to the authority of the original MS.' A later hand has added a few headings in the margin (περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, etc.). The Catena is apparently by the same hand as the Aristeas, but has more ornamentation and red initials. In some places part of a leaf has been cut or torn away.


fol. 1. Aristeas fragments.

14. Anonymous introduction to the books of the O.T. (inc. το μεν

ουν βιβλίων).

45. Catena on the Octateuch.

The Aristeas is written in a single column: the size of page being 12½ x 9 in., of writing varying from 9 x 7 in. to 7½ x 5½ in. The Aristeas and the introduction to O.T. are by the same hand, a large square upright writing with thick strokes and red initials in the margin: the page is unruled. In the latter part of the MS., foll. 45—60 are written in double columns in a rougher hand; at fol. 61 the first hand begins again, and the remainder is sometimes in single, sometimes in double columns, text and commentary coming alternately and the order of books being confused (Judges, Joshua, Deuteronomy, Numbers). The fragments of Aristeas contained are less than half the letter; they are 528. 17 Σαββάταιοι—532. 17 διο μεν ηϑαν τη, 553. 10 ὑ ὑπεν εὐχομε­νος—563. 16 πρῶτα, 567. 7 ·σιλεν κρατω δε—end.


fol. 1. Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis (frag.).

inc. πασα γραφη ημων των Χριστιανων θεοπνευστος εστι, at end λειτω.
members of the group which are extant at the several passages referred to.

(1) 523. 9. εγκρατεῖς εγενοντο—καὶ τὴν χώραν (78 letters) om BTZ.
(2) 529. 11. βουλεσθαὶ καὶ—δισταζειν δὲ (51 letters) om BCTZ.
(3) 532. 17. ἀπὸ τῆς βασισεῶς—τορεια καὶ (48 letters) om BTZ.
(4) 533. 13. θεσιν ἡθελει—ὡς αὐ τῷ (41 letters) om BTZ.
(5) 547. 12. καὶ κακοποιουσιν—τροφὴν ἀλλὰ (48 letters) om BPTZ.
(6) 548. 13. —τὰς ἡμερὰς δυσιαζειν—οἱ προσφερον—(46 letters) om BPTZ.
(7) 552. 13. γενοῦσα—τὴν περὶ σεαυτὸν (47 letters) om BPTZ.
(8) 564. 25. θέου δὲ—τοὺς αξίους (45 letters) om BPTZ.
(9) 566. 24. ἦσαν γαρ οἰκον προσβείς (20 letters) om BPTZ.

Also at 533. 4 the words πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀλήθειας—τεθεντὸν (48 letters) are omitted by TⁿSZ (C and P do not contain the passage); but they are inserted in the margin of T, apparently by the first hand, and are found in B. These omissions show that an ancestor of the group was written by a careless scribe who dropped several lines (averaging 48 letters) of his archetype. From the last instance quoted, and from numerous other passages, it appears that B and T bear a specially close relationship; indeed it is conceivable that B is a copy of T, but in that case it has introduced several corrections of its own, not found in the parent MS.¹

As to the value of the readings of this group, it appears that the 'singular' readings of B are in nearly all cases due to a correction of the text. Instances of these are 522. 18 the insertion of ἐν λόγῳ before βραχεί, 525. 12 εάν οὖν φαινεῖται σοι εἰννομον B (εάν οὖν φαινεῖται Eus.). The phrases εάν φαινεῖται σοι and εάν φαινεῖται are abundantly attested by the Alexandrian papyri in petitions of subordinates to high officials, but the insertion of εἰννομον receives no support. Again we have 526. 13 χαριστηρίων B (χαριστικον cett. Eus.), 527. 18 ἀνδρεῖς τῶν τετιμημένων παρὰ σοι Ἀνδρέας καὶ Αριστεας B (Ἀνδρεᾶς τῶν τετ. παρὰ σοι καὶ Ἀρ. cett.: B has misunderstood the genitive), 529. 18 οἰδά γαρ ὣς δαφιλοὺς τῆς υλῆς αὐτῶς οὐσίας B (εἰ τι γαρ εἰ τα τῆς οὕσης cett. Eus.), 538. 1 σχῆμα B (χυμα = 'size' cett.: B has removed a characteristic word of Aristeas, cf. 521. 17, 567. 11). The readings of BT, where the other members of the group are opposed to them, are also generally to be rejected: e.g. 525. 25 νόμισματα BT (νομισματος cett. Eus. Jos.), 526. 25 δυναμένως BT (δύναμος cett. Eus.): they have occasionally corrected the order of words, 551. 19 διατελοῦν εἰσὸν BT (εχ. διατ. cett.),

¹ The divergence of the two subdivisions of the B group is seen in the difficult passage (531. 6) where BT omit the words ὡστε καὶ τὴν τῶν κυριατῶν ἠθειν, while CSZ retain them and add τεσποιηθαί καθ ὅ αν μέρος.
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569. 5 τῶν ἰδιωτῶν τινες BT (τινες τ. ἰδ. cett.). Where however the members of the group unite as against the HKA and GI groups, the reading gains in probability, and more especially is this the case where the support of either Eusebius or the GI group. Thus in 526. 2 αναστασίας BTZGI Eus3 (αναρπαστός HKA), 526. 6 προοντας B°TZ Eus. (παροντας cett.), 547. 7 ins καὶ πτωτῶν PZGI Eus1 (om cett.), the B reading is right. But in some places the whole group has been affected by correction. Thus in 519. 11 TSZ (the only extant members at this point) read εαυτὸς προεδωκαμεν εἰς τὸν προειρημένον αἵδια προεβείαν, but the reading εαυτὸς επεδεδοκαμεν κ.τ.λ. of the other MSS. is corroborated by the usage of the papyri of the second century B.C. (Paris Pap. 49 καταπεπειραματ...εἰς παν τὸ σοι χρησιμον ειμαυτον επιδιδομα, Par. Pap. 63 col. 6 προθύμοι εαυτον επιδιδοτον, Grenfell, Erotic Fragment, etc. XLII. 6 εἰς τε παν τὸ παραγγελλομένον | προθύμοι εαυτον επιδεδοκοτον).

A few instances where correction is seen at work may be quoted. At 550. 10 HKAGI read παντα δύναμιν εἰπε παρεσται καθ-κοντας, οἷς συγχρησθεὶς (-σθε), καμοι μὲν υμών. Παντα δύναμιν, which is clearly wrong, is corrected by BTZ to πασαν δύναμιν, by P to παντ (=πανθ)α δυναμιν; παρεσται is further corrected by BT to παρεσταναι and καμοι to καμε, corrections which give a grammatical but hardly an intelligible sentence. The slight alteration of δ' υμών for δύναμιν (a correction which Wendland also appears to have adopted) restores sense to the passage, and the B text is seen to be due to conjecture. Similarly at 555. 1 B and P have corrected in different ways the characteristic word απεκρινατο (‘answer’), B reading εἰπε and P απεκρινατο: a little before (553. 21) B reads αποκριναθαι where the remaining MSS. have ἀποσφαι-νεθαι. At 527. 1 BTZ read τον αρχισωματοφυλακα (B at first wrote σωματοφυλακα: τον αρχισωματοφυλακαν cett.), thus removing an idiomatic use of the genitive, frequently attested by the papyri. The above instances will afford sufficient proof that a good deal of recension has gone on in this group. At the same time it is clear that in other places it has escaped the corruptions which the other groups have undergone, though it is sometimes difficult to say whether a reading of this group is primitive or due to correction. The agreement of the group with Eusebius (where his evidence exists) is, as was said, sometimes a test; but in the majority of cases the B text is not corroborated by Eusebius, and in a few instances where one or two members only of the group agree with Eusebius, this appears to be due to a fortuitous coincidence in emendation. Such passages are 548. 4 μυθωδος B Eus. (δυμωδος cett. incl. PTZ): 527. 4 γραψε BT Eus. (γραφον cett.). In the latter instance Eusebius altered the form of the sentence by reading γραψε and inserting γαρ after κεχαρισμενος; in BT the change to γραψε was due to κεχαρισμενος εση having become 33—2
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corrupted to καὶ χαρισμένος εσή; the participle γράφων is corroborated by Josephus (ἐπιστέλλων περὶ δὲν δὲν θέλης ποιήσεις κεχαρισμένα).

The extracts of Eusebius, consisting of about a quarter of the letter, are contained in the eighth and ninth books of the Praeparatio Evangelica (viii. 2—5, 9, ix. 38). The Eusebian MSS. which are to be followed in these books are, as Heikel1 has shown, I (Codex Venetus Marcianus 341) and O (Codex Bononiensis 3643). The extracts from Aristeas in these two MSS. have been collated for the present text, and their evidence is quoted as Eus I and Eus O. For the other Eusebian MSS. the text of Gaisford (Oxford, 1843) has been used; O was unknown to Gaisford, and his collation of I was incomplete. The Venice MS. by its general agreement with the Aristeas MSS. shows itself to be far the best text of Eusebius; the Bologna MS. or one of its ancestors has been very carelessly copied, and there are numerous omissions which did not always appear worthy of record in the apparatus to the present text. With regard to the value of the Eusebian text, it may be well to quote the verdict of Freudenthal2 on the general character of his extracts from earlier writers. He says, 'Eusebius shows himself more reliable in the text (Wortlaute) of his originals than in the names and writings of the excerpted authors. It is true that he occasionally allows himself small alterations in the text, most frequently in the opening words of the extracts. He often abbreviates his originals, drops repetitions (beseitigt Doppelglieder), omits individual words and whole sentences, and no small number of inaccuracies of other kinds are also to be met with. On the other hand it is only in extremely rare cases that he inserts additions of his own, and the cases in which we meet with fundamental alterations of the text are still more uncommon.' This estimate is quite borne out by the Eusebian extracts from Aristeas, where there are frequent instances of slighter alterations and omissions, which the paraphrase of Josephus often helps us to detect. Among omissions we have 520. 16 εἰ δυνατῶν om Eus. (ins Jos. Ar. codd.), 525. 10 καὶ πολιτευομένων om Eus. (ins Ar. codd.: Jos. however omits the words in his paraphrase, and they may be a gloss). Of alterations we may note out of numerous instances 525. 24 where the strange word ρισκοφυλάκας is altered to χρηματοφυλάκας (Jos. paraphrases τοὺς φύλακας τῶν κιβωτῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐτύγχανον οἱ λίθοι), 526. 17 επικρίμων καταστήσα (a bad correction, because

1 De Praeparationis Evangelicae Eusebii edendae ratione (Helsingforsiae, 1888).
2 Hellenistische Studien, Alexander Polyhistor (Breslau, 1875) p. 7 f. See also the note on p. 203 on Eusebius and Pseudo-Aristeas.
the royal plural used throughout the rest of the letter of Ptolemy is dropped), 527. 24 κατα πολλοὺς τροπούς (κατα πολλοὺς Ar. codd. ‘in many individual instances’), 572. 9 ακρίβως (ηκρίβωμενως Ar. codd.), 573. 2 κατα δὲ την αιτησια (κατα δὲ την ανεσιν Jos. Ar. codd.). In a few cases a rather longer addition is made; at 544. 22 before των συγγενικων the words ουτε των υποβεβηκτων ουτε and at 546. 14 the words επι των πολεων και οικησεων δια το σκεπαζεσθαι are probably the insertions of Eusebius; just before the last passage (546. 11) συντηρουνται τας αρχας και μεσοτητας και τελευτας is an unintelligible alteration of the correct reading και συντηρουντος. Among passages where Eusebius is certainly right may be mentioned 526. 2 ανασταστος Eus1 GIETZ (αναρταστους cett.), 542. 10 ειδεικες (ενδικως Ar. codd.), 547. 7 the insertion of και ποτων Eus1 GIPZ, and lastly 541. 21. The readings in this passage are instructive:

(1) προσ τα δι ημων επιζητηθεντα Eus.
(2) προσ δι ημων επιζητηθεντα GIMZ*.
(3) προσ ημων επιζητηθεντα HKADFL.
(4) προσ δε ημων επιζητηθητων BPTZcont.

Eusebius preserves the true text; the τα then dropped out, and while in the HKA group the reading was still further corrupted, in the B group sense was restored to the passage by a conjectural emendation. Passages where Eusebius and Josephus unite as against the Aristeas MSS. are 524. 18 αναγραφης (αντιγραφης Ar.), 525. 5 τετυχηκε (τετυχε Ar.), 526. 8 omission of the negative, ἦ 528. 7 the perfect απεσταλκαμεν (Jos. has the perfect πετουμαμεν : απεστηλαμεν Ar.), 572. 20 ποιητων Jos. Eus. B (ποιητικων or ποιητικως Ar. cett.); in such cases the patristic reading should generally be followed. On the whole the Eusebian evidence is of the greatest importance; it tends to show that the GI group, especially if supported by any member of the B group, is nearest to the primitive text.

Lastly, with regard to the evidence of Josephus, he gives in the twelfth book of the Jewish Antiquities a paraphrase of about two-fifths of the letter, omitting the central portion, namely the visit to Palestine, the discourse with Eleazar and the seventy-two questions and answers. He has taken the trouble to reshape nearly every sentence, while retaining many of the characteristic words of Aristeas. Under the circumstances it is not always possible to reconstruct his text, and at some of the most difficult passages his evidence is uncertain; in some cases the text was certainly unintelligible to him. He is however often useful in enabling us to detect the alterations which have been introduced into the text by Eusebius or the B group. It is needless to add that Niese’s text of Josephus has been followed.

Beside the MSS. of Aristeas above mentioned the following
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are known to the present writer, which he has not had the opportunity of collating: Codex Monacensis 9 (saec. xi.), quoted in Mendelssohn’s fragment of the text, Codex Atheniensis 389 (circa saec. xv., chart., foll. 328, Aristeas and Catena)¹, Codex Scollarensis Σ. 1. 6 (dated 1586, and written χειρί Νικολάου Τουρριακοῦ καὶ βασιλικοῦ ἀντιγραφέως, Aristeas and Catena on Genesis and Exodus)².

The collations here given are not absolutely complete. Itacisms and other orthographical details have not been generally recorded, neither have all the slight omissions of the Codex O of Eusebius or of the fragment Q of Aristeas; but apart from these no substantial variants have, it is hoped, been omitted. The dates of the various correctors’ hands have not been accurately ascertained; the symbol B¹, T¹ has been used to denote a correction probably by the first hand or a hand nearly contemporary with the date of the MSS. B and T. Words are enclosed within daggers † † where the MS. reading is left in the text, although probably corrupt; angular brackets < > denote emendations of, or insertions introduced into, the reading of the MSS.; square brackets [ ] signify that words found in the MSS. are probably to be omitted.

¹ Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς ἔθν. βιβλ. τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Σακκέλλωνος καὶ Ἀλκ. Ι. Σακκέλλωνος (Athens, 1892).
ἈΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ

'Αξιολόγου διηγήσεως, ὁ Φιλόκρατες, περὶ τῆς γεννηθείσης ἦμιν ἐντυχίας πρὸς Ἐλεάζαρον τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερέα συνεσταμένης, διὰ τὸ σὲ περὶ πολλοῦ πεποιηθαί, παρ' ἐκαστα ἁυτομομνησκοντι, συνακούσαν περὶ ὧν ἀπεστάλημεν καὶ διὰ τί, πεπέραμαι σαφῶς ἐκθέσθαι σοι, κατειληφώς ἦν ἔχεις φιλομαθῆ διάθεσιν, ὅπερ μέγιστὸν ἦστιν ἀνθρώπω, προσμανθάνειν ἂει τί καὶ προσλαμβάνειν, ὦτοι κατὰ τὰς ἱστορίας, ἦν καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πράγμα πεπεραμένω. οὕτω γὰρ κατασκευάζεται ψυχῆς καθαρὰ διάθεσις, ἀναλαβοῦσα τὰ κάλλιστα· καὶ πρὸς τὸ πάντων κυρώσατον νενευκύια, τὴν εὐσέβειαν,

10 ἀπλανεὶ κεχρημένη καλοί διοικεῖ τὴν προαίρεσιν. Ἐχοντες ἡμεῖς πρὸς τὸ περιέργως τὰ θεία κατανοεῖν, ἐαντοὺς ἐπεδώκαμεν εἰς τὸν προειρημένον ἀνδρὰ προσβείαν, καλοκαγαθία καὶ δόξη προτειμημένον ὑπὸ τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ κατακεκτημένον μεγίστην ὁφέλειαν τοὺς σὺν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων

15 τότους πολιτάς, πρὸς τὴν ἔρμηνειαν τοῦ θείου νόμου, διὰ τὸ γεγράφθαι παρ' αὐτοὺς ἐν διφθέραις ἐβραίκοις γράμμαις. ὥν δὴ καὶ ἐπουράνια ἡμεῖς σπουδῆ, λαβόντες καιρὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα περὶ τῶν μετοικισθέντων εἰς Αἰγύπτον ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, πρῶτως κεκτημένου τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν

20 Αἰγύπτου παρειληφότος. Ἀξιόν ἦστι καὶ ταύτα σοι δηλώσαι. πέπεσιμαι γὰρ, σὲ μᾶλλον ἔχοντα πρόσκλισιν πρὸς τὴν σεμνότητα, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων διάθεσιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν σεμνὴν νομοθεσίαν διεξαγόντων, περὶ ὧν προαιρούμεθα <δηλοῦν, ἀσμένως σε>

ακούσετε θαί, προσφάτως παραγεγενήμενόν ἐκ τῆς νήσου πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ βουλόμενον συνακούσειν ὅσα πρὸς ἐπισκευὴν ψυχῆς ὑπάρχει. καὶ πρῶτον δὲ διεισερχόμεθα σοι, περὶ ὧν ἐνόμιζον ἀξιομηνυμονέωτων εἶναι τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἥν μετελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν κατὰ τὴν λογιστήτην Ἀξιοππυτον λογιστῶν ἀρχιερέων περὶ τοῦ 5 γένους τῶν Ἰουδαίων. φιλομαθῶς γὰρ ἔχοντι σοι περὶ τῶν δυνα-μένων ωφελήσαι διάνοιαν ἐστὶ μεταδίδοναι, μάλιστα μὲν πάσιν 10 τοῖς ὁμοίοις, πολλῷ δὲ μάλλον σοι γνησίαν ἔχοντι τὴν αἰρετικήν, ὥς ἐνόμιζον κατὰ τὸ συγγενεῖς ἀδελφῶν καθεστώτι τῶν τρόπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἀρμὴν τῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ἱμίν. χρυσοῦ γὰρ χάρις ἥ 15 κατασκευὴ τις ἀλλή τῶν τετιμημένων παρὰ τοῖς κενοδόχοις ωφελείαν ὁμίλῳ ἔχει τὴν αὐτήν, ὅσον ἡ παιδείας ἁγιωθή καὶ ἡ περὶ τούτων φροντίς. Ινα δὲ μὴ περὶ τῶν προλεγομένων μηκῶνοντες ἄδολεσχόν τι ποιῶμεν, ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς διηγήσεως ἐπανήξομεν.
οὐκ ἦστω, ἀλλ' ἐτερος τρόπος. Μεταλαβῶν δὲ ἐκαστα ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔπει γραφήναι πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερᾶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅπως τὰ προειρημένα τελείωσιν λάβῃ. Νομίσας δὲ ἐγὼ καὶρὸν εἶναι περὶ ὧν πολλάκις ήζωκεῖν Σωσίβιον τε τὸν Ταραντίνον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, τοὺς ἅρχιστοματοφύλακας, περὶ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῶν μετηγμένων ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως—ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐτελθὼν τὰ κατὰ κοίλην Σωρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην ἀπάντα, συγχρομένος εἰμιμερίᾳ μετὰ ἀνδρείας, τοὺς μὲν μετώρκιζεν, οὕς δὲ ἡχιμαλώτιζεν, φοβῆσε πάντα ὑποχείρια ποιούμενος. ἐν ὁσῳ καὶ πρὸς δέκα μυριάδας ἔκ τῆς τῶν Ἰ Ο Ἰουδαίων χώρας εἰς Ἀγγυστον μετήγαγεν, ἀφ' ὧν ὠδε τρεῖς μυριάδας καθοπλίσας ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν κατάκις ἐν τοῖς φοιτοίς τῇ μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἰκανῶν εἰσελήλυθοτῶν σὺν τῷ Πέρσῃ, καὶ πρὸ τοῦτων ἑτέρων συμμαχιῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Ἀιθιόπων βασιλεὰ μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμιτιχῷ· ἀλλ' οὐ 15 τοσοῦτοι τῷ πλῆθει παρεγνήθησαν, ὅσοις Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ Δάγου μετήγαγε· καθὼς δὲ προεῖπομεν, ἐπιλέξας τοὺς ἀρίστους τοὺς ἥλικιας καὶ ῥώμη διαφέροντας καθώπλισε, τὸ δὲ λουπὸν χῦμα πρεσβυτέρων καὶ νεωτέρων, ἐτὶ δὲ γυναικῶν, εἶσαν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, οὐχ οὗτος τῇ προαιρέσει κατὰ ψυχὴν ἔχων, ὡς κατακρατούμενος 20 ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, δ' ὡς ἐπεποίητο χρείας ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἀγώσιν—ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐτεί τινα παρείρεσιν εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν αὐτῶν ἀπελάβομεν, καθὼς προδεχόλωται, τοιούτους ἐχρησάμεθα λόγους πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. Μήποτε ἄλογον ἢ ἐλέγχεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων, ὁ βασιλεύς. τῇ γὰρ νομοθεσίας κεκομῆς πάσι 25 τοῖς Ἰουδαίως, ἴνα ἤμεις οὐ μόνον μεταγράφαι ἐπινοοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διερμηνεύσωμεν, τόν λόγον ἔζομεν πρὸς ἀποστολήν, ἐν οἰκείας ὑπαρχόντων ἐν τῇ σῇ βασιλείᾳ πληθὺν ἰκανῶν; ἀλλὰ τελεία καὶ πλουσία ψυχὴ ἀπόλυσον τοὺς συνεχομένους ἐν ταλαιπωρίαις, κατευθύνοντος σου τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ τεθεικότος αὐτοῖς θεοῦ τῶν 30 νόμων, καθὼς περιείρασμαι. τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην

4 ηζώσα σιωχεὼς τοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ταρ. G 26 οπολυσας G
5 σωματοφύλακας A | ek] απὸ HKAGIQ
11 ekδελγεμένων T | κατελειπεν G
14 Ἀθ. ] Ἀγγυστων T
21 etel] eti
26 ικετειας K 28 απολυσας G 29 σου] σοι TZ
θεόν οὖν σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἥμεις δὲ, βασιλεὺς, προσομομάζοντες ἐτέρως Ζήνα καὶ Δία τούτο δ' οὐκ ἀνοικείως ὦι πρῶτοι διεσήμαναν, δὲ δ' ἥξωποιοῦντα τὰ πάντα καὶ γίνεται, τούτων ἀπάντων ἥγειοθαί τε καὶ κυριεῖν. Ὑπερηφάνους δὲ σύμπαντας ἀνθρώπους τῇ λαμπρότητί τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπόλυσιν ποίησα τῶν ἐνεχομένων σ ταῖς οἰκείαις.

Οὐδὲ πολὺν χρόνον ἐπισχῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν κατὰ ψυχήν πρὸς τὸν θεόν εὐχομένων, τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ κατασκευάζας πρὸς τὸ τοὺς ἀπάντας ἀπολυθήναι (κτίσμα γὰρ ἐν θεοῦ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ μεταλλοιώντας καὶ τρέπεται πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διό πολλαχῶς καὶ ποικίλως ἑπεκαλυμμένων τὸν κυριεύεται κατὰ τοῦ καρδίαν, ἑνα συναναγκαζόμενο, καθὼς ήξιον, ἐπιτελείαν μεγάλην

§ Β γὰρ εἶχον ἐλπίδα περὶ σωτηρίας ἀνθρώπων, προσθέμενος λόγον, ὅτι τὴν ἐπιτέλειαν ὁ θεός ποιήσει τῶν ἀξιομενῶν. ὁ γὰρ πρὸς δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ἐπιμέλειαν ἐν ὁσίότητι νομίζουσιν ἀνθρωποῖς ποιεῖν, κατευθύνει τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ διανακύψας καὶ προσβλέψας ἰαρῷ τὸ προσώπῳ Πόσας ὑπολαμβάνεις μυριάδας ἔσσεθαι; ἔφη. παρεστὼς δὲ Ἀνδρέας ἀπεφήνατο Βραχεῖ πλείον μυριάδῶν δέκα. ὁ δὲ, Μικρόν γε, εἶπεν, Ἀριστέας ἡμᾶς ἄξιοι πράγμα. Ἰωσίβιος δὲ καὶ τῶν παρών τινὸς τοῦτ ἢ περὶ σωτηρίας ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως 20 χαριστήριον ἀναθητῇ τῷ μεγάστῃ θεῷ τὴν τοῦτων ἀπόλυσιν. μέγιστος γὰρ τετιμημένος ὑπὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντος τὰ πάντα καὶ δεδοξασμένος ὑπὲρ τοῦ προγόνου, εἰ καὶ μέγιστα ποιήσεις χαριστήρια, καθήκον ἐστὶ σοι. 

Διαχείδεις δὲ εὖ μάλα τοὺς ὁψονίοις εἶπε προσθέναι, καὶ σύμματος ἐκάστου κομίζεσθαι δραχμᾶς ἔχωσιν, καὶ περὶ τούτων 25 ἐκθεῖναι πρόσταγμα, τὰς δὲ ἀπογραφὰς ποιεῖσθαι παρ’ αὐτά, μεγαλεῖος χρησάμενος τῇ προθυμίᾳ, τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν πάσαν ἐπιτελεσθείσας ἡμῶν προαίρεσιν, καὶ συναναγκαζόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπολυτρώσαι μὴ μόνον τοὺς συνεληλυθότας τῷ στροφοπέδῳ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἄλλα καὶ
ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ.

εἰ τινες προῆσαν, ἦ μετὰ ταῦτα παρεισήχθησαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν. ὑπὲρ τὰ τετράκοσια τάλαντα τὴν δόσιν ἀπέφαινον εἶναι. καὶ τοῦ προστάγματος δὲ τὸ ἀντίγραφον οὐκ ἀχριστον οἴομαι κατακεχωρίσθαι. πολλῷ γὰρ ἡ μεγαλομοιρία φανερώτερα καὶ εὐδήλος 5 ἔσται τοῦ βασιλέως, τοῦ θεοῦ κατισχύντος αὐτῶν ἐς τὸ σωτηρίαν γενέσθαι πλήθεσιν ἱκανοῖς. ἂν δὲ τοιοῦτο τοῦ βασιλέως προσταθήσεται "Οσοὶ τῶν συνεστρατευμένων τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ Συρίαν καὶ Φωνίκην τόπους ἐπελθόντες τὴν τῶν Ἰούδαίων χώραν ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοτο σωμάτων Ἰούδαίων καὶ ταῦτα διακεκομίσασιν εἰς 10 τῇ τῆς πόλει καὶ τῆς χώρας ἡ καὶ πεπράκασιν ἐτέροις, δοκοῖς δὲ καὶ εἰ τινες προῆσαν ἡ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐστὶν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀπολύειν παρὰ χρήμα τοὺς ἠχοντας, κομικομένους αὐτίκα ἐκάστου σωμάτος ὑδατίας εἰκοσι, τοὺς μὲν στρατιώτας τῇ τῶν ὕψοινόν δόσει, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης. νομίζομεν 15 γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν βούλησιν καὶ παρὰ τὸ καλὸς ἠχον ἡχιαλωτείσθαι τούτους, διὰ δὲ τῆς στρατιωτικῆς προπέτειαν τῆς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν κατεφθάρθαι καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰούδαίων μεταγωγῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀἰγυπτίων γεγονέναι· ἱκανὴ γὰρ ἢ τῇ παρὰ τὸ παλιόν γεγονεύν ἐκ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὑφέλεια· διὸ παντελῶς ἀνεπικής 20 ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καταδυναστεία. πάσων οὖν ἀνθρώπως τὸ δίκαιον ἀπονείμειν ὑμολογοῦμεν, πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀλόγως καταδυναστευοῦμεν, καὶ κατὰ τὰν ἐκξητοῦντες τὸ καλὸς ἠχόν πρὸς τῇ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τῇ τὰν πάντων ἐυσέβειαν, προστετάχθημεν ὡς τῶν Ἰούδαίων ἐστὶ σωμάτων ἐν οἰκείας <πανταχὴ> καθ᾽ ὄντινον 25 τρόπον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, κομικομένους τοὺς ἠχοντας τὸ προκείμενον κεφάλαιον ἀπολύειν, καὶ μηδένα κακοσχολός περί τούτων μηδὲν οἰκονομείν· τάς δ᾽ ἀπογραφὰς ἐν ἡμέραις τρισέ, ἀφ᾽ ἂς ἡ ἡμέρας ἐκκεῖται τὸ πρόσταγμα, ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τοὺς καθεσταμένους περὶ
τούτων, καταδεικνύοντας εὐθὺ καὶ τὰ σώματα. διειλήφαμεν γὰρ καὶ
ημῖν συμφέρειν καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τούτ’ ἐπιτελεσθήναι. τὸν δὲ
βουλόμενον προσαγγέλλειν περὶ τῶν ἀπειθησάντων, ἐφ’ ὧν τοῦ φανέν-
tος ἐνόχου τὴν κυρίαν ἐξει. τὰ δὲ ὑπάρχοντα τῶν τοιούτων εἰς
tὸ βασιλικὸν ἀναληφθῆσαι. Ἐισδοθέντος τοῦ προστάγ-5
ματος, ὅπως ἔταναγνωσθῇ τῷ βασιλεί, τὰ ἄλλα πάντ’ ἔμοντο
πλὴν τοῦ. Καὶ εἶ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταύτα εἰσηγμένοι εἶναί
tῶν τοιούτων, αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὁ βασιλείς προσέθηκε, μεγαλομοιρία
καὶ μεγαλοψυχία χρήσαμεν, ἐκέλευσε τὸν διαφόρων δόσιν
ἀθρόαν οὔσαν ἀπομείρασα τοῖς ὑπηρεταῖς τῶν ταγμάτων καὶ βασι-
λικοὺς τραπεζίταις. οὔτω δοχθὲν ἐκεκύρωτο ἐν ἡμέραις ἐπτα’ πλευν
δὲ ταλαντῶν ἕξακοσίων Ἒξηκοντα ἡ δόσις ἐγεγονεὶ. πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ
tῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων τέκνων σῶν ταῖς μητράσιν ἐλευθεροῦντο. προσαν-
εγεχέντος εἰ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐκοσα δραχμὰ δοθήσεται, καὶ τοῦτ’
ἐκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλείς ποιεῖν, ὀλοσχερῶς περὶ τοῦ δόξαντος ἀπαντ’ ἰ5
ἐπιτελω.

§ Eus 5'Ως δὲ κατεπράξθη ταύτα, τὸν Δημήτριον ἐκέλευσεν εἰσδοῦναι
περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν βιβλίων ἀναγραφῆς. πάντα γὰρ διὰ
προσταγμάτων καὶ μεγάλης ἀσφαλείας τοὺς βασιλεῖσι τοῖς
διώκειτο, καὶ οὕτως ἀπερρίμμενοι οὕτ’ εἰκῆ. διόπερ καὶ τὸ τῆς ὀ
εἰσδόσεως καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀντίγραφα κατακεχώρικα, καὶ τὸ
tῶν ἀπεσταλμένων πλῆθος καὶ τὴν ἐκαστὸν κατασκευὴν, διὰ τὸ
μεγαλομοιρία καὶ τέχνη διαφέρειν ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν. τῆς δὲ εἰσδό-
σεως ἑστιν ἀντίγραφον τόδε. βασιλεῖς μεγάλῳ παρὰ Δημήτριον.
προσταξαντὸς σου, βασιλεῦ, περὶ τῶν ἀπολεπώντων εἰς τὴν συμπλή-25
ρωσαν τῆς βιβλιοθήκης βιβλίων, ὅπως ἐπισυναχθῇ, καὶ δα διαπε-
τωκότα τύχη τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπισκευῆς, πεποιημένοι οὐ παρέργως

HKAGIBT
3 ἐφ ὦ ex conj (cf 3 Macc 3[28]) ἐφη codd ἐφην 1vid 5 εἰσδοθέντος]
+ ὁν B 7 ει καὶ K [η] ει GIZ 10 ουσαν + δασιν B 11 πλευν TZ
17 τῳ Δημήτριῳ ΒΤ | εκδοναι Ευς ὡ καὶ Τζ codd aliq 18 ἀναγραφης Τζ οτ Eus [antigraφης Τζ οτ Ευς] αντιγραφης Ar codd omn 19 ασφαλ. καρβαης Ευς 20 διωκητο
Ar codd txt Ευς (διωκεται Ευςο) | καὶ 1ος ins Ευς om Ar | το Ευς Τζ Τζ
21 εκδοσεως BTZ Ευς codd aliq 24 αντιγραφον -φα B εστιν ουτωs BT
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tὴν ἐν τούτοις ἐπιμέλειαν, προσαναφέρω σοι τάδε. τοῦ νόμου τῶν Τιουδαίων βιβλία σὺν ἑτέροις ὅλογοι τισίν ἀπολείπει· τυγχάνει γὰρ Ἐβραϊκὸς γράμμασί καὶ φωνὴ λεγόμενα, ἀμελεστερὸν δὲ, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ὑπάρχει, σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ τῶν εἰδώτων προσανα-5 φέρεται προνοίας γὰρ βασιλικῆς οὔ τέσσερε. δέων δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦθ ὑπάρχειν παρά σοι διηρκεισμένα, διὰ τὸ καὶ φιλοσοφοφέραν εἶναι καὶ ἀκέραιο τὴν νομοθεσίαν ταύτην, ὡς ἂν οὕσαν θείαν. διὸ πόρρω γεγόνασιν οἳ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλῆθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προερημένων βιβλίων, καὶ τῶν κατ’
10 αὕτα πεπολεμεμένων καὶ πολιτευμένων ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἅγιν τυπα καὶ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὕτοις θεωρίαν, ὡς φησὶν Ἐκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης. ἐὰν οὖν φαίνεται, βασιλεὺς, γραφήσεται πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα τὸν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις, ἀποστείλαι τοὺς μάλιστα καλὸς βεβιωκότας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ὄντας ἄνδρας, ἐμπείρους τῶν κατ’
20 τὸν νόμον τῶν ἑαυτῶν, ἀφ’ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἔξ, ὅπως τὸ σύμφωνον ἐκ τῶν πλειόνων ἔξετάσαντες καὶ λαβόντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἀκριβεῖς, ἀξίως καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς σῆς προαιρέσεως, θῶμεν εὐσήμως. εὐτυχεὶ διὰ παντός. Τῆς δὲ εἰσόδοσεως ταύτης γενο-μένης, ἑκέλευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γραφῆναι πρὸς τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον περὶ
25 τούτων, σημάναντας καὶ τῆς γενομένης ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν αἵμα- λωτῶν. ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ εἰς κατασκευὴν κρατήρων τε καὶ φιαλῶν καὶ τραπέζης καὶ συνδεών χρυσίων μὲν ὀλίγης τάλαντα πεντήκοντα καὶ ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ λίθων ἴκανων τῇ πλῆθος. ἑκέλευσε δὲ τοὺς ρυσκοφύλακας τοὺς τεχνίτας, ἦν ἃν προαιρῶνται,
20 τῆς ἐκλογῆς διδόναι, καὶ νομίσματος εἰς θυσίας καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς τάλαντα ἑκατόν. ἐκθέσαμεν δὲ σοι περὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς, ὡς ἂν τὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀντίγραφα διελθῶμεν. ἦν δὲ η τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴ τῶν τύπων ἕξουσα τούτων 

Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος

Ελευθερώς ἄρχισεν χάριν καὶ ἔρρωσθαι. ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει πλείονας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν χώραν κατφικώθαι γενθήσεται ἀναστάσεως ἐκ τῶν Ἰεροσολύμων ὡς Περσῶν, καθ’ ὅν ἐπεκράτησεν χρόνον, ἐτεὶ δὲ καὶ συνεκληθέναι τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν Ἀλγυπτίων αἴχμαλώτων,—ἀφ’ ὃν πλείονας εἰς τὸ στρατιωτικὸν σύνταγμα 5 κατεχώρισεν ἐπὶ μείζονι μισθοφορίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς προοίμας κρίνας πιστοὺς φρούρια κτίσας ἀπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτως τὸ τῶν Ἀλγυ-
πτίων ἔθνος φόβον [μὴ] ἔχει διὰ τούτων· καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ παραλαβόντες τὴν βασιλείαν φιλανθρωπότερον ἀπαντῶμεν τοῖς πάσι, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τοῖς σοῖς πολῖταις—ὑπὲρ δέκα μυριάδας αἴχμαλώτων ἡλευ-
τοι θερώκαμεν, ἀποδόντες τοῖς κρατοῦσι τὴν κατ’ ἄξιον ἀργυρίῳν τιμήν, διορθοίμενοι καὶ εἰ τι κακὸς ἐπράξθη διὰ τάς τῶν ὁχλῶν ὅρμας, διελθηφότες εὐσεβῶς τούτο πράξει, καὶ τῷ μεγάτω θεῷ ἱεροποτικὸν ἀνατιθέντες, δι ημῶν τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δόξῃ κρατίστῃ παρ’ ἄλλην τὴν οἰκουμένην διατηρήσει· εἰς τὲ τὸ στρατεύμα τοῦς 15 ἀκμαὐστάτους ταῖς ἡλικίαις τετάχαμεν, τοὺς δὲ δυναμένους καὶ περὶ ἡμᾶς εἶναι, τῆς περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν πίστεως ἀξίους, ἐπὶ χρειῶν καθεστά-
καμεν. Βουλομένων δ’ ἡμῶν καὶ τούτως χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πάντι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς μετέπειτα, προορίηθημα τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν μεθερμηνεύθηναι γράμμασιν ἐλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν παρ’ ὁμοῖων λεγομένων ἐβραίκων γραμμάτων, ἐν ὑπάρχῃ καὶ ταῦτα παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐν βιβλιοθήκῃ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις βασιλείας βιβλίοις. καλῶς ὁμοιόμενοι καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας στουδῆς αξίως ἐπιλεξάμενοι ἀνδρας καλῶς βεβιωκότας προσβιτέρους, ἐμπειρίαν ἐξοντας τὸν νόμον, καὶ δυνατοὺς ἐρμηνεύσαι, ἀφ’ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἡς, ὅπως ἐκ τῶν πλείονων 25 τὸ σύμφωνον εὐρέθη, διὰ τὸ περὶ μειῶνων εἶναι τὴν σκέψιν. οἰόμεθα γὰρ ἐπιτελεσθέντος τούτου μεγάλην ἀποίσεσθαι δόξαν.
ἀπεστάλκαμεν δὲ περὶ τοὺτων Ἀνδρέαν τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων καὶ Ἀριστέαν, τιμωμένους παρ’ ἡμῖν, διαλεξομένους σοι καὶ κομί-ξοντας ἀπαρχάς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναθημάτων καὶ εἰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ἄργυριον τάλαντα ἑκατόν. γράφων δὲ καὶ σὺ πρὸς ἡμᾶς περὶ ὅν ἔαν 5 βουλὴ κεχαρισμένος ἑστή, καὶ φιλίας ἀξίων τι πράξεις, ὡς ἐπιτελεσ-
θησομένων τὴν ταχύτητα περὶ ὅν ἄν αἰρῇ. ἐρωσί. Πρὸς ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀντέγραψεν ἐνδεχομένως ὁ Ἐλεάζαρος ταῦτα Ἐλεάζαρος ἀρχιερεὺς βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίω φίλῳ γνησίῳ χαίρειν. αὐτὸς τε ἐρωσί καὶ ἡ βασιλίσσα Ἀρσινόη, ιο ἡ ἀδελφὴ, καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καλῶς ἂν ἔχω καὶ ὡς βουλόμεθα, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίονες. λαβόντες τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολὴν, μεγάλως ἐχάρημεν διὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν σου καὶ τὴν καλὴν βουλήν, καὶ συνα-
γούντες τὸ πάν πλήθος παρανέγκων αὐτοῖς, ἵνα εἰδῶσιν ἄν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν εὐσέβειαν. ἐπεδείξαμεν δὲ καὶ τὰς φιλίας ἃς 15 ἀπέστειλας, χρυσὰς ἔκοσι καὶ ἄργυρας τριάκοντα, κρατήρας πέντε, καὶ τράπεζαν εἰς ἀνάδεσσιν, καὶ εἰς προσαγωγὴν θυσίαν καὶ εἰς ἐπισκευὰς ὅν ἄν δέητα τὸ ἱερὸν ἄργυριον τάλαντα ἑκατόν, ἀπε ἐκόμισεν Ἀνδρέας τῶν τετμημένων παρὰ σοὶ καὶ Ἀριστέας, ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντες καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ 20 δικαιοσύνης ἄξιοι κατὰ πάντα. οἱ καὶ μετέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὰ παρὰ σοῦ, πρὸς ἄ καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀκρόκασιν ἀμοίβαντα τοῖς σοῖς γράμμαις. πάντα γὰρ ὅσα σοὶ συμφέρει, καὶ εἰ παρὰ φύσιν ἔστιν, ὑπακούσι-
μεθα τοῦτο γὰρ φιλίας καὶ ἀγαπήσεως σημεῖον ἔστι. μεγάλα γὰρ καὶ ἀνεπίληστα τοὺς πολίτας ἡμῶν κατὰ πολλοὺς εὐνήγετηκας.

1 τοτων Jos Eus] τοτων Ar | τον arχισωματοφυλακα B (arχι sup lin HKAGIBT
primas manu) TZ Jos txt Ar codd cett Eus1 (των σωμος) 2 Ἀρισταῖον Ar codd Eus7 (-eav Eus1 cum Ar codd) | κομίζοντες Z | 4 γραφε BT Eus txt codd cett et Josvid | av B Eus7 (eav Eus1 cum codd cett) | 5 κεχαρισμένος Ar codd κεχαρισμένας γαρ Eus | 7 ταυτ. τὴν επ.] ταυτα Eus7 | 8 ταῦτα Eus7 (outows) | 9 εἰ αὐτοὺς τε ἐρωσίατε Eus txt (cf 2 Macc 90, 1τ.28) Ar codd (-σαι Z) | 12 συναγωγεῖς K | 13 αργυρωμεν G conv vid Jos παρεγν. IG B - αὐτὴν Eus7 Jos | 16 προσαγωγὴν Z | 17 προσδέθηται Eus txt Ar codd Jos | 18 εκουμένων Ar codd -σεν Eus7 (ξεν cett) -σεν Jos | 19 Ἀνδρέας] | 20 παρεδώκαν Ar codd B | καὶ] pr Andreeses B | Ἀρισταῖος Jos Eus7 (-eav 1) 21 γραμματεῖς] πραγματεία Eus | 24 καὶ] pr καὶ συν BT (σοι G καὶ σοι IZ) txt codd cett Eus | ανεπίληστα A | πολλοὶ Μ.Α πολυ K πολλοὶ τροποὺς Eus
εἰθέως οὖν προσηγόμεν εὔπερ σοι θυσίας καὶ τῆς ᾠδελφῆς καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν φίλων· καὶ ἤξατο πᾶν τὸ πλήθος, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθώς προαιρῇ διαπαντός, καὶ διατούροι σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνη μετὰ δόξης ἀ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεοῦ, καὶ ὅπως γένηται σοι συμφερόντως καὶ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ὁ τοῦ ἁγίου νόμου μεταγραφῇ. 5 παρόντων δὲ πάντων ἐπελεξαμεν ἄνδρας καλοὺς καὶ ἁγάθους πρεσβυτέρους, ἀφ’ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ξέ, οὔς καὶ ἀπεστείλαμεν ἔχοντας τὸν νόμον. καλὼς οὖν τοιχίες, βασιλέω δίκαιε, προστάζεις, ὡς ἂν ἡ μεταγραφή γένηται τῶν βιβλίων, ἵνα πάλιν ἀποκατασταθῶσι πρὸς τὸν ήμᾶς ἀσφαλῶς οἱ ἁγάθοι. ἐρρωσα.9 10 Ἱώσηφος Ἐξεκίας Ζαχαρίας Ἰωάννης Ἐξεκίας Ἐλισαίου. δευτέρας: Ἰούδας Σίμων Σομόλος Ἀδαῖος Ματθαῖος Ἐσχελμᾶς. τρίτης: Νεμιᾶς Ἰωσήφος Θεοδώρος Βασίας Ὀρνίας Δάκις. τετάρτης: Ἰωάθας Ἀβραίος Ἐλισαίου Ἀνανίας Χαβρίας... πέμπτης: Ἰσακος Ἰάκωβος Ἰησοῦς Σαββαταῖος Σίμων Δενίκ. 15 ἑκτης: Ἰούδας Ἰωσήφος Σίμων Ζαχαρίας Σομόλος Σελεμίας.
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"Ως δὲ ἐπηγγειλάμην καὶ τὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων διασαφήσας, § Jos
ποιησώ. παλιντεχνία γὰρ διαφέροντα συνετελέσθη, τοῦ βασιλέως
πολλῆς ἐπίδοσιν ποιομένου καὶ παρ' ἐκαστὸν ἐπιθεωρήσατο τοὺς
τεχνίτας. διὸ παραδείγματι οὐδὲν ἤδυνατο οὐδὲ έκή συνετελέσατι.
5 πρῶτον δὲ σοι τὰ πέρι τῆς τραπεζής ἐξηγήσομαι. Προσθε-}
μεῖτο μὲν οὖν ο ἑαυτός ὑπέροπλὸν τι ποιήσας τοῖς μέτροισ τὸ
κατασκεύασμα. προσέταξε δὲ πυθέσθαι τῶν ἀνὰ τὸν τόπον, πηλήκι
τὸς ἐστὶν ἡ προοίωσι καὶ κεμὲνη κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωις.
ὡς δὲ ἀπεφήναντο τὰ μέτρα, προσεπηρώθησεν, εἰ κατασκεύασε
10 μέίζονα. τυνὲς μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἠλογῶν μηδὲν
ἐπικυλίευσιν. ὁ δὲ εἰςτε βούλεσθαι καὶ πενταπλῆς τοῖς μεγέθεσι
ποιήσας, διστάζει δὲ μὴ ποτὲ ἀχρηστὸς γένηται πρὸς τὰς λειτουρ-
γίας. οὐ γὰρ αἱρέσθαι τὸ κέσθαι μόνον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ <τὰ> παρ’
αὐτοῦ, τολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον χάριν ἔχειν, έαν τὰς καθηκούσας λειτουργίας
15 ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ κατασκευασμένων οἷς καθήκε ποιῶνται δεόντως.
οὐ γὰρ ἔνεκεν σπάνεως χρυσῷ τὰ προσυντεκτελεσμένα βραχύμετρα
καθέστηκεν, ἀλλὰ φαίνεται πρὸς τινὰ λόγον, εἰπεῖν, οὕτως συνεστη-
κέναι τοῖς μέτροισ. ἐτὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς οὐσίας οἴδαν ἀν ἑσπάνυζε·
διόπερ οὐ παραβατέον οὐδὲ ὑπερβετέον τὰ καλῶς ἔκοιντα. τῇ μὲν
20 οὖν ποικιλία τῶν τεχνῶν ἐκέλευσεν ὅτι μάλιστα χρησάσθαι, σεμνῶς
ἀπαντὰ διανοούμενος καὶ φώσιν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν εἰς τὸ συνιδεῖν πραγ-
μάτων ἐμφασιν. ὁσα δὲ ἀν ἐν ἅ γραφα, πρὸς καλλονὴν ἐκέλευσε
πουείν· ὡσα δὲ διὰ γραπτῶν, μέτρα αὐτοῖς κατακολουθήσαι.
25 Δύο γὰρ πήχεων τὸ μύκος, τὸ δὲ ἱγος πήχεως καὶ Λύμιος § Q
συνετέλουν, χρυσίων δοκίμων στερεάν πάντοθεν τὴν ποιήσιν ἐργα-
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τῆς] οὐδα γὰρ ὡς δαπάλους τῆς υλῆς αὐτοῦ B. Fort legendum ei τι γαρ
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24 πήχεων] pr καὶ ημεσουs Jos qui et post μήκος add (ex LXX vid) evos de το
ευροσ
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σάμενοι, λέγω δὲ οὐ περὶ τι περιπτυγμένου τοῦ χρυσοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἐλασμὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεδέσθαι. στεφάνην δὲ ἐποίησαν παλαιοτιλιάν κυκλοθέν· τὰ δὲ κυμάτια στρεπτά, τὴν ἀναγλυφὴν ἔχοντα σχοινίδων ἔκτυπον, τῇ τορείᾳ θαμαστῶς ἔχουσαν ἐκ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν. ἂν γὰρ τριγυνία· καὶ καθ’ ἕκαστον μέρος ἡ διατύπωσις τῆς ἐνεργείας 5 τῆς αὐτήν διάθεσιν ἔχειν, ὡστε καθ’ ὁ ἂν μέρος στρεφοῦτο, τὴν πρόσοψιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτὴν· ἕκειμένοι δὲ κατὰ τῆς στεφάνης τὸ μὲν Η εἰς αὕτην τὴν τράπεζαν ἀπόκλιμα τῆς διατύπωσιν ἔχειν τῆς ἁραίω-

ητος, τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸς κλίμα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ προσάγωντος εἶναι θεωριάν. διὸ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν δεξιὰν εἶναι τῶν δύο κλιμάτων συνεβαινε, μετέωρον 10 ἐπικειμένην, ὁς προερήκαμεν, τριγύνον κατεσκευασμένον, καθ’ ὃ ἂν μέρος στρεφοῦτο. λίθων τε πολυτελῶν ἐν αὐτῷ διαθέσεις ὑπῆρχον ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν σχοινίδων· ἔτερος παρὰ ἔτερον πλοῦκι εἶχον ἀμύ-

μητον τῇ ποιῆσει. πάντες δ’ ἦσαν διὰ τριμάτων κατελημμένοι χρυσαῖς περόνας πρὸς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. επὶ δὲ τῶν γωνίων αἱ 15 κατακλείδες συνέσφηγγον πρὸς τὴν συνοχήν. ἐκ πλαγίων δὲ κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην κυκλοθέν τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω πρόσοψιν ὑθεσία κατε-

σκευάστο διάλειον, ἔκτυπωσιν ἔχουσα προσοχῇς· συνεχέις ἀνα-

γλυφαῖς ῥαβδωταῖς, πυκνὴν ἔχονσας τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλα θέσιν περὶ ὁλην τὴν τράπεζαν. ὅποι δὲ τὴν ἐκτύπωσιν τῶν λίθων τῆς 20 ὑθεσίας, στέφανον ἐποίησαν οἱ τεχνίται πάγκρατον, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ προδήλωσ ἔχοντα βοτρύνων καὶ σταχὺν, ἐτί δὲ φοινίκων καὶ μῆλων ἔλαιας τε καὶ βοῶν καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων. τοὺς δὲ λίθους ἐργασά-

μενοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν προερημένων καρπῶν διατύπωσιν, ἔχοντας

HKAGIQB
CTZ Jos

1 χρυσοῦ] ad hoc Αcorr in mg add ou κατα τι μερος της τραπεζης συνε-

σταλμενον του χρυσου και ωχι ορωμενον· αλλα δια παντων επιλαμπουντος· κα-

τα τας σωματικας διαστασεις ητου κατα βαθος κατα μηκος κατα πλατος ομοιο εχοντος· στερεα γαρ νη δι αλο ετο σχηματος. το δε ειδος ως φυσι Θεοδοριτος (-μητ. L) τριγυνος κατα λογον αναγωγης ψηλοτερας καὶ 

θειοτερας. Hanc notam L textui inscrimit· 3, 4 σχοινιδων GIBTs] σχοι-

νιδων HKAC -ηων T11Z (σχουσειδη Jos) 4 εκτυπον T11 εκτυπον cett 7 κειμενης δε και B txt cett. Fort κειμενω legendum· 11 κειμενην BCTZ 12 en αυτω] en εαυτω GIQCZ εαυτω T 18 κατακλειδαι CQ | συνεσφ.]+ δε GICQ 17 αποθεσια Q 18 εκτυπωσι B] εκτυπων (ek τυπων GI)cett | Fort legendum προοχης (con Schmid) | συνοχης GIBC 19 εχο-

νας QCZ. 22 δε]+και A
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ικάστου γένους τὴν χρόαν, ἀνέδησαν τῷ χρυσῷ κύκλῳ περὶ ὅλην τὴν τῆς τραπέζης κατασκευήν κατὰ κρόταφον. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ στεφάνου διάθεσιν, ὁμοίως κατὰ τὴν τῆς ὑσθεσίας διασκευήν κατεσκεύαστο, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ῥαβδώσεως καὶ διαγλυφῆς, <διὰ τὸ> 5 κατ’ αμφότερα τὰ μέρη τὴν τράπεζαν πρὸς τὴν χρήσιν πεποιήσαν, καθ’ ὅ ἂν μέρος αἱροῦνται, ὥστε καὶ τὴν τῶν κυμάτων θέσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς στεφάνης εἶναι κατὰ τὸ τῶν ποθῶν μέρος. ἔλασμα γὰρ ἐποίησαν καθ’ ὅλον τοῦ πλάτος τῆς τραπέζης στερεὸν δακτύλων τεσσάρων, ὥστε τοὺς πόδας ἐνίσθησαι εἰς τοῦτο, περονάς <σὺν> κατακλέισιν 10 ἔχοντας ἐσφίγγθαι κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην, ἕνα, καθ’ ὅ ἂν αἱροῦται μέρος, ἡ χρήσις γ’ τούτο δὲ κατὰ ἐπιφάνειαν θεωρεῖται ἀμφοτεροδεξίον τῆς κατασκευῆς οὐσίας. ἐπ’ αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς τραπέζης μαίανδρον ἐκτυποῦν ἐποίησαν, ἐν ὑπεροχῇ λίθοις ἔχοντα κατὰ μέσον πολυτελεῖς, τῶν ἑπταλίδων ἀνθράκων τε καὶ σμαράγδων, ἐτὶ δὲ 15 ὄνυχος, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν τῶν διαφερόντων εἰς φραίστητο. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ μαίανδρον διάθεσιν ἐπέκειτο σχιστῆ πλοκῆ, θαυμασίῳ ἔχοντα, ὑμβυστὴν ἀποτελοῦσα τὴν ἄνα μέσον θεωρίαν· ἐφ’ ἣ κρυστάλλων λίθος καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ἥλεκτρον ἐντεῦτως, ἀμύητον θεωρίαν ἀποτελοῦσα τοῖς θεωροῦσι. τοὺς δὲ πόδας ἐποίησαν 20 τὰς κεφαλίδας ἔχοντας κρινωτάς, ἀνάκλασιν κρίνων ὑπὸ τὴν τράπεζαν λαμβανόντων, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐντὸς προσόψεως ὅρθην ἔχοντα τὴν πεταλωσίν. ἦ δὲ ἐπ’ ἐδάφους ἐρείσι τοῦ ποδὸς ἀνθράκος λίθος πάντωθεν παλαιστιαία, κρυπτόδος ἔχουσα τάξιν κατὰ τὴν πρόσοψιν, ὅτι δὲ δακτύλων τὸ πλάτος ἔχουσα· ἐφ’ ὅν ἐπίκειταί τὸ πᾶν ἔλασμα 25 τοῦ ποδὸς. κατασκεύασε δὲ ἐκφύτων κυστὸν ἀκάθων πλεκόμενον ἕκ τοῦ λίθου, σὺν ἀμπέλῳ περιείλομενον κυκλόθεν τῷ ποδὶ σὺν


34—2
τοῖς βότρυσιν, οἱ λιθουργεῖς ἦσαν μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς. ἦ δ' 
αὐτὴ διάθεσις ἦν τῶν τεσσάρων τοιῶν, πάντα ἐνεργῶς πεποι-
μένα καὶ προσηγμένα, τῆς ἐμπειρίας καὶ τέχνης τὰς ὑποχαγ 
ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχοντα πρὸς τὴν ἀλληλειαν, ὡστε καὶ ἰσημένος τοῦ 
κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα πνεύματος κίνησιν εἰπεῖγεσθαι τὴν τῶν φύλλων δ 
θέσιν, πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀλληλειας διάθεσιν τετυπωμένων ἀπάντων. 
ἐποίησαν δὲ τριμερές τὸ στόμα τῆς τραπέζης, οἰονεὶ τρίπτυχον, 
πελεκίνους συναρμοζόμενα γομφυτοῖς πρὸς εαυτὰ κατὰ τὸ πάχος τῆς 
κατασκευῆς, ἀθέατον καὶ ἀνεύρετον τὴν τῶν ἀρμῶν κατασκευάσαντες 
συμβαλῆν. ἡμιπηχιοῦ δὲ οὐκ ἐλάσσονος ἦν τὸ πάχος τῆς ὀλί 
τραπέζης, ὥστε πολλῶν εἶναι ταλάντων τὴν ὀλίγη διασκευὴν. ἐπεὶ 
γὰρ οὐ προήρητο τοὺς μεγέθεσις οὐδὲν προσβῆναι ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὃσον 
ἐδεί διαπανηθήμην κατασκευαζόμενων μειζώνων, ταῦτα ἀποδείκ 
πλείονα· καὶ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐπετελέσθη 
θαυμασίως καὶ αξιολόγως ἔχοντα, καὶ ταῖς τέχναις ἀμίμητα, καὶ τῇ 15 
kallhνη διαπρεπῆ. 

Τῶν δὲ κρατήρων δύο μὲν ἦσαν <χρύσεοι> 

Τῇ τῇ κατασκευῇ, φολιώτην ἔχοντες ἀπὸ τῆς βάσεως μέχρι τοῦ μέσου 
τὴν διασκευὴν τῇ τορείᾳ, καὶ τὴν τῶν λίθων ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν φολί 
δῶν σύνδεσιν πολυτέχνων ἔχοντες. ἔται μαιανδρὸς ἐπέκειτο τηχναῖος 
ὑψεῖ, τῇ δ' ἐκτύπωσιν ἐνυπήρχε διὰ λιθόσεως ποικίλης, ἐμφαίων ὑ 
σὺν ὠραώτητι τὸ τῆς τέχνης φιλόσοφον. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ πάλιν, ἐφ' ἡ 
διαπλοκὴ ρόμβων, δικτυωτὴ ἔχουσα τὴν πρόσοψιν ἦν ἐπὶ τὸ 
στόμα. τῇ δ' ἀνὰ μέσον ἀσπιδίσκου λίθων ἐτέρων παρ' ἐτέρους, τοῖς 
γένεις παραλλαγὴν ἔχοντων, τεταρακτύλων οὐχ ἐλαττών, ἀνεπλή 
ρουν τῷ τῆς καλλονῆς ἐναργής. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς στεφάνης τοῦ στόματος 25 
κρίνων τύπωσις σὺν ἀνθεμίσι καὶ βοτρύων σχοινία διαπλοκὸι 
dιεκτυωτοῦ κυκλοθέν. οἱ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοιαύτην ἐχθ 
tῆς κατασκευῆς, χαροῦντες ύπὲρ δύο μετρητάς. οἱ δ' ἀργυροὶ λεία 

KAGIQBC TZ Jos

1 οἶ; 2 o GI 2 εναργῶς BZ 4 τοῦ πρ. κατα τον a. Q 7 στόμα] 
σχήμα Jos 8 συναρμοζόμενον KA 9 a. έτει ὑπέρον codd txt ex Jos (aoratov) 
10 ἡμιπηχιοῦ B | ἐλάσσον Q | τῆς KB] τῆς cett 11 επείδη Q 12 προ-
ειρήτο GCTZ | οὖν CTZ 13 om. μειζώνων C 14 απετελεσθη BCT 
15 τῆς τέχνης CQ 16 χρυσοῦ (om codd) ex Jos supplevi 17, 18 ἀπὸ 
τῆς βασ.—τορείᾳ καὶ om BTZ 18 τορεία G 19 σωθεσίν GI 
25 ἐνεργεῖς 26 σχοινίων codd txt ex Jos conj Schmidt 28 λιαν 
QGIZT*fort
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εἴχον τὴν διασκευὴν, ἐνοπτὸν δὴ γεγονοῦν πρὸς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θαυμασίως ἔχουσαν, ὡστε πάν τὸ προσαχθὲν ἀπανγάζεσθαι σαφέστερον μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τοῖς κατόπτροις. οὐκ ἐφικτὸν δὲ ἐστιν ἐξηγήσασθαι τὰ προσυντελεσθέντα πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐμφασιν. ὡς γὰρ ἐπετελέσθη, τεθέντων τῶν κατασκευασμάτων ἐτέρου παρ’ ἐτέρον—

λέγω δὲ πρῶτον ἀργυρῷ κρατήρος, ἐπί ξυροῦ, πάλιν ἄργυροῦ καὶ χρυσοῦ—παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητος ἐγένετο τῆς προσόψεως ἡ διάθεσις, καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν προσιότων οὐ δυναμένων ἀφύστασθαι διὰ τὴν περιαγωγιν καὶ τὸς ὄψεως τερπνών. τοικὴ γὰρ ἦν ἡ τῆς ἐπιφανείας ἐνέργεια. προσορωντὼν γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ κατασκευὴν, ψυχαγωγία τις ἦν μετὰ θαυμασμοῦ, συνεχώς ἐφ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐπιβαλλούσης τῆς διανοίας τεχνίτευμα. καὶ πάλιν ὅτε πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἄργυρων προσβλάψαι τὸς θέσιν ἤθελεν, ἀπέλαμπτα τὰ πάντα κυκλόθεν, ὡς ἄν τις ἔστηκε, καὶ διάξυσιν ἔποιεί μείζονα τοῖς θεω-

15 μένοις· ὡστε παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητον εἶναι τῶν ἐνηργημένων τὴν πολυτεχνίαν.

Τάς δὲ χρυσὰς φιάλας διετέρωσαν στεφάνωις ἀμπελοῦ κατὰ μέσον, περὶ δὲ τὰ χείλη κισσοῦ τε καὶ μυρίνης, ἐτὸς ἐλαίας ἀνέπλεξαν στεφάνων ἐκτυποῦ, πολυτελεῖς ἐνέντες λίθους· καὶ τὰς λούσις δὲ τορείας διημεγεμένως ἐπετελεσαν, ἀπαντὰ φιλοτε-

20 μθέντεσ εἰς ὑπεροχὴν δόξης τοῦ βασιλέως ποιήσαι. καθόλου γὰρ ὅτε ἔν τοῖς βασιλικόῖς ὑπήρχε διακοσμικάς τοιαύτης κατασκευὴ τῆς πολυτελείας καὶ τεχνουργίας, ὅταν ἐν τούτῳ ἄλλω. πρόνοιαν γὰρ οὔ άρκετον ἐποιεῖτο ὁ βασιλεὺς, πολλοῖς εἰς τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα. πολλάκις γὰρ τὸν δημόσιον χρηματισμὸν παρῆλθε, τοῖς δὲ τεχνίταις

25 παρῆδροι ἐπιμελῶς, ἵνα καθηκόντως τῷ τόπῳ συντελέσωμ, εἰς ἄν ἀπεστελέθη τὰ τῶν ἔργων· ἰδιοὶ πάντα σεμνῶς ἐγεγονεί, καὶ ἠ γαρ καταξίων τοῦ τε ἀποστελλότων βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ προστατοῦντος ἀρχιερέως τοῦ τόπου. καὶ γὰρ τὸς λίθων πλῆθος ἀφθονον, καὶ

1 δὴ] de TZ om BC 2 προσαξὲν GI προσταχθὲν Z | απεργάζεσθαι Q KAGIQBT
4 προσφυτ. B 4, 5 πρὸς τὴν—τεθέντων om Tmt (insmgs) Z 6 προπτερον Z Jos
8 om ou Q 13 προσβλέφεται T επιβλέφεται B 13, 14 θεσιν—
ως αν τις om BTZ 14 εποιεῖ] επι Q 18 δι ελαιας Q | ευεντες BTZ 19 τορεῖας KAcorr] τορεῖας cett | διηλλαγμένας B 22 και τεχν.] τῆς τεχνουργίας B 23 εποιεῖ KAGI 24 παρείς TZQ 25 επιτελε-

σώσων B*
μεγάλοι τοῖς μεγέθεσιν, οὐκ ἔλαττον πεντακοσιλίων· καὶ ταῖς τέχναις κρατιστεύοντα πάντα, ὡστε πενταπλασίως τοῦ χρυσοῦ τιμωτέραν εἶναι τὴν τῶν λίθων δόσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν τεχνῶν ἐνέργειαν.

Ὑπολαμβάνων οὖν καὶ τούτων τῆς ἀναγραφής ἀναγκαίων εἶναι, δεδήλωκα σοι. τὰ δ’ ἔξης περιέχει τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον ὅδον 5 ἡμῖν γενομένην· τὴν δὲ θέσιν τῆς δῆλης χώρας πρῶτον δηλῶσον. Ὅσα γὰρ παρεγγένησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους, ἐθεωροῦμεν τὴν τόλμην μέσην κειμένην τῆς δῆλης Ἰουδαίων ἐπ’ ὀροὺς ὑψηλὴν ἔχοντος τῆς ἀνάτασιν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κορυφῆς κατασκεύαστο τὸ ἱερὸν ἐκπτετοὺς ἔχον· καὶ οἱ περὶ βολοῦ τρεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἐβδομήκοντα δὲ πῆχες τῷ μεγέθει, καὶ τὸ 10 πλάτος ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸ μῆκος τῆς κατὰ τὸν ὦκον διασκεδαστικὸ ύπήρχε, μεγαλομορφία καὶ χαράγμα κατὰ πάντα ὑπερβαλλούσῃ διωκοδομημένων ἀπάντων. καὶ τοῦ θυρώματος δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸ συνδέμων κατὰ τὰς φλάς καὶ τῆς τῶν ὑπερθύρων ἀσφαλείας ἐκδηλοῦ ἡ τῶν χρημάτων γεγονότα ἀφεδεχθεὶς διαπάνη. τοῦ τε 15 καταπτετόματος ἡ διατύπωσις θυρώσι κατὰ πάν ὁμοιότατη ύπήρχε καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποδρομήν αὐτῇ ἐνιαυτήν κίνησιν λαμβανόμενης τῆς δινής, διὰ τὸ ἀπ’ ἐδάφους γενομένης τῆς ὑποδρομής <κατατείνειν> τῆς κόλπωσιν μέχρι τῆς ἀνω διατάσεως, ἣδειαν τινα καὶ δυσπάλλακτον τὴν θεωρίαν ἔχοντος τοῦ πράγματος.

Ἡ τε τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κατασκευὴ σύμμετρον [ἐχούσα] πρὸς τὸν τόπον καὶ τὰ θύματα διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξαναλούμενα τὴν διοικοδομήν εἰχε, τῆς δ’ ἀναβάςεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτό, πρὸς τὴν εὐκοσμῶν ἔχοντος τοῦ τόπου καθηκόντως, τὸ κλίμα τῶν λειτουργῶν, τῶν ἱερών κεκα-
λυμμένων μέχρι τῶν σφυρῶν ἔγοινοις χιτῶσιν. ἔν οἶκος βλέπει \textsuperscript{1} Eus πει πρὸς ἐω, τὰ δ’ ὀπίσθια αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέραν· τὸ δὲ πάν ἔδαφος λιβάδιστρωτόν καθότατε καὶ κλίματα πρὸς τοὺς καθήκοντας τῶτος ἔχει τῆς τῶν ὦδάτων ἐπιφορᾶς ἐνεκέρ. ἤ γὰρ νεόται διὰ τὴν σμήξην τῶν 5 ἄπο τῶν θυσίων αἰμάτων. πολλὰ γὰρ μυρίδαις κτηνῶν προσά- γωνται κατὰ τὰς τῶν ὥρτων ἡμέρας. ἦδατος δὲ ἀνέκληστός ἐστίν σῶστας, ὡς ἄν καὶ πηγὴς ἐστι δεύτερων τούτων πολυπροτοὺς φυσικῶς ἐπιρρεοῦσης, ἐτί δὲ θαυμάσμαι καὶ ἁδινηχθῶς ὑποδοχείων ὑπαρχόντων ὑπὸ γῆς, καθὼς ἀπέφαινον, πέντε σταδίων κυκλόθεν τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν κατα- 10 βαλῆς, καὶ ἐκαστὸν τούτων σύριγγας ἀναρίθμους <έχοντο>, καθ’ ἐκαστὸν μέρος ἠκάπτιστόν τῶν ἑμπάτων· καὶ πάντα ταύτα μεμολύβωθαι κατ’ ἐδάφους καὶ τοῦ τοῖχον· επὶ δὲ τούτων κεχύσθαι τολύτε πλήθος κοινάσεως, ἐνεργῶς γεγενημένων ἁπάντων· εἶναι \textsuperscript{7} Eus δέ πυκνὰ τὰ στόματα πρὸς τὴν βάσιν, ἀόρατος ἔχοντα τοῖς πάσι 15 πλην αὐτοῦ οἷς ἐστί προθυρία· ὡς ἀροτῆ καὶ νεόματι πάντα καθαρίζονται τὰ συναγόμενα παμπληθεί πῶς ἡμάτων αἴματα. Πεπεσμένος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν τῶν ὑποδοχείων κατασκεύην δηλώσῳ καθὼς ἐπιστώθην· προήγαγον γὰρ πλέον σταδίων τεσσάρων ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ πρὸς τινὰ τόπον ἐκέλευσαν κατακύψας συναόσαι 20 τοῦ γυνομένου ψόφου τῆς ἀπαντῆσεως τῶν ὦδάτων· ὥστε συμφανεῖ 2 μοι γεγονόταν τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἄγγειων, καθὼς διδήλωται. Τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν ἡ λειτουργία κατὰ πάν ἀνυπέρβλητος ἐστὶν τῇ βρομῇ καὶ τῇ τῆς εὐκοσίας καὶ σιγῆς διαθέσει. πάντες γὰρ αὐτοκελεύ- στως διαπονοῦσι πολλῆς γνωμήν κακοπάθειας, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τὸ 25 διασταγμένων μέλει· καὶ ἀδιαλέπτως ὑπηρετοῦσιν, οἱ μὲν τὴν ἐνείαι, οἱ δὲ ἐλαιον, οἱ δὲ σεμιδαίλαν, οἱ δὲ τὰ τῶν ἄραμάτων, ἑτερον

1 Ex 36\textsuperscript{28} (28\textsuperscript{20})

1 αποβλέπει Eus 2 ἡς Eus 4 επιφορᾶς Eus 6 αυτ. KAGIQB
epilpētos B txt Eus (-lip.\textsuperscript{9}) KΤQ aekeklyptos cett 9 exefaloun Eus
eis \textsuperscript{10} ekastou] ek Eus | εχοντος ins Schmidt 11 eautas Ar codd Eus\textsuperscript{10} (-τας
eis\textsuperscript{21}) txt Schmidt | ταῦτα πάντα Eus 12 μεμολυβωθαί Ar codd txt
Eus\textsuperscript{10} B1 | τους τοιχους Eus\textsuperscript{9} (των -ων Eus\textsuperscript{10}) | πολύ τι πλῆθ. κεχ. K 13 om
ti Eus | κονιας eos Ar codd Eus\textsuperscript{9} | ενεργων Z 15 ois] + ouk 'Q | μπη
Tcors | Ῥευματι B 17 πεπεσμενοι (-ως A). et autοs codd corr Schmidt
Eus\textsuperscript{19} ekelewn B] ekeluvse (-σεν GI) cett 25 mellei GIBTZ 26 etepos G
ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς δόλοκαντοῦντες, ἵσχυ διαφερόντως συγχρώμενοι
διαλαβόντες γὰρ ἀμφοτέρως τῶν μόσχων τὰ σκέλη, πλεῖον ὄντα
tαλάντων δῶ ἱχθῶν ἐκάστου, ἀναρρίπτουσιν ἐκατέραςθαυμασίως
ὕψος ἴκανον καὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτάνουσι τῆς ἐπιθέσεως. ὂμωσὶ δὲ καὶ τὰ
τῶν προβάτων ἐτὶ δὲ αἴγων τοῖς βαρέσει καὶ πιμέλῃθαυμασίως ἔχει.
κατὰ τὰν γὰρ ἐκλεγομένων οὐς ἐπιμελεῖς ἐστὶν ἀμώμητα καὶ τῇ
παχύτητι διαφέροντα, τὸ προειρημένον ἐπιτελεῖται. πρὸς ὅτι τὴν
ἀνάπαυσιν τόπος αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἀποτεταγμένος, οὐ καθίζουσιν οἱ
diαναπαύσεως. τούτων δὲ γιγαντεύων, τῶν διαλειτουργῶν ἐγείρονται
πρόθυμοι, οὐδενὸς ἐπιτάσσοντος τὰ τῆς λειτουργίας. ἦ τε πάσα ἑο
συγή καθεστηκεν, ὡς τῶν λαμβανέων, μηθ’ ἕνα ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷ
tὸπω παρεῖναι, πρὸς τούς ἐπιτακσίους παρόντων τῶν λειτουργῶν—
καὶ τῶν προσαγόντων δὲ τὰ θύματα πολὺ τι πλῆθος—ἀλλὰ φόβῳ
καὶ καταξίωσις μεγάλης θείοτητος ἀπαντεῖται. Μεγάλην
δὲ ἐκπληξὶν ἕμιν παρέσχεν, ὡς ἐθεασάμεθα τὸν Ἑλέαζαρον ἐν τῇ
λειτουργία, τὰ τοῦ στολισμοῦ καὶ τῆς δόξης, ἤ συνιστάται διὰ
τὴν ἔνδυσιν οὗ ἐφεύ ξίτωνος καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν λίθων. χρυσοῦ
γὰρ κόλωνες περὶ τῶν πολέμων εἰσὶν αὐτοῦ, μέλους ἤχον ἀνείπεσε
ἰδίαξον. παρ’ ἐκατέρων δὲ τούτων ἄθετοι πεποικιλόμενοι ῥοῖκοι,
tῇ χρόνοθαυμασίως ἐχοντες. κατέζωστο δὲ διαφόρῳ ζώῃ δια-
πρεπεῖ, διωφασμένη καλλίστους χρώμασιν. ἐτὶ δὲ τοῦ 
στήγος
ἀρχι τὸ λεγόμενον λόγιον, ἐν ὁ συνεφογμένοι λίθοι ἡκαδάγο,
διαλλάσσοντες τοὺς γένεσιν, χρυσῷ κεκολλημένοι, τὰ τῶν 
φυλάρχων ὁπόματα κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διάταξιν γεννηθέσαι, ἀπαγά-
ζοντες ἐκατόστας ἀνεξήγητος τῆς ἴδιουτης τῆς φυσικῆς χρόαν.
ἐπὶ 25
δὲ τῆς κεφαλής ἔχει τὴν λεγομένην κίδαριν. ἐπὶ δὲ ταύτης τὴν
ἀμίητον μίτραν, τὸ καθηγομένον βασίλειον ἐκτύπων ἐτὶ

17 ff Ex 284-27-31 20 ib35 21 ff ib15-23
26 ff ib32 ff.

KAGIQB
TZ 1 χρωμενοι Α 2 πλειων ΒΤ 3 ταλ. διο ταλαντον ΚΒ 4 υψος]
pr eis ΒΤ | επιθεσ., | επιθυμιας Ζ (-εσεως sup ras in T) 5 προβ. | πραγμα-
tων Ζει (προβ. Zμη) 6 οις τι πιμελεσ εστιν B 8 om autous BT
11 καθω υπολαμβανειν conj Schmidt [εα] επι Α 12 τας επτακοσιας Ζ
16 ζη ΒΤΖ | συνιστατο ΚΑ 19 τουτον Κ 20 θαυμασιαν Q
21 διωφασμενοι Κ 27 εκτυπον GIQ (-πων Ζ)
πετάω χρυσῷ γράμμασιν ἁγίοις ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ μέσον τῶν ὀφρών, δόξῃ πεπληρωμένον· δ' κριθεὶς ἄξιος τούτων ἐν ταῖς λειτουργίαις. ἦ δὲ συμφάνεια τούτων ἐμποιεῖ φῶς καὶ ταραχὴν, ώστε νομίζειν εἰς έτερον ἑληλυθέναι εκ τοῦ κόσμου· καὶ διαβεβαιώμα, πάντα ἀνθρώπων προσελθόντα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν προειρημένων εἰς ἐκπλήξεις ἥξεων καὶ θαυμασμὸν ἀδηγήτων, μετατραπέντε τῇ διανοίᾳ διὰ τήν περὶ ἐκαστον ἁγίαν κατασκευὴν. Πρὸς γὰρ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπότων ἐπὶ τὴν παρακειμένην ἀκραν τῆς πόλεως αναβάντες θεωροῦμεν· ἦ δὲ κεῖται µὲν ἐν ὑψηλοτάτῳ τόπῳ, πύργοις εἴησαλωμένη πλείσσι, µέχρι κορυφῆς εὐµήκεια λίθοις ἀνφικοδομημένων αὐτῶν, ὡς μεταλαμβάνομεν, πρὸς φυλακὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τόπων· ἵνα, ἐὰν ἐπίθεσις τις ἡ νεωτερισμὸς ἡ πολεμῶν ἐφόδος γένηται, µηθεὶς δύνηται ὅδον εἰς τοὺς περιβόλους ποιῆσαι τοὺς περὶ τὸν οἶκον· ἐπικείμενων καὶ διξυβελῶν ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων τής ἀκρας καὶ ὀργάνων ποικίλων, καὶ τοῦ τόπου κατὰ κορυφὴν ὅντος τῶν προειρημένων περιβόλων, ὡσανεί φυλασσομένων τῶν πύργων ὑπὸ τῶν πυστοτάτων ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῇ παραδία μεγάλας ἀποδείξεις δεδοκότων· οὕτως οὖν εἰχὼν ἐξουσίαν ἔξειν τῆς ἀκρας· εἰ µὴ τοῖς ἔφοροις, καὶ τούτῳ ἐκ μέρους, οὐδὲ εἰσοδεύει εἰὼν οὐδένα. µετὰ ἀκριβείας δὲ πολλῆς εἰχὼν· εἰ καὶ τὶς ἐπιταχύν ἐνοικὸς διὰ τοῦ προκαθγεύμου· πρὸς θεωριὰν εἰσδεδιασθαί τινα· οἶνον καὶ καθ' Π ἡμᾶς ἐγεγόνει· µόλις γὰρ ἀνόπλους ὄντας ἡμᾶς δύο παρεδεξαμένον πρὸς τὸ κατανόησαι τὰ τῶν θυσίων. ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ δ' ὅρκων πεπιστῶσθαι τὸ τοιοῦτον· τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ὁµορκοῦν, κατ' ἀνάγκην· 20 ἐπιτελευμένους> θείως τὸ κατὰ τὸν ὅρισμόν πράγμα, ὅντας πεντακοσίων µὴ παραδεξαθαί πλείον ἀνθρώπων πέντε κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἱεροῦ τὴν πάσαν εἶναι φυλακὴν τῆς ἁκραν· καὶ τὸν καταβαλλόμενον αὐτὴν τὴν προφυλακὴν τῶν εἰρημένων οὖσις ἀπαλλάθων.
σθαί. Τῆς δὲ πόλεως ἐστὶ τὸ χῶμα συμμέτρως ἔχον, οἷον τεσσαράκοντα σταδίων ὑπὸ τοῦ περιβόλου, καθόσον εἰκάσαι δυνατὸν. ἔχει δὲ τὴν τῶν πύργων θέσιν στερεοειδῆ (καὶ φαινομένων διάδων τῶν ὑποκειμένων, τῶν ὄρεων ἐπάνωθεν εἰθεσμένων) καὶ τὰς διὰ τούτων διεξόδους. ἀνάκλασιν γὰρ ἔχει τὰ τῶν τούτων, ως ἂν ἐν ἄρροις τῆς 5 πόλεως ἐγκομιμηθῇς. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ διαβάθρα πρὸς τὰς διώδους. οἱ μὲν γὰρ μετέρωοι τὴν ὁδείαν, οἱ δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτὰς ποιοῦνται, καὶ μάλιστα διεστηκότες τῆς ὁδείας, διὰ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγνείαις ὤντας, ὅπως μηδενὸς θυγανώσειν, ὅν οὗ δέον ἔστιν. Οὐκ ἀλάγως δὲ τὴν πόλιν

§ P συμμετρία καθηκούσῃ κατασκεύασαν οἱ πρῶτοι, σοφῶς δὲ ἐπινοήθη- 10

§ H σαντες. τῆς γὰρ χώρας πολλῆς οὐσίας καὶ καλῆς, καὶ τινῶν μὲν

πεδινῶν, τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σαμαρείτην λεγομένην, καὶ τῶν συναπτοῦντων

τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρα, τινῶν δὲ ὅρεων, τῶν <συναπτούντων

τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρα, δεί> πρὸς τὴν γεωργίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμελείαν
tῆς γῆς γίνεσθαι συνεχῶς, ἵνα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτω τὴν εὐ- 15

καρπιάν ἠχοσίναι οὐ καὶ γνωμένου γεωργεῖται μὲν πάντα δασφειάς

πολλῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ προερημηθῇ χώρᾳ. τῶν δὲ πόλεων ὅσα μέγεθος ἠχοσίναι καὶ τὴν ἀκόλουθον εἰδαμονίαν, ταύταις συμβεβήκηκεν εὐανδρείαν, ἁμελείσθαι δὲ τῆς χώρας, πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ κατὰ

ψυχῆν Ἠλλαροῦσθαι γενεκότων, καὶ τῇ κατασκευῇ πάντας ἀνθρώπων 20

ἐπὶ τὰς ἑδονὰς εὐκαταφόρους εἶναι. τούτῳ δὲ ἐγίνετο περί τὴν

'Αλεξάνδρειαν ὑπὲρβάλλουσαν πάσας τῷ μεγέθει καὶ εἰδαμονίᾳ
tῶν πόλεως. οἱ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποξενούμενοι κατα-

μένοντες ἐφ’ ἰκανὸν εἰς ἐλάττωσιν ήγον τὰ τῆς ἐργασίας. οἶκεν δὲ

βασιλεία, ἵνα μὴ καταμενώσας, προσέταξε ἡ μᾶλλον εἰκόσιν ἡμέρων 25

παρεπιθημένη καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν χρείων ὁμοίως δι’ ἐγγάρίτων
dιαστολῆς ἠδοκεῖν, ἕαν ἀναγκαῖον ὑ κατακαλέσαι, διακρίνειν ἐν

ημέραις πέντε. πρὸ πολλοῦ δὲ ποιοῦμενος καὶ χρηματιστᾶς καὶ


Fort latet vitium aliquid: sensus totius loci perobscurus est 5 exoddus B 8 διεστηκότας KGITZ (κυκάς edd) | τῆς | τας K | μηθεὶν BZ 11 πεδινῶν μεν P 12 λεγομένων codd omn 13, 14 των—γεωργίαν | τω προς τη γεωργία των πρ. τη γεωργία cett verba ex conj addidi 15 om και P 16 fort meta δαισ. legendum 19 εὐανδρείαν eu (sequente lacuna) B 20 και] και τω vel dia to conj Schmidt 22 ὑπὲρβαλλουσα

HA*GIT*Z 23 επιξενουμενοι BP
τοὺς τούτων υπηρέτας ἐπέταξε κατὰ νόμον, ὅπως μὴ πορισμοῦν λαμβάνοντες οἱ γεωργοὶ καὶ προστάται τῆς πόλεως ἐλαττώσι τὰ ταμεῖα, λέγω δὲ τὰ τῆς γεωργίας πρόσφορα. Παρεξέβημεν δὲ ταῦτα διὰ τὸ καλὸς ἢ μὲν τῶν Ἑλεόζαρων ὑποδεδειγμέναι τὰ 5 προειρημένα. μεγάλη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν γεωργοῦμένων φιλοσοφία. καὶ γὰρ ἐλαίκοις πλήθεισι σύνδεντος ἐστὶ καὶ σιτικοῖς καρποῖς αὐτῶν ἡ χώρα καὶ ὀστρίοις, ἔτι δὲ ἀμπέλῳ καὶ μέλιτι πολλῷ. τὰ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρῶν καὶ φωικών οὐδ' ἄριθμεῖται παρ' αὐτοῖς. κτήνη τε πολλὰ παρμυγῆ, καὶ δαφνῆς ἡ τούτων νομῆ· διὸ καλῶς 10 ἐξελεύαν, ὅτι πολυανθρωπίας οἱ τόποι δεόνται, καὶ τὴν κατα- σκευὴν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν κωμῶν θέβνοτο κατὰ λόγον. πολὺ δὲ πλῆθος καὶ τῶν ἀρωμάτων καὶ λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ χρυσοῦ παρα- κομίζεται διὰ τῶν Ἀράβων εἰς τὸν τόπον. ἐργάσιμος γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐμπορίαν ἐστὶ κατασκευασμένη ἡ χώρα, καὶ πολύτεχνος ἡ πόλις, 15 οὗ σπανίζει δὲ οὔτε τῶν διακομιζόμενῶν διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. ἔχει γὰρ καὶ λιμένας εὐκαίρους χορηγοῦντας, τὸν τε κατὰ τὴν 'Ἀσκαλώνα καὶ Ἰόππην καὶ Γάζαν, ὅμοιος δὲ καὶ Πτολεμαίδα τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτισμένην. μέγη δὲ κεῖται πρὸς τοὺς προειρημένους τόπους, οὐκ ἀπέχουσα τούτων πολὺ. ἔχει δὲ πάντα δαφνῆ κάθυνορ 20 οὗσα πάντοθεν ἡ χώρα καὶ μεγάλην ἀσφάλειαν ἔχουσα. περιττεὶ δ' αὐτὴν δ' ἀλεξομενὸς Ἰορδάνης ποταμὸς ἀείρουσ. <τῆς δὲ χώρας> οὐκ ἐλαττων ἔξακισφιλῶν μυριάδων ἀρουρῶν κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον οὖν (μετέπειτα δὲ οἱ γειτνιῶτες ἐπέβησαν αὐτῇ) ἐξήκοντα μυριάδες ἀνδρῶν ἔγκλησαν καθεστῆκεισαν ἑκατονταρουφοῦσ. πληροῦμεν δὲ 25 ὁ ποταμὸς, καθὼς ὁ Νεῖλος, ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸν θερισμὸν ἡμέραις, πολλὴν ἀρδεύει τῆς γῆς· ὁ δὲ ἐ[text cut]
ἀλλοι δὲ χειμάρροι λεγόμενοι κατίασι, περιλαμβάνοντες τὰ πρὸς τὴν Γάζαν μέρη καὶ τὴν Ἀζωτίων χώραν. περιέχεται δὲ ἀσφαλείας αὐτοφυέως, δυσεισβόλος οὖσα καὶ πλήθεσιν ἀπραγμάτευτος, διὰ τὸ στενὸς εἶναι τὰς παρόδους, κρημνῶν παρακειμένων καὶ φαράγγων βαθέων, ἐτὶ δὲ τραχείας οὕσης πάσης τῆς περιεχούσης πάσαν τὴν 5 χώραν ὅρευσι. Ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρακειμένων ὅρεων τῆς Ἀραβίας μέταλλα χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου συνιστασθαί πρώτερον. ἐκλείπεται δὲ ταύτα, καθ’ ὑπὲκράτησαν Πέρσαι χρόνον· τῶν τότε προστατοῦντων ποιησμένων διαβολῆν, ὡς ἄχρηστος ἡ κατεργασία γίνεται καὶ πολυδάπανος, ὡς μὴ διὰ τὴν μετα-ιο λείαν τῶν εἰρημένων συμβῆ καὶ τὴν χώραν καταφθείρεσθαι, καὶ σχεδὸν διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων δυναστείαν ἀλλοτριωθηναί, παρεύρεσιν λαβόντων εἰς τοὺς τόπους εἰσόδου, διὰ τὸ τὴν διαβολὴν γεγονέναι ταῦτην.

"Ὀσον οὖν καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐδει, κεφαλαιωδὸς σεσημαγκά σοι, 15 ὦ Φιλόκρατε ἁδελφέ· τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπομένων δηλώσομεν. Ἐπιλέξας γὰρ τοὺς ἀρίστους ἀνδρας καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντας, ἀτε δὴ γονεῶν τετευχότας ἐνδόξων, οὕτως οὐ μόνον τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων γραμμάτων ἐξειπεποίησαν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐλληνικῶν ἐφρόντισαν οὐ παρέργοις κατασκευὴς· διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὰς προσβείας εὖθεται καθεστήκεσθαι, καὶ τούτ’ ἐπετέλουν ὅτε δέοι, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ὁμίλιας καὶ τὰς ἑπερωτήσεις τὰς διὰ τοῦ νόμου μεγάλην εὐφυίαν εἶχον, τὸ μέσον ἐξηλικότες κατάστημα (τοῦτο γὰρ κάλλιστόν ἐστιν), ἀποτεθεμένοι τὸ τραχύ καὶ βάρβαρον τῆς διανοίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ κατοίκησαι καὶ νομίζειν ὑπερφρονεῖν ἐτέρως ὑπερβεβηκότες, τὴν 25 δ’ ὁμιλίαν καὶ τὸ συνακούει καὶ πρὸς ἐκατόν ἀποκρίνεσθαι δεόντως παραδεδεγμένοι, καὶ πάντες ταύτα συντηροῦντες καὶ μᾶλλον ἐν τούτοις βουλόμενοι ὑπερφέρειν ἐτέρων ἐτέρου, καὶ τοῦ καθηγομένου

πάντες άξιοι καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς. νοήσαι δὲ ἢν, ὡς ἡγάπησαν τὸν Ἑλεάζαρον δυσαποστάτως ἔχοντες, καὶ ἐκεῖνος αὐτοῦς χωρὶς καὶ τοῦ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα γεγραφέναι περὶ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως αὐτῶν πολλὰ παρεκάλεσε τὸν Ἀνδρέαν ποιήσας, συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι 5 παρακαλῶν, καθ’ ὅ ἂν δυνώμεθα. καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελλόμενον ἦφροντίσειν περὶ τούτων, ἐξῆς καὶ λίαν διαγωμάν. εἰδέναι γάρ, ὅτι φιλάγαθος ὦν ὁ βασιλέας, πάντων μέγιστον ἥγεται τὸ μεταπέμπεσθαι, καθ’ ὅν ἂν τόπων ὁμοσθῆ τις ἀνθρώπως διαφέρων ἀγωγῆ καὶ φρονήσει παρ’ ἐτέρους. μετείληφα γὰρ καλῶς αὐτῶν λέγειν, ὅτι 10 περὶ ἑαυτῶν ἔχων ἄνδρας δικαίους καὶ σωφρόνας τὴν μεγίστην ἐν φυλακῇ τῆς βασιλείας ἔχων, συμβουλευόντων παρρησίᾳ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον τῶν φίλων. οὐ δὴ σύνεστι τοῖς ἀποστελλόμενοι ὑπ’ αὐτῶν. καὶ δὲ ὅρκων ἐπιστούτο, μὴ προέσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, εἰ 15 τις ἔτερα χρεία πρὸς τὰ κατ’ ἵδιαν αὐτῷ κατετείγον. πρὸς δὲ τὴν 15 κοινὴν πᾶσι τοῖς πολίταις ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐξαποστέλλειν αὐτοὺς. τὸ γὰρ καλῶς ζῆν ἐν τῷ τὰ νόμιμα συντηρεῖν εἶναι· τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιτε- λείσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀκρόασεως πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡ διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως. προτεθέμενος οὐν ταύτα καὶ τὰ τούτως παραπλῆσθα φανερὸς ἦν τῆς διάθεσιν, ὅς ἦν πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

20 ἂξιον δὲ ἐπειμνησθῆναι βραχεῶν τῶν υποδειχθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ § Eus πρὸς τὰ δὲ ἡμῶν ἐπιζητήθεντα. νομίζω γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς περιερ- γίαν ἔχων τινὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ νομοθετία περὶ τέτοιων βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν, καὶ τῶν νομιζόμενων ἀκαθάρτων εἶναι κνωδάλων. πυθανομένων

20 ff Lev 11. Deut 14:3-19

ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

γὰρ ἡμῶν, διὰ τί, μιᾶς καταβολῆς οὕσης, τὰ μὲν ἀκάθαρτα νομίζεται πρὸς βρῶσιν, τὰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀφήν (δευσιδαιμόνως γὰρ τὰ πλεῖότα τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἡπάντη δευσιδαιμόνως) πρὸς ταῦτα οὕτως ἐνήρξατο Θεωρεῖς, ἐφι, τὰς ἀναστροφὰς καὶ τὰς ὁμιλίας, οἷον ἐνεργάζονται πράγμα, διότι κακοὶ ὁμιλήσαντες διαστροφᾶς ἐπιλαμβάνουσιν ἀνθρωποὶ, καὶ ταλαίπωροι δὲ ὅλου τοῦ ξένη εἰσιν. ἐὰν δὲ σοφοὶ καὶ φρονύμοις συζώσων, εὕ ἀγνοεῖ ἐπανορθώσεως εἰς τὸν βίον ἔτυχον. διαστελλόμενος οὖν τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης πρῶτον ὁ νομοθέτης ἡμῶν, καὶ διδάξας ἕκαστα περὶ τούτων, οἷς ἀπαγορευτικῶς μόνον ἀλλ' ἐνδεικτικῶς, καὶ τὰς βλάβας τοις προδόλοις καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γινομένας ἐπισπαστὰς τοὺς αἰτίους—προσπεδείχε γὰρ πάντων πρῶτον, ὅτι μόνον ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται, πεπληρωμένων παντὸς τόπου τῆς δυναστείας, καὶ οὕθεν αὐτὸν λανθάνει τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γνωμένων ύπ’ ἀνθρώπων κρυφῶς· ἀλλ’ ὅσα ποιεῖ τις αὐτῷ φανερὰ ἵνα καθέστηκη, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι. ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐξεργαζόμενος ἀκριβῶς καὶ πρόθελα θεῖος, ἔδειξεν ὅτι κἂν ἐννοήθη τις κακιάν ἐπιτελείων, οἷον ἂν λάθωι, μὴ ὅτι καὶ πράξεις, διὰ πάντης τῆς νομοθεσίας τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνατον ἐνδεικτικῶν. ποιησάμενος οὖν τὴν καταρχὴν τάντα, καὶ δεῖξας ὅτι πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ πάρ’ ἡμᾶς ἢ ἢ τὸν ἀνθρωποὶ πολλοὶ θεοὶ εἶναι νομίζοντων, αὐτοὶ δυναμικῶτεροι πολλῷ καθεστῶτες οὐ σέβονται ματαιῶς· ἀγαλματα γὰρ ποίησαντες ἐκ λίθων καὶ ξύλων, εἰκόνας φαινεῖν εἶναι τῶν ἐξεφύτων τι πρὸς τὸ ξήν αὐτῶς χρήσιμον, οἷς προσκυνοῦν, παρὰ πόδας ἔχουσεν τὴν ἀναισθησίαν. εἴτε γὰρ κατ’ ἐκείνοι τις <θεός εἰς>, κατὰ τὴν ἐξεύρεσιν, 25
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3 τῆς νομοθεσίας B | παν] πασι B πᾶλιν παν B HKA πᾶλιν cett Eus
5 εργαζονται AIBP Eus<sup>codd</sup> det 6 δια του την Eus<sup>1</sup> δι ολον την την Eus<sup>0</sup>
8 ενευχον BT | ouv Eus] δε εστι B om cett 9 πρωτον ο νομ. Eus.] o πρωτομοδετης Ar codd 10 ενδικως Ar codd txt Eus 11 προδηλως I ροδηλωσαι υπο | epι P Eus<sup>codd</sup> | om του P Eus | γενου. P Eus<sup>codd</sup> (γεγεν. Eus<sup>1</sup>)
12 πρωτον παντων Eus P | om o BPTZ | η δυν. aut. dia παντ. Eus<sup>0</sup>
13 δυναιτι-εστιν GIZ παντος] pr του B 14 ουδεν B | των επιγινομενων -νωμ. Z) PT*Z (γης suprascr T<sup>1</sup>) 15 υπ] υπω των B | κρυφος G1 κρυφαιως Eus<sup>1</sup> 16 εργαζομενος B εξεργαζαμενος Eus<sup>0</sup> 17 προ-
δηλωθειν HKA 18 λανθανοι B λαθη P | dia πας] δι ολης Eus<sup>1</sup> εξ ολης Eus<sup>0</sup> 22 πολλων Eus P | πολλων Ar codd cett 23 και | η Eus 25 ει
ti HKAG<sup>vid</sup> I | theos eis corr Wendland] thet codd Eus
παντελῶς ἀνόητοι· τῶν γὰρ ἐν τῇ κτύσει λαβόντες τινὰ συνεθήκαν καὶ προσποτέσθειαν εὔχρηστα, τὴν κατασκευὴν αὐτῶν οὐ ποιήσαντες αὐτῶν· διὸ καὶ καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν ὁμοίων ἀποθεοῦν. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ καὶ νῦν ἑσπεριμακρυτέροι καὶ πολυμαθέστεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν πρὶν 5 εἰσὶ πολλοί, καὶ οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιεν αὐτοῖς προσκυνήσεις. καὶ νομίζουσιν οἱ ταῦτα διαπλάσαντες καὶ μυθοποιήσαντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ σοφότατοι καθεστάναι. τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων πολυματαίων τι δεῖ καὶ λέγειν, Ἀιγυπτίων τε καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων, οἵτινες ἐπὶ θηρία καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰ πλείστα καὶ κνυδάλων τὴν ἀπέρεισσι πεποίηται, 10 καὶ ταῦτα προσκυνοῦσι, καὶ θύουσιν τοῦτοι καὶ ἱεροὶ καὶ τελευτήσασι; — συνθεωρήσατο οὖν ἐκαστὰ σοφὸς ἄν δονομοθέτη, ὅποι θεὸς κατεσκευασμένοι εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῶν ἀπάντων, περιέφραξεν ἡμᾶς ἀδιακόπτους χάραξε καὶ συνδροῦσε τείχεσιν, ὅπως μηθεὶν τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνων ἐπιμεγέμονα κατὰ μηδέν, ἀγνοί καθεστώτες κατὰ σῶμα 15 καὶ κατὰ ψυχήν, ἀπολελυμένους ματαίων δοξῶν, τῶν μόνων θεῶν καὶ δυνατῶν σεβόμενοι παρὰ δὴν τὴν πάσαν κτίσιν. δειν οἱ Αἰγυπτίων καθηγεμόνες ἀρείες, ἐγκεκυνφότες εἰς πολλὰ καὶ μετεσχηκότες πραγμάτων, ἀνθρώπους θεοῦ προσονομάζουσιν ἡμᾶς· δὸ τοις λοιποῖς οὐ πρόσεστιν, εἰ μὴ τις σέβεται τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεῶν, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν 20 ἀνθρωποὶ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ σκέπης· ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα διάθεσις αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ταῦτα καταφεύγει. τοῖς δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν οἷδει ταῦτα λε- λόγισατ, περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυναστείας δὲ ὅλου τοῦ ἐξήν ἢ σκέψις αὐτοῖς ἐστιν. ὅπως οὖν μηθεὶν συναλλογοῦμεν μηδὲ ὁμολογοῦν- τες φαύλους διαστροφὰς λαμβάνωμεν, πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέφραξεν 25 ἀγνείαις καὶ διὰ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ ἄφων καὶ ἀκοής καὶ ὀράσεως

1 ανοητὸν Ευς 2 εὐχρηστοτατὴν (+τὴν Ευσο) κατ. Ευς 3 om ΗΚΑΓΙΒΡ
αυτοῦ Ρ 4 εὐρήμ. ΑΒ ευρητικωτεροὶ Ευς 5 φθανον Ευσ φθασιέαν Β
(-σοιν Τ) φθανοσαν κετ 7 τῶν] + μεν Ευς | δει[ δη ΗΑΓΙ 9 κνωδ.]
πρ επι Ευσι | απερ εισι ΡΤΖ 11 ου] τοιγαρον Ευσι | om εκαστα Ρ | ο
νομ. υπο θ. σοφ. ων Ρ 12 κατεσκευασμενα Η (α 3ο sup lin) Ευσονδ' θεt
13 μηθεὶν Ευς Ζ μηθεὶν ΗΚΑΓΙ 14 καὶ σωμα καὶ ψυχὴν Ευσο 15 απο-
λελυμενοι Ευς Ρ]-μενων κεττ 16 πασαν την κτ. Ρ | Αἰγυπτίων οἱ Ευς
18 εἰς πραγματα Ι 19 τις] τι ΗΑ (s postea suprasc Η*vid A*vid) ΚΓΙ
21 ημων ΒΤΖ Ευσο 23 om δε ΗΑΓΙ | om της τον Ευσ | 23 αυτων Β* |
ουν Ευς] τε εν Β εν κετ | μηθειν ΒΠ Ευς | συναλίσγομ. Τ Ευς 24 φαυλω
Ευσο γαμοις Ρ | λαμβανομεν Ευς | περιεφραξαν Ευσο 25 αφης Ευσο
νομικῶς. τὸ γὰρ καθόλου πάντα πρὸς τὸν φυσικὸν λόγον ὁμοία καθέστηκεν, ὑπὸ μίας δυνάμεως οἰκονομούμενα, καὶ καθ' ἐν ἔκαστον ἔχει λόγον βαθύν, ἄφ' ὄν ἀπεχόμεθα κατὰ τὴν χρῆσιν, καὶ οἷς συγχρώμεθα. χάριν δὲ ὑποδείγματος ἐν ἡ δεύτερον ἐπιδραμῶν σοι σημανό. Μὴ γὰρ εἰς τὸν καταπεπτυκότα λόγον ἐλθῆς, ὅτι μγων 5 καὶ γαλάς ἢ τῶν τοιούτων χάριν περιεργάσα ποιούμενοι ἐνομοθέτει ταῦτα Μωυσῆς. ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀγνὴν ἑπίσκεψιν καὶ τρόπων ἐξαρτημένων δικαιούσης ἔνεκεν σεμνῶς πάντα ἀνατάκται. τῶν γὰρ πτημῶν, οἷς χρώμεθα, πάντα ἡμερα καθέστηκε καὶ διαφέρει καθαριότητι, πυροί καὶ ὀσπρίσεως χρώμενα πρὸς τὴν τροφήν, οἷς περισσοτεραὶ τὰ τρυγόνες ἀπακολ. πέρδικες ἐτὶ δὲ χῆνες καὶ τὰ ἀλλά ὡς τοιαῦτα. περὶ δὲ ἀπηγόρευται πτημῶν, εὐρήσεως ἁγια τε καὶ σαρκοφάγα καὶ καταδυναστεύοντα τῇ περὶ ἑαυτά ὕπναμε τὰ λοιπὰ, καὶ τὴν τροφήν ἔχουσας δαπάνησιν τῶν προερημεύμενών ἥμερων μετὰ ἀδικίας· οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄρνας καὶ ἐρίφους ἀναρτάζουσι, ἵππας ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωποις καὶ ἀδικούσι τε καὶ ἔως, παρασίημοι οὐν θέτο διὰ τοῦτον, ἀκάθαρτα προσονομάσας, ὅτι δέν έστι κατὰ ψυχήν, οἷς ἡ νομοθεσία διατάκται, δικαιούσην συγχρήσθαι καὶ μηδένα καταδυναστεύειν, πεπωθότας ἵσθι καθ' ἑαυτόν, μηδὲ ἀφαίρεσθαι μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἐκ δικαίου τὰ τοῦ βίου κυβερνῆν, ὡς τὰ 30 τῶν προερημεύμενων πτημῶν ἡμερα ζῶν τὰ φύσει τῶν ὀσπρίων ἑπὶ γῆς δαπανάς, καὶ οὐ καταδυναστεύει πρὸς τὴν ἐπαναίρεσιν τῶν συγγενικῶν. διὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐν παραδεδωκεν ὁ νομοθέτης σήμευσιν.

5 f Lev 11
11 Lev 12
17 Deut 14
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σθαι τοῖς συνετοῖς, εἶναι δικαίους τε καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιστελεῖν βία, μηδὲ τῇ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἵσχὺς πεποθότας ἐτέρους καταδυναστεύειν. ὅπων γὰρ οὐδέ ἀφασθαὶ καθήκε τῶν προειρημένων διὰ τὴν περὶ ἑκαστα διάθεσιν, πῶς οὐ φυλακτέον παντάπασι τοὺς τρόπους εἰς τούτο καταλλαλεῖαι; πάντα οὖν τὰ τῆς συγχωρήσεως ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν τροπολογίων ἐκτέθειται. τὸ γὰρ διηθλεγέαὶ καὶ διαστελλέας ὅπλως δύνασθον ἔστι τοῦ διαστελλέων ἑκαστα τῶν πράξεων ἐπὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον· ἢ γὰρ ἵσχὺς τῶν ὅλων σωμάτων μετ᾽ ἐνεργείας ἀπέρεισθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἔχει καὶ τὰ σκέλη, μετὰ διαστολῆς οὖν ἀπαντᾷ ἐπιστελεῖν πρὸς δικαιοσύνην ἀναγκαζέως τὸ σημείουται διὰ τούτων· ἐτεὶ δὲ καὶ διότι παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπων διεστάλμεθα. οἱ γὰρ πλείονες τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτοῦς μολύνουσιν ἐπιμιγγόμενοι, συντελοῦντες μεγάλην ἄδικιαν, καὶ χώραι καὶ πόλεις ὅλαι σεμνόνεται ἐπὶ τούτως. οὐ μόνον γὰρ <προάγουσι> τοὺς ἀρσενας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τεκούσας ἐτεὶ δὲ θυγατέρας μολύνουσιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων διεστάλμεθα. περὶ δὲν δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ προειρημένος τῆς διαστολῆς τρόπος, περὶ τούτων εἶναι καὶ τὸν τῆς μυσῆς κεκαρακτηρικῶς. πάντα γὰρ ὅσα διηθλεῖ καὶ μηργικισμόν ἀνάγει σαφῶς τοὺς νοοῦσιν ἐκτίθειται τὸ τῆς μυσῆς. ἢ γὰρ ἀναμηρύκησις οὖθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους διαστελλόμεθα; τὸ γὰρ ἐζην διὰ
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6 Lev 113 ff (Deut 146 ff) 18 Lev 113 ff

1 om te P Eusο vid 2 autous Eus | eteron BT 4 ou | ouv KAIG ΗΚΑGIΒΡ TZ Eus


S. S. 35
ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

τῆς τροφῆς συνεστάναι νομίζει. διό η παρακληθεῖται καὶ διὰ τῆς
γραφῆς ὁ λέγων οὐτως· καλεῖ Μηναθημιη κυρίοι τοῦ ποιικάντος
ἐν σοὶ τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά. κατανοοῦμενα γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα
καὶ ἐνδοξα φαίνεται· πρῶτον μὲν ἡ σύμπτησις τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἡ
τῆς τροφῆς διοίκησις καὶ ἡ περὶ ἕκαστον μέλος διαστολῆ. πολλῷ
δὲ μᾶλλον ἡ τῶν αἰσθήσεων διακόσμησις, διανοια ἐνέργεια καὶ
κίνησις ἀόρατος, ἢ τε ὀφάγης τοῦ πρῶς ἐκαστὸν τι πράσσειν, καὶ
τεχνῶν εὑρέσις ἀπέραστον περιέχει τρόπον. διὸ παρακληθεῖται
μνείαις ἐχειν, ὡς συναρτθεῖται τὰ προειρημένα θεία δυνάμει σὺν
κατασκευῇ. πάντα γὰρ χρόνον καὶ τόπον ὁρίζει πρὸς τὸ διὰ τὸ
παντὸς μνημονευόμενον τοῦ κρατοῦνθος θεοῦ καὶ συνυπότους. καὶ
γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν βροτῶν καὶ ποτῶν ἀπαρχαμένους εὐθέως τότε ἐπὶ
κρυσταλλά τοῖς κεφαλαίων παράσημων ἢμῖν μνείας δεδοκεν, ὡσαντῷς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τών πυλῶν καὶ θυρῶν
προστεταχεῖ ἡμῖν τιθέναι τὸ λόγια, πρὸς τὸ μνείαν εἶναι θεοὺς
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν δὲ διαρρήκθην τὸ σημεῖον κελεύει περιήθαι,
σαφῶς ἀποδεικνύον ὅτι πᾶσιν ἐνέργειαν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιστελεῖ
δει, μνήμην ἔχοντας τῆς <ἑαυτῶν κατασκευῆς>, ἐπὶ πασὶ δὲ τῶν περὶ
θεοῦ φῶβον. κελεύει δὲ καὶ κοινασκομένους καὶ διανικαστικούς
μελετήτας τοῦ θεοῦ κατασκευᾶς, οὐ μόνον λόγω, ἀλλὰ διαλῆψει 20

2 ff Deut 718; 1021 14 ff Deut 67 ff
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1 om καὶ Ευς 2 om o Ευς | κυριου|+τοου θεου Ευς 3 και μεγ. (+και θαυμαστα P) και ενδ.] και ενδοξα και μεγαλα Ευς1 ενδοξα Ευς⁰ 4 πρωτα Ευς⁰ | τη συμπ. τη του σ. Ευς1 τη του σ. Ευς⁰ | και 2ο] om ΒΡΤΖ 5 μερος Ευς⁰ 6 των ΒΡ] της της των cett Ευς¹ 8 επε- 
βραστων περιέχει K Ευς απεραντου παρέχει ΒΡΤΖ txt HAGI 9 τα 
προειρ.] om ΒΤ +συνεχομενα Ευς¹ | θειας δυναμεως P | συν κατασκευη K] συγκατασκευη (και συγκ. ΒΤ¹ Acorr) codd cett Ευς¹ (om Ευς⁰) 10 τοπων κα 
χρων Ευς¹ χρωνω και τροπων P 11 και συντηροντωσ] συντηρουσας κα 
tas arχas και μεσοτητας και τελευτας Ευς¹ (om και συντηρ. —κελευει 13 Ευς⁰) 12 τοπων] pr των GI | απαδαπ] αρξαμενουs Ι αρξαμενουs K om ΒΤ | συγ- 
χρησια Ευς] συγχρησα Ar codd 14 epι] pr επι των πολεων κα 
αι αικησων δια το σκεπαζεθαι και Ευς 15 προστεταχε μεν] προστεταχε 
Ευς 16 το συμ. διαρρ. P | περεικεθαι ΡΖ περι...θαδαι (ras 3 lilt) T 18 της εαυτων κατασκευης Ευς] αυτης B τουs Ευς και τουs Z της cett (cum seqq conj) της ημων συστασως edd pr | om de Z | περι] του P Ευς⁰ 19 διανισταμενουs] + και πορευομενουs Ευς 20 λογω μονου Ευς | αλα] 
+kai KP Ευς
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θεωρούντας τήν κίνησιν καὶ ὑπόληψιν ἑαυτῶν, ὅταν εἰς ὑπὸν ἔρχονται, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν, ὥς θεία τις ἐστι καὶ ἀκατάληπτος τούτων ἡ μετάθεσις. Δέδεικται δὲ σοι καὶ τὸ περισσόν τῆς λογίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν διαστολὴν καὶ μνείαν, ὥς ἐξεθέμεθα τὴν διυχλήν καὶ τῶν 5 μηρυκισμῶν. οὐ γάρ εἰκῇ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐμπεσόν εἰς ψυχὴν νερομοβετήτρια, πρὸς δὴ ἀλλήθειαν καὶ σημείωσιν ὀρθοῦ λόγου. διατάξας γὰρ ἐπὶ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀφάς ἕκαστα, κελεύει μηθὲν εἰκῇ μὴτε πράσσειν μὴτε ἁκούειν, μὴτε τῇ τοῦ λόγου δυναστεία συγχωρομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν τρέπεσθαι. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν 10 κνωδάλων δὲ ταύτῶν ἐστὶν εὔφρεν. κακοποιητικὸς γὰρ ὁ τρόπος ἑστὶ καὶ γαλάς καὶ μγων καὶ τῶν τούτων ὅρμων, ὡς δεγγόρευται. πάντα γὰρ λυμαίνονται καὶ κακοποιοῦσι μῦσες, οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν τροφῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ <εἰς τό> παντελῶς ἀχρηστὸν γίνεσθαι ἀνθρώπω, ὅτι ἢν δὴ τοῦτ ὁ ἐπιβάλλεται κακοποιεῖν. τὸ τε τῆς γαλῆς 15 γένους ἡδίαζεν ἐστὶν χωρίς γὰρ τοῦ προερημιένου ἔχει λυμαβευτικὸν κατάστημα· διὰ γὰρ τῶν ὅτων συλλαμβάνει, τεκνοποιεῖ δὲ τῷ στόματι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ τοιοῦτος τρόπος τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἀκαθάρτως ἐστιν—δόσα γὰρ δὲ ἁκοής λαβώντες, ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ σωματοποιοῦσαντες, κακῶς ἐτέρους ἐνεκύλισαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν οὐ τὴν τυχόναν ἐπετέλεσαν, 20 μιανθέντες αὐτοὶ παντάπασι τῷ τῆς ἀσεβείας μολυσμῷ. καλῶς δὲ ποιῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὡς τοὺς τοιούτους ἀνιρεῖ, καθὼς μεταλαμβάνομεν.—Ἐγὼ δὲ ἑπὶ Τοῦς ἐμφανιστάς οἴομαι σε λέγειν· καὶ γὰρ αἰκίαις καὶ βανάτοις ἐπαλγέσων αὐτοὺς περιβάλλει συνεχῶς.—'Ὁ δὲ Τούτων γὰρ καὶ λέγω· ἦ γὰρ ἐπαγρύπνησιν ἀνθρώπων ἀπωλεία 11 Λευ 1129

1 τα κινηματα Ευσο | υποληψιν | πρ την Ευς 2 ἐρχονται ΓΙΖ 2 γ. η ΗΚΑΓΙΒΡ ΤΖ Ευς τοιων μεταθησις Ευς 3 ευλογιας Α αλογιας Ρ 4 εξεθεσαι Ευς | ομ των Ευς 5 και Ευς | om Ar codd 7 και ποτων ΓΙΠΖ Ευς | om Ar codd cett Ευς 8 τη Ευς | om Ar codd 9 χρωμενους Ι 10 ff. εστων ο τροπος Ευς 12 λυμαινεται Β | και κακοπ. —— τροφην αλλα (13) om BPTZ 13 εις το Ευς | om Ar Ευς codd cett | γινεται ΒΠΖ 17 τουτο τουτουν Ευς | τοις ανθρωποις Ευς 19 ετεροις Τ | ακαθαρσιαν | + το ευς | αστελεσαν Β Ευς 21 ημων Τ Ευς | αναφει GI 23 επαλγεσι (ομ αυτους) K | παραβαλλει Ευς (περιβ. Ευς) 24 τουτους — επαγρυπνησις | τουτοις γαρ επαγρ. Ευς επαγρυπνυν. γαρ Ευς | εις ανθρωπων απωλειαν Ευς Τ | ομ Ευς (cf Diod 14. 68 επαγρυπνησις τη τουτων απωλεια) Ar codd 35—2
ἀνόσιος. ὁ δὲ νόμος ἡμῶν κελεύει μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἐργῳ μηδένα κακοποιεῖν. καὶ περὶ τούτων ὅπως ἐπὶ βραχὺ <διεξῆλθον, προσυποδείξας> σοι διότι πάντα κεκανόνισται πρὸς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ οἶδεν εἰκὴ κατατετακται διὰ τῆς γραφῆς οἴδε θυμωδῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' ὅλου τοῦ ζῆν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἄσκομεν δικαιοσύνην 5 πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, μεμνημένοι τοῦ δυναστεύσων θεοῦ. περὶ βρωτῶν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, ἔρπτῶν καὶ κνωδᾶλων, καὶ πάσης λόγου ἀνατείνει πρὸς δικαιοσύνην καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων συναν- στροφῆν δικαιαν.

Ἐσοὶ μὲν οὖν καλὸς ἐνόμιζε περὶ ἐκάστων ἀπολογείσθαι καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν προσφερομένων ἔλεγε τὸ μόσχον τε καὶ κρῶν καὶ χιμάρων, ὅτι δεῖ ταῖς ἐκ βουκολίων καὶ ποιμνίων λαμβάνοντας ἡμέρα θυσιάζειν, καὶ μηθὲν ἄγριον, ὅπως οἱ προσφέροντες τὰς θυσίας μηθὲν ὑπερήφανον ἐαυτοῖς συνιστοροῦσιν, σημειώσει κεχρημένοι τοῦ διατάξαντος. τῆς γὰρ ἐαυτοῦ ψυχῆς τοῦ παντός τρόπου τὴν προσφορὰν ποιεῖται ὁ τὴν θυσίαν προσάγων. 15 καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν νομίζω τὰ τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀξία λόγου καθεστάναι διὸ τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ νόμου προῆγμα δια-

§ Jos 1 'Ο δὲ Ἐλεάζαρος ποισάμενος θυσίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρὰς ἐπιλέξας καὶ πολλὰ δῶρα τῷ βασιλεῖ κατασκευάσας προεπέμψεν ἑμᾶς μετὰ 20 ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς. ώς δὲ παρεγενήθημεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, προσ-
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1 ανωτάτου Eus° | λογω] νομῳ BTZ
1 f. κακοποιεῖν μηθένα Eus
2 οὐν] δὲ P | οὐν—διεξῆλθον] διεξῆλθον βραχὺ Eus° | διεξέλεθεν Ar codd
(—ελθὲν P) Eus
3 προσυποδείξαντα Ar codd Eus Eus δεικτιον ιευσ° | διεξελθον Eus° | διεξέλθεν ιευσ° sti Eus
4 μυθωδὸς B Eus | ἅλλ να] ἅλλα H 6 μεμικείμενους BTZ
17 οὐν] ον P | καὶ 30° o Eus
8 αναστροφὴν P 9 ἐνομιζοντο 10 ὑπο-
λογεσθαι G ἀπολεγογθαι Eus | ἐπὶ Ar codd Eus° kai per Eus° 11 om τε Eus 12 δει Ar codd
12 λαμβάνοντες omississ ἡμέρα—προ-
σφεροντες (13) BTZ | θυσιαζειν] κατασκευαζειν Eus 13 συνιστοροντι P
19 BPTZ Eus° | Φιλόκρατες BT Eus] Φιλόκρατη codd cett 20 παρασκευ-
ασας P 21 Αλεξανδ.] + καὶ P | προσαγγελει G (—ελει I ἔγγελει ATZ) txt HKP (Β προσαγγελήη)
ηγγέλη τὸ βασιλεῖ περί τῆς ἄφιξεως ἡμῶν. <παρεμένοι> δ’ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν Ἁνδρέας τε καὶ ἑγῷ, φιλοφρόνως ἡσυχασμέθα τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὰς ἔπιστολας ἀποδεδωκαμεν παρὰ τοῦ Ἑλεαξάρου. περὶ πολλοῦ δὲ ποιούμενος τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀνδράσιν ἐντυχεῖν, 5 ἐκέλευσε τοὺς λοιποὺς πάντας ἀπολύσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν χρειῶν, καλεῖν δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. οὐ πάσι παραδόξου φανέντος—διὰ τὸ κατὰ θὸς εἶναι, πεμπταίοις εἰς πρόσωπον ἐρχοθαί βασιλεῖ τοὺς περὶ χρήσμον ἀφικομένους, τοὺς δὲ παρὰ βασιλέων ἢ πόλεων ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς μόλις ἐν τριάκοντα εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν παρίσταθαι—τοὺς δὲ 10 ἥκοντας τιμῆς καταξίων μεῖξονος, καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν κρίνων τὸν πέμψαντος, ἀπολύσας οὐς ἐνόμισε περισσότερον, ὑπέμενε περιπάτων, ἐως ἂν παραγινομένους ἀσπάσηται. παρελθόντων δὲ στὴν τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους δύο χεὶς καὶ ταῖς διαφόροις διφθέραις, ἐν αὖς ἡ νομοθεσία γεγραμμένη χρυσογραφία τοῖς Ιουδαϊκοῖς γράμμασι, βαν- 15 ισ μασίως <εἰργασμένον τὸν υμένος>, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλα συμβολῆς ἀνεπαύσθητον κατεσκευασμένην, ὡς εἰδεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς ἀνδρας, ἐγγύτερα περὶ τῶν βιβλίων. ὡς δὲ ἀπεκάλυπταν τὰ τῶν ἐνειλημάτων καὶ τοὺς ύμένας ἀνεῖλεξαν, πολυν ἐπιστὰς χρόνον καὶ προσκυνήσας σχεδὸν ἐπικαίει εἰπὲν Ἔφισσωτο μέν, ἄνδρες, ύμιν, τῷ δ’ ἀποστεί- 20 λατι μᾶλλον, μέγιστον δὲ τῷ θεῷ, οὕτως ἐστὶ τὰ λόγια ταῦτα. ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ πάντων εἰπόντων ὑπὸ μίαν φωνήν, τῶν τε παραγεγονότων καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων, ἐν βασιλείῳ, προήθη δακρύσαι τῇ χαρᾷ πεπληρωμένος. ἡ γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐντασις καὶ τὸ

1 παρεμεν δ’ HGIZ παρημεν δ’ KAPT ως δ’ παρημεν B txt ex conj HKAGIBP
Schmidt 3 epideudoumen BZ Fort leg aaceduk, (apadosan Jos) | παρα] pr τὰς GIP 4 περὶ] pr καὶ PTZ | παουμεν] + o βασιλεις BP 5 απαν-
τας P 7 κατὰ εὕνο ΗΚΑΓΙΠΤ κατὰ εὕνοις Z απὸ εὕνοι B txt ex Jos (παρα τὸ εὕνο) 8 περὶ] + τι B | χρησμον| fort χρησμον | om εν HP
9 υπεροχὴς P | τριακοντα] λ ημεραι B 10 του] τους K 11 υπεμεν B
txt cett cum Josτίδ (περιεμεν) 12 παραγεγομενοις BT 14 om τοις Z
15 εργασιμου K (ἐργ. Ι) εργασιμες BTcort (οu T*) εργασιμες Ρ | τ τῆς υμερου HKcort GIBPcort του υμερου A | της] τους P | συμπλοκας Z 16 ανε-
pαισθητος BTcort | κατεσκευασμη HKAGI 17 επερωτα GIB*P | εν-
eilηματων Jos] ανειληματων (-λημμ. GPTZ) Ar codd 20 ουτων BT]
tivos cett (ou Jos) 21 ειποντων δε παντι ου. K 23 της χαρας BT e
ntasis PZ] ekstasis B εντασις cett
ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

τῆς τιμῆς ὑπερτείνον δοκράειν ἀναγκάζει κατὰ τὰς ἐπιτυχίας, κελεύσας δὲ εἰς τὰξιν ἀποδοῦναι τὰ τείχη, τὸ τηνυκτα ἀστασάμενος τοὺς ἄνδρας εἶπε Δίκαιον ἦν, θεοσεβεῖς ἄνδρες, ὃν χάριν ὑμᾶς μετεπεμβὰμεν, ἐκείνοις πρῶτον σεβασμὸν ἀποδοῦναι, μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν δεξίαν ὑμῖν προτεῖναι διὸ πεποίηκα τοῦτο πρῶτον. μεγάλην 5 δὲ τέθειμαι τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην, ἐν ἧν παραγεγονέτε, καὶ κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἐπίσημος ἐσται πάντα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν χρόνον συντήτικα γὰρ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπέ, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. πάντα <ἐξ ὑμῖν>, εἰπε, παρέσταται καθηκόντως, οἷς συγχρῆσθησθε, 10 καὶ κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν νίκην ἡμῖν προσπετπωκέναι τῆς πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ναυμαχίας. διὸ καὶ δείπνησα σήμερον μεθ’ ὑμῶν βουλήσομαι. 

HKAGIBP
TZ Jos
ταξέν ὁ βασιλεὺς· τοὺς γὰρ ἡμῖν εἰκῆν κατακλίνας, τοὺς δὲ λατοὺς μετὰ τὴν έαυτοῦ κλωσίαν, οἰδέν ἐλλειπὼν εἰς τὸ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἀνδράς. Ὡς δὲ κατεκλίθθησαν, ἐκέλευσε τῷ Δωρεθέω τοῖς ἑθισμοῖς οἱς χρώνται πάντες οἱ παραγινόμενοι πρὸς 5 αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, οὕτως ἐπιτελεὶν. διὸ τούς ἰεροκήρυκας καὶ θύτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, οἰς ἔθος ἦν τὰς κατευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, παρηγήσατο· τῶν δὲ παραγεγονότων σὺν ἡμῖν Ἑλεάζαρον ὡντα τῶν ἱερέων πρεσβύτερον παρεκάλεσε ποιῆσασθαι κατευχῆν, ὡς ἀξιολόγως στὰς εἴπε Πληρώσαι σε, βασιλεὺς, πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν 10 ὃν ἐκτασεν ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός· καὶ δώῃ σοι ταῦτ’ ἔχειν καὶ γνακικί καὶ τέκνοις καὶ τοῖς δομονοῦσι πάντα ἀνέκλειπτα τὸν τῆς ζωῆς χρόνον. Εἰπόντος δὲ ταῦτα τούτου κατερράγη κρότος μετὰ κραγγῆς καὶ χαρᾶς εὐφροσύνου πλείονα χρόνων· καὶ τὸ τηνικαίτα πρὸς τὸ τέρπεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἁτουμασμένων ἐτράπησαν, τῶν λειτουργιῶν 15 ἂπασῶν διὰ τῆς τοῦ Δωρεθέου συντάξεως ἐπιτελουμένων· εν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ παίδες ἦσαν, καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως. 1

"Οτε δὲ καίρον ἔλαβεν ἐκ διαστήματος, ἤρωτησε τὸν ἔχοντα τὴν πρώτην ἀνάκλιναν (ἡσαν γὰρ καθ’ ἡλικίαν τὴν ἁνάπτωσιν πετουμένοι) Πώς ἂν τὴν βασιλείαν μέχρι τέλους ἀπαθητόν ἔχων 20 διατελοί; βραχὺ δὲ ἐπισγχών εἴπεν Οὕτως ἂν μάλιστα διευθύνοις, μμούμενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διαπαντὸς ἐπιεικὲς. μακροθυμία γὰρ χρώμενος, καὶ βλημάξας τοὺς ἄξιοις ἐπιεικέστερον, καθὼς εἰσίν
άξιοι, μετατιθείσι εκ τῆς κακίας καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄξιες.

'Εσπα-
νέσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν ἐχόμενον ἥρωτα Πῶς ἄν ἕκαστα πράττοι; ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη Τὸ δίκαιον εἴ πρὸς ἀπαντᾶς διατηροῖ, ἐαυτῷ καλῶς τὰ ἐκαστὰ πράξει, διαλαμβάνων ὅτι τῶν ἐννόμιμα σαφές ἐστὶ θεῷ καταρχῇ δὲ θείον φῶς λαμβάνων ἐν οἴδεθι διαπίπτοις. Καὶ 5 τούτον δὲ εὕ μάλα παραδεξάμενος ἔτερον ἐπηρώτα Πῶς ἄν ὀμοίους ἐαυτῷ ἔχοι τοὺς φίλους; κάκεινος εἶπεν Εϊθεωροῦσι πολλῆν σε πρόνοιαν ποιούμενον ὅν ἄρχεις ὄχλων· αὖ δὲ τούτῳ πράξεις ετι-
βλέπων ὡς ὁ θεὸς εὐφρενεῖ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, ὃ ἔγυναι αὐτοῖς καὶ τρόφην καὶ τὰ λουτά κατὰ καιρὸν παρασκευάζων ἑ ἀπαντα. Συνεπιμαρτυρήσας δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἥρωτα Πῶς ἄν ἐν τοῖς χρησιμοσκοι καὶ διακρίσεις εὔφημίας τυχανόι καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποτυχανόντων; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εϊ ὁπισθώς ὅνοιο τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ μηδὲν υπερηφάνως μηδὲ τῇ περὶ σεαυτὸν ἴσχυι πράσασοι κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων. τούτῳ δὲ ποίησεις τὴν διάταξιν βλέπων 15 τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· τὰ γὰρ ἰκετεύομενα συντελεῖσθαι τούτων ἀξίων, τοῖς δὲ ἀποτυχανόνουν ὃ δὲ ὑνεφόντως σημαίνεσθαι τὸ βλαβερὸν αὐτοῖς· οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ούδὲ <κατὰ> τὴν μεγαλω-
σύνη τῆς ἴσχύος τύπτοντος αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἐπιεικεῖα ἐρωμένῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Εὗ δὲ καὶ τούτον κατεπαινέσας ἥρωτα τὸν ἐξῆς Πῶς ὡς ᾧ ἐν ταῖς πολεμικαῖς ἥρεις ἀγέλησο εἴη; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εϊ μὴ 
πεποιθῶς υπάρξαι τοῖς ὄχλοις μηδὲ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν ἐκικαλοῦν ἀδίκως ἐκ τις ἐπιβολὰς αὐτῶς κατευθύνῃ δικαίως 
διεύχουντα πάντα. 'Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ καὶ τούτων τὸν ἐπερον ἥρωτα Πῶς ἀν φοβερὸς εἴῃ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εϊ τῇ τῶν 25 ὀπλῶν καὶ δυνάμεων παρασκευὴν πολλῆν χρώμενος <εἰδεῖ> ταῦτα
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ρχοις HAGI ὑπαρχεῖ BPTZ | ωμοĭς cett loi P 23 εὐκακῆ B | εὐποιο-
 lupas I 26 τῇ τῷ T 26 oplou P | καὶ δυναμεὼν] om Z καὶ δυναμεῶν G | εἰδεῖ ex conj] εἰ η δε εἰ (οἱ B) codd
οντα κενα επι πλειονα χρονον προς το συμπερασμα δραν τι· και 
γαρ ο θεος διδους ανοχας και ενδεικνυμενος τον της δυνατειας 
φοβον εγκατασκευαζει παση διανοια. 
Και τούτον δε επαι- 
νεσας ειπε προς τον εξομενον Τι καλλιστον αυτω προς το ζην αν 
5 ειτη; κακεινος εφη Το γινοσκειν οτι θεος δυνατειει των απαντων, 
και επι των καλλιστων πραξεων ουκ αυτοι κατευθυνομεν τα βουλευ-
θεντα θεος δε τελειοι τα παντων και καθηγειται δυνατειων. Επι-
φωνησας δε και τουτης καλος λεγειν τον έτερον ηροτα Πως δε 
ακεραια συντηρησας άπαντα τοις εγγονοις την αυθην παραδοι 
10 διαθεσιν <επι τελει>; ιδε δε ειπεν Ευχομενος αει προς τον θεον § C 
γαθας επινοιας λαμβανει προς τα μελλοντα πρασσεσθαι, και τοις 
εγγονοις παρακελευμονος μη εκπληττεσθαι τη δεξη μμηδη τω 
πλούτω θεον γαρ ειναι τον χαριζομενον ταυτα, και ου δε έαυτους 
έχειν την υπεροχην απαντων. 
Επιμαρτυρησας δε τούτου 
15 του μετα ταιτα επυμβαντο Πως αν τα συμβανοντα μετριω 
φεροι; έκεινος δε εφη Ει προληψεν λαμβανοι, οτι γεγοναν 
υπο του θεου παντες ανθρωποι μετασχειν των μεγιστων κακων, 
ωσαιτους δε και αγαθων και ουκ έστιν ανθρωπων οντα τουτων άμιγη 
γενεσθαι. ο θεος δε την ευθυχιαν διδωσιν, ον ικετευεν αναγ-
20 καιον. 
Φιλοφρονηθεις δε και τούτων καλως ειπεν απαντας 
αποφαινεσθαι: επερωτησας δε έτε ενα καταληξι το την έχων, ινα 
και προς το τερπεσθαι τραπεντες ήδεως διεξαγωμει. εν δε ταις 
μετα ταιτα έξ εξεις ημεραις και παρα των λοιπων έξεις μαθησομαι 
τι πλεον. ειτε επηρωτα τον άνδρα Τι περας άνδρειας έστιν; δε 
25 δε ειπεν Ει το βουλευθεν ορθως εν ταις των κινδυνων πραξειν 
επιτελοιτο κατα προθεσιν. 
τελειοται δε υπο του θεου παντα σοι 
καλως βουλευμενη ψηφιση, βασιλειυ, συμφεροντως. 
Επιφωνηταντων § Jos 
20 δε παντων και κροτω σημειαμενων προς τοις φιλοσοφους ειπεν ο 
βασιλειυς (ουκ ολιγοι γαρ παρησαν τουτοις) Οιομαι διαφερειν τους 

8 om και BPTZ | τουτο Ζ 9 εκγονοις ABT 10 επιτελεις BZcett HKAGIB CPTZ Jos 
epitele Τ επιτελοι cett 12 εκγονοις AB*T 13 om ou B 14 απαν-
tων] pr των H | τουτους I 16 φερει P | λαμβανεις BT | γεγονας BPT 
18 αγαθων] pr των BT 19 om de C 20 τουτω P 21 αποκρυνεσθαι 
B | om de C 23 ημερας GI | εξεις 20] om BPTZ 24 εστ επηρωτα 
BCTZ (ετιτα BC]) εστ επηρωτα cett 27 βουλευμενω BT] βουλευμεν cett 
28 σημειαμενων CTZ 29 ολιγοις Ζ
άνδρας ἀρετῆ, καὶ συνιέναι πλείον. οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ τοιαύτας ἐρωτήσεις λαμβάνοντες, ὥς δέον εἶτιν ἀποκεκριντα, πάντες ἀπὸ θεοῦ τοῦ λόγου τὴν καταρχὴν ποιοῦμενοι. Μενέδημος δὲ οἱ Ἐρετρείους φιλόσοφοι ἔστε Ναὶ, βασιλεῖς προνοίᾳ γὰρ τῶν ὅλων διοικομένων, καὶ ὑπεληφτῶν ὅρθως τοῦτο, ὅτι θεόκτιστον ἔστιν Ἀνθρώποις, ἀκολουθεῖ πάσαν δυναστείαν καὶ λόγον καλλονήν ἀπὸ θεοῦ κατάρχεσθαι. τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπινεύσατος τὰ περὶ τούτων Ἡσιόδος Πλησίον." ἔτραπτησαν δὲ πρὸς εὐφροσύνην. ἐπιλαβοῦσας δὲ τῆς ἐστέρας τὸ συμπόσιον ἐλύθη.

Τῇ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάταξιν τὰ τῆς ἀναπτώσεως καὶ συμποσίας ἐπετελεῖτο. καθὸ δὲ ἐνόμισεν ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐκαιρὸν εἶναι πρὸς τὸ πυθανέσθαι τι τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἐπηρώτα τοὺς ἐξῆς τῶν ἀποκεκριμένων τῇ προτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. πρὸς τὸν ἑνδέκατον δὲ ἤρξατο τὴν κοινολογίαν ποιεῖν τιθα (δεκα γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ ἡρωτημένοι τῇ προτέρᾳ). στῆς δὲ γενομένης ἐπυθανόντος Πώς 15 ἀν πλοῦσιος διαμένοι; βραχὺ ὃ ἐπισκόπων ὁ τὴν ἐρωτήσεων ἐκδηχόμενος ἔπετεν Εἰ μηδὲν ἀνάξιον τῆς ἁρχῆς μηδὲ ἀσελγῆς πράσσοι, μηδὲ δαπάνης εἰς τὰ κενὰ καὶ μάταια συντελοῖ, τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους εὐφρεσία πρὸς εὐνοιαν ἁγοι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πάσιν αἴτιοι ἁγαθῶν ἐστίν, ὁ κατακολουθεῖν ἄναγκαιον.

Ἑπαί- 20 νέεσα δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τούτου ἔτερον ἐπηρώτα Πώς ἀν τὴν ἀλήθειαν διατηροῦ; δὲ πρὸς τὸ τούτο ἀπεκρίθη Γυνώσκων ὅτι μεγάλην αἰσχύνην ἐπιφέρει τὸ σκέδος πάσιν ἀνθρώποις, πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν· ἐξουσίαν γὰρ ἔχοντες ὃ βουλοῦνται πράσσειν, τίνος ἐνεκεν ἄνεφικτον; προσλαμβάνει δὲ δεὶ τοῦτο σε, βασιλεῖ, διότι 25 φιλαληθῆς ὁ θεὸς ἐστίν.

Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ εἰ μᾶλλα καὶ τούτων ἐπιβλέψας ἔπειν Τί ἐστι σοφίας διδαχῆ; δὲ ἔτερος

άπεφηνατο Καθὼς οὐ βούλει σεαυτῷ τὰ κακὰ παρείναι, μέτοχος δὲ τῶν ἁγαθῶν ὑπάρχειν ἀπάντων, εἰ πράσσοις τούτῳ πρὸς τούς ὑποτε- 
γαμένους καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας: εἰ τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ ἁγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπεικεστέρον νουθετοῖς καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἁνθρώπους 5 ἀπαντᾷ ἐπεικείᾳ ἀγεί. 'Επαινέσας αὐτὸν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐπεὶ Πὼς ἂν φιλάνθρωπος εἶ; κάκεινος ἐφή Θεωρῶν ἃς ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ καὶ κακοπαθείας μεγίστας αὐξεῖ τε καὶ γεννᾶται τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· οἶδεν οὔτε εὐκόπως δεὶ κολάζειν, οὔτε αἰκίας περιβάλλειν· γινώσκων ὅτι τὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἦν ἐν δόξαις τε καὶ 10 τοιμαρίας καθέστηκε. ἐπινοῶν οὖν ἔκαστα πρὸς τὸν ἔλεον τραπέζη· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἔλεημον ἔστιν. 'Αποδεξάμενος δὲ τούτου ἐπικαθάνετο τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔφη Τίς ἀναγκαίωτατος τρόπος βασιλείας; Τὸ συντηρεῖν, ἐπειδ' αὐτὸν ἀδυροδόκητον, καὶ νήφειν τὸ πλεῖον μέρος τοῦ βίου, καὶ δικαιοσύνην προτιμάν, καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους φιλοποιεῖται, καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πιθανοκαίον ἔστιν. Ἐπισταθηκαί καὶ τούτον πρὸς τὸν ἐπερν Εἶπεν Τί τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐστὶ κατάσταμα; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐφή Τὸ διαλαμβάνειν ὅτι πάντα διαπαινότος ὁ θεὸς ἐνεργεῖ καὶ γινώσκει, καὶ οὐθὲν ἂν λάθος ἄδικον ποιήσας ἢ κακὸν ἐργασάμενος ἄνθρωπος· ὃς γὰρ θεὸς ἐνεργεῖτε τὸν ὅλον κόσμον, οὐτός καὶ 20 σὺ μμούμενος ἀπρόσκοπος ἄν εἶης. Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἐπερν ἐπεὶ Τίς ὤρος τοῦ βασιλέως ἔστιν; ὁ δὲ ἐφή Τὸ καλῶς ἀρχεῖν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μή τῷ πλοῦτῳ καὶ τῇ δόξῃ φερόμενον ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἀχήμον τι ἐπιθυμήσατι, εἰ καλῶς λογίζοιο. πάντα γὰρ σοι πάρεστιν ἃς οὐδὲν. ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀπροσδήσῃ ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιεικῆς.
καὶ σὺ, καθόσον ἀνθρωπὸς, ἐννοεῖ, καὶ μὴ πολλῶν ὅρεγον, τῶν δὲ ἰκανῶν πρὸς τὸ βασιλεῖαν. Κατεπανέσας δὲ αὐτὸν, ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἔτερον. Πῶς ἀν τὰ κάλλιστα διαλογίζοτο; ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ἐκεῖνος. Εἶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐπὶ παντὸς προβάλλον συνεχῶς, καὶ νομίζει τὴν ἀδικίαν τοῦ Ἐπὶ στέρησιν εἶναι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς διαπαντὸς τοὺς δίκαιοις ἀγαθὰ προσημανεῖ μέγιστα. 

Τούτον δὲ ἐπανέσας εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον. Πῶς ἂν ἐν τοῖς ὑπνοῖς ἀτάραχος εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἐφη 

Δυσαπαλόγητον ἡρώτεικα πράγμα. συναφέρειν γὰρ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐν τούτοις τοῖς κατὰ τὸν ὑπνὸν ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ περιεχόμεθα ἀλογίστῳ κατὰ «τάδε» αἰσθήσει. πάσχομεν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑποτίτουσιν ὡς θεωροῦμενα· ἀλογιστοῦμεν δὲ, καθότων ὑπολαμβάνομεν καὶ ἐπὶ πέλαγος καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἡ πολεῖν, ἡ πέτασθαι φερομένους καὶ διαιρέως εἰς ἐτέρους τόπους, καὶ τοιαύτα ἐτέρα, † καὶ ὁ ταῖθ' ὑπολαμβάνων μὴ καθεστάναι. πλὴν ὅσον ἐμούσε εἴρητον, οὕτω διείληφα· κατὰ πάντα τρόπον σέ, βασιλεῦ, καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ τὰ πραττόμενα πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἐπανάγειν, ὡς <ἑαυτῷ> συνιστορή, ὅτι τὸ κατ' ἁρετὴν συνηρήν οὕτε χαρίζεσθαι προαρή παρά λόγον, οὐδὲ ἐξοσία χρώμενος τὸ δίκαιων αἰρέσ. ἐπὶ πλείον γὰρ, ἐν οἷς ἔκαστος πράγμασιν ἐγχειρῆσας τὴν διαγωγὴν ποιεῖται, καὶ καθ' ὑπνὸν ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἡ διάνοια τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἔχει, † ὡς δὲ πάντα διαλογισμὸν καὶ πράξει ἐπὶ τὰ κάλλιστα τρεπομένην κατευθύνει καὶ ἐγχειρῶσ καὶ ἐν ὑπνῷ. διὸ καὶ περὶ σὲ διαπαντὸς ἐστὶν εὐστάθεια. Κατευθυνόμεθα δὲ καὶ τούτων εἰπε πρὸς τὸν ἐτερὸν. Ἐπεί σον δέκατος τὴν ἀπόκρυσιν ἔχεις, ὡς ἀν ἀποφῇ, πρὸς τὸ δείπνον τραπεζόμεθα.
Ηρώτα δὲ Πώς ἀν μηδὲν ἀνάξιον ἐαυτῶν πράσσομεν; ὦ δὲ εἶπεν Ἔπιβλεπε διαπαντὸς εἰς τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχήν, ἵνα τούτους ἀκόλουθα καὶ λέγης καὶ διανοῦ, γινώσκον ὅτι πάντες ὁι ἄρχεις περὶ σοῦ καὶ διανοοῦνται καὶ λαλοῦσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἐλάχιστὸν ὑποκρίνεσθαι, τοῦτο συνθεωροῦντες ἀκόλουθα πάντα πράσσοντες: οὐ δὲ υἱάς ὑπόκρισιν ἔχεις, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς βασιλεύεις, θεοῦ δόντος σοι καταξίως τῶν τρόπων τὴν ἴγμενον. 
Τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως εἰ μάλα συγκροτήσαντος μετὰ φιλοφροσύνης ἐπὶ πλείονα ἀνθρώπους καθυπνοῦν παρεκάλουν. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸς τούτους ὦς ἐλήξεν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἐτράπησαν τῆς συμποσίας διαταξίν.

Τῇ δὲ ἐχομενῇ, τῆς αὐτῆς διατάξεως γενήθεις, ὅτε καὶ υπελάμβανεν ὁ βασιλεύς εἰναι τοῦ πυθαγερίσσα τι τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἦρωτα 15 τὸν πρῶτον τῶν ἀπολιπόντων πρὸς τὴν ἐξῆς ἐρωτήσῃς: Ὑπὸς ἐστὶν ἄρχη κρατίσθη; ἔκεισθας δὲ ἔφη Ὑπὸς κρατεῖν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ μὴ συγκατέφερεν ταῖς ὁρμαῖς. πάσι γὰρ ἀνθρώποις φυσικὸν εἶναι τὸ πρὸς τὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ῥέπειν· τοῖς μὲν οὖν πολλοῖς ἐπὶ τὰ βρωτά καὶ ποτά καὶ τὰς ἱδονὰς εἰκός ἐστὶν κεκλίσθαι, τοῖς δὲ βασιλεύσαν ἐπὶ 20 χώρας κατάκτησιν, κατὰ τὸ τῆς δοξῆς μέγεθος· πλὴν ἐν πᾶσι μετριῶτης καλὸν. ὡς δὲ θεὸς δίδωσι, ταῦτα λαμβάνων σύνεχεῖ τῶν δ' ἀνεφίκτων μὴ ἐπιθύμει. 
Τοῖς δὲ ῥηθείσιν ἀρεσθείς πρὸς τὸν ἐχομένων εἶπε Πώς ἀν ἐκτὸς εἰς τὸν φθόνον; διαλυτῶν δὲ ἔκεισθας ἔφη Πρῶτον ἐν νοσά, ὅτι θεὸς πᾶσιν μερίζει δόξαν τε 25 καὶ πλούτου μέγεθος τοῖς βασιλεύσαι, καὶ οὐδές περὶ ἐαυτῶν ἐστε


ΑΡΙΣΤΕΑΣ

βασιλεὺς· πάντες γὰρ θέλουσι μετασχεῖν ταύτης τῆς δόξης, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνανται· θεοῦ γὰρ ἔστι δόξα.

'Επαινέσας δὲ τὸν ἄλλην διὰ πλείονον ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἔτερον Πώς ἂν καταφρονοῇ τῶν ἔχθρων; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἡσιηκὼς πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εὔνοιαν καὶ κατεργασάμενοι φιλίας, λόγον οὖνεν ἂν ἔχοις· τὸ δὲ κεχαριτωθῇ πρὸς 5 πάντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ καλὸν ὤρον ἐληφθήναι παρὰ θεοῦ τοῦτ' ἐστι κράτιστον.

Συναινέσας δὲ τούτως τὸν ἔξης ἐκέλευσεν ἀποκριθήναι, πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπὼν Πώς ἂν δοξαζόμενοι διαμένω; εἴπε δὲ Ἡ γροθυμία καὶ ταῖς χάρισι πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλούς μεταδοτικός ὃν καὶ μεγαλομερῆς οὐδέποτ' ἂν ἀπολύσαι δόξης· ἢν δὲ τὰ προερήματα οἱ διαμένουσαν τὸν θεοῦ ἐπικαλοῦ ἀπαντῶς. 

Εὐφημίσας δὲ τούτων ἔτερον ἠρώτα Πώς τινα δεῖ φιλότιμον εἶναι; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη Πρὸς τοὺς φιλικῶς ἔχοντας ἡμῖν οἴνονται πάντες δι' ἂν πρὸς τούτους δέον· ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολαμβάνω, πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιδοξοῦντας φιλοτιμίαν δεῖν χαριστικῆν ἔχειν, ἢν τούτω τῷ τρόπῳ μετάγωμεν 15 αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ καθήκον καὶ συμφέρον ἐαυτῶς. δεὶ δὲ τὸν θεοῦ λιτανεύειν, ἢν ταύτ' ἐπιτελήται· τὰς γὰρ ἀπαντῶν διανοίας κρατεῖ.

Συνομολογήσας δὲ τούτως τὸν ἔκτον ἐκέλευσεν ἀποφήμασθαι πυνθανόμενοι οὗς δεὶ χαρίζεσθαι· ἐκεῖνος δ' ἀπεκρίθη Γονεύσι διαπαντός, καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς πεποίηται ἐντολὴν 20 μεγάλῃν περὶ τῆς τῶν γονέων τιμῆς. ἔποιμένως δὲ τὴν τῶν φίλων ἑγκρίνει διάθεσιν, προσομοίασας ἑικόνι τὴν ψυχή τῶν φίλων. σὺ δὲ καλῶς ποιεῖς ἀπαντάς ἀνθρώπους εἰς φιλίαν πρὸς ἐαυτῶν καθιστῶν.

Παρακαλέσας δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐπιθυμῶν καὶ τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί καλλονής ἄξιον ἔστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Εὐσέβεια. καὶ 25 γὰρ αὕτη καλλονή ἐς ἐστὶ πρωτεύουσα. τὸ δὲ δυνατὸν αὕτης
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ἔστιν ἀγάπη· αὕτη γὰρ θεοῦ δόσις ἑστὶν· ἣν καὶ σὺ κέκτησαι πάντα περιέχων εἰς αὐτὴν τὰ ἁγάθα. Διὰν δὲ φιλοφρόνως ἐπικροτήσας εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἑτέρον Πῶς ἄν πταῖσας πάλιν τῆς αὐτῆς κρατήσαις δόξης; ὦ δὲ ἔφη Σὲ μὲν οὐ δυνατὸν ἐστι πταῖσαι, πάσι 5 γὰρ χάριτας ἐσπαρκας, αἱ βλαστάνουσιν εὐνοιαν, ὥ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ὀπλῶν κατισχύσας περιλαμβάνει τὴν μεγίστην ἀσφάλειαν· εἰ δὲ τινες πταίσωσιν, ἐφ’ ὅς πταίσουσιν, οὐκέτι χρὴ ταῦτα πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ φιλίαν κατακτησάμενοι δικαιοπραγεῖν. θεοῦ δὲ δόρων ἄγαθῶν ἐργάτην εἶναι καὶ µὴ τῶν ἑναντίων. Συναρεσθεῖς δὲ τούτως 10 πρὸς τὸν ἑτέρον εἶπε Πῶς ἄν ἐκτὸς γένοιτο λύπης; ὦ δὲ ἐφήσεν Εἰ µηδένα βλάπτοι, πάντας δὲ ὕψεις, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ κατακολούθων· τοὺς γὰρ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς καρποὺς ἀλυπτὰς κατασκευάζειν. ἰκετεύει δὲ τὸν θεόν, ἵνα µὴ τὰ παρὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἡμῶν ἀνακύπτοντα βλάπτῃ, λέγω δὴ οἶνον θάνατοι τε καὶ νόσοι καὶ λύπαι καὶ τὰ 15 τοιαῦτα. <αὐτῷ> δὲ σοὶ εὐσεβείς καθεστῶτι τούτων οὐδὲν ἀν προσέθλοι. Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἑπανέσας τὸν δέκατον ἡρώτα Τῇ µέγιστον ἐστὶν δόξης; ὦ δὲ εἶπε Τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν θεόν· τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶν οὐ δώροις οὐδὲ θυσίαις, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς καθαρότητι καὶ διαλήψεως ὅσιας, καθὼς ὑπὸ τὸν θεοῦ πάντα κατασκευάζεται καὶ διωκεται 20 κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βουλήσεως ἦν καὶ σὺ διατελεῖς ἔχων γνώμην, ἥ πάρεστι σημειοῦσθαι πάσιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ συντελεσθεμένων καὶ συντελουμένων. Ἔκεῖ, µείζονος δὲ φωνῆς πάντας αὐτοὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἑπτάζετο καὶ παρεκάλει, συνεπιφυσοῦντων τῶν παρόντων, μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν φιλοσόφων. καὶ γὰρ ταῖς ἀγωγαῖς καὶ τῷ λόγῳ 25 πολὺ προέχοντες αὐτῶν ἦσαν, ὡς ἀν ἀπὸ θεοῦ τὴν καταρχήν ποιοῦ- μένοι. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι προηλθὲ 20 τῶν προσώπων.

1 γαρ] δε B [θυ δοσις BCPTZ] θεοδοσιος cett 2 αυτη] εαυτη K αυτω HKAGIB B* εαυτω B1 txt cett 3 της αυτης καλω P 5 εσπερκας HA [ευνοιαν] +ει δε τινες πταιουσ εφ οις πταιουσ K* (del rubricator) 8 κτησι- 

4 µενους BT [αγαθου CT*Z 9 συναρεσθεις B 10 εφησεν] εφη AP 

11 βλαπται] λυπεται Zvid (fin ex corr) [ωφελει KT ωφελι P 12 αυτου 

K 13 om ta KBCTZ 14 βλαπται CPZ [λεγη δη (de Z)) om P | om 

tε P 15 τοιαυτα δε σω codd (cum lacuna post τοιαυτα BC) αυτω inserui | 

18 αυτω—καθεστωτι] ευσεβει δε σοι οντι P 19 καθω—κατα (20)] om 

HKAGI 22 δε µειζονος Z 25 προσεχοντες BZ [αυτω B* | ησαω P] om cett 27 προσωπων BTHcorr] πραιποσητων PKcorr πραιποσητων cett
Τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ κατὰ τὰ αυτὰ τῆς διατάξεως τοῦ συμποσίου γενομένης, καθὼς εὐκαιρον ἔγενετο τῷ βασιλεῖ, τούς ξῆς ἡρώτα τῶν προαποκριμένων, ἐπεὶ δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ Τὸ φρονεῖν εἰ διδακτὸν ἔστιν; ὃς δὲ εἴπε Ψυχῆς ἦστι κατασκευή, διὰ θεᾶς δυνάμεως ἐπιδέχεσθαι πάν τὸ καλὸν, ἀποστρέφεσθαι δὲ ταναντία.

Συνομολογήσας δὲ τὸν ἐχόμενον ἡρώτα Τὶ πρὸς ὅγειαν μάλιστα συντείνει; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐξῆς Σωφροσύνης ταύτης δὲ οὐκ ἦστιν ξυχεῖν, ἐάν μὴ θεὸς κατασκευάσῃ τὴν διάνοιαν εἰς τοῦτο.

Παρακαλέσας δὲ τούτων πρὸς τὸν έτερον ἐφή Πῶς ἄν γονεύσῃ τὰς ἀξίας ἀποδόθη χάριτας; ὃς δὲ εἶπε Μηθῖν αὐτοὺς λυπήσας· τούτῳ δὲ οὐκ ἦστιν, εἰ μὴ θεὸς τῆς διανοίας ἤγερθον πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα. Προσπενεύνας δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἐξῆς ἡρώτα Πῶς ἄν φιλήκουσιν εἰς; ἐκεῖνος δὲ εἴπε Διαλαμβάνων ὅτι πάντα συμφέρει γινόσκειν, ὅπως ἄν πρὸς τὰ συμβαίνοντα ἐκλεγόμενοι τοις ἡκροαμένων ἀνθυποτίθεν πρὸς τὰ τῶν καιρῶν ἑκατέρους ἀντιπράσπεστης, σὺν χειραγωγίᾳ θεοῦ· τούτῳ δὲ ἦστιν, 15 αἱ τῶν πράξεων τελεωσίσεις υπ' αὐτοῦ.

Τούτῳ δὲ ἐπιείσασθαι πρὸς τὸν έτερον ἐπεὶ Πῶς ἄν μηθεὶ παράνομον πράσσοι; πρὸς τούτῳ ἔφησε Γινώσκων ὅτι τὰς ἐπινοίας ὁ θεὸς ἐδώκε τοῖς νομοθετήσας πρὸς τὸ σώζεσθαι τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀκόλουθος εἰς ὑπ' αὐτοῖς. Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἐτέρον εἶπε Τίς ἦς ὑφέλεια συγγενείας ἐστίν; ὃς δὲ ἀπεφήνατο Ἑαν τοῖς συμβαίνοντις νομίζωμεν ἀντιχοῦσι μὲν ἑλαπτοῦνται, καὶ κακοπαθῶμεν ὡς αὐτοί, φαίνεται τὸ συγγενὲς ὅσον ἵσχυον ἐστὶ—τελομένων δὲ τούτων καὶ δάξα καὶ προκοπὴ παρὰ τοῖς τοιούτοις ὑπάρξει· τὸ γὰρ συγγενές...
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eυνόως γινόμενον ὡς ἕξ ἐαυτοῦ ἀδιαλυτὸν πρὸς ἀπαντα—μετὰ δὲ εὐμερίας, μηδὲν προσδείσθαι τῶν ἐκείνων, ἀλλὰ <θεὸν> ἱκετεύειν, πάντα ἀγαθοποιεῖν. 'Ὡσαίτως δὲ ἐκείνοις ἀποδεξάμενοι αὐτὸν ἀλλὸν ἡρώτα Πῶς ἀφοβία γίνεται; εἶπε δὲ Συνιαστορούσης 5 τῆς διανοίας μηδὲν κακὸν πεπραχέναι, θεοῦ κατευθύνοντος εἰς τὸ καλὸς ἀπαντὰ βουλευσθαί. Τούτῳ δὲ ἐπιφωνήσας πρὸς ἄλλον εἶπε Πῶς ἀν προχείρως ἔχοι τὸν ὄρθον λόγον; ὦ δὲ εἶπεν Εἰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀτυχήματα διαπαντὸς ἐπιβλέποι γινώσκων ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀφαίρεται τὰς εὐμερίας, ἔτεροι δὲ δοξάζουν εἰς τὸ 10 τιμᾶσθαι προάγει. Καλῶς δὲ καὶ τούτον ἀποδεξάμενος τὸν ἐξῆς ἀποκριθῆναι παρεκάλει Πῶς ἄν μὴ εἰς ῥαθυμίαν, μηδὲ ἐπὶ τὰς ἱδονὰς τρέποντο; ὦ δὲ Προχείρως ἔχον, εἶπεν, ὅτι μεγάλης βασιλείας κατάρχηκε καὶ πολλῶν ὀχλῶν ἀφηγεῖται, καὶ οὐ δεὶ περὶ ἑτέρων τι τὴν διάνοιαν εἶναι, τῆς δὲ τούτων ἐπιμελείας φρονίζειν. 15 θεόν δὲ ἄξεσιν, ὅπως μηθην ἐλλίπτῃ τῶν καθηκόντων. Ἐπαυνέσας δὲ καὶ τούτον τὸν δεκατον <ἡρώτα> Πῶς ἄν ἐπιγνώσκοι> τοὺς δόλου τινι πρὸς αὐτὸν πράσσονται; ὦ δὲ ἀπεφθάνω πρὸς τοῦτο Εἰ παρατηροῦτο τὴν ἀγωγὴν ἑλευθερίον οὖσαν, καὶ τὴν εἰσαξίαν διαμε- νουσαν ἐν τοῖς ἀστασμοῖς καὶ συμβουλίαις καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ συνανα- 20 στροφῇ τῶν συν αὐτῷ, καὶ μηθὲν ὑπερτείνοντας τοῦ δεόντως ἐν τοῖς φιλοφρονήσει καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἀγωγὴν. θεὸς δὲ τὴν διάνοιαν <ἀξεῖ> σοι, βασιλεῦ, πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα. Συγκροτήσας πάντας τ’ ἐπαυνέσας κατ’ ὄνομα, καὶ τῶν παρόντων ταύτα ποιούντων, ἐπὶ τὸ μέλες ἐτράπησαν.
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Ἡ δὲ ἐχομένη τῶν καρδιῶν λαβὼν ἐπηρώτα τὸν ἔξης Τῖς ἐστὶν ἀμέλεια μεγίστῃ; πρὸς τὸν ἐφή Εἰ τέκνων ἀφροντίς τις εἶπ, καὶ μὴ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀγαλεῖν ἑυχόμεθα γὰρ αἱ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, οὐχ οὔτως ἐπεὶ ἐαυτῶν ὃς περὶ τῶν ἐγώνων, ἵνα παρῇ πάντα αὐτοῖς τὰ ἄγαθα. τὸ δὲ ἐπεδιέσθαι πανδείαν σωφροσύνης μετασχεῖ, τὸν δὲ δυνάμει τούτῳ γίνεται. Φησάς δὲ εὐλογεῖν ἄλλον ἱρώτα Πῶς ἂν φιλόπατρις εἶπ; Προτιθέμενος, εἰπὲν, ὅτι καλὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἐν καὶ τελευτᾷν. ἦ δὲ ἐνεία τοῖς μὲν πένθει καταφρόνησεν ἐργαζέται τοὺς δὲ πλουτοῖς ἔνειδος, ὡς διὰ κακίαν ἐκπεπτωκός. εὐεργετῶν οὖν ἀπαντας, καθὼς συνεχώς τοῦτ' ἐπιτελεῖς, θεοῦ δεδόντος τοι σοὶ πρὸς πάντας χάριν, φιλόπατρις φανήσῃ.

Τούτου δὲ ἀκούσας τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔξης ἐπινιθάνετο Πῶς ἄν> ἀρμόσαι γυναικὶ; Ἕνωσκον> ὅτι μὲν θρασύ ἔστιν, ἐφή, τὸ θῆλυ γένος, καὶ δραστικόν ἐφ' ὃ βούλεται πράγμα, καὶ μεταπέτωτον εὐκόσιον διὰ παραλογισμοῦ, καὶ τῇ φύσει κατασκεύασται ἀσθενεῖς· δεόν δ' ἵστα κατὰ τὸ ὤγεις 15 χρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἐρν ἀντιπράσσειν. κατορθούται γὰρ βίος, ὅταν ὑπὲρ κυβέρνων εἰδῆ, πρὸς τίνα σκοτὸν δεῖ τὴν διεξοδὸν ποτεύσθαι. θεοῦ δ' ἐπικλῆσει καὶ βίος κυβερνᾶται κατὰ πάντα. Ἀνακολογοσάμενος δὲ τούτῳ τὸν ἔξης ἱρώτα Πῶς ἄν> ἀναμάρτητος εἶπ; ὅ δὲ ἐφήσεν 'Ὡς ἀπαντᾷ πράσσων καὶ μετὰ διαλογισμοῦ, καὶ καὶ μὴ πεθόμενος διαβολαῖς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὃν δοκιμασθῇ τῶν λεγομένων, καὶ κρίσει κατευθύνων τὰ τῶν ἔντειξεων, καὶ διὰ κρίσεως ἐπιτελῶν ταῦτα, ἀναμάρτητος, ἐφήσεν, ἀν εἶπεν, ὅ βασιλεὺς. τὸ δ' ἐπινοεῖν ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀναστρέφεσθαι θείας δυνάμεως ἔστιν.
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εργον. Διαχυθέως δὲ τοῖς εἰρήμενοις τὸν ἐτερον ἴρωτα Πῶς ἂν ἐκτὸς θυμοῦ γένοιτο; πρὸς τοῦτο εἰπε Γινώσκων ὅτι πάντων ἐξουσίαν ἔχει, καὶ, εἰ χρῆσαι θυμῷ, θάνατον ἐπιφέρει ὡπερ ἀνωφέλες καὶ ἀλγευνὸν ἐστιν, εἰ τὸ ἐξον αφελεῖται πολλῶν, διά τὸ κύριον

5 εἶναι. πάντων ὅ ὑπηκοῶν ὄντων καὶ μηδενὸς ἐναντιουμένου, πίνος χάριν θυμωθήσεται; γινώσκειν δὲ δεῖ, διότι θεός τὸν πάντα κόσμον διακεῖ μετ' εὐμενείας καὶ χωρὶς ὁργῆς ἀπάσης τούτῳ δὲ κατακολουθεῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶν, ἐφὴσεν, ὃ βασιλεὺς. Καλῶς δὲ ἀποκεράθαι φήμασι τούτων ἐπιμνήνιον τοῦ μετεπειτά Τί ἐστιν

eὐβουλία; Τὸ καλῶς ἀπαντᾶ πράσσειν, ἀπεφήνατο, μετὰ διαλογισμοῦ, κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν παρατίθεντα καὶ <τὰ> βλαβέρα τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον τοῦ λόγου διάστημα, ἦν πρὸς ἑκαστον ἐπινοήσαντες ὥμεν εὐ βεβουλευμένου, καὶ τὸ προτεθὲν ἦμιν ἐπιτελήται. τὸ δ' ἀν

cράτιστον, θεοῦ δυναστεία πάν βούλευμα <τελείωσιν ἔξεις> σοι

15 τὴν εὑσέβειαν ἀσκοῦντι. Καταρθωκέναι δὲ καὶ τούτων εἰτῶν ἀλλὸν ἴρωτα. Τί ἐστι φιλοσοφία; Τὸ καλῶς διαλογίζεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἑκαστον τῶν συμβαίνων, ἀπεφήνατο, καὶ μὴ ἐκφέρεσθαι ταῖς ὀρμαίς, ἀλλὰ τὰς βλάβας καταμελεῖν τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐκβαινούσας, καὶ τὰ τοῖς καρόν πράσσειν δεόντως μετριοπαθῆ καθ-καθοντά. ἦν δὲ ἐπίστασιν τούτων λαμβάνωμεν, θεραπεύεις δεὶ τὸν

θεόν. Ἐπισημήνας δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐτερον ἴρωτα Πῶς ἂν ἀποδοχὴ ἢ ἐξενιεία τυγχάνοι; Πᾶσιν ἰσος γενόμενοις, ἐφη, καὶ μᾶλλον ἦττοι ἢ καθυπερέχου φαινόμενοι πρὸς ὦς ἐξενιείες. κοινῶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὸ ταπεινούμενον προσδέχεται κατὰ φύσιν, καὶ τὸ

tοις ἀνθρώπων γένος τοῖς ὑποτασσομένους φιλανθρωπεῖ. 'Επι-

μαρτυρηθήσας δὲ τούτως ἀλλὸν ἴρωτα Πῶς <ἀ> ἄν κατασκευάσῃ καὶ
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μετὰ τοῦτο διαμένῃ; πρὸς τούτ’ εἶπεν Ἑι μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ταῖς
tοιχίσεων ἐπιτελοί, πρὸς τὸ φείδασθαι τοὺς θεωροῦντας διὰ τὴν
καλλιτήν, καὶ μηθένα τῶν κατεργαζομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα παραπέμποι,
μηδὲ τοὺς ἄλλους ἁμισθίας ἑνεκελευνεῖς ἀναγκαίοι τὰ πρὸς τὴν
χρείαν. διανοούμενος γὰρ ὡς θεὸς πολυνορεῖ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, χορη-
γὸν αὐτοὺς καὶ υγείαν καὶ εἰσανθησίαν καὶ τὰ λοιπά, καὶ αὐτὸς
ἀκόλουθον τι πράξει τῶν κακοπαθεῖν ἀποδεῖται τὴν ἀντάμησιν.
τὰ γὰρ ἐκ δικαιοσύνης τελοῦμενα, ταῦτα καὶ διαμένει.

Εὕ
δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἑρηκεναί φήσας τὸν δέκατον ἤρωτα Τί ἐστι σοφίας
καρπός; ὃ δὲ εἶπε Τὸ μὴ συνιστορεῖ ἐαντῷ κακὸν πεπραγότι, τὸν
δὲ βίον ἐν ἀλληθεία διείξατεν. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ κρατίστη χαρὰ καὶ
ψυχῆς εὐσταθεῖα σοι γίνεται, μέγιστο βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἐπιτάξει ἐπὶ θεῷ
καλὰ κρατοῦντι σοι τῆς ἀρχῆς εὐσεβῶς. Ἡς δὲ συνήκουσαν
πάντες ἐπεφώνησαν σὺν κρότῳ πλείωνι. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ
προτείνειν ὁ βασιλεὺς [λαμβάνειν] ἑτράπη, χαρὰ πεπληρομένος.

Τῇ δ’ ἐξῆς καθὼς πρότερον ἡ διάταξις ἦν τῶν κατὰ τὸν πότων
ἐπιτελοῦμένων, καμοῦ δὲ γενομένου τοὺς ἀπολιπώσας ὁ βασιλεὺς
ἐπηρώτα. πρὸς τὸν πρώτων δὲ ἐφή Πῶς ἂν μὴ τράποι τις εἰς
ὑπερηφανίαν; ἀπεκρίθη τί δὲ Ἑι τὴν ἰσότητα τηροί, καὶ παρ’ ἐκαστὸν
ἐαυτὸν ὑπομιμήσκοι, καθὼς ἀνθρώπων ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἢ γείτονα. καὶ 20
ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὑπερηφάνους καθαρεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιείκεις καὶ ταπεινοὺς
ὑψοῖ.

Παρακαλέσαις δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν ἐξῆς ἐπηρώτα Τίσι δὲι
συμβουλαῖς χρησίβα; τοὺς δὲ πολλῶν, ἐφῆ, πεπεραμένοις πραγ-
μάτων, καὶ τὴν εὐνοιαν συντηροῦσιν ἀκέραιον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν
τρόπων ὑποι μετέχουσιν αὐτῷ. θεοῦ δὲ ἐπιφάνεια γίνεται πρὸς τὰ 25
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τοιαύτα τοίς ἀξίοις. Ἑσπανέσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἄλλον ἦρωτα Τὸς ἐστὶ βασιλείς κτήσις ἀναγκαιοτάτη; Τῶν ὑποτελαμένων φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἀγάπησις, ἀπεκρίνατο. διὰ γὰρ τούτων ἄλλως εὐνοίας δεσμός γίνεται. τὸ δὲ γίνεσθαι κατὰ προοίμιον ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς. 5 ἐπιπελέι.

Κατεπανέσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐτέρου διεπνυθάνετο Τέρας ἐστὶ λόγον; κάκεινος δὲ ἐφήσε τὸ πεῖσα τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα, διὰ τῆς ὑποτελαμένης τάξεως τῶν βλάβας ἐπιδεικνύντα· οὗτο γὰρ λήψῃ τὸν ἄκροατᾶν ὅπηκοιμενος, συγχρώμενος δὲ ἐπαινύα πρὸς τὸ πεῖσα. θεοῦ δὲ ἐνεργεία κατευθύνεται πειθῶ. Εὖ δὲ 10 λέγειν φήσας αὐτὸν ἐτέρον ἦρωτα Πῶς ἂν, παμμικῶν ὁχλῶν ὄντων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, τούτοις ἀρμόσαι>; Τὸ πρέπον ἐκάστῳ συνυποκρίνομενος, εἰπε, καθηγεμόνα λαμβάνων δικαιοσύνην· ὅς καὶ ποιεῖς θεοῦ σοι διδόντος εἰ λογίζεσθαι. Φιλοφρονηθεὶς δὲ τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἐτέρον εἶπεν Ἐπι τίςι δεῖ λυπείσθαι; Πρὸς ταῦτα, ἀπεκρίθη, τὰ 15 συμβαίνοντα τοῖς φίλοις, ὅταν θεωρῶμεν πολυχρώμα καὶ ἀνέκφευκτα γινόμενα. τελευτήσασι μὲν γὰρ καὶ κακῶν ἀπολελυμένοις ὅχι ὑπογράφει λύπην ὁ λόγος· ἀλλὰ ἐφ' ἑαυτούς ἀναφέροντες καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συμφέρον λυποῦνται πάντες ἄνθρωποι. τὸ δ' ἐκφυγεῖν πᾶν κακὸν θεοῦ δυνάμει γίνεται. Οὐς ἔδει δὲ φήσας αὐτὸν 20 ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς ἐτέρον εἴπεν Πῶς ἀδοξία γίνεται; ἐκείνος δὲ ἐφήσεν ὅταν ὑπερηφανεία καθηγῆται καὶ θράσος ἄληκτον, ἀτμασμός ἐπιφύεται καὶ δόξης ἀναίρεσις. θεὸς δὲ δόξης πάσης κυριεύει, βίων οὐ βουλεύει.

Καὶ τούτῳ δ' ἐπικυρώσασα τὰς ἀποκρίσεις τὸν ἔξης ἦρωτα Τίσι δεῖ πιστεύειν ἑαυτὸν; Τοῖς διὰ τὴν 25 εὖνοιαν, εἴπε, συνουσί σοι, καὶ μὴ διὰ τὸν φόβον μηδὲ διὰ πολυ-
ορίαν, ἐπανάγωντας πάντα πρὸς τὸ κερδάνειν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀγα-
πήσεως σημείον, τὸ δὲ δυσνοίας καὶ καιροτρησίας· διὸ γὰρ ἐπὶ
tὸ πλεονεκτεῖν ὅποτε προδοτὴς πέφυκε, οὔ δὲ πάντας εὐνόους
ἐχεις θεοῦ σοὶ καλὴν βουλὴν διδόντος.

Σοφῶς δὲ αὐτὸν
ἐπίων ἀποκεκρῖθαι, ἐτέρῳ εἰπε Τί βασιλείαν διατηρεῖ; πρὸς τοὺς
ἐξήν Μέριμμα καὶ φροντίς, ώς οὐδὲν κακοπρηγήσεται διὰ τῶν ἀπο-
tεταγμένων εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους ταῖς χρείαις· καθὼς σὺ τοῦτο πρᾶσσεις
θεοῦ σοὶ τὴν σεμνὴν ἐπίνοιαν διδόντος.

Θορυβᾶς δὲ τοῦτον
ἐτέρων ἐπηρότα Τί διαφυλάσσει χάριτα καὶ τίμην· οὔ δὲ εἶπεν
'Αρετή. καλῶν γὰρ ἔργων ἐστὶν ἐπιτέλεια, τὸ δὲ κακῶν ἀποτρίβε-ιο
tαι· καθὼς σὺ διατηρεῖς τὴν πρὸς ἁπάντας καλοκαγαθίαν παρὰ
θεοῦ δώρων τούτων ἔχων.

Κεχαρισμένως δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἀπο-
dεξάμενος τὸν ἐνδέκατον ἐπηρότα (διὰ τὸ δόῳ πλεονάζειν τῶν ἐβδο-
μίκοντα.) Πῶς ἄν κατὰ ψυχήν καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις εἱρμοκυκόν έχοι;
ὁ δὲ ἀπεφήνατο Διαλαμβάνων ὅτι κακῶν οὐδὲν ἔργασται τῶν ὑπο-
tεταγμένων οὐδενὶ, πάντες δὲ ἀγνωστοί περὶ τῶν ἐνεργητικῶ-
tων, εἰδότες, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ ξῆν ἀποτρέχοσιν, ἔπιμελητίν σε τῶν
βίων. οὔ γὰρ διαλείπεις ἐπανορθῶν ἁπάντας τοῦ θεοῦ σοὶ καλο-
φροσύνην διδωκότα.

'Επισημήνας δὲ κρότῳ πάντας αὐτοὺς
ἀπεδέξατο φιλοφρονούμενος, καὶ προπίνων ἑκάστῳ πλείον τῷ ἐπὶ τό
τε περιβάλλειν, μετὲ εὐφροσύνης τοῖς ἀνδράσι συνών καὶ χαρᾶς
πλείονος.

Τῇ ἐβδομῇ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν, πλείονος παρασκευῆς γενομένης,
προσπαραγωγομένῳ πλείονων ἐτέρων ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων (ἡσαν γὰρ
ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ.

ικανοὶ πρέσβεις), ἐπηρώτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καυροῦ γενομένον τὸν πρωτεύοντα τῶν ἀπολιπότων τῆς ἐρωτήσεως Πῶς ἀν ἀπαραλογιστος <εἴη>; ἐκάνον δὲ ἐφη Δοκιμάζων καὶ τὸν λέγοντα καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ περὶ τίνος λέγει, καὶ ἐν πλείον χρόνῳ τὰ αὐτὰ δι᾽ ἕτερων τρόπων ἐπερωτῶν. τὸ δὲ νῦν ἔχειν ὡς καὶ δύνασθαι κρίνειν ἑκαστὰ θεοῦ δώρημα καλὸν ἔστω· ως ἕν τοῦτο κέκτησαι, βασιλεῦ. Κρότῳ δὲ ἐπηρώτησαμένος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔτερον § C ἐπηρώτα. Διὰ τί τὴν ἀρετὴν οὗ παραδέχονται τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ πλείονες; "Ὅτι φυσικῶς ἀπαντεῖς, εἶπεν, ἀκρατεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς τοῦ ἡδονᾶς τρεπόμενοι γεγόνασιν· δὲν χάριν ἀδικία πέρυκε καὶ τὸ τῆς πλευρὲς χώμα. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς κατάστημα κωλύει τοὺς ἐπιφερομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἡδονοκρασίαν, ἐγκράτειαν δὲ κελεύει καὶ δικαιοσύνην προτιμᾶν. ὃ δὲ θεὸς πάντων ἤγειται τούτων. Ἐν δὲ ἀποκεκρίθαι τούτον εἰπών ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡρώτα Τίνας δεῖ κατακόλουθοι ποὺς βασιλεῖς; ὃ δὲ ἐφη Τοῖς νόμοις, ἵνα δικαιοπραγοῦντες ἀνακτῶνται τοὺς βίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καθὼς ὑπὸ τοῦτο πράσσουσιν ἀέναν μνήμην καταβέβλησαι σεαυτοῦ, θεῖοι προστάγματι κατακολουθοῦν. Ἐπών δὲ καὶ τούτων καλῶς λέγειν τὸν ἐξόμενον ἡρώται Τίνας δεῖ καθιστάνειν στρατηγοὺς; ὃς δὲ ἐπεν ὁ θεοὶ 20 μυσοπονηρῶν ἐχουσι, καὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν αὐτοῦ μυμοῦμεν, πρὸς τὸ διαπαντὸς εὐδοκεῖν ἔχειν αὐτούς, τὰ δίκαια πράσσουν· καθὼς σὲ τοῦτο ἐπιτελεῖς, εἶπε, βασιλεῦ, θεοῦ σου στέφανον δικαιοσύνης δεδωκότος. 

Ἀποδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν μετὰ φωνῆς ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξόμενον ἐπιβλέψας εἶπε Τίνας δεῖ καθιστάνειν ἐπὶ τῶν δυνάμεων 25 ἄρχοντας; ὃ δὲ ἀπεβήσατο Τοῖς ἀνδρεῖς διαφέροντας καὶ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιομένους τὸ σώζειν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἢ τὸ
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ

ποντικάν, τὸ θράσει ἡ παραβάλλοντας τὸ ξὺν. ὃς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς εὖ ἔργαξεται πάσι, καὶ σύ τούτων μιμούμενος εἰσεργασεῖ τοὺς ὑπὸ σειστόν.

Ὁ δὲ ἀποκεκρίθαι φήσας αὐτὸν εὖ, ἀλλὸν ἡρατὰ Τίνα δαμαζέων ἁξίων ἐσταν ἀνθρωπον; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Τὸν κεχορηγημένον δόξη καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ ψυχὴν ἰσον πᾶσιν ὅντα: καθὼς 5 σύ τούτῳ ποιῶν ἀξιοθαυμαστὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδόντος εἰς ταύτα τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν.

Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ καὶ τούτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἐτερον εἶπεν Ἔν τὸι δὲ πράγματι τοὺς βασιλεῖς τὸν πλεῖώ χρόνον διά-

γειν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐν ταῖς ἁναγνώσεσι καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν πορειῶν ἀπογραφαῖς διατρίβειν, ὅσι πρὸς τὰς βασιλείας ἁναγεγραμμέναι 10 τυχάνουσι, πρὸς ἔπανορθοις καὶ διαμονὴν ἀνθρώπων. ὁ σὺ πράσσων <ἀνέφικτον> ἀλλος δόξαν κέκτησα ὅποι σοὶ τὰ βουλή-

ματα συντελοῦντος. Ἔνεργῶς δὲ καὶ τούτῳ προσεητῶν ἐτερον ἡρατὰ Τίνας δὲ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς διαγωγὰς ἐν ταῖς ἁνέσεις καὶ δραμαύαις; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Θεωρεῖν ὅσα <παίζεται> μετὰ περί-15 στολῆς, καὶ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τίθεναι τὰ τοῦ βίου μετ' εὐσχημο-

σούνης καὶ καταστολῆς γινόμενα, <εἰ> βιοὶ σωφρονοὶ καὶ κατέχων ένεστι γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐπισκεύης τις. πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔλαχιστων αἱρέτων τί δείκνυται. σὺ δὲ πᾶσαν ἡσικροὶς καταστολὴν διὰ τῶν ἐνεργείων φιλοσοφεῖς διὰ καλοκαγαθίαν ὑπὸ θεοῦ τιμῶ-

μενος. Ἐναρεστήσας δὲ τοῖς προειρημένοις πρὸς τὸν ἑνατον εἶπεν Πῶς δὲι διὰ τῶν συμποσιῶν διεξάγειν; ὁ δὲ ἔφησε Παραλαμ-

βάνοντα τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς καὶ δυναμένος ὑπομιμήςκενα τὰ χρήματα τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῶν τῶν ἁρχομένων βίου—ἐμμελέστερον ἡ μο-

σικτέρων οὐκ ἂν εὕροι τι τούτων· οὕτω γὰρ θεοφιλεῖς εἰσὶ, πρὸς τὰ 25 κάλλιστα πεπαθευκότες τὰς διανοίας—καθὼς καὶ σύ τούτῳ πράσσεις, ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ θεοῦ σοι κατευθυνομένων ἀπάντων.

Διαχυθεῖς
δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐπυθάνετο τοῦ μετέπειτα Τί καλλιτόν ἐστι τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἔ ἐ ἱδίωτον βασιλέα κατασταθήναι ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, ἡ ἐκ βασιλείων βασιλέα; ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐξῆ ἦ <Τον> ἀριστον τῇ φύσει. καὶ γὰρ ἐκ βασιλείων βασιλείας γινόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους ἀνήμεροι τε καὶ σκληροὶ καθιστάνται· πολλοὶ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τινὲς τῶν ἰδιωτῶν καὶ κακῶν πεπειραμένοι καὶ πενίες μετεχθηκότες ἀρχαίτες ὄχλων χαλεπώτεροι τῶν ἀνοσίων τυράννων εξέβησαν. ἄλλα ὡς προεῖπον, ἦδος χρηστόν καὶ παιδείας κεκουσμηκὸς δυνατὸν ἀρχεῖν ἐστιν καθὼς ἐκ βασιλείων μέγας ὑπάρχεις, οὗ τοσοῦτον τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ πλούτῳ προσχόν, ὅσον ἐπιτεθείαι καὶ φιλανθρωπία πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὑπερήφανοι τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδωρημένου ταῦτα. ἔπι πλείονα χρόνον καὶ τοῦτον ἑπανέστας τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἡρότα Τί μέγιστον ἐστι βασιλείας; πρὸς τούτο εἶπε Τὸ διαπαντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καθεστάναι τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους, καὶ κομίζεθαι τὸ δίκαιον ταχέως ἐν ταῖς διακρίσεις. ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται διὰ τῶν ἡγούμενον, ὡς μισούνιαρος ἢ καὶ φιλάγαθος καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενον ὑψόλην ἀνθρώπον σώζειν καθὼς καὶ στὸ μέγιστον κακὸν ἠγησια τὴν ἀδικίαν, δικαίως δὲ πάντα κυβερνῶν ἀέναν τὴν περὶ σεατὸν δοξαν κατασκευασάς, τοῦ θεοῦ σοι διδόντος ἐχειν ἀγνήν καὶ ἀμυγην παντὸς κακοῦ τῆς διάνοιαν. Καταλήξαντος δὲ τοῦτον κατερράγη κρότος μετὰ φωνῆς καὶ χαρᾶς ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον. ὡς δὲ ἐπαίσιστο, ὁ βασιλεὺς λαβὼν ποτήριον ἐπεχέσται καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀπάντων καὶ τῶν εἰρήμενων λόγων. ἐπὶ τάσι δὲ εἶπε Τὸ μέγιστα μοι § Ἰος γέγονεν ἀγαθὰ παραγενθήσεντων υἱῶν· πολλὰ γὰρ ὕφελθαι, καταβεβλημένοι υἱῶν διδαχὴν ἐρεῖ πρὸς τὸ βασιλείου· ἐκάστῳ δὲ τρία τάλαντα προσέταξεν ἀργυρίου δοθῆναι καὶ τὸν ἀποκαταστῆ·
Jos σοντα παιδα.1 συνεπιφωνησάντων δε πάντων, χαρὰς ἐπληρώθη τὸ συμπόσιον, ἀδιαλείπτως τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς εὐφρασύνην τραπέντος.

'Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα πλείονα· καὶ τούτοις, ὁ Φιλόκρατες, συγγνώμην ἔχειν. τεθαυμακώς γὰρ τοὺς ἄνδρας ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἐποιούντο πολλοὺς χρόνους δειμένας· καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἐρωτῶντος 5 μεμεριμνηκότος ἔκαστα, τῶν δὲ ἀποκρινομένων ἄλληλως ἔχοντων τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἔρωτισεις, ἀξίου θαυμασμοῦ κατεφαίνοντό μοι καὶ τοῖς παροῦσι, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις. οἴομαι δὲ καὶ πάσι τοῖς παραληφθομένοις τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἀπιστῶν φανεῖαι. ψεύσασθαι μὲν ὁδὸν οἷς καθήκον ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων· εἰ δὲ καὶ τὶ παρα-10 βαίνην, οἷς ὄνοιν ἐν τούτοις· ἀλλ', ὡς γέγονεν, ὄντως διασαφοῦμεν ἀφοσιούμενοι πᾶν ἀμάρτημα. διὸς ἐπειράθην ἀποδεξάμενοι αὐτῶν τὴν τοῦ λόγου δύναμιν παρὰ τῶν ἀναγραφομένων ἔκαστα τῶν γυνομένων ἐν τῇ τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ταῖς συμ-ποσσίαις μεταλαβεῖν. θος γὰρ ἐστιν, καθὼς καὶ ὑμνώσκεις, ἀφ' 15 ἂν ἰμέρας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀρχηγεῖται χρηματίζειν, μέχρις οὗ κατα-κομπηθῇ, πάντα ἀναγράφεσθαι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πρασσόμενα, καλῶς γυνομένου καὶ συμφερόντως. τῇ γὰρ ἐπιούσῃ τῇ τῇ πρότερον πεπραγμένα καὶ λελαμβημένα πρὸ τοῦ χρηματισμοῦ παραγωγών-σκεται, καὶ, εἰ τὶ μὴ δέοντις γεγονός, διορθώσεως τυγχάνει τὸ 20 πεπραγμένον. πάντ' οὖν, ἀκριβῶς πάντων ἀναγεγραμμένων, ὡς ἠλέκθη, μεταλαβόντες κατακεχωρίκαμεν, εἰδότες ἕν ἔχεις φιλομά-θειαν εἰς τὰ χρήσιμα.

Metà δὲ τρεῖς ἰμέρας ὁ Δημήτριος παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, καὶ διελθὼν τὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ σταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν 25 νῆσον, καὶ διαβὰς τὴν γέφυραν, καὶ προσέλθὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια
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μέρη, συνέδριον πουησάμενος εἰς κατασκευασμένον οἶκον παρὰ τὴν
ηώνα, διαπρεπὼς ἔχοντα καὶ πολλῆς ἰσχύος ἔφεδρον, παρεκάλει
τοὺς άνδρας τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐπιτελεῖν, παρόντων ὅσα πρὸς τὴν
χρείαν ἔδει καλῶς. οἱ δὲ ἔπετέλουν ἐκαστὰ σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες
5 πρὸς έαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον
προσόντως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου. καὶ
μέχρι μὲν ὄρας ἐνάτης τὰ τῆς συνεδρείας ἐγίνετο· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα
περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος θεραπείαν ἀπελύστω τίγνεσθαι, χορηγουμένων
αὐτοῖς δαφιλῶς, ἐν προηγούμενος, πάνων. ἐκτὸς δὲ καὶ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν,
οσα βασιλεῖ παρασκευάζετο, καὶ τούτους ὁ Δωρόθεος ἔπετέλει
προστεταγμένον γὰρ ἡν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. ἀμα δὲ τῇ πρωί
παρεγέντο εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν, καὶ πουησάμενοι τοῖς
ἀσταμασμοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀπελύστω πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῶν τόπον. ὡς δὲ
ἐσόθ ἐστι τὰς τοῖς οὕνειας, ἀπονυμένοι· τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰς
15 χείρας, ὃς ἀν ἱππαντὸ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἑτέρωτον πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν
καὶ τὴν ἐκάστοτε διασάφησιν.⁴ Ἔπηρωτησα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο Ἡ Ἰος.
Τίνος χάριν ἀπονικήμενος τὰς χείρας τὸ την καινοῦ εὑχόντα; διεσα-
φον δὲ, ὅτι μαρτυρίον ἑστι τοῦ μηδὲν εἰρήνασθαι κακῶν· πάσα γὰρ
ἐνέργεια διὰ τῶν χειρῶν γίνεται· καλῶς καὶ ὅσιως μεταφέροντες ἐπὶ
tὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα. καθὼς δὲ προειρήκαμεν,
οὕτως καθ᾽ ἡκάστην εἰς τὸν τόπον, ἐχόντα τερπνότητα διὰ τὴν
ηῷνα καὶ καταύγειαν, συναγόμενοι τὸ προκεῖμενον ἐπετέλουν.
συνέτυχε δὲ ὦτους, ὅτι ἐν ἡμέραις ἐβδομήκοντα δυσὶ τελειωθῆναι
τὰ τῆς μεταγραφῆς, οἰονεὶ κατὰ πρόθεσιν τινα τὸν τουτοῦτον γεγενη-
25 μένου.
Τελείωσιν δὲ ἐλαβε, συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος Ἡ Ἰος

---

⁴ Επηρωτήσα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο Ἡ Ἰος.
τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐτελεσθῇ, παρανέγιον πᾶσι, παρόντων καὶ τῶν διερμηνευσάντων, οίτινες μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πλῆθους ἐτυχον, ὡς ἄν μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν παρατίων γεγονότες. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον ἀποδεξάμενοι παρεκάλεσαν μεταδοῦναι τοὺς ἡγουμένοις τοὺς αὐτούς, μεταγράφαντα τὸν πάντα νόμον. ἦκαθὼς δὲ ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ τεύχη, στάντες οἱ οἱ ἐρείς καὶ τῶν ἐρμηνευόντων προσβίτεροι καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος οἱ τὸν ἡγουμένην τοῦ πλῆθους εἶπον Ἐπεί καλῶς καὶ ὅσιως διηρρήνευται καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἡκριβωμένων, καλῶς ἔχον ἐστὶν, ἵνα διαμείνῃ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται η μηδεμία διασκευής. πάντων δὲ ἐπιφωνήσαντῶν τοὺς εἰρημένοις, ἐκέλευσαν διαράσσασθαι, καθὼς έδος αὐτοΐς ἐστίν, εἰ τις διασκευάζῃ προστιθέσῃ ἤ μεταφέρων το τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ πουκύμονος ἀφαίρεσθαι καλῶς τούτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διαπεντὸς δέννα καὶ μένοντα φιλάσσηται.

Προσφωνήθηκαν δὲ καὶ τούτων τῷ βασιλεῖ μεγάλως ἐχάρη· τὴν γὰρ πρόθεσιν, ἣν εἴχεν, ἀσφαλῶς ἔδοξε τετελειώθαι. παρανεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πάντῳ, καὶ λίαν ἔξεδωκε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν. καὶ πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον εἶπε Ποὺς τηλικούτων συντελεσμένων οὐδεὶς ἐπεβάλετο τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἢ ποιητικῶν ἢ ἐπιμνησθῆναι; ἐκείνος δὲ ἔφη Διὰ τὸ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν νομοθεσίαν καὶ διὰ θεοῦ γεγονέαν· καὶ τῶν ἐπιβαλλομένων τεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πληγέντες τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἀπέστησαν. καὶ ὡς ἐφησεν ἀκηκοέναι Θεοτόμου, διότι μέλλων τινὰ τῶν προηρμηνευμένων ἐπισφα-
ΦΙΛΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ.

ιστοὺς ἐκατόν, καὶ φιάλας καὶ τρυβλία καὶ κρατήρας χρυσοῦς δύο πρὸς ἀνάθεσιν. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ παρακαλών, ἵνα, εάν τινες τῶν ἀνδρῶν προαιρέσθηται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνακομισθῆναι, μὴ κωλύσῃ· περὶ πολλοὺ ποιούμενος τοῖς πεπαθημένοις συνεῖναι, καὶ εἰς τοιούτους ἵνα τὸν πλοῦτον κατατίθεσθαι δαμιλῶς, καὶ οὐκ εἰς μάταια. 1

Σὺ δὲ, καθὼς ἐπηγγελόμην, ἀπέχεις τὴν διήγησιν, ὁ Φιλόκρατε. τέρπειν γὰρ οἶομαι σε ταῦτα, ἢ τὰ τῶν μυθολόγων βιβλία. νένευκας γὰρ πρὸς περιεργαίαν τῶν δυναμένων ὦφελείν διάνοιαν, καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὸν πλείων χρόνον διατελεῖς. πειράζομαι δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἀξιολόγων ἀναγράφειν, ἵνα διαπορευόμενος αὐτὰ κόμιζῃ τοῦ βουλής τοῦ ματὸς τὸ κάλλιστον ἔταβον.
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Distribution of LXX. MSS., 123 f.
Doctrine, Christian, its terminology partly derived from LXX., 473 f.
Dogmatic interest detected in LXX., 327
Dorotheus, 81
‘Double books,’ 220
Doublets, 325
Index II.

Driver, S. R., 68, 234 ff., 246, 321, 429, 441, 481, 489
Dublin fragments of Isaiah, 144

Δαφλ, 480
διασπορά, 2
diorëthôn, diorðoústhai, 77
déka, 359
diωδεκαπρόφητον, 76, 123, 206

E, 134 ff.; e', 53
Ebedjesu, 208 ff.
Ecclesiastes, the book, 316
Ecclesiasticus, the book, 269 ff.
Editions of Greek O. T., 171 ff.; of particular books, 190 ff.
Egypt, early settlements of Jews in, 3 ff.; evangelisation of, 104 ff.
Egyptian versions, the, 104 ff.; recension of LXX., 78 ff.; words in LXX., 21
Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, R., 440
Emmanuel Psalter, 164
Ephraem codex rescriptus, 128 ff., 490
Epiphanius, 31 ff., 66 ff., 204 ff., 431
Esdras, the Greek, 48 ff., 265 ff., 310; fourth book of, 110, 285
Esther, the Greek, 20, 25, 75, 229, 257 ff.
Ethiopic version, the, 109 ff.
Euergetes II., 24, 270, 280
Eupolemus, 24 ff., 399 ff.
Eusebius, 64, 56, 77, 125
Exodus, book of, 215, 234 ff., 243
Ezekiel, the poet, 569 ff.
Ezra-Nehemiah, 25, 220, 265 ff.

ἐβδόμη ἐρμηνεία, ἡ, 55, 82, 85
Εβραῖος, 56
εὐκοσίδον, τά, 281
ἐκκαιδεκαπρόφητον, 76, 123
ἐκκλησία, 317, 456
ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἐκδοσις, 80
ἐκλογαί, 361
ἐλληνικὴ διάλεκτος, ἡ, 294
ἐναλλάττων, 55
ἐνδιάθηκα, τά, 281
ἐπηγγέεις ἑραμνοθείσαι, 361
ἐξω, τά, 281

ἐπικατασκευάζων, 65
ἐπιτομαὶ ἐρμηνείων, 361
ἐφαγέλων, 456
Εὐσεβίου, 76, 77

F, 135 f., 348 f.
Fayûm, the, 7, 291
Festival in commemoration of the completion of the LXX., 13
Field, F., 41, 46, 82 ff., 458
Formula consensus eccl. Helv., 436 f.
Formulae of citation, 382, 408, 412
Fourth Gospel, quotations in the, 388, 398
Fragments, uncial, still unworked, 146 ff.

G, 72 ff., 78, 137 ff.; Θ, 234, 485 ff.; Γ, 146
Genesis, the book, 215, 234, 243
Genizah, the Cairo, 34
Georgian version, the, 120
Ginsburg, C. D., 431
Gothic version, the, 117 ff.
Grabe, J. E., 125 ff., 183 ff.
Graeco-Latin MSS., 141 ff.
Graecus Venetus, 56 ff.
Graetz, E., 17
Grammar of LXX., proposed, 290
Greek versions of the O. T.: before LXX., 1 f.; the LXX., 9 ff.; of cent. ii. A.D., 30 ff., 457 ff.; mediaeval, 56 ff.
Greek of LXX., 9, 289 ff.
Greek, modern, affinity of LXX.
Greek to, 309
Gregory of Nazianzus, 205
Grotta Ferrata palimpsest of the Prophets, 146
Grouping of books, 216 ff.; internal order of groups, 226 ff.
Gwynn, J., 48, 50

Ἅλκι, 3

H, 138 ff.
Hadrian, 31 ff.
Haggadah, 327 ff.
Hagiographa, date of the Greek, 24 f.; distribution in the Greek
Index II.

Bible, 218, 228 f.; inferior position assigned to, 318

Halacha, 327

Haphtaroth, 343

Harris, J. R., 146 f., 274, 282, 345 ff., 411

Hatch, E., 256, 328, 406 ff., 428 f., 452, 455 ff., 460

Headings to chapters, 353 ff.

Hebraica veritas, 68, 86, 435


Hebrews, Ep. to the, quotations in, 391, 402

hedera, 464

`Hellenist,' `Hellenistic,' 294 f.; LXX. the Hellenistic Bible, 29, 370 ff.

Heptapla, the, 66 f., 113

Heptateuchus, 227

Hermas, 47, 411

Hesychius, 78 ff.; Hesychian text, 80, 107 ff., 144 f., 150 ff., 482, 486


Hilary of Poitiers, 219, 471

Hippolytus, 277, 424 ff.

Hody, H., 15

Holmes, R., 185 ff.

Hort, F. J. A., 81, 91 f., 189, 257 f., 300, 486 ff., 491

Howorth, H., 267

Hypolemniscus, 71 f.

Hyvernat, H., 106, 111

İ local, 324

İ, 141

Jacob of Edessa, 116

Jamnia, 320, 439 f.

Jashar, book of, 246

Ignatius, 413 f.

Jebb, R. C., 294, 309


Jerome, 9, 14, 23, 34, 40, 74, 76 f., 89, 98 ff., 273, 277, 435, 464

Jews in Egypt, 3 ff.; Jewish order of O. T. Canon, 200; Jews wrongly charged with corrupting text of LXX., 424, 479

Infinitive of purpose, 306

Innocent I., 211

Inspiration claimed for LXX., 14, 462 f.

Interpretation of O.T., 326 f.; use of LXX. for the, 445 ff.; patristic int. based on LXX., 463 ff.

Interpolations in text of LXX., 423 f.

Job, book of, 43 f., 69, 100 f., 108, 228, 255 ff., 318, 337, 480

Josephus, 12 f., 26, 217, 220, 279 f., 298 f., 376 ff.

Joshua ben Chananya, R., 32, 440

John of Damascus, 207 f.

Irenaeus, 9, 30, 42, 49, 414 ff.; I. (Minutius Pacatus), 289

Isidorus, 212

Jubilees, book of, 110, 285


Judith, book of, 103, 222 ff., 229, 272 f.

Junilius, 207

Justin, 30, 417 ff., 464, 479

Justinian, 33

Iδιγραφος (ψαλμος), 125, 252 f.

Ιστορικόν, τό, 205

K, 139, 349, 354 f.

Kaisariyeh, 75


Kenyon, F. G., 130, 225, 487

Kimchi, D., 57

Kingdoms, books of, 214 ff.; 1 K., 245 f.; 3 K., 237 ff., 246 ff.; 4 K. 249

Kirkpatrick, A. F., 318 ff., 441

Klostermann, E., 58, 132, 353
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L, 139
Lagarde, P. de, 109, 118 ff., 121, 188, 206, 255, 442, 483 ff., 494
Lamentations, book of, 226 ff., 259, 360
Langton, Stephen (Arhbp), 343
Laodicene canons, 209, 282
Latin versions, 88 ff., 493
Lections, lectionaries, 168 ff., 343, 356 ff.
Lee, F., 183
Leipzig fragments of Octateuch, 139
lemniscus, 71 f.
Leontius, 207 f., 218
Leontopolis, 8
Lexicography, 290, 302 ff., 310; lexicon of LXX., proposed, 290
Lightfoot, J. B. (Bp), 105
Libraries of Alexandria, 10 f., 16 f., 22 f., 293
Library of Pamphilus, 75
Liturgical notes in titles of the Psalms, 250 f.
Liturgies, the ancient, use of the LXX. in, 471 ff.
London papyrus fragments of Psalter, 142 f.
Lucian, 81 ff., 395 f., 483 ff.; Lucianic texts, 93, 116 ff., 121, 148 ff., 379, 395, 403, 482, 486
Ludovicus de Vives, 15
Λουκιανός, 80, 365
M, 78, 140, 352 ff.; Μ, 234
Maccabees, books of, 276 ff., 312 f., 372
Macedonian words, 291 f.
Mahaffy, J. P., 5 ff., 21 ff., 279 f., 292
Malchias, 370
Malchion, 81
Manetho, 17
Marchalianus, cod., 77, 80, 108, 144 f.
Masius, Andreas, 113
Massora, Massoretic text, 234 ff., 322, 434 ff.
Materials at the disposal of the critical editor, 491 f.
McLean, N., 119, 135, 189, 191, 489
Melito, 203, 221
Mercati, G., 62
Mesrop, 118, 120
Metaphors in LXX., 329
Methodius and Cyril, 120 f.
Methurgeman, 3, 20
metobelus, 71 f.
Minutius Pacatus, 289
Moabite stone, the, 320 f.
Mommsen, Th., 5, 8, 212 f., 347
Montfaucon, B. de, 136
Morinus, J., 436; P., 181 f.
Moses bar-Cephas, 111; M. of Khoren, 118, 120
Muratorian Fragment, 268
Museum, the Alexandrian, 165 f., 293
MSS. of LXX., uncial, 124 ff.; cursive, 148 ff.; notation of, 122 ff.; grouping of books in, 123; distribution of, 123 f.; displacements in, 131, 271
Μακκαβαϊκά, τά, 222
Μωσαϊκά, τά, 206
N, 131
Nathan, R. Isaac, 343
New Testament, the: use of LXX., 26, 381 ff.; tables of quotations from LXX., 382 ff.; number of quotations, 386, 391 f.; discussion of passages quoted, 392 ff.; LXX. indispensable to the study of the N.T., 450 ff.; vocabulary of N.T., how far indebted to LXX., 452 ff.
Nicephorus, stichometry of, 208 f., 346 ff.; catena of, 186, 362 f.
Nicomedia, 85
Nicopolis, 55
Notation of MSS., 122 f.
Notes at end of Job, 250 f.
Number of books in O.T. canon, 219 ff.
Numerals confused, 321

NAVH, 480

O, 144
OBELUS, 70 ff.
Octapla, the, 66 f.
‘Odes,’ the nine, 254
Old Latin version, the, 88 ff., 493
Olophernes, 272
Order of books in Jewish lists, 200; in uncial Bibles, 20 f.; in patristic lists, 203 ff.; internal order of groups, 226 ff.; order of contents of books, 231 ff.

OKTAEνΩς, 76, 66
OKTAEνΧΟς, ᾗ, 123
ἐράδεις (in Isaiah and Daniel), 360
Ἡρεγῆς, Ἐ, 72, 77, 365

P, 124, 164
Pachymius, 79
Pagnini, S., 343
Palaeography, Hebr., 320 f.; Greek, 364
Palestinian Syriac version, 114 f.
Paladius, 50
Pamphilus, 76 ff.
Papyrus MSS., 142, 146, 225, 229; ‘transition to vellum,’ effect of, 229 f.
Parashahs, 342 f.
Paris uncial Psalter, 143
Parsons, J., 185
Passages in LXX. discussed, 330 ff.
Patristic quotations, 406 ff.; texts, editions of, 406, 492; commentaries, 430 ff.
Paul of Tella, 112 f.
Pauline Epistles, quotations in, 389 ff., 400 ff.
Pearson, J. (Bp), 457, 477
Pentapla, 67
Pentateuch, Greek, the original LXX., 23; Samaritan, 436 ff.
Peshitta, the, 112, 116
PESUKIM, 342
Peter, Gospel of, 50
Petersburg, St, palimpsest of Numbers, 138
Pharisaic influence in LXX., 17, 281, 283
Philadelphus, 10, 16 f.
Phileas of Thmuis, 79
Philio, 12 f., 298; 372 ff., 478 f.; the poet, 369
Philometor, 17
Philopator, 279
Philoexenus of Mabug, 115
Phrynicus, 296 f.
Points, the Hebrew, 321 f.
Polycarp of Smyrna, 414; the chorepiscopus, 115
Polyhistor, 369
Printed editions of LXX., 171 ff.
Prologue to Sirach, the, 24, 300, 319
Proper names, 304, 313, 449 f.
PSALTERIUM ROMANUM, GALICANUM, HEbraicum, 98 ff.
Pseudepigrapha, 265, 281 f.
Pseudo-Aristeas, see ‘Aristeas’
Pseudo-Athanasius, 82, 85, 207, 282; Pseudo-Chrysostom, 205
Pseudo-Clement, 411; Pseudo-Gelasius, 211 f.
Ptolemies, list of the early, 5 f.
‘Ptolemy and Cleopatra,’ 25, 258

ΠΑΛΑΙΟΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ, τὸ, 77
παραγραφαί, 361
παραμετακ, τὸ, 208
Παραλειπόμενα, 214
παρθένος (in Isa. vii. 14), 30
περικοπή, 358
πεντάενχος, ᾗ, 123, 204 ff.
ΠΙΠΙ (ἌΣΕΙ), 39 f.
προσευχὴ Ἀσάριον, 253, 260; προσευχὴ Μαννασσή, 253 f.
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προφήτας, ἡ (ἩΠ), 32
φροσπαί, 258
προφητικῶν, τό, 205; προφητικά, τά, 208
Πτολεμαίκα, τά, 299
Q, 66, 75, 77, 144 f., 348
Quinta, the, 53 ff., 66 f.
Quotations from LXX. by Jewish Hellenists, 369 ff.; in N.T., 381 ff.; in early Christian literature, 406 ff.

R, 141 f., 495
Rahlfs, A., 135
Recensions of the LXX., 76 ff., 481 f.
Redpath, H. A., 135, 141, 147, 290, 495
Reuchlin, J., 436
Robinson, F., 105
Ryle, H. E., 25 f., 215, 275, 283, 342, 374, 404
Roman edition of LXX., 174 ff., 486
Ruffinus, 210, 223

S (=N), 75, 77, 129 ff., 352, 490; c', cy', 364; s', 53
Sabatier, P., 92
Samaritans in Egypt, 6, 437 ff., 441 f.; Samaritan Pentateuch, 436 ff.
Sanday, W., 218 ff., 360
scriptio defectiva, 321
Scrivener, F. H. A., 189
Semitic words in LXX., 19, 306 ff.; Semitic idioms, 323 ff.
'Septima,' the, 53 ff.
'Septuagint,' the name, 9 f.; early history of the version, 9 ff.; Origen labours upon it, 59 ff.; recensions, 76 ff.; versions based upon the LXX., 87 ff.; MSS. of LXX., 122 ff.; printed editions, 171 ff.; books contained in the Greek O.T., 197 ff.; language and style, 289 ff.; merits and defects, 315 f.; use by pagan writers, 22; by Hellenists, 29 f., 369 ff.; in the N.T., 381 ff.; in the Fathers, 406 ff.; its importance, 433 ff.; textual problems, 480 ff.
Sequence, Hebrew and Greek, tables of, 231 ff.; discussion of, 234 ff.
'Sexta,' the, 53 ff.
Shashanq (Shishak), 3 f.
Sibyllines, the, 372, 380
Siloam inscription, the, 321
Sinaïtic MS., the, 129 ff., 490
Sinker, R., 315
Sirach, 269 ff., 372; prologue to, 29, 74, 300, 319; the Hebrew, 270 ff.; disturbed order of the Greek, 271 f.; literature, 286
'Sixty books,' the, 209 ff., 220, 281
Slavonic version, 120 f.
Smith, H. P., 340, 441; W. R., 30 f., 246, 440
Soter, 6, 19, 293
Stephen, K., 343
Stichometry, 344 ff.
Stoicism of 4 Macc., 280
Streane, A. W., 259
Susanna, 260 f.
Symmachus, 49 ff., 476, 483
Synagogue use of LXX., 29 f.
Synoptic Gospels, quotations in, 386 ff., 391 ff.
Syntax of O. T. Greek, 305
Syriac versions, 111 ff.

σαρβηθ σαβανέ Ἔλ, 277
σεγῆ, 411
σειρά, 361
Σειράξ, 269
σελίς, 64
Σουσάννα, Σοσάννα, 260
στάσεις (in the Psalter), 359
στίχος, 344 ff.
συμβουλευτικών, τό, 205
σῶν = ΝΠ acc., 39, 308
σύνοψις ἐν ἑπτάδιῳ, 206
Σύρος, 6, 56, 116
σιγάνος, 261

τιμή, 449
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T, 142, 495; Θ', Θε', 364
Talmud, Aquila quoted in the, 33
Targum, the Babylonian, 3
Taylor, C., 33, 41, 57, 271, 286
Tertullian, 9, 284, 351
Tetragrammaton, the, 39 f., 320, 327
Tetrapla, the, 65 ff., 73, 113 ff.
Text-division, systems of, 342 ff.
Thackeray, H. St J., 131, 267
Thecla the martyr, 125
Theodorus (Egyptian Bishop), 79;
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 112, 115, 316, 432
Theodotion, 42 ff., 260 ff., 339 ff., 395 ff., 403, 417, 421 ff., 458 ff., 483
Theodotus, 369 f.
Thomas and Aquila, dialogue of, 31 f., 206
Tobit, book of, 273 f.
Transliteration, 46, 324 f.
trifaria varietas, 85 f.
Turin uncial Prophets, 145

ἐρήμων τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, 261

V, 132, 495; U, 142 f.