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GENERAL PREFACE

The contents of this Volume are by no means homogeneous. Under the comprehensive head of "Remnants" it includes portions of the Old Testament and of the New: the former being excerpts merely; the latter, complete Epistles: the former belonging indisputably to the seventh century; the latter, to be assigned rather to the sixth: of the former it merely exhibits the text preserved in a single manuscript; of the latter, it offers a critical edition based on an ample Apparatus of authorities.

Thus the two Parts into which it is divided have hardly anything in common, save what the Title expresses,—that both belong to the later Syriac Versions of the Bible, and that of the Versions to which they severally belong neither has reached us in a complete form.

In Part I, I present a thoroughly revised text of the Four shorter Catholic Epistles, which are not found in the Peshitta, but of which this anonymous Version is, and has for nearly three centuries been, included in the printed editions of the Syriac New Testament. And in the Introduction I have set forth the grounds on which I claim for it that it belongs to the Philoxenian New Testament of A.D. 508.

Part II consists of Extracts from the Version of the Old Testament, after the Hexaplar Greek text of the Septuagint, which is known to have been made between A.D. 613 and 619. They are all (except the first two) taken from the Books of Chronicles and of Nehemiah. None of these extracts,—in fact, no portion of the Syro-Hexaplar text of these Books—has hitherto been published.

To have placed these Old Testament Extracts before the New Testament Epistles would have been a more obvious arrangement.
But I have preferred to follow the order of priority in date as between the Versions, and to treat the work of the Sixth Century as Part I, and that of the Seventh, as Part II.

The History of the Woman taken in Adultery (St. Joh. vii. 53–viii. 12) I have subjoined to the other New Testament writings,—in two distinct recensions. Of these, though the one usually printed (assigned to one Paul as translator) is probably of the seventh century, the other has come to us from a sixth-century source, through a sixth-century translator. It therefore properly belongs to Part I, and I have not thought it worth while to separate from it the later but better known recension.
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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 1 (under 7): for xiv, read xv.
2 (under 11): dele Gospels.
3, line 4: for Lawler, read Lawlor.
4, line 12: for A, read II.
10 (notes), line 6: for 3 writes, read 3 5 write.
12 (notes), line 18: after hkl, add *.
14 (notes), line 1: dele arb.
19 (text), line 3: write מְנֵס (with ribbui).
19 (notes), line 16: for 13 (after 11), write 13*.
20 (notes), line 17: after 13 18 19, insert (11, 13, final ם).
25 (notes), line 7: correct as in Suppl. N. on 2 Joh. 10, p. 121.
26 (text), line 1: add final ו to סְדַךְ.
30 (notes), line 6: dele arb, and correct as in Suppl. N. on 3 Joh. 12, p. 127.
31 (notes), line 9: after 1 2, insert 6.
32 (notes), line 6: after edd, insert (exc. L).
34 (notes), line 14: after 8, insert (corr.).
35 (notes), line 3: for (similarly hkl), read (hkl om.).
37 (notes), line 3: for צָוַאָסְדָּאָ, write צָוַאָסְדָּאָ.
38, line 5: for (9), write (9, omitting the rest).
46, line 26: dele and translated.
57 (notes), line 7: for (some), read (m).
57 (notes), line 18: after authority, insert except hkl as regards (a).

Pages 58 to 61: see p. 104, note * for omissions in these pages.
Page 58 (notes), line 12: after lat, insert vg.
59 (notes), line 15: after lat, insert vg.
61 (notes), line 12: dele arb.
62 (notes), line 5: after lat, insert (correction as in Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 4, p. 104).
Page 62 (notes), line 9: for καὶ (2), write καὶ (3).

62 (notes), lines 13, 14: place (8) before S in 13, and dele in 14.

63 (notes), line 5: for Α write Α*.

63 (notes), line 8: for Ν Α*, write Ν* Α.

64 (notes), line 23: before sing., insert gen.

65 (notes), line 6: dele So before Ν* B, and ins. om after eth.

66 (notes), line 8: after mss., ins. hkl.

73 (heading): for IOANNOY, write ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.

74 (notes), lines 13, 14: dele hkl in 13, and ins. bef. lat in 14.

75 (notes), line 22: ins. οὐκ before ἔσονυμη (for ἔσονυμη) and before ἕδελον.

78 (notes), lines 4 and 6: (correct as in Suppl. N. on Jud. 5, p. 130, note †).

81 (text), line 2: for ἀβρὰ, write ἄαυτὰ (see p. 140, on Jud. 16).

81 (notes), line 25: dele gr.

82 (notes), line 3: for D write Π.

83 (notes), lines 26 and 27: (correct as in Suppl. N. on Jud. 25, p. 137).

90 (notes), line 3: dele in hkl.

96, line 10: dele 5, and for nine, write ten.

98, line 37: before ὅλο- insert καὶ.

101, line 15: for ii. 9, write i. 19.

109, line 12: for ἰελωρ, write ἰελωρα.

110, line 12: for γελωτα write γελωτα.

115, line 15: for 1 write 2 bis.

121, line 16: for 1 alone, write 1 and 20.

121, line 34: for 12 read 18.

130, line 18: in ᾿ΟΟΑΣΩ insert ο before 1.

132, line 34: in ΠΒΑΩ write Π for Π.

133, line 3: for from noun to participle, read from absol. to emphat.

143, line 30: after ἧς, insert 1 ομοευθ (as 1).
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INTRODUCTION


1. The Syriac Version of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles,—the Second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of St. John, and that of St. Jude—of which a revised text is here offered, has for more than two centuries and a half been included in all printed editions of the Syriac New Testament. But from the earlier editions it is lacking. When the Editio Princeps was published in 1555,* Widmanstad, the editor, was obliged to call attention to the fact of the absence from his volume, not only of a few passages here and there,† but of five whole Books,—the Revelation and these Four Epistles. For this omission he apologizes in such terms as to imply that he believed it to be due to the imperfection of the manuscript whence he derived his text,—a copy which the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch‡ had sent to Europe from Mardin in Mesopotamia by the hands of a priest named Moses, with the object of having it printed.§ Widmanstad must therefore have been unaware that the Canon of the current Syriac New Testament—the Peshitta—was, in respect of these Books, deficient according to the standard of the Greek and Latin Churches.

* The history of this Edition is to be gathered from the Dedicatio prefixed to it by the editor, and from his subjoined Epistola. In these he gives some account of his life and studies. He was born in 1506 or 1507, and died not long after the issue of his work.

† Of these the most considerable is the Historia Adulterae (St. Joh. vii. 53—viii. 12), for which see pp. 39 et sqq., and pp. 85 et sqq., infr.

‡ Probably Ignatius XVII, or his successor. The dates of these Patriarchs in the sixteenth century are not clearly ascertained. They all have for many centuries assumed the name Ignatius.

§ "Reliquae Sanctorum Petri Ioannis et Iudae epistolae, unà cum Apocalypsi, etsi extent apud Syros, tamen in exemplaribus quae sequunti sumus defuerunt." Widmanstad, fo. BB, 1r°. The MS brought by Moses was written at Mosul, but its date is not recorded. The seat of the Jacobite Patriarch was, and still is, Deir Zaferan, a monastery near Mardin.
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2. This deficiency, as regards the Four Epistles, had been noted as early as the sixth century by the Greek traveller Cosmas (known as Indicopleustes),* and has since been abundantly verified by the concurring evidence of the earlier Peshitta manuscripts, all of which, like the Mardin copy, give only three Catholic Epistles (James, 1 Peter, 1 John). Whatever may be the age of the Peshitta New Testament,—whether its literary structure, and its Canon, were of gradual growth or due to a definitive act at a more or less determinable date,—it is agreed by all that never, from the time when it first attained acceptance as the Syriac Authorized Version, did it include the Books which (after the Mardin manuscript) the Editio Princeps omits. Moses, however, assured Widmanstad that all the missing portions of the sacred text were extant in Syriac, and undertook to bring back copies of them from the East, whither he was about to return.† This undertaking was not fulfilled; he appears to have proved untrustworthy, to have left Europe under a cloud of suspicion, and never to have resumed communications with the West.

3. Nor was it through any Jacobite agency, nor from Mesopotamia, that the Syriac text of these Four Epistles first reached Europe, and found its way into our printed Syriac New Testaments: it came from the Lebanon, and is due to the Maronite Church.

This Church indeed had already, before the time of Widmanstad and his edition, become the medium through which the Syriac Scriptures were first introduced to European scholars. It had submitted itself to the Roman See as early as the time of the Fourth Lateran Council (1211); and at the Fifth (1513) its Patriarch was represented by three of his priests. From one of these, the learned Teseo Ambrogio of Pavia acquired a knowledge of Syriac, being thus the first European to study that tongue; and he was also the first to possess a Syriac manuscript—a copy of the Gospels and the Psalter, obtained no doubt from his teacher. This Teseo, though he never succeeded in printing more than a few fragments of the Gospel text in Syriac, yet was an important agent in bringing about its ultimate publication; for in his latter years (in 1529) he instructed Widmanstad, the future

* Topographia Christ., lib. vii. 292.
† "Moses nostri Meredinaeus, . . . ex Mesopotamia favente Deo reversus . . . . reliquas SSS. Petri Ioannis et Iudae Epistolam cum Apocalypsi quae ad perfectionem Novi Testamenti nobis defuerunt . . . . adportabit." Widm., fo. KK. 3.
editor of the first Syriac New Testament—then a youthful student of Biblical literature—in the elements of that language, and entrusted to him his Syriac Gospels, charging him to commit it in due time to the Church of Christ.*

It was not, however, till after the lapse of more than five and twenty years (Teseo having died in the interval), that Widmanstad was enabled to fulfil the charge thus laid upon him. But his Syriac New Testament of 1555 more than fulfilled it. That edition, though Teseo's Maronite manuscript of the Gospels was used for reference by its editor, presents (as above stated) a completer text—not the Gospels merely, but the entire Peshitta New Testament as exhibited in the Mardin manuscript. And to the Patriarch who sent that manuscript to Europe in order to have it printed for the use of his people, and to Widmanstad who carried out its publication, belong the honour of having enriched Biblical literature by the *Editio Princeps* of the New Testament as read in all the Churches, Jacobite, Maronite, and Nestorian alike, whose Vulgate Bible was the Peshitta.

**SECTION II.**—*The extra-Peshitta Epistles.*

1. Thus, though it was from the Jacobite Church of Mesopotamia that the New Testament in the Peshitta Version first came complete into the hands of Western scholars in the middle of the sixteenth century, the way had been prepared for its publication by a series of causes, ultimately due to the action some forty years earlier (in the time of the Fifth Lateran Council) of the Maronite Church of the Lebanon. And it is noteworthy that from the same Maronite Church—apparently at or soon after the close of the same century—came the first copy that is known to have reached Europe of the supplement to the Peshitta text with which this Introduction deals—the Four Epistles which the Peshitta omits.

2. Nicolas Serarius, a learned Jesuit of Mainz, in his *Prolegomena*

* "Obtestatus ut quo me beneficio tum complecteretur, id olim apud Ecclesiam Iesu Christi collocarem." Widmanstad, *ut supr.*—Some account of this Teseo Ambrogio is to be found in Tiraboschi, *Letteratura Italiana*, vol. viii, pt. iii; and in his own *Introductio in Chaldaicam Linguam*, &c.,—a rare book, published in 1539, which contains the short passages from the Gospel text above mentioned. He was born in 1469, and died in 1540.
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Biblica (1612), informs us that a copy of these Epistles in Syriac had been brought to Rome by some Maronites, and thence to Mainz;* where it was translated into Latin by Balthasar Etzel, Professor of Hebrew in the Jesuit College of that city. This translation Serarius prints at the end of his Commentary on the New Testament (1612).† What became of this copy is unknown; but his Latin, which is very literal, is still reckoned among the authorities for the Syriac text of these Epistles, and agrees in the main, though not without variations, with other copies which have since become accessible,—especially late copies of Maronite origin.

3. The publication of the actual Syriac text followed after no long interval. A copy of the Acts and all seven Catholic Epistles in Syriac, presented to the Bodleian Library in 1611, by Paul Findar, British Consul at Aleppo, attracted the notice of Edward Pococke, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from his early youth an eager student of the Semitic tongues. From it he derived the text of his edition, the Editio Princeps of our Four Epistles, which he published at Leiden in 1630.‡ To this work he was stimulated by the example and in it he was aided by the services of Louis De Dieu, of Leiden, who in 1627 had published there a Syriac text of the Apocalypse. The two volumes, De Dieu's and Pococke's, issued from the same press, are exactly uniform in shape and arrangement; taken together they supply the Books of the New Testament Canon which are not in the Peshitta, so as to enable the student to read the whole of it in Syriac.

4. It only remained to put the parts together in due order, and exhibit the Syriac New Testament as a whole. This was done by Gabriel Sionita, a Maronite, who edited the Syriac text of the great Paris Polyglot published by Le Jay in 1645, in which our Four Epistles and the Revelation appear each in its place as in the Bibles of Western Christendom: and so likewise in the better known and more con-

* Serarius, writing at Mainz, says of the parts of the N.T. that were lacking in Widmanstad's edition, "nunc a Maronitis Romam et inde huc perlata habentur, scil., 2 Petr., 2 et 3 Joann., Jud., et Apocalypsis." (Prolegg. Bibl., p. 80.)
‡ See below, Sect. xiv, "Versions"; also p. 4.
† For the Bodleian MS (our Cod. 8), and the Editio Princeps, see below (Sect. xii, "Manuscripts"; xiii, "Editions," and pp. 1, 4). For Edward Pococke (1604—1691), see his Life by Dr. T. Wells, prefixed to his collected Works (1740). He was Lecturer in Arabic (1640), and afterwards Professor of Hebrew (1649), in the University of Oxford.
veniently arranged London Polyglot, commonly called Walton's, which followed twelve years later.*

It is not to be assumed that (as some have supposed) Sionita merely inserted into his text, in their places, the Epistles and Apocalypse as edited by Pococke and De Dieu. A careful comparison of his texts with theirs leads to a contrary conclusion. Of the Apocalypse this is not the place to treat: † as regards the Epistles, the Apparatus attached to the text of the present edition shows clearly that Sionita has given them from an independent manuscript, better (on the whole) than Pococke's. It appears, moreover, that Thorndike, who edited the Syriac for Walton, was content to reproduce Sionita's text of them, with very few (apparently casual) deviations. The only addition made to the Syriac New Testament in Walton's volume, is that of the Historia Adulterae, ‡ which the Peshitta omits, and no edition before Walton's supplies.

The whole of the supplementary matter then introduced into these great Polyglot Bibles has ever since held its ground, and is included in every edition of the Syriac New Testament since issued. Yet its two main components — the Four Epistles and the Apocalypse — differ widely in point of congruity with the main text to which they have thus been attached. No one could possibly mistake the Apocalypse of De Dieu's text for a part of the Peshitta—its differences of diction and method lie on the surface, and in point of fact it has never been found in any manuscript associated with any Book of the Peshitta. But it may well be doubted whether these Four Epistles, if they had been first published as they appear in the Polyglots, arranged as in the Greek New Testament in their places as four of the series of Seven Catholic Epistles, would have been challenged by critics as the work of a later age. If the manuscript whence Widmanstäd printed his Editio Princeps had been one of those which (as our Codd. 11 and 12) exhibit them so placed, it is not improbable that they would have passed for a long time, perhaps to the present day, as an integral part of the Peshitta New Testament. The translator's idiom is pure; he has shown himself a skilful continuator by successfully maintaining the

* See below, Sect. xiii, "Editions;" also p. 4.
† See for it Appendix III, infr., p. 154.
‡ See note † to p. xvii, supr.; also Postscript, p. lxxi, infr.
manner and linguistic usage of the Peshitta, of which he must have been a diligent student.

**SECTION III.**—Date and Authorship of our Version of the extra-Peshitta Epistles.

We are thus led to enter on the inquiry, In what age, and by whom, was this translation made?

1. The major limit of its age may be unhesitatingly fixed. It is a production of the Monophysite Church. Of the manuscripts which exhibit it not one is Nestorian. It cannot, therefore, claim to be coeval with the Peshitta, the “Authorized Version” of all Syriac-speaking Christendom,—of Nestorian and Jacobite alike, presumably prior to the earlier of the schisms in which those names arose. It belongs, therefore, to a period later than that of the Council of Ephesus (431), later probably than that of Chalcedon (451).

The evidence of Cosmas (above referred to) may be supposed to bring the limit yet lower down, into the sixth century, to which his work belongs. Yet his statement is not to be pressed so far. It testifies to the general and public Syriac use in receiving but three Catholic Epistles; it merely tells us what we know on other testimony, that none but those three were contained in the Syriac Vulgate, and it does not exclude the possible existence in his time (though unknown to him, and perhaps not widely known nor ever generally accepted) of a Syriac translation of the other four.

2. Later, thus, than the Peshitta, where does it stand in order of time relative to the other extant Syriac New Testament, the Harklensian?

Here we are on firm ground, for concerning the Harklensian our information is at first hand, full and precise. The official colophon subscribed by the translator to most copies of it, including the oldest, states that it was made at Alexandria, A.Gr. 925 (A.D. 614), by one Thomas, otherwise known as “of Harkel,” Jacobite Bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis). It includes all the Books of the New Testament (with the doubtful exception of the Apocalypse), our Four Epistles with the rest, each in its place among the Seven, as in the Greek.—Two complete copies of it,* and many portions of it (especially of the Gospels) have

* See *infra*, p. 146. The copies above noted as complete are the α and β there described. The former has, however, lost by mutilation a few leaves at the end.
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been preserved. Its character (as a translation which has attained a singular degree of accuracy by sacrificing propriety of idiom as well as literary quality) is such that it lends itself readily to critical comparison. And we shall have advanced a step towards fixing the age of our Version, if we can satisfy ourselves whether it, or the text of the same Four as given in the Harklensian, is the earlier.

The question thus raised has been confidently answered by White, the editor of the Harklensian.* He lays it down as certain that our Version is later—not only than the Harklensian, but also—than the time of Bar-Salibi, who (writing in the middle of the twelfth century) in his Commentaries on the Acts and Epistles follows the Harklensian text of these Four Epistles, and states that they were not found in Syriac except in that Version.† This statement, however, is demonstrably erroneous; for we have tangible evidence that these Epistles in our Version, though Bar-Salibi had not met with them, were known and transcribed in and before his time. Our oldest copy of them, dated A.Gr. 1134 (A.D. 823), was in fact three hundred years old before he wrote. And an Arabic Version of them, undoubtedly based on it, is also believed to belong to the ninth century.‡ Thus the evidence of Bar-Salibi, and White's inference from it, fall together to the ground.§

Putting aside, accordingly, as inadmissible, the low date assigned by White, we return to the question above stated, Is our Version prior or posterior to the Harklensian? It cannot well be dated (as we have seen) so early as the fifth century, nor so late as the ninth. Does it belong to the eighth, or to the seventh, or to the sixth?

3. And here a fact presents itself, of cardinal importance towards the solution of our problem. Thomas of Harkel, who in his colophon

* Dr. Joseph White was Landian Professor of Arabic (1775), afterwards Regius Professor of Hebrew (1802), in the University of Oxford. His edition (under the title Versio Syriaca Philoxeniana) was published at Oxford (1778—1803), in successive volumes.

† This statement White cites (in his opening note on 2 Peter, p. 43) from Pococke's Praefatio to the Editio Princeps. Pococke found it in a (still inedited) Commentary by Dionysius (better known as Bar-Salibi, Bishop of Amid (Diarbe kr), 1166—1171, the most learned of the Jacobite divines of the twelfth century) contained in the Bodleian MS Or. 560, on the Apocalypse, Acts, and Epistles. This MS has lost many leaves; a more complete one is in the British Museum (Rich 7185).

‡ See below, Sect. xii, "Manuscripts," Cod. 1, p. xlii, Sect. xiv, "Versions"; also pp. 1, 4.

§ On this mistake, see further in Sect. vii, p. xxxii infr.
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above referred to, appended to the several divisions of his work,*

is himself the primary authority for all we know of his Version of the

New Testament, expressly and with exact detail of time and place

describes it as being—not a fresh translation, but rather—a revision

of a previous translation, modified by comparison with one or more

Greek texts. Of that earlier translation likewise he gives a particular

account: it was made (he tells us) at Mabug (Hierapolis), in A.Gr. 819

(A.D. 508), "in the days" of the famous Philoxenus (or Xenaias),† his

predecessor by a century as Bishop of that city. And he distinctly

intimates that our Four Epistles were included in that primary version

as they are in his revision of it; for at the close of the second division

of his work,—the Acts followed by the Catholic Epistles (all seven),

—he repeats in somewhat more precise terms the colophon as before—

subjoining it in immediate sequence to the Epistle of Jude.

This Philoxenian Version, however, failed to supersede the Peshitta,

and as a whole it has disappeared, itself superseded by the Har-

klensian—or at most surviving only in its revised form as in the

Harklensian.

SECTION IV.—Identification of it as part of the Philoxenian N.T.

These facts have suggested the surmise that the Four Epistles of our

Version may be in fact the Epistles as they stood in the original and

unrevised Philoxenian—retained (while the rest was left to lapse) to

supply the defect of the Peshitta where it falls short of the Greek.‡

A careful examination of the two texts will enable us to deter-

mine—(1) Whether there is between them a relation of inter-

dependence? (2) If they are so related, which is the original work,

and which the derivate?

(1) In the first place, it may be accepted as certain that the two

* See, for this colophon, White, ut supr., vol. i, p. 561; ii, p. 274.

† Bishop of Mabug, 485; an active upholder of the Monophysite doctrines;

banished by Justin in 518, along with the Patriarch Severus of Antioch, and

many other Bishops who refused to accept the decrees of Chalcedon; died in

exile (probably by violence) a few years later. See Assemani, Biblioth. Orient.,

t. ii, pp. 19, 20.

‡ Dr. Davidson seems to have been the first to suggest this identification

(Biblical Criticism, p. 642). From him it was adopted by Dr. Tregelles (Dict. of

Bible, vol. iii, p. 1636); and afterwards by Dr. I. H. Hall (Syr. Antilegomena, p. 2,

and elsewhere).
versions are not independent. Here again it is necessary to set aside the judgment of White, who has laid it down as a self-evident fact that the Harklensian Version of 2 Peter [and, by implication, of all the four] "has nothing whatever in common with the Version published by Pococke."* He gives no reasons for this decision, he alleges neither differences of diction nor divergences of substance, such as undeniably present themselves: he treats the question as one to be disposed of without argument. — In opposition to his dictum, it is to be emphatically affirmed that the relation between the two is so close as to compel the conclusion that one of them is founded on the other. Farther on in this Introduction it will be shown in detail (Sectt. x, xi) that, underneath differences and divergences which lie on the surface, there is a solid and extensive substratum of agreement, amounting to affinity—both in the language and in the matter represented by it—an affinity which can be adequately expressed only by stating that one of them is a revision of the other, rewritten throughout as regards diction and style, and altered in substance here and there into accordance with a fresh Greek text. They are not two translations made each of them direct from a different Greek text, each by a scholar independently rendering the Greek before his eyes in his own words and way. Thus the problem remaining to be solved is, whether (a) our Version is the Harklensian rewritten into purer Syriac after a freer method of translation?—or (b) the Harklensian is our Version corrected by a scholarly (not to say pedantic) hand so as to attain a servile fidelity of reproduction?—in either case with some readjustment of text after a second Greek exemplar.—Or in other words, and more briefly, the question is: Of these two Versions of the Four Epistles, ours and the Harklensian, which is the primary, and which the derivate?†

* White, ut supr., p. 43. It is to be noted that in this matter Pococke, with less material to judge on, judged more sagaciously than White. In the Commentary of Bar-Salibi (see note † on p. xxiii supr.) he had found many citations from these Epistles in a version by a translator unnamed, whom he designates Syrus alter ["S.A."]. This version he discerned to be, though distinct from that which he edited, yet so obviously akin to it that he cites its renderings all through his notes. They are now identified as belonging to the Harklensian, which in Pococke's time was unknown: but it is strange that White, its editor 150 years later, should have failed to recognize the kinship which the earlier scholar had the acuteness to detect in the short and scattered fragments he had lighted on.

† A third alternative might be supposed: that the two Versions are related not as primary and derivate, but as two derivatives from a lost primary, their common
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(2) In deciding between the alternatives (a) and (b), one consideration forces itself into notice which goes far towards determining our judgment. The two alternatives do not stand before us on an equal footing of probability. Of these two Versions of the Four Epistles, one (the Harklensian) is professedly a revision of a previous one (the Philoxenian); and this fact raises a strong presumption against the theory (of alternative a), that it may also be the primary version from which ours was derived. For that theory would require us to suppose three successive versions,—the original Philoxenian, the Harklensian (admittedly derived by revision from it), and our Version (again by re-revision derived from the Harklensian). To postulate thus two revisions where only one is necessary and sufficient to account for the facts of the case,—and three versions where the evidence points to the existence of but two,—would be idle; and in point of fact no one has ever advanced alternative (a) as an hypothesis worthy of notice. I have stated it here only as logically possible, not as entitled to practical regard. Dismissing it therefore, we fall back on alternative (b), and accept the theory that our version is the primary whence the Harklensian is the derivate.—But, inasmuch as the author of the Harklensian presents it as a revision of the Philoxenian, the identification of our Version with the Philoxenian follows by necessary inference. Thus the surmise above indicated (p. xxiv) takes shape in the definite conclusion that the Version of the Four Epistles, into whose age and origin we are inquiring, is a part of that previous Version, the Philoxenian, on which the Harklensian was based,—surviving while the rest of it has disappeared.

(3) In confirmation of this conclusion, we shall find in the details given in the Sections (x, xi) above referred to, proof that our Version is exactly such as the Philoxenian basis of the Harklensian must have been;—that it is a version which, if modified in its diction after the graecizing method which Thomas affected, and altered in substance here and there after a Greek text (or texts) such as he tells us he employed, would yield as result a version answering exactly to the description of the Harklensian. We are justified, accordingly, in closing the inquiry here, and accepting the solution of the question proposed which thus offers itself.

original. But (seeing that the parent of the Harklensian was admittedly the Philoxenian) this supposition would merely mean that our Version, though not the Philoxenian, is directly derived from the Philoxenian,—a theory not only baseless, but so needless that it may safely be dismissed.
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And in answering the question of the age of the Version we have found moreover the answer to the question of its authorship. We have learnt not only that it is prior to the Harklensian of A.D. 614, and therefore not later than the sixth century, but that it belongs to the original Philoxenian New Testament, the Syriac Version made for Philoxenus of Mabug, in the first decade of that century.


(1) How it has chanced that the Philoxenian Version, as a whole, has passed into oblivion, we cannot tell. It never seems to have gained acceptance. Probably it was altered too much to find favour with readers who clung to the accustomed words of their familiar Peshitta, excellent as all admit it to be,—yet not altered enough to satisfy the desire of the scholarly student, who wanted to have the Syriac Scriptures brought into strict conformity with the Greek—a desire fulfilled not long after by the Harklensian. But why these Epistles have survived while the bulk of the works perished is easily understood. As above suggested, they supplied to Syriac-speaking readers and hearers what the Peshitta failed to give—the text of Epistles, short but precious as bearing the names of three holy Apostles, and widely accepted by great Greek Fathers of the Churches, not only of Antioch but of Alexandria. Writings known to form part of the New Testament as read by the "Faithful" (M’haimne)* of the Monophysite Church of the Copts in Egypt,† could not fail, when presented in the Syriac tongue, to be welcomed by their brother "Faithful" of the Church, Monophysite likewise, of the Syrians, the Jacobites in Mesopotamia.—How, or when, these Epistles first came to be read in Church, does not appear.

* By this title the Monophysites designated themselves, regarding the adherents of the Fourth General Council, the "Chalcedonians," as having fallen away from the Faith.—The name "Jacobite" came to be applied to the Syrian Monophysites when Jacob (usually known as "Baradaeus") had revived their Church from its collapse under the persecutions which had nearly put an end to it. He was Bishop of Edessa, 541–578. It is usual to call the Coptic Church also "Jacobite," the Coptic and the Syrian Churches being alike Monophysite, and in close communion. The Life of Baradaeus has been written by John of Ephesus (see for it Land’s Anecdota Syr., t. ii, pp. 249 et sqq., 264 et sqq.).

† Not only the text of all Greek manuscripts of the N.T., but that of the Coptic Versions, includes our Epistles; and also (though not without signs of doubt) the Apocalypse.
The earliest copy of them (see above, p. xxiii, and below, p. xlii) is included in a volume of Miscellanies, not in a book for ecclesiastical use; but copies from the twelfth century down (codd. 12, 13, &c.) bear rubrics marking parts of them for Lessons,—not of the ordinary yearly course, but for special Festivals.

(2) Concerning the previous history of this Philoxenian New Testament, and especially these Epistles, the sum total of our information is brief, but definite. It is first mentioned by Moses of Agel,* a writer of the middle of the sixth century (a Monophysite), who states that one Polycarpus, whom he designates "Choreiscopus," "translated the New Testament and David into Syriac from the Greek, for Xenaias [Philoxenus] of Mabug." This was written apparently about the year 550, when the Version spoken of was only about forty years in existence; and Moses evidently supposed it to be probably unknown to his readers. His evidence thus not merely confirms that of Thomas (above cited, p. xxiv), who wrote a generation or two later, but throws light upon it by explaining how the Version came to bear the name of Philoxenus to whose "days" Thomas assigns it; and it further gives us the name of the actual translator. It is, however, from Thomas, not merely in his colophon, but in his Version at large, that we gain our fullest and most important knowledge of its Philoxenian prototype; for in that Version we may presume that he has retained much of the general substance and leading features of the work of Polycarpus. And, moreover, in his asterisks and marginal notes (to be dealt with presently†) he has apparently preserved traces of it.—But beyond these indirect indications, and a few minute fragments of the Pauline Epistles that have casually survived,‡ our Four Epistles are the only part of the Philoxenian New Testament—with the probable exception of the Revelation §—that is now forthcoming.

(3) The earliest evidence of their existence appears (as above stated, p. xxiii) in the ninth century, in a MS volume dated A.D. 823

* See for Moses of Agel (or Aggil), Assemani, B.O., t. ii, p. 82. His statement (as above) occurs in an Epistle prefixed to his Syriac translation of the Glaphyra of Cyril of Alexandria, in which he warns his readers to expect to find that Cyril's citations from the Greek Bible often differ from the Peshitta, and refers them to the more recent and exact version of Polycarpus. This is probably the version of the Glaphyra that is extant (though mutilated) in MS. Add. 14555 (Br. Mus.).
† In Sect. x (d) and xi (c), infra., pp. xxxvii, xl.
‡ See below, Sect. vi (a), p. xxx.
§ Ib.
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(our Cod. 1); and in it they are not set apart, but associated with the three Catholic Epistles of the Peshitta—2 and 3 John subjoined to 1 John (which stands first of the Seven), 2 Peter to 1 Peter, Jude following,—with no note to mark them as belonging to a different Version. They appear also, probably within the same century, in another shape, rendered from our Syriac into Arabic,* in a copy of the Acts and Epistles, in which all the Seven stand on equal terms, in the usual order as in the Greek.—After this there is a blank in their history. No other copy of them can be dated with confidence earlier than the twelfth century,† to which three of our five oldest MSS (9, 12, 14) apparently belong. The later ones are mostly of the fifteenth century (as Codd. 11, 13, 20),—or of the sixteenth and seventeenth (as Codd. 8, 10, 15, 17), or even more recent. Cod. 1 (Add. 14623) was written in an Egyptian (Copto-Syrian) monastery; the twelfth century group, and apparently a few of the later ones (Codd. 19, 20), come from Tūr-‘Abdin (a district of Mesopotamia); the rest are mostly from the Maronite Church of the Lebanon,—except one, recent but of much importance (Cod. 18), which was probably written in the convent on Mount Sinai where it is preserved. The manuscripts also which Etzel's Latin and the Paris Polyglot text represent, though not forthcoming, are known to have been Maronite (see pp. xx supr., lvii infr.).

Thus the materials by which is established the text of the present edition, testify to the fact that these Epistles have been preserved, read, and transcribed by Syriac-reading Christians dispersed over many regions, through many centuries.

SECTION VI. Other surviving Remains of the Philoxenian.

The question may be conveniently treated at this point, which naturally arises, whether any other portions survive of the Version to which Philoxenus gives his name and authority.

(a) As regards the New Testament, one or two copies of the Harklensian Gospels have been with some confidence put forward by successive critics as Philoxenian, on the ground of certain divergences

* See below, Sect. xiv (6).
† For the date of our Cod. 2 (Add. 14473), which may be older, see below, Sect. xii, p. xiii.
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from the Harklensian manner and from the consent of most other copies, which appear in the text presented by them,—as the Florentine MS of A.D. 757 by Adler,* the Cod. Angelicus of Rome by Bernstein,† and (more recently) an early MS (not later than 900) now at Beirút, by Dr. Isaac Hall.‡ But of none of these has the identification been, or can be, admitted as even probable; though the peculiarities noted in each of them may be due to the retention of some Philoxenian words or forms of words—just as many (probably most) Latin Vulgate MSS exhibit in their text an admixture of "Old Latin" readings. The only relics of the unrevised Philoxenian (other than our Epistles) that are to be accepted as such without doubt, are the five minute fragments, above referred to (p. xxviii), of the Pauline Epistles found by Cardinal Wiseman on the margin of his "Karkaphensian" MS, and published by him in 1828.§ They are from Rom. vi. 20, 1 Cor. i. 28, 2 Cor. vii. 13, ib. x. 4, Eph. vi. 2.

But the Version of the Apocalypse, of which a short account is given in Appendix III (p. 154 infr.), discovered and published by me in 1898, has a good claim to be reckoned Philoxenian, bearing to the Apocalypse, as published by De Dieu in 1627 (and printed in the ordinary editions of the Syriac New Testament), much the same relation as our Four Epistles bear to the Harklensian text of the same. Of this Apocalypse the only known copy forms part (along with the Four Epistles) of our Cod. 12,|| which is the only complete Syriac New Testament MS that has reached Europe from the East. If this identification of it as Philoxenian be admitted, it follows that this MS is to be regarded as a copy of the Peshitta supplemented into conformity with the Greek canon by interpolation of these books from the Philoxenian,—or, in other words, that it preserves for us just so much of the Philoxenian as suffices to supply the defect of the Canon of the Peshitta.

(b) Further, our primary authority in the matter, Moses of Agel, informs us (see p. xxviii supr.) that besides the New Testament the Philoxenian translator extended his labours to one Book of the Old—

§ Horae Syr., p. 178, note 11.
|| See below, Sect. xii, p. xlv.
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the Psalter, which (it is implied) he rendered from the Greek. Of this Version no fragment is known to have been preserved as a citation, nor is any trace of it identifiable now. Yet it is probable that the text of the Psalms as they appear in the existing Peshitta, may have been (in parts at least) modified somewhat into approximation to the Philoxenian text. The large use made of this Book, far beyond all other Old Testament writings, in the offices of the Church, would naturally dispose the Syriac-speaking "Faithful" to favour a Psalter based (as the Philoxenian was) on the Greek, as a means of assimilating their psalmody to that of the Greek-speaking fellow-members of their communion.—If this be so, it seems to account for the fact that in very many places the Psalter, unlike the other Books of the Peshitta Old Testament, represents the text of the LXX rather than that of the Hebrew.

Moses, as above cited, mentions no other Old Testament Book as translated by Polycarpus. But we have direct evidence that his work comprised at least one great Book of the Prophets—that of Isaiah. The great Milanese MS of the latter half of the Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament (Cod. Ambros. C. 313, infr.), which bears on its margin a wonderfully complete apparatus of the readings and renderings of the later Greek translators, exhibits also in one place (Esai. ix. 6) an alternative rendering which it definitely cites as from "the version that was translated by the care of holy Philoxenus."—Being thus assured that this Version extended to Isaiah, we are justified in following the judgment of Dr. Ceriani who accepts as Philoxenian a series (preserved in a seventh-century MS) of large fragments of Isaiah* in Syriac in a translation made from the LXX; distinct, therefore, from the Peshitta, but agreeing neither textually nor in diction with the Syro-Hexaplar.†

* These fragments (B.M., Add. 17106) have been printed in Monumenta S. et P., t. v, fasc. i, by Dr. Ceriani (Milan, 1868). They are, Esai. xxviii. 3-17, xliii. 17—xlix. 18, lxvi. 11-23.

† The Syriac translation of the Glaphyra of Cyril of Alexandria, made by this Moses of Agel, has been mentioned above (note * to p. xxviii). To it the Syriac fragment of that treatise extant in MS. Add. 14555 presumably belongs. It is reasonable therefore to infer that the passages of Isaiah which occur in it belong likewise to the Philoxenian; for inasmuch as Moses commends that Version to his Syrian readers, he would no doubt himself borrow its renderings to represent the Prophet's words where cited by Cyril in the Glaphyra. See my article Polycarpus Chorepiscopus in Dict. of Christian Biography, vol. iv, p. 433.
SECTION VII. The Harklensian New Testament.

Compared with the Philoxenian New Testament, the Harklensian has not fared amiss. Many copies of the Gospels in this Version exist: two \((a, \beta)\) of the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse.* Portions of the Epistles are to be found in some manuscript lectionaries. In one MS \((\gamma)\) these Four Epistles alone, though of the Harklensian Version, are in a subscription† wrongly described as Philoxenian. This mistake suggests the suspicion that the two Versions, the primary and the derived, had in course of time become confused in ordinary usage, regarded perhaps as merely first and second editions of the text sanctioned by Philoxenus. Some such confusion has prevailed even among modern Biblical scholars;‡ and to it in fact the wording of Thomas's colophon naturally leads. Possibly this usage may account for the apparent misstatement of Bar-Salibi above noticed, which seems to ignore our Version, and which has so far misled White in his estimate of its age and its relation to the Harklensian.

SECTION VIII. Comparative Value of the two Versions.

We claim then that our Version, though it has reached us without a name, is properly to be designated as The Philoxenian. And we claim also that it is worthy of the care bestowed on it by the scribes to whom its preservation is due, and by the editors of later times who have included it in every edition of the Syriac New Testament, from the Paris Polyglot of 1645 to the present day. Its evidential value ranks high; it is that of a witness to the text of these Epistles as read in Greek by a scholar belonging to the Church of Edessa in the first decade of the sixth century. That text he has reproduced with such careful exactness that the textual witness borne by his work is equivalent in most respects to that of a Greek copy certainly not later in date than the fifth century,—inferior, therefore, in age to none of the Greek manuscripts available for the text of this part of the New Testament, save only the four great uncial Bibles. The points are few, scarcely one of them other than trivial, at which his render-

* See Appendix II, p. 146, infr. † Ib. See for this subscription, p. 152 infr. ‡ So White:—see title of his edition, given in note * to p. xxiii supr.
The merit of the later worker is of a different order from that
of the earlier; it is critical, not literary. His work, as a witness
to the text of the Greek, is more nearly equivalent to a Greek manuscript
than any other existing Version can claim to be.—But at what a sacrifice of propriety of Syriac idiom, and by what a strain on the
resources of Syriac vocabulary and syntax, he has secured this exactness of rendering we have already seen, and the fact is well known to
all who have even cursorily examined his Version. To describe in
detail his methods of translation would be out of place here;* it may suffice to say that in his rendering of the Greek of the New Testa-
ment he has systematically done just such violence to the Syriac as Aquila before him did to the Greek in forcing it into verbal conformity with the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

Yet it would be unfair to ignore the fact that now and then his alterations of the Philoxenian are neither petty nor pedantic: in some cases he has improved on it. Thus, he does well to give ἰηφημω for σκόρωμα (2 Pet. i. 13) instead of ιηπημω (= σωμα), ιτομμοί for φωσφόρος (ib. 20) instead of ἰηλωμ (≈ ηλως). So, again, ιηνωκοί represents τηφρω (ii. 6) better than ιτομο (≈ κατακαώ), and more adequately expresses προπημυς (3 Joh. 6) than ιτομο (≈ ἵφο-

* See my article Thomas Harklens, in Dict. of Christian Biography, vol. iv.
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On the other hand, for the only really gross blunder in either Version he is solely responsible,—the ἐγείρον (Jude 7) by which he misrepresents in his text the still stranger misreading of his margin, μεμψήμυροι for μεμψήμυροι (see p. 135 infra).

SECTION IX. The affinity between the two Versions, twofold.

The conclusion above drawn (Sect. iv, p. xxvi et seq.), that the two Versions of the Four Epistles are closely akin,—ours being the primary of which the Harklensian is a revision—is based on the affirmation that when compared together they reveal an affinity such as can be accounted for in no other way. Of this affinity the proper evidence lies in the Apparatus subjoined to the Syriac and Greek Texts as printed in this edition, where the Harklensian readings and renderings are set forth for comparison; and it is more fully stated in such instances as seem important and illustrative, in the Supplementary Notes. The strength of the case cannot be adequately appreciated without a careful study of these texts and annotations. But in the two following Sections it is proposed to state the main heads of the evidence they yield, and to illustrate them by examples.

The relation between the Versions, its nature and extent, would best be exhibited by printing them side by side, as our Authorized and Revised English Versions are often printed, and marking their agreements and disagreements (whether of substance or of form) by distinctive type. The comparison between the Versions thus facilitated would disclose many examples of textual divergence, and moreover it would place them in instructive contrast as regards literary method. Such differences, textual and literary, are to be expected; they are consistent with—in fact, necessary to—our hypothesis that ours is the text which Thomas re-handled in his graecizing manner, and emended after an auxiliary Greek copy.—But along with the occasional disagreements in text there would be apparent a preponderating amount of textual coincidence; and the dissimilarity of literary form would be seen to be grammatical merely and superficial, insufficient to disguise an intimate and fundamental affinity in diction and phraseology. For the purpose of our present inquiry, therefore, we set aside such minor differences, whether of substance or of form, and we address ourselves to show that the affinity which
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subsists between the two Versions is twofold,—(i.) in diction, and (ii.) in text; and is of such a nature, so intimate, and manifested in so many ways and at so many points, as to negative the possibility of regarding them as independent of one another.

SECTION X. Their Affinity (i.) in Diction.

Under this head the evidence is so abundant that to do justice to it would be impracticable within the limits of an Introduction. Its force can be fully learnt only (as has been said above) by a thorough comparative study of both texts. An idea of it, sufficient to carry conviction, may, however, be given within small compass by setting down a representative collection of examples of Greek words or phrases that are unfamiliar, or that find no adequate equivalent in Syriac, which both Versions render or represent alike. Such examples are as follows:

a. Coincidences in rendering unusual or difficult expressions.

The Versions coincide in their rendering of ἰσότυμος, φιλαδελφία,* μεγαλοπρεπής, αἰχμηρός, τρυφή, σπίλος, μῶμος, κύλισμα, κατακλυσθεῖς, δυσνόητος (2 Pet. i. 1, 6, 7, 17, 19; ii. 13, 22; iii. 6, 16): χαίρεων (of salutation), 2 Joh. 10: φλυαρῷ (3 Joh. 10): ἐπαγωνίζομαι, παρεισδόνω, ἐπιπναξομαι, ἐπιτημῶ, ἐκχέω, ἀντιλογία, φθινοπωρυνός, ἐπαφρίζω (Jud. 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13).

It is not credible that two translators dealing independently with words such as these (and the list might be extended) should in all cases light upon identical renderings. A few such instances might be casual; some measure of coincidence is likely to occur between any two translations of one and the same original. But as between the two Versions we treat of the points of identity are too frequent and uniform in recurrence to be thus fortuitous.—This observation applies especially to the examples in which the coincidence is not merely in the selection by both of the same word to render a Greek word, but in the employment of the same periphrasis to represent a Greek word for which Syriac offers no equivalent (as often happens in the case of Greek compounds). Such are the first three of the ten examples from 2 Peter, and five (the

* Their rendering of this word is different from that of the Peshitta, in signification as well as in form.
first three and last two) of the eight from Jude, of those above given. It is hardly possible to question that in these instances the later Version borrowed from the earlier,—especially as the periphrases are neither easy nor obvious, but formed with skill and study.—Moreover (it may be fairly added), they are in the freer manner of our Version,—not in that of the Harklensian with its word-for-word laboriousness; and the latter, therefore, may be presumed to be the borrower.

b. Coincidences in erroneous or imperfect Renderings.

Further, the Versions conicide, not only in renderings, but now and then in mis-renderings. The reviser has in some places followed his predecessor, not in well-chosen equivalents or happy periphrases, but in his (by no means frequent) errors or failures. Thus, both treat μνωπάζων (2 Pet. i. 9) as signifying merely οὐχ ὑφόν, both misconstrue ἐπιλύσεως (ib. 20) as a nominative,* both force on πυροῦμενοι (iii. 12) the sense of πυρὶ δοκιμαζόμενοι, both render δίκην ὑπέχουσα (Jud. 7) as if it were εἰς δίκην κατακρυνόμεναι, both pervert διακρυνομένους (ib. 23) to mean μεταμελομένοις. But under this head the leading example is in Jud. 6, where both are misled by a false etymology into translating αἰδίος as if equivalent to ἀγνωστοῖς. This error appears, it is true, to have had some currency,† and is not, therefore, peculiar to these Versions. But inasmuch as the Harklensian translator renders αἰδίος correctly where it occurs in the Epistle which follows next in order (Rom. i. 20), it is fair to infer that his mistranslation of it here in Jude is due to his too faithful adherence to his Philoxenian precursor.

c. Simultaneous variation in Renderings.

Another class of coincidences carries the evidence farther, and convincingly. They are found to agree not only in single renderings, but in simultaneous variation of renderings where a word recurs. Such instances appear where 2 Peter and Jude run parallel.—Thus in the case of [σω]ενοχούμενοι. In 2 Pet. ii. 13 both render it by the verb (a rare one) σωματεύομαι; in Jud. 12 by the still rarer

* Possibly both followed a Greek reading (unattested), ἐπιλυσις (see Greek Text, p. 61 infr.). If so, this is an instance of textual coincidence, to be added to those given in the following Section (xi,—see p. xi).
† See Note, p. 130, infr.
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The passages in which the verb occurs are closely alike—in both it is used in one and the same sense; no reason can be assigned for the change of rendering: the former Version has arbitrarily varied, and the latter has mechanically followed.—Again: For ἐπέρογκα, in 2 Pet. ii. 11, both give Ἱονᾶ; in Jud. 12 both vary to the equivalent and cognate but distinct form Ἰονᾶς—a coincidence in itself petty, but none the less telling as evidence of the mutual relation between the Versions. So again, both distinguish the σπυλαίας of Jud. 12 from the σπυλαί of 2 Pet. ii. 13, by making the minute change from Καπλαῖας to Καπλαῖς. —Other cases, affecting less unfamiliar words, point the same way;—as that of κρίμα, translated in both by the usual Ἱονᾶ in 2 Pet. ii. 3; but by Ἰονᾶ where it is used, with no alteration of meaning, in Jud. 4. —In like manner, in comparing 2 John with 3 John, we note that the verb ἐργαίζεσθαι is rendered in 2 John by both translators by the ordinary Ἱονᾶς; in 3 John by the less familiar Ἱονᾶς. —A coincidence the converse of this, but equally pointing to affinity, appears in the use of the verb Ἰονᾶς (properly equivalent to πεπλω) which both exceptionally employ to represent two other Greek verbs,—ἐρωτᾶ in 2 Joh. 5, παρακαλῶ in Jud. 5.—In all such cases the fact that the two vary needlessly, yet vary together and alike, amounts to a proof of their interdependence. Moreover, inasmuch as of the two, the one is nowhere studious to maintain, while the other habitually affects, precision in uniform rendering, it follows that the latter, which in the above-cited instances of variation deviates from its ordinary practice, has in these cases been led so to deviate by the example of the other,—in other words, is the derivate Version.

d. Philoxenian Renderings retained on the Harklensian margin.

Another line of investigation leads also to a like conclusion. It lies in the critical apparatus attached by Thomas to his text,—his asterisks and his marginal notes. The former usually relate to variations of reading in the Greek original as to the presence or absence of the words marked by them, and belong to our next Section. The latter for the most part offer alternative renderings of the Greek (where no doubt exists as to the reading); and in these are to be found distinct proofs of the relation we allege, for some
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of them prove to be words or phrases belonging to our Version, which the reviser has discarded from his text and replaced by renderings of his own, but has thought worth retaining on his margin. The two most important of these for our purpose are as follows:—(a) In 2 Pet. ii. 4 our Version renders ταρταρώσας by ἄραπας (as if καταβασάω εἰς τὰ κατώτερα). The Harklensian follows, as regards the form of the periphrasis, and retains the verb employed (a rare one), ἐπὶ. But for the noun he substitutes ἄμμον (eis Τάρταρον), transliterating the Greek word; and in explanation he inserts as a note the ἄμμον which he has displaced from his text.—(b) Again, in 3 John 6, where our Version translates προπέμυτας by ἄμμον (which strictly means ἐφοδιάσας), the reviser (as above noted, Sect. viii, p. xxxiii) with greater accuracy writes ἄμμον in his text, but places the former participle on his margin.—In neither of these cases is there any question as to the Greek word represented: they are merely examples of the endeavour of the later translator to improve on, and of his carefulness at the same time to record in a note as an alternative, the rendering of the earlier.*—It is not to be expected that more than a few instances of this kind should appear; but even one such would be evidence that Thomas had our Version before him as he worked, that it is the Version which he revised, and therefore is the Philoxenian.

SECTION XI.—Their Affinity (ii.) in Text.

Under this head it is to be premised that only a limited extent of textual agreement is to be expected, in view of the known facts. Thomas informs us (as we have seen) that in revising the work of his predecessor he used a Greek copy or copies. Hence we must be prepared to find more or less of textual divergence in his Version from the other. And, moreover, in examining the two Versions from this point of view, it is to be borne in mind that the relation between them cannot be determined by comparing them in isolated places chosen as test-passages because they furnish notable examples of disputed text,—such as 2 Pet. ii. 13 (where there are the rival

* See below, pp. 109, 112, for instances where, by insertion of a Greek word on his margin, Harkl. calls attention to his correction of our Version.
readings, ἀδικοῦμενοι and κομιοῦμενοι, ἁγάταις and ἀπάταις)—or iii. 10 (where some authorities give κατακαψεται for εἰρεθήσεται)—or as the passage Jude 22, 23, with the complicated variations recorded on it. For it is on such passages that the hand of the reviser, guided by his auxiliary Greek copy, is most likely to have operated. The only trustworthy method is to select for examination a fairly complete list of passages in which textual variations, great or small, affecting the sense, are recorded in critical editions of the Greek. If on a scrutiny it proves that in their reading of a large number of such passages the Versions agree, that fact will outweigh as evidence of affinity the counter-fact that they diverge in a limited number of conspicuous passages.

a. Shown by frequency of agreement.

In forming such a list it will, of course, be proper to disregard variations so petty as to be attributable to accident, and those in which the intention of the translator is doubtful. Putting aside all such, and confining ourselves to the textual variations attested by the Greek uncials only, it will be found that the Apparatus attached to our Greek Text records more than one hundred places where there exists textual variation of such nature as to show itself in the Syriac translation.—It would take up too much space to print the list of these passages here in full,—and it would be needless, inasmuch as for the purpose of our present inquiry the question is of the amount of agreement on the whole, not of the importance of each individual instance. It suffices to state as the result that, of the hundred instances, in about two-thirds the Versions coincide in the reading they represent; in one-third they differ. The amount of agreement thus shown is evidently greater than would probably be found to exist between two Versions made independently by two translators, neither of whom had knowledge of the work of the other, directly from two distinct and unrelated Greek exemplars.—This result is such as might reasonably be expected when of the two Versions compared one is a revision of the other, made with the help of a fresh Greek text; and it is therefore consistent with our hypothesis as to the two Versions under consideration. It confirms us in the view that ours is the previous Version on which Thomas of Harkel based his; and it gives us a measure of the extent of his textual alterations, showing how far he
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retained the text of his basis, and how far he emended it on the authority of his auxiliary Greek text. (See further in Sect. xxi.)

b. Shown by agreement in singular readings.

It is possible, no doubt, that the extensive textual affinity thus ascertained may be in part due to agreements in text between Thomas’s Greek copy and the copy which the Philoxenian translator followed. But though such agreements are not improbable in cases where the affinity shows itself in readings which (as those of our list) are attested by existing Greek MSS, there are over and above these not a few examples of coincidence between our two Versions in readings weakly or doubtfully supported by Greek authority,—some even where our Philoxenian and the Harklensian stand together against all Greek authority whatever. About twenty such are recorded in the Apparatus of our Greek Text (infra.),—such as 2 Pet. i. 3 (omission of ἡμῶν), i. 20 (ἐπιλύσεις for ἐπιλύσεως), iii. 2 (ὁδια prefixed to τῶν ἀποστόλων); 3 Joh. 10 (ἐποίησεν for ποιήσει), ib. 15 (insertion of ἐκαστὸν before κατ’ ὄνομα, and αὐτῷ after it); Jud. 9 (ὁς for ὅτε), ib. 18 (ἐπ’ ἀσέβειαν for τῶν ἀσεβειῶν). Of these and such as these the natural explanation is that they are textual individualisms, possibly errors, of the prior translation, retained by the reviser.

c. Also by the Apparatus attached to the Harklensian Text.

1. Evidence less obvious, and more limited, yet more distinct where it exists, is to be found in the asterisks (⋆) above referred to, attached to certain words and phrases in the Harklensian text. It may safely be assumed that Thomas in using this sign was led by the famous example of Origen in his Hexapla, and that he thus marked whatever in his text was not found in his Greek exemplar, but inserted on some other authority. Sometimes the other authority so referred to may be a second Greek copy; for in one or two cases the sign relates to nothing found in the Philoxenian text. But in most places where they occur they are capable of being explained as references to this text;—and not a few of them refuse to admit of any other explanation, inasmuch as in it, and it alone, are to be found the word or words on which the Harklensian sets this mark.—Thus (2 Pet. i.) no authority except the Philoxenian vouches for the insertion of ἡμᾶς (after καθίσματος, ver. 8), or of αὐτῷ (after ἐνεχθείση, ver. 17); and therefore,
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when we note that in these verses the Harklensian writes \( \text{συναποστασίας} \), \( \text{συναποστασίας} \), we are bound to infer that in each case he refers to the word present in the text of the prior Version, and that he prefixes \( \text{συναποστασίας} \) to note the absence of the word so marked from his Greek exemplar.

A more conspicuous instance—an absolutely conclusive one—is the \( \text{κατακλυσμός} \) (\( \text{κατακλυσμός} \)) of 2 Pet. ii. 4 (Harkl.) ;—and to it are to be added, \( \text{οὐδεὶς} \) (\( \text{οὐδεὶς} \)) of 2 Pet. ii. 13; the \( \text{αὐτὸν} \) (\( \text{αὐτὸν} \)) after \( \text{διδάχησι} \) of 2 Joh. 9; the \( \text{πάσης} \) (\( \text{πάσης} \), before \( \text{ἐκκλησίας} \)) of 3 Joh. 6. Many other words with \( \text{συναποστασίας} \) may be in like manner accounted for,—as \( \text{οὐδεὶς} \) (\( \text{οὐδεὶς} \)), 2 Pet. i. 5; \( \text{αὐτὸν} \) (\( \text{αὐτὸν} \)) after \( \text{οὐνόματος} \), 3 Joh. 7; but in these cases there exists Greek authority for the marked words, to which the asterisk may possibly refer.

2. The marginal notes also of the Harklensian (which in Section x, d (p. xxxvii supr.) have been used as evidence of affinity between the Versions in diction) yield in a few places evidence to like effect, of affinity in text. Thus, the \( \text{ἐκφυτεύω} \) (\( \text{ἐκφυτεύω} \)) given in the Harklensian margin as alternative for the \( \text{κατακαθίσταται} \) (\( \text{κατακαθίσταται} \)) of its text, points to our Version as its source. And so in other instances,—as the \( \text{ἐπιδείξεσθαι} \) (\( \text{ἐπιδείξεσθαι} \)) for \( \text{καθιστά} \) (\( \text{καθιστά} \)) (\( \text{βολομένως} \)), 3 Joh. 10; and the insertion of \( \text{αὐτὴς τῆς ἐκκλησίας} \), ib. 12,—the like inference is at least probable.

Thus by these two independent lines of inquiry into the relation between these two Versions—the line of Affinity in Diction, as shown (Section x) in coincidences of rendering,—and the line of Affinity in Text, as traced in the examples adduced in the Section (xi) just completed—we have justified the assumptions on which the argument of Section iv is founded. And we have confirmed the result there arrived at, that the Versions are related one to another as primary and derivate, the Harklensian (professedly a revision) being the derivate and ours the primary; whence the conclusion drawn in that Section irresistibly follows, that our Version is the translation which alone is properly entitled to bear the name of Philoxenus, issued under his sanction A.D. 508.

* Probably in the Greek text (p. 63 infr.) \( \text{oὐδεὶς} \) ought to have been inserted before \( \text{τροφὴν} \).
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SECTION XII.—AUTHORITIES FOR OUR TEXT: MANUSCRIPTS.

A brief list of the Manuscripts on which the text of this Edition of our Four Epistles has been constructed is given below (pp. 1, 2), prefixed to the Syriac Text. In this Section I proceed to give such fuller details concerning them as seem worth recording.* I deal first with the MSS of the earlier group (see p. 96 infra.), which I distinguish as A, the later being B, with an "Intermediate" group between.

(i.) MSS of Group A (Early).

Cod. 1. (British Museum, Add. 14623, Catal. DCCLXXXI.)

Of our MSS this stands first, alike in age and in textual value. It is free from the corrupt readings which here and there disfigure the printed texts, and though it is not without errors of its own, they are mostly errors of sight on the scribe's part, and not due to editorial attempts at correction. Examples of such errors are:—

(2 Pet. i. 4), میپا for میپا (ib. ii. 13, and Jud. 12), مککا for مککا (ib. iii. 4), مککا for مککا (ib. 7). But the interpolation مککا (ib. iii. 2), and the great divergences (by omission and insertion) in Jud. 24 are grave exceptions to the general trustworthiness of its text. On the whole, however, its superiority to all the rest is so marked as to place it at the head of group A, and seems to warrant us in accepting its readings, as in some cases has been done in our text, even where it stands alone.—The MS as a whole is not to be classed as Biblical; it is a miscellany of which the other contents are extracts from approved divines, Syriac, or Greek in a Syriac translation; its only Biblical section is No. 7, which exhibits our Epistles. But it is not therefore to be presumed that the compiler of the MS regarded our Four Epistles as non-canonical, for he includes them with the Three of the Peshitta, arranging all Seven as on an equal footing (though not in their normal Greek order), 1, 2, 3 John; James; 1, 2 Peter; Jude:—Alone of all our MSS it was written in Egypt, but by a Mesopotamian monk of Dara (not far from Mardin), and was

* It may be taken for granted that all of them are (directly or indirectly) Jacobite (the Maronite being presumably derived from Jacobite sources), as follows from the fact that they include these Epistles, which were unknown to the Nestorians Churches.
presented some thirty years later to the monastery of the Theotokos, in the Nitrian Desert. It bears date A. Gr. 1134 (A.D. 823), being thus older by at least three centuries than any of our other MSS which can be dated with certainty. Its age thus gives weight to its textual authority:—while, on the other hand, we are to remember that it is later, also by three centuries, than the time of Philoxenus; an interval long enough for the entrance of many errors into the text had it been transmitted to our scribe by less competent or careful copyists.—It is on vellum, palimpsest, written in a clear, cursive script, and in good preservation. This MS, and Codd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, belong to the great Nitrian collection acquired by the Museum in 1839–47.

Cod. 2. (Br. M., Add. 14473(2), Catal. cxxxi.)

An undated MS of which the age cannot be determined with confidence. Dr. Wright's opinion is, "of about the xith century." But its script gives no trustworthy evidence in the matter, for it is evidently not the normal handwriting of the scribe, but a somewhat clumsy attempt to imitate the fine estrangela character of the MS (see Catal. cxxvi) to which it is appended, a copy of the Acts and Three Epistles (Peshitta). It consists of nine leaves of vellum, supplying our Four.—Its text agrees closely with Cod. 1 in most of the crucial passages, and even in its most notable misreadings, as noted above (2 Pet. iii. 2, 4, and 7,—in the second of which 1 and 2 stand alone), and also in the remarkable double aberrant reading in Jud. 24. It avoids, however, in 2 Pet. ii. 13 the (οσιοντ) of Cod. 1, yet inconsistently adopts it in the parallel, Jud. 12 (correcting it, however, in the margin). Yet its agreement with Cod. 1 is so much less strong in 2 and 3 John* than in 2 Pet. or Jude, as to suggest the suspicion that in 2 and 3 John the text follows a different exemplar. But on the whole, while there is enough of divergence between Codd.1 and 2 to preclude the supposition that 2 was copied from 1, their internal evidence proves them to represent a common archetype. Hence follows the important inference, that the readings common to 1 and 2 (which, as we shall see, are the readings for the most part which characterize group A) were not originated by the scribe or editor of 1, but represent an earlier authority—how much earlier we cannot tell.

* See notes infr. on Syr. text, 2 Joh. 1, 5, 8, 13; 3 Joh. 4, 6, 7, 9.
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After Codd. 1 and 2 it will be convenient to disregard numerical order, and to pass on to the other MSS (9, 12, 14), which may be distinguished from 1 and 2 as forming a later subdivision of group A.

Cod. 9. (Cambridge University Library, Oo. 1, t. 2.)*

This is the second volume of the great Syriac Pandect (the "Buchanan Bible"), which, though the vellum of which it is composed is much damaged by damp and decay, is one of the most notable monuments of Syriac Biblical antiquity. It was presented to the University of Cambridge by Dr. Buchanan in 1809. The New Testament in it is complete, except that it lacks the Apocalypse. Though it exhibits our Four Epistles, it places them, not in their proper order, but together, subjoined to the Three of the Peshitta. It adds, however, a note in which it reckons them all together and on a par, as "The Seven Catholic Epistles of the Apostles." This tacit recognition of their canonicity is hardly weakened by the fact that next after them it places "the Six Books of Clement,"—documents coinciding in the main with those which are known as the "Syrian Octateuch."†—From this MS Dr. Lee ‡ derived many corrections of the text of our Epistles, and of the Syriac New Testament at large, for his editions.—It gives a general, but far from uniform, support to the text of Cod. 1, deviating now and then into the readings of the later MSS. But in no case does it follow 1 in its exceptional lapses (as noted above), save in the instance of the word ًً (see above, p. xlii; also notes on 2 Pet. ii. 13, Jud. 12 (Syr. text), and Note on p. 107 infr.).

Its script is strangela, of the modified form affected in the twelfth century in Tūr Ābdīn, the district of N.E. Mesopotamia,

† For these six documents, see Journal of Theological Studies, vol. iii, pp. 59 et sqq., where Book 3 is printed by Dr. Arendzen, partly from this MS and partly from one at Mosul. It is the 'Apostolic Church Order' (see Bishop Wordsworth's Ministry of Grace, p. 34), the Greek of which has been edited by Harnack and others. Books 1 and 2 are the Testament of Our Lord—edited in Syriac by the Patriarch Rahmani (1899), in English by Dr. Cooper and Dean Maclean (1902).
‡ See a memorandum by Dr. Lee, Classical Journal, vol. xxiii, p. 248, where he states that he collated it ("the Travancore MS") for his Syriac N.T. of 1816. He notes that it is "a Jacobite copy," and remarks that it "could not have been brought into India earlier than 1663" (referring to Assemani, B.O., t. iii, pt. ii, p. 463, for the arrival of the Jacobites in India in that year). See also Milne Rae's Syrian Church in India, ch. xvii, p. 269.
near Mardin, which was then and still is the headquarters of the Jacobite Church—now a feeble remnant.*—However, it was not there, but in Malabar, that it came into the possession of Dr. Buchanan in 1806, a gift from Mar Dionysius [Thomas] VI, Metropolitan of the Syro-Indian Church, the “Christians of St. Thomas.” The donor believed it to be an immemorial heirloom of his Church, “near a thousand years old,”—that is, to belong to the ninth century. But as we have seen, its date is shown by the character of the writing to be probably three hundred years later. And inasmuch as the Church of Malabar was Nestorian until Mar Gregorius, the first Jacobite Metropolitan (whence this Mar Dionysius had his succession), was sent from Mesopotamia in 1663-5, it may be presumed that this MS, including as it does the Epistles which are unrecognized by Nestorians, and written in a Tur'abdinese hand, did not reach Malabar before that date.†

Cod. 12. (The “Crawford MS, No. II,” now in the John Rylands Library, Manchester.)

The late Earl of Crawford and Balcarres acquired this MS by purchase from a dealer, but its previous owners are unrecorded, except that it was written for one Gabriel, a priest, and that in 1534 it was sold to “Simeon of Hatacha, Patriarch.”‡—It is unique,


† That Cod. 9 is of Cent. xii is further indicated by the occurrence in it, in two places, of notes naming the Patriarch Michael—presumably “Michael the Great,” who transferred his see from Amid [Diarbekr] to Mardin, and died in 1199.—See further in Cambridge Catalogue, as above.—See also Buchanan, Christian Researches (Foy’s edition, 1858), p. 40; and Pearson’s Memoir of Dr. Buchanan, vol. ii, pp. 70-115.—At first it was “reputed to be as old as the Alexandrine MS”; another estimate was “as early as the fifth or sixth century,”—which, however, Dr. Buchanan rejected as “certainly too high.”—It was at Caudenate, a village near Diamper [Udlampur], both close to Cochin in Travancore, that Buchanan received it from the Metropolitan.—Had it been forthcoming in 1599, it would presumably have been produced at the “Synod of Diamper” held in that year, at which the authorities of the Church of Rome severely censured the Churches of Malabar for (inter alia) the absence of these Epistles from their New Testament. See Geddes, History of the Church of Malabar (1694), p. 132 et sqq. (ch. xiv, Decr. ii).

‡ See for a full account of this MS, my Memoir in Transactions of Royal Irish Academy, vol. xxx, pp. 347 et sqq.; also, Preliminary Dissertation prefixed to The Apocalypse in Syriac, from the Crawford MS, ch. viii, pp. cvi et sqq.
as being the only known Syriac MS (brought from the East, and not written in Europe, as Cod. 16 was—see below, p. 1 v) which contains the entire New Testament as recognized by all non-Syrian Churches; for it not merely includes all seven Catholic Epistles in their normal order, but after the Fourth Gospel it places the Apocalypse, in a version nowhere else extant. I have elsewhere* endeavoured to show that this Apocalypse, as well as our Four Epistles, is the work of Polycarpus. If this be so, Cod. 12 may be described (as above, p. xxx) as the Peshitta N.T. supplemented by the Philoxenian, so as to conform to the Greek canon. It claims to have been written in "the monastery of Jacob the Egyptian Recluse and of Bar-Shabba,† beside Ṣalach in Tur-ʻAbdin in the Sultanate of Ḥesna d'Kipha." Its script is of the same well-marked character as that of Cod. 9, and it may be confidently assigned to the same period. As compared with Cod. 9 it is somewhat superior in text when measured by the standard of Cod. 1, with which it agrees closely,—in one case too closely, repeating the error of 2 Pet. iii. 7 (ܐܡܐܢܐܐ). But in this comparison Cod. 9 is at a disadvantage, being damaged in many places, whereas the strong vellum of Cod. 12 is in sound preservation. This MS is one of the forty-two collated for Mr. Gwilliam's standard edition of the Peshitta Gospels, Tetraevangelium Sanctum, where it is numbered 12, as here.


Of this MS (which originally contained the entire New Testament, excepting, probably, the Apocalypse), many leaves are wanting from both ends. In it, as in 9, the Four Epistles are placed after the Three. It now gives no note of time or place, but it may be confidently set down as Turʻabdinese of the twelfth century, like Codd. 9 and 12. Not only does its script show the same characteristics, but it is one of a large group of Biblical MSS (on vellum) in the same division (Supplément) of the great Library to which it belongs, all closely alike in script, evidently the work of one and the same school of calligraphy, nearly all of them dated shortly before or after A.D. 1200, and signed by scribes who call themselves monks of some monastery of Tur-ʻAbdin.—Its text for the most part agrees with that of the two

* See references in note †, p. xlv supr.; also Appendix III, p. 154 infr.
† The colophon which contains this statement is given in full in Apoc. Syr. Crawford (cited in same note †), pp. 82, 98.
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preceding, but conforms less closely to the A standard, and lapses not infrequently into the errors of the B-text.

Thus it appears that the MSS of our A-group are all of Jacobite origin; that (possibly excepting Cod. 2) they represent the text as read in a region of Mesopotamia which had its ecclesiastical centre first at Amid and then (as now) at Mardin; and that none is later than A.D. 1200, one being as early as the ninth century.

(ii.) MSS of Intermediate Character.

(a) Of Earlier Date.

After these I place two MSS, Codd. 4 and 5, possibly of the same period as Codd. 9, 12, 14, but written with less care, on paper, and in a cursive hand; intermediate in text between the A- and B-groups, but tending mostly to the latter; neither complete; both without note of date or place.

Cod. 4. (Br. M., Add. 14474, Catal. cxxi.)

Eight leaves (now ff. 105–12), hardly earlier than the twelfth century, containing 1 Pet. of the Peshitta, followed by 2 and 3 John and Jude of our Version. These have been inserted (to make up a volume of Acts and Epistles) into a ninth century MS of singular construction, whose contents are—(1) The Pauline Epistles, (2) The Acts, (3) The Epistles 2 Peter, James, 1 John—(1) and (2) being of the Peshitta Version, (3) of the Harklensian (the δ of p. 146 infr.). Between James and 1 John the binder has interpolated our eight leaves.—It is noteworthy that the scribe of the original MS, in choosing his three Catholic Epistles from the Harklensian, should have preferred 2 Peter to 1 Peter; and again, that the scribe of these supplemental leaves should go back to the older Version for 2 and 3 John and Jude.—The text of these is mainly of the B-type, but in a few instances agrees with that of the A-group.

Cod. 5.* (Br. M., Add. 14681, Catal. cxxiii.)

This appears to have been a complete Peshitta New Testament, but the earlier part is not forthcoming, and it now begins with the Acts (at ii. 42), to which Book it subjoins the Three Catholic Epistles. After them followed (as in Codd. 9 and 14, but arranged as in Cod. 1)

* I had at first reckoned this MS in group B (p. 96 infr.), but on re-consideration I now rank it as intermediate.
our Four, beginning with 2 and 3 John; 2 Peter breaks off in ii. 4, and Jude is lost; then (after a gap) come the Pauline Epistles. It is probably a century later than Cod. 4; but its text, though intermediate like that of Cod. 4, exhibits a larger proportion of A-readings, some of them important, as for example the |ος for |ος of 2 Pet. ii. 1. The MS is furnished all through with marginal variant readings, some from the Harklensian (see note *, p. 101 infr.)*

Neither of these MSS yields any note of place. Apart from them stands another group (Codd. 3, 11, 13, 20), likewise intermediate in textual character, all of the fifteenth century, and all tending more than 4 and 5 to the A-text.

(b) Of Fifteenth century.

Cod. 3. (Br. M., Add. 17226, Catal. cxxiv.)

This MS contained, when entire, the Acts and Catholic Epistles, the Four being subjoined to the Three, but has unfortunately lost most of the Acts, and the end of Jude, breaking off in ver. 20. No note of time or place is now forthcoming, but it is probably of the fourteenth century. Its text is appreciably nearer to the A-type than that of Cod. 5, and it shows in places a distinct affinity with Cod. 1 (as, e.g., in Jud. 7), repeating even its errors, as in 2 Pet. iii. 2 (_pagination_0), iii. 7 (_pagination_2). But it follows the A-text in 2 Pet. ii. 1, 10, 11, 17, 18,—though not in omitting the negative in iii. 10.

Cod. 11. (The "Williams MS.") This MS (Acts and Epistles) is now in the possession of Mr. Robert S. Williams, of Utica, New York. It was acquired by his brother, a missionary at Mardin; and an Arabic note records that it was written at Hesna d' Kipha, in Tur-'Abdin, in A.Gr. 1782 (= A.D. 1471). It is thus locally connected with group A, especially with Cod. 12. It was copied for the owner, David of El-Homs (in the Lebanon country), from a MS acquired by him† at El-Keifa

* Also its corrections of 2 Pet. ii. 4, 2 Joh. 10 (see pp. 103, 121, infr.), may be Harklensian.

† If Dr. Hall rightly interprets the words of this David, the original of this MS was a compilation by the unnamed writer of a poem which concludes it. He suggests that this writer may have been one of the Christians of the [Syro-Indian] Church of Malabar, but does not state what the "indications" are which (as he says) "favour this conjecture." It seems improbable; and the fact that the compilation includes _Proceemia_ taken from the _Horreum Mysteriorum_ of Gregory bar-Ebraya (ob. A.D. 1386), marks it as the work of a Jacobite, probably not earlier than the fourteenth century. I have not found El-Keifa elsewhere mentioned.
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(apparently a place visited by him in a journey from his home to Tūr-‘Abdīn). The Four Epistles were published from this MS in photographic facsimile by Dr. I. H. Hall, The Syrian Antilegomena Epistles (1886). From it were derived many corrections of the text of our Epistles in the New York edition (N) of 1886,—as (e.g.) o (for 9) prefix to 12o\makebox{\textbf{O}} (2 Pet. i. 3), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (ib. 4), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (ii. 1), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (ib. 17), insertion of 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (iii. 5), and 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (ib. 13); also of 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (2 Joh. 5), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (2 Joh. 6), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (3 Joh. 9); and of 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (3 Joh. 10). But the editor has not followed its omission of the negative (2 Pet. iii. 10), nor its readings, 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (2 Pet. iii. 1), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (3 Joh. 10).—In all these places, it agrees with the A-group; and on the whole, its text is about on a par with that of Cod. 3.

Cod. 13. (Wetstein’s MS, Amsterdam, Biblioth. des Remonstr. Gemeente, No. 184.)

This MS now exhibits only the Acts and Epistles, but the numbering of the quires (quinions) shows that it has lost the first 173 leaves (17 quinions and 3 leaves of an eighteenth), no doubt containing the Gospels.* It now begins with Acts i. 1 (on the fourth leaf of quinion 18, having evidently been intentionally divided at that point from the preceding quires). The order of the Epistles is, (1) the Three Catholic of the Peshitta, (2) the Pauline, (3) the Four. The scribe Cuphar (\makebox{\textbf{O}}) states in the colophon that he began it in a monastery of Gargar, and completed it in the monastery of the Theotokos at Mardin, A.Gr. 1781 (A.D. 1470). Gargar is a bishop’s see, suffragan to Melitene,† belonging therefore to the specially Jacobite region of N.E. Mesopotamia. Thus, in place as well as in date, it is closely akin to Cod. 11. In text, however, it leans less towards the A-type than either Cod. 11 or Cod. 3. Yet it agrees with the A-text in a few of the places above cited (under Codd. 3, 11); scil., 2 Pet. ii. 17, iii. 10, 13; 3 Joh. 10; Jud. 10: and, moreover, it has the very important A-readings 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (2 Pet. ii. 18), o prefixed to 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (Jud. 4), 1\makebox{\textbf{O}} (for 1\makebox{\textbf{O}}, ib. 7), none of which is given by 11, and only the first by 3. In the last-named place, however, it has evidently been

* As these 173 leaves would give room for other matter besides the Gospels, it may be that the Apocalypse followed them (as in Cod. 12).
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corrected from the Harklensian (see Note, p. 130 infr.), as was noted by Wetstein (Prolegomena in Clem. R., p. v [ad calc. N.T., 1752]). From this MS he edited (eodem anno) the [pseudo-]Epistles of Clement of Rome Ad Virgines,* which it appends to the Biblical text, as Cod. 9 (see p. xliv) appends other documents bearing the name of Clement.

Cod. 20. (The Peckover MS.)

This MS, the property of Lord Peckover, is a complete Peshitta New Testament, with our Four Epistles subjoined to the Three, and followed by the Pauline. Prefixed to them is the superscription “Four Epistles of the Apostles which are not found in all copies.” A note at the end of the volume describes it as “the New Testament, the Peshitta Version, exceedingly accurate.” Apparently, therefore, the scribe regarded our Epistles as belonging to that Version, though not always included in all copies of it. He gives, further, the date and place of writing,—“in the former Canun, A.Gr. 1787” (= Dec., a.d. 1475), “in the monastery of Jacob the Egyptian Recluse, beside Ṣalāch in Tūr-ʾAbdīn.”—Thus it was written under the same roof as Cod. 12, but some three hundred years later, its age being nearly the same as that of Codd. 11 and 13. Its text too is, on the whole, of the same intermediate character as theirs, but with much closer approach to that of the A-group. Yet it lapses into B-readings at a few signal points (notably 2 Pet. ii. 1, and iii. 10); while in the opposite direction it transgresses (like 13) by deviating (in three places, 2 Pet. i. 15, ii. 6, and Jud. 7)† after the Harklensian. But for these blemishes, it might almost rank as equal in excellence of text to Cod. 12, to which it adheres closely—even in the place where they both err with 1 in reading [אֶדֶן] for [אֶדֶן] (2 Pet. iii. 7).—Another peculiarity it exhibits in common with Codd. 1 and 2, but more frequently,—the insertion of B-readings on its margin while the A-reading stands in the text,—as 2 Pet. ii. 17, 18 (see pp. 109, 142, infr. ; and cp. Sect. xix, 4).‡

It appears, then, that of these four MSS, alike in their intermediate textual character, three at least (11, 13, 20) were written contempo-

* Since edited by Beelen (1856). See also under Cod. 19 infr.
† See Notes, pp. 101, 105, 180, infr.
‡ I have collated the text of our Epistles from photographs of this MS kindly given me by Dr. Rendel Harris, to whom I owe my knowledge of its existence.
raneously, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, and within the narrow region of Mesopotamia where the Jacobite Church at that time most prevailed, with Mardin as its patriarchal centre, and the Tûr-'Abdin district as its stronghold. Comparing the subdivision thus formed with that which comprises the three earlier MSS, 9, 12, 14, we perceive that in that region the tradition of the A-text as we find it exhibited in these twelfth-century copies survived, though more or less impaired in purity, down to the fifteenth. The characteristic form of the estrangela script, and the vellum, which are noted in the earlier three, in the latter three disappear; they are written on paper, in a cursive character,—as also is Cod. 3 (paper), a manuscript similar to them in script and in text, and probably of the same region, and not much earlier in date.

The affinities above noted between Codd. 12 and 20 are interesting evidence of the care with which, in the monastery where they were written, the tradition of the text was preserved.

(c) Of Recent Date.

Two other MSS of much later date may be here conveniently described, as being closely akin in textual character to the four last described; they are Codd. 18 and 19.

Cod. 18. (Library of the Convent of St. Catharine on Mt. Sinai, no. 5.*) Of all the MSS used in the text of this edition, this is the only one which I have not seen, either directly or as reproduced by photography. I know it only through a collation of it made by the late Professor Bensly in 1893, for which I am indebted to his kindness. In it the Four Epistles are a supplement to a late copy (on paper) of the Acts and Three Catholic Epistles (Peshitta), which is itself a supplement to a much earlier manuscript (on vellum, probably of sixth century) of the Pauline Epistles. In the letter which contains his collation, Prof. Bensly writes, “The above Catholic Epistles [2 Pet., 2 and 3 Joh., and Jud.] have been added in a hand apparently of last [xviiith] century.” The text, however, is farther removed from the B-type than that of any other of our entire list of twenty, except Cod. 1, and it is free from the errors above noted (p. xliii) as blemishes in that.

* In Catalogue (Mrs. Lewis’s), Studia Sinait., No. 1, pp. 2, 125.
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MS,—except the $\text{\joh}$ of 2 Pet. ii. 13 and Jud. 12. On the other hand, it has a few aberrations of its own, of which the most notable is recorded on p. 25 inf. (2 Joh. 10). Again, instead of omitting $\text{\ms}$ from 2 Pet. ii. 11, it (with Cod. 19) substitutes $\text{\ms}$ for $\text{\ms}$; and though it avoids the misreading of Cod. 8 in 3 Joh. 10 ($\text{\ms}$), it has instead the similarly erroneous $\text{\ms}$ of Cod. 9, which is found also in the Arabic. As to the original whence this copy was made, no information is forthcoming; it must have been a MS of the highest value. The Convent has no ecclesiastical connexion with Mesopotamia or any part of the Antiochian Patriarchate, being subject to the Patriarch of Jerusalem; but its connexion with the sister convent of the same dedication at Cairo points to Egypt as the region where the archetype of the MS is to be sought,—if so, presumably in the Syrian Convent of the Nitrian Desert, whence the Library of the British Museum and so many other libraries have drawn their most precious documents of Syriac literature and theology. However this may be, the isolation and remoteness of its abode enhances the value of the text of Cod. 18.

Cod. 19. (In the possession of Dr. Rendel Harris.)

This is the most recent MS of our list, being a transcript made within the last few years in the East. It is a MS (cursive, on paper) of the Commentaries of Bar Salibi on the New Testament, and gives the text of the Acts and Seven Catholic Epistles in full, Acts and the Three in Peshitta Version, followed by our Four, with a note prefixed describing them as "from Thomas of Harkel."* To these it subjoins (like Cod. 13) the Epistles of [ps.] Clement To Virgins. Its text, in point of adherence to the A-type, stands next after Cod. 20; yet of the two notable B-errors recorded against 20, it falls into but one ($\text{\ms}$ of 2 Pet. ii. 1),—while, on the other hand, it follows the Harklesian, with Cod. 20 and also Cod. 13, in its interpolation in Jud. 7 ($\text{\ms}$). About the exemplar whence this transcript was made, I have no information; but a singular misreading ($\text{\ms}$ for $\text{\ms}$, Jud. 24) indicates that it represents, directly or indirectly, an estrangela predecessor, for in that script (though not in cursive) $\text{\ms}$ might readily pass into $\text{\ms}$.

If these two MSS were not so recent, they would be entitled in point of text to take their places,—Cod. 18 in group A, Cod. 19 among

* This is a further instance of the tendency, above remarked on (p. xxxii), to confuse the two Versions.
those of the intermediate MSS which approach nearest to group A and are most free from the corruptions of group B.

(d) An Unclassed Fragment.

Another MS may be conveniently mentioned here, a fragment so brief that it cannot be classed definitely, but may be set down as of intermediate text.

Cod. 6. (Br. M., Add. 17115.) A pair of leaves, assigned by Dr. Wright to the ninth or tenth century, subjoined to a vellum MS (fragmentary), of sixth century, of SS. Matthew and John. They are numbered ff. 87, 88; and on the verso of 87 is given the text of Jude 1-13 (with lacunae). A few verses of Hebr. i. are on the recto, and of Acts vii. on f. 88.—Even in this short space the text shows affinity with that of Codd. 1 and 2, by reading $\delta\text{om\sigma}$ in ver. 2, $\text{\lambda\iota\nu\iota\iota}$ in 3, $\Delta\text{\nu\mu\nu}$ in 7, and (wrongly) $\text{\rho\sigma\sigma\tau\ \lambda\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\iota}$ in 12: but there are other points in which it sides with the B-group.

(iii.) MSS of Group B (Late).

The remaining six MSS, Codd. 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, form group B, and belong in date to the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries.

Cod. 7. (Br. M., Rich 7162, Catal. R.-F., xviii.)

Alone of the British Museum MSS of our list, this does not come from the Nitrian Convent. There is no reason to question the judgment laid down in the Rosen-Forshall Catalogue (p. 25, no. xviii) that it is Maronite; but Dr. Wright (Catal., Appx. A, p. 1203) corrects the date there given, and substitutes “fifteenth” for “fourteenth” century. It is a copy (paper) of the Acts and Epistles, very carefully written, but in text exhibiting almost uniformly the corrupt readings of the later MSS of this group. Yet it (along with Cod. 10) avoids the grave blunder of Cod. 8 in reading $\text{\rho\sigma\nu\lám\omeg}$ for $\text{\rho\sigma\nu\lám\opa}$ (3 Joh. 10); also (again with Cod. 10) it escapes the snare into which not only Cod. 8 but even Cod. 1 and others of the better MSS have fallen in the parallel passages, 2 Pet. ii. 13 and Jud. 2.

Cod. 8. (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Or. 119, Catal. 35).

This is the MS (Acts and Catholic Epistles, in Greek order; paper)

* Correct note on p. 31 accordingly.
whose text of our Four Epistles Pococke reproduced, with some well-judged emendations, in his *Editio Princeps* (II). “It is one of a collection of Oriental MSS presented to the Library by Paul Pindar in 1611 [the gift is entered in the Benefactors’ Book under the year 1612]. Pindar was consul at Aleppo from 1609 to 1611, and was requested by Bodley to get books there for the new Library. ... It seems most probable that Pindar had the copy made, and that Fadhlallah bar-Jacob” [who signs it as scribe] “was employed on it about 1610. It cannot be earlier.”* Whether the scribe was Jacobite or Maronite does not appear. Either would be easily found at Aleppo;† but Dr. Payne Smith’s judgment that he was Jacobite (*Catal.,* col. 109) is probably right, as appears from the request at the end of the volume for the prayers of the μητροθόθοος—the ὑποθέτοος, as the Jacobites styled themselves. Yet it is not certain that this title was assumed exclusively (as μητροθοος, “the Faithful,” was) by them. Its text unquestionably agrees most closely with that of MSS known to be Maronite,—as Codd. 10, 15 (below), and the copies used by Etzel and by Gabriel Sionita. It is unfortunate that so admirable an editor as Pococke did not light upon a better MS; its text is, on the whole, the most corrupt of all that are forthcoming.

10. (Ussher’s MS, Trinity College Library, Dublin, B. 5. 16, *Catal.* 1509.)

The history of this MS is similar to that of Cod. 8, and its date is but little later (1625). Thomas Davies, a British merchant at Aleppo, procured it for Ussher with other transcripts, all on paper, most of them in the same hand, from the Lebanon region. The handwriting identifies the scribe as being the Joseph bar David, of Van in Lebanon, who in 1627 wrote in the Maronite Convent of Kenobin the greater part of a Syriac Old Testament, formerly in Ussher's collection,

* I quote these words from a memorandum kindly furnished by Mr. Cowley, Sub-Librarian of Bodley’s Library.

† A few years later (1624–27), Thomas Davies, residing at Aleppo, was able to find scribes to make transcripts for Ussher of many Syriac MSS; among others, a Peshitta Old Testament (now in Bodl. Library, Or. 141), the joint work of “Joseph of Van on Mount Lebanon” (a *Maronite* therefore) and “Cyriacus, Jacobite Priest and Monk.” It was copied from a MS at the Convent of Kenobin on Lebanon, where the Maronite Patriarch resided. See below, under Cod. 10. See also *Ussher’s Works*, vol. xv, pp. 215, 376; and Bodl. *Catal.*, coll. 10, 14.
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now in the Bodleian (Bod. Or. 161).* The contents of Cod. 10 are, in Ussher's words, "those parcels of the New Testament, viz. the History of the Adulterous Woman, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle of Jude, with the Book of the Revelation,"†—that is, the portions of the New Testament which the Peshitta lacks. They are placed in the order as named above by Ussher; but the quire-signatures show that the Revelation originally stood first.—Its text of the Epistles is very closely in agreement with that of Cod. 7, and it also has points of coincidence with that of the Polyglots where they differ from Cod. 8.—From it the Syriac text of the passage, John vii. 53—viii. 12 (the "Pericope de Adultera"), was first printed (1631), by De Dieu (in his Commentarius in Evangelia, p. 443), to whom Ussher lent this and other MSS; and a few years later it was inserted in the Gospel text of Walton’s Polyglot (1657), whence it has passed into all subsequent printed editions. It is disfigured by an egregious blunder—the omission of the negative in ver. 11, so as to read "Go and sin more"! The [presumably] accordingly appears in brackets in the text as printed by De Dieu and by Walton.—This MS was long supposed to be lost, the account of it by Ussher (as above) having been misunderstood as describing a complete Syriac New Testament.‡


This is a (paper) MS of earlier date than Codd. 8 and 10, but ranks in age with Cod. 7, being dated [A.D.] 1482 § (אלא). It was written at Kuzhaye (אודד) in the Lebanon.|| It appears to have been originally a copy of the Seven Catholic Epistles, on six small quires, or rather semi-quires (paper); but the first three are missing, and thus James and most of 1 Peter are lost. What remains of 1 Peter is Peshitta, and it and 2 Peter occupy quire 4. Quire 5 (presumably containing 1 John (Peshitta)) is also missing; 2 and 3 John and Jude fill three leaves of quire 6, the fourth leaf being blank. After this is inserted a smaller leaf, containing the Pericope de Adultera. It seems clear that this

* Catal., coll. 1, 10.
‡ For a full account of it, see my Memoir in Transactions of R.I.A., vol. xxvii, pp. 269 et sqq.
§ Zotenberg, Catal., p. 22, wrongly says 1582.
|| See Thes. Syr., s.v.
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copy has been intentionally mutilated, in order to separate (so far as the quire-arrangement would permit) the non-Peshitta portions from the rest.—Its text of 2 and 3 John and Jude is of the B-type. As regards 2 Peter, it is not available for our purposes, for it offers a translation distinct from Peshitta and Harklesian alike, otherwise unknown, and of no merit,—of interest only as showing how widely a really independent version will deviate from previous ones. The Pericope of this MS also differs much from all other known texts (except one; see p. 45 infr.).

17. (Bodl. Libr., Dawk. 23 (1), Catal. 34.)

This is a fragmentary copy of 2 and 3 John and Jude only; filling three mutilated paper leaves, probably of the seventeenth century (or later;—"haud ita antiquum" is Dr. Payne Smith's judgment).* They are prefixed to a New Testament, perhaps as old as the fourteenth century, which appears to have come from Egypt, its leaves being numbered in Coptic figures. Its text is of the B-type, yet not so uniformly as 7, 8, and 10. Its mutilated condition, its late date, and the absence of indication of place, render it almost useless as a witness to the text.


This is vol. 5 of a Syriac Bible (paper), written in Paris 1675. Its text of our Epistles is of the same type as that of the preceding five. But as it dates thirty years after the printing of the Epistles in the Paris Polyglot, it cannot rank as an independent witness, and I have not included it among my authorities, except for the Pericope, which it inserts in its place after John vii. 52.]

Thus it appears (a) that all the four MSS which most constantly attest the B text are Maronite (7, 8, 10, 15), in date ranging from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century; and (b) that no Maronite copy belongs to Group A, or to the Intermediate list. Hence, combining these results with those stated above (pp. xlii, l) as to the Earlier and Intermediate MSS, we find reason to believe that these witnesses to the text may be classified in place as well as in date,—that there is a group from N.E. Mesopotamia (Jacobite), and a group from the Lebanon (Maronite); the latter closely coincident with group B, the former including group A and part of the Intermediate.

* Catal., no. 34, col. 106.
SECTION XIII.—Authorities for our Text: Editions.

Above (p. xx,—see also p. 4 infr.) I have related the main facts of the first printing of these Epistles (by Pococke (II), 1630), and of their first appearance in their place as part of a complete Syriac New Testament (in the Paris Polyglot (P), 1645). On one or both of these editions all subsequent texts of these Epistles are founded. Some (as Gutbir's Syriac N.T., 1664) give a text slightly amended—apparently by conjecture*: for two only, Dr. Lee's (L, of 1816 and 1820), and Dr. Perkins' (N, New York, 1886), has fresh MS authority been obtained (see pp. xliv, xlix, supr.). But Pococke's text has not been borrowed by the Paris editor (Sionita): a careful comparison of the two shows plainly that the latter represents an exemplar distinct from, and appreciably better than, Pococke's cod. 8;—and thus avoids one or two of the worst errors of the Editio Princeps (e.g., [B] for [B], 2 Pet. i. 4; [N] for [N], 3 Joh. 10).—The London Polyglot (A), 1653, simply reproduces the Paris text, with variations so few and petty as to be probably due to inadvertence (as the omission of [A] in 2 Pet. iii. 10). The editor (Thorndike) seems to have neglected Pococke's text altogether.—It is to be noted that Sionita was—and it may be assumed as certain that his MS. also, like Pococke's must have been—Maronite.—For L, see Dr. Lee's account in Classical Journal (cited above, p. xlv, note †). It was issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. To the American Bible Society is due the edition (N) of 1886, and its precursors—their Syriac Bible, printed (1841) at Urmi in Persia, and reprinted at New York (1874). As noted above (pp. xliv, xlvii), the MSS (11, 13) whence L and N have derived their emendations of the text of our Epistles are Tur'abdinese.

SECTION XIV.—Authorities for our Text: Versions.

Under this head I deal only with the secondary Versions which are known to have been made from our Syriac and not from the Greek. There are but two such:—(a) the Latin of Etzel ("etz," printed in 1612), and the Arabic ("arb," printed in 1897 by Dr. Merx,† and in 1899 by Mrs. Gibson, Studia Sinaitica, No. vii).

* The useful Syriac N.T. of Schaaf (1708) gives in an Appendix a convenient summary of the variations of Pococke's, the Polyglot, and Gutbir's texts.
† From a transcript made by Mrs. Burkitt (Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie, Dec. 1897).
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(a) Of Etzel and his Latin translation, and the publication of it, a sufficient account has been briefly given above (p. xx.—see also p. 4 infr.). Here it is only necessary to repeat that the exemplar (not now forthcoming) whose text it represents was Maronite, and to add that it agrees in the main with the B-text,—though with some exceptions, of which the most considerable are,—ο for ἐθετό (καὶ ἀθετήτης, 2 Pet. ii. 3), ἐπίμα (τίμια, for τιμάς, ib. 4), ἀλαθνος (λαλαπος, for ἀλαθνος, 2 Pet. ii. 17), and ὑπομνησθη (ὑπομνήσω, for ὑπομνήσθηνι, 3 Joh. 10). It thus avoids in all these places the errors of Cod. 8, in which (except the last) Codd. 7, 10, and P share; and is to be classed perhaps (with 3) as intermediate, rather than with the B-group.

(b) Of the Arabic, there will be occasion to treat further in another Section (xviii, p. lxvi): here a few facts only need be stated. The MS* no. 154 of the Library of St. Catharine's Convent on Mt. Sinai (see p. 4 infr.) contains the only known copy of this Version. This MS includes (with other documents) the Acts and Catholic Epistles in Arabic, all seven in their Greek order. I have no knowledge of Arabic, and make no claim to judge of the Version as a whole. But it is pronounced by Professor Burkitt (to whom I owe my first knowledge of its evidence) and by other competent Arabic scholars to be translated from the Syriac as above stated. As regards our Four Epistles, the fact (of which I am assured) that it represents (2 Pet. ii. 13) the reading, on all hands admitted to be a blunder, οσιλανυιο (ἰμαρίους), for οσιλανυιον (ἀγάπας)—a blunder impossible in Greek but easy in Syriac—suffices to prove the Arabic translator to have worked on the Syriac as his basis, not on the Greek.—The Acts (mutilated in the early parts) and the Three Epistles follow the Peshitta; the Four, our Version.† The text of these latter, as represented by it, is largely but not uniformly of the B-type. Thus, while it follows the B-readings which represent κοσμω, ἀνωθεν, καλιν (2 Pet. i. 3, 4; ii. 1, 17; iii. 1), the doubled και χαιρεν (2 Joh. 10), ὑπο πυρ (Jud. 7),—on the other hand it avoids many others, such as σπουδαστε, γελοιον, οιχ (before ειρεθησεται) (2 Pet. i. 15, ii. 18, iii. 10), and the significant omission of και before

* See Mrs. Gibson's Catalogue of Arabic MSS in Convent of St. Catharine (Studia Sinaitica, no. iii).
† See Mrs. Gibson's Introduction, p. viii, to her edition, as above (p. lvii); also her Appendix, pp. 52 et sqq.
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Κεριον (Jud. 4). On the whole, however, it leans decidedly to the B-side. If it is rightly assigned, as Mrs. Gibson with other authorities of the highest competence assign it on palaeographic grounds, to the ninth century, it is, as a witness in great measure to the B-text, coeval with our oldest witness to the A-text (Cod. 1). And thus it proves that many of the most serious corruptions of the B-text are not, as the MS evidence would otherwise lead us to conclude, recent in date and Maronite in origin.

Section XV.—The Text of the Earlier as against the Later MSS adopted in this Edition.

From the materials described in the foregoing Section the text of the present Edition has been formed, irrespective of all previous printed texts. All those texts are based ultimately, as we have seen, on two manuscripts—one, our Cod. 8, the other not now forthcoming,—which are reproduced, the former in the Editio Princeps, the latter in the Paris Polyglot;—the former being (see p. liv supra) of the seventeenth century, the latter nearly identical with it in text, and probably little if at all earlier in date. One or other of these has been assumed as the Textus Receptus by subsequent editors; two only of whom (both of the nineteenth century) have corrected it here and there—Dr. Lee in L after Cod. 9, and the American editor in N, after Cod. 11.* The text of all these, even of L and N, presents a considerable number of readings which diverge widely from the text of the original as attested by Greek authorities, most of these divergences being unconfirmed by any other evidence. Many, but not all, of these divergent readings have been made known to Biblical students in the Apparatus subjoined to Tischendorf's Greek Testament (eighth edition).†—The text as now presented, based on the combined testimony of some twenty manuscripts, varying in date from the ninth century to the seventeenth or later (including every one which I have been able directly or indirectly to reach), and thus completely reconstructed, will be found to differ frequently—in not a few places materially—from the text as hitherto edited.—The

* See p. Ivii supra.
† Tischendorf cites the Syriac New Testament from Schaaf's edition (or rather from the Latin version attached to its text) as "Syr[...]", except in the Four Epistles, where he writes "Syr[...]"; assuming Schaaf to have uniformly repeated Pococke's text, which is not always the fact. See my article in Hermathena, vol. vii, pp. 281 et seqq.
twofold result of this process has been that (chiefly on the authority of the older manuscripts)—

(1°) The weight of our Version as a textual authority, in many cases of dispute as to the reading of the Greek, is transferred from one side to the other:

(2°) The greater part of the readings which deviated most widely from the consensus of the Greek authorities disappear.

Connected with head (2°), another result appears:—that

(3°) The text of the Philoxenian is brought closer to that of the Harklensian.

Every instance of such approximation is to be accounted as a confirmation, by the authority of the Harklensian, of the textual evidence on which our emendation of the Philoxenian has been made,—the evidence (that is) of our earlier group of Philoxenian manuscripts.—Or, to state the case more justly, in each such instance the Harklensian is to be recognised as the earliest witness to the true text of its Philoxenian prototype—its testimony, which is that of a careful scholar, not of a mere transcriber, reaching back to a date (614) long prior to that of any extant copy, little more than a century later than the date (508) when the Philoxenian was given to the Syriac-speaking Church.

SECTION XVI.—The Text of the Later MSS upheld by Professor Merx.

Another view of the facts disclosed by the collation of our manuscripts is, however, possible. It may be said that in these earlier manuscripts of the Philoxenian we have it, not in its genuine and original form, but as re-handled by some editor or editors in order to bring it into conformity with the Harklensian revision; while the later manuscripts preserve the text as derived by them from copies that had escaped such meddling of correctors. Such a view has in fact been put forward by Professor Merx. This eminent scholar holds that the true text of the Philoxenian is on the whole correctly exhibited by our later manuscripts and the printed editions based on them. The readings of our earlier manuscripts he rejects as corruptions in the form of editorial corrections: the agreement of the Harklensian with these he sets down not as testimony in their favour but as indications that it is the source whence they have been derived.—In confirmation of this judgment, and to meet the prima facie improbability of the later copies
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having preserved the original form of the text more truly than the earlier, he invokes the support of the Arabic Version, which (as above shown) was made not from the Greek but from the Philoxenian, of which Version the only known copy is supposed to be of the ninth century,—older therefore than any of our manuscripts except probably Cod. I, which bears date A.Gr. 1134 (A.D. 823). This secondary Version, in many (yet not in all) instances, proves to agree with the readings of our later copies as embodied in the ordinary printed text; and Dr. Merx accepts it as decisive in favour of that text against the evidence of our earlier copies.

In Professor Merx's view, then, the readings in which the ordinary printed text, with the bulk of the later manuscripts of the Philoxenian,—as against the text now presented, amended after the earlier manuscripts—diverges from the Greek as read by all other authorities, are not mere errors of transcription in the Syriac, but represent genuine (but otherwise unattested) variants in the Greek exemplar which the Philoxenian translator has faithfully reproduced. And on the other hand, our earlier manuscripts present a text which, though more nearly conformed to that of other witnesses, is not the Philoxenian as originally issued, but as re-handled by editors who have corrected it into conformity with the Harklensian, which adheres closely to the Greek.

These two opposite views of the facts presented by the manuscripts of Philoxenian text admit of an easy comparative test, addressed to the eye as well as to the understanding.

SECTION XVII.—Professor Merx's Theory tested by Juxtaposition of Examples of rival Readings.

Let us write down, side by side, some leading examples of the readings in which the manuscripts of our later differ from those of our earlier group, placing under each the corresponding Greek, and judge in each case by inspection whether of the two hypotheses is more probable,—that the Syriac as exhibited by the later group is a scribes' perversion of the earlier,—or, that it represents a variant which, though found in no extant Greek manuscript and supported by no other Version, really existed in the underlying Greek.

As above, in Section xii, we call the earlier group A;—the later, B. It will be found that, in every case, the Syriac as given by printed texts and the B-group represents a reading of the Greek which is not known—and which resembles none that is known—to the Greek
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witnesses;—whereas it is readily accounted for as a facile and obvious corruption of the Syriac as exhibited by the A-group and adopted thence into our emended text.

(i.) I place first a few examples chosen because they serve the purpose of this Section in the most convincing manner,—the Greek evidence being, in each and all of them, unanimous, with the A-text and against the B-text.*

(a) 2 Pet. i. 4 (τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα).
With A, we read \[\text{μοῖοοῖς}\] for \[\text{μοῖοοῖς}\] of B
= (all Greek) ἐπαγγέλματα \(\neq\) ἐπιγνώσεις† (unattested).

Here it seems impossible to doubt that B represents a Syriac scribe's blunder, between two words which to eye and ear present but small and easily overlooked difference, though in sense widely remote. The other alternative is barely admissible, that the Greek exemplar, which the Philoxenian represents, really read ἐπιγνώσεις or ἐπιστήματα (or any word equivalent), alien to the purport of the passage and unconfirmed by other evidence—that B has preserved this genuine Philoxenian reading, and that A has been tampered by a corrector so as to bring it into conformity with the current Greek text and the Harklensian.—This latter explanation perverts the facts; it accounts for the B-readings by a complicated hypothesis assuming the existence of an unsuitable and otherwise unknown Greek variant, and supposing an imaginary editor to have borrowed from the Harklensian the reading as now found in the A-text.—The former explanation is, on the contrary, simple and natural; it merely alleges a common and very minute error of transcription. I have therefore unhesitatingly adopted the A-reading into the reconstructed text of this Edition.

(b) 2 Pet. ii. 1 (ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ).
With A, we read \[\text{καθαρός}\] for \[\text{καθαρός}\] of B
= (all Greek) ἐν τῷ λαῷ \(\neq\) ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (unattested).

Here the facts are similar to those of example (a): and the like alternative is set before us. The B-reading is unworthy of considera-

* The lists of passages set forth under this head and the following are not meant to be exhaustive, but merely to give a sufficient view of the facts. It is limited to examples in which the Greek authorities are unanimous or nearly so.
† Or possibly (to suit the context), the neuter ἐπιστήματα (in the sense of σημεία).
tion, lacking all support and unsuited to the context. It cannot be accepted as representing a variant in the Greek, and is to be dismissed as an instance of a very common mistake into which Syriac scribes are notoriously apt to fall,* of writing before (or before, or for) , to which it is so similar in form.

(c) 2 Pet. ii. 17 (ανάλαπτος ἑλαφρόνειαν).
With A, we read \( \text{ανάλαπτος} \) for \( \text{δείγμα} \) of B
= (all Greek) \( \text{ανάλαπτος} \) (unattested).

[The resemblance between the Syr. words is still more marked in estrangela, as \( \text{λάβε} \) for \( \text{λάβε} \).]

Of this example the same is to be said as of the previous ones; and the error in the Syriac arises here, as in (b), from the similarity to the eye between and to which it is so similar in form.

(d) 2 Pet. ii. 18 (ὑπερογκα γάρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι).
With A we read \( \text{ὑπερογκα} \) for \( \text{συνεργασία} \) of B
= (all Greek) \( \text{γάρ} \) (unattested).

This is an example exactly parallel to (a), (b), and (c).

(e) 2 Pet. iii. 1 (διεγείρω τὴν εἰλικρίνη διάνοιαν).
With A we read \( \text{διεγείρω} \) for \( \text{διεγείρω} \) of B
= (all Greek) \( \text{εἰλικρίνη} \) (unattested),

Another like example.

(f) 3 Joh. 10 (λόγοις ποιηροῖς φλαναρῶν ὑμᾶς).
With A we read \( \text{λόγοις} \) for \( \text{λόγοις} \) of B
= (all Greek) \( \text{φλαναρῶν} \) (unattested).

A sixth example; all of these being cases in which the Greek evidence is unanimous, and all the MSS of A-group agree with it.

To these may be added another, in which also the Greek evidence is unanimous, but the A-MSS, though unanimous as against B, are not fully agreed among themselves.

(g) Jud. 7 (πρόκειναι δείγμα πυρός).
With A we read \( \text{πρόκειναι} \) for \( \text{δείγμα} \) (unattested).

* See e.g., Matth. i. 21, where the Curetonian makes, while Peshitta and Sinaitic avoid, the same mistake between these words.
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Some of the A-group exhibit the (apparently conflate) ἸΔαυλ2 Δαυλ2 ἴπο δείγμα πυρός. But whichever of the A-readings is right, the B-reading is equally due to the resemblance between ἸΔαυλ2 and Δαυλ2, leading to the omission of the former.

It will be noticed that in each and all of the above examples, the B-text is not only uncorroborated but (with the exception of example (e) where the B-reading is merely commonplace and pointless) is in itself improbable as being unsuited to the context in which it is found. This fact would not, of course, disprove the possibility that such readings existed in the exemplar used by the Philoxenian translator, though they would lower its value as a textual witness. — But another feature, likewise found in common in all these examples without exception, cannot be thus dismissed from consideration. It is this, that (as above pointed out) in every case there is apparent to eye and ear a close resemblance between the Syriac words wherein A and B differ — words utterly remote from one another in meaning — which compels us to infer that one word has been written by mistake for the other; while the Greek words represented by them are quite dissimilar inter se. For this fact Professor Merx has not accounted; on his theory it is a mere accident that ἸΔαυλ2 and Δαυλ2 look so much alike, and ἸΔαυλ2 and Δαυλ2, ἸΔαυλ2 and Δαυλ2, — while there is no likeness between ἔπιγνώσεις (or ἔπιστήματα) and ἐπαγγέλματα, κόσμῳ and λαῷ, ἀνωθεν and λαὶλαπος, γελοῖον and ὑπέρογκα, καλὴν and εἰλικρινή, ποιῶν and φιλναρῶν, ὑπὸ πῦρ and δείγμα πυρός. — If indeed such likeness, however close, appeared in but one instance, it might be set down to chance, though it would justify us in suspecting a mistake in that instance. But recurring as it does in every instance, it warrants us in drawing confidently the general conclusion that the outward resemblance between two Syriac words, and not the existence of a Greek variant, has caused the B-text to deviate from the A-text and from the Greek. For it cannot be a mere accident that in every one of these examples two dissimilar Greek words should be represented by two Syriac words so nearly alike in written (or spoken) form that either might readily be by inadvertence substituted for the other. Then, as between the two Syriac words which in each case have by their similarity led to the disagreement of the texts, we are bound to accept the one which by
its own fitness and by all Greek evidence is attested as right, and
to reject the other as a mere error of transcription.

(ii.) The following examples are less conclusive only in that the
B-reading is a possible variant in the Greek though not recorded as
such,—or, as in example (i), an actual though weakly attested variant.

(h) 2 Pet. i. 4 (τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια).
With A we read  for (of B = (all Gr.) καὶ τίμια (unattested).

(i) 2 Pet. i. 15 (σπονδάσω ἐχεῖν υμᾶς).
With A we read  for = (nearly all Gr.) σπονδάσω (3 Gr. mss only) σπονδάσατε.

(j) 2 Pet. i. 16 (οὐ γὰρ ... ἐγνωρίσαμεν υμῖν).
With A we read  for = (all Gr.) ἐγνωρίσαμεν.

(k) 2 Joh. 6 (יוa περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ).
With A we read  for = (all Gr.) τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ (unattested).

(l) 3 Joh. 9 (ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν).
With A we read  for = (all Gr.) αὐτῶν (unattested).

(m) Jud. 2 (εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθεῖη).
With A we read  for = ἐμῶν (unattested).

(iii.) A third class of examples (which might have been classed under
i.) consists of passages where B, against A (and the Greek), omits or
inserts letters (mostly prefixes) or small words, which might easily be
overlooked or interpolated. Some of these are material to the meaning
or connexion.—Such are—

2 Pet. ii. 3, for πονεῖ (λόγων for καὶ λόγους); ii. 6, om o before  (καὶ before πόλεις); ii. 8, om  after  (ὁ before δίκαιος); iii. 5, om ἐὰν (γὰρ after λανθάνει); iii. 10, ἑάτε  before  (οὐχ before εἰρεθήσεται); iii. 13, om  after  (κανίν after γῆν); 2 Joh. 5, om ἁμαρτάνω before  (ὁς before ἐντολήν); Jud. 4, om o prefix to  
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With these may be classed, 2 Joh. 10, the repetition of χαί (καὶ χαίρειν); 3 Joh. 6, the omission (by homeoteleuton of ἔν) of Λαύρης (προπέμψας); also, Jud. 10, of Ἱλαύρης (ἀλογα before ζελα). Most of these examples, though trivial to the eye, affect the text appreciably—some of them gravely. The reading of 2 Pet. iii. 10 is of great critical interest; the omission from 3 Joh. 6 leaves the passage unmeaning; that from Jud. 4 (of a single letter) appears to be an intentional tampering with the text in mistaken zeal, to compel it to attest the Godhead of Our Lord.

In all of them, the B-text is absolutely without Greek support, and its deviations can only be ascribed to inexactness on the part of the scribes. Under this head therefore we have further confirmation of our estimate of it as being untrustworthy where it is opposed to the A-text.

SECTION XVIII.—The Arabic Version and the B-text.

Turning now to the Arabic Version and the support it lends to the B-text,—which is really the only fact of importance that has been adduced in favour of that text,—it is to be noted that its support is by no means given to all the B-readings. Thus under head i., it sides with A against B in two (d, f) of the seven examples there cited (representing with A, ὑπεργον of 2 Pet. ii. 18, φιλανρων of 3 Joh. 10). Likewise under head ii., in one out of six (σπονθάσω of 2 Pet. i. 15). Under iii. there are eleven examples, in but three of which the Arabic agrees with B;—namely, να (γαρ) in 2 Pet. ii. 3, the omission of —γαρ (οἱ ἁγ) in 2 Pet. iii. 5, and the insertion of a second χαίρειν (καὶ χαίρειν) in 2 Joh. 10. Of the remaining eight, in which the Arabic supports the A-text, some are very important.

The evidence therefore of this secondary Version (under heads i. and ii.) merely proves that of those corruptions of the B-text which are due to mistake between words which look and sound alike, most are as early as the tenth or even the ninth century,—older than the manuscript evidence alone would have led us to suppose,—though probably later by three centuries than the time of Philoxenus. But its evidence under head iii. proves further that the B-text, where it errs in the matter of inconspicuous (yet, as the examples of 2 Pet. iii. 10, Jud. 7 prove, far from insignificant) insertions or omissions, has suffered not a little from the carelessness of transcribers of much more recent date.
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SECTION XIX.—The Harklensian Version and the A-text.

1. As regards the coincidences between the A-text and the Harklensian, and the suggestion that they are due to editorial corrections made in the former to conform it to the latter, I have remarked (pp. 98, 99, 110, infr.) on the perversity of the criticism to which that suggestion belongs. I have now to point out that (as we have seen in last Section that the Arabic does not always corroborate the B-text, so likewise) the A-text is not uniformly in agreement with the Harklensian. As we there saw that A sometimes has the Arabic on its side, so we now meet the counter fact that B sometimes (though rarely) has erred in company with the Harklensian. A notable instance of this occurs 2 Pet. i. 15, where the Harklensian leads, and all the B-group (but not the Arabic) with most of the intermediate follow, in adopting against the A-group the plainly erroneous reading σπονδάσατε. So again, 2 Pet. ii. 10, the Harklensian with the B-text, not the A-text, reads ἐν ἐπιθυμίας for ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ; ib., 11, omits παρὰ Κυρίῳ; and, 2 Joh. 5, omits ὡς before ἐντολήν. In these cases therefore Professor Merx's theory of the A-text fails absolutely.

2. Further, even in the cases where the A-group agrees (as against the B-group) with the Harklensian as regards the Greek text represented, it differs as regards the Syriac word employed.—Thus, (a) 2 Pet. i. 4, the Harklensian is with A against B in representing παγγέλματα (see Sect. xvii, head i., a, p. ixii); but the Syriac equivalent used by Harklensian is ḫaḏša,—not (as Philoxenian, A-text) ḫaḏē. Again, (β) Ib., Harkl. (head ii., h, p. lxv) renders τίμια by ṣalā—not (as Philox., A) by ṣalā (which is rather = τιμητά). Again, (γ) 3 Joh. 6, Harkl. (head iii., p. lxv) renders προσέμψας by ḫalāt—not (as Philox., A) by ḩalā. Lastly, (δ) Jud. 10, Harkl. (again head iii., p. lxvi) renders αλογα by ḫalātāt—,—not (as Philox., A) by ḩalātāt. It is obvious that if the A-readings in these places were corrections made by an editor of the Philoxenian to assimilate it to the Harklensian, the assimilation would have extended to the Syriac equivalent employed, as well as to the Greek text followed.

3. Moreover, in one of the above examples, the Harklensian, in discarding the A-rendering, attests the A-reading against the B-reading,—namely, 3 Joh. 6. Here, its margin, though its text renders προσέμψας
more exactly by ḫlō, retains as an alternative the ṣēm of the A-text which the B-text omits.—A like case occurs, 2 Pet. iii. 10, where the Harklensian, though in its text it adopts the rival reading of some Greek authorities (κατακαθίστησαί for the better attested ἐπιβηθήσεται which the Philoxenian follows), on its margin records the ḫlō of the latter,—but in so doing confirms our A-text by omitting the negative ḫ (= oφ) which the B-group interpolates before it. Thus these two Harklensian notes prove not only (as pointed out in a previous Section) that the translator had the Philoxenian before him, but that he had it in the form exhibited by group A, not by group B.—It is worth while in passing to remark that in the case of this last-cited passage, the facts are against Professor Merx’s theory in three respects. For the A-reading (ἐπιβηθήσεται without the oφ of B) (1) cannot be borrowed from the Harklensian, which in its text substitutes κατακαθίστησαί for ἐπιβηθήσεται:—(2) is not contradicted, but supported, by the Arabic in omitting the negative:—(3) is actually attested by the Harklensian margin where it is placed as an alternative to the reading of the text.*

Finally, an examination of the MSS discloses other facts worthy of record as bearing on the matter in hand.

4. Where the MSS of the A-group show traces, as here and there happens, of the corrector’s hand, the corrections are in the direction not of the Harklensian, but of the B-text. Even the earliest and best of them, Cod. 1, has been so dealt with in two places, where a later hand has introduced B-readings:—2 Pet. i. 4, [סח] ( = τιμάως); and so 2 Pet. iii. 1, [חח] ( = καλ|$).† Similarly in Cod. 2, the B-interpolation [ח] ( = oφ) has been placed in the margin of 2 Pet. iii. 10.‡ Also Cod. 20, which, though of fifteenth century, has a text largely coinciding with A, in three places where it exhibits A-readings inserts the B-readings in its margin:—2 Pet. ii. 17 (text, [חח]; marg., [חח]): ii. 18 (text, *[חח]; marg., [חח]): iii. 16 (text, [חח]; marg., [חח]).§

5. Where instances are detected, as admittedly happens now and

* Note that, e contra, the very recent Cod. 19 inserts on its margin the Syr. equivalent for the κατακαθίστησαί of Harkl.
† See pp. 10, 18, 98, 113 infr.
‡ See pp. 20, 115 infr.
§ See pp. 142, 143 infr.
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then, of tampering with the text of our MSS with the purpose of conforming it to the Harklensian, they occur not in the A-group, but in some of the later MSS which are intermediate in text between it and the B-group, and give to the latter only a partial and intermittent support,—namely, Codd. 5, 11, 13, 19, 20.* Of these, 11, 13, 20 (good copies written with scholarly care) are of the later part of the fifteenth century; 19 is a very recent transcript of unknown origin; 5 alone has a claim, though a doubtful one, to be assigned to the twelfth, and the Harklensian note found in it is by a later hand.

SECTION XX.—Summary.

On these grounds then (explained more fully in detail in the Supplemental Notes) I submit that we are bound to reject the theory which attributes to editorial manipulation the large agreement of the A-text with the Harklensian. That agreement is due to the fidelity (1) of the early caligraphers who produced the A-group of MSS, and (2) of the Harklensian reviser in reproducing all that he retained of the original Philoxenian,—so that in his Version we have the best, and (by two centuries) the earliest, witness to the authentic Philoxenian text.—And in confident reliance on the basis (confirmed by this attestation) furnished by our earlier codices, I present the text constructed on it, as a restoration, complete so far as the extant evidence warrants, of the text of these Epistles as it came, just fourteen centuries ago, from the translator's hands.

SECTION XXI.—The Underlying Greek Text.

The Syriac Text, thus restored, is represented with the closest attainable exactness in the Greek Text subjoined to it. By reference to this, and to the appended foot-notes, which contain an ample Apparatus Criticus of the various readings of the Greek, a reader though unacquainted with Syriac may obtain an accurate knowledge of the textual evidence yielded by our Version, and of the relation which the Greek Text represented by it bears to that of the principal

* See pp. 101 and footnote, 103, 130 infr. Other instances are found in Cod. 15, which is one (though the earliest) of the B-group, and exhibits Harklensian readings throughout, and moreover gives 2 Pet. in the Harkl. version.
Greek witnesses severally—especially the seven available uncials (N A B C K L P)—and to that of the Latin and other primary Versions.

For my own guidance in this part of my work, I have made a Table of the passages in which the seven vary appreciably inter se (neglecting variations of such nature as to be incapable of reproduction in Syriac), and have noted the agreements of each MS with the texts attested by the Philoxenian and the Harklensian severally. It is unnecessary to print this Table at length; but it is worth while to state the results it yields, which are as follows.

1. The passages it includes are in number 115. In these, the instances in which the Philoxenian text agrees with each several uncial are:—With N, 65; with A, 60; with B, 53; with C, 44; with K, 51; with L, 55; with P, 51.—It is to be borne in mind that C lacks 2 John, and that but for this defect its figure would presumably exceed 50. Setting it aside then as doubtful, we learn that, of the rest, N and A support our text in rather more than half the 115 places; B and the three later MSS (K L P) in rather less than half,—the highest number of instances of agreement being markedly with N, the lowest with K and P.

2. Moreover, the important result discloses itself (briefly stated by anticipation above in Section xi, a, p. xxxix), that the agreements of our Philoxenian with the Harklensian are more numerous than with any of these Greek texts,—being 76 in all, about two-thirds of the 115 passages recorded in my Table. Besides these, it has been pointed out above (xi, b, p. xl) that there are some twenty places in which Philoxenian and Harklensian agree together against the consent of the semi-uncials and all other Greek authority.—These facts, taken together, demonstrate forcibly the closeness of the textual affinity that subsists between these Versions.

To estimate the comparative value of the texts followed by them severally, and to investigate the character of each, would be an interesting task; but it lies outside the range of this Introduction.

December, 1908.
INTRODUCTION

Postscript.—The Pericope de Adultera.

Concerning the Syriac MSS in which the passage, John vii. 53—viii. 12, is to be found, sufficient particulars will be found on p. 3 infr. (see also pp. 41—49, 87—92). The facts may be summed up as follows:

1. Its translation into Syriac, in the form in which it appears in Walton's Polyglot and subsequent Syriac New Testaments (distinguished as I., p. 41 infr.), is ascribed in some copies, including the earliest, to "the Abbot Paul, who found it in Alexandria" (see pp. 41, 42 infr.), presumably the Paul of Tella of the early seventh century, to whom we owe the Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament (see Introduction to Part II, infr.).* Of the eight copies of it (p. 3 infr.), cited in the Apparatus which accompanies the text (Codd. a, b, c, d, e, f, 10, 16), one only (16) reads it in the Gospel text (Peshitta), one only (b) as part of a Lection from the Gospel (Peshitta), one only (e) in the Gospel text (Harklensian). The rest include it as an extract (as f, 10, 15), or (as c) append it to, or (as d) set it on the margin of, the Fourth Gospel (Harkl.), or finally (as a, the oldest) write it on a fly-leaf of an early MS of the Peshitta Gospels.†—Another recension of the narrative, infr., p. 45, differing only in wording, is found in Codd. g and 15; the former of which includes it in the Peshitta text of the Gospel, the latter inserts it on a separate leaf attached to a copy of the Catholic Epistles.—Of the above, the two (Codd. g and 16), which alone treat it as part of the Peshitta Gospel text, are of the seventeenth century.

2. The story in a form substantially different, of which the Syriac text is preserved in the eighth Book (ch. vii.) of the Chronicle which bears the name of Zacharias of Mitylene,‡ is given (distinguished as II) at p. 46 infr., from Codd. h and i, of which the former is a copy of the Chronicle, the latter an extract from the same. In Cod. f also (a copy of Bar-Salibi's Comm. on the Gospels), it is cited in extenso after the comments on Joh. vii., followed by the other (Paul-) form of the same.

* Or else his contemporary, the "Abbot Paul," who in A.D. 624, in Cyprus, translated into Syriac the works of Gregory Nazianzen. See Assemani (B.O., t. i, p. 171), who calls him Bishop of Cyprus; Wright, Catal., p. 423; also his Syriac Lit., p. 135.

† For the history of its appearance in print, and of its admission into the printed Syriac New Testament, see under Cod. 10 (p. lv supr.).

‡ Printed by Land, Anecdota Syr., t. III.—Dr. Hamilton and Mr. Brooks have published an English translation of the Chronicle (1899), to which the latter has prefixed an important Introduction.
This eighth Book and those that follow are the work of a continuator, and were completed in A.D. 569. He tells us that it "was found [i.e., apparently, the Greek of it] in the Gospel of Mara, Bishop of Amid" [died circ. 527]. Whether Mara, or this continuator, or some other, translated it into Syriac, is uncertain. It seems to be extant neither in Greek nor any other language. This Syriac version of the story in this form belongs (as the date of the eighth Book above given proves) to the sixth century,* and is earlier by nearly half a century than the better known version by Paul of the story in its familiar form. Both forms (it is to be noted) claim to have been "found" by Syrian ecclesiastics at Alexandria.†

3. Below (p. 46) I have referred to a version of the Paul-form of the Pericope, appended to a very recent copy of the Gospels (Bodl. Or. 625) bearing date 1801, the work of a Malabar scribe,—which I have forborne to print, judging from internal evidence that it was merely a translation from the Latin Vulgate probably connected with the action of the Synod of Diamper. I have found, since p. 46 was written, that in Decr. 2, cap. xiv of Actio III of that Synod, A.D. 1599, after noting the defects of the Peshitta Bible, the Synod orders that they are to be supplied "according to the Chaldee copies which are emended and the Vulgate Latin Edition"; and that this is to be done by Francisco Roz, a Jesuit, Professor of Syriac in the Jesuits' College at Vai-

* The MS h (Br. M., Add. 17202), which contains the Chronicle, is probably to be dated not later than A.D. 600.
† For Zacharias, see Land, Anecdota Syr., t. III, Introduction; also that of Mr. Brooks (above mentioned): for Mara, Land (as before), pp. 245, 250 (v. and vii. of Chronicle, Book viii): for both, Assemani, B.O., t. ii, pp. 52, 54.
‡ Catal., Oo. 1, 11 (7); Oo. 1, 21.—Whether the Syriac version of the Revelation (with Commentary), of the same Library, Add. 1970, is identical with the above, I have not ascertained. It professes to be translated from an Arabic translation from the Latin. All these MSS are Nestorian, of the eighteenth century.
SYRIAC TEXT
THE FOUR SHORTER CATHOLIC EPISTLES

2 PETER, 2 JOHN, 3 JOHN, JUDE

AND

THE SYNTAXIS DE ADULTERA

(ST. JOHN VII. 53—VIII. 12)

SYRIAC TEXT
MANUSCRIPTS CITED.

The Manuscripts on which the following texts are based, and to which the Apparatus Criticus refers, are as follows:—

(A.) For the Four Epistles.

1. London, British Museum, Add. 14623 (Catal. Dcclxxxiv). No. 7 of a Miscellany of Extracts. It contains the Seven Catholic Epistles. Order: 1, 2, 3 John; James; 1, 2 Peter; Jude.—2, 3 John begin fol. 26v°; 2 Pet., fol. 28r°; Jude, fol. 30v°. Dated A.G. 1134 (=A.D. 823).


5. *Ib., ib.,* Add. 14681 (Catal. cxxiii). Acts and Epp.; the Four (originally) following the Three, but preceding the Pauline. Order: 2, 3 John (beginning fol. 68 r°); 2 Pet. (f. 69 r°, breaking off in ii. 5); Jude lost. Cent. xii or xiii.

6. *Ib., ib.,* Add. 17115 (Catal. xcv). One of two leaves appended to a viith cent. MS of SS. Matth. and John. It contains (fol. 87 v°) only Jude 1–13. Of Cent. ix or x.


12. Manchester, John Rylands Libr. [formerly Earl of Crawford's, Haigh Hall, Wigan, no. 11]. New Test.; Apoc. following Gospels and preceding Acts; then Epp. (Cath. in Gr. order (2 Pet., quire 17, fol. 4 v; 2, 3 John, Jude, ib., fol. 10 r), followed by Paul.). Complete. Estrangela. Cent. xii (late) or xiii (early).


15. Ib., ib., Ancien Fonds 31 (Catal. 60). The Cath. Epp.; but only 2, 3 John, Jude (fol. 5) are of our version;—followed (fol. 9 r) by Peric. de Adult. (see under MS g, p. 3). Dated A.D. 1482.*

16. Ib., ib., Suppl. 79 (Catal. 5). New Test., being tom. 5 of a Bible.—Peric. de Adult. in text of St. John vii, viii; Cath. Epp. in Gr., Lat. order (after Pauline). Dated A.D. 1675. [Used in the present work only for the Pericope.]


19. (Belongs to Dr. Rendel Harris.) A recent transcript by an Eastern scribe, from a Tûr-‘Abdîn MS, unknown. Contains the Seven Epp. in Gr. order, following Acts.

All the above I have myself collated and re-collated (no. 11 from Dr. Isaac Hall's phototypes); except 8, for which I have trusted

* Catal. wrongly says 1582.
Pococke, and 18, which is known to me only by a collation kindly
given to me by the late Professor Bensly (who also allowed me to use
his collations of nos. 9, 14). Moreover, 9, 14, 15, 16 have been re-
collated for me by Rev. Professor Hugh Jackson Lawler, D.D., and
2, 7 by Rev. Arthur Aston Luce.

(B.) For the Pericope de Adultera.

hand (probably of Cent. IX) on fol. 1 v° of a MS of the Gospels (of
Cent. V or VI).

(Pesh. mixed with Harkl.): Pericope stands as part of Gospel text on
fol. 105 v°. Estrangela. Cent. XII.


A.G. 1503 = A.D. 1192): Pericope on margin of St. John viii., fol. 206 v°,
in a hand probably of Cent. XV.

in its place in text of St. John. (See White’s edition, t. i, pp. 559, 628,
640). Of Cent. XII.

f. Dublin, Library of Trinity College, B. 2. 9 (Catal. 1512). Bar
Salibi’s Commentary on the Gospels: Pericope cited in extenso; in its
ordinary (Paul) form, fol. 544b, preceded by the other (Mara) form,

Bernstein, Syrische Stud. für Zeitschr. der Deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.,
t. iii, p. 197. A complete N.T. (Pesh.): Pericope (with deviations*)
in its place in text of St. John. Dated A.D. 1611.

Hist. of Zacharias Rhetor (edited by Land, Anecdota Syr., t. iii). In
libr. viii. 7 (fol. 144 v°) the Pericope is cited from Mara. Estrangela.
Cent. VI (late) or VII.

i. Ib., ib., Add. 17193, 3 (Catal. DCCCLXI). Catena. Pericope (Mara),

MSS 10, 15, 16, supr., also exhibit the Pericope.

* The Pericope in MSS 15, g is of a divergent type; see p. 45 infr.
Note that all these MSS follow (with variations, see especially 15 and g) the Paul-form of the Pericope, except h and i, which give the Mara-form, while f gives both. Presumably the copies of Bar Salibi's Commentary in the Brit. Mus. (Catal., R.-F., xliii, Wright, dcccxxii) and in the Biblioth. Nat. (Catal., 67, 68) also include both forms.

All the above I have myself collated, except g, for which I have followed Bernstein. The Rev. George Margoliouth, of the Brit. Mus., has kindly re-collated for me MSS h and i.

**Versions Cited (for the Epistles only).**

hkl. The N.T. (Syr.) of Thomas of Harkel (a.g. 927 = a.d. 616), which contains the Four Epp. placed as usually in Gr. MSS. Edited by White (vol. ii, 1778), Oxford. (See also Appendix A.)


etz. A Latin version of the Four Epp. only, from our Syr. text, by Balthasar Etzel, printed by Nicolaus Serarius in his Comment. in Epp. Canonicas, pp. 53... Mainz, 1612.

**Editions Cited (II, P, for the Epistles only).**

II. Pococke's Editio Princeps of the Four Epistles, Leiden, 1630. From MS 8.*

P. Paris Polyglot, 1645. The Four Epistles in this work are edited by Gabriel Sionita from an unknown MS distinct from all the above.

A. London Polyglot (Walton's), 1657. Hardly to be counted as independent of P. Contains the Pericope de Adultera (derived from 10), as well as the Four Epistles; as do also the two following:—


For a fuller account of the above MSS, versions, and editions, see Introduction.

* In the Apparatus Criticus I designate the text of the Bodleian MS by "8"; by "II," the text as Pococke gives it in his marginal column in Hebrew character.
SUPERSCRIPTIONS, &c.

Of our MSS, 1 alone prefixes a general superscription to all Seven Catholic Epistles, which it arranges in the usual Greek order (only placing St. John's Epp. before St. Peter's), making no distinction among them as to canonicity; as follows:—

"The Epistles of the blessed Apostles."

13 alone prefixes to the Four shorter Epp., which it separates from the others by interposing the Pauline Epp., a distinct heading; thus:—

"We join to the Epistles of Paul, these Epistles of the Apostles, which are not found in all copies."

2 Peter is introduced by 1 thus:—

"The Second Epistle of the same blessed Peter."

By 9, and similarly by 3 (but it omits):—

"The Second Epistle of [the same] Peter Chief of the Apostles."

Of 2 John the heading in 4 is:—

"The Second Epistle of John the holy Apostle and Evangelist."

Of Jude, in 4:—

"The Epistle of Jude the Apostle brother of James the Apostle and first Bishop of Jerusalem."
So 7 and 8, but end with \( \text{\textasciitilde} \), omitting \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) before it; also 13, for the first five words only; similarly 10, but omits \( \text{\textasciitilde} \).

Similarly 19 prefixes to the simple heading (which is merely \( \text{\textasciitilde} \)):

\( \text{\textasciitilde} \)

(“This Jude is the son of Joseph the carpenter, and brother of James Bishop of Jerusalem.”)

6 differs from all in prefixing to the simple heading the word \( \text{\textasciitilde} \) \( [\text{\textasciicircumflex}] \) ( = “Catholicon”).

None of the other headings in the several MSS is noteworthy.
I. Superscription: 3 7 11 write 
é

(1) 3 7 11 19, 
é—-the rest, hkl, edd, as text. | 8 alone om 
é, II (and edd which repeat its text) follow:—all else ins 
hkl arb etz; also P A L N). | 14 18 subst for 
and so arb etz:—all else, hkl, edd, as text. | 3 writes 
| All MSS have 
and so arb etz, and edd:—P A (but not II) wrongly 
renders “per iustitiam.” | (2) 5 writes 
(one 0, as also 
5 19 in v. 3); 19 has here. | 5 om 
but suppl in mg. | 7 om 
| (3) 1 2 5 7 8 13 14 18, II L N:—3 10 11 
12 19, P A, [see Note on Greek text]. | 5 writes 
| 3 writes 
| 10 om 
| 1 2 9 11 12 14 18 19, 
hkl arb etz, L N:—3 7 8 10 13, II P A, ins ? (5 ins 0) after prefix 0. |
1. 9 12 11 2 14 18 19, to like effect hkl (ἑκτοκός), P A N: — 3 5 7 8 10 13, arb etz, II L, ἦκτορ (9 ?). | ἦκτορ (9 ?) | 9 12 14 19, to like effect hkl (ἑκτοκός) etz ("et praetiosas"): — 2 3 5 7 8 10 11 13, arb, edd, ἦκτορ (9 ?). 1 seems to have written ἦκτορ (sic,— for 9 ?), but corr by ins | before 9 : 18 gives ἦκτορ (without ribbui), but ins a over 9 [see Suppl. Note]. | 3 writes ἦκτορ. | 3 5 19 pref o (for ?) to ἦκτορ. | 10, with P A, writes ἦκτορ (also at III. 18). | and they use like contraction infr., ev. 10, 12, 19, 20, et passim. | 8 om ἦκτορ; followed by II, also by L; but the idiom requires ἦκτορ. | 7 10 13 write ἦκτορ without 9 (9 ?). | 18 ins initial | (see on ii. 18). | 9 (5) 3 om ἦκτορ before ins. | 2 pref o to ἦκτορ. | 14 om ἦκτορ; hkl ins, but with prefixed [see Suppl. N.]. | 1 writes ἦκτορ. | 2 om final o of ἦκτορ. | 5 om ἦκτορ (1), but corr in mg. | 9 om ἦκτορ (2). | 1 writes ἦκτορ (also at III. 18). | 5 om (but corr in mg) ἦκτορ (2). | For ἦκτορ, 19 has ἦκτορ (bis). | 9 pref o to ἦκτορ; also writes ἦκτορ (no suffix, with one o). |
2 Pet. I. 9–15

1. ἰωάννης ἐν Περγάμῳ. Μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς σήμερον ἐκ τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἵνα ἄφητον σῷς ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ.

2. ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ παρώνῳ. Μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς σήμερον ἐκ τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἵνα ἄφητον σῷς ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. 

3. ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ παρώνῳ. Μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς σήμερον ἐκ τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἵνα ἄφητον σῷς ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ.

4. ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ παρώνῳ. Μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃς σήμερον ἐκ τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἵνα ἄφητον σῷς ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ ἡ σκῆπτρον ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ θανατίῃ τοῦ δικαίου θεοῦ.
10 11 13, hkl etz, Π Π Α Ν, αύτός. [See Suppl. N.] | After κατα, 19 ins οόι. | | (16) 18 writes οόι for οόι; and | om οόι for which 9 subst βο. | | 1 2 5 (corr) 11 12 14 18 19; similarly hkl, N, ins | οόι before διδό (as text):—the rest, and Π Π Α Λ, om. | | οόι | 1 2 9 11 12 14 19; similarly hkl; also etz, but with ἑνpref ("ut vos scire faciamus"); 5 has | οόι:—the rest (18?), οόι; also edd (but N om prefix). | | άλλο άλλο] 1 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 18 19, hkl, Π Π Λ Ν:—2 3 5 8, II, om ί. | | For οόι, 18 has οόι; also | writes οόι for οόι. | | (17) 7 8 10 11 13 19 ins οόι after οόι (1), also arb etz ("de post"), edd:—1 2 3 5 (corr) 12 14 18, hkl, as text;—(5 om from οόι to άλλο άλλο (incl.), but suppl in mg);—[9 illegible, vv. 17, 18, and part of 19]. | | 10 om point from άλλο άλλο. | | 12 has άλλο άλλο for άλλο (cp. Μτ. iii. 17 (psh)), | οόι (before οόι)] 1 2, similarly hkl:— the rest om, also edd. | | άλλο άλλο] 1 2 10, hkl:—3 5 7 8 11 12 13 18 19, edd, ins άλλο before verb; also 14, after verb (but marked for transposition). | | (18) 12 om άλλο (1); also 5 (but suppl):—all else, hkl, edd, ins. [See Suppl. N.] | (19) 5 om άλλο. | οόι] 1 2 3 5 7 11 18
I.

... 

19, edd: 8 10 12 14, סכ (without point). See Poc.'s note in loc. | 3 5 8 om ה, before סכ, also II. | (20) [See note on Gr. text, and Suppl. N.] | 10 writes נושא. | (21) After נ, 5 om סכ, but suppl interl. | 2 5 14 write נושא (bis). | 1 2 3 5 18:— 7 8 9 11 12 13 19, edd, סכ הדוקק merely.

II. (1) סכ] 1 2 3 5 9 (?) 11 12 14 18, hkl, N :— 5 (corr) 7 8 10 13 19, arb etz ("in saeculo"), II P A L, סכ סכ ; (9 shows סכ . . . , with barely room for more than סכ). | סכ סכ | So (but without ribb.) 1 2 18:—12, סכ סכ :—the rest, edd, סכ סכ (ribb. doubtful in 9):—hkl, סכ סכ | (2) 2 11 12 14 write סכ סכ with ribb.; and similarly hkl (סכ סכ), but not arb. | סכ סכ] 1 2 3 5 7 12 18 19, N:—the rest (MSS and edd) add final נ. | (3) 3 om prefix סכ from סכ סכ סכ סכ; 18 om the א after נ; 19 has סכ סכ סכ סכ. |
[2 Pet. II. 3-7]

II.

4 Χωσονα ἐν στήλᾳ, οὐ πάντα. Πάντα δὲ ἰδὼν τὸν ἄνθρωπον: ἵνα σωθῆναι τοὺς πολλούς.

5 Οὗτοι μὲν εἰσήλθαν: οὗτοι δὲ μὴ εἰσῆλθαν. οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν ἀποκαλύφθαι διὰ τὴν ὑπομονήν: ἵνα ἀποκαθίσθηται ὁ πάντως ἀριστοκράτης.

6 Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐθαύμασαν τοὺς ἐμόνων καὶ οὐκ ἤδοντο καὶ ἠδούντο. οὕτως ἐστιν ἡ ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀκρόπολεως τῆς Πειραιαοῦ:

7 οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ πόιος ἔκαθορισεν ἰδίῳ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπηρεάσατο, ὡς ἡμέρα ἀναμνήσεως ἡκομμαθείσης ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἡμερίῳ ἵνα ἀνέρχωσθηται ὁ πάντως ἀριστοκράτης καὶ ἀνακατακρίβωσθηται τῷ ἀδικεῖσθαι.

---

1 2, arb: — 12, σωστὰ (without o or ribb.), also 19 (with ribb.): — 9, οὐχί (but prefix effaced): — all else, etz, edd, οὐχὶ: — but hkl reads with 19, σωστὰ (without o).

13 om [οὗτοι] 1 2 12: — all else, hkl, edd, σωστὰ; — to which 13 pref ο. — For σωστὰ, 5 has ἀριστοκράτης (suppl in mg).

1 om [αισθήσεως] (but corr).

(4) [Note that in this and six ensuing vv., 9 is often illegible.] For 11, 12 has οὐ (so perhaps 1, which writes on an erasure).

2 om οὐ.

After οὐ, 5 ins (?)

[5 om οὐδὲ, but suppl in mg [see Suppl. N.].] All MSS and edd have οὐδὲ; — and so hkl, but with *.

(5) For οὐδὲ, 3 writes οὐδὲ; hkl has οὐδὲ (no prefix or ribb.).

7 writes όμοιοι. [N.B., 5 breaks off in this v. after οὐδὲ.]

(6) οὐδὲ] 1 2 3 14 18 19 (also 9 probably), hkl arb: — 12, οὐδὲ only: — 7 8 10 11 13, etz, edd, om.

10 om οὐδὲν, 2 writes οὐδὲν. 9 14 read οὐδὲν for οὐδὲν.

11 ins τῇ τῇ 

and pref ἐπὶ to the latter. 11 also reads οὐδὲν; so as by these two alterations to conform to hkl; — N follows 11 in the former, but (inconsistently) not in the latter [see Suppl. N.].

(7) οὐδὲν]

So most MSS (14 οὐδὲν); also hkl arb etz, edd: — 1 2 read οὐδὲν. 10 om
II.

3 om ō from ḥālāmāh. | For ʿaṣṣ, 11 14 have ḥālāmāh. | 10 writes ḥālāmāh; also hkl. | (8) 3 writes ʿaṣṣ. | ṣājān | 1 2 3, arb:—7 8 10 11 12 13 14 19, etz, edd, om ṣājān: hkl has ḥālāmāh ṣājān. | 10, P A, write ḥālāmāh before ṣājān; and | after it, 12 repeats ṣājān. | (9) For ṣājān, 12 18 read ṣājān. | 7 om ṣājān | 1 2, arb:—the rest, edd, ḥālāmāh; arb (?) etz, fut. [see Suppl. N.]. | (10) 18 om ʿāṣim. | ṣājān | 1 2 3 12 18:—7 (om ʿāṣim) 8 10 11 13 14 19, hkl, edd, ṣājān; (etz also plural). | 9 12 13 write ḥālāmāh ṣājān; 14, ḥālāmāh ṣājān. | 19 has ḥālāmāh for ṣājān. | 13 om ō from ṣājān. | 12 13 19 om ō from ṣājān. | (11) 2 writes ṣājān. | 14 om ō from ṣājān. | ṣājān | 1 2 3 9 (pref ō) 12; also hkl with ∗:—18, 22 23 (placed after ḥālāmāh [sic]); also 19 (but after ḥālāmāh; no ribb.):—the rest, arb etz, edd, om. | 18 writes ḥālāmāh ṣājān. | ṣājān | (12) 18 ins ḥālāmāh before ṣājān. (Thus 18 reads, ḥālāmāh ṣājān.) | 12 om ō from ṣājān. | 9 pref ō for ṣājān.
to ἀκιλκ. | (13) Λῷος 

1 2 9 12 14 19 :—3 (?) 7 8 10 11 13 18 (?), etz (hkl and arb indecisive), edd, Λῷος. | Λᾶμπαν] 1 2 :— the rest, hkl (with ribb.), edd, ins | between and o. | Λῷος: So all MSS (except 19, Λῷος), hkl with * [see Suppl. N.], and edd. | From Λῷος, 3 19 om prefix. | Λᾶμπαν] Сτασαστασιμα 279 (txt) 10 11 12 13 14 19, etz, Π (see Poc.'s note in loc.) ΠΑΛΝ:—1 3 8 9 (mg) 18, arb, Λᾶμπαν (= in restimentis suis) : hkl (txt and mg) deviates. [See note on Gr. text.] | (14) 3 om ἐνὶ before Λᾶμπαν (= Λᾶμπαν), 1 2 write Λᾶμπαν (= Λᾶμπαν),—to agree with Λᾶμπαν [see note on Gr. text]. | For Λᾶμπαν, 19 has Λᾶμπαν. | For Λᾶμπαν, 2 writes Λᾶμπαν; 3, Λᾶμπαν (but corr). | (15) Λᾶμπαν] 1 (over erasure) 2 3 7 8 10 11 13 19, hkl etz (arb om), edd:—12, Ἐνὶ; also 9 (but prefix doubtful), and 14 (with prefix ἐν) ; 18, Λᾶμπαν. | For Λᾶμπαν, 19 has Λᾶμπαν. | 18 writes Λᾶμπαν. | (16) Λᾶμπαν] 1 2 3 9 (pref ὁ) 12 (ins ἐν) after ἐν) 14 (over erasure) 18, etz ("cor- rectio"), Λ:—7 8 10 11 13 19, hkl arb (= "correptor"), ΠΑΝ, Λᾶμπαν. | Λᾶμπαν] 1 2 :— all else, hkl, edd, om prefix. | 2 writes Ἐνὶ (scil, Λῶν). | Λᾶμπαν] 1 2 :— the rest, hkl (with different
II. 

18 writes  scape, 9 om. | 2 reads  scape. | 12 14 18 place as in text: — 10 11, P A, om: — 3 7 8 9 13 19, arb, II L N, after | 9 om  scape, and | pref 0 (for 0) to  scape. | 1 2 3 7 8 10 12 14 18 19, II P A L: — 9 11 13, hkl, N, (om); (arb either reads  scape, or om). | For (as), 1 has (as). | 12 om ? from  scape. | (21) 18 om ? from  scape. | 2 writes  scape. | For | 14 has | 2 has | 11 has  scape. | 7 writes  scape. | 13, 19, (similarly hkl, <br>but suppl in mg). | 12 transp  scape; as does hkl. | 1 2 (pref ) | 3 11 13 14 18 19, hkl etz, N: — 7 8 10 12, II P A L, om. | 7 (but corr) 10, P A, om prefix from  scape. | 12 14 write  scape. | 1 2 19, hkl: — the rest (except 10, neutral), etz, edd, scape. | 8 om prefix from  scape, also II P A L: — all else, hkl arb etz, N, ins; 7 writes  scape.

III. (i) 8, II P A L, om  scape: — all else, hkl, N, ins. | 18 writes  scape; hkl,  scape. | 1 2 11 12 14 18 19, hkl: — 3 7 8 10 13, arb etz, edd,  scape (9 hiat, and great part of vv. 1, 2, 3 is lost); —
2 Pet. III. 1-5

III. 2

1 seems to corr by interlining; [see Suppl. N.]. 1 2 12, hkl:—3 7 8 10 11 13 14 18 19, edd, (pl. masc):—7 (corr) 8 10 11 12, also hkl (so etz), edd, (pl. fem). 2 writes ins. 1 2 3 After, 1 2 3 ins From 19 om. 3 writes ins. After, 13 ins 3 writes (p). [see Suppl. N. on ii. 19]. 1 18 write (see on ii. 18). (4) For 13 has 13 has, 18, 13 has 1 3 12 13 18 19, (similarly hkl), P A L N:—2 7 8 9 10 11 14, II, om 1. For, 9 18 have 14, 9 (om). 9 writes ins. 1 ins before 1 2 have ins. 1 2 have 18 reads ins. for 1 2 9 11 12 14 18, hkl (before etz, L N:—3 7 8 10 13 19, arb, II P A, om. 2 om; 10 (with P A, not II L N) subst prefix? 1 2 9 12 13 (corr) 14 18 19, hkl, L N:—3 7 8 10 11 13, arb etz, II P A, subst? 1 3 writes 13 reads 13 reads The MSS which here give plur. verb, write (no ribb.), exc. 14; also (incl. 14) in vv. 7, 10, 12. 1
III.

6 7

8

9

10

(6) [1 2 (corr, pr. m.)] 9 11 12 13 14 18 19, (hkl similarly, (7) 10, etz, om β. | [Αθησί] 7 8 9 10 11 13 19, hkl arb etz, edd:

(8) From 2 om μ; 3 writes θέρμα, | (9) From ουδὲνα γίνομαι, 8 om ι (but II corr). | 9 10 om second ο from ουδὲνα γίνομαι (9 subjoins ουδὲνα (?)). | ουδὲνα γίνομαι] So (aph) 1 8 11 12 13 19, edd:—7 10, ουδὲνα γίνομαι (pa.); 14, ουδὲνα γίνομαι; the rest neutral. | [Σταυρος] 1 2 3 7 8 9 11 18, hkl, Π Λ Ν:—12, ουδὲνα γίνομαι:—10 13 14 19, Π Α, (pa.) | 2 writes ουδὲνα γίνομαι; 12, ουδὲνα γίνομαι. | [Σταυρος] 1 2 3 11 12 14 18:—7 8 9 10 13 19, hkl arb (?), etz (?), edd, ουδὲνα γίνομαι:—10 13 14 19 (in one word), edd:—3 7 11 13 14 19 (in one word), 10 (corr), ουδὲνα γίνομαι. | [Σταυρος] 7 8 9 (corr 0) 10 11 12 13 14 19, edd:—1 18, hkl, ουδὲνα γίνομαι:—2 3, ουδὲνα γίνομαι. | 2 om μ, and writes ουδὲνα γίνομαι.] 1 2 7 11 12 13 18 19, (and so hkl mg; hkl txt reads ουδὲνα γίνομαι, as also 19 mg, without ουδὲνα γίνομαι), arb:—2 (corr) 3 8 9 10 14 (final μ), etz, edd, pref ουδὲνα γίνομαι.
III. 11

[see note on Gr. text, and Suppl. N.].

(11) 1 2 9 11 14 18, hkl:—3 7 8 10 12 13 19, edd, (12) 9 om (13). | 1 3 7 8 9 (mg) 11 13 14, II L N, (so too 10, P A, but in contraction with (12) following):—2 12 13 (corr) 18 19, hkl, P A L N:—2 8 10, II, om (1). | 9 transp, writing (13) 1, hkl, (12) [see Suppl. N.]. | For (15) 1, hkl, (after 13) [see Suppl. N.]. | 1 2 3 9 11 12 13 14 18 19 (pref 3), hkl arb, L N:—7 8 10, II, etz, om. | For 18, has (15) 1 om first: (but corr). | For 1 om first; 2 18, hkl, have 18, (14) 3 writes (12, Suppl. N. on ii. 19). | From 18, 1 om first (but corr). | For (15) 11 13 write 2 (14) 2 18, hkl, have 2 writes.
7 12, ύμεῖς 16 | 12 pref ? to ἀμε. | (16) For ? (prefix to ἱστοκαταστάσεως), 9 12 give ἀλλάζει; also hkl. | For καὶ, Λ, 9 has ἐπιστέπεσι. | For ἥνεκέν, 9 12 19 write ἤδης. | Before ἧν, 8, hkl (arb etz, ambiguous), Π Λ Ν, om [see Suppl. N.]. | Μακράλα, | 1 2 9 12 14 18, (hkl to like effect):—3 7 8 10 11 13 19, arb etz, edd, | Πολυεπίστημον, | 1 writes [see Suppl. N. on ii. 19]. | 18 ins ἄντλεται | before ἀμε. | (17) 13 om τοῦ (1). | For ἀκούστε, 3 12 have ἀκούστε. | To ἦλθεν, 7 8 10 pref a second ἦν; II follows. | (18) In ὁσαίως, 1 2 18 [see on i. 6] ins ἦν before ἔν· 3 subst 3 12 11 12 14 18 19, hkl, Ν:—3 7 8 9 10 13, Π Π Α Λ, om ἦν. | For ὁσαίως, 3 has ἐκ τοῦ ἄλλου; 12, ὁσαίως; hkl, μεταφράσται. | ἦν] 1 2 3 9 12 13 14 19:—7 8 10 11 18, hkl, edd, om ribb.
Codd.
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19.

(1) [17 hiat, vv. 1, 2, 3 to 23]. | 2 om صنف (but sec. m.
suppl in mg); 18 writes صنف (but corr; see on v. 5). | صنف.
1 2 3 4 5 9 14 15 18, hkl, L N:—7 8 10 11 12 13 19, Π Π Α, صنف. |
After صنف, Π Α, with 10, ins كاسك. | 4 om after صنف to end
of ver. | 2 om | 13 19 om | به | صنفه | 1:—all else, hkl,
edd, om suffix. | 19 writes صنفه. | ابن | 1 9 12 14 18, hkl
(without suffix):—2 3 4 5 7 8 10 11 13 15 19, arb etz, edd, | ابن.

(2) [On | صنفه, see Suppl. N.] | 2 writes | صنفه [see Suppl. N.
on 2 Pet. ii. 19]. | 9 om | صنفه أباباد. | (3) All MSS, arb
etz, Π N:—Π Π Α L, صنفه; (similarly hkl, صنفه). | صنفه | 1 2 3 4
5 (corr) 9 12 17 18, (and so hkl, صنفه) arb, L:—7 8 10 11 13 14 15 19,
etz, Π Π Α N, om; (5 om صنفه 2, suppl in mg). | For | صنفه, 18 has
صنفه. | For صنفه, 1 has صنفه. | (4) 4 om
صنفه. | For صنفه, 1 has صنفه; 3 5 (but corr), صنفه; 18,
5 15 9 12 14 18, L; so 11, N, Θο:—2 3 4 7 10 13 15 17 19, etz (not arb), P A, om Θο:—8, II, om Θο; hkl writes ρο Θο only. | 18 om Θο. | After Θο, 14 ins Θο. | For Θο, 1 has Θο. | 18 om Θο before it. | Θο:—1 2 3 4 5 9 14 18, hkl, N:—7 8 10 11 12 13 15 17 19, Π Π Λ, Θο. | (6) 1 9 11 12 14 18 19, (and so hkl), N:—3 5 (with ribb.) 7 8 10 13 15 17, arb etz, Π Π Λ, Θο. | 2 4 om after from Θο to Θο (inclusive); 4 om also Θο (2). | To Θο (2), 3 pref Θο | 1 2 3 7 8 14 17 18 (with Θο for θο), hkl, Π Λ Ν:—15, Θο (only):—4 5 9 10 11 12 13 19, Π Α, Θο. | 2 writes Θο (1 gives no point). | (7) 17 writes Θο. | Π Α, hkl, om Θο. | 13 18 (corr) 19 write Θο. | 1 om Θο. | Θο:—1 3 15 18, Π Α (ep. 1 Joh. iv. 2, psh):—2 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 19, hkl, Π Λ Ν, Θο. | 2 18 write Θο (no Θο in last syll.); 14 subst Θο for θο (2); 18, Θο for θο (1). | (8) 1 om Θο before Θο. | Θο:—1 3 15 18, Π Α So
most MSS, and apparently arb etz ("perfectam") :—but 2 3 4 13 (mg) 19, hkl, read \textit{consuetudinam}. | (g) 4 pref 0 to \textit{alav}. | 8, hkl, (not II), drop suffix of \textit{consuetudinam} (o). | For \textit{alav}, 14 17, hkl, have \textit{alav}. | osa] 1 2 8 10 11 13 15 17 18 19, hkl etz, II P A N ;—3 4 5 7 9 12 14, L, pref 0 :—4 add \textit{f} also arb. | From \textit{alav}, \textit{consuetudinam}, 18 om prefix prep. | (10) 4 pref 0 to \textit{alav}. | 5 transp \textit{alav}. | For \textit{alav}, 1 writes \textit{alav}. | \textit{substitutur} \textit{consuetudinam} \textit{alav}. | 1 2 3 4 5 (corr) 9 12, hkl (with \textit{alav}), L N :—5 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 19, II P A N, add \textit{alav} :—18 subst \textit{alav}. (arb repeats verb, but varies rendering; and so etz, "ave et vale non dicetis"). | (11) After \textit{substitutur}, 1 alone \textit{ins alav}; 18 for \textit{substitutur} \textit{alav}. | osa] 1 alone:—all else, \textit{consuetudinam} [see Suppl. N.]. | (12) 10, P A, om osa. | For \textit{alav}, 1 writes \textit{alav}, but interl \textit{alav} after it. | 1 om before \textit{alav}, against all else, hkl, edd. | Cp. (for construction) 3 Joh. 9, 13. | 10 writes \textit{alav}, and \textit{consuetudinam}. | \textit{consuetudinam} All (exc. 14, \textit{aph.}) apparently write \textit{pael}; also hkl, edd,—here, and 3 Joh. 14. | For \textit{aph.}, see 2 Pet. iii. 9 and note (supr.); also Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19.
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For 43, 17 19 write 47. 8 writes 3, but II corr. (13) 1 writes 3 (as in ver. 4); 18, 3 3 3 3. 18 writes 3 3 3 3 3 3. At the close, 1 5 9 12 14 18 19, arb, have only 2 3 4 5 (mg) 7 8 10 11 13 15 17, hkl (but with #) etz, edd, pref to it.
1. [Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19].
2. 3. 4. 5.

(1) For 4 has also hkl. [See Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19].
(2) 12 has 7 8 15, L, subst 0 for ;—8, L N, write the verb; all else that supply vowel write ;—so hkl, P A. For 9 10 and P A transp.
For khl, 4 has khl writes hkl writes [3,016] 1 2 3 4 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 18 19, $\Pi\ P\ A\ N$: -5 9 12, L, hkl, pref. [6,112] 1 9 12 18:—2 3 4 5 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 19, hkl, edd, pref. [6,112] 1 3 4 5 9 11 12 13 14 18 19, hkl (mg; in txt, using equivalent verb, arb, N:—7 8 10 15 17, etz, $\Pi\ P\ A\ L$, om. [See Suppl. N.] [6,112] 1 2, hkl:—all else, edd, hkl, (except 14, arb, N. [6,112] 1 9 12 13 (mg) 14 18 19, hkl, L:—2 3 4 5 7 8 10 11 13 15 17, arb etz ("post"), $\Pi\ P\ A\ N$, arb. | 7 drops o from khl, | and so 5 from khl: [6,112] (mg) 14 18 19, hkl, L:—2 3 4 5 7 8 10 11 13 15 17, arb etz ("post"), $\Pi\ P\ A\ N$, arb. | 7 drops o from khl, | and so 5 from khl: [6,112] 1 8 has khl. | For khl, 18 has khl. | For khl, 9 has khl, (4, but corr). | (9) To khl, 4 9 12 19, pref:—against all else, and hkl. [6,112] 9 11 12 14 18, hkl, L:—2 3 4 5 7 8 10 13 15 17 19, arb etz, $\Pi\ P\ A$, (arb, L). | $\Pi\ P\ A$], (1 alone,$\Pi\ P\ A$), (arb, L). | [6,112] 1 3, hkl (with o after):—the rest, and edd, vary;—some ins | once only (after o, or $\Pi$, or $\Sigma$,—or subst for o, or for second $\Sigma$); some twice (after o and $\Pi$, or o and $\Sigma$, or $\Pi$; and $\Sigma$); | 4 om second $\Sigma$. MSS and edd vary also in vowels; 1 2 9 12 18 19 are unpointed. | 1 writes
[3 John 10-12]

3 χάρατος τοῦ ἱδρύον τοῦ θεοῦ, Παῦλον ἐκ τῆς ὑποτύγχανης ἑλέους καὶ ἡγεσίας, διὰ τῆς θυσίας τῆς σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἁγίας θεοῦ ὑπὸ τούτοις ἡμᾶς (10).

10 ἐβραίοις, ἐπιφάνειας ἐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου ἰδίου καὶ τῆς δόσεως τῆς γνώσεως, ἐκ τούτων ἐκτίναξεν ἡ ἡγεσία καὶ ἡ ἑλέους: ἡ ἡγεσία καὶ ἡ ἑλέους οὐκ ἑτέρως ἐπέκειτο αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς ὑποτύγχανης ἑλέους καὶ ἡγεσίας ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας τῆς σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἁγίας θεοῦ εἰς τούτοις ἡμᾶς (11).

11 ἠγέρθη δὲ ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς ἑλέους, ἑλέους ἐπιφάνειας, ἵνα ἐποθήκη μὴν ὄντως ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἐνθυσίας ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς ἑλέους καὶ ἡγεσίας ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας τῆς σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἁγίας θεοῦ εἰς τούτοις ἡμᾶς (12).

here and in v. 10 [but see Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19]. | 5 om ἐκ (but ins in mg). | (10) 9 has ἔστι (as hkl) for ἔστιν. | ἔστιν (12) ἐκτίναξε (or ἐκτίναξεν) 2 3 4 5 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 18, hkl (om ὅ) etz ("venero"), P A L N:—1 8 17 19, arb, II ("venerit"), ἔστι (om ὅ) [see Suppl. N.]. | 1 2 (mg) 5 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 19, hkl similarly (ἐστιν) etz, P A L N:—8, II, ἔστι; 9 18, arb, ἔστιν: (2 3 4 om this and three following words). | 2 (mg) has ἔστιν for ἔστις. | 18 has ἔστιν for ἔστις. | From ἔστιν, 2 (but corr) 12, om prefix. | ἔστιν 1 2 3 5 9 11 12 13 14 17 18 19, hkl arb:—4 7 8 10 15, etz, edd, ἔστιν. | ἔστιν 1 2 10 12 13 17 19, hkl, N:—4, 14, II, ἔστιν. | (9 writes ἔστιν; 11, ἔστιν (similarly P A L); 8, ἔστιν; 3 5 7 15 18 uncertain). Cp. Prov. xxx. 15 (Syr-Hxp.). | 5 writes ἔστιν for ἔστιν. | 12 om ἔστιν (after ἔστιν). | For ἔστιν, see under v. 9. | ἔστι 1 5 9 12, arb:—2 3 4 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 18 19, hkl (but om ὅ before ἔστιν) etz, edd, pref ἔστιν. | (11) 2 reads ἔστιν; hkl om suffix. | 2 has ἔστιν for ἔστιν (but sec. m. supplies pref. ἔστιν). | For ἔστιν (bis), 2 has ἔστιν. ἔστι 1 19, hkl, write ἔστιν (2) without prefix; also 18 (but with ἔστι subjoined):—all else, arb etz, edd, ἔστιν. | 2 3 write ἔστιν (without prefix). | (12) ἔστιν 1 2 4 5:—3 9 11 12 13 19, hkl, ins ὅ after ἔστιν and after ἔστι:—7 8 10 14 15 17, edd, after ἔστι only (also 18, but drops ὅ). MSS point the
word variously; 1 2 12 18 leave it unpointed. [301] 1 3 4 5 7
8 9 11 12 13 14 18 19, II L N:—2 10 17, P A, [301]; 15, 301. 1
18 writes トリエisen トリエ; all else ins (18,
14 トリエ تنفيذ トリエ), and so arb etz, edd:—hkl om from text, but in mg writes
14 トリエ تنفيذ トリエ; 5 writes トリエ for トリエ. 14 om トอาการ トリエ; 3 writes it twice. [301] 1 9 12 14 19, arb, L:—
2 3 4 5 7 8 10 11 13 15 17, hkl etz, II P A N, plural; (5 om トリエ, but
corr; 18 is doubtful). 1 For トリエتنفيذ トリエ, 2 3 4 5 19 have
トリエ تنفيذ トリエ. 1 For トリエتنفيذ トリエ, 2 writes トリエتنفيذ トリエ; 5, hkl, トリエتنفيذ トリエ.
(13) After トリエتنفيذ トリエ, 10 om トリエتنفيذ トリエ; and after トリエتنفيذ トリエ, om トリエتنفيذ トリエ (but corr). 1 18
1 om トリエتنفيذ トリエ; 2 3 4 subst トリエتنفيذ トリエ. 1 For トリエتنفيذ トリエ, 2 5 write トリエتنفيذ トリエ.
(15) 14 has トリエتنفيذ トリエ for トリエتنفيذ トリエ. 1 2 pref トリエتنفيذ トリエ to トリエتنفيذ トリエ. 1 After トリエتنفيذ トリエ,
2 om トリエتنفيذ トリエ, and writes トリエتنفيذ トリエ two, but (sec. m.) suppl トリエتنفيذ トリエ in
mg. [301] 1 2 3 5 (interl) 11 12 14 18 19, hkl:—4 7 8 9 10
13 15 17, arb etz, edd, om prefix.
(1) After [καθαραία], 2 om στά, and ins a word, partly erased, so that Ἰκαθαράια alone is legible, no doubt καθαράια. In mg appears also another erasure, in which Ι can be discerned, probably of καθαράια. | Before καθαράια, 8 om o; also II L N (but not arb etz, nor P A). | (2) καθαράια | 1 2 3 4 6, hkl:— 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 18 19, arb etz, edd, καθαράια; (11 doubtful; 17 kiat.). | (3) 1 writes καθαράια. | For καθαράια, 3 has καθαράια; also 4, for καθαράια. | For καθαράια, 2 has τούτο (but corr). | 2 om καθαράια (but sec. ins in mg); 4 subst καθαράια. | To καθαράια, 3 4 6 pref o. | [καθαράια] 1 2, N:—all else subst final δ for δ; also hkl, II P A L. But 15 writes καθαράια; hkl. | [See Suppl. N.] | To καθαράια, 18 adds καθαράια (probably also 9, as space indicates). | For καθαράια, 18 writes καθαράια. | (4) For καθαράια, 3 writes καθαράια. | For καθαράια, 3 4 6 subst καθαράια.
3 6 write (retaining (reAMA). | For 5, 19 reads | For 10 writes (no suffix). | 10 writes | 12 12 18 (corr); so hkl (P-A) — 3 4 6 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 19 (9 doubtful), arb etz, edd, | For 12, (corr) 12, P A, have | 6 pref 0 to | 1 2 12 13 14 18 19, hkl (P-A) (arb) — 3 4 6 7 8 10 11 15 17 (9 hiat.), etz, edd, | om 0. [See Suppl. N.] | (5) 2 15 write (KAMAMA | 0 without 12, without 0. | 1 2, hkl — 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19, arb etz, edd, | Before | 2 om 0 (but sec. m. corr). | For 18 has | (6) 9 pref 1 to | (KAMA | 0 (N) = (D) 1 2 3 12 14 — 7 8 11 13 15 17 19, hkl etz, edd, (N) (6 doubtful; 9 10 unpointed) 18, | (7) | 1 2 3 12 14 19, L — 3 4 6 7 8 10 11 13 15 17, hkl, if P A N, 18, (KAMA | 11 16, hkl, N, for 0, have | From 0, 2 om 0 (but sec. m. corr). | 12 om 0 before 0. | For 6 has | [Jud. 4-7] So (with
or without ribb., and variously pointed) 1 2 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 17 18 19, L N : - 8, Π P A, : - 3, hkl, : - 4, Σ 11 15, : 12 13 18 19, arb etz, Π P A : - 1 2, 4 6 7 8 9 11 13 14 15 17, Π L N, 11 19, hkl, : 1 2 3 4 6 9 12 18, hkl : - 7 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 19, arb etz, edd, read plur. | 13 19, with hkl, read 7 12 13 18, hkl, (om *), 9 Mat; but writes 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19, arb etz, edd, 12 3 4 6 have 9 (doubtful). | 12 13 18 19, hkl : - 1 2 3 4 (om 9), 6 (om 9), 7 8 10 11 14 15 17, arb etz, edd, 9 (9 Hiat) 9 (9 Hiat); but writes hkl, apparently without 9 (9 Hiat). See note on gr txt [and Suppl. N.]. | For 9 (9 Hiat) (of 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19, hkl arb etz ("positae sunt"), edd), 1 2 3 4 6 have (9 doubtful). | 12 13 18 19, hkl : - 1 2 3 4 (om 9), 6 (om 9), 7 8 10 11 14 15 17, arb etz, edd, 9 (9 Hiat) 9 (9 Hiat); but writes hkl, apparently without 9 (9 Hiat). See note on gr txt [and Suppl. N.]. | 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19, arb, edd : - 1 2 3 4 6 15 18, hkl etz ("rei judicii"), 9 (9 Hiat). | (8) 7 om 9; 19 writes 9 (9 Hiat). | 1 2 11, hkl : - the rest, arb etz, edd, write as singular. | 3 writes 17, 18 om 9, and pref 9 to 9 (9 Hiat). | 1 2 9 12 13 14 (with ribb.) 18 19, hkl : - 3 4 6 7 8 10 14 15 17 18, Π Π A Π, ins prefix 9 : - 9 11 12 13 19, N, subst 9 (9 Hiat); so hkl, 9 (9 Hiat). | (9) 11, N, hkl, ins 9 before 9 (9 Hiat). as well as before 9 (9 Hiat). | 18 writes 1 2 9 12 13 (corr) 14 18 19, hkl, Π Π Π, : - 3 4 6 7 8 10 11 15 17, arb etz, Π Π A Π,
JUD. 12-15

13

14

15

17 writes [but see Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19.] 3 writes

14) 10, PA, om /1. | 11 om 4. | 12 om prefix. |

15) Before 13 om prefix. | 16) 2:— the rest, hkl, edd, transp. |

17 writes [see note on gr txt]:—— the rest, hkl arb, edd, (but some transp; 8 writes ] 11 om 4. | 12 has [but see Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19.] 3 writes

(13) 1 writes — as hkl. 12:— the rest, edd, om prefix: hkl has (but om further on); 9 hiat. 18 writes

(14) 10, PA, om /1. | 11 om 4. | 12 om prefix. |

7 writes | 15 writes | 9, followed by L, also hkl, om |

Before | 12 om [15] 2:— the rest, hkl, edd, transp. |

(15) Before 13 om prefix. | 16) 2:— the rest (but 15 writes ]1, hkl, edd, 4. | 12, hkl (which also writes before):—— the rest, fut (3 4 9 11 14 18, L N. 4. | 7 8 10 12 13 15 17 19, PA, 4. | 12 [see note on gr txt]:—— the rest, hkl arb, edd, (but some transp; 8 writes ] 11 om 4. | 12 has [but see Suppl. N. on 2 Pet. ii. 19.] 3 writes
there cod. 3 fails.
edd, transp.  
[1] 1 2 4 9 11 12 13 14 17 18 19, N:—
3 7 8 10 15, hkl, II P A L, om [111]; [for the verb, 9 12 write 12 13 14 18 19, om o before (2) ]
For 8 has Qe: : For Qe: 8 (followed by II N) writes 3 8 12 18, II L N:—7 11 13, P A, (the rest give no points).  
[1] 1:—all else (exc. 9 (hiat), and 10 (om)), edd, have 3 om p.  
[14] 1 writes with initial 1; 13 19, suff 3 om, retaining 14 om prefix o before  
[17] 1 18:—7 8 10 11 13 14 15 20, hkl, II P A L, (N, 2:—3 4 19, hkl 12, (Cp. 2 Pet. iii. 2.)  
(18) 3 om  
1 (see v. 16) 18, pref 1:—12 has 15 (both om 11 reads 4 om  
18 writes 1 18 (also 10, but erased), hkl:—the rest (but 9 hiat), arb etz, edd,  
(20) 11 om
For 

15 reads for 

10 has

(21) 18 reads for 

(22) 9 writes for 

(23) 1 all else, hkl,edd, and 18 suff to it 

(24) 1 all else, arb etz, edd, prefix ; (and so hkl as to suffix) edd : — but 19 has 

4 writes 

[corr] 12 13 14 19 : — 2 4 7 8 10 11 13 

17, arb etz, edd, suff : — 18 suff ; 9 hiat ; 1 om verb ; hkl has verb in infin., without suffix. 

(25) 18 om 

1 2 om from to inclusive (1 also om ), — and subst 

[see Suppl. N.] 14 (with 1 2) om ; and also (with 1, not 2) om 

(1 4 but before ) 13 19, arb : — all else, etz, edd, om. 

After , 13 19 ins . 4 om 

Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft ®
The only noteworthy Subscriptions to these Epistles are as follows.

MSS. 1, 9, 11, 15 alone close the Seven Catholic Epistles with a subscription applying to all; describing them thus:—

("The Seven Epistles [Catholic] of the [holy] Apostles: one of James, and two of Peter, and three of John, and one of Jude."

To 2 Pet., 3 appends as subscription:—

("The Second Epistle of Peter Chief of the Apostles."

To 1, 2, 3 Joh., 1 and 4 append:—

("The three Epistles of John the Apostle."

To Jud., 7 8 10 15 subjoin:—

("The Epistle of Jude the Apostle [son of Joseph], brother of James [and of Joses’]."

Note.—In the Apparatus Criticus, which the foregoing notes constitute, it has not seemed worth while to include the readings of 16, a MS. which has little if any claim to rank among the independent witnesses for the text. But it may be here recorded that it is an exception to the consent of the other MSS. against 8 in 2 Pet. i. 1, where it om \( \text{Αποστάλλομαι} \); and that in 2 Joh. i. 3 it differs from them all (8 included) in writing \( \text{γνωστός} \) for \( \text{γνωρίζω} \); in both cases agreeing with one or more of the printed editions, from which probably it derived its text.
سلام من یاریم
THE PERICOPE DE ADULTERA.

I. As found in a Greek MS of St. John, and translated, by the Abbat Paul. (St. Joh. vii. 53—viii. 12.)

II. As translated from his MS of the Greek Gospels by the Bishop Mara. (St. Joh. viii. 2—11.)

I.

SUPERSCRITIONS, &c.*

The *Syntaxis* is introduced in the MSS. of the Paul-text as follows:—

In a; also (om the words in brackets) in d (but with  for before \(\alpha\) before 1?oi [9]):—

[Yet another chapter from the Gospel of John son of Zebedee.] This *Syntaxis* is not found in all the copies; but the Abbat Mar Paul found it [in one of the Alexandrian copies], and translated it from Greek into Syriac, as it is written here; from the Gospel of John. [Canon tenth; number of sections, 96‡: according to the translation of Thomas of Ḥarkel.] “

* For the manuscripts and editions cited, see above, pp. 3, 4.
‡ Sect. 96 (Syr.) includes St. Joh. vii. 45—viii. 19, coinciding with Sect. 86 (Gr.).
In c, to like effect:

(‘... from the Gospel of John in a few of the ... of the Gospel [it] is found. But Mar Paul translated it from the Greek into the Syriac tongue. And it is in number 86th,* in canon tenth; according to the interpretation of the Alexandrians.

‘It is after the [words], ‘Search and see that prophet out of Galilee ariseth not’ (St. Joh. vii. 52), that it is thus written.’)

e inserts on margin one sentence of the a d note, in a corrupt form:

("This Syntychion is not found in every copy.")

f, after giving, and commenting on, the passage in its Mara-form (see infr., p. 46), proceeds:

("Otherwise thus. A section that was found in Alexandria (or, in an Alexandrian [copy]), after the verse ‘Search and see ... . . . prophet ariseth not.’")

10 has the simple heading, repeated by A, L:—

("Lection concerning the woman the sinner; which is not in the Peshitta.")

No note is prefixed or subjoined to the passage in b (where it forms part of a Lection), nor in 16 (which inserts it in the Gospel text).

In N there is a prefatory note, for which no authority is assigned.

* See footnote † to p. 41.
VII. (53) This verse does not appear in b 16:—all else, and all edd, ins. [\textit{אאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאא아 (

VIII. (1) Before מַלָּק, b alone ins מַלָּק. (2) מַלָּק מַלָּק a 16, L N:—b e e 10, A, מַלָּק מַלָּק:—f, o 12 (without מַלָּק):—(d is neutr.). מַלָּק a b e e 16:—f, edd, ins מַלָּק:—(d 10 neutr.). To מַלָּק, f pref o. (3) f om מַלָּק and subst מַלָּק. f also om מַלָּק, and om prefix from מַלָּק, and ins מַלָּק after it. (4) b alone writes מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק and מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק. Before מַלָּק, c d e f 10 16, edd, ins מַלָּק, but a b om. For מַלָּק, f alone has מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק. (5) מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק So a b d f:—c 10 16, edd, pref o;—also e (but om מַלָּק). מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק מַלָּק So a b d f:—c e 10 16, edd, pref מַלָּק (pret. peal). מַלָּק (pret. peal):—c e 16, מַלָּק (pret. peal):—c e 16, מַלָּק (pret. peal):—c e 16,
VI

| 6 | After it, f alone ins | | (after ؟) | | a b:—c d e f 10 16,edd,om. | | d alone writes | | After |

| 7 | So a c 16,L:—c f,A,دیاص (aph.):—b,N،دیاص (peal) [as v.8 infr.];—(d 10،دیاص (neutr.)). | | (7) f alone om | | [mذح] So a b (om ؟) 10 16,edd:—c d e transp:—f om | | [ذح] So a c d e 10 16,edd:—b (with ribb.) | | f،ذح. | | f alone writes | | for | | 4ذح] 16 alone transp, to follow دیاص | | b subst ف. | | f writes دیاص. | | (8) b om whole ver. | | | | (9) For o (prefix to دیاص)، d has | | [ذح] a b c e 10 16,edd:—d f pref ؟. | | (10) 16 om | | | | (11) From دیاص، a seems to om o. | | For | | دیاص، f writes | | [ذح] So d e,edd:—b c f write دیاص; (a 10 16,neutr.). | | (12) | | | | (2) After it، b 16،ins دیاص. | | e writes دیاص for ماع (but corr in mg). | | b writes ل for دیاص (but sec. m. corr). | | دیاص (before | | [ذح] a d e f:—b c 10 16,edd,transp. | | [ذح] So a b 16,
Another translation of this form of the Pericope, found only in g and 15, with neither heading nor subscription, is as follows:

VII.
53

VIII. 1, 2

10 blown to 3

40 blown to 3

50 blown to 3

3 blown to 3

4 blown to 3

5 blown to 3

6 blown to 3

7 blown to 3

8 blown to 3

9 blown to 3

10 blown to 3

15 writes 10.

For 10, g

10} So g:

9} So g:

8} So g:

7} So g:

6} So g:

5} So g:

4} So g:

3} So g:

2} So g:

1} So g:

[1] LN: c d e, transp: f om $30/2; 10 om t (hence A, which follows 10, ins [u] in brackets). | So a c d e 10: b 16, edd, subst (as psh), $30/2; f stops short. | a c 10 proceed, ... d stops short; b 16 proceed with psh txt; e with bkl.
In another MS (Bodl. Or. 625, Catal. 27), a copy of the Peshitta Gospels written in Malabar, A.D. 1801, the same passage in substance, but with much verbal variation, is inserted at the end, with a note assigning it to "section 8," after the words "Search and see . . . no prophet" (St. Joh. vii. 52). On examination it proves to be a fairly accurate rendering into Syriac of the Pericope as it stands in the Latin Vulgate; and may therefore safely be set down as the work of some ecclesiastic, or disciple, of the Roman Church in Malabar (probably dating from the Synod of Diamper, 1599), and not as a relic of the traditions of the Syro-Indian Church of the "Christians of St. Thomas." It is thus of no value as a witness to the text, and is not inserted here.

The version of the same, included in the polyglot N.T. of Elias Hutter (1599), is hardly worthy of mention.

II.

A distinct form of this narrative, differing in substance as well as in diction from all others (Greek or Syriac), corresponding, though with much deviation, with St. Joh. viii. 2-11, is found in ms h (Ecclesiastical History of Zacharias Rhetor); and in i, an extract from the same in a Catena; and again in f (Commentary of Barsalibi on the Gospels), where it stands (among the comments on St. Joh. viii.) before the Paul-form (supr.), and is given on the authority of Zacharias. All these state that it was found and translated by Bishop Mara.

SUPERSCRIPTIONS, &c.

In these MSS it is prefaced as follows:—

In h:—

\[ \text{SUPERSCRIPTION} \]
In i, the above is repeated—but omit the words in brackets; ins o before סכיס; writes יד (= 89) for the number; נאמר (with ה); אסנ for אסנ."

("[Now] there was in the Gospel of the holy Bishop Mara, in the eighty-ninth canon, a chapter which peculiarly belongs to John in his Gospel; and in other copies [the like of] this passage is not found.")

In j, the same is amplified, as follows:—

(“There was found in the Gospel of Mara, Bishop of Amid, who was versed in the Greek tongue (as Zacharia the Rhetorician and Bishop of Melitene has recorded), in the eighty-ninth canon of the Gospel, a chapter which peculiarly belongs to John, and is not found in all copies; neither have we seen any one of the commentators that has said anything concerning it. Yet we have judged it well to write the whole text of the word in its place.”)
In this recension, v. 1 does not appear; vv. 6 and 8 are combined into one and placed after v. 9.

(2) i om |ονα, f pref 0, h pref ? | i writes |οςκα. | (3) h writes |αιθη. | (4) f i om |εμ, before |σαταπ; also | om prefix 0 from |οουουσα; also | om |οά. | (5) h i ins stop after (not before) |οουουσα. | f om |οάκα. | f om |οτητα; i writes |θατη. | (7) After |οουουσα, f i ins |οτοιοια. | For |σαταπ, f i have |ονα ονα. | For 2α, f has |καμ. | After 2α, i om |ονα. | h i place a stop after |σαταπ, and another after |οουουσα: — f in neither place, but only between |ονα and |σαταπ. | For 2α, f has |ονα; i, |σαταπ. | |υμα [να] So f i: — h has |ονα. | For 0
VIII.

prefix, before סימן, i writes סינך. | (9) f i write סינך. | f transp, so that סינך takes the place of סלך, at close of ver. | (8) Before סלך, f i om stop; | f om also the prefix סלך; | also writes סלך. | f writes סלך (without suffix). | (10) To סלך, f i pref סלך. | i ins סלך before סלך instead of prefix סלך. | h writes סלך as suffix, for סלך. | i subst סלך. | f subst סלך. | Before סלך, f ins סלך. | f subst סלך. | (11) i writes סלך for סלך. | f om סלך before סלך. | f transp, placing סלך before סלך.

The above, cited from Zacharias ("Syr. cod. vatic. 146"), has been printed by Mai (Ser. V. N. C., ut supr., p. 47, note *). His text agrees with that here given; except as follows:—

GREEK TEXT
The following Greek Text is offered for the use of Biblical students who do not read Syriac.

It is a reconstruction of the text on which the Syriac translator presumably worked. His translation is so exact that, for the most part, where there is variation among the authorities for the Greek text, the reading which he followed can be determined with certainty.

In nearly all the (not very numerous) places where the evidence of the Syriac is inconclusive as to the underlying Greek, the variation of reading is immaterial—affecting the presence or absence of the article, or of a superfluous preposition, or the choice between two nearly equivalent words, or between moods or tenses of the verb which Syriac fails to distinguish. All these, as well as the very rare instances where the version has not decided clearly between two readings which differ substantially, are pointed out in the *Apparatus Criticus* at foot of each page, or (where the variation is very minute) indicated by square brackets in the text.

Of the *Apparatus Criticus*, the object (apart from such exceptional cases) is: (a) to note the evidence of the Syriac, on this or that side, wherever the reading of the Greek is disputed; (b) to record every instance in which it appears to follow a text otherwise unattested; (c) to distinguish among its textual deviations those which seem due merely to inexactitude of rendering, or to the incapacity of the Syriac idiom to represent the Greek with precision, rather than to variation in the underlying Greek.

In the still rarer instances where the translator plainly indicates the Greek he had before him, but has rendered it wrongly or imperfectly, his error or failure is not reproduced in this Text, but is noted in the *Apparatus*. The Text gives the Greek as he presumably read it, not as he has inadvertently misrepresented it.

The above applies primarily to the Greek Text of the Epistles; but the Greek Text of the *Pericope* (Paul-version) has been formed on like lines. That of the two which follow it is of course conjecturally reconstructed.
THE FOUR SHORTER CATHOLIC EPISTLES
2 PETER, 2 JOHN, 3 JOHN, JUDE;

AND

THE SYNTAXIS DE ADULTERA
(St. John VII. 53—VIII. 12).

GREEK TEXT
As represented in the foregoing Syriac Texts.
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

USED IN THE Apparatus Criticus.

MSS The consent of the Greek uncial manuscripts, viz. N A B C K L P (as commonly noted).*

mss The consent of the Greek cursive manuscripts, as numbered in Tischendorf's eighth edition of N.T., tom. ii; and in Dr. C. R. Gregory's Supplemental tom. iii.

[An asterisk added distinguishes the reading of the first hand; an accent, that of a corrector.]

gr Greek authorities in general.

lat The consent of the Latin texts (so far as ascertained by Editor).

lat vt The Old Latin texts, so far as known to Editor: (d h m represent the readings of Cod. Bezae, of Cod. Floriac., and of the “Speculum”; Icf, those of Lucifer Calarit.).†

lat vg The Vulgate of St. Jerome: (am fu to l represent vg as read in Codd. Amiat., Fuld., Tolet.; cl, the Clementine edition, 1592).

S The Syriac text of the present Edition (S₁, S₂, &c., the Syriac MSS noted as 1, 2, &c., in the Notes to the Syriac text).

syr Syriac texts in general; psh, the Peshittā version; hkl, the Harklensian (hkl §, readings so marked in text of hkl; hkl (mg), its marginalia).

syr-hxp The Syro-Hexaplar version of O.T. from the LXX.

arm The Armenian version

egp The consent of the Egyptian (viz. cop, the Coptic; sah, the Sahidic) as cited by Tischendorf.

* C lacks 2 Joh., and 3 Joh. 1, 2; P lacks Jud. 4-15.
† d (Scrivener, Cod. Bez.) gives only 3 Joh. 11-15: h (Buchanan, O. L. Bibl. Texts, No. v), 2 Pet. i. 1–ii. 7: m (Mai, Nova Patr. Biblioth., t. i), 2 Pet. i. 2–9; ii. 11–15, 21, 22; iii. 9–12; 2 Joh. 7, 10, 11; Jud. 6, 7: Icf. (Hartel, Corpus Ser. Lat., t. xiv; De non Conven. c. Haeret., pp. 28, 33), 2 Joh. 4–11; Jud. 1–8, 11–16, 17–19.
ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ

ΠΕΤΡΟΤ Β, ΙΩΑΝΝΟΤ Β, ΙΩΑΝΝΟΤ Γ, ΙΟΤΑΑ.
ΠΕΤΡΟΣ

τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Ἑπιστολῆ Β.

I. 1 Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἵσότιμοι ἢμῶν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ 2 Κυρίου ἢμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ἢμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: 2 χάρις ἢμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἢμῶν 3 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 3 ὡς [τὰ] πάντα τὰ τῆς θείας δυνάμεως

I. (1) The omission of καὶ ἀπόστολος (which most editions of S require) is a mere blunder of one very late copy (8) with no Greek or other support. | ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὁ οὐ, εἰς δικαιοσύνην, as Ν and some lat.:—not διὰ δικαιοσύνης (as the "per iustitiam" of the Polyglots suggests). | Κυρίου] So Ν, 9 68, sah:—all else (incl hkl), Θεοῦ. | ἢμῶν] (after σωτῆρος) A few mss, arm egp eth:—hkl and all else om. | (2) τοῦ Κ. ἢμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρ. So 69 137 163 214 216, hkl lat et (some) νε (some):—P, lat νε (am fu, &c.), τοῦ Κ. ἢμῶν merely:—nearly all else ins Θεοῦ καὶ, after τοῦ, and proceed, Ἰησοῦ (or Ἰησοῦ Χρ., or Χρ. Ἰησοῦ) τοῦ Κ. [ἡμῶν]. | (3) ὡς [τὰ] πάντα . . . δεδωρημένου] S (not hkl, which deviates) apparently understood these words thus: "Inasmuch as He (Ἰησοῦ of ver. 2) hath given all the things that belong to divine power towards life and godliness." (Similarly the lat of Polyglots [see Suppl. N.].) S must therefore have read the Greek as (a) om ἢμῶν after πάντα, (b) ins τὰ before τῆς, (c) om τὰ before πρὸς, (d) with δεδωρημένου (for —μένης), gen. absol. agreeing with αἰτοῦ,—this pron. being thus detached in construction from τῆς δυνάμεως, and the latter connected with πάντα τὰ. In none of these variations is it supported by any authority. The gr vary, and S is indeterminate, as to τὰ before πάντα, which Ν Α,
I. αὐτοῦ πρὸς ζωῆν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένον, διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντός ἡμᾶς, ἵδια δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ
4 δι' ἄν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα ύμῖν δεδό-4
ρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως,
ἀποφεύγοντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμῶν φθορᾶς. 5 καὶ 5
αὐτὸ δὲ τούτο σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενεγκόντες, ἐπιχορη-
γήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει υἱῶν τῆν ἁρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἁρετῇ
tῆς γνώσει, 6 ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τῆν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκράτεια τῆν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἡ ὑπομονή τῆν εὐσέ-
βειαν, 7 ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσέβεια τῆν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ 7
φιλαδελφία τῆν ἀγάπην. 8 ταῦτα γὰρ υἱῶν παρόντα καὶ 8

5 13 137 216 251 ins.—the rest om. | ἵδια δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ] Ν Α Κ Ρ, 13 15 25 36 66 68 69 73 80 137 163 214 216, lat vt (m) νγ εγγ.,—hkl similarly, but add τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ:—Β Κ Λ, most mss, διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. | (4) μέγιστα καὶ τίμια] So Α Κ Ρ, 5 13 31 68, lat νγ:—the rest, τίμ. κ. μέγ. | For τίμια (subst for τίμια), which many copies of Σ represent, see note on syr txt, [and Suppl. N.]. | ἐπαγγέλματα] Late copies of Σ, followed by Pococke and Lee (but not by Polyglots or New York txt) represent, by an easy error of one letter in syr, an unsuitable and unattested reading ἐπιγνώσεις. [See note on syr txt, and Suppl. N.]

| υἱῶν] Α, 68, hkl (mg, but placed after τίμια):—the rest, ὑμῖν (mostly before καὶ). | ἀποφεύγοντες] S with hkl:—all else, ἀποφεύγοντες. | ἐπι-
θυμῶν φθορᾶς] S alone; but 13 43 65, lat εγγ, ἐπιθυμῶν (genit. sing.)
φθ.:—C P (?), few mss, hkl, ἐπιθυμίας καὶ φθ.:—ΑΒΚΛ, most mss, ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθ.; (Ν deviates). | (5) αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο] Ν Α, 5 13 68 69
137 163 214 216, &c., hkl, arm:—Β Κ Λ Ρ, most mss, αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ.
(Α, lat, diverge.) | πᾶσαν] Κ, 41 69 163 214 216, om:—all else ins (hkl
with Λ). | παρεισενεγκόντες] S perhaps read this ptcp (as 137 214) for
—ἐγκαντεῖς (of all else), and mistook it for pres.—S and hkl here and
elsewhere neglect force of compound (e.g. ii. 1 infr.). | For ἐν with
dat., S represents εἰς with accus.; and so vv. 6, 7. | (8) παρόντα]
Α, 5 8 9 73, lat sah:—all else, ὑπάρχοντα. (The syr verb used, though
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I.  
πλεονάζοντα, οὐκ ἄργοις οὐδ’ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν ὑμᾶς,
9 εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν. ὑμᾶς ἀριστεῖται, τυφλὸς ἐστιν, μυωπάζων λήθην λαβῶν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτημάτων.
10 διὸ μᾶλλον ἀδελφοὶ σπουδάσατε, ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων, βεβαιῶν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ [τὴν] ἐκλογὴν ποιήσητε ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες, οὐ μὴ πταίσητε ποτε. 11 οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, τοῦ Κυρίου [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 12 διὸ οὐκ ἀμελήσω ὑπομιμήσκεν ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ περὶ τούτων, καὶ περὶ εἰδότας, καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13 δικαίωμα δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ’ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν

sometimes = ὑπάρχειν, is = παρεῖναι in v. 9 infr., which seems decisive for παρ. here.) | ὑμᾶς So hkl (≠), arm.—all else om. | (9) λήθην λαβῶν Lit., ἐπιλαβόμενος (ep. Judic. iii. 7, syr-hxp.). | ἀμαρτημάτων] As Ν Α Κ, many mss,—also lat ("delictorum");—or ἀμαρτίων, as the rest. | (10) ὑμῶν τῶν καλῶν ἔργων...ποιήσετε] Ν Α, 5 8 15 36 68 69 73 99 137 214 216, hkl lat τγ' egp arm eth (but of these only Α, 5, hkl (≠) eth, ins ὑμῶν):—all else om ἐν...ἔργων. The verb is fut. in S and hkl, which may represent ποιεῖσθε (as Α, 15 99), but rather ποιήσει (as 5 8 25 36 69 73 214; so lat, "faciatis"). (Ν, and those which om ἐν...ἔργων, read ποιοῖσθαι.) | (11) S (not hkl) represents τὸς αἰωνίου βασιλείας (but probably by mere laxity of rendering). | Α, 106, om ἡμῶν after Κυρίου, but ins after σωτήρος:—all gr else ins after Κυρ. only; as also hkl: egp alone as S. | (12) οὐκ ἀμελήσω] (Lit., οὐκ ἀμελῶ) Κ Λ, most mss, hkl.—Ν Α Β Ρ, 25 27 29 126, lat egp arm eth, μελλῆσαι (without neg.). | ὑπομιμ. ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ] So 69 214 216, and hkl.—Ν Β Κ Λ, many mss, place ἀεὶ first (Ν with περὶ τούτων following) and ὑπομιμ. last,—also lat τή (h) (but om ὑμᾶς):—Α, some mss, lat τγ' cop eth, ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομ.: Ρ, few mss, sah, om ἀεὶ. | τῇ παρούσῃ] Lit., ταύτῃ τῇ (but probably no variation of reading
in the gr is to be inferred). | (13) σκηνώματι S (not hkl) renders as if σώματι were read (so also in ver. 14, σώματος); but here again S is not to be regarded as implying a gr variant. Cp. in lat vt (h), "corpore," "corporis," here. In 14, however, a few gr mss give σώματος; and so lat νη (tol) sah arm. | (15) σπουδάζω] So best txt of S, with N, 31, arm; nearly all else σπουδάζω (but note that S often renders fut. by pres.):—later copies of S, with mss 37 58 216, hkl, σπουδάζατε. | καί(2) S and hkl alone. | (16) ἔξακολοθοῦντες] So best txt of S (not hkl), for aor. ptep. of gr. | (17) ἐνεχθείσης] Lit, ἐλθοῦσας: and so in νν 18, 21. | Before Οὔτος, S seems to have read ὅτι (narrantis). | εἰς ὅν] Or, ἐν ὅ, with 13 24 69 137 214. | ἐγώ] So most copies of S, with nearly all gr; but S, S2, with 13 24 32 37 69 214, hkl, om. | (18) S, and hkl (≠), alone ins aυτῷ. | (19) S suggests the comparat. βεβαιώτερον, by rendering as if the gr were βέβαιον καί; hkl by supplying before βέβαιον advb. = μᾶλλον,—but retains the καί of S after it. | S renders as if reading τῆς προφητείας for τῶν προφητικῶν: | also as if ἥλιος for φωσφόρος. In neither case is a gr.
I. ὡς λύχνῃ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ· ἐως οὗ [ἡ] ἡμέρα διανυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

20 τούτο πρῶτον γυνώσκοντες· ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφὴς ἑνίας ἐπίλυσις οὐ γίνεται. 21 οὖ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Πνεύματος Ἀγίου φερόμενοι, ἐλάλησαν ἁγιοὶ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι.

II. 1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφηταὶ ἐν τῷ λαῷ· ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι· οῖτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρετείς ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι ἐπάγοντες ἐαυτοῖς ταχυν ἀπώλειαν. 2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν τῇ ἀσελεγείᾳ, δι' οὕς ἂν ὁ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθῇ· 3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ καὶ [ἐν] πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσουται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκ-4 παλαι οὐκ ἄργει, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει. 4 Εἰ γὰρ ο Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο· ἀλλὰ σειραῖς variant to be supposed. | (20) ἐπίλυσις] So S must have read (unless he mistook ἐπιλύσεως for nominat.), leaving ἑνίας to agree with γραφῆς, and construing γραφῆς with ἐπίλυσις, not with προφητεία. Similarly hkl as regards ἐπίλυσις; but renders as if reading πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἐπίλυσις οἶδα [?] οὐ γίνεται. [See Suppl. N.] | (21) ἁγιοὶ Θεοῦ] So Ν Α Κ Λ, most mss, lat et (h) v g:—B P, 68 69 137 216, hkl arm, ἄπο Θ:—C 27 29, eth, (by conflation) ἄπο Θ. ἁγιοὶ.

II. (1) λαῷ] A blunder of some later scribes of S represents κόσμῳ [see Suppl. N.]. | S and hkl neglect παρά in παρεισάξουσιν (see on i. 7 supr.). | (2) ἀσελεγείᾳ] So most copies of S (but no gr):—others, with most gr, and hkl, ἀσελεγείαι,—but no syr supports ἀπωλείας (of some gr). | (3) Only S, S₂, arb, ins καὶ [2]: no gr add εν. | οἶς] S represents ὅν. | (4) σειραῖς] So Κ Λ P, most mss and versions (hkl translit):—against Ν Α Β Κ, στερ oid. | ταρταρώσας . . . παρέδωκεν] S renders as if κατέβαλεν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα . . . καὶ παρέδωκεν: hkl, καταβάλων εἰς τάρταρος (translit
ΠΕΤΡΟΤ Β.  

II.  
ζόφου ταρταρώσας [αὐτούς], ταρέδωκεν [αὐτούς] εἰς κρίσιν κολάσεως τηρείσθαι. 5 καὶ ἀρχαῖον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο. 5 ἀλλ' ὁγίου Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν· κατα-κλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας. 6 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καὶ καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν [αὐτάς]. ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς. 7 καὶ δίκαιον 7 Δῶτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων εἰς ἀσελγεία ἀναστροφῆς, ἐρρύσατο. 8 βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἄκοὴ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἡμέραν εἷς ἡμέρας ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ δι-καίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν. 9 οἴδεν Κύριος τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν. 10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὅπισώ 10 σαρκῶς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους, καὶ κυριότητος

sic in txt; in mg (gr), ταρταρψ[ας] ταρέδωκεν. | αὐτοὺς (bis)] S and hkl ins pron., probably without gr equivalent; and so S, αὐτάς, v. 6. | κολάσεως τηρείσθαι] Reading otherwise unattested, except by hkl (which marks κολ. with #). Among gr, the nearest to it is ms 13 (also ap Joh. Damasc.) κολαζομένους τηρείσθαι. So lat vg (with variations) "crucianatos reservari." Similarly Ν Α, 5 25 33 65 73, read κολα-ζομένους τηρείν (cp. close of ver. 9), which S may have meant to express here. All else τηρομένους (or τετηρήμα) and om κολάζ. | (6) Και[12] So best copies of S, with gr and hkl. | και[12] S alone. | τεφρώσας S renders as if κατακάισας: hkl better [see Suppl. N.]. | καταστροφῇ So hkl and nearly all — B C* (but corr), few mss, cop, om (P deviates). | ἀσεβέσιν] B P, 69 137 214: — the rest, hkl, ἀσεβέιν [see Suppl. N.]. | (7) ὑπὸ S, punctuates as if reading ἄτρο, construed with ἐφρύσατο. | S and hkl, with all gr except B, express ὃ before δίκαιος. | (8) S alone ins αὐτοῦ. | (9) τεφράσμον] So nearly all:—Σ', some mss, hkl cop, read —μῶν. | S may represent τηρεῖν (as gr, hkl), or —ἐ, or —ἡμ. | (10) ἐπιθυμίᾳ] So best copies of S, with most gr, lat arm eth:—C P, some mss, hkl cop, —μίας. | S alone ins καὶ (before αὐθάδεις); | S with hkl alone
καταφρονοῦντας· τολμηταὶ καὶ αὐθάδεις· οiêu δοξαν οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. 11 ὅτου ἀγγελοὶ ἵσχυὶ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες [αὐτῶν]. οὐ φέρονσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ 12 Κυρίον βλάσφημον κρίσιν. 12 οὕτωι δὲ ὦ ἄλογα ζῶα γεγενημένοι φῦσει εἰς ἀλωσιν καὶ [ eius] φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες· ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται. 13 ἀδικούμενοι, μισθῶν ἄδικιας ἤδονήν ἥγουμενοι, τὴν ἐν ἥμερα τρυφῆν, σπίλοι καὶ μεστοὶ μόμων, ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν· [συν]ἐνωχοῦμενοι. 14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίας, καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεά-

ins oī. | δῦξαν] So S; but perhaps intends plur. | (11) παρὰ Κυρίον] So the best copies of S, followed by hkl (*), with some mss.;—and similarly Ν Β Κ Λ Π most mss, lat vt (m) eg (tol) arm, παρὰ Κυρίῳ: — against A, some mss, lat eg (most) cop eth, which om. | (12) γεγενημένοι] S alone:—all else neut. (Ν' Α' Κ Λ, many mss, and hkl, γεγενημένα; Α Β Κ Π, many mss, γεγενημένα). | φῦσει] So S and hkl:—95, lat vt (m) eg, have φυσικῶς (which possibly S intends):—all else, φυσικά. | καταφθαρήσονται] So Ν' Κ Λ, many mss, lat vt (m) eg (some) egp:—Ν' Α' Β' Κ' Π', some mss, hkl lat eg (am, &c.), καὶ φθαρ. | (13) ἀδικούμενοι] So Ν' Β Π, arm. This reading is probably represented by S, whose rendering is ἦν ὦ ῥα ἄδικα (ἀδικούμενοι) being treated as middle, not passive, and μισθῶν construed with ἥγουμεν [see Suppl. N.]:—against Ν' Α Κ Λ, all mss, lat vt (m) eg egp eth, κομιοῦμενοι, (so hkl=ἀγορίζοντες). | μεστοὶ μόμων] S and hkl only,—possibly a periphrasis for μῶμοι (of all gr), or for a variant (unrecorded) μῳμητοί. | ἀγάπαις] So Α' Β, lat vt (m) eg hkl (mg):—hkl (txt) and all else, ἀπάτας. Note that whereas hkl (mg) renders ἀγάπαις literally, S employs a syr word which is properly=κατάπαυσις or the like [see Suppl. N.]; cp. the pll. Jude 12. Many copies of S err, here and in Jude, by substituting a similar syr word. | (14) μοιχαλίας] So Ν' Α, 63 68 73, hkl lat (most) egp:—Β Κ Λ Π, the rest, μοιχαλίδος. | ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας] So Ν' Κ Λ Π, most mss, hkl lat (some) sah:—
II. ζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεον- 
εξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα, ὁι καταλιπόντες τὴν εὐθείαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν εἶναι 
τῇ ὀδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βεώρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἤγαπησεν ἔλεγξιν ἐξ ἐσχεν ἰδίας 
παρανομίας ὑποξύγιον ἀφόνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῆ 
φθεγξάμενον, ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

οὐτοὶ εἰσὶν πηγαί ἄνυδροι, νεφέλαι ὑπὸ λαίλατος ἐλαυ- 
nόμεναι, οῖς ὁ ζώφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. ὑπέρογκα 
γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγώμενοι, δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις 
σαρκὸς ἀσελγέσιν, τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ.

A B, ἀκαταπάστος:—13 27 40 68 105 215, &c., lat (most), ἀκαταπάστον. But S and hkl treat ἀμαρτίας as acc. pl. (ἀκαταπ. agreeing with it, and both governed by ἔχοντες), not as gen. sing.; moreover, some copies of S represent [ὁφθαλμοὺς] ἀκαταπάστου ἀμαρτῶν [see Suppl. N.]. | (15). Καταλιπόντες] B C K L P, most mss:—S A B*, 13, hkl lat νγ, καταλειπόντες. S and hkl seem to have read οἴ (or οἰ) before this ptcp. | τὴν] So apparently S, with some mss. | ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὀδῷ] S alone renders as if the gr were καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ (cp. i. 16; ii. 2, supr.),—but no variant is to be inferred. | Βεώρ] B, 81, lat (some) arm sah:—S A C K L P, most mss, hkl lat (most) cop eth, Βοσόρ. | (16) ἀλέγξιν] The later copies of S, with hkl, render this by a word—“correptricem” (sc., asinam). | (17) νεφέλαι (without καὶ before it)] So L, many mss:—S A B C, most mss, καὶ ὀμίχλαι,—P, 31, hkl (txt and gr mg), καὶ ὀμίχλη. | For ὑπὸ λαί- 
λατος, a few of the later copies of S, and arb (not hkl), have a corrupt 
reading [see syr txt and note in loc; also Suppl. N.] = ἄπτο (or ἐξ) ἄνωθεν (cp. Mt. xxvii. 51, Joh. xix. 23, Jac. i. 17—psh and hkl). | S, 
with S B, hkl lat egp, om eis aiōna:—against all else. | (18) ὑπέρογκα] 
The same late copies of S as in case of ὑπὸ λαίλ. (ver. 17), with little 
further syr support (not hkl or arb), have here corrupted the syr into 
similar word=γελοίου (or γέλωτα); [see syr txt and note in loc; also Suppl. 
N.]. | ἀσελγέσιν] S alone. Possibly this adjct. may represent ἀσελγείας 
sing.), which P, many mss, hkl (but using a syr word of different
II.  
19 ἀναστρέφομένους. 19 καὶ ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς ὧ γὰρ τις ἤτηται 
20 τοῦτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται. 20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα 
τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ σωτηρὸς ἡμῶν, τοῦτοι πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἤττῶνται, 
21 γέγονεν αὐτῶν τὰ ἑσχάτα, χείρονα τῶν πρῶτων. 21 κρείσσον 
γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνώκειν τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἢ 
ἐπιγνώσων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἐπιστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης 
22 αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς. 22 συμβεβηκεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς 

root) lat cop, read here: — the rest, [ἐν] ἀσελγείας. | ἀσελγείας] (Or ἀσελγείας) S with Ν Α B, 8 9 13 25 69 73 142 214 &c., hkl lat egp eth: —
Ν* C KLP, most mss, arm, ὀντως. | ἀποφυγόντας] Ν A BC, 5 7 13 27 68 142 &c., hkl lat: the rest, ἀποφυγόντας. | (19) καί (before ἐλευθερον), S alone ins. | ἐπαγγελλόμενοι] (Or ἐπαγγέλλονται). All gr 
give ptcp., and so hkl. | καί (before δεδούλω).] So Ν* B, egp eth. | (20) ἡμῶν (after Κρ.)] Ν A C L P, 5 27 68 73 127 180 214 &c., hkl 
and all verss: — Β Κ, most mss, om. | καί σωτηρὸς ἡμῶν] So 4 18 25 38 39 106 (mg) 177 193, sah: — L, a few mss, cop eth, om: — all else, 
hkl lat, om ἡμῶν only. Thus S alone writes ἡμῶν twice (cp. iii. 2, 18); 
but copies vary as to placing καί κατ' ἡμ. | τοῦτοι] All gr, but no 
lat, add δέ. | S rather represents ἐμπλακέωνοι, against all gr, hkl. | 
αὐτῶν] Some copies of S, αὐτοῖς αὐτῶν. All gr, hkl, αὐτοῖς. | S, τὸ ἑσχάτον 
... τοῦ πρῶτου, but probably no variation of text is implied. | (21) εἰς 
tὰ ὀπίσω] So Ν A, 5 8 9 13 25 33' 69 137 180 214 &c., hkl lat: — all 
else om. | ἐπιστρέψαι] So probably S (in view of its like rendering of 
ἐπιστρ. in next ver.) with Κ L, mss: — or else ὑποστρ., with Β Κ Ρ, few 
mss.; — or perhaps rather ἀνακύψαι, as Ν A and some mss (5 8 13 25 33 
180) which support S in ins εἰς τὰ ὀπί. | (22) δέ] So S and hkl, with 
most gr: — Ν* A B, lat et (m) υγ (am) arm, om; lat υγ (fu cl) subst γάρ. | 
τὰ] S (but some copies om) and hkl: — all else, τά. | τὸ ... ἐξεραμά] 
Possibly S here read τὸν ... ἐμετον, as 137 214, &c., — which word is 
rendered in syr-hxp (Prov. xxvi. 11) by the syr word here used by S 
and hkl. | Only one copy (8) of S, but most edd, om καί: — the rest,
II. ἄληθονς παροιμίας, Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα· καὶ ὑποσμηνεύει εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου.

III. 1. Ταῦταν ἦδη ἀγάπητοι [μου] δευτέραν ὑμῶν γράφω ἐπι- I στολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινὴ διάνοιαν, 2. μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν 2 ἀγίων προφητῶν, καὶ τῆς διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. 3. τοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες 3 ὀτι ἔλευσονται ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἥμερῶν ἐμπαίζοντες ἐμ- παίκται, κατὰ τὰς ἱδίας [αὐτῶν] ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι· 4 καὶ λέγοντες· Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παροιμίας 4 αὐτοῦ; ἂφ' ἂς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐκουμηνήσαν πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5. λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς 5 τοῦτο θέλοντας, ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἥσαν ἐκπαλαί, καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὦδατος καὶ δι' ὦδατος συνεστή τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ. 6. δι' δὲ νῦν οὕρανοι 7 κόσμος ὑδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπάλετο. 7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ 7

and all gr and other authorities, ins. | κύλισμα | Or κύλισμόν, — S and hkl are indecisive.

III. (1) S alone ins μου after ἀγάπητοι here and ver. 8. [See Suppl. N., 3 Joh. 1.] | (2) S and hkl alone ins διὰ before τῶν ἀποστόλων. | After ἀποστόλων, S and hkl with very scanty support om ἡμῶν:—all MSS and nearly all mss, lat arm, ins; (a few mss, ἠμῶν). | ἡμῶν after Κυρίου, S with hkl egp only. | ἡμῶν after σωτῆρος (as ii. 20), S with egp eth. | (3) ἐσχάτου] K L P (C*, ἐσχάτῳ), most mss:—the rest, ἐσχάτων. | ἐμπαίζοντες] So S; (possibly meant as equivalent to [ἐν] ἐμπαίγμονη, as N A B C P, some mss, lat ἐγϋ egp eth:—or to ἐμπαίγμονης, as hkl with 137):— K L, most mss, om. | After ἱδίας (here expressed in syr by the separate pron.), S and hkl seem to om αὐτῶν, as 214, lat ἐγ— all else ins. | (4) S and hkl, with 69 137 214, egp, ins ἡμῶν after πατέρες:—against all else. | (5) Late copies of S om γὰρ:—all else ins. | In syr txt (p. 19) the stop indicated after γῆ is probably wrongly
III.

καὶ ἡ γῆ, τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσών, πυρὶ τηροῦμενοι, εἰς ἥμεραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. 8 Ἕν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὡμᾶς ἀγαπητοί [μου]. ὅτι μία ἥμερα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἐτή ἐστίν, καὶ χίλια 9 ἐτή ὡς ἥμερα μία. 9 οὐ βραδύνει [ὁ] Κύριος ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις αὐτοῦ ὡς τινὲς βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ δι' ὡμᾶς μὴ βουλόμενος τινὰ ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς 10 μετάνοιαν χωρήσαι. 10 ἦζε δὲ ἥμερα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης, ἐν ἦ [οἱ] οὐρανοὶ βούλιαν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καν- σούμενα λυθήσονται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα ἐυρεθή- 11 σεται. 11 Τούτων οὖν πάντων λυμένων, ποταποὺς δεῖ

placed. | S and hkl alone write συνέστη for συνεστῶσα. | (7) τῷ αὐτοῦ] Ν C K L, most mss (of which a few om preceding τῷ), hkl eth:—A B P, a few mss, lat egp arm, τῷ αὐτῷ. | S and hkl connect πυρὶ with τηρο- μενοι, as LP; the gr vary in interpunction; Ν A B C write no point. | (8) S alone ins ὐστίν. | (9) βραδύνει] S, hkl lat:—not βραδύνει, as P, egp. | ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις αὐτοῦ] S and hkl:—all else, τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (om αὐτοῦ). | δ'] So Ν A, 5 13 69 73 137 214, hkl lat sah eth:—B C K L P, most mss, arm, εἰς. | ὡμᾶς] Ν A B C P, 5 9 13 27 73 114* 117* 127 137 216 &c., hkl lat sah arm eth:—K L, many mss, cop, ὡμᾶς. | τῶν] P, 13 43 98 99, lat vt (m) vg (am, &c.) cop arm:—all gr else, hkl, lat vg (fu cl), τῶν. | (10) After κλέπτης, C K L, most mss, hkl, add ἐν νυκτὶ:—S, with Ν A B P, 5 13 25 27 68' 180 &c., lat egp arm eth, om. | βούλιαν] S renders as if = ἀφιᾶ, but probably through misapprehension of the meaning of the word, or inability to convey it:—hkl, as if ἐν βούλιαν (rather ἐν κρανγῇ). | λυθήσονται] A K L, most mss, hkl:— Ν B C P, 36, λυθήσεται. | εὐρεθήσεται] Ν B K P, 27 29 66*, hkl (mg) arm sah (?):—A L, most mss, hkl (txt) lat vg (some, but am, &c., om) cop eth, κατακαθήσεται:—C, ἀφανισθήσονται. [See note on syr txt, and Suppl. N.] | (II) οὖν] Ν Α K L, most mss, hkl (mg) lat (most) cop:—B, 5 69 214, hkl (txt), οὖν:—C P, 29 39 100, δὲ οὖν. Other variations are recorded. | ὡμᾶς] So Ν' Α C K L P, most mss, hkl lat sah:—Ν*, few
ΠΕΤΡΟΤ Β.  

III. 

ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς ὑμῶν καὶ εὐσεβείας, 

12 προσδοκώντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ 12 Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ οὐρανοῖ πυροῦμενοι [ἐν πυρὶ] λυθή- 

σονται, καὶ στοιχεία καυσοῦμενα τακῆσονται; 13 κανοὺς δὲ ὀυρανοὺς καὶ κακῆν γῆν, κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ 

προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. 14 Διὸ ἀγαπητοῖ 14 [μοι] ταῦτα προσδοκώντες σπουδάσατε ἀσπιλοι καὶ ἀμω- 

μητοι αὐτοῦ εὐρέθηναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ. 15 καὶ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου 15 μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς 

ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος, κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν 

ἐγεραφεὶ ὑμῖν, 16 ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν 16 αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ δυσνόητά τινα ἀ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς,
III.

καὶ ἀστήρικτοι, στρεβλοῦσιν, ὡς καὶ τὰς λυπὰς γραφαὶς

17 πρὸς τὴν ἵδιαν [αὐτῶν] ἀπώλειαν. Ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοὶ

[μου], προγνώσκοντες, φυλάσσεσθε, ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἄθεσ-

μῶν πλάνη ἐξακολουθοῦντες, ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἱδίου στηριγμοῦ.

18 ἀυξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάρη καὶ [ἐν] γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν

καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς. ὃ

ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ πάντοτε καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

for 'α,—seeing that the syr pron. may represent either fem. or neut. | For αὐτῶν, which S and hkl doubtfully om, after ἱδιαν, see on ver. 3

supr. | (17) ἐξακολουθοῦντες] So apparently S (cp. i. 16, ii. 2, supr.) :—

all else, συναπαχθέντες. | (18) αὐξάνετε] Or αὐξάνεσθε, as C P, 15 40. | καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός] So 9 40 69 137 214, hkl :—all else om. | ἀμήν] S with

hkl only :—all else, αὐτῶν. | S alone writes ἡμῶν after σωτῆρος (as ii. 20,

iii. 2); and | ins καὶ πάντοτε after νῦν, and | subst ἡμέρας αἰώνων for

ἡμέραν αἰῶνος. | ἀμήν] So all except B and two or three mss.
IΩΑΝΝΟΥ

τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Ἐπιστολῆ B.

1 'Ο πρεσβύτερος ἐκλέκτη Κυρία καὶ τοῦς τέκνους αὐτῆς, ὁ δὲ μόνος ἀλλὰ πάντες οἱ ἑγωνικότες τὴν ἀληθείαν. 2 διὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν τὴν 2 μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 3 ἔσται μεθ' ἡμῶν χάρις καὶ ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ Θεοῦ 3 πατρός, καὶ παρὰ Κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ νῦν τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθεία καὶ [ἐν] ἀγάπῃ. 4 Ἐξάρην λίαν ὦτε 4 εὐρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατούντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καθὼς ἐντολήν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. 5 Καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε Ἡ

(1) οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ] Α, 73 :—all else, incl hkl, καί οὐκ ἐγὼ (L add δε). | After ἀλλὰ, all except S ins καὶ. | (2) ἐστίν] S, with 31 only ; hkl, οὐσαν :—all else, ἔσται. | (3) μεθ' ἡμῶν] Ν B L P, many mss, lat vg (am) sah eth :—Α om :—Κ, most mss, lat vg (most) cop, μεθ' ἡμῶν ;—so hkl, ἡμῶν (also, with Α, om ἐσται). | S alone ins καί before ἔλεος, and (with hkl, which om ἐλ.) before εἰρήνη. | παρά . . . παρά] S repeats, without varying, the prep. :—Ν* and some gr subst ἀπό for παρά (1) ; Ν*, 99 194, lat vg (am), om παρά (2). | Κυρίων] So the best text of S, with Ν K L P, many mss, hkl lat vg (tol) cop arm :—Α Β, lat vg (most) sah eth, om. (S alone add ἡμῶν, probably only by syr usage.) | S and hkl alone repeat ἐν before ἀγάπῃ. | (4) ἐλάβομεν] Ν, 13 28, have ἐλαβον. | παρά] Or ἀπό (as Α, 73 ;—in syr there is but one prep. to represent "from"). | (5) S places καίνην after ἐντολήν, with Ν Α, 5 13 31 68 217, hkl lat cop :—Β Κ Λ Π, most mss, sah, after γρ. σου. | γράφω] So apparently S and hkl, with 64 65 66
Kuría, oúx ós éntolhν kaihn γράфω σοι, ἄλλα ἢν εἴχομεν ἴνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἄλληλους. ἦν αὐτή ἐστίν ἢ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὐτὴ ἡ ἐντολή ἐστιν καθὼς ἦκουσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ τε περιπατητέ. ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐληλυθότα ἐν σαρκί, οὐκ ἐστιν οἱ πλάνοι καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος. βλέπετε [εἰς] ἐαυτοὺς ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε δ ἐιργάσασθε, ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε. πᾶς ὁ παραβάινων καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδακῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ διδακῇ αὐτοῦ, οὐτὸς καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει. εἰ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς υἱάς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδακήν ὠφεῖ εὐφελεί, μὴ

106 217 &c., arm. eth.—all else, lat, γράφων. εἴχομεν] So ἘΚΠ, most mss.—Ἀ Λ, εἴχαμεν:—some mss, εἴχομεν. ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ] Ἀ ἘΚΠ, 5 13 35, hkl, lat ἐγ (am &c.), place thus before ἐστίν.—Ἀ Λ, ἐν τῇ, most mss, lat ἐγ (cl) egp arm, transp. ἵνα ἵνα] S om ἵνα (1) (before καθὼς), but ins ἵνα (2) (before ἐν αὐτῷ), with ἘΚΠ, many mss, hkl lat ἐγ (lcf):—Ἀ Λ, 31 73, ins both:—Κ, many mss, lat ἐγ egp arm, ins ἵνα (1) but om ἵνα (2). περιπατῆτε] So S, with gr (L.—εἰτε) :—except Ν, which has ἵσητε (as also probably hkl). ἐξῆλθον] Α Β Π, many mss, hkl, lat ἐγ (m lcf) ἐγ (most) sah arm:—Κ ἘΚΠ, many mss, cop, ἐξῆλθον. ἐν τῇ] So S and hkl:—all else ἐν. εἰς] So ἘΚΠ alone (idios) is probably due to syr. idiom. ἀπολέσητε . . . ἀπολάβητε] ἘΚΒ, 5 13 35 40 66 68 73 137 194 217 219, &c., hkl lat arm egp eth:—Κ ἘΚΠ, some mss, ἐλάβωμεν . . . ἐλάβωμεν. ἵνα] ἘΚΠ alone (idios). ἐν τῇ] Α Λ, mss nearly as last note, hkl (txt) lat cop arm eth:—Β ἘΚΠ, many mss, hkl (mg), οὐκ ἀυτῶν. ἐξῆλθον] Κ ἘΚΠ, most mss, hkl cop arm; (and so lat ἐγ (lcf) ἐγ (cl, &c.), “recedit”):—Ἀ Β, lat ἐγ (am &c.) sah eth, προάγων. θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει] Λιτ., ἔχει οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. αὐτοῦ] S with hkl (*), lat ἐγ (lcf):—Κ ἘΚΠ, most mss, cop eth, τοῦ Χριστοῦ:—Ἀ Λ, some mss, lat ἐγ sah arm, om. Θεός:—Ἀ Λ, ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξῆλθεν. ἔνας:—Ἀ Λ, ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξῆλθεν. τοῦ Χριστοῦ:—Ἀ Λ, ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξῆλθεν.
λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν, καὶ χάρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε.

11 ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτῷ χάρειν, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἐργοῖς αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς. 12 Πολλὰ ἔχων γράφειν ύμῖν, οὐκ ἐβουλήθην διὰ 12 χάρτου καὶ μέλανος, ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς, καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλήσαι, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ἦ πεπληρωμένη. 13 Ἀσπαζόμενοι σε τὰ τεκνὰ τῆς ἄδελφης σοι τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς. ['Η χάρις μεθ' ύμῶν.] Ἀμην.

IOANNON

τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Ἑπιστολὴ Γ.

1 ὁ προσβύτερος Γαίῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, δόν ἐγὼ ἄγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. ἀγαπητέ [ἡμῶν], περὶ πάντων εὐχομαι σε εὐ-

οδοῦσθαι καὶ ἰγαίων, καθὼς εὐδοὐσταί σου ἡ ψυχή.

3 ἐχάρην γὰρ λίαν, ἐρχομένων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαρτυροῦντων

σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς σὺ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς. μει-

ζοτέραν ταύτης χαρᾶν οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα ἐν

5 τῇ ἀληθείᾳ περιπατοῦντα. ἀγαπητὲ [ἡμῶν], [ἐν] πίστει

(1) After ἀγαπητῷ, most copies of S ins μου,—but the best om, with all gr, and all versions incl. hkl. | (2) Here and in vv. 5, 11, S ins ἡμῶν after ἀγαπητὲ:—against all gr, hkl, and all versions. [See Suppl. N.] Ὁρ. 2 Pet. iii. 1. | περὶ πάντων] So all gr. S renders as if ἐν παντὶ (or πᾶσι); but no divergence from the gr is to be inferred here (nor in next note): hkl represents περί. | After εὐχομαι, S renders as if reading ὑπέρ σοῦ for σε, and (as is its habit) ὅπως with subjunctive for infinitives εὐδοῦσθαι, ἰγαίων,—but no variation of txt is to be in-

ferred. | (3) γάρ] So all: except N, few mss, lat νγ sah arm eth, which om. | (4) ταύτης] So 27 29 31 40 66 68 69 73 217, &c., egp:—MSS, most mss, hkl lat νγ arm eth, τοιτων. | χαρᾶν] So all:—except B, 7 35, lat νγ (am el) cop, χάραι. | S places οὐκ ἔχω after χαρᾶν, with C', 38, hkl eth:—all else, before it. | (5) [ἐν] πίστει] S alone:—all else, K
ποιεῖς δὲ εἶναι ἐργάζῃ εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τοῦτο ξένους·

οἱ ἐμαρτύρησαν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐνώπιον πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὕς καλῶς ποιεῖς προπέμψας, ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ. 7 ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον, μηδὲν λαβόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν. 8 ἡμεῖς οὖν ὁφελομεν ἀπολαμβάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους· 9 ἵνα συνεργηθῇ γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. 9 Ἐγραψα δὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλ' ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρεφῆς οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. 10 διὰ τοῦτο εἴναι ἐλθὼν, ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ 10 ἔργα ἀποτίθεσθαι, λόγους πονηροῖς φλαρῶν ἡμᾶς. καὶ μὴ πιστὸν (which perhaps S may intend). 1 ἐργάζῃ So S and hkl, with A, lat vγ:—all else, ἐργάζῃ. 1 S represents the gr, καὶ μᾶλλονἢ ὁ (ἢ ὃτι) εἰσιν ξένοι,—evidently a periphrasis, not a variant,—for καὶ τοῦτο ξένοις, as read by Ν Α Β Μ, 27 29 68, &c., hkl lat egp arm eth:—K L P, many mss, read καὶ εἰς τοὺς ξ. 1 5 ἐργάζῃ τῆς] S, with hkl & alone ins. 1 ποιεῖς] 7 18 27 29 68, hkl lat vγ (some, not am):—all else, ποιήσεις (except as in next note). 1 προπέμψας] S (but some inferior copies om) with all else:—except C, lat vγ (cl) arm, which read ποιήσεις προπέμψας. 1 7 ὑπέρ] Some copies of S represent a variant, ὑπόσω. 1 αὐτοῦ] S, hkl &c., some mss, lat vγ (some, not am) arm (some) eth:—all else om. 1 For λαμβάνοντες, of all else, S and hkl seem to have read λαβόντες. 1 ἐθνῶν] So K L P, most mss, hkl lat vγ (am cl, &c.) sah:— Ν Α Β Μ, some mss, lat vγ (fu, &c.) cop, ἐθνικῶν. 1 8 ἀπολαμβάνειν] So C' K L P, many mss, hkl:— Ν Α Β Μ*, some mss, ὑπολαμβ. (which possibly S and hkl may have read). 1 S and hkl apparently represent γινώμεθα, as most gr:—against K, few mss, which read γενώμεθα. 1 9 Ἐγραψα ἀν] This no doubt is what S and hkl mean to express (by rendering as if ἐγγέλω γράφειν (ὄρ —ψα)), with Ν', 13 15 18 26 29 33' 36 40 49 73 180 217, lat vγ (ep. ver. 13 infr. and 2 Joh. 12):—against Ν* Α Β Μ, 7 68, egp arm, which give τι for ἀν:—also against K L P, most mss, which om both. 1 αὐτῶν] Many copies of S subst ὕμων, against all else. 1 10 εἰναι ἐλθὼν, ὑπομνήσω] The reading of S (as if εἶναι ἐλθη, ὑπομνησθητι), as in Pococke's against all gr and other authority, is (as a whole) weakly attested by the syr copies, and (as regards the
ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτους, οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς ἄδελφοὺς· καὶ τοὺς ἐπιδεχομένους κωλύει, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκ-

11 Ἀγαπητὲ [ἡμῶν], μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸν. ὦ ἀγαθοποιῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔστιν, ὦ κακοποιῶν
12 οὐχ ἐώρακεν τὸν Θεόν. 12 Δημητρίῳ μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων [καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας] καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ οἶδας ὅτι ἡ μαρ-
13 τυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθῆς ἔστιν. 13 Πολλὰ εἶχον γράψαι σοι, ἀλλ’

last word) by but one (S₈). [See Suppl. N.]: ἐπιθύμεις] S, hkl:—all else, ποιεῖ. [φλαφᾶς] The editions of S, with some late copies [see note on syr text] represent ποιῶν (or ἐργαζόμενος),—a mere scribe’s blunder. [οὐκ] So S:—all else, οὐ&tau;e. [ἐπιδεχομένους] C, 5 7 27 29 66', hkl (mg) lat ἕγ (some) sah arm:—the rest, hkl lat ἕγ (am fu) cop, βουλομένους. (11) So S₁, S₁₉, read ὀ κακοποιῶν without copulative, as do Ν Α Β Κ Π, most mss, hkl lat ἔτ (d) ἕγ (am cl, &c.):—other copies of S, with L, some mss and versions, read ὀ ἔτ [ὁ καὶ ὀ] κακοπ. (12) All copies of S but one, with C, hkl (mg) arm, ἑνὶ καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας after πάντων:—S₁ om, with all gr, hkl (txt), &c.—Note that A seems to have originally had ἐκκλησίας for ἀληθείας, but corr. prima m. ; so too S₁₄ (after καὶ . . . ἐκκλησ.). om καὶ . . . ἀληθ. [οἶδας] So most of the better copies of S, with Ν Α Β Κ, many mss, lat ἔτ (d) ἕγ εγκ arm:—but nearly all later copies of S, with Κ Λ Π, most mss, hkl (txt and gr mg) eth, οἴδατε. A few mss, οἶδαμεν. (13) γράφαι σοι. So Ν Α Β Κ, some mss; (also hkl lat ἔτ (d) ἕγ εγκ arm eth, ἑνὶ σοι):—against Κ Λ Π, most mss, which have γράφειν (om σοι). The syr does not distinguish between the tenses of infinitive; but as S and hkl both read σοι, it is to be presumed that they read γράφαι, and not γράφειν to which no gr here subjoins σοι. [οὐ θέλω] S and hkl represent pres., with nearly all gr, and lat ἔτ (d) ἕγ (tol) ("nolo"):—but A has ἢβουλήθην, 27 has ἢβελον, lat ἕγ (am cl, &c.) "nolui." [γράφειν] The MSS which write γράφαι above (see last note but one) have γράφειν here, and vice versa ; therefore it is probable that S follows the former here, as there. | S and hkl, with Λ, 13 73, hkl lat ἔτ (d) ἕγ
οὖ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμον γράφειν σοι 14 ἔλπίζω 14 δὲ εὐθέως ἰδεῖν σε, καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσομεν. 15 Εἰρήνη σοι. ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ φίλοι. ἀσπάζον τοὺς 15 φίλους ἐκαστὸν κατ' ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

eyg y[π. σοι:]—the rest transp. | (14) S, S, S, lat et (d), read γάρ for δέ. | Ν Κ Λ Π, most mss, with ἰδεῖν σε:—the rest transp. But in this case the evidence of S and hkl in favour of ἰδεῖν σε is inconclusive, the other order being impossible in syr. | (15) φίλου] So nearly all:—except A, few mss, hkl (mg) eth, which read ἄδελφοι. | φίλους] 33 81 160, followed by hkl, read ἄδελφους. | S and hkl alone ins ἐκαστὸν before κατ' ὄνομα: also | they alone ins αὐτοῦ after ὄνομα. | S and hkl close without ἄμην, which L, 15 26, lat vg (few) ins.
ΙΟΥΔΑ

τοῦ 'Αποστόλου 'Επιστολή.

1 1 'Ιουδας 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ 'Ιακώβου, 
toῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένως, καὶ [ἐν] 'Ιησοῦ 
2 Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς, 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ 
3 ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη. 3 Ἀγαπητοί [μου], πᾶσαν σπουδὴν 
ποιούμενοι γράφειν ὑμῖν, περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ὑμῶν σωτηρίας: 
ἀνάγκην ἔχω γράψαί ὑμῖν, παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωγίζεσθαι τῇ 
4 ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. 4 παρεισέδυσαν

(1) 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ] Ν Α Β Λ, many mss, hkl lat νγ (am cl, &c.) egp 
arm eth:—Κ Π, many mss, lat νγ (some), transp. | τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] S 
and hkl, with 27 29 66', arm:—all else om. | ἡγαπημένως] Ν Α Β, 
5 33' 68 73 98 (mg) 126 (mg) 163, hkl lat ντ (lef) νγ egp arm:—Κ Λ Π, 
most mss, ἡγασμένους. | καὶ [ἐν] 'Ιησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένου] So (but 
without ἐν, which the syr idiom requires) all gr, except 163 which (with 
hkl) om. | S (probably for mere convenience of rendering) places [τοῖς] 
κλητοῖς immediately before τοῖς ἐν Θ. Π. ἡγαπ., so as to connect it with 
ἔθνεσιν. | (2) καὶ ἀγάπη] Many copies of S read ἐν ἀγάπῃ, but un-
supported: hkl (alone) add ἐν Κυρίῳ. | (3) For μοῦ subjoined to 
ἀγαπητοὶ (here and in vv. 17, 20) cp. 2 Pet. iii. 1, 3 Joh. 1 [and Suppl. N. 
on the latter]. | γράφειν . . . γράψαι] Neither S nor hkl attempts to 
distinguish between these two infinitives. (Cp. 2 Joh. 12, 3 Joh. 13 
with note on gr). | ἡμῶν] So nearly all copies of S, with Ν Α Β Κ(?), 
many mss, hkl lat ντ (lef) sah arm:—but S₄, ὑμῶν, with few mss, lat νγ: 
—Κ Λ Π, most mss. cop, om; also S₂ (prima m.). | (4) S separates 
ἀνθρ. from τινες (same syr word for both), and joins it with ἀσέβεις.
γάρ τινες οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα· ἀνθρωποι ἁσεβεῖς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἁσελυείαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην Θεὸν καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνοῦμενοι. 5 "Τπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀπαξ λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς µὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. 6 ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς µὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν έαυτῶν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολύσαντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν. 7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτῶν πόλεις, τὸν ὄμοιον τρόπον τούτους ἐκπορνεύσασα, καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα ὑπὸσω σαρκὸς 

Θεόν] K L P, many mss, hkl:—the rest om. [καὶ Κύριον] So MSS, nearly all mss, hkl and all verss., and the best copies of S:—some late copies om καὶ [see Suppl. N.]. Similarly a few ms read Θεὸν καὶ δεσπότην τὸν Κύριον Ι. X. | (5) ὑμᾶς[ός] Ν K L, many mss, ins; and so the copies of S which (see next note) read πάντας. But the better copies which read πάντα, and hkl, apparently om ὑμᾶς, with A B C' [P hiat, vv. 5-15], and all else. [See note on syr txt, and Suppl. N.] πάντα So our oldest copies (S₁ S₂), with Ν A B C', 6 7 13 27 29 68 163, hkl lat vt (lcf) vg cop arm eth:—K L, most mss, sah, τοῦτο. Most copies of S read πάντας. | ὁ Θεός] C', 5 6 8 (also Clem. A.), lat vt (lcf) vg (tol) arm:—A B, few mss, lat ὑγ (am cl, &c.) egp eth, Ἰησοῦς:—Ν C* K L, most mss, hkl, [δ] Κύριος. | ἀπαξ (before λαὸν)] S, hkl, with Ν, 68, lat ὑγ (tol) egp arm (and so Clem. A.):—A B C L, most mss, lat ὑγ (most) eth, after εἰδότας (K, a few, after τοῦτο,—see note on πάντα). [See Suppl. N.] (6) For τε of most gr, after ἀγγέλους, A and a few mss, with hkl, lat ὑγ cop, have δὲ (lat vt (lcf m), "quoque"):—S has simple copulative. | ἀπαξ[ός] S and hkl, misled by false etymology, render as if ἀγιωστοὺς (as hkl, Act. xvii. 23). | τετήρηκεν] Copies of S vary between pres. and preter.; either may mean the gr perf.; no gr reads τηρεῖ. (7) σαρκὸς ἐτέρας] So hkl and most of our better copies (S₁ S₂ S₆ S₁₂), with all gr and other authorities:—S₁₄ and later copies
Before τρο-κενται, hkl, and two of our copies (S₁₃ S₁₉), both of which elsewhere show signs of Harklensian interpolation, ἵνα τέφρα (ἐπ. 2 Pet. ii. 6, τεφρόσως): also render the verb so as to express the προ-, which S (in all other copies) neglects. Moreover, lat et (lcf m) agrees in both these points. [See Suppl. N.] | δείγμα πυρός] So all gr, and all versions else; and so (a) some copies of S (including S₁₉). Most of the other copies (incl. S₁₄) read (b) ὑπὸ πῦρ:—the rest, (incl. S₁ S₂) read (c) ὑπὸ δείγμα πυρός. Of these, (b) is to be rejected as a blunder of a Syr. scribe [see note on syr txt, and Suppl. N.]; (c) seems to be formed by conflation of (a) (b), unless it is an error for ὑπόδειγμα (as 2 Pet. ii. 6). Note that all these diverging texts of S agree in construing πυρός (or πῦρ) with what precedes, not with the following δωκὼν; and so hkl. | (8) εὐπνιαζόμενοι] S and hkl paraphrase, ἐν ἐυπνίῳ [—IOUS] ποδοῦντες. | κυριότητα] One good copy (S₁₄) writes plur., with N. | καὶ δόξαι] So S:—hkl, nearly all gr, δόξας δέ. But 3 5 55, lat, δόξαν δέ. | (9) ὅς] S and hkl:—all gr, ὅτε (except B, which subst ὅτε for ὅ δέ before Μιχαήλ, and τότε for ὅτε here; similarly lat eg, but without τότε). | [Most late copies of S read διαλεγόμενος διεκρίνετο, but unsupported. | αὐτῷ] S and hkl alone ins; but probably only in order to express the ἐπι- in ἐπενεγκεῖν (ἐκ., ἐπι αὐτόν ἐνεγκεῖν). | (10) δέ (after ὅτου)] S₁ S₂ alone om. | Some later copies of S om ἁλογα:—against all else. | (11) S and hkl render ἐπορεύθησαν, as S renders
80

μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.

12 Ὁδότι εἰσὼν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν σπουδαῖς συνενωχούνεται, νεφέλαι ἀνυδροὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφέρομενα, δένδρα φθινοπωρικά, ἀκαρπὰ ὄντα, διὸς ἀποθανόντα, ἐκρύζωθεντα, 13 κύματα ἁγρία θαλάσσης ἐπαφρύζοντα τὴν ἀντῶν ἀισχύνην, ἀστέρες πλανήται, οἷς ὁ ζῷος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰώνα τετήρηται. 14 Προεφ- ὦν ὡς καὶ τούτοις ὁ αὖ ἐβδομος ἀπὸ Ἦδαμ Ἐνώχ, λέγων, Ἡδοῦ Κύριος ἔρχεται ἐν μυριάσιν ἄγιων, 15 ποησαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχήν, περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ὃν ἁσβήσαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν

εὐακολουθ., 2 Pet. ii. 15; but no variation in gr need be suspected. | (12) οἱ ἐν ταῖς | So Ν' Α B L, 13 27 29 &c., hkl:—Ν* Κ Κ, most mss, lat vt (lcf) egp, om oί. | ἀγάπαις] So Σ (except some copies which have a misreading (= ἰματίως), with Ν B K L, most mss, hkl and verss: —Α C, three mss, ἀπάταις. Oρ. 2 Pet. ii. 13 [also Suppl. N. on same]. | αὐτῶν] A, lat vt arm:—all else, ὕμων. | ἀφόβως] Σ and hkl connect with πομαίνοντες, not with συνενωχομένου. | παραφέρομενα] Or (as some gr) περιφερ. | φθινοπωρικά] Σ (also hkl) paraphrases, ὃν ἐφθιτό ἡ ὀπώρα. | S alone ἵνα ὄντα (lit., a ἵστυν). | (13) ἐπαφρύζοντα] Σ (also hkl) paraphrases, δι' ἀφροῦ αὐτῶν δηλοῦτα. | (14) Σιο, and Polyglots om δὲ, with A, few mss. | S alone ἵνα ὃν (hkl ὃ merely) before ἐβδομος. | [ο] Κύριος] Of the copies of Σ, only Σ: S2 place before verb (as in μαρὰν ἀθά, 1 Cor. xvi. 22); the rest, with hkl, transp, and so probably the gr. | ἔρχεται] Σ and hkl only:—all else, ἦλθεν. | μυριάσων ἀγίων] So (but add ἀγγέλων) Ν, 8 25 56, sah arm:—all else, and versions (incl hkl), ἀγίας μυριάς [or μισρ. ἀγ.] αὐτῶν. | (15) πᾶσαν ψυχῆν] So Σ, S2 (not the rest) with Ν, sah:—all else (incl hkl), πᾶντας τοὺς ἁσβείσες. | Before περὶ (1), Σ with Ν Α B C, many mss, hkl lat vt (some) egp arm eth, om αὐτῶν:—Κ L, most ms3, ins. | After ἔργων, Σ om ἁσβείσες αὐτῶν, with Ν, 6 7 26 29 66', sah (also C, 15 18 36 68 117, arm, om ἁσβ., retaining αὐτῶν):—Α B K L,
16 σκληρῶν λόγων δὲν ἐλάλησαν ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. 16 Οὕτωι εἴσον γογγυσταὶ καὶ μεμψύμοιροι, κατὰ τάς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεὶ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμά-
17 ζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελεῖων χάρων. 17 'Τοιεὶς δὲ, ἀγαπητοὶ [μου], μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 18 ὅτι ἔλεγον ὕμων [ὅτι] ἐν ἐσχάτῳ τῶν χρόνων ἔσονται οἱ ἐμπαίζοντες, κατὰ τᾶς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι ἐπὶ ἀσεβεῖαν. 19 οὕτωι most mss, hkl lat vg cop eth, ins. [λόγων] Ν C, 6 8 13 18 25 27 29 36 43 56 68 99, hkl lat vg (tol) sah arm eth:—A B K L P, most mss, lat vg (am cl, &c.) cop arm, om. | After ἐλάλησαν, S alone add nothing:— all else, ins kar' αὐτοῦ (or the like). | (16) μεμψύμοιροι] S alone pref καὶ, and it paraphrases, μεμφόμενοι ἐν παντὶ [μέρει, οὐ πράγματι]: hkl gives in mg μεμψύμοιροι, and renders unmeaningly by μεμφόμενοι μνημα (which White mistranslates). | ὠφελεῖων] S and hkl only:—all else, gen. sing. | (17) τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων] So S, with nearly all gr, and verss (incl hkl):—A, 6 29 163, lat vt (lcf), τῶν προειρ. ῥημ. | (18) οὕτωι(1)] So S, with hkl and all else:—exc lat vg, ("qui" =) οὗ. This latter reading Tischendorf wrongly attributes to S (misled by the editors' Latin, which repeats lat vg). | οὕτωι(2)] S and hkl are here indecisive as to ins or om, for the particle which they employ here is often prefixed where the gr has no οὕτωι. In this case the gr and other authorities are divided. | ἐν ἐσχάτῳ] S with K L P, most mss, hkl lat vg cop: (or perhaps with Ν A B C, 5 6 7 8 13 15 18 22 27 29 33 36 66 73 106 180, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων):—a few have ἐπ' ἐσχάτων. | τῶν χρόνων] 6 7 15 17 18 26 27 29 36 66 68 106 126 (mg) 130:—Ν Α Β Κ, 5 8 13 22 33 73 180, hkl, [τῶν] χρόνων:—K L P, many mss, lat vg cop, [τῶν] χρόνων. | ἐσονται] Ν* B C* K L P, most mss; hkl lat vt (lcf.) arm:—Ν' Α C', 5 6 7 8 13 22 26 29 33 36 66 73 81 126 130 180, lat vg egp eth, ἔλοιποντα. | οὐ ἐμπαίζοντες] All else, ἐμπαίζοντες. | ἑαυτῶν] Οὐ (perhaps) δὶας, with slight gr support:—all else, ἑαυτῶν, οὐ (before or after ἐπιθ.) αὐτῶν. | ἐπ' ἀσεβεῖαν] (Οὐ, ὡπεισώ ἀσεβείας) So S, and hkl similarly, but pl.:—all gr else, τῶν ἀσεβεῖων. | (19) Neither S nor...
εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. 20 Τμεῖς 20
de, ἀγαπητοί [μου], τῇ ἀγίᾳ ύμῶν πίστει ἐποικοδομεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, 21 ἑαυτοὺς δὲ ἐν 21 ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρῆσομεν, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν ἡμῶν αἰώνιον. 22 καὶ οὐς 22 μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, 23 διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, 23 μυσώντες καὶ τὸν ἄπο τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

hkl ins ἑαυτοὺς after ἀποδιορίζοντες: as do C, many mss, lat ὕ (am tol cl), against all other gr, lat ὕ (lcf), &c. | (20) S places τῇ ἀγίᾳ ύμῶν πίστει before ἐποικοδομεῖτε, with K L D, most mss, arm.—N A B C, 5 13 68 73 163 217, hkl, lat ὕ ἐγρ ἐθ, transp. | ἀγίᾳ] S and hkl, for ἀγωνιστῇ of all else,—perhaps for lack of superlative in syr. | ύμῶν] So nearly all:—C, few mss, ἡμῶν. | ἐποικοδομεῖτε] S alone (rather ἀνοικοδομεῖτε, —cp. Act. xv. 16 (hkl)) :—all else (incl hkl) ἐποικοδομοῦντες. | (21) S alone ins δὲ. | τηρήσομεν] S and hkl, with B C* :—nearly all else, τηρήσατε. | S alone ins ἡμῶν (3). | (22) ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε] So S, with Clem. Alex. alone of gr, and Jer. of lat [see Suppl. N.] :—the rest read σώζετε ἐκ τ. ἀρπάζοντες, and place in next ver.—In this ver., after οὐς μὲν, N B C* K L P, many mss, hkl, read ἐλεάτε (or —εῖτε) :—A C*, many mss, lat ὕ cop arm ἑθ, ἐλέγχετε. | (23) διακρινομένους δὲ] So Clem. Alex., Jer., as above :—all else place διακρινομ. (without δὲ) in ver. 22, joining it with ἑλεάτε (or ἐλέγχετε). Of these, N A B C, many mss, hkl lat (ℏ), have διακρινομένους (with S) :—K L P, many mss, arm, read διακρινομένοι). But all exc S, Clem., and Jer., agree in beginning this ver. with οὖς δὲ σώζετε (except that B om οὖς δὲ). (Note that the syr verb properly = μεταμελομένους or μετανοοῦντας). | ἑλεάτε] (Many texts which have ἑλεάτε in last ver. (22), read ἐλέγχετε here). Before this word, N A B, many mss, hkl, lat ὕ cop arm ἑθ, ins σώζετε ἐκ τ. ἀρπάζοντες, adding (except B) οὖς δὲ (see last two notes) :—C, and (with slight change) K L P, many mss, hkl, subst σῶς. ἐκ τ. ἀρπάζοντες for ἑλεάτε, and om οὖς δὲ and what follows (but C, hkl, retain ἐν φόβῳ). [For vv. 22, 23, see further in Suppl. N.] | Among the variations of the authorities, note that S is one of those which here recognize two
classes of persons; not three, as many others do. | (24) ἡμᾶς] S₁, with A:—the other copies of S, with N B C L, many mss, hkl lat ev cop arm eth, ἡμᾶς:—K P, many mss, αὐτούς. | καὶ ἀσπίλους] C, 6 17 27 29 43 66 68 163 195, &c., hkl arm:—all else om. | After ἀσπίλους, S proceeds, καὶ στήσαι (later copies add ἡμᾶς (not hkl)); S₁₈, ἡμᾶς) ἀμώμους, exc S₁, which has καὶ ἀμώμους (om verb). Thus all copies of S end the ver. with ἀμώμους:—all gr, hkl and other vers., ins:—(a) before ἀμώμ., κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ,—(b) after ἀμώμ., ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει,—(with all which words S deals as below, in next ver.). | (25) κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει] The copies of S which retain these words, ins them in this ver. (between διὰ Ἰησ. Χρ. τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν and δόξα [καὶ] μεγαλωσύνη . . . . ). This apparent dislocation two copies (S₁ S₁₈) avoid by om the words; another (S₂) om κατενώπιον τῆς δ. but retains ἐν ἀγαλλ. S₁ S₂ (not S₁₈) om also all the preceding part of the ver. (μόνῳ Θ. σωτ. ἦμ.) ; and for the words they om, they subst. καθαρισθέντας κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (but unsupported by other authority). In none of the above deviations in ν. 24, 25 from the gr, does hkl or any other vers. support S₁. | S om σοφῷ after μόνῳ, with N A B C, 6 7 13 17 27 29 40 56 66* 68 73 160 163, hkl lat ev cop arm:—against K L P, most mss. | ἐκ 1. X. τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν] N A B C L, many mss, hkl lat ev cop:—K P, most mss, om. | [For the placing of the bracketed words, see Suppl. N.] | τὸ θέλημα] Or, τῆν πρόθεσιν (as 2 Tim. i. 9 (psb)). | αὐτῷ] So S₁ and a few other copies; similarly N (ὁ), lat ev (am, &c.) "cui":—all else om. | S with K P, most mss, om πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος:—against N A B C L, some mss, hkl lat ev. | πάντας] S hkl (txt), with all, exc N, cop, a few mss, which om, as also hkl (mg); with τῶν αἰῶνων added after τοῦ αἰῶνος.
'Η περὶ τῆς Μοιχαλίδου
Περικοπή.
The Greek MSS which give the *Pericope*, with or without note of doubt, are (as cited by Tischendorf) D E F G H K M S U Γ Λ Π (but in F only viii, 10, 11 are extant). It also appears in more than 300 mss.

The Old Latin versions preserved in the copies known as c (Cod. Colbert), e (Cod. Palat.), ff (Cod. Corbei.), also exhibit it.*

In the Notes appended to the following Greek Text (I.), the readings of the Greek MSS are taken from Tischendorf, *N.T.*, t. i. (eighth ed.); those of the Old Latin from Sabatier, *Latinae Verss.*, t. iii. (e); Tischendorf, *Evang. Palat.* (e); Buchanan, *O.L. Bibl. Texts*, no. v. (ff).

The Old Latin d, which is interpaged with the Greek D (Cod. Bezae), also gives a text independent in a few places of the Greek.

* The Old Lat mss l, r, include the *Pericope*; but apparently as borrowed from the Vulgate.

The mss g, h, belong to the Old Lat. class only in St. Matthew.

The ms b has lost the *Pericope* by excision of two pp., retaining only viii. 12.
Ἐκ

τοῦ κατὰ ἸΩΑΝΝΗΝ Ἑυαγγελίου.

I.

(p. 43, supr.)

VII. 53 Ἐπορεύθη οὖν ἐκαστὸς [αὐτῶν] εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

VIII. 1, 2 Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὅρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. ὁρθρον δὲ πάλιν ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἦρξετο πρὸς 3 αὐτὸν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. προσήνεγκαν δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαίοι γυναίκα ἐν μοιχεία κατα- 4 λῃθησάν, καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: Διδάσκαλε, αὐτὴ ἡ γυνὴ κατελήφθη ἐπαυτοφώρῳ

VII. (53) This verse lat et (ff) om; as do two syr. S alone writes οὖν after ἐπορεύθη, instead of καὶ before it. D M S Τ and some mss, lat, write verb in plur. No gr expresses αὐτῶν,—probably a syr pleonasm.

VIII. (1) Ἰησοῦς δὲ] U Γ Α, some mss, write καὶ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς. (2) ἦλθεν] So U Γ, many mss, lat et (c d ff) ἐλ ("venit"):—most gr, παρεγένετο (D, παραγένεται).—In the syr and these lat the verb used is the same as renders ἦρξετο just after. πρὸς αὐτῶν] So D M S U Γ Α, most mss, lat :—E G H K Π, some mss, om. (3) προσήνεγκαν] Nearly all gr read ἐγέρσαν, and so lat et (ff) ἐγ.—but lat et (e e) as syr. After Φαρισα., S with D M S U Γ Α, most mss, lat et (e) ἐγ, om πρὸς αὐτῶν (but for "ad eum," e gives "autem"):—which E G H K Π, many mss, lat et (c ff) ἐγ. καταληθῆσαν] Or, καταλημμένη;—gr vary as to tense; D writes εἰλημμένη (om κατ). (4) κατελήφθη] Or, [κατ]—ἐλημμαται,—gr vary much. (Here, D writes with κατ-, M S Λ with-
KATA IΩANNHN [St. Joh. VIII. 5–9]

VIII.

μοιχευομένη. 5 εν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῶν Μωσῆς ἐνετείλατο τάς 5 τοιαύτας λιθάζειν: σὺ οὖν τι λέγεις; 6 τούτῳ δὲ εἴπον 6 πειράζοντες αὐτόν, ἵνα ἐχωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. ὦ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας ἐγραφεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν. 7 ὁ δὲ ἐπέμεναν 7 ἐρωτῶντες αὐτόν, ἀνέκυψεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Ὅ ἀναμάρτητος [ἐξ] ὑμῶν, πρῶτος βαλέτω ἐπ' αὐτὴν [τὸν] λίθον. 8 καὶ 8 πάλιν κύψας ἐγραφεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν. 9 Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες 9 ἐξηρχοντο εἰς καθ' εἰς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,

out). [μοιχευομένη] Lit., μοιχείας. (5) ἡμῶν (before Μωσῆς)] So S Γ, many mss.—D Η, few mss, om.—the rest, lat, (placed variously) ἡμῖν. [ἐνετειλα] Or ἐκέλευσεν, as D. [λιθάζειν] (Lit., ἵνα λιθάζωμεν) So D M S U Λ, most mss, lat vt (e) νγ:—the other MSS, some mss, lat vt (c ff), λιθάζονται or λιθοβολέσωσι. | D has δὲ νῦν for οὖν, lat vt (c ff) "autem" only. | M S U Λ, many mss, lat vt (c ff) add περὶ αὐτῆς after λέγεις. | (6) D M, one ms, om τοῦτο . . . . . . κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ, [but see Suppl. N.] | εἰπον] So M S Γ, some mss, lat.—the rest, ἐλεγον. [κάτω κύψα] Some gr have κατακύψας; some, κάτω νεύσας. | Between ἐγγραφεῖν and κατέγρ., gr vary (here and in ver. 8). | Λ with three mss supports syr in om τῷ δακτύλῳ:—all else ins before ἐγγραφεῖν. (7) ἐπέμεναν] All gr, ἐπέμενον. | D, few mss, om αὐτοῦ. | ἀνέκυψεν καὶ] So D M S, some mss, lat:—the rest, ἀνακύψας. | αὐτοῖς] So D S U Γ Λ, most mss, lat vt (most) νγ:—all else, πρῶς αὐτοῖς (exc M, om). | νῦν] Rather εἰ [ὑμῶν] (but no gr ins εἰ). | πρῶτος] So most gr, and lat:—E G H, few mss, πρῶτον. | Some ms, αὐτῆς. | As to ins τὸν, gr vary; also | as to order of placing (i) βαλ., (ii) εἰτ' αὐτ., (iii) [τὸν] λίθον. M supports syr exactly; D in placing iii last (but with ii before i); most gr, and lat, place i last. | (8) κύψας] Or κατακύψας, as D, few mss:—the other gr, κάτω κύψας (lat indecisive). | D, few mss, lat vt (ff), ins τῷ δακτύλῳ before εἰς τὴν γ. | (9) For the earlier part of this ver. (οἱ δὲ . . . . . εἰς), D subst ἐκατοστὸς δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξηρχοτο. | ἐι εἰ ἀκούσαντες] So most gr (with small variations), Λ and a few mss om. | Many gr add καὶ ὅπδ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι; but D M U Γ Λ, many mss, lat, om as syr. | ἐξηρχοτο] Some gr;
VIII.

10 καὶ κατελείφθη μόνη ἡ γυνὴ, οὐσα ἐν μέσῳ. 10 ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τῇ γυναικί. Ποῦ εἶσίν; οὐδείς σε κατέ-κρινεν; 11 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Οὐδείς, Κύριε. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω· πορεύομαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε. 12 "Οτε οὖν συνήχθησαν, ἠλάλησεν . . . K.T.L.

εξῆλθον (or —θεν). | After προσβ., S U Γ, some mss, add ἐως τῶν ἑσχάτων (D, ὅστε πάντας ἔσελθεῖν, and similarly lat vt (c ff)); all else om as syr. | For μόνη (syr alone), most gr lat vt (e ff) ἐγ. (cl) μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς (or [ὁ] Ἰησ. μόν.). καὶ:—D, few mss, lat vt (c) ἐγ. (am, &c.), om ὁ Ἰησ. :—some gr, om μόνος. | οὐσα] (Lit. ὃς ἢν) So all MSS, nearly all mss, lat vt (ff):—many mss, lat vt (c "erat stans");—e om) νγ., ἐστώσα. | (10) After ὁ Ἰησ. many gr ins καὶ μηδένα θεασάμενος πλὴν τῆς γυν.: others, εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ:—D M S Γ, many mss, lat, om with syr. | τῇ γυναικί] So D, lat vt (c):—the rest, αὐτῇ (or πρὸς αὐτήν); or om. | Before ποῦ, many gr, lat vt (e ff) ἐγ., ins γώναι (or ἡ γυνῆ):—D E F G H K, many mss, lat vt (c), om, as syr (but observe that syr with D and c subst for γώναι, the τῇ γυναικί of last note). | A few mss om ποῦ εἰσίν. | Most gr, lat ἐγ. (cl), ins [ἐκεῖνοι] οἱ κατήγοροι σοῦν (ff, "qui te perduxerunt"):—D M Γ Λ, many mss, lat vt (c e) ἐγ. (am), om as syr. | (11) ἡ δὲ] Or κάκεινη, as D. | D add αὐτῷ after εἰπεν(1), and | writes ὁ δὲ εἶπεν for εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησ. | D E F G H K M S, many mss, lat ἐγ. (not vt), om αὐτῇ as syr. | πορεύομαι] D has ἔπαγε (but syr uses same verb as supr., vii. 53, viii. 1). | ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μηκέτι] So D M S U Γ, most mss, lat vt (e ff, "ex hoc jam") ἐγ. "amplius jam":—the rest μηκέτι only. | (12) ὁτε οὖν συνήχθησαν] So lat vt (b e):—but all gr, πάλω [οὖν], without συνήχθαι; and so lat vt (c ff) ἐγ.
KATA IΩANNHN [St. Jn. VII. 53—VIII. 11]

I'.

[Similar text, from unknown source (see p. 45, supr.).]

53 Καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐκαστὸς [αὐτῶν] εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ.

I. Καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ὀρος τῶν ἐλαϊῶν. ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὰς ὅρασι, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

II. ἐπορεύθη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ὀρος τῶν ἐλαϊῶν. ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὰς ὅρασι, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. Αὐτοὶ ἐκατομμύριοι γυναῖκα ὑφεπέθεσαν ἐν πορνείᾳ, καὶ ἐστησαν αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ. Αὐτίκης, ταύτην τὴν γυναίκα ὑφρομεν ἐν πορνείᾳ.

VII. 53

VIII. 1, 2

5 ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ Ποσείδως ὑπετάται λιθάζεσθαι τί λέγεις σὺ; 6 τούτῳ δὲ εἶπον ὅταν εὑρωσίν καὶ αὐτὸν αἰτίαν. ὅ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐκυψεν καὶ ἐγραψεν τῷ δακτύλῳ [αὐτοῦ] εἰς τὴν γῆν. 7 καὶ ὅσον προσεδόκησαν ἐπερώτημα αὐτοῦ, ἐπῆρεν τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ἐπεν αὐτοῖς. Τὸς ἐξ ὕµῶν ἀναμάρτητος; λιθαζεῖτω αὐτὴν πρῶτον. 8 Καὶ ἐκυψεν καὶ ἐγραψεν εἰς τὴν γῆν. 9 ἀκουστὰς δὲ τούτῳ [ἀπ'] αὐτοῦ καὶ συνυνέτες τὴν ἐλεγξὶν αὐτοῦ, ἤρξαντο εἰς καθ' εἰς ἔξερχομενοι, ἐως οὖ ἐξήλθον οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ πάντες. Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰησοῦς μόνος, καὶ ἤ γυνὴ οὕσα ἐν μέσῳ. 10 καὶ ἐπῆρεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ἐπεν αὐτῇ. Γύναι, ποὺ εἰσὶν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κρίναντες σε; 11 ἂν δὲ ἐπεν. Κύριε, οὐδένα ὀρῶ. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κρίνω. πορεύομαι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μὴ ἐπίστρεφε εἰς ἀμαρτίαν.

VIII. (3, 4) πορνεία (ἢ μοιχεία) is common to this text with text II (see next p.). See notes, p. 88, on vv. 6, 8 (τῷ δακτύλῳ). (7) προσεδόκησαν The syr verb so rendered here is usually ἐπερώτημα in hkl. (7) προσεδόκησαν The syr verb so rendered here is usually = προσδοκάω in hkl. (7) πρεσβύτεροι Cp. 1 Pet. iii. 21, and see hkl. for the syr equivalent.
II.

(p. 47, supr.)

VIII. 2, 3 2 'Εγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος Ἰησοῦν, 3 προσ- ἴπτες γυναῖκά των εὑρεθείσαν ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξουσαν ἐκ 4 πορνείας, 4 καὶ ἐγνώρισαν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἰδὼς ὡς Θεὸς τὰ πάθη αὐτῶν τὰ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ 5 τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, 5 'Εν τῷ νόμῳ τί ἐνετείλατο; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἠπὶ στόματος δύο καὶ τριῶν μαρτυρῶν λιθασθή- 7 σεται. 7 ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Κατὰ νόμον ὅστις καθαρὸς καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν παθῶν τῆς ἀμαρτίας, καὶ μετὰ πεποίθησεν καὶ ἐξουσίας, ὡς ἀμεμπ- τος ὃν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ μαρτυρῶν μαρτυρησάτω κατ' αὐτὴς, καὶ πρῶτον βαλέτω ἐπ' αὐτὴν. [τὸν] λίθον, καὶ ὁ 9 καθεξῆς, καὶ λιθασθῆτω. 9 Ἐκεῖνοι δὲ, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένοι ἦσαν καὶ μεμπτοὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πάθει τῆς παραβάσεως, εἰς καθ' εἰς ἀνεχώρησαν παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατέληπτον τὴν (6)8 γυναίκα. καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθον, (68 ἣν ἀτενίζων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν

[For the order of the verses, see first note on syr text, p. 48.]

γὴν καὶ γράψας ἐν τῷ κοινωντὶ αὐτῆς, ὁ ἐίπεν τῇ γυναικί. ἦν ἦγαγόν σε ὧδε καὶ ηθελον μαρτυρῆσαι κατὰ σοῦ, κατανοήσαντες ἐιπον αυτοῖς, ἀ ἦκουσας, κατέλυσόν σε καὶ ἀνεχώρησαν. Τοπέρον καὶ συ ἐντεύθεν, καὶ μηκέτι ποίει ταὐτὴν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν.
POSTSCRIPT.

In addition to the nineteen Manuscripts cited in the Critical Apparatus subjoined to the texts of the *Four Epistles* (see pp. 1, 2, *supr.*), another has been made known to the Editor since the foregoing sheets were printed. A full collation of its text is given in Appendix I; and a description of it will be found in the section "Manuscripts, &c.," of the Introduction.

In Appendix II is added a collation (with White's text) of three inedited Manuscripts of the Harklensian Version of these Epistles.

These Appendices are subjoined to the Supplemental Notes.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES

ON THE ABOVE SYRIAC AND GREEK TEXTS.
In the following Notes the Syriac version of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, as above printed, is assumed to be the original (or "unrevised") Philoxenian of A.D. 508; of which assumption the grounds are fully stated in the Introduction (supr.). In them, accordingly, it is referred to as "Philox." (or "Phx."), or (in its relation to the underlying Greek) as $S$; while the codices of the Syriac text are distinguished by their proper numerals (see pp. 1, 2, supr.), or, as in the footnotes to the Greek, by the notation $S_1$, $S_2$, &c.

The codices classed as the "earlier" group are 1, 2, 9, 12, 14; those of the "later" group are 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 17. The remaining nine are of intermediate but unequal age and value.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES.

2 PETER.

I. i. The omission from this verse of \(\text{γαλ \ αποστολος} = \text{καλ \ αποστολος}\) rests on the sole authority of the Bodleian manuscript (8) whence Pococke derived the text of his Editio Princeps (II) of these Epistles. No Greek or other authority confirms it. This is the first of the instances in which subsequent editors have been misled by this very inaccurate and recent text. The Polyglots duly insert the word.

Ib. The Harklensian coincides with Philoxenian in the rendering \(\text{Δοσος} \ \text{λογομον} \) for \(\text{ισοτιμον}\). This agreement is the more notable as it involves the anomalous use of the construct followed by a preposition-prefix. There is but one other instance in these Epp. (Phx.; but for Hkl., see Jud. 16) of this rare usage (infr., ver. 17, where see Note). In the New Testament, \(\text{ισοτιμος} \ \text{is} \ \text{απαξ λεγόμενον} \): the only similar compound is the (also \(\text{απ λ.} \) \(\text{ισόφωνον}\) (Phil. ii. 20), which Peshitta paraphrases, and Harkl. represents by \(\text{μησος} \ \text{καθε} \) (using absol. not constr.).—Note that in both these instances (vv. 1, 17) a Greek compound is represented:—similarly, both versions of the Apocalypse exhibit a like instance in rendering the \(\text{απ λ.} \) compound \(\text{ποταμοφόρητον}\) (Rev. xii. 15).

3. Note that \(\text{πο} \) is here pron. ; (\(\text{απ \ πλειω ... \ βιο \ αυτου} \ \text{δεδωρημένον}\) : So Polygl., “quippe qui ... dedit.” Philox. treats \(\text{δεδωρ.} \) as act., here and ver. 4.

4. In this verse, 8 has two misreadings which have passed from it through II into most editions (e.g., Gutbir's and Bagster's), though neither has any Greek or other except Syriac (direct or indirect) authority. Both had been noted by Pococke (Noate, pp. 41, 42), and for each he had suggested a conjectural emendation,—since abundantly verified by other codices, including (with slight exception in each case)

* See footnote to p. 99, infr.
most of our earlier group, and also the new witness 20; as well as 18 and 19, which, though transcripts recently made, apparently present an early text.

(a) The first of these errors—\[\text{λποϊ (}= \varepsilon\tau\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon)\] for \[\text{λποϊ (}= \varepsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\alpha)\]—was rectified in P (the Paris Polyglot of 1645), presumably on the authority of a codex in the hands of the editor, Gabriel Sionita,—and in A (that of London, Walton's of 1657, which closely reproduces the Paris text). Yet it holds its ground in the European editions, even L (Lee's, 1816—the Buchanan codex (9) which he used being here hardly legible). In N (the American edition, New York, 1886) it is corrected after the Williams codex (11). The resemblance between the two words in Greek is but slight and remote; in Syriac it is very close. Thus the corruption is to be ascribed to the Syriac. But it must have been an early one, for the Arabic version from the Syriac (of Cent. ix or x) has adopted it. The emendation \[\text{λποϊ} \] is attested by all our earlier group (except 9, which is doubtful), and also by 18, 19, 20, as well as by 11, and the text which P represents,—against the later group, and the text from which Etzel derived his Latin version.

Here Hkl. supports our emended text, but in such wise as to exclude the supposition that the \[\text{λποϊ} \] of the authorities for that text may have been a correction borrowed from it; for in rendering \[\varepsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \] it employs a different though equivalent word, \[\text{λδκσο} \]. Note that this latter rendering is used in our version, iii. 13 infr.; and also iii. 4, 9 (\[\varepsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\gamma\lambda\dot{\iota}a\]). In these three places Hkl. prefers \[\text{λποϊ} \]; so that in their use of these two words the two versions agree in no instance, nor is either consistent in itself. They agree however in rendering \[\varepsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\ll	ext{λδμωνοι} \] by \[\text{δφολακςο} \] (ii. 19, infr.).

(b) The second error—\[\text{και τιμάς} \] \([= \kappa\alpha\lambda \tau\iota\mu\acute{a}\varsigma]\) for \[\text{και τίμια} \] \([= \kappa\alpha\lambda \tau\acute{i}\mu\acute{i}\alpha]\) —stands in all editions before the present. In this instance the correction though less strongly is sufficiently attested,—by 9, 12, 14, being the majority of our earlier group (though not by 1 or 2), with 19 and 20, and (apparently) 18; also by Etzel's text, though not by that of the Arabic translator nor that of the Paris editor.—Here the evidence of 1, our primary authority, needs to be fully stated; for a mere copyist's error in it, erroneously corrected, seems to have introduced the misreading. The scribe apparently first wrote \[\text{καπ} \] \([= \kappa\alpha\lambda \omega\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omega\mu\alpha] \) or \[\text{καπ} \), which would \[\text{δλο-καύτωμα} \] \([= \omega\mu\varsigma\alpha]\),—for which compare Mark xii. 33 (Pesh.): a later
but early hand has attempted to emend this by inserting \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) before \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) (and perhaps marking with ribbu\( i \)),—so that the word now stands as \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \). Hence the spurious reading \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) of 2 (which codex is undoubtedly in this Epistle closely akin to 1) and of the later texts in general (except as above, 18(?), 19, 20, and Eitel's), including even that which is represented by the Arabic. This reading would obviously be the more readily adopted because of the occurrence of \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) \( (= \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) in vv. 1 (supr.) and 17 (infr.).—Here again the remark suggests itself that, though the Harkl. supports \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) in common with 9, 12, 14, 19, these codices cannot have derived their text here by correction after that version; for its rendering is not \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) as theirs, but the cognate and equivalent \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \). It is to be noted that this latter adjective is throughout the N.T. substituted by Harkl. for \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \), which Pesh. like Philox. prefers. Similarly in the Apocalypse, the earlier (presumably Philox.) version (S) renders \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) by \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \), and the later (\( \Sigma \), presumably Harkl.) in every case substitutes \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \).* Seeing that \( \Sigma \) is evidently a revision of S, their usage as regards these two words serves to confirm the reading \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) here.

\( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \). All copies of Philox. read \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) \( (= \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \)), against nearly all Greek authorities—see note on Gr. text in loc., p. 58). Harkl. in its text has \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) \( (= \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \), as all Gr. copies except A and 68), but adds the alternative \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) in its margin;† probably referring to the Philox. reading \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) is rarely found in Gr. copies). See, for a like instance, Note on ver. 8 (infr.).

5. Of our codices, 14 (Paris, 29) alone omits \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) \( (= \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \), but with some Gr. support. Harkl. inserts it, but (\( \alpha \) only) with \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) prefixed (\( \gamma \) diverges). This symbol may imply that the translator was aware of Gr. evidence for and against the word; but (in view of such instances as those in vv. 4, 8, &c.) it is rather to be taken as signifying that \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) was absent from his Gr. exemplar, but \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \text{\textsuperscript{\textdegree}} \) was retained by him because he found it in Philox.

* By the earlier (S) version is meant that edited by me (Dublin, 1897). The later (\( \Sigma \)) is that first edited by De Dieu (Leiden, 1827), and included in the Polyglots and all subsequent Syr, New Testaments. For the grounds on which the former is to be accepted as Philoxenian, and the latter as Harklenian, see Appendix III. infr.

† Of the three codices of Harkl. distinguished as \( \beta \), \( \gamma \), \( \delta \), collated in Appendix II. (infr.) with cod. \( \alpha \) and White's text, \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) give no marginal notes or textual marks; \( \delta \) (like \( \alpha \)) gives several, in this place and elsewhere.
6. The word \(\text{λαοῦμονος}\) is not found in Pesh. ; but in Harkl. it = \(\epsilon\gammaκράτεια\), as here, in the only other places (Act. xxiv. 25 ; Gal. v. 23) where that word occurs in N.T.

7. So too \(\text{λαοῦν} \ \text{δόξα} \ (= \phiιλαδέλφια, i.e. "love of the brotherhood," not "brotherly love" merely) is the usual (and correct) rendering of the word in Harkl., but never in Pesh.

In this case, therefore, and in that from ver. 6, we have words not drawn from the Pesh. vocabulary. But we have no reason to doubt that if the rest of the Philox. N.T. were forthcoming, we should find that Philox., as well as Harkl., employed these words in rendering \(\epsilon\gammaκράτεια\) and \(\phiιλαδέλφια\) elsewhere.

8. Here again, as in ver. 4 (supr.), all our codices support \(\betaλωμ\) after \(\text{φυτή} \text{ρυκών}\), while Harkl. inserts it, marked (\(\alpha\) only), as \(\betaλ\) \(\text{φυτή} \text{ρυκών}\) in ver. 5, with \#. In this instance the word inserted has no Gr. attestation: the inference therefore is here certain that Harkl. in retaining \(\betaλ\) is following Philox., while by prefixing \# he notes its absence from the Gr. text or texts used by him in revising that version.

9. Both versions here alike fail in representing \(\mu\nuωπάζων\), and agree in giving for it \(\text{μν}_\text{υν} \ \text{δλ\(\beta\)} \ (= \delta \text{ο}ν\(\beta\) \text{δρων})—a rendering so inadequate as to be almost a mistranslation.

10. All our codices read as if \(\epsilon\mu\nuο\nu\) occurred not only after \(\kappaλ\eta\sigma\nu\), but also after \(\kappaλογ\gamma\nu\). In all the Gr. it is read once only, before both nouns. Harkl. also writes it once only, but after the former noun, representing it, as he usually does, by the separate pronoun \(\betaλωκ\) (not, as Philox., by the suffix \(\text{φυτή}\), to which is prefixed \# (\(\alpha\ \delta\)). This mark cannot well refer to his Gr. text (cp. note on ver. 8), for no Gr. fails to insert \(\epsilon\mu\nuο\nu\) once. It appears therefore to be misplaced, and perhaps belongs to a second \(\betaλωκ\) now missing, which may have stood \(\alpha\) after \(\lambda\etaκ\) \(\ (= \epsilonκλογ\gamma\nu\)\), as in Philox. the suffix \(\text{φυτή}\); or \(\beta\) after the preceding \(\epsilon\text{φυτή} \ (= \epsilon\text{φων})\), as in Philox. we have \(\epsilon\text{φυτή} \ (= \epsilon\text{φων} \ \epsilon\mu\nuο\nu\)—where the Gr. copies vary (see note, in which \(\beta\) is assumed, on Gr. text in loc., p. 59) as to the insertion of \(\epsilon\mu\nuο\nu\) in \(\delta\iota\ \tau\omegaν \ \kappaαλ\omegaν \ [\epsilon\mu\nuο\nu\] \epsilon\text{φων}\). Again \(\epsilon\) it may be that the \# ought to be so placed as to mark the doubt about this insertion (\(\delta\iota\ \tau\omegaν \ldots \epsilon\text{φων})\), as Wetstein* supposed. If so, it ought to stand before \(\betaλ\) \(\kappaλογ\gamma\nu\), thus—\(\betaλ\) \# ?

* N.T. Graecum, note in loc.
The rendering \( \text{οἶκος} \) \( \text{ἀμελῶ} \) is to be classed with those noted in vv. 6, 7. The verb \( \text{ἀμελῶ} \), though it belongs to the Pesh. vocabulary, is found there only in \text{peal}; but it occurs in \text{aphel} (as here) in Harkl., 2 Cor. iv. 1 (but = \( \text{εἴκκακῶ} \), not \( \text{ἀμελῶ} \)).

Ib. For \( \text{ἀπορρυμένου} \) compare ii. 14, iii. 16, where the same participle (preceded by \( \text{ἵ} \)) represents \( \text{ἀπορρυμένος} \)—also iii. 17, in which place (see second Note on it \text{infra.}) \( 30700 \) occurs = \( \text{ἀπορρυμένος} \). Each of these verbalss is \( \text{ἄπ. λεγ.} \) in Greek N.T. In Pesh. and Harkl. \( 30700 \) occurs rather as = \( \text{ἀνα-} \) (or \text{kata-})\( \text{κείμενος} \), as Mt. ix. 10 and Mk. xiv. 3, and \text{passim}; and the verb \( \text{στηρίζω} \) is usually rendered by \( 30700 \).

In rendering \( \text{γροῦμαι} \), Phx. varies. Here, \( 30700 \) = \( \text{οὐσὶοὺς} \); \( \text{δι. ii. 13, γροῦμενοι} \) = \( \text{όσιοῦς} \); iii. 9, \( \text{γροῦνται} \) = \( \text{οὖσιοῦς} \); iii. 15, \( \text{γρεῖνόθε} \) = \( \text{οὖσιοῦς} \).—Harkl. agrees only in iii. 15, avoids the impersonal form, and uses \( \text{οὖσια} \) in all these places and elsewhere in N.T.—as does also Pesh. For \( \text{οὖσια} \) see second Note \text{infra.} on ii. 9.

Our authorities here are decisive for \( \text{οὐδὲν} \) \( \text{(σπονδάζω)} \), which is the reading of all our earlier group (with slight grammatical variation), and of 18 and 19, and the Arab.; against the rest, including 11, 13, 20, and Etzel, which have \( \text{οὐδὲν} \) \( \text{(σπονδάζατε)} \). All editions accept this latter, except Lee's, which corrects after 9. Only two or three Gr. cursiveos support it. But it is the reading of Harkl.; though its value is as small as its attestation, for it is to all appearance a mere careless repetition of \( \text{σπονδάζατε} \) from ver. 10 (\text{supr.}). The Gr., however, except \( \text{N} \) \( \text{(σπονδάζω)} \), read \( \text{σπονδάσω} \), which Philox. may perhaps represent.

In view of the suggestion which has been thrown out against the manuscripts of our earlier group, that they have been corrected after the Harkl., we note that, in this instance, it is against the later, not the earlier, copies that such a suspicion lies. The aberrant reading \( \text{οὐδὲν} \) seems to have originated with Harkl., and to have been adopted from it by Philox. copies of later date; while the earlier group, and (in this instance) the copy which Arab. represents, adhered to the true text. It is to be added that, of the codices which here agree with Harkl., at least four (5, 11, 13, 20) show plain traces elsewhere of revision into conformity with Harkl. readings.*

* For 5, see \text{infra.}, first Note on 2 Pet. ii. 4; for 11 and 20, third Note on 2 Pet. ii. 6; for 13 and 20, first Note on Jud. 7.
17. The rendering (both versions) of the compound μεγαλοπρεπεῖς here by Ἠῤῥος Διὸς is similar in form to that of ἵστομεν in ver. 1 (see Note supr. there). The Gr. word does not again occur in N.T. It appears in Deut. xxxiii. 26 (LXX), where Syr.-Hxp.* has a like periphrasis, Ἠῤῥος Ἰησ., only with the absol. Ἰησ., instead of the constr. as here. Again, in Clem. R., where μεγαλοπρεπεῖς is not infrequent, the Syr. gives the inverse rendering Ἠῤῥος μακάριοι (no prefix to Ἠῤῥος). The verb Διὸς is not used in Pesh., and is rare in Harkl.; but frequent in Syr.-Hxp., which also has Ἠῤῥος Λαοὶ for μεγαλοπρέπεια (e.g. Ps. viii. 2), corresponding to the rendering of μεγαλοπρεπεῖς in the Syr. Clement.

18. The σᾶς in this verse, representing a repetition of αὐτῶς after ἐνεχθέονας, which all our MSS attest, and in which all copies of Harkl. concur (α δ marking it with ≠), is to be coupled with the ρῶσι ≠ of ver. 8 supr. as an indubitable instance of reference made by the latter version to the former; for no Gr. or other authority than Philox. has αὐτῶς here.

19. In neither version does Ἤῤῥος occur except in this place, nor anywhere in either Pesh. or Harkl. N.T.; and αὐχυμηρός is ἅπ. λ. in N.T., and is not in LXX. But Ἤῤῥος is to be found in Pesh. and Syr.-Hxp. O.T.,—in the latter once = αὐχυμωδής (Mic. iv. 8). For Ἤῤῥος see 2 Pet. ii, 4, 17, and second Note infr. on 4; and the parallels in Jude (6, 13).

20. Here the two versions, though otherwise differing in their treatment of πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίᾳ ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, agree so far as this, that they render as if ἐπιλύσεως were nominative. If this is not merely an example of loose rendering, it must either be a grammatical error, or represent an otherwise unattested variant ἐπιλύσεως. In any case it is a signal instance of coincidence between Philox. and Harkl. But in Philox. the result of it is, that ἰδίᾳ is left to agree with γραφῆς (see Gr. text),—“No prophecy is the interpretation of its own Scripture” (lit. “of the Scripture of itself”). Not so in Harkl., which gives Ἰσρ. Ἡλίας Ἰησοῦς Ἡλίας Ἰδίᾳ (πᾶσα γραφὴ προφητείας ἐπιλύσεως ἰδίᾳ οὐ γίνεται), “No Scripture of prophecy is the interpretation

* See Masius in Critici Sacri, t. I, pt. ii, in loc.—Deuteronomy is one of the lost books of this version, but is cited by Masius from a MS not now forthcoming. See the art. Polycarpus Chorep., Dict. Chr. Biogr., vol. iii.
of itself" [of the Scripture, the necessary changes in the Syr. being made to suit the changed subject of the sentence, ܐܐ^ (masc.) instead of ܐܐ^ (fem.)]. Cp. the reading ("omnis prophetiae scriptura") of the Old Lat. h (for which see fourth Note infr. on ii. 4).

II. i. Here ܐ^ (= ܐ ܠܐ, as all Gr. and Harkl.) is read by all copies of Philox. of the earlier group, and by four others (3, 5, 11, 18),—against the quite unsuitable and uncorroborated ܐ^ (= ܐ ܟܘܣܡܐ [or ܢܝܘ]) of the rest of the later copies (including 13, 19, 20), and of the copy represented by the Arab., and by Etzel's and the Paris editor's. This variant, though of early origin, is obviously a mere corruption unworthy of serious consideration. The confusion between the similar words, ܐ^, ܐ^, is notoriously frequent in Syr. manuscripts, ancient as well as recent.

4. The ܐ^ of Philox. follows those Gr. which read ܦܐܡܐ—as against ܓܡܘ. Harkl. represents the same reading, but employs the Syr. word ܐ^, nearly identical with the Gr., writing it (a only) ܓ^, as if transliterated from the Gr.* This transliteration, slightly varied, our codex 5 repeats on its margin.

Ib. For ܐ^ (= ܓܠܘ, and so in the pll., Jud. 6) Harkl. in both places prefers ܐ^. But both have ܐ^ ܐ^ (ver. 17 infr., and Jud. 13) for ܓܠܘ ܬܘ ܣܟܘܬܘ. Thus in this instance Philox. is more consistent in rendering than Harkl., which varies without reason.

Ib. ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^ ܐ^  доволь] Lit., ܟܛܒܒܠܒܢ ܐܝ ܬܐ ܟܢܗܕܪܐ. This very suitable periphrasis for ܛܪܛܪܐܘܫܬܐ does not satisfy Harkl., which, again transliterating, substitutes ܓ^ (with ܛܪܛܪܐܘܫܬܝ[adelphia]† in Greek letters on marg.), but retains the rare verb ܓ^ (nowhere in Pesh. N.T., nor elsewhere in Harkl.), and moreover adds ܐ^ in marg.; thus doubly betraying its dependence on Philox.

Barsalibi (ap. Pococke as above, footnote on ܦܐܡܐ) seems to have read ܓ^ (a participial form) for ܓ^.

It seems better to write ܓ^ (pa.) with Poc., &c., than ܓ^ (pe.) with the Polyglots, &c. See Thes. Syr., s.v.

* Poc. (note in loc.) cites this reading of Harkl. (from the inedited Comm. of Barsalibi).
† White (after a) prints ܛܪܛܪܐܘܫܬ, but ܒ writes ܛܪܛܪܐܘܫܬ.  "

Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft ©
This would represent \( \text{kai} \ \text{pαρέδωκεν} \ [\text{αντων}ς] \ \text{τηρείσθαι} \ \text{εἰς} \ \text{κρίσιν} \ \text{κολάσεως}, \) — an unattested reading. Probably Philox. here paraphrases the well-supported reading (see note on Gr. text) \( \text{παρέδω} \ \text{εἰς} \ \text{κρατομένους} \ \text{τηρεῖν} \ [\text{or} \ \text{τηρείσθαι}]. \)

Note that here the Old Lat. text \( h \) (see p. 54 \text{supr.}, and note \(^{†}\)) independently confirms the Vulg. ("crucianos reservari") in support of \text{kαλαζομένους} \text{τηρείσθαι}, by rendering "puniendos servari."*

With this peculiar rendering Harkl. deals in a remarkable way;—retaining it \text{verbatim}, only \( a \delta \) marking \[\text{ομιλεύει} \] with \( \# \). He thus at once shows his relation with Philox., and his recourse to a different text. For with \[\text{ομιλεύει} \] his version repeats Philox.; omitting it, he represents the better-attested Greek text, \text{παρέδωκεν} \text{εἰς} \text{κρίσιν} \text{τηρουμένουs}. For \[\text{ομιλεύει} = \text{κολασις}, \] \text{op. Mt. xxv. 46} \( \text{[ομιλεύει]} \), Pesh. and Harkl.), also 1 Joh. iv. 18 (Harkl., not Pesh.); likewise \[\text{ομιλεύει} = \text{κολάζεων}, \] ver. 9, \text{infr.} It more properly = \text{βάσανος} (or \text{βασανωμός}).


6. Harkl. renders \text{τεφρώσας} \text{by} \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{μενιδ,} \] better than \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{μενιδ} \] of Philox. See first Note \text{infr.} on Jud. 7, where Hkl. interpolates \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{μενιδ}. \]

\[\text{Ib.} \] Both versions render \text{καταστροφῆ} \text{by} \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{ομιλεύει} \] \text{καταστροφῆ}; as Harkl. also, 2 Tim. ii. 14 (where alone \text{καταστροφ} \text{recurs in N.T.}); not found in Pesh.

\[\text{Ib.} \] These words are ambiguous, and may be taken to mean—

\( a \) "An example for the ungodly who were hereafter to be" (as the Lat. versions of Etzel, Pococke, and Sionita (P) render). So understood, the Syr. may be taken to represent (though inexacty) the reading of most Gr. MSS, followed by Lat. Vulg. and by Rec. Text and Rev.—also Arab.—\[\text{ιτραδεγμα} \ \text{μελλόντων} \ \text{αδεβίων} = "\text{an example for those who should hereafter be ungodly}" (\text{μελλόντων} and the equivalent \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{μελλόντων} \text{μελλόντων} \] being taken as masc.).

But the Syr. may equally well mean—

\( b \) "An example for the ungodly of things [or persons] about to be" (\text{μελλόντων} and \[\text{ομιλεύει} \text{μελλόντων} \text{μελλόντων} \] taken as neuter); which exactly reproduces

* The following readings of \( h \) (which breaks off in ii. 7) on chapter i., which have been by oversight omitted in the footnotes of Gr. text, may conveniently be recorded here—

\( i. 3, "\text{propria virtute."})-(4) "\text{in cupiditate corruptionem."}-(8) "\text{vos}" (\text{interlined}).-(9) "\text{per bona opera."}-(12) "\text{non differam semper}" ("\text{vos}" \text{interl. before "semper"}).-(20) "\text{omnis prophetiae scriptura}" (as Harkl.).
the better reading of the Gr., ἐποδείγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέων (so MSS B P, followed by W-H). This reading, as more truly represented by the Syr., has been adopted in the Gr. Text, supr., p. 62.

In this case there is no variation in our Syriac copies, except that 11 and 20, with Harkl.,* represent μελλόντων by ἀπλοῦμενοι (fem., equivalent to neut.), thus definitely adopting the rendering (b). In this variation from the other codices, 11 and 20 give an instance of a correction into conformity with Harkl., introduced into Philox. by painstaking editors at a late date (Cent. xv.). So again, codd. 13 and 20 in Jud. 7; where see first Note infr.

9. [20] This reading rests, as regards the consonants, on the authority of codd. 1 and 2, but is written by them ιδη (presumably = ριη = τηρεῖ). For this there is no Gr. support. The rest read ἰδοῦ (=τηρησεί). But as this also is unknown to the Gr., ἰδοῦ can only be understood as if ἰδοῦ (ι being carried on from the preceding fut. ἰδοῦ) so that ἰνα ῥύησαι . . . πρέσβης . . . τηρεῖν. This being so, I have ventured, while adopting ἰδη on the authority of 1 and 2, to disregard their pointing, and to write ιδη (as on p. 7, supr.), which is a more usual form† of the 3 pers. fut. sing. of this verb than ἰδοῦ. With either reading the Gr. represented is τηρεῖν.

10. [20] So Codd. 1, 2, 12 (9 is here illegible), and with them 3, 18, 20; representing ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ with the best Gr. text. Harkl. follows the less approved reading ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις, as does 14, with 11, 13, 19, and all later Syr. copies, and with them Arab. and Etzel. Here again recurs a combination of authorities such as we met at i. 15 (see above); the later group of Syr. following Harkl. against the earlier.

Ib. Both versions seem to render τολμηραί (here only in N.T.) by ἱδοῦ (as both give ἱδοῦ, Jud. 9), but to differ as to αὐθάδες (in Phx., ἱδοῦ; in Harkl., ἱδοῦ), which adject. Harkl. (a δ) writes in Gr. on marg., referring it (according to α) to ἱδοῦ. But on the other hand, δ clearly marks the marginal αὐθάδες as relating to ἱδοῦ. And so too in the only place where αὐθ. recurs in N.T. (Tit. i. 7) Harkl. renders it by ἱδοῦ, writing (as here) αὐθάδη in marg., and subjoining the transliteration ἱδοῦ. It is therefore probable

* White, in his Lat. version, mistranslates Harkl. here, treating the ptcp. as fem.
† See Thes. S., s.v.; also Pococke's note in loc.
that Hkl., in this place as in that, and possible that Phx. also, makes \( \text{λοιμος} = \text{αισθάνεσ} \). They may have read \text{αισθάνεσ} before \text{τολμηται} in their Greek.

11. \( \text{κατεργάζω} \text{νικώς} \), by which Philox. and Harkl. alike represent \( \text{λοιμος} \text{καὶ δυνάμει} \), looks as if they read \( \text{δυναμα} \text{καὶ λογξ} \). (cp. Apoc. v. 12, vii. 12 [in both versions]—the only other instances in N.T. where the two words are combined). \( \text{Δύναμις} \) is rendered \( \text{νικώς} \) by both in i. 3, 16, the only other places of its occurrence in these Epp.

Ib. Here our authorities for and against insertion of \( \text{κατεργάζω} \text{νικώς} \) are ranked very nearly as for \( \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων} \) (ver. 10). Our older copies (in this case including 2) give the words,—except 14, which joins most later copies in omitting, as does also Arab.; on the other hand, 3, 20, and (with variation) 18, 19, insert. Harkl. inserts, but with \# , presumably implying (as in former instances) that he found the words in Philox., but with no equivalent in his Gr. exemplar. Some extant Gr. mss omit, but of the MSS only A. It is, however, to be noted that \( \text{κατεργάζω} \text{νικώς} \) represents the \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων} of some mss, rather than the \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων} of the MSS and most mss: this, however, may be due to grammatical inaccuracy on our translator's part, rather than to variation in his exemplar. (The reading of 18 and 19, \( \text{κατεργάζω} \text{νικώς} \), may possibly be meant to represent \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων}, misunderstood, or misread as \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων}).

Thus in each of these consecutive verses, 10 (see note on \( \text{παρὰ} \text{Κυρίων} \)) and 11, we have an example of a reading in which the weight of the earlier group (14 in each case alone dissenting) is on the side of the best-attested Greek text; while a reading of inferior authority is preferred by Harkl., followed by the bulk of our later codices, with 14, and also with Arab.—We infer that these are cases of a corruption derived from Harkl., so early as to have affected the Arab. In case of ver. 11, the evidence of the adhesion of Philox. (implied by the Harkl. \#) to the better reading, is earlier still.

12. The agreement between the versions, in their rendering (or reading) [\( \text{ἐν} \) \text{φύου}, for \text{φυσικῶς} (or —κα)], is noteworthy.

Ib. The (not very happy) rendering \text{ἀλωρις} by \( \text{κατεργάζω} \) (Harkl. better, by \( \text{κατεργάζω} \)) has only one parallel in Pesh. N.T., Hebr. vii. 1 (= κοτῆ). It is usually = \( \text{μάχαιρα} \text{or} \text{ῥομφαία} \) (especially in the older Syr. version of Apoc.).
13. By ἀδικοῦμενοι (as if = ἐν οἷς ἐστιν ἄδικα (or [ο] ἄδικαν ἔχοντες),—the better-attested but more difficult reading of this verse). But his rendering does not allow ἀδικοῦμενοι to be read (as by some interpreters) with the preceding verse;—nor (as by others) to be construed (passive) with μισθὸν ἄδικας (following),—"wronged of the hire of wrongdoing," or (as Rev. Vers.) "suffering wrong as the hire of wrongdoing." He treats it (as of middle voice) apart in construction from the succeeding words, and leaves μισθ. ἄδικ. to be governed by ἡγούμενοι,—"These in whom is wrongdoing (= these wrongdoers) by them the hire of wrongdoing is esteemed pleasure" (οὐδὲν ἴσον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἢ αὐτὸν), "even the luxury which is in the daytime" (οὐδὲν ἴσον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ). The habitual wrongdoer regards his wrongdoing as the work by which to earn the pleasure of daytime revelling.

Harkl. follows the rival reading κομιοῦμενοι (which it renders by ἐνοχιστὶ); yet, though thus necessarily diverging from Philox., betrays dependence on it by retaining not only the leading words (Ἠας, Ἴαςιν, ἵσομοι), but even the redundant ἴσοι, for which (as customary) it refers to Philox. by prefixing ἴσοι.—Neither ἴσοι nor ἵσομοι occurs in Pesh. N.T., but both in Syr.-Hxp.;—the former also in Harkl., the latter in Pesh. O.T.

For ἵσοι, see Note supr. on i. 13.

Ib. The very remarkable expression ἴσομοι ἴσικα (lit., μεστοὶ μῶμοι),* for μῶμοι, is one of the most noteworthy examples of agreement between the two versions, betokening their interdependence.

Ib. ἰσόμοις] In many codices an early corruption of this appears, ἰσουμοῖς (= ἐν τοῖς ἰμαρίοις αὐτῶν). This is notable,—(a) as one of the few instances (to be classed with ἴσοι of i. 4) in which 1 errs gravely;—and (b) of the yet fewer in which 2 differs for the better from 1;—and (c) as an error (which is rarest of all) common to 1 with the Arab.,—a fact which marks it as a very early one. Moreover, (d) when we compare this verse with its parallel in Jude (12), where the word recurs, we find much inconsistency and vacillation about it in

* This expression is met with sometimes among the self-disparaging epithets which Syr. scribes lavished on themselves in their colophons;—e.g., in Cod. 12, and again Cod. 20 (both Pesh. N.T.). See for these the section "Manuscripts, &c.," of Introduction (supr.). The colophon of 12 is printed, in Syr. and English, in my Apocalypse in Syr., pp. 32, 98 (pt. ii.).
most of our codices. 1, and with it 3, 18, are consistently wrong in both places; 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, consistently right in both. 2, though it avoids the misreading of 1 here, adopts it in Jud. 12 (but corrects in marg,—apparently secunda manu); 9 shares in the inconsistency of 2, but (unlike 2) tries to bring the passages into agreement by inserting the misreading on its marg. here. In both places 8 misreads, but corrects on marg. of Jude only. The Arab. translator is to be added to the list of the inconsistent, but in a different way from the rest; for he misreads here, but reads rightly (though he translates inaccurately) in Jude, rendering “in their garments” here, “in their passions” there.

It is clear that by ὑποστᾶσις Philox. represents ταῖς ἀγάπασις αὐτῶν, understanding ἀγάπη in its secondary and ecclesiastical sense of “love-feasts.” Elsewhere in N.T. (Pesh. and Harkl.) we find ἁπάσης = ἀναψωξίας (Act. iii. 19), or = κατάπαυσις (Act. vii. 49, Hebr. iii. 11 et passim). Cp. LXX and Syr.-Hxp., Essai. lxvi. 1; Ps. xciv. [xcv.] 11.—In later usage, as here, it denotes the Ἀγάπη: thus in Ignat., Smyrn., viii, ἀγάπην ποιεῖν is rendered in the Syriac version (Corp. Ignat., pp. 109, 129) " водуш.".

Harkl., in text, represents the variant ἀπάταις here; but in marg. gives ὑποστᾶσις, a literal rendering of ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν: while in Jude it reads ἀγάπαις, and renders it by ὑποστᾶσις, as Philox.

Ib. Both versions represent συνενωξομενοι by ὑποστᾶσις, neglecting to express the συν. Harkl. adds ὑποστᾶσις (= ἐν ὑμῖν), and (a) writes the Greek εὐνωξουμενοι εν νυμιν in marg. (also the variant, or alternative, ὑποστᾶσις = ἐν αἵτως), as if his exemplar read these words. Our translator habitually, and Harkl. frequently, neglects the force of prepositions in Greek compounds (as of παρά- i. 5, ii. 1, supr.). Cp. Jud. 12, where the word συνενωξικός recurs, and is rendered by both ὑποστᾶσις instead,—a notable example of simultaneous variation. See further, third Note infr. on Jud. 12.

14. ὑποστᾶσις ὑποστᾶσις ὑποστᾶσις These words, with the participle thus read as masc. (agreeing with ὑποστᾶσις = ἀμαρτίας), represent ἡ ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτίας (accus. plur. governed by ἡ ἀκατάπαυστος)—“Having eyes full of adultery, and [having] incessant sins.”*—But 1 and 2 suggest a different

* So the Polygl. and Arab.; but Etzel and Pococke, “eyes full of adultery and (of) incessant sins.” The former is preferable, for the latter, though a possible rendering of the Syr., would imply a Greek reading ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτίας, which is nowhere recorded.
rendering, by pointing ἄρα ἔχετε (ponsor, fem.) to agree with ἁμάρτια (= ὀφθαλμοῖς),—"Having eyes [that are] full of adultery and [that are] incessant in sins";—ὄφθαλμοι being used in active sense (= "to bring to an end," "to cease from"), not neut. (= "to come to an end," "to cease"). This no doubt is the true rendering of the Greek; but the order of the words in the Syr. makes it apparent that our translator understood it as indicated by the usual pointing.—So also Harkl., who though using a different verb (πάθα) points it as masc.,—a notable coincidence between the versions in an unusual rendering.

15. Here εἰκαστατεύω is rendered by ἔλαβε followed by ὅ, not by ἔλαβο (as i. 16, ii. 2, where only this verb recurs in Gr. N.T.). Harkl. in all these places renders by ὅλαβο followed by ὅ, which is the usual Pesh. and Harkl. rendering of the simple verb ἐκκατάστατευω.

17. The Greek texts here vary between νεφέλαι and ὀμίχλαι; our version represents the former by πάρι; Harkl. the latter (but in singular) by ψέκαν. In the parallel, Jude 12, where all Greek have νεφέλαι, Harkl. agrees with Philox. in πάρι; but here he notes his accuracy by placing ὀμίχλη in marg. (a),—apparently to call attention to his correction of Philox. The noun he employs is rare, but occurs= ὀμίχλη in Syr.-Hxp.,—as Job xxxviii. 9.

17, 18. Here again (as in i. 4; ii. 10, 11) we encounter in immediate sequence two widespread textual corruptions which (as in those places, but here with still ampler attestation) we can confidently correct from our older codices.

(a) In ver. 17, [πάρι] πάρι (= ἐπὶ λαίλαπος) is the reading of all the older copies (2 deviating only by a mis-spelling), supported by the best of the later ones (3, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20), and by Etzel; agreeing with Harkl. and all Greek texts. The [πάρι] πάρι (= εἰ ἁωθε), of the three late codices 7, 8, 10, and the Polyglot text, and of the Arab., is so obvious a corruption (by omission of the first and last letters of πάρι, each of which has for neighbour a letter of similar form) that the true reading suggested itself to Pococke as a correction of his codex 8 (see his note in loc.), though in his text he retains its misreading. Thus the only early voucher for πάρι is the Arab. translator (and it may be that his exemplar read πάρι but was misunderstood by him, the word being far from common).—From Pococke's and the Paris text the false
reading has passed into most editions; but Lee has corrected it (from 9), and the American editor (from 11). No trace of ἐὰν ἀνοθεν appears in any Greek authority, or in any version.

(b) In ver. 18, with equal confidence and no less preponderance of authority, we adopt the correction ἅσαξ (=ὑπέρογκα), attested by the same Syr. codices as the previous instance (except that 11 joins the later ones 7, 8, 10, and the Polyglot text). Etzel's also goes with these latter; but Arab. changes places with it, and supports the older text. So also Harkl. (with ὑπέρογκα [sic] in marg.). The misreading ἅσαξ, which Pococke's text and the Polyglots have thus introduced into all the editions (except that of Lee, which follows 9; but including the American), represents γελῶτα (or γελοῖον), a word quite inappropriate here, and known neither to any Greek authority or any translator; while ἅσαξ is a proper equivalent for the ὑπέρογκα of all Greek texts, as appears from the rendering in both versions of the same word where it recurs in the parallel passage of Jude (ver. 16) by the cognate ἅσαξ. By this latter word the ὑπέρογκα of Deut. xxx. 11 (LXX), is rendered in the Syr.-Hxp. version [see Masius, Syrorum Peculium, s.v. ἅσαξ]. This is another signal instance of simultaneous variation in both versions, in rendering of a recurring word, as in case of συνευκρούμενοι (see last Note supr. on ver. 13).

Thus in these two notable instances our text as emended after our best codices agrees with Harkl. But it would be a mere perversion of the facts to suggest that these codices borrowed either reading as a correction from Harkl.,—the true inference being that Harkl., itself the earliest witness to the text of our version, on which it is based, here confirms the testimony of the earliest extant manuscripts of that text.

18. The adj. ἅσαξ may (as suggested in note to Gr. text, p. 64) represent the alternative reading ἀσελγείας (gen. sing.,—"lusts of wantonness" for "wanton lusts"). But the suspicion occurs that the translator, reading with best Greek text ἀσελγείας, may have mistaken it for a dat. plur. feminine from ἀσελγής.

19. As between the rival readings οὐκ and οὐ (after ήτις) in this verse, there arises no doubt touching the Greek text; for ἄγνωστα οὐκ οὐκ and οὐ ήτις οὐκ equally represent ή τις ήττηται (as all Gr. authorities read). In this connexion οὐ (as read by 1 and 2,
supported by 12 and 18) is as adequate as ἵνα to express the power by which "a man is overcome,"—as shown by the use of ἴνα in the second member of the sentence to express the power by which he "is brought in bondage" (Ἰνα ἵνα ἵνα = τούτῳ δεδουλωται). The reading ἴνα best reproduces the symmetry of the antithetical phrase of the Greek; and seems therefore preferable to the ἵνα of the majority of our codices (including 9 and 14). They are, however, countenanced by Harkl., striving laboriously as usual for accurate expression of the meaning. It may be from Harkl. that ἵνα has made its way into so many of our codices; but more probably it may have been introduced independently by some scribe in a like effort to make the sense more clear.

That copyists found difficulty in understanding the passage is shown by the variations in pointing the participle ἵνα (see note on Syr. text in loc.).—If by ἵνα, which 1 and 2 write, they meant present participle act. (ἵνα), they must have misunderstood the text which (in writing ἵνα) they preserved as regards the letters. I write ἵνα, participle pass.—For a like case of doubtful pointing in these two codices, see above, Note on ii. 9 (ἵνα).

Ib. Both 1 and 2 write ἵνα (point on ἵνα).—If by ἵνα (see last Note) these codices mean ptep. active, they presumably intend ἵνα,—active likewise,—to be distinguished from ἵνα, passive. But in this case, and many others of participles with ἵνα preformative, the usage of 1 (and sometimes of 2), as regards diacritic points, is peculiar, and needs examination.—The facts are as follows.

(a) Whereas by ordinary usage the participles pael and aphel are distinguished as (pa.) φασάναι, (aph.) φασάναι, 1 frequently (and 2 now and then) places point over the preformative ἵνα where aph. is not admissible. One such instance occurs above, ver. 14, where ἵνα is written by 1, though the aph. of the verb ἵνα is ἵνα ἵνα is not in use; but pa. only.—Other like examples are: iii. 3, ὁθυμάζονται; iii. 13 and 14, ἵνα ἵνα; iii. 16, ὁθυμάζονται; 3 Joh. 2, ὁθυμάζονται; ib. 9 and 10, ὁθυμάζονται; Jud. 10, ὁθυμάζονται; ib. 12, ὁθυμάζονται; ib. 13, ὁθυμάζονται. So also 2 writes ἵνα (2 Joh. 2). None of these verbs occurs in aph.; all occur in pa. [see Thes. Syr., under their several roots]; except that ἵνα, the aph. of ἵνα, is found, though rarely; but not in the sense of ἵνα φημεῖν, which in the place above cited (3 Joh. 2) is as usual expressed by pa. ἵνα ἵνα.
(b) Again; the verb ἔρχομαι, in pa. (ἔρχεται) is usually = ἐλπίζω, as 2 Joh. 12, 3 Joh. 14; but in aph. (ἔρχομαι) frequently = ὑπομαίω, as 2 Pet. iii. 9. Yet 1 writes ἔρχομαι in 2 Joh., 3 Joh.; but in 2 Pet., ἔρχεται.*

(c) In very many cases 1 leaves such participles unpointed. Sometimes also it combines the point over ὡ to with ribbui (e.g. ὑπερβάλον, Jud. 10) over plur. ptcps.

In case of the participle aph. of ὑπάρχω, which occurs 2 Pet. i. 5, ii. 1, 1 writes in the former place ἔρχομαι, in the latter ὑπομαίω,—inconsistently.

(d) On the whole, it appears that the usage of this manuscript (and others) is, to indicate the participle pael by a point over, the participle aphel by a point under, the word ;—usually, but not invariably, over, or under, the preformative ὡ.

20. The codd. of Harkl. vary here, as do those of Philox. (see note in loc. on Syr. text, p. 18 supr.), between ὡ καὶ ὡ ρ. Thus α (which White needlessly corrects), with δ, reads ὡ καὶ —against β γ, ὡ τοι. (See Appx. II., in loc.) The pleonastic ὡ is idiomatic, and is undoubtedly to be read here: ὡ τοι is apparently a scribe’s correction;—perhaps to conform to the Gr. αὐτῶν,—for which Philox. seems to have read αὐτῶν, Harkl. to have omitted it.

Ib. Harkl. represents τὰ ῥεκχετα by ὡ ἔκχεται (more exact than the ὡ τοι of our version), and calls attention to the correction by inserting the Greek on his marg. (as in ver. 17, ὀμεῖχη).

22. The rendering ᾗος, in both versions, for ἐξιφαμα, points to Prov. xxvi. 11, where the same word is used by Pesh., and by Syr.-Hxp. (= ἐμετων, LXX). It is possible that Philox. and Harkl. may have read ἐμετών here, with a few Gr. authorities.

Ib. For ἔος = κώλαμα we have a parallel in Syr.-Hxp., Ezech. x. 13 (Symmach.) ; but it is nowhere found in Pesh. (O.T. or N.T.).

III. i. ἐνίθι] See first Note infr. on Jud. 14.

Ib. ἐφε] Here our earlier codices (so far as available; —9 hiatus) are united in support of this word, and are joined by 11, 18, 19, 20.—

* In notes to Syr. text, on these three verses, the facts (as to cod. 1), here given exactly, are incorrectly stated.
It is the proper equivalent of the Gr. (ἐλακροεῖς)—as Clement R., ii. 9, where the Syr. renders ἐλακροεῖς by ʃ; (Bensly’s Epp. of S. Clement in Syr., p. *). The commoner word ʃ; (=καλός,—so 3, 7, 8, 10, 13) has naturally been substituted by transcribers, so early that it has misled Arab., as well as Etzel, and all editors;—and yet it is found in no extant codex earlier than the xivth century (except probably 3, which may be of xiiiith). As a rendering it is quite inadequate.—It is to be noted here, that 1, which heads our list of witnesses to ʃ; , has at this point been altered (whether by the scribe or by a later hand) by interlining ʃ:—an instance like that noted in the Note (b) supr., on i. 4, to show that whatever rehandling this codex may have undergone, has been in the direction of divergence from, not of conformity to, Harkl.

_Ib., 2 and 4._ In these verses we have two instances of the concurrence of 1 and 2 in readings which are indefensible:

In _ver._ 2, the insertion by codd. 1, 2 of ʃ; after ʃ; (=τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ Ὁσῶν ἡμῶν), has no support from any Greek or other authority,—except from our codex 3 (which elsewhere often agrees with the manuscripts of the earlier group). It is an obvious interpolation in the interests of orthodoxy, to be unhesitatingly rejected, though attested by our best Syr. witness 1 and its associate 2.

In _ver._ 4, ʃ; (=κατεκαταστάλει), for ʃ; ( =διαμένει, as all Gr.) is another misreading of 1 and 2, against the rest,—but in this case an accidental one, the words being closely alike to the eye.

3. For the participle ʃ; (=ἐμπαιζοντες) in this place, _cp._ the parallel, Jud. 18, and footnotes on Gr. text of both. The two passages seem to have been altered into verbal agreement in the Syr. of our translator, but not of Harkl.

5. The omission of ʃ; after ʃ; in this verse, is a like case with the substitution of ʃ; in verse 1,—being supported by the same late codices (3, 7, 8, 10, 13) with Arab. and the Polyglots, and opposed by the same better evidence (of 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20,—but not 19, which here changes sides) reinforced by 9,—also by Etzel (who passes over to the earlier group). In this instance, Lee and the American Editor correct the text (after 9 and 11).

_Ib._ The words ʃ; are attested by all our codices, as by all Gr. and other authorities; but Harkl. inserts them with the mark #.
It follows that in his exemplar καλ δι' ὑθατος did not appear, and that he derived them from some other source. But there is nothing to show whether that source was Philox., or a second Gr. exemplar.

6. Both versions render κατακλώσθεις (ἀπ. λεγ. in N.T.) by δει; and so Syr.-Hxp., Ps. lxxvii. [lxxviii.] 20 (LXX.), and elsewhere. The noun ἔκατακλώσθεις, occurs ii. 5 supr. (both versions); likewise (Pesh. and Harkl.), Mt. xxiv. 38, Luc. xvii. 27; as in Gen. vi. 7, Syr.-Hxp. (Pesh. similarly). But the verb δει does not occur in Pesh. N.T. It appears in Harkl., but used in a different sense; as Luc. viii. 23 (=πλεω), Act. xiii. 4 (=ἀποπλεω), xv. 39 (=ἐκπλεω); so again (=πλεω), Apoc. xviii. 17 (both versions);—likewise in Syr.-Hxp., as Esai. xlii. 10, and elsewhere. Similarly, Job xi. 2 (Syr.-Hxp.), it represents νίχωμαι, and, 4 Kings vi. 6=ἐπισολάξω (in which place Syr.-Hxp. coincides with Pesh.).

7. Here again is an instance in which, as in vv. 2, 4, the codices 1 and 2 have gone wrong together. For the true reading [οϊοντα], as determined by the undisputed Greek τεθυσανρισεν, they give a word (as in the case of v. 4) similar to the eye—and in this case to the ear also—στοι[οντα] (=δεησενοι). Here once more cod. 3 betrays its proclivity to follow cod. 1; 12 also joins, and 20; but not 9 nor any later copy (14 has the neutral but unsupported reading ὕσσιν). The verb [ολοντα] seems not to belong to the Syriac Scriptural vocabulary; it is nowhere else used in either version of N.T., Pesh. or Harkl. For θησανρισεν, they write ἢκλεος ὅςσοι.

9. For [ολοντα] = ἦγονται, see second Note supr. on ii. 19 (the pointing of participle pael and ap海尔).

Ib. For [βαλοντα] = βοιλομενος, see Note infr., on 2 Joh. 12.

10. Of the two modes of representing σταυρωσια in Syr.—[σταυρωσια] (a naturalized word), and [σταυρωσια] (a mere transliteration of the Gr.)—we may presume that Philox. consistently adopted one or other in this verse and ver. 12.—Now, of our codices, three of the earlier group (9, 12, 14) with 11, 13, 19, 20, as well as 7, 8, 10, write in ver. 10, [σταυρωσια], partly supported by 2 and 3 (σταυρωσια); while [σταυρωσια] is written by our best authority (1) supported only by 18, and (as might be expected) by the graecizing Harkl. But in ver. 12, most of our best group change sides; 2 and 14 alone remain stedfast to [σταυρωσια]; 1
joins them; while 9 goes over to the graecized οὐκοδῷά, and 12 similarly (οὐκοδῷά). Of the whole number, 18 alone agrees in both places with Harkl.; the rest in ver. 12 give οὖκοδῷά (except 7, 8, 10, which omit). Possibly the scribes of the copies which thus vary may have intended by so doing to correct the apparently tautologous repetition in ver. 12 of the words of ver. 10. They may have meant to suggest that the στοῖχεια in one place (οὖκοδῷά) were to be understood as "the heavenly bodies" (as often in Syr.; rarely in late Gr.), while the στοῖχεια in the other (οὐκοδῷά) were "the elements," according to the legitimate meaning of the word. But it is not to be supposed that the translator had any thought of such distinction, though it may have been introduced by his transcribers.—On the whole, it seems best to accept οὖκοδῷά in both verses.

Ib. All texts of Philox. here attest εἰρεθῇσεται (as read by Ρ, B, K, P, and other authorities), by rendering οὐκοδῷά (11, 13, 14, 20, οὐκοδῷά)—supported by the margin of Harkl. (α), which offers it (οὐκοδῷά) as alternative for the οὖκοδῷά of its text (=κατακαίσεται, as read by A and most Greek cursives; see notes on Syr. and Gr. texts, in loc.). But our codices, even those of the earlier group, are divided as to omitting or inserting the negative οὐ before the verb. For its omission, we have 1, 2, and 12, with the later but carefully edited 7, 11, 13, reinforced by 18 and 19, and confirmed (as above) by the Harkl. note: while 9 and 14, and also 20, here siding with 3, 8, 10, Etzel, and the Polyglots, are for its insertion. But the Arab. translator by throwing his weight into the scale with 1, 2, and 12, turns the balance in favour of the affirmative reading, in agreement with the Gr. witnesses for εἰρεθῇσεται, none of which prefixes to it οὖχ. —It is to be noted that in 2 (an estrangela codex), οὐ is inserted (prima manu? ) before the verb, in cursive character—clearly by an afterthought. In 7, room seems to have been intentionally left by the scribe for like interpolation. Likewise White, in his edition of Harkl., prints a conjectural [οὐ] before the verb where it appears on the margin.—The conclusions to which these facts lead are : —that Philox. represents a Greek text which with Ρ, B, &c. (as above) read εἰρεθῇσεται (without οὖχ); that he rendered it οὐκοδῷά accordingly, without οὐ; that the copies of his version used by Harkl. in the second decade of the seventh century, and by the Arab. translator early (probably) in the ninth, preserved
his text faithfully; that from the twelfth century (to which 9, 12, 14, belong), to the fourteenth and fifteenth (the age of 7, 11, and 13), and thence down to the present day (represented by 19), the true reading of his text has survived in some of the better edited copies;—but that many later transcribers, finding the passage, so read, to be difficult, attempted to make it clear (as we perceive that the scribe or corrector of 2 did, and as White in later times has done) by the unwarranted intrusion of the negative. In so doing, they acted not as copyists but as editors; and the testimony of their transcripts has no more textual weight than that of the margin of the Harkl. interpolated (as noted above) by White.

The difficulty of the reading so attested is great, as is shown by the many emendations of the original—none convincing—that have been made by copyists or suggested by critics.* It is at least possible that the Gr. uncialsin have rightly read, and that the Syr. of Philox. rightly retains, the disputed εὐρεθήσεται (without negative). In an Epistle in which strained uses of words are not infrequent, it may be understood in the sense of "shall be discovered, or disclosed";—cp. Hierem. x. 18, ὃποι εὐρεθητῇ η πλαγγḏ σον,—where Syr.-Hxp. (with some difference of reading) renders by μακάς, as here (the subject of the verb being Μοναὶ = θλώς). Compare also Ezech. xxviii. 15, εὐρέθῃ τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν σολ. Thus εὐρεθήσεται is made to mean φανερωθήσεται,—as a cognate verb is used in the strikingly similar passage, apparently founded on this verse and 12, of [Pseud.] Clem. R. (ii. 16), ἐρχεται ἡ μέρα τῆς κρύσεως ὡς κλίσανος καὶ ὁμοιονος, καὶ τακήσονται [. . . .] τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλισος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ τὰ φάνερα ἐργά.

II. Here, for Μοσός (= οὖν) of all our texts, Harkl. (codd. a β δ) gives Μοσοῦ (≡ οὐτοῦ), but with Μοσόν on marg. (a δ) as alternative (γ substitutes it in text), apparently derived from Philox. But inasmuch as οὖν is read by most Gr. texts, it is not unlikely that Harkl., though his exemplar read οὐτοῦ (B and a few mss), may have compared a second Gr. text and thence borrowed οὖν. His marg. (a δ) gives another alternative (or perhaps an addition), γάρ (= γάρ), not otherwise attested.

* Of these the most plausible is πυρω[better πυρεν-]θήσεται, proposed by Dr. E. A. Abbott and Mr. Vansittart (cited by Dr. Mayor, page cc.).
Ib. Note that 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (whether written as masc. or fem.) is to be pointed as ethpeal (𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤃), not (as in the editions) ethpeal (𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁). The meaning λύωμαι belongs to the former (as in vv. 10 and 12), not to the latter.

12. The rendering of πυροφέμενοι in both versions, as if διὰ πυρὸς δοκιμαζόμενοι (1 Pet. i. 7), is quite out of place here; and may almost be classed with that of αἰδοῖος (in Jud. 6, infr., q.v.) as a mistranslation into which Harkl. has been led in following Philox. In Apoc. (iii. 18) both versions use the same verb in rendering πεπυρωμένον ἐκ πυρὸς (𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁𐤁), in which place it is precisely suitable.

Ib. (を迎える,:) [Pococke in a note in loc. remarks on the wrong pointing of this word, 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁𐤁, in cod. 8: but being unaware of the existence of the verb μαθαί (= πάρκομαι) he makes the needless correction 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁, as from the equivalent 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁.]

16. The periphrasis of Philox. 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 for δυσνόητον is closely followed by Harkl. (in plur.) 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁; but the adj. 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 is employed by the latter is commoner than the participial form as in Philox., and is the usual representative of δυσ- in compounds such as this.

Ib. The omission in the printed texts of 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (after 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 and before 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁) leaves 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 to represent of [ἄμαθείς], and implies the absence from the Greek of the relative ἃ. This omission is, however (as in i. 1 that of 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁), a mere slip of the scribe of 8, unsupported by any other Syr. (including the Polyglots), and against all Gr.; yet it has passed through Pococke’s text into the editions,—even Lee’s and the American. All Gr. texts read ἃ of ἄμαθες ... στρέβλων (the antecedent to ἃ being the preceding δυσνόητα τινα). But Philox. renders these words by a singular (𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁), so that his 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (plur. fem.) apparently has for antecedent 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (fem., = ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς), and the Gr. represented will naturally be ἃ, not ἃ. Or else the 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 may be referred farther back to the 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (περὶ τούτων), and ἃ may be accepted as relating not to the ἐπιστολαῖς of Paul, but to “the things” about which he spoke (λαλῶν περὶ τούτων) in them.—Harkl. avoids this ambiguity by rendering δυσνόητα τινα, 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 (plur. fem., for neut.), thus supplying the required antecedent to 𐤀𐤇𐤀𐤃𐤁 = ἃ.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES. [2 Pet. iii. 17–2 Joh. 3

17. For φυλάσσετε, Philox. gives (as if the Gr. were φυλάσσετε ἑαυτούς) ἔγκειται ὡς, for which idiomatic rendering Harkl. after his fashion writes ἔγκειται ὡς, but marks the pronouns with #. In this case (as in ver. 5, supr., where see second Note) this symbol has no necessary reference to Philox., or to any other authority. Both versions, in what they subjoin to the verb, intend to give the force of the middle voice. And Harkl. punctiliously inserts the # to note the pronouns as superfluous, inasmuch as the Syr. verb (ע"ג) is capable of a reflexive as well as an active meaning.

Ib. For בָּדָא (as in text, = στηργυμός) which all editions give, it seems that we should print בָּדָא. In Pesh. N.T., בָּדָא occurs = συμπόσιον (Mc. vi. 39), κλοιών (Luc. ix. 14)—and so in Harkl., in the latter place (but not the former). We find בָּדָא = στήργυμα in Syr.-Hxp., but the vowel-pointing is by no means settled. See Thes. Syr., s.v.—For the verb בָּדָא see second Note supr. on i. 12.

2 JOHN.

2. All MSS and nearly all mss begin this verse with δὰ τὴν ἄλλης ἑαυτῶν, and so Philox. (יוּה יְהוּדָא). Harkl. omits, his exemplar apparently having been one of those from which the words have dropped out (after τὴν ἄλληθ. immediately preceding in ver. 1); but cod. a supplies in marg.—perhaps from Philox., but more probably from a second Gr. exemplar. For his usage seems to be, when he retains a word from Philox. which was not in his Gr., to place it not (as here) on his margin, but in his text with # (see Notes supr. on 2 Pet. i. 5, 8, &c.).

3. All our copies, with Arab. and Etzel, support the best-attested Gr. reading, ὑμῶν (= כְּדָא); whereas the Polyglots (giving בָּדָא) represent the less-approved ὑμῶν. Herein they agree (no doubt accidentally) with Harkl. Lee's edition (but not the American) follows them.

Ib. The insertion of הָדָא (= Kυρίου ὑμῶν) before Ἰησ. ῥπ., as in all our older codices except 14, and some later ones (including 3, 18, 20), is confirmed by the support of Arab., as well as Harkl.,—a somewhat unusual combination; and the reading has adequate Gr. attestation (of N K L P, many mss, and other versions).—On the other side, not only our later copies (such as 7, 8, 10, 15), but some of more weight (11,
13, 19), and the Polyglots and Etzel, omit, with the strong Gr. support of A B and some mss, and of other versions.—Of the editions, Lee’s inserts (with 9); Pococke’s (with 8) and the American (with 11) omit.

5. Here \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} = \text{ἐπισταμαι} \); in Jud. 3 = \( \tau\alphaρ\text{καλα} \) (as also, Pesh. and Harkl., Act. xxvii. 33, 1 Pet. v. 12); elsewhere in Pesh. and Harkl. nearly always = \( \text{πεπλωω} \), which it properly represents. But Harkl. coincides with Philox. in the singular use of the word as \( = \text{ἐπισταμαι} \) here; and again in the verse of Jude where it exceptionally represents \( \tau\alphaρ\text{καλα} \)—a signal mark of the relation between the two versions.

For \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \) (\( = \text{ἐπισταμαι} \)) see Jud. 10.

Ib. Here 1, supported by 9, 12, 14, also by 11, 20 and other codices, reads \( \text{ἀλα} \) \( (= \text{άς}) \) before \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \). Its omission (for which there is no Gr. authority) from the Polyglots and Pococke’s text, followed by most editions, is attested by most of the later copies,—and by 2, which here forsakes 1, contrary to its habit, and sides with the inferior text. Moreover, we have here again an unusual grouping of authorities, for Harkl. omits \( \text{ἀλα} \), while Arab. joins 1 and its group in inserting it. The only editions which give the true reading are Lee’s and the American, guided as before by codd. 9, 11, respectively. (Cp. 1 Joh. ii. 7.)

Ib. The \( \text{άλα} \) \( \) of S and Harkl. properly represents \( \gamma\rho\text{ϕω} \) (of some mss), rather than \( \gamma\rho\text{ϕων} \) of the MSS and most mss. (Cp. again 1 Joh. ii. 7.)

Ib. After \( \text{άλα} \) \( \) (\( \text{έπισταμαι} \)) Harkl. appears to have read in some copy \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \) \( \tau\alpha\text{λαιων} \), for he inserts \( \text{λαως} \) \( \text{ℓεος} \), marking it with \( \#. \) No text of S, however, countenances this interpolation, nor does any Gr. authority (except that \( \text{N} \) inserts \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \) ), and it is probably due (as above) to the influence of 1 Joh. ii. 7.

6. Here Arab. returns to the side of the later group in reading \( \text{λεος} \) \( (= \text{της} \) \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \), which has no Gr. authority), with 7, 8, 10, 15, 17, and also 3, 5, 13, for \( \text{στολαια} \) \( \) \( (= \text{τας} \) \( \text{ἐπισταμαι} \text{αυτως} \). The latter is given by 1, and all its allies (except 2, which omits sentence), and also by 11, 18, 19, 20, as well as by Harkl. The Polyglots and Etzel share in this error; the American alone of the editions corrects it (after 11); Lee neglects to do so.

The omission in 2 (shared by 4) is inadvertent,—due to the recurrence of the word \( \text{στολαια} \).

rately; which in this instance has been happily exercised, so as to rep

resent the ἐραχμενον (not ἐληνυθον) of the Gr.—It may be that

Philox. intended the same, but if so his copyists, by misplacing the

point, have done him injustice.

Ib. Notwithstanding the plural form of ἀλλή [ἀλλά] (= οἱ μὴ δυμολογοῦτες) preceding, Philox. and Harkl. both (with the Gr.)

read the last clause of the verse in the singular ἐραχμενον (οἱ πλάναι καὶ ὁ ἀνιψη ). But a few late copies

of Philox. (13, 18 (corr.), 19) read the former words in sing., while Harkl.

(marg. of a) reads the latter in plur.—Both are obviously editors’

grammatical corrections. Neither has any Gr. support; but the latter

is countenanced by two Old Lat. authorities,—the Speculum (8), and a

citation by Lucifer Calar. (217).

8. In this verse, as read by B and some mss and in the Lat. of

Lucif. C., there is a grammatical defect—in the change from second

pers. (πα μὴ ἄπολεστες = ὅσοι) to the first (ἐργασάμεθα). Both

Philox. and Harkl. avoid this, following S A and others which read

ἐργασασθε (= ὅσοι); Harkl. (a), however, inserts in marg. the

variant ὅσοι (= ἐργασάμεθα).

Note that, whereas both versions here make ὅσοι = ἐργάζομαι,

both use ὅσοι for ἐργάζομαι, 3 Joh. 5 (where alone it recurs in these

Epp.),—a remarkable agreement in variation of rendering, from a

familiar to an unusual one (see Note infr. on 3 Joh. 5).

9. After the second ἐν τῇ δεδαχᾷ, Philox. expresses αὐτοῦ by adding

the pronominal suffix (οὐχ οὗ). Harkl. to like effect, but (as usual)

by adding the separate pron. οὗ, which, however, he marks with #.

This mark can only be taken as referring to Philox., for no Gr. or

other authority supports αὐτοῦ (though some supply Χριστοῦ).

10. The rendering of χαίρεων in both versions by ψευδέ is not after

the usage of Pesh., which keeps to the Semitic ψευδέ. In Harkl.,

however, we have for χαίρεων (as salutation) the literal ψευδέ (Act.

xxv. 23, xxiii. 26; Jac. i. 1).

Ib. The footnote on ψευδέ (p. 25 supr.) is incorrect; it ought

to be as follows:—
Thus (neglecting the aberration of 18) there are three readings:—
(a) διήθαι τοῦ κυρίου, (b) διήθη τοῖς κυρίοις, (c) διήθη τοῖς κυρίοις. It seems probable that (c), the reading of most of the later copies (joined by 14 and others), is merely a conflation of (a) with (b). It may well be that Philox. originally expressed χαὶ ῥεῖν by διήθαι τοῦ κυρίου (a); that some editor, for greater accuracy (perhaps after the example of Harkl.), left out (b) the τοῖς, σοι not being expressed in the Gr.; and that later copyists, with no Gr. authority, combined the two (c). Etzel, followed by Pococke, tries to give meaning to the reiteration of διήθη by rendering "ave et vale"; Arab. similarly; also Schaaf, "salve tibi et vale";—but Polygl., less plausibly, "laetare bonoque sis animo." These translations, and the editions except (as above) L N, follow the later copies, and read as (c).

11. The shaphel form ἐκλάβω (= κοινωνεῖ), which I adopt on the authority of 1 alone, is rare; else in Pesh. N.T. only Act. vii. 61 (= οὐκεῖσθαικόκων). All other copies, with Harkl., use the ordinary eshtaphel form εκλάβω, which conjugation is the one usually employed in rendering κοινωνεῖ in Pesh. and Harkl. alike. On the authority of Thes. Syr. (s.n.) I write the last syllable with ί, not ή.

12. Our translator uses the verb ἱερολομαῖ to render βούλομαι here; and in the parallel, 3 Joh. 13, to render θέλω (if he so read that verse);—Harkl., with more precision, while he uses ἱερολοῖ here, writes ἄντι for θέλω there. But both versions render βούλομαι by ἄντι instead of ἱερολο号楼, 2 Pet. iii. 9 and Jud. 5.

13. All texts of Philox., with all Gr., read ἔρχομαι (ὁδηγῆσαι ἐκαὶ τὰ τέκνα); while Harkl. substitutes ἔρχομαι (ὁδηγῆσαι ἐκαὶ τὰ τέκνα), with Ethiop. alone; but in the marg. he (u) inserts the ordinary reading (whether from Philox. or from a Gr. exemplar). [Correct here the Syr. text (p. 26), where ἐρχομαι is wrongly printed for ἐρχομαι.]

Ib. The closing salutation before ἡχὰρμοιτο/datatables (ὁ φίλου μετὰ σοῦ), is not given by any of our older codices except 2, nor in 12, 19, 20; and 5 has it only on marg. (writing ἐρχομαι); Arab. also omits it. But all the other later copies, and 2, with Etzel and the Polyglots, insert it, followed by all editions. It is very weakly supported by Gr. evidence,—of a few cursive s only; Harkl., however,
inserts it, (a) marking it with *.—Either, therefore, (a) Harkl., though it was not in his exemplar, derived it from a second Gr. copy which agreed with the few that exhibit it;—or (b) it was in the text of Philox. as known to him. It is just such an interpolation as scribes are prone to make; and it may have been intruded into some copies of the Syr. text before the very early date (A.D. 616) at which Harkl. was published,—though the text whence our older copies were derived, and which Arab. represents, remained free from it.—It is the only case in which a starred insertion in Harkl. supports the later against the earlier text of our version.

3 JOHN.

1. Here 1, 2, alone of our codices, write δρομέω (= τῶ δακτύλω) without pronominal suffix (= μου), herein confirmed by all Gr. authority. So also Harkl. writes μοι. But in vv. 2, 5, 11 all codices alike write δρομέω (= ἀγαπητέ μου), —and (nearly all) similarly τοῦτο ( = ἀγαπηταὶ μου) in 2 Pet. iii. 1; Jud. 3, 17, 20,—without authority from Gr., and against Harkl., in all these places.—This supplying of the pronomoun may safely be set down as a mere Syr. habit; and accordingly has been noted by the use of square brackets in our Greek text.

2. The Editio Princeps, misled by 8, has misled the editors (except of the Polyglots) into writing γείας ( = ἐνδοδοθεῖι),—peal for aphel. The γείας ( = ἐνδοτοι) immediately following confirms the vocalization of 1 and all codices which indicate any vowel, including 9, 12, 14, as well as 13, 19, 20 (2 gives no point). The Greek verb is here ἀπ. λεγ. (in N.T.), and the Syr. verb likewise (in Pesh. and Harkl.)*; but in LXX and Syr.-Hxp. they often appear as equivalents (e.g. Ps. i. 3, Dan. viii. 12).

5. For Δούς σοι ( = ἔργασῃ), cp. 2 Joh. 8 (supr.), where the same Gr. verb is represented by δοκεῖ,—both versions concurring in this change of rendering. Of δοκεῖ for ἔργασμα, the only examples in Pesh. are Joh. vi. 30, 1 Cor. xiii. 10; and it is remarkable that only

* By a misprint, Thes. Syr. cites it as in Hkl., Lc. xii. 16 ( = ἐφορῶ); it ought to have been cited from Hier. (Palestinian).
in these places Harkl. in like manner writes EMPL (or sometimes EMPL), which both versions employ everywhere else.

6. All our copies read δὲκ (= πάσης τῆς or δόλης τῆς) before Ἔκκλησίας (καλῶς ποιεῖν). All our early copies, and most of the later, retain the words,—as also Arab. The evidence of Harkl. is to the same effect, but given in an unusual form. He represents προτέψις by a different Syr. verb, writing EMPL in his text, but in marg. adds as explanation the EMPL of our version, and subjoins the Gr. (προτέψις [sic]), with the rendering δὲκ. In this case it seems impossible to question that Philox. is the source whence Harkl. derives the alternative rendering in his note, which thus confirms the reading of our earlier against our later copies.—It is to be added that this is one of the instances in which Harkl. has altered Philox. for the better. For EMPL properly = εὐδοκίσας, "victum praebens" (cp. Josue ix. 18 [12], εὐφορίασθησεν, LXX (= EMPL Syr.-Hxp.)); and in Pesh. N.T. only occurs Act. xxviii. 10, where εὐθεῖως τὰ πρὸς τὰς χρείας is represented by EMPL;—whereas the EMPL of Harkl. belongs to the vocabulary of Pesh., which invariably renders προτέψιμος by EMPL; Harkl. sometimes by EMPL (as here in text), or else by the more exact EMPL (as here in marg.).

7. All our copies write EMPL (= τοῦ ὑψίματος αὑτοῦ), with the inferior Gr. texts which supply the pronoun. Harkl. writes EMPL (= τοῦ ὑψίματος), but subjoins the separate pron. EMPL (= αὐτοῦ), with #: prefixed. The # probably (as in previous instances) marks the insertion as due to the text of Philox.

Ib. Philox. writes EMPL (= τῶν ἑθνῶν, as many Gr. texts read), and the Arab. follows; but Harkl., EMPL (see Appx. II., in loc., and corr. note on Gr. text, p. 74), which represents τῶν ἑθνῶν, the more approved Gr. reading. This adjective is, however, unknown.
to Pesh.—Possibly ἕθνικῶν is meant as a loose rendering of ἑθνικῶν,—as the Latin Vulgate has "gentibus" here, not "gentilibus." The adjectival rendering of ἑθνικός appears also in Harkl., e.g. Mt. v. 47, and elsewhere. Thus the evidence of Harkl. against ἑθνῶν is distinct, while that of Philox. is open to question.

9. The use of ἥθος (ὁθος ἁθος, lit., ἔβοινὸμην γράφατ) in the rendering of ἔγραψα ἄν by both translators is peculiar. For the impersonal ἥθος followed by fut. with ᾧ prefix (which some of our codices insert here), see Thes. Syr., s.v. Here ἥθος becomes almost an auxiliary verb (like "would" in English). In modern Syriac it seems to be similarly used, but without ᾧ, — as ἥθος Ἄι (="I wish to go").*

Ib. The variant ἢθος (= ὑμῶν, as in all Gr. texts) is found in 2 and most texts of Philox., and adopted by Arab.; but 9, 12, 14, with 11, 18, 20, write ὡθος; also Harkl. 1 stands apart, reading ὡθος = ἀνῶν πάντων,—but probably by a mere slip of the pen for ὡθος.

10. The Gr. authorities here read without exception ἣν ἔλθω, ἑπο-

μνήσω: but Pococke's edition and most others represent ἣν ἔλθῃ, ἑπο-

μνήσθητι (not otherwise attested, = ἣν ἔλθῃ ὡθος ὡθος) (= ὑπομνήσθητι, "remember thou"). The Polyglots, Lee's, the American, and the present edition, read ὡθος ἔλθῃ ὡθος ὡθος, exactly rendering the Greek as above.

These alternative readings differ in two points: (a) the pointing of the verb ἔλθῃ; (b) the presence or absence of the preformative ἄν, as regards the verb ὡθος.

To take (b) first:—For ὡθος (Poc.) 8 is the sole witness.—Putting aside for the moment 9, 18, all the rest read ὡθος. It is evident that 8 has in mere inadvertence dropped the initial ἄ after the ἄ (final letter of ἔλθῃ) immediately preceding. The remaining ὡθος could then only be understood as second person imperative peal, ὡθος (= ὑπομνήσθητι, "remember thou"). This again required that the preceding ἔλθῃ ὡθος should mean ἣν ἔλθῃ ("if he comes"),—for "if I come, remember thou [his doings]" would be meaningless. And hence (a) resulted the pointing ἔλθῃ (= ἔλθῃ, "if he comes," or "if he has come").

* Maclean, Grammar of Vernacular Syriac, s. 51.
Thus the twofold perversion is accounted for, by which the true text as in the Polyglots,—(and so Etzel before them, "quandocunque venero recordabor") with 3[2]p, first pers. fut. pe., and 'tou, first pers. fut. aph.,—has been corrupted into that of 8 and Pococke, followed by Gutbir and all later editors, except Lee and the American; though Pococke (see his note in loc.) had pointed out its doubtfulness.

As regards (a), however, it is to be added that 2 (as also 17 and 19) writes 3[2]p—apparently representing *elby—while they retain the true 'tou, giving thus a reading *elv elby, *upomnivos, which is intelligible, though otherwise unsupported.—As regards (b), the two copies above excepted, 9, 18, agree with 8 in dropping the preformative 1, but with the verb in plur., *opin. Both, however, write 3[2]p (=3[2]p), as if reading *ellv elbyo, *upomnivos—unmeaningly. Arab. also represents *upomnivos, but (more consistently) with *ellv elby preceding.

But it is not always clear what tenses and persons are indicated by the points in our copies,—and this caution applies especially to 1 and its reading 3[2]p.

Harkl. has 3[2]p opin. 3[2]p, apparently intending the same sense as our text. Though 3[2]p might stand (in it and in some of our codices) for 1 (ptcp. roel), it can hardly be so meant, for the ptcp. would be ambiguous as between the meanings elbyo and elby, and a personal pronoun would be required after it (whether 3[2]p or opin).

Ib. The reading of all the editions, Polyglots included, *rmo (=eivy-σκεπτόμενος, or (as ver. 5 supr.) έργαζόμενος), is untenable. It is attested by but five, most of them untrustworthy, copies (4, 7, 8, 10, 15). It is unsuited to the context, it can hardly be construed at all, and it in no wise represents the Gr. φλιναρος, which (though *π. λεγ. here in N.T.,* and abnormally used as an act. verb [C subjoins eiv]) is the undisputed reading of the Gr. authorities. Dr. Field seems to have been the first to propose conjecturally the correction *sdmo, which stands in place of *rmo in Harkl. Elsewhere, *sdmo usually = καταλω (as in Pesh. N.T. often, and in Harkl. now and then); but in Syr.-Hxp. it is the rendering of παραλαλω (as Ps. xliii [xliv] 17 [16], and of καταλαλω, Mal. iii. 13, 16). In this sense it may be accepted as fairly representing φλιναρος, understood as "to prate maliciously [against]." This correction is now amply verified by the evidence of all our copies of Philox. except

* But we have φλιναρος, 1 Tim. v. 13.
the five inferior ones above noted,—that is, of all the five oldest, and eight of the twelve later (eighteen in all being here available).—In this case Arab. agrees with the older text, and with Harkl.—The Harkl. translator notes that φλυρόνωv was an unusual word, and perhaps betrays his consciousness that his rendering of it is hardly adequate, by inserting it in Gr. characters on his marg.—The Latin of Etzel ("facit in nos"), of Pococke ("facit nobis"), and of the Polyglots ("tractat nos"), alike show the difficulty they felt in dealing with their Syriac text.

Ib. For ἐκαστὸς ἐπιθερμόνον (impersonal, third pers. preter.) the ptep. ἐκαστόν (agreeing with the subject) is more usual, and is read here by some codices.—See Pococke's note in loc., and cp. Mt. vi. 34. Harkl. supports our text as printed supr., and a parallel for it is to be found in Syr.-Hxp. (Prov. xxx. 15).—The various points and other marks attached to the word in many of our copies (see footnote in loc., p. 29 supr.) show that it was a difficulty to the scribes.

Ib. Philox. (all texts) writes ἐκαστὸς ἐπιθερμόνον, with C and some mss, and supported by some Latin. Harkl. follows the other MSS and most mss, and the best Latin, which give τὸν ὑπολογένον (ἐν δὲ ἐκαστὸς); but in marg. a inserts ἐκαστὸς as alternative,—whether deriving it from Philox., or from a Greek exemplar, is doubtful.

II. All editions of Philox. prefix ὡ (= καὶ) to ὡσι, with C and some mss, and supported by some Latin. Harkl.,—agreeing with all Greek MSS (except L) and many mss. Our other codices insert it, except 18, which instead of it subjoins ὡ (= δὲ) to ὡσι, thus agreeing with L and many mss which write δὲ κακοτρων.; and so also Arab. and Etzel. No Greek reads καὶ δ κ.—As the prefix ὡ does not usually or properly represent δὲ, and as ὡ (= the proper equivalent of δὲ) is so weakly attested, I prefer to follow 1, 19, as in text supr.

12. Nearly all our codices, Arab., Etzel, and all editions, read ὡσικο before ὡσικο,—as if the Greek were καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, which is substantially the reading of C and of the Armenian version. Cod. 1 (alone) omits ὡσικο altogether. Cod. 14, on the other hand, inserts it and omits ὡσικο (which seems to have been originally the reading of Α). But 1
has for its reading the support of A as corrected \(\textit{prima m.}\), and of B and the rest. In view of the conflict of evidence, I have retained the words, but enclosed them in brackets, to mark the doubt.

Yet \(\underline{12}\) \textit{εκκλησίας}, if not part of the original text of \(S\), must have been a very early interpolation; for not only is it attested (as above) by all our codices except 1, and by the Arab., but is also supplied in nearly identical form by the Harkl. \((a)\) on its marg. \(\underline{12}\) \textit{εκκλησίας}. The usual doubt, however, arises whether this marginal note refers to Philox., or to a Greek copy which read as C does or substituted \(\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\) for \(\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\varepsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\). Moreover, it may be asked, Why, if the Harkl. margin refers to Philox., does it write \(\underline{12}\) \textit{εκκλησίας} and not (as Philox. \(\underline{12}\) \textit{εκκλησίας}?

Possibly the explanation of the facts may be, that \(\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\) was an early variant for \(\alpha\lambda\theta\varepsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\) (as the alteration made by the scribe of A indicates): that the Philox. translator was aware of both readings, and placed one \(\underline{\underline{15}}\) in his text and the other \(\underline{12}\) in his margin; that the scribe of 1, and of the exemplar followed by the Harkl. translator, preferred \(\underline{\underline{15}}\) \((=\tau\epsilon\gamma\varsigma\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\varepsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\)\), while the scribe of 14 preferred the other, \(\underline{12}\) \((=\tau\epsilon\gamma\varsigma\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\)\), and the remaining codices, including that followed by Arab., adopted the conflate reading which includes both (as in the editions), and which (among Greek MSS) C also exhibits;—and finally, that the Harkl. marginal reading comes from a second Greek exemplar which either (as 14) substituted \(\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\), or (as C) gave a conflate text.—The conflation was probably formed in the Syr. text independently of that in the Greek.

Ib. Our oldest codices (except 2) read \(\underline{\Delta\iota}\) \(\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\) (sing. \(=\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\)), with \(\Sigma\) A B C and many mss,—also Latin and other versions,—instead of \(\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\) \((=\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\)\), as many other Greek), which nearly all our other copies (including 2) give (except 19, which sides with the older text, and 20 (of which presently), [18 is doubtful]) ; as also Etzel and the Polyglots, and all subsequent editions except Lee's.—It is to be added, in correction of the footnote on these words, p. 30 \textit{supr.}, that Arab. renders as if reading \(\underline{\Delta\iota}\) \(\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\) \((=\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma)\); also, that this is the reading of 20, not confirmed by any Greek text, though a few mss have \(\nu\\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\). In this case Harkl. sides with 2 and the later text, inserting \(\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma\) (in Greek letters) on margin.—This insertion of such a familiar word is not to be classed with such instances as the marginal
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φλυαρων (ver. 10 supr.), or ταρταρώσας and νπερογκα (2 Pet. ii. 4, 18) and others which are notable by reason of strangeness; it can only mean that the translator thus justifies his text by reference to his Greek exemplar, and tacitly corrects (or at least notes his departure from) the Philox. which he was re-handling. It follows therefore that Philox. as known to him read the words, as in our older texts, in the singular.

15. Our codices without variation read [ἴνθη] and [ἴνθη] (= οἱ φίλοι, τοῖς φίλοις), strongly supported by the Greek authorities (all MSS except A) as to the former, and almost unanimously (all MSS) as to the latter.—Harkl. (a) offers [ἴνθη] (= οἱ ἀδελφοί) on his marg. as alternative in the former case, and in the latter his text (all codd.) substitutes [ἴνθη] (= τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς). Here, therefore, we have a Harkl. note which has reference to the variation of the Greek text only, irrespective of the Philoxenian.

JUDE.

1. The prefix ὅ in Ἰησοῦ is not to be taken as implying that our translator read ἦν before Ἰησοῦ in his exemplar*: the Syriac idiom demands the preposition.

2. The variant [ἴνθη] (= ἐν ἀγάπῃ), for [ἴνθη] (= καὶ ἀγάπῃ, as all Gr. read), is strongly attested,—by 9, 12, 14 as well as by 13, 18, 19, 20, and the bulk of our later codices, by Arab. as well as by Etzel. Yet, in view of the lack of Gr. support, it seems best to read [ἴνθη] with 1, 2, confirmed by 3, 4 and the important fragment 6. In some manuscripts ὅ is so written that ὅ may readily be mistaken for it.

3. [ἴνθη] This form of writing the word so as to naturalize it is authorized by Pesh. usage (as e.g. Mt. xviii. 7;—so also Curet.†), and Codd. 1, 2 adopt it here. Our other codices write it as a transliterated word (ἴνθη) = ἀνάγκη, and so Harkl. (ἴνθη).

Ib. For [ἴνθη] ἀκολουθοῦμεν (= παρακαλῶν), see Note supr. on 2 Joh. 5.

Ib. Both versions render ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι as if it were ἵνα ἀγώνα ποιῆτε,

* As in Westcott and Hort's note in loc. ("Select Readings").
† Cod. Sinait. (Lewis) here writes ὅ by error for Ἰησοῦ.
—and in Pesh. δ ἄγωνιζόμενος is similarly rendered, 1 Cor. ix. 25. But Pesh. elsewhere, and Harkl. everywhere, make ἄγωνιζομαι (ἔταγωνιζ. does not recur in N.T.) = ܐܠܡܐ (except Col. iv. 12, where both vary independently). Thus the coincidence of Philox. and Harkl. versions in this instance is notable among the tokens of their affinity.

4. Here, in their rendering of (the ἅπ. λεγόμ.) παρευσέωσαν, we have signal evidence of their interdependence. Neither here evades (as elsewhere we have marked them evading) the attempt to give the force of the compound verb (see note on Gr. text of 2 Pet. i. 5, p. 58 supr.) by treating it as a simple one; but both make use of the well-chosen periphrasis ἔκκλησθη ἄν ( = παρευσάχ. εἰς ταγωγήν; note that the noun is a rare one, nowhere else in Harkl., and not in Pesh.). In this case it is clear that Harkl. is the borrower. He never of his own initiative ventures on such a rendering: the bold and successful periphrasis marks the method of Philox.

 Ib. Another case of interdependence occurs in the rendering of κρίμα. This word occurs in these Epp. only here and 2 Pet. ii. 3. Both versions there render ἱνα (by which word both invariably represent κρίσις); here, they coincide in simultaneously changing to ἔκκλησθη.—In Pesh., likewise, κρίμα = ἔκκλησθη, 1 Cor. xi. 29; in Harkl., ἱνα. But Pesh. and Harkl. alike employ ἔκκλησθη to represent κατακρίμα (as Rom. v. 16) and other like compounds.

 Ib. Philox. here introduces in his rendering an effective paronomasia, ἔκκλησθη μ. . . ἔκκλησθη, which is not in the Gr. (χάρηστα . . . εἰς ἀτάλ-γειαν), of Hebraic character. Cp. Isai. v. 7, יְהוָה מְלֹטֶס והנֶחַ מְלֹטֶס. This is not reproduced by Harkl., which renders ἀτάλ-γειαν by ἔκκλησθη.

 Ib. After ἔσο ( = δεσπότην), Philox. (all codices) inserts ἡσύχας (= Θεόν), with Gr. K L P and many mss. This reading if accepted would strengthen the case for understanding τὸν μόνον δεσπότην of the Father.* But most of our copies (not 1, 2, 12 or 14,—9 hiat) also omit the Ο ( = καί) before Κύριον,—thus forcing the words to describe “our Lord Jesus Christ” as τὸν μόνον δεσπότην Θεόν. For the omission there is hardly any Gr. authority, unless we rely on the citation by Cyril Alex. (Act. Conc. Ephes.; see Tischendorf in loc.). And some of the best of our later codices, 13, 18, 19, 20, side with the older in

* See Dr. Mayor’s note in loc. on this point.
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retain the copulative; also Arab., as well as Harkl. But all the rest, and Etzel, omit; as also the Polyglots and all editions, except Lee's.*

5. On βούλομαι, rendered \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) see Note supr. on 2 Joh. 12.

Ib. Of the rival readings, πάντα and ροϊτα, Philox. ignores the latter; and most codices, with Arab. and Etzel, read \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (= τάμας πάντας), —unsupported otherwise. But 1, 2, with Harkl., write \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (= πάντα), which agrees with the best Gr. authorities (see note† on Gr. text, p. 78 supr.). Note that though 1, 2, and Harkl., read \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \), they represent εἰδότας πάντα, without τάμας,—whereas the \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) of the later Syr. text represents εἰδότας τάμας πάντας. The \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) in both is enclitic after the ptcn., and is not to be regarded as a separate pronoun. It is the suffix \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \), in the latter reading, that represents τάμας.

6. Here both versions concur in the misrendering of ἁξίοισ by \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (= ἀγνώστοις), as if formed from εἰδέναι, ὄδα, and not from ἄει. (So, too, Arab. represents ἄοράτοις.) Into this mistake Harkl. has been led by following Philox.; for in the only place where the word recurs in N.T. (Rom. i. 20) he renders it rightly by \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (Pesh. Thesaur.). A like etymology is cited, from one authority, in Steph. Thesaur. (London, 1819),—ἀξίοις, παρὰ τὸ εἰδὼ, τὸ βλέπω;—and, from another, an equally erroneous guess,—ἀξίοις, παρὰ τὸ ζω. This latter, in the original Thesaur. (1572) is ascribed to Eustathius, and explained, ὁ μὴ ζω, ἀλλὰ βίαβαιος καὶ στάσιμος.

7. Before \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) or \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (= πρόκεινται), three of our copies, 13, 19, 20, which elsewhere show signs of correction after Harkl., follow it in interpolating \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (= τέφρα,—cf. τεφρώσας, 2 Pet. ii. 6;)† and at the same time prefixing \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \) (to express προ-) to \( \text{\textsuperscript{130}} \).

* Correct note in loc., p. 32, where this exception has been overlooked.
† In correction of that note, and of Tischendorf's in loc., it is to be stated that B as well as NKL inserts τάμας after εἰδότας,—as pointed out by Dr. Mayor, p. clxxiii on the authority of Cozza-Luzi's photographic facsimile.
‡ White wrongly renders "cineris" (as if the word were τέφρα, genit.). Wetstein (in loc.) suggests τέφρας is to be read for ἑτράς, which in the Gr. text stands before πρόκειται and after σαρκός: and this the Old Lat. favours, by omitting "alteram" after "carnem." But in Prolegg. in [pseudo-Clem. R., page v, he correctly reports the reading of his codex (13), and renders it τέφρα. Neither 3, 19, 20, however, nor Harkl., omits the Syr. equivalent of ἑτράς.
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(which properly = καῦται only). This interpolation is found also in the Old Latin (ap. Lucif. Calar.), "cinis propostae sunt exemplum."*

Ib. The words that follow are read in three different forms:

(a) By the editions, with the majority of late codices, and also 14 and (probably) 9, and by Arab., and Etzel, \[\text{Δαίμων} \text{Δαύδ} (= ὑπὸ πῦρ)\];

(b) By 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, with Harkl., \[\text{Δαίμων} \text{Δαύδ} (= δείγμα πυρὸς)\];

(c) By 1, 2, with 3 and (omitting Ν) 4, 6, \[\text{Δαίμων} \text{Δαύδ} (= ὑπὸ δείγμα πυρὸς).\]

Of these (c), though so strongly attested, looks suspiciously like a conflation of (a) and (b).—Between these two, one can scarcely hesitate to prefer (b);—for (a) is to all appearance a corruption of it—Δαύδ for Δαίμων—by dropping out two letters, the 0 and final 1; and moreover it is opposed by all Gr. texts, which unanimously give δείγμα. Yet it is to be borne in mind that (b) is really attested only by 12, 18;—for (as has been pointed out above) 13, 19, and 20 are here merely conforming to Harkl. It may be that (c) is to be preferred as the true reading of Philox., representing a variant πρόκεινται ὑπὸ δείγμα (for δείγμα, as 2 Pet. ii. 6) mistakenly read by the translator as ὑπὸ δείγμα. — Or again, Δαίμων Δαύδ θεός may represent ὑπὸ κείνηται (for πρόκεινται) δείγμα.

In any case, Δαίμων must be restored, whether after Δαύδ or instead of it. The presence of Δαύδ, if a corruption, is a very early one, being common to our earliest manuscript (1) and our earliest version (Arab.).

The construction of πυρὸς with δείγμα and not with δίκηρ, as in all copies of Philox., is upheld (see Gr. text, p. 79 infr., and note) not only by the Old Lat. (ap. Lucif. Cal. ut supr.) but by Harkl.—though White's Lat. version represents it otherwise.

Ib. The rendering, common to both versions, of δίκηρ ὑπέχωνται, by \[\text{μέρους} \text{κατακριθέωσαι} \text{(cp. 2 Pet. ii. 6, where both have ὁμοὶ = κατέκρινεν).}\]

8. Where ἐνυπνάζομαι elsewhere occurs in N.T. (only Act. ii. 17), or in LXX (passim), it means simply "to dream" (as Old Lat. here renders, "somniantes"). The paraphrase of it (see note on Gr. text, * De non conveniendo c. Haeret, p. 219.

† Τρόκειμαι is not found in N.T.; but in LXX.,—as ἀντιγραφον ὑποκείμενον, 1 [3] Esdr. viii. 9.
p. 79 supr.) given here by Philox. and Harkl. is of uncertain meaning; for the rare ptcp. ἐνθάλησαν which they employ (not elsewhere in Pesh. or Harkl.) may mean (1) (as in the Syr. of Wisdom (iv. 2) = ποθοῦντες) "longing (or lusting) in dream,"—or (2) as others interpret it, "imagining in dream" (as if = φαντασομένους,—so Pococke, "imagi-
nantes"). See Dr. Mayor, in loc., p. 33. Whichever meaning be preferred, the fact of the concurrence of the two versions in the peculiar treatment of the Gr. is equally signal as a mark of their affinity.

9. On the other hand, they concur in the very weak rendering of διακρυόμενος διελέγετο by the ἡμᾶς which makes no attempt at giving the force of either compound verb. For διακρυόμενος see further on ver. 23.

Ib. Here again in rendering τετιμήσας σου, the versions coincide in using a verb ἄρα, which in Pesh. is found else only 1 Tim. v. 1 (there = εὐπλήσας), and in Harkl. not at all. Both usually represent it by Ἢσ.

11. Both likewise concur in representing the moral sense here given to ξεκύθησαι, by εὐπλήσας. Parallels are to be found in O.T. Pesh.; and in Syr.-Hxp. (as Jer. ii. 20, διαχύθησαμαι = ἡμᾶς). In N.T. Pesh. (not Harkl.) we find, 1 Pet. iv. 4, συντρέχων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀνάχων concisely translated, δυσέςκαθήθησαν;—also Rom. i. 27, ξεκύθησαν (which the translator evidently read for τεκαίθησαν of all Gr. texts) is rendered as here. Hence Pococke and the Polyglot and other editors, and White [Harkl.], have been misled into rendering the Syr. verb here, "erasing."]

Ib. The rendering of ἀντιλογία here, whether by δυσέςκαθήθησαι (as the older copies of Philox.), or by δυσέςκαθήσας (as the later copies, and Harkl.), is not found in Pesh., nor elsewhere in Harkl.—Even the cognate δυσές, and the parent verb ἰδω, are rare in the former, and seem to be absent from the latter.

12. For ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αἰτῶν) see third Note supr. on 2 Pet. ii. 13. Here, Harkl. concurs with Philox. in representing ἀγάπαις (but with ὑμῶν for αἰτῶν); yet is scrupulous to note in marg. that ἀγάπη properly = ἦσας (which word he gives as alternative reading in 2 Pet., while in his text he represents ἀπάταις). See note on Gr. text of 2 Pet., p. 63 supr.
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Ib. For ἁλαδῆς (in both versions) cp. 2 Pet. ii. 13, where both make ἁλαδῆς = σπυλαδῆς—a small but significant coincidence, in the change from noun to participle,—especially as the employment as here of a participle to represent a noun is strange.

Ib. The agreement again of both versions in here representing the rare verb συνενεχούμενοι by ἀμαθοῦμεν is made doubly notable by the fact that both render the same verb otherwise (by ἀμαθοῦμεν) in the parallel passage of 2 Pet. (ii. 13,—see Syr. text, p. 16 supr.). It occurs nowhere else (and the simple ἀμαθοῦμεν not at all) in N.T. In Pesh. N.T., neither verb is found;—in Harkl., only ἀμαθοῦμεν, once (1 Tim. v. 6, where it = σπαραλῶ). Here, as in 2 Pet., both versions fail to represent the συν- of the compound verb. And even the ιμῶν after ἀγάπας here,—and similarly the ιμῶν after συνενεχούμενοι in 2 Pet. (both of which Harkl. represents and thus suggests συν-) disappear in the rendering of Philox., which replaces ιμῶν by αὐτῶν here, and in 2 Pet. omits ιμῶν. Both also connect συνενεχ. here with σπυλάδης, and make ἀφόβως qualify τομαίοντες (see Dr. Mayor's note, p. 41).

Ib. For φθινοπωρινά (understood as of trees “that cast their fruit”), Philox., taking it as a compound of φθινό with ὀπώρα (in its secondary sense of “fruit”), offers the periphrasis ὁσιοῖ μοῖοι. (For the other explanation, “autumnal”—from φθινοπωρον—“the declining autumn” (ὀπώρα), see Dr. Mayor's Appx., p. 55.) Harkl. in this follows Philox.,—both (1) as to the noun, ὁσιοῖ, which is not in Pesh. N.T., and occurs but once in Apoc. (xviii. 14, where for ὀπώρα σου the older version has ὁσιοῖ; the later, ὁσιοῖ ὁσιοῖ);—and (2) as to the verb, ὁσιοῖ, which Philox. has in the sense of καταπαίουμαι, 2 Pet. ii. 14 (ὁσιοῖ); Pesh. only Jac. iv. 14 (ὁσιοῖ = ἀφανιζομένη)—but Harkl. in neither place.

Ib. The manner in which Philox. deals with ἐκρίζωθεντα invites remark. Not only does he put aside the obvious and quite adequate rendering of this verb by ὁσιοῖ, which both Pesh. and Harkl. everywhere else employ, but he substitutes a periphrasis ἀναβαίνειν, which rather means “grown up” than “plucked up”;—in fact Pococke and others render it “et ascenderunt a radice sua”; and the Polyglots even less intelligibly, “quarum [arborum] e radicibus emerserunt.”—Probably he here uses ὁσιοῖ as = ἀνεσηπάσθη,—of which meaning it seems to be
capable;—for though the Lexx. do not record it as thus used in *peal*, we find ἁμαρτάνει (ethpa.) = ἀναστάσθη (Act. xi. 10, Pesh.); also the ptcp. aph. ἁμαρτάνει = ἀναστάσθη (Lc. xiv. 5, Pesh. and Harkl.), and the fut. aph. ἁμαρτάνοι = ἀναστάσῃ (Dan. vi. [vii.] 19, Syr.-Hxp.).—Harkl. here, while with Philox. he avoids ἀργόν, yet instead of ἁμαρτάνει uses in his similar periphrasis the better-chosen ἁμαρτάνει (αἱμάρτης = ἐκτιλλω, ἁμαρτάνω, belongs to the Syro-Hexaplar vocabulary, see Thes. S., s.v.).

13. Here, on the contrary, for ἐπαφριζοντα (a rare verb) Syriac offers no equivalent. Both versions alike expand it into δί [Harkl., δι' ᾧ] ἀφροῦ αὐτῶν δεικνύτα.

Ib. For ᾧ δοκεῖν = ὁ ζῷον τῶν σκότων, cp. second Note supr. on 2 Pet. ii. 4.

14. ἁμαρτάνει (= ἢβδομος)] Philox. here, and always, expresses the ordinal number (as Pesh. does) by the cardinal with prefix ἢ, which is the idiomatic usage. But Harkl. here employs the later adjectival form, ἁμαρτάνει; and similarly writes ἁμαρτάνει for ὄγδοον (2 Pet. ii. 5, where Philox. has ᾧ ἁμαρτάνει),—and so elsewhere in places where the ordinal denotes second, third, &c., in a series.—But in the two remaining instances where an ordinal (δευτερος) occurs in these Epp. (2 Pet. iii. 1; Jud. 5)—merely meaning second, or secondly, as opposed to first, Harkl. with Philox., renders by ἡμιάρτητον. Cp. on this point (e.g.) the Pesh. and Harkl. renderings of Mt. xxii. 26, and of Joh. xxii. 14—17.

14, 15. In these two verses our version exhibits three remarkable agreements with readings in which Ν is singular or nearly so among Gr. authorities.—(a) In 14, it represents ἐν μυρίασιν ἀγίων (for ἐν ἀγίαις μυρίαις)—but Ν, &c., add ἀγγέλων;—(b) In 15, τὰς σαν ψυχῆς, for πάντας τοὺς ἀσέβεις;—(c) In 15, after ἐργαζόμενο, it omits ἀσέβειας αὐτῶν.—In (a) and (c) the text of Philox. shows no variation; in (b) the reading rests solely on codd. 1, 2;—and in it Ν stands alone among Gr. authorities. The Sahidic alone of the versions agrees with ours and with Ν in all three places: Harkl. in none of them. (See the Gr. and Syr. texts, pp. 35, 80, supr., and the notes on each, in loc.).

15. ἁμαρτάνει (= ποιήσατε .... καὶ ἔλεγξα). This inconsistency in rendering the two Gr. infinitives occurs only in codd. 1, 2. The rest write ἁμαρτάνει for the latter,—to all appearance merely a
scribe's grammatical correction; the true reading of Philox., with its irregularity, is no doubt that which the two oldest copies preserve. Harkl. corrects it in the opposite way, by writing the former verb as well as the latter in the infinitive (ῥάκκα). Notably, it is the habit of Harkl. to render Gr. infin. by infin.; Philox. tends to substitute (where admissible) the fut. with ? prefix.

16. Here Philox. once more, in rendering μεμψίμωροι, offers a fairly adequate periphrasis (see note on Gr. text in loc.): Harkl., forsaking the guidance of the prior version, is misled—by a reading (else unknown) which he records on his marg., μεμψίμωροι—into an attempt to render the word etymologically (as if = μεμφόμενοι μυριάδα),* δέκα εἴκοσι. White renders "conquerentes de principatu," but the Gr. of Harkl. marg. implies ἐκατόεις (= μυριάς, as ver. 14), not ἐκατόεις (= μεγαλωσύνη, as ver. 25).

Ib. For ἰδαλίγματα (= ἱπέρογκα), see note (p. 17), and first Note supr., on ἰδαλίγμα, 2 Pet. ii. 18.—The form here used is the Syro-Hexaplar rendering of the same Gr. word, Thren. i. 9,—also (as cited by Masius, Syr. Pecul., s.v.), Deut. xxx. 11.

20. Neither version attempts to express the superlative ἀγωνιστήριον,—both render merely as if ἀγιά, which no Gr. gives, were read here.

22. For οὐκαὶ δὲ μὲν, 10 and 20 (and Arab. similarly) read οὐκαὶ δὲ; representing καὶ τὸ ἰμάτιον αὐτῶν (sc., the ἐσπλωμένον χητῶν). The noun ῥηξις is sometimes written without ἰ, and its use = ἰμάτιον is frequent in Pesh. (In the footnote in loc., p. 37, the reading of 10 is wrongly given as οὐκαὶ δὲ).

22, 23. To the notes (p. 82 supr.) on the complicated variations in the text of these verses, the following remarks are supplementary.

(a) Philox. here, against Harkl. and the other versions, and the Gr. manuscripts, supports the form in which the passage is cited by a writer so early and so learned as Clement of Alexandria (οὐς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακριόμενος δὲ ἐλεεῖτε (Strom. vi. 8)—and by Jerome

* For an example of the etymological skill of Harkl., see his note on Act. x. 1, where he explains Κορήλιος as = κορήν ἥλιον: also (assuming the later Syr. version of Λποç. to be his) his rendering of ἐν μέσφ οὕραν ἀμάτη, as if it were written, ἐν μέσφ οὐράν οἱμάτι (or —τοι) (Λποç. viii. 13).
similarly, "alius quidem ex igne rapite, aliorum vero qui judicantur miseremini" (In Ezech., xviii. 7).

(b) Of the two classes into which the authorities here divide themselves—those which (as A B, &c.) distinguish three classes in the passage,—and those which (as C K L P, &c.) reduce them to two—Philox., with Clement and Jerome, belongs to the latter—as does also Harkl. (though with difference).

(c) Both Syriac versions, also with Clement and Jerome, read διακρινομένως (for —όμενοι).

But (d) Harkl. differs from Philox., Clem., and Jer.,—(1) in expanding ἀρπάξετε into σῶσετε ἀρπάξοντες,—(2) in inverting the order of the two classes;—and also (3) it connects ἐν φόβῳ (which Clem. and Jer. do not include in their citation) with ἀρπάξετε instead of with ἐλεάτε.

And finally, (e) Harkl. retains the verbs employed by Philox. (οἱ δὲ ημεῖς ταῦτα ἐφάγομεν τὴν [2]), while he alters the passage in substance otherwise—though the use of οἱ δὲ ημεῖς to represent διακρινομένως is strange, and difficult to account for (see next Note).

23. It is hardly possible to regard οἱ δὲ ημεῖς as a rendering of διακρινομένως: in Pesh. usage it is the proper equivalent of μεταμελομένως. Above (ver. 9) both versions translate διακρινόμενος by ἄφινε—apparently in the sense of "disputing"; but though this meaning would suit ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους (as A C read), it is hardly compatible with ἐλεάτε.

In order therefore to solve the difficulty which the word presents, we are compelled to suppose that Philox., though knowing (as ver. 9 proves) the proper meaning of διακρινομένους, yet felt it to be so inappropriate here that he judged it necessary to force on the verb the meaning conveyed by οἱ δὲ ημεῖς,—passing from the idea of "waving in mind" (as διακρινόμενος, Jac. i. 6) to that of change of mind or purpose (as μετανοῶ, μεταμέλομαι), and that Harkl. adopted from him this perversion of the Greek.

All the Gr. authorities write διακρινομένους (or —όμενοι) here; there is no reason to suspect that the exemplars used by the two translators, can have read μεταμελομένως (or —όμενοι) instead. The only alternative reading that offers itself as possible is διαπρομένους (as διεπρῶντο, Act. v. 33,—cp. vii. 54); but it is hardly plausible enough to be worth suggesting.

But the Syriac text may perhaps admit of emendation. As we have
seen, it agrees with that of Clement, and of Jerome. Clement does not explain διακρινομένους, but he probably understood it as Jerome does, who apparently derived his reading from Clement, and (as above stated) renders it by "qui judicantur" [and so in Lat. Vulgate (though it reads ἔλεγχετε for ἔλεατε) "judicatos"]. Now seeing that the Syr. renders διακρινόμενος (middle) by ὑπὸ (peal) in ver. 9, he may be expected to render it here, if with Jerome he regarded it as passive, by the etkpeal ὑπὸ—plural, ὑπομένοι. The change of a single letter ὑ into ὕ, and the dropping of the second ὑ, would then give, as an easy corruption, the ὑπομένοι of our text. Yet it seems rash to suppose that such a corruption should have been admitted so universally as to have supplanted the genuine reading in all copies,—and so early as to have passed unquestioned into the Harklensian revision.

24. Philox. here supports C and some mss which interpolate ἀπώλον καὶ. Harkl. confirms this,—independently as it seems, for he renders the adject. by ἀπολομον ἃ, a different form from the ἀπολομον ἃ of Philox., though from the same root ἀπολομον (= ἀπώλον).

24, 25. As the words ἁλομος ἀπωλομομένος (= κατανατικὸν τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει) are omitted by codd. 1, 14, and (partly) by 2,—and as the other copies, though they insert, misplace them contrary to the Gr. and to the requirements of the context, it would be better to place them [in brackets] earlier in the passage, at the end of ver. 24, so as to connect them (as in the Gr.) with ὅσεῖμαι (= ὅσεῖμαι).—For the words which 1 and 2 interpolate instead, ἁλομος ἀπωλομομένος (= καθαρισθεῖται κατὰ τὸ βέλημα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ)—no other authority appears to be forthcoming, and no source suggests itself.—Their insertion has no doubt caused (by homoeotel.) the omission above noted as affecting the text of codd. 1, 2.

25. In the notes, p. 83, it ought to have been pointed out that S (alone) reads τιμῆ for ἐξονύμια, and removes μεγαλωσύνη to stand after it. Also, the last note on that page ought to be thus:—πάντας τοὺς αἰώνας] N, 27 36 99, cop, om πάντας. After αἰώνας, L, few mss, hkl (mg) lat νῦ (cl), add τῶν αἰώνων.
NOTE
ON THE USE OF מ' WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIX IN THIS VERSION.

The possessive pronoun used adjectively, or the genitive of the personal pronoun used possessively, of the Greek, is commonly represented, in Syriac as in Hebrew, by a pronominal suffix attached to the noun denoting the object possessed. But sometimes (though exceptionally), even in the earlier Syriac, it is expressed as a separate word, formed by attaching the suffix to the particle מ'. So in the Peshitta N.T. we find מ' סלע = δ καρπὸς δ εὐμῶς (Joh. vii. 8,—cp. vii. 6).

In the later Syriac, especially in translations from the Greek,—notably in the (seventh-century) Syro-Hexaplar O.T. and the Harrlensian N.T.,—this usage is so frequent as to have become habitual.

In our Philoxenian Four Epistles it occurs,—not indeed normally, yet by no means rarely,—in all twenty-one times (in 2 Pet. eleven times, in 2 Joh. once, in 3 Joh. thrice, in Jud. six times); whereas in the Harrlensian text of the same Epistles it has almost superseded the vernacular use of the pronominal suffix with the noun, which remains only here and there in that text—apparently as a survival from the prior version.

In six of these twenty-one instances, the suffixed מ' represents the adjective ἐδως (2 Pet. i. 3, 20; iii. 3, 16, 17; Jud. 6);—yet not uniformly, for in two of the places (eight* in all) where ἐδως occurs, it is expressed (2 Pet. ii. 16, 22)† by the pronominal suffix attached to the noun affected (which is the Peshitta usage in representing ἐδως).—In the remaining instances likewise (fifteen in all) there is not uniformity of usage, nor is it to be expected. Our translator's habit is to guide himself not by definite rules, but in each place to choose what word or form seemed to him best to convey the sense of his original. But in six of these fifteen places it is to be noted that his מ' with suffix represents the genitive (possessive) of a personal pronoun placed before the noun which denotes the object possessed (2 Pet. i. 16; ii. 2; iii. 7; Jud. 3, 18, 20). In these places the displacement of the pronoun presumably has some significance in the Greek, which the Syriac attempts

* Seven of these are in 2 Pet., in which Epistle it is a favourite word.
† In one of these places (ii. 16) the ἐδως has no special force (ἐδιὰς παραφωλιας), and Philox. loses nothing by neglecting it. In the other (ii. 22) Philox. repeats verbatim the words as cited from Prov. xxvi. 11 (Pesh.).
to reproduce by this \( \text{ἐκέινον} \) with suffix. In four of them the intention is obviously to emphasize the pronoun. In 2 Pet. i. 16 (ἡ ἰδίανον μεγαλουόρτος), and Jud. 18 (τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίαις), the choice of pronouns marks the emphasis further. So too in 2 Pet. iii. 7 (τὸ αὐτόν λόγῳ) the emphasis is reverential, and seems to point to the (somewhat remote) subject (see ver. 5, τοῦ Θεοῦ). Again, in Jud. 20, the writer’s appeal to his readers for personal effort, on the basis of their existing faith, is pointed by the prominent position given to the pronoun (τῷ ἰμῶν πίστει).

In all these cases the \( \text{ἐκέινον} \), \( \text{ἐκέινοις} \), \( \text{ἐκέινοι} \) of Philox. reproduces the emphatic force of the Greek. In the two remaining, the like force takes different forms.—In 2 Pet. ii. 2 (αὐτῶν τῷ ἀσέλγειά) the transposition of the pronoun points to the “false teachers” whose “lascivious way” many will follow, and the Syriac \( \text{σὺν} \) \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \) marks this; whereas \( \text{σὺν} \) \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \) would rather convey “will follow their own lascivious way.” In Jud. 3 (ἡμῶν σωτηρίας) the order of the words indicates that (as the epithet \( \text{κοὐνῖς} \) requires) by “our salvation” the writer does not mean “salvation for himself and those about him,” but “salvation which is mine and yours,” yours as well as mine: in Syriac, \( \text{σὺν} \) \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \), not \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \) merely.

Similarly, in the remaining instances, in which the Greek though it implies emphasis does not mark it by choice or order of words, the Syriac translator at his own discretion indicates it by \( \text{ἐκέινον} \) with suffix. Thus, in 2 Pet. iii. 13 \( \text{ἐκέινοις} \) is emphatic for the same reason as in iii. 7, though in κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτῶν the pronoun is not placed before the noun as in τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ.—Thus, too, by \( \text{ἐκέινος} \) (2 Pet. i. 15; 3 Joh. 4) there is laid a personal stress on “my departure,” “my children” (τὴν ἡμῖν ἔξοδον, τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα),—just as in the instance above cited from the Peshitta (Joh. vii. 8). So again in 3 Joh. 12 (ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν), in which place the \( \text{ἐκέινος} \) emphasizes the reference to ἡμεῖς μαρτυροῦμεν, just before.—In 2 Joh. 12 (ἡ ἡμῶν) the force of \( \text{ἐκέινος} \) is to mark that the joy, as in Jud. 3 (see above) the faith, is “ours” in the sense of “mine and yours.”—With this is to be reckoned the \( \text{ἔμοι} \) of Jud. 21 (where Philox. reads ἡμῶν in the Greek, unsupported), for this verse merely repeats the \( \text{ἔμοι} \) of Jud. 3; \( \text{ἐμοῦ} \) and σωτηρία being in Syriac alike expressed by \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \).—Yet again, in 2 Pet. ii. 12 (ἐν τῷ φθορῷ αὐτῶν), \( \text{σὺν} \) \( \text{ἐμοῖς} \) has the same distinctive emphasis as in ii. 3,—the translator (wrongly perhaps) taking αὐτῶν to relate to the (persons or) things indicated by the plur. relative pronoun in the words.
(Note that he cannot have understood αὐτῶν to be the ἀλογάς ζωᾶ of ver. 12,† for ἡλίας (= ζωᾶ) is feminine, and would require ἀλίαν.)

In Jud. 16 ἀλίαν probably indicates that εἰρηνῶν was read in the exemplar used by Philox. for αὐτῶν (as in ver. 18), with CLP and some mss,—a point which I have overlooked in constructing the Greek text.

In the only instance that remains, 3 Joh. 9 (ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν), the genitive pronoun is not possessive; and the ambition for pre-eminence imputed by the phrase is better brought out by ἀλίαν than if in the ordinary way the suffix were attached to ἀλίαν.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES ON JOHN VIII. 1–12.

Recension I (pp. 44, 88).

VIII. 4, 6. The omission by D of τὸ τέταμεν ἐκ τῶν μεταφόρεσθαι αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἐφοσοῦν καταγγείλει στόχον αὐτὸ, is compensated in advance by the words which it has introduced into ver. 4, ἐκτοτεράλακτες αὐτῶν ἵνα ἐφοσοῦν καταγγείλει στόχον αὐτῶ.—In M, which omits the words as D does from ver. 6, they appear in slightly varied form after ver. 11.

Recension I' (pp. 45, 90).

7. In the note on προσεδόκησαν (p. 90), the words “in hkl” are to be struck out.

Recension II (pp. 48, 91).

7. If the comma be placed before μαρτυρῶν (= ἀλίαν), that participle is to be read with μαρτυρήσατω (= ἀλίας) following (“testifying let him testify,”—pleonastically, as often in LXX, and sometimes in N.T., as Mt. xiii. 4).—But if it be placed after μαρτυρῶν, the construction is, δοτις . . . . μαρτυρῶν, ὡς ἠμέμπτος (“whoso [is] . . . . testifying, as one free from like blame”). The participle cannot be construed as = μαρτυροῦμενος (“attested as free from blame”), for the passive ptp. is in Hkl. rendered by ἀλίας, which Pesh. avoids usually by periphrasis, as Acts vi. 3; x. 22.

* This rendering agrees with the explanation of the passage given by Spitta ap. Mayor, note in loc., p. 131.
† So Dr. Mayor, no doubt rightly, interprets.
APPENDIX I.

COLLATION OF MANUSCRIPT 20.*

(See above, p. 93, Postscript. MS dated A.G. 1787 = A.D. 1475.)

General Superscription:—

Γεγυμονον μεν τας Καθαρας 

"The four Epistles of the Apostles which are not found in all copies."

Superscription to 2 Peter:—

Second Epistle of Peter Chief of the Apostles."

Superscriptions to 2 and 3 John:—

Second Epistle of John the Apostle," and "Third Epistle of the same John the Evangelist.""

Superscription to Jude:—

Epistle of Jude son of Joseph."

2 PETER.

I. (1) ἐπὶ τῶν (no 1). | ins ἐπίσκοπος (= kai ἀπόστολος). | (3) om ἀπέκδος. | om; prefix to (so as to read ἡ θεία δύναμις [δεδωρηταί]); but | om διὸ (= δεδωρηταί). | | (with ribb., = kai ἀπεπαίδευς). | (4) ἐπιτυγχάνειν (= ἐπαγγέλματα). | (5) ματαιότης (= καὶ σκοτειναί). | writes ἀποθέον (pres.). | (6) ὅλον (by lapse, —the word is rightly spelt in next line). | (9) ἀλήθεια (= ἀλῆθες, not

* The scribe of this MS, when he inserts the vowels, tends to put τ for δ.
II. (1) \(\text{καὶ \text{θλαβέω}}\) (= ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ). | (2) \(\text{ἐπιστρέφω} (=\text{ταῖς ἀσελγείαις})\). | (3) \(\text{στῆλε}\) avant l'infinitif (=τῆς παρονμίας). | (4) \(\text{προσφέρω} (=\text{ἀποστάσει})\). | (5) \(\text{ἐπιστρέφω} (=\text{τῆς παρονμίας})\). | (6) \(\text{ἐπιστρέφω} (=\text{τῇ παρονμίᾳ})\). | (7) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (8) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (9) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (10) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (11) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (12) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (13) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (14) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (15) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (16) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (17) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (18) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (19) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (20) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (21) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (22) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (23) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (24) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (25) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (26) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (27) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (28) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (29) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (30) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (31) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (32) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (33) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (34) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (35) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (36) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (37) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (38) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (39) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (40) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (41) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (42) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (43) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (44) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (45) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (46) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (47) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (48) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (49) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (50) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (51) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (52) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (53) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (54) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (55) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (56) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (57) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (58) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (59) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (60) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (61) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (62) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (63) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (64) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (65) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (66) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (67) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (68) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (69) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (70) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (71) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (72) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (73) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (74) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (75) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (76) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (77) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (78) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (79) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (80) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (81) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (82) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (83) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (84) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (85) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (86) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (87) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (88) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (89) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (90) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (91) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (92) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (93) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (94) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (95) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (96) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (97) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (98) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (99) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\). | (100) \(\text{τότε} (=\text{ἐγγράφη})\).
(4) οὐκ ἦτε (ἔρθη) for οὐκέτι (ἀδήμονε) for ἔσττε (of 1 and 2, = κατεσκεύασται). | ins after (no ribb., though plur. verb; so likewise in vv. 7, 10 (not in vv. 12, 13)). | Punctuates after ἔσττε and after οὐκέτι; not after ἔσττε or after ἔσττε (masc. for fem.). | (5) ἦτε (ἐκδεδεμένη) for ἔσττε (ἐκαθαρίσθημεν). | (6) ἦτε (sic; the last vowel being due to the subjoined ὦτε). | (7) ζημεύουσα ( = ἵππος) for ζημεύει ( = τεθυμαρωμένοι). | (9) οὐθὲν ( = μετέχοντες) for οὐαί ( = μετέχοντες). | (10) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (11) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (12) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (13) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (14) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (15) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (16) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (17) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (18) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (19) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες). | (20) ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες) for ζημεύει ( = μετέχοντες).

2 JOHN.

(1) (without suffix). | (2) Δεῦτε | ἔσττε (pret. for pres.). | (2 and 3) om ἔσττε ( = εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔσται μεθ' ἤμων) by homoeot. (similarly om ἔσττε, ver. 3). | ins ἔσττε ( = υπερτοῦ) after ἔσττε ( = Θεοῦ), but corr. | (5) ἔσττε ( = ὦς) after ἔσττε ( = οὐχ). | om ἔσττε ( = ἴνα ἄγαπάωμεν ἄλληλους). | (6) ἔσττε ( = τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτῶν) for ἔσττε ( = τὸν ἐντολήν). | (7) ἔσττε ( = ὅς) after ἔσττε ( = Οὐ). | (8) ἔσττε ( = δὲ ποιῶν) for ἔσττε ( = δὲ παραβαίνων), by lapse. | ins ἔσττε ( = καί) before ἔσττε ( = τὸν πατέρα). | (10) ins ἔσττε ( = καί) before ἔσττε ( = τὸν πατέρα). | (11) om ἔσττε. | om ἔσττε ( = καί) before ἔσττε ( = τὸν πατέρα).
(12) | (13) $\text{Δως} (= \tau\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon)$ for $\text{Δως}$ ($= \tau\varsigma \alpha\delta. \sigma\omicron\upsilon$). | om (see note on syr txt).

3 JOHN.

(1) $\text{Σώζεται}$ (with suffix, $= \tau\omega \\dot{\alpha} \gamma\alpha\nu\pi\tau\tau\omega\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon$). | $\text{Σώζεται}$ (with suffix, $= \tau\omega \\dot{\alpha} \gamma\alpha\nu\pi\tau\tau\omega\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon$).

(2) $\text{Σώζεται}$ for $\text{Σώζεται} \, \text{(agh.)}$ for $\text{Σώζεται} \, \text{(agh.)}$. | $\text{σώζεται}$ for $\text{σώζεται} \, \text{(agh.)}$ for $\text{σώζεται} \, \text{(agh.)}$.

(3) $\text{προ̱}$ ($= \delta\epsilon$) for $\text{προ̱}$ ($= \gamma\alpha\pi\rho\)\nu$, which some om. | (4) om $\omicron$ before, and ins $\omicron$ ($= \delta\epsilon$) after, $\text{προ̱}$ ($= \mu\alpha\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho\nu$). | $\text{προ̱}$ ($= \delta\epsilon$) after, $\text{προ̱}$ ($= \mu\alpha\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho\nu$). | (5) ins $\omicron$ for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (6) ins $\omicron$ before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (7) ins ι before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (8) ins $\omicron$ for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (9) ins $\omicron$ before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (10) ins $\omicron$ ($= \varepsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$) for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ ($= \varepsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$). | (11) ins $\omicron$ before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ ($= \varepsilon\kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota$ $\kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota$) | (II) ins $\omicron$ before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ ($= \varepsilon\kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota$ $\kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \iota$).

JUDE.

(2) $\text{Σώζεται}$ for $\text{Σώζεται}$ ($= \eta\mu\omega\nu$). | (3) $\text{Σώζεται}$ for $\text{Σώζεται}$ ($= \eta\mu\omega\nu$).

(4) $\text{Σώζεται}$ without suffix ($= \eta\mu\omega\nu$). | ins $\omicron$ ($= \kappa\alpha\iota$) before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$: $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ ($= \kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron \eta\mu\omega\nu$). | (5) $\text{Σώζεται}$ ($= \eta\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\omicron\upsilon$) for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ ($= \tau\alpha\nu\tau\iota$). | (6) $\text{προ̱}$ (at end) for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (pret. for pres.). | (7) No prefix to $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ or to $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (8) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (see note on syr txt). | (9) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$.

Before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$, ins $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (with 13, 19, and hkl). | om $\text{} \omicron \omicron$, and ins $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (masc.). | (8) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ for $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (sing.). | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ with prefix. | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ before $\text{} \omicron \omicron$, instead of prefixes | $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (10) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ $\text{} \omicron \omicron$. | (II) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (sing. | (12) $\text{} \omicron \omicron$ (ep. 2 Pet.
Subscriptions.

To 2 Peter:—

ὁμολογεῖ Πέτρου Αποστόλου Κύριου τῶν Ἀποστόλων

("Here ends the Second Epistle of Peter Chief of the Apostles.")

To 2 John:—

ὁμολογεῖ Ἰωάννου Ἀποστόλου Κυρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων

("Here ends the Second of John the Apostle.")

To 3 John:—

ὁμολογεῖ Ἰωάννου Εὐαγγελίστου Κυρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων

("Here ends the Third Epistle of John the Evangelist.")

To Jude:—

ὁμολογεῖ Ἰουδαίου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἰουδαίου Κυρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων

("Here ends the Epistle of Jude son of Joseph.")

* Perhaps = κλιναίω in the sense of ὑποτάγητε [τοῖς ἰμασίων], as Ps. xlv. 7 (LXX and Syr.-Hep.).
APPENDIX II.

COLLATION

OF WHITE'S EDITION (W), WITH THE OXFORD MANUSCRIPT (a),
AND THREE INEDITED MANUSCRIPTS (βγδ), OF THE
HARKLENSIAN VERSION

OF THE FOREGOING EPISTLES.

α is the first of Ridley's two Harkl. MSS, described by him as Cod. Heracleensis in his work De Syr. Versionibus Novi Foed., 1761 (p. 7). It contained the whole N.T., except (probably) the Apocalypse, but breaks off at Hebr. xi. 27. (New College, Oxford, no. 333.)

β is the Cambridge (University Library, 1700) MS. It is complete, and contains the whole N.T., except Apoc.; and like Cod. Alex. subjoins to it the Epistles of Clement of Rome. See Cambridge Catal. of Syr. MSS. Date A.Gr. 1481 (= A.D. 1170). See also Lightfoot's Clement of Rome (1890), vol. i., pp. 129 et sqq.

γ is an undated MS of Acts and Epps., mutilated at beginning and end, in which our four Epistles only are of the Harkl. version. It belongs to Dr. Rendel Harris.

δ is the MS above designated Cod. 4 (see p. 1 supr.). It contains Acts and Epistles; but only 2 Peter is of Harkl. version.

2 PETER. (MSS α β γ δ.)

Superscription to 2 Peter:—

α β place ἰο̣ἀ; γ after 1; δ at end. | γ writes ἰο̣ἀ; α β δ, with 1 in first syll. and for 1 final. | γ δ, ἰο̣ἀ; α ins ο, β ins 1, after ο. | γ om ἰο̣ἀ | β γ δ om ἰο̣ἀἀἀ.

I. (1) β writes ἰο̣ἀἀἀ. | On ἰο̣ἀ, δ gives same syr note as α; γ δ om it and all other marginalia, syr or gr, and all asterisks and like
symbols, throughout these Epp. | (3) None ins (after which W supplies conjecturally. | (3 and 4) The altern. (in mg, which a attaches to of ver. 4, seems in to be intended for after of ver. 3. In both places retain in txt. | All ins (at end of ver. 3, and om the equivalent of δv δv from beginning of ver. 4.—But a ins (needlessly) in mg as altern. for (further on in this ver.; while the mg of δ (quite unmeaningly) refers it to ver. 10 (after = ταυτα). It seems pretty certain that the note in mg was meant to assign to the beginning of ver. 4, subst for the unattested , where it would supply the required connecting link between the vv. | (4) With a, δ writes και φθοράς in mg. | (5) Before αυτό, a alone places #; which word β δ write in txt; but γ subst . | (8) All ins (after , but a alone pref #. | γ om . | (10) All ins , but a δ with #. | a γ δ, —but β, . | (11) All write .: (W wrongly om ?; see his note). | (13) For Ταυτα, γ writes . | The syr and gr notes of a are also in δ. | (14) For , γ writes . | (16) For ω γ δ to , as in a, β γ δ write . | (17) β pref o to . | The reference in mg of a, to Matth., is also in δ. | (18) All ins ΑΛ, a δ with #. | (20) With a, δ gives και εισφθοράς in mg, but does not, as a, translit. into syr letters.

II. (1) For of a, β γ δ write (γ alone with ribb.). | (3) γ writes (by lapse). | (4) After Π, a (by lapse) writes , instead of (which β γ δ give);—W corrects by conject. | For , β γ δ write (γ δ with ribb.; , δ). | From , β γ om first , δ om first . | In mg δ writes ταυταφθορας,—and so a, but without final as. | δ also, with a, repeats in mg the of Phx. | All write , a δ with #. | (6) for of W (a gives no point), β γ δ write . | a writes with ribb., but β γ δ do not. | (10) For of a γ δ, β writes . | a γ δ write ;
COLLATION OF W WITH α β γ δ. [2 Pet. II. 10–III. 12]

β, ἡμέρας. | On mg, α writes ἀνδραίας, referred to ἥμερας; also δ, but referred to ἡμέρας preceding [see Suppl. N. in loc.]. | (11) All ins ἡμέρας (but α δ with #). | (13) β writes ἡμέρας without ribb. | α δ pref to ἡμέρας:—β γ om. | All ins ἡμέρας, α δ with #. | β om 0 before ἡμέρας. | a δ give in mg, ἡμέρας (= ειν τῇ ἀνάρξῃ ἀπό τῇ) as altern. for ἡμέρας (= εἰν ταῖς ἀπάντας αὕτῃ). | a (mg) also gives ἡμέρας as altern. for ἡμέρας, and writes εὐχαριστοῦν εἰν ὑμῖν:—but δ gives neither. | (15) For ἠμέρας, α (not W) gives by lapse αι. | (16) For ἠμέρας, γ (corr) has ἡμέρας (see note on this word, p. 16). | All write ἠμέρας (2) without 0 prefix (which W ins without authority);—so Ν, and many texts of lat vg. | The prefix 0 (after ?) to ἡμέρας does not appear in β γ δ. | (17) To ἡμέρας, α δ attach in mg the gr ὀμιλεῖ; also | (18) to ἡμέρας, ὑπερεργον Ἐκλειψαν (sic). | (19) For ἠμέρας of α, β γ write ἠμέρας; δ, ἠμέρας. | (20) δ writes ἡμέρας, but marks for transposition. | After ἡμέρας, α δ write ἡμέρας for ἡμέρας of β γ, which latter W subst conjecturally (cp. note on this word, p. 17). | a δ write τα ἑσφάρα in mg (= ἠμέρας). | For ἡμέρας of α, β γ write ἠμέρας; δ, ἠμέρας. | a δ write ἠμέρας:—β γ, ἡμέρας.

III. (1) After ἡμέρας, γ ins ἡμέρας? | (2) For ἡμέρας, γ writes ἡμέρας. | (5) β γ write (by transp): ἡμέρας; also δ (but marks for re-transp). | Here, and in vv. 7, 10, 12, 13, β γ write ἡμέρας (without ribb., though used as plur.); also δ (in vv. 7, 12 only). | β ins ἡμέρας after ἡμέρας. | All ins ἡμέρας; α δ with #. | (6) For ἡμέρας of α, β γ δ write plur. (γ without ribb.). | β γ δ read ἡμέρας:—α, ἡμέρας (which W rightly corr). | (8) γ (by lapse) writes ἡμέρας for ἡμέρας. | (9) For ἡμέρας (W), a β γ δ have ἡμέρας. | (10) a (not δ) ins the gr ροικίδον, στοιχα (sic), in mg. | For ἡμέρας, β γ δ read ἡμέρας; and | a alone gives for it the altern. ἡμέρας (see note in loc., pp. 20, 67 [and Suppl. N.]). | (11) For ἡμέρας of a β δ, γ reads ἡμέρας; which α δ give in mg as altern.;—adding ἡμέρας. | For ἡμέρας, a (and so W) gives wrongly ἡμέρας, against β γ δ. | γ writes ἡμέρας (without ribb.). | δ has στενδοντας in mg (= ἡμέρας). | (12) Before ἡμέρας, β γ write ἡμέρας. None ins [ὁμέρας] after ? before
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which W prints conjecturally. (13) α δ write *μηθὲν* :—
β γ om. ribb. (15) α alone writes ἀδελφὸς :—β γ δ om 1. | β
alone places τίμημα before ἀπόκρυψα. (17) α om 0-6, which W
rightly supplies :—β γ δ give it. | All write ἀδελφὸς ; α δ
with #. | β γ δ ins μπαθομένη :—α om. (18) γ (by
lapse) writes *μηθὲν* for *μηθὲν* ; | β alone writes *μηθὲν* (with ribb.).

Subscription to 2 Peter :—

α γ δ, *μηθὲν*, ἀδελφὸς, μεθinks; β ins *μηθὲν* after 12τν, writes ἀδελφὸς, and om *μηθὲν*.

2 JOHN. (MSS α β γ.)

Superscription to 2 John :—

All add τιμήμα τοῦ κυρίου (= τιμήμα τοῦ αὐτοῦ)* after ἀδελφὸς. | β γ write *μηθὲν*, —
not ἀδελφὸς before the name. | All write ἀδελφὸς (a with a second 1 after o); and | β ins before it
ο | [β has also the running title, ἀδελφὸς.

(1 and 5) β γ write *μηθὲν* ; α alone places κυρίου in mg, with *μηθὲν*
in txt. | a in mg writes, 12ατα τίμημα (κυρίου, that is, "lady"). | (2) All om 12τα ἀδελφὸς, but a suppl in mg. | γ points *μηθὲν*. | (5) All ins ἀδελφὸς (a with #). | (7) a γ write 12τα :—β, 12τα. | a β γ, *μηθὲν* (a gives plur. on mg as altern.). | β γ with
a read *μηθὲν* ; a adds on mg *μηθὺς*. | (8) a writes 11ινιν, but W corr. | (9) All ins παρὰ (a with #). | (12) For μηθὲν,
γ reads ἄνδρα. | For ιμηθὲν of a (?), β γ read *μηθὲν*. | All read ἀδελφὸς (as in Phx.). | All read *μηθὺς* (a with #).

Subscription to 2 John :—

α γ, *μηθὲν*, ἀδελφὸς, μεθinks; β ins *μηθὺς* before ἀδελφὸς,
and 12ατα after μεθinks.

* I.e., "of the same author" [as the First Epistle].
3 JOHN.

Superscription to 3 John:—

α β ins ὁμοθέτης (as in 2 Joh.)—γ om. | β alone ins ὁμοθέτης | γ only.

(1) a writes ὁμοθέτης—β γ om second δ. | (2) a writes ὁμοθέτης—β, γ δ (γ gives no point or vowel). | (4) a β, ὁμοθέτης—γ, δ | (6) All ins ὁμοθέτης, a with #. | All write ὁμοθέτης,—but a alone explains in mg by the of Phx., adding the gr προτεστατε (sic), with the literal rendering ὁμοθέτης. | (7) All ins ὁμοθέτης, a with #. | β transp ὁμοθέτης. | (9) β γ write ὁμοθέτης (without σι after δ, as in a). | (10) γ pref σι to ὁμοθέτης. | a writes ὁμοθέτης—β γ, δ, ε, ζ. | (9 and 10) a β write ὁμοθέτης—γ, δ, ε, ζ. | All read ὁμοθέτης, a alone adds (mg) altern., ὁμοθέτης. | (11) a β read ὁμοθέτης—γ transp. | After σι, γ ins ὁμοθέτης. | (12) a writes ὁμοθέτης—β γ om first and second δ. | After ὁμοθέτης, a (mg) ins ὁμοθέτης—β γ om ὁμοθέτης. | (14) β γ om δ before ὁμοθέτης. | (15) All read ὁμοθέτης—a alone gives in mg ὁμοθέτης as altern.

In mg, a alone gives the gr,—(ver. 2) εὐδοκουσθάι: (5) πιστὸς: (ib.) καὶ τὸντο: (10) διατρεφθής: (ib.) φλυαρών: (12) καὶ οἴδατε.

Subscription to 3 John:—

α, ὁμοθέτης; β (not γ) add ὁμοθέτης; γ om ὁμοθέτης and ὁμοθέτης.

JUDE.

Superscription to Jude:—

In a β, ὁμοθέτης; γ likewise (but writes ὁμοθέτης).

(3) γ writes ὁμοθέτης without point over σι, and om second δ from ὁμοθέτης. | β γ write ὁμοθέτης for of a. | (4) a γ, 446:—β, ὁμοθέτης. | (6) γ om δ before ὁμοθέτης. | γ (by homoeot.) om
JUD. 6-25] COLLATION OF W WITH a β γ δ.

For a β γ give (7) For of W, a β γ give (a with but one point). γ writes without ribb. For, γ writes (8) γ writes (without ribb.), and γ punctuates (:) after (9) after and for of a. (10) γ om γ. (11) For β γ give (cp. note on this ver., p. 34). β γ om from γ. (12) a alone has gr and syr notes in mg. β γ write without ribb. (14) For of a, β γ write Without ribb. After a alone gives in mg the interpolation, (15) γ writes without ribb. a (mg) gives a gloss, (= τι ἔγκατέλυσεν τὸν Κύριον). (16) a writes on mg, μεμψιμένου. On a (mg) has gloss, (17) = επανοντες εν οὐει δίδυκες). β writes without ribb. (19) γ writes for. (19) a β, γ :—γ, (cp. note in loc., p. 36). (21) β om γ. γ writes it. β γ write without ribb. (against a); a alone (in mg) supplies for it the altern. (apparently = τέλος, for ἔλεος). (25) W (not a) om final of. After a alone gives, a (mg) add (= τῶν αἰώνων); also γ (txt), but without ribb.

Subscription to Jude:—

a has; β ins after γ om, but appends.

General Subscription to Acts and Catholic Epp.

(In a and β, following Jude; in γ, following 2 Pet., which in that MS stands last.)

So β; also a (but writes; and om the second 0 from

("End of writing the holy Book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven Catholic Epistles.")
COLLATION OF W WITH a β γ δ.

For convenience of reference, I subjoin here a classified list of White's deviations from a.

A. The following are casual:—

2 Pet. ii. (6)  

2 Joh. (1) W om marg. note of a, explaining  as =  

2 (mg)  (W); for  of a.  

B. The following are intentional:—

(i) Necessary corrections:

2 Pet. ii. (4)  for  |  (15)  for  (tacite).  |  (22) om  (mg) (tacite).  |  iii. (5)  for  |  (17) [οὐ] suppl.; a om.

2 Joh. (8)  for  (tacite).
(ii) Needless or wrong corrections:


Jude (7) om ? from לִשְׁמַע.

To these I subjoin—

C. Errors in Latin Version:—


Two of the above require remark:—

2 Pet. ii. 13. White here retains in text the reading of α (which δ confirms), ψαμαμ ( = ἐν τρυφή, which is unattested); but in his version renders as if he read (as β γ) ξαμαμ ( = τρυφήν, as all Greek).

Ib. 16. He also retains in text the ο after η in ζηλωτας (which α alone ins), = τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνῆς; but in his version represents ζηλωτας = ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνῆς, which most gr read (and so β γ δ). This reading of α is notable, in view of the reading of Cod. B, ἐν ἀνθρώπων φωνῆς.

White’s vocalization and interpunction are mostly correct, but he sometimes writes Greek vowels for the equivalent vowel-points.
APPENDIX III.

THE SYRIAC VERSIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The two Syriac versions of the Apocalypse (which I distinguish as S and Σ) referred to in the Supplemental Notes, are—

1. The Version usually printed in editions of the Syriac N.T., beginning with the Syriac column of the Paris Polyglot (1645), edited by Gabriel Sionita. It was first published by De Dieu (Leiden, 1627) from a manuscript bequeathed by Joseph Scaliger to the University Library of Leiden (Cod. Scalig. 18. Syr.). Other copies of it have since become known,—one (Ussher’s) in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (B. 5. 16, — No. 1509 in Catal.); another in the Mediceo-Laurentian Library, Florence (formerly the property of the Convent of S. Marco, No. 724); another (from the Nitrian Convent of the Theotokos, in Egypt) now in the British Museum, London (Add. 17127); others in Rome. Of these the Nitrian copy alone is of ancient date, A.D. 1088; of the others none is earlier than the sixteenth century. But it is unfortunately incomplete. This text I designate by the letter Σ (Σd, Σf, Σl, Σn, Σp representing the Dublin, Florence, Leiden, Nitrian, and Paris copies severally,—the last being the copy (not forthcoming) represented by the Paris Polyglot).

2. The Version published by me (Dublin, 1898), from the Manuscript 12 (see above, p. 2), which is unique as containing the whole N.T.,—not only (as above) our Four Shorter Catholic Epistles, placed in the usual Greek order, but also including the Apocalypse, placed immediately after the Gospel of St. John, and before the Acts. This text of the Apocalypse is also unique, no other manuscript having as yet been found to contain it. It is quite distinct from, though evidently akin to, the text of Σ, both as regards its diction and method, and as regards the underlying Greek text. I distinguish it as S.
The relation between the two Versions,—S, which is written in idiomatic Syriac, and Σ, which graecizes after the Harklensian fashion,—and the reasons for regarding S as the original Version, and Σ the later and derivative,—are fully set forth in the Introductory Dissertation to my edition of S (chap. ii, ss. v, vi, vii; chap. v).—Here it will suffice to state briefly that the two are related in the same manner and degree as are the Philoxenian and Harklensian Versions of the Four Epistles,—so completely as to raise a presumption in favour of the supposition that S is part of the Philoxenian N.T., and Σ of the Harklensian.

The arguments for regarding Σ as belonging to the Harklensian have been materially strengthened since my edition was published, by the re-discovery in 1897 of Σf (long set down as missing), which ends with a colophon containing a distinct statement that Σ is part of the work of Thomas of Harkel. (See Hermathena, vol. x, p. 227, for an account of this manuscript.)
### SYRO-GREEK INDEX

of Words and Phrases specially dealt with in the preceding
Introduction and Notes.*

| [λα], ἀδελφία (see [ἀδελφόν]). | [λα], ἀδελφία (see [ἀδελφόν]). |
| [ἐκ] ἐξακολουθώ (p), 109. |
| [τιμή (see [τιμῇ] and [τιμή]). | [τιμή (see [τιμῇ] and [τιμή]). |
| [στοιχεία, στοιχεία, 21, 114. | [στοιχεία, στοιχεία, 21, 114. |
| [θησαυρίζω, θησαυρίζω, xlii, 20, 114. | [θησαυρίζω, θησαυρίζω, xlii, 20, 114. |
| (prep. prefix), ἐν, 109, 128. | (prep. prefix), ἐν, 109, 128. |
| [ἀναίσχυντος (qu. ἄμωμος ?), 145. | [ἀναίσχυντος (qu. ἄμωμος ?), 145. |
| ἑμπαίζω, 19, 36 ; 66, 113 ; ἑμπαίζω, 19, 36 ; 66, 113 ; | ἑμπαίζω, 19, 36 ; 66, 113 ; |
| ἑμπάκτης, 19. | ἑμπάκτης, 19. |
| [πυρ] πυρ, πυρ [ἐν πυρί], [πυρ] πυρ, πυρ [ἐν πυρί], xxxvi, 68, 117. xxxvi, 68, 117. |

* Those which belong solely to one or other of the two Versions are distinguished as Ḃ (Harkl.) or p (Philox.).
INDEX.

βουλομαι, 121, 124.

γέλως, γελοῖον, xxxvii, lxiii, lxviii, 110.

(.isdir), αὐθάδης (or τολμητης), 105.

ἐπέρογκος, xxxvii, lxiii, lxviii, 110, 135.

ἐπιτιμῶ (p), ἐπιπλήσω (πλη), xxxv, 132.

κρίνω, διακρίνομαι, 132, 137; κρίνω, κρίμα, κρίσις, xxxvii, 129.

τεφροδ (h), τεφρό, xxxiii, 104; τεφρις, τέφρα, lii, 33, 79, 130.

(with pronom. suffixes), 138.

Ηδονή, xxxv, 107.

ἀγοράζω, 13; κομίζομαι (h), 63, 107.

προτέμπω (p), ἐφοδιάζω (ἐξρ), xxxiii, xxxviii, lxvii, 123.

χαίρω: χαίρω, χαίρε, χαίρεων, xxxv, 25, 121.


[κατα]κρινω, xxxvi, 131; [κατα]κριμα, xxxvii, 129.

δείκνυμι: δεικνύμ (δεί αφροῦ αὐτῶν δεικνύντα) ἐπαφρίζοντα, xxxv, 35, 134; ἐπιστήμη, δείγμα, lxiii, 33, 131.
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δύναμις, 106.
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στουδαζω, lxv, 101.
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ἐπιτιμῶ, xxxv, 132.
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,, 30, line 7:

After 17), add and in Nehemiah.
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To N, append note * * N breaks off at Nehem. vii. 3.

,, 47 (notes), line 1:

For παλλή, write πολλή.
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INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I. Prefatory.

The Remnants of the sixth-century Syriac Version of the New Testament, which form Part I of this volume, though none of them is large and all four together make a collection of but moderate bulk, yet possess as a whole the unity of a common history which has thrown them together as a group, while each of them moreover is in itself a complete Book.—The present Part II makes (in this respect) a humbler claim: it professes to be merely a gathering of fragments, hitherto overlooked, of sundry Books of the Old Testament in the Syriac Version made in the seventh century from the Septuagint, usually described as the "Syro-Hexaplar" Version. These fragments have been put together and printed here because that Version, valuable though secondary, has reached us in an imperfect form (with some Books mutilated and others lacking); and they have escaped the notice of its previous Editors, and are now for the first time published.

In describing them as fragments, however, it is not meant to convey that they are mere broken pieces, each sundered by accident from its context. They are extracts, every one of them selected with intelligent purpose by a careful compiler,—most of them with a certain continuity so as to form a series. Some are very short, but each can stand by itself; each relates some fact or facts, or teaches some lesson,—or does both. Each and all are here presented as contributing something of appreciable value towards filling up in a measure the gaps in the Version to which they belong.

SECTION II. The Syro-Hexaplar Version: its Importance.

All who are interested in the textual study of the Old Testament in general, and in particular of the Old Testament in the Greek, will agree that to recover any missing portion of this singularly faithful Syriac reflex of the Greek is a matter of importance. It is a link between the Biblical student of to-day and that chief of Biblical
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scholars who more than sixteen hundred years ago laid the foundation of all critical knowledge of the Septuagint. The lifelong labour of Origen in constructing his immense Hexapla gave an impulse which, even after the actual volumes which contained his work had perished, remained in the Church as a living power. It quickened the zeal of Pamphilus, who in prison spent the hours of awaiting martyrdom in transcribing, and with the help of Eusebius collating, copies of the Septuagintal column of that master-work, enriched with a marginal apparatus of readings gathered from the other columns.* Through these men in turn that same impulse, transmitted by the medium of their autograph transcripts still accessible after three centuries, moved Paul, Monophysite Bishop of Tella,† to reproduce in Syriac the whole of the Septuagintal Old Testament as thus arranged and annotated. This great task was executed by him at Alexandria, where he spent some years (apparently a fugitive from troubles in his own country) in the second decade of the seventh century.‡ And it is a notable fact that in this, its Syriac reproduction, the result of Origen's vast labour and learning has reached us in a state nearer to completeness than in the original Greek in the form into which it was cast by the pious diligence of Pamphilus and Eusebius. It "forms our chief authority for the text of Origen's revision."§

* Some of these copies are even now represented for us by transcripts more or less partial or incomplete, of which the most notable are Cod. Colerto-Sarravianus (M) of the Octateuch, and Cod. Marchalianus (Q) of the Prophets,—both of which are now accessible in photographic reproductions. See for these, Dr. Swete's Introduction to the O.T. in Greek, Part i, ch. v (pp. 137, 144; also pp. 148 et sqq.)

† A city of Mesopotamia, distinguished as Tella-Manzlat.

‡ The work of Paul on the LXX, like that of his fellow-worker Thomas on the N.T., was obviously undertaken with a view of bringing the Bible of Syriac-speaking Christians into conformity with that of their Greek-speaking brethren in the faith, especially those of Alexandria—the Monophysite Churches of Mesopotamia and of Egypt being in close communion. Both these men carried out their task in "the Enaton of Alexandria," in the same Antonine convent, at the same time (between A.D. 613 and 619); both had access there to the same storehouses of Biblical literature. These facts are gathered from the notes subjoined by Paul and Thomas to their versions (see the article Paulus Tellensis, D.C.B. vol. iv, p. 266 et sqq.). Their versions are executed in the same spirit of literal conformity to the Greek, without regard to the genius of the Syriac tongue. Both together were apparently meant to be taken as one Revised Syriac Bible. There is reason to believe that Thomas was one of those who helped Paul in his work (see p. 72 infr., note† on ἀληθίνη, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3).

§ Dr. Swete, in Introduction (as in note * above), p. 114.
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SECTION III. The Extant MSS. of it.

No copy, however, of the whole Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament is known to be now extant, nor is every part of it forthcoming even in detached MSS. Yet one MS, apparently the second volume of such a copy, survives, including all the poetical and prophetical Books. Another MS, the first volume of a similar (or possibly the same) copy, is known to have belonged in the sixteenth century to Andreas Masius, who was the first European scholar to direct attention to this Version. He used it in his edition of the Book of Joshua (Josuae Historia, 1594), and describes it as containing, besides that Book, "Judicium historias et Regum, praeterea Paralipomena, Esdram, Esther, Judith; denique Tobiae et Deuteronomii bonam partem,"—the former half (that is) of the Old Testament, mutilated at both ends so as to lack the first four Books of the Pentateuch, with the earlier part of Deuteronomy and the latter chapters of Tobit. This MS has unfortunately been missing since his time, and of it we have only his citations in his Josuae Historia, and his other writings.

But the second volume (above referred to) has fared better. It was obtained by Cardinal Borromeo* from the Convent of the Theotokos in the Nitrian Desert of Egypt—whence the British Museum has since derived its great treasures of Syriac MSS,—and placed by him in the Ambrosian Library (C 313 inf.), which he founded (1609) in Milan. It is unmutilated, and probably was written in the eighth (or early ninth) century. Its contents are as follows:—The Psalter (including Ps. cli.), Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Sirach, the Twelve Minor Prophets, Jeremiah (with Baruch, Threni, and Epistle), Daniel (with Susanna, Bel and Dragon), Ezekiel, Isaiah.

The loss, however, of the MS of Masius has been in great measure compensated by the subsequent acquisition of single copies of some of the Books it contained. One such copy, of Fourth Kings, has long been in Paris, in the Bibliothèque Nationale; it came like the Milan MS from the Nitrian Convent. Among the treasures acquired from the same ancient storehouse by the British Museum, are single copies of Joshua, Judges (with Ruth),† and Third Kings; and besides these,

† It may be that Ruth is to be understood as included with Judges in Masius' list.
three Books which were missing from the Masian volume—Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (the first lamentably mutilated).—It is to be added that the Book known as "1st [or Third] Esdras" (now reckoned Apocryphal), as it appears in some (though not the earliest) MSS of the Peshitta Old Testament, and in Walton’s Polyglot, is borrowed from this later Version.*

Summing up these facts, then, it appears that of the Old Testament as translated by Paul, all the Books (of the Hebrew Canon) are now forthcoming except Leviticus, Deuteronomy, First and Second Kings [1 and 2 Samuel], Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther;—of which Leviticus alone is not on the list of those known to Masius.

These MSS are mostly of the eighth century,—one at least, the Exodus of the British Museum, is dated so early as A.Gr. 1008 (A.D. 697), only eighty years after the Version was made; the Genesis is probably still earlier. None of them is later than the ninth century;† all (including the Ambrosian) are written on vellum, in a good strangela script, nearly all profusely furnished with elaborate marginal *apparatus*, and marked with the Origenian asterisk and obelus throughout the text; all come from the Nitrian Convent, though probably written in Mesopotamia; and of the single copies,

* Of the deuterocanonical Books (besides 1 Esdras as above) the Syriac Tobit of many MSS and of the printed editions is in part Hexaplar (see below). Wisdom and Sirach are in the Ambrosian Syro-Hexaplar MS, as also the LXX additions to Jeremiah and to Daniel. Judith is on the Masian list, but is not now to be found. Whether any Books of Maccabees were translated by Paul does not appear.

The earliest Syriac O.T. which includes 1 [8] Esdras, seems to be the Buchanan Bible (Cambridge Univ. Library, Oo. 1., t. 2, circ. 1200 A.D.). The recent MSS Poc. and Uss. (Bodl., Poc. 391, Or. 141, both of cent. xvii), also exhibit it, and from them it was first edited, for Walton’s Polyglot. All these MSS describe it as “according to the Seventy”; Buch. and Uss. note also that it is “not in the Peshitta.”

The Book of Tobit likewise (or at least the earlier chapters (i.-vi.) of it), as printed in Walton’s and other editions, is recognized by Poc. and Uss. as Septuagintal. The references of Masius in his *Syrorum Peculium* (see p. xv, *infra*) preserve some small traces of it. See Dr. Ceriani, *Le Edizioni e i Manoscritti delle Versione Siriache* (1869), p. 22, for the identification of this Book as Syro-Hexaplar.

† For these Nitrian MSS see Wright’s *Catalogue of Syr. MSS*, Brit. Mus., pp. 28–37 (nos. *XLVIII–LIX*). Among them are also copies of the Psalms and of some of the Prophets, which are found (as above) in the Ambrosian MS.

For the Paris MS, see Zotenberg’s *Catalogue des MSS. Syriques*, Biblioth. Nat., no. 27, p. 10. See also Bruns, *Curae Hexaplares*, in Eichhorn’s *Repertorium*, vols. viii–x (1780–82).
the 4 Kings of the Paris Library plainly belongs to the same set of MSS as those of the London Museum.—It is not too much to hope that the volume once studied by Masius may yet be recovered, or that some yet unexplored monastic library may yield more MSS supplying the lacking Books of this Version.

SECTION IV. Printed Editions of Parts of it.

Of the extant Books, no complete collection has yet appeared in print. Masius never published any entire Book from his MS, and after his death and its disappearance, learned men whose interest in it he had roused by his Josuae Historia, vainly sought to obtain similar MSS from the East.* It was not till after the middle of the eighteenth century that the attention of Biblical scholars was first invited to the MS of the Ambrosian Library by the Librarian Branca, in 1767.† A few years later (1788) Bugati published from it at Milan the text of Daniel. He was, however, anticipated by Norberg, a Swede, who had obtained leave to transcribe the MS, and in 1787 published from it (at Lund) the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.—Bugati also edited from it the Psalter, but it was not published till 1820, after his death. In 1825, the rest of Norberg's transcript (except the deuterocanonical Books) was published at Berlin by Middeldorpf, together with Fourth Kings from the Paris MS (see above, p. xi). Of this latter he had obtained transcripts from Eichhorn, who in his Repertorium (vol. vii, 1780, "Curae Hexapl."") had published the first account of it, and had been the first to make known the name of Paul of Tellah as the author of the Version of 4 Kings (and of the contents of the Ambrosian MS), citing as evidence a note appended to it,—"The Abbat Mar Paul, Bishop of the Faithful, translated this Book from the Greek tongue into Syriac from the Version of the Seventy-two, &c."‡

More recently, a fresh impulse was given to the study of this Version, when the acquisition (1840—1851) by the British Museum of the great Nitrian collection brought within the reach of Biblical

† See Bruns in Eichhorn’s Repertorium, ut supr., vol. iii, 1778.
‡ See Lagarde, Bibliothecae Syriacae, p. 256, lines 28, 29, for this note, which (with others) he prints at length.
scholars the Syro-Hexaplar MSS above enumerated (pp. xi, xii). Of this, the earliest result was the publication by Dr. Skat Rördam (from Add. 17103) of the Books of Judges and Ruth,* edited with much learning, and accompanied by a Greek text adapted to the Syriac (instead of a Latin Version such as Bugati and Norberg gave)—an example which in the present volume I have followed.—Dr. Ceriani, Keeper of the Ambrosian Library, in his Monumenta † (Tom. i, fasc. 1), with a view to a complete edition of the Version as extant, printed Baruch and Lamentations from the Ambrosian MS, followed (Tom. ii, fasc. i—4) by the Books of Genesis (imperfect) and Exodus (to ch. xxxiii. 2) from the Br. Mus. MSS, Add. 14442, and Add. 12134. To these he prefixed important Prolegomena.—To him is likewise due the publication (1874) of the entire contents of the great MS of which he is the custodian, reproduced in facsimile by photozincography. Lagarde in 1880 issued (in Hebrew type) his Vet. Test. Fragmenta Quinque (scil., the Syro-Hexaplar Exodus, Numbers, Joshua and 3 Kings, from the Br. Mus. MSS, Add. 12134, 14437,‡ 12183), with 4 Kings (Paris, Biblioth. Nat., Anc. fonds 5). All these five, with what remains of Genesis, he re-edited in his Bibliothecae Syriaceae, completed after his death by Professor Rahlfs (Gottingen, 1892).—This volume, and with it Dr. Ceriani’s facsimile edition, taken together, give us the whole of what now survives of the Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament,§ including the deuterocanonical Books (Wisdom, Sirach, and the additions to Jeremiah and to Daniel) which Middendorpf’s edition omits. But the Septuagintal 1 Esdras, and also the Book of Tobit (which Masius reckons among the contents of his MS), do not appear in either of these publications. Both have been edited by Lagarde in his Libri Vet. Testamenti Apocryphi Syr. (1861).||

* Copenhagen, 1861.
† Monumenta Sacra et Profana (Milan, 1861–63).
‡ This volume contains Numbers and 3 Kings.
§ I use “Hexaplar” as a general designation; but it is to be noted that of the MSS cited above some Books are described as “from the Tetrkapla” (viz., Judges and Ruth, Job, the Minor Prophets, Daniel). Joshua is “from the Hexapla . . . collated with the Tetrkapla.” 4 Kings alone “from the Heptkapla.” The rest are “from the Hexapla” (or without any indication).—All these MSS bear in their text the Origenian asterisks and other like signs; and all (except Judges) are furnished with marginal variants from the other three Greek translators—4 Kings also from a “fifth,” and the Psalter from a “sixth” as well as “fifth.”
|| See note * to p. xii supr.
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Thus there are still lacking to us of this Version a large part of Genesis, the whole of Leviticus, Deuteronomy, 1 and 2 Kings [1 and 2 Samuel], 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah—and the deuterocanonical Judith, and the Books of the Maccabees.

Of these Books we have only a number of brief citations, some very minute (often of a single word), which we owe to Masius, who in his Sylororum Peculium (a short Lexicon (1572) prefixed to the Biblia Regia*) gives many references to the text of his MS: to Joshua, Judges, and 3 and 4 Kings, which are extant in other MSS; and also to Deuteronomy (the latter chapters from xv. 7), 1 and 2 Kings [Samuel], Judith and Tobit (the earlier chapters, i.—vii. 8).—Other and less brief references to Deuteronomy and Joshua occur in his contributions to Critici Sacri (tom. ii, Amsterdam, 1698). His use of it in the notes to his Josaue Historia (see above, p. xi) is continuous throughout.†

SECTION V. The Extracts printed in the present Volume.

In the present Volume are given, from the Syro-Hexapla:—
1. A short extract from one of the missing parts of Genesis:
2. A single passage of Leviticus—apparently the only one as yet found:
3. A series of extracts systematically selected by a compiler, from 1 and 2 Chronicles:
4. A similar series from Nehemiah.

A. Two passages from the Pentateuch.

1. The first of these, Gen. xxvi. 26—31, stands first of four passages, written on a single leaf now prefixed to a volume (7145 Rich, Br. Mus.) of fragments, very diverse in age and script, put together (presumably by a seventeenth century binder) to form a copy of the Pentateuch. This leaf, unlike the rest of the volume to which it has thus been attached, is of vellum, and the script is estrangela (apparently of the ninth century). It seems to have belonged to a volume of extracts,

* The "Antwerp Polyglot" of 1572.
† See the complete collection of these reff. supplied by Professor Rahlfs to Lagarde's Biblioth. Syr., pp. 24—32 f.—Note that no excerpts from Esdras or Chronicles occur in any of the works (as above) of Masius.
the rest of its contents being three passages (Hexaplar also), from Joshua, Proverbs, and Sirach severally.* As there is a gap in the only extant MS of Genesis, from xx. 12 to xxxi. 53, this recovered passage has some value as a contribution towards supplying the matter that is lacking. The text is notable, as exhibiting a variant not otherwise attested, in verse 28 (see p. 3, p. 33 n., infr.).

2. The next, Leviticus xxvi. 42—46, comes from a Lectionary (Brit. Mus., Add. 12139) of somewhat later date than any of the MSS above cited,—A.Gr. 1311 (A.D. 1000).† As above noted, the Book Leviticus was not in Masius’ MS, the earlier part of which was lacking,—nor is any copy of it, or (except in this MS) any part of it, now known to be extant. This Lection is the only evidence we possess to show that Leviticus was included in Paul’s Version.

B. Series of Passages from Later Historical Books.

Of the Books of Chronicles and of Esdras [Ezra], our Remains are more considerable in extent. Another Nitrian MS (Brit. Mus., Add. 12168) supplies these,—a welcome addition, for from these Books, Masius, though (as we have seen) he names them among the contents of his MS, has left us no citation. The MS whence I take them is a Catena of extracts,—most of them from Scripture, with illustrative matter, chiefly selected from Commentaries. It is the work of an early compiler who (probably not later than the middle of the seventh century) selected and arranged the materials with care and judgment. The Scriptural passages he draws mostly from the Peshitta, —with the exception of those taken from 1 and 2 Chronicles, from 1 and 2 Ezra, and from Daniel, which are headed, “according to the version of the Seventy.” His “First of Ezra” is the Book usually distinguished as “Greek Esdras,” and reckoned with the Apocrypha‡;

* The extract from Joshua (xxii. 1-6) has a certain similarity to that from Genesis; whence it seems probable that these passages are combined not at random, but with some definite purpose.
† See facsimile in Wright’s Catal., Plate x.
‡ The Council of Florence, and after it the Council of Trent, followed Jerome’s authority in rejecting this Book (along with 4 Esdras, with which it has nothing in common). As “3 Esdras” it is appended with “4 Esdras” to the Vulgate Latin, as non-canonical. In the Anglican Article VI it is placed outside the Canon as “Third of Esdras,” but in the authorized Version it heads the Apocrypha as “1 Esdras.” It is often, and conveniently, designated as “Greek Esdras.”
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and his "Second of Ezra" is Nehemiah. His "Daniel" is of the text given by the Cod. Chisianus* in Greek, and followed by the Milan Cod. Ambrosianus in Syriac,—usually described as "Daniel according to the Seventy" (as distinguished from "Daniel according to Theodotion"). The Daniel extracts are identified, by comparison with Cod. Ambrosianus as belonging to the Version of Paul; and there can be no doubt that the extracts from Chronicles and Esdras come from that Version likewise.

3. The passages of 1 and 2 Chronicles have been selected with discrimination. They are taken from the parts which have no counterpart in the Four Books of Kings. Hence the First Book is represented in our Catena by excerpts wholly genealogical, from chh. i.—iij., and vi., which (beginning from Adam) set forth (1) the regal pedigree through Judah to Zerubbabel and his sons (i.—iii.), and (2) the sacerdotal and (generally) the Levitical pedigree to the time of Jozedek (vi.). After these is a brief note of the descendants of Moses (ch. xxiii.).—The excerpts from the Second Book are written continuously with those from the First, but with the rubric, "Further from the Second Book of Chronicles," interposed. This Book (chh. xxvi.—xxxv.) yields the more interesting narratives of the sacrilege and punishment of Uzziah (xxvi.); the revival of worship under Hezekiah (xxix., xxx.); his honourable interment (xxxii.); the apostasy of Manasseh and his repentance and reformation (xxxiii.); the attempt of Josiah to check the advance of Egypt against Assyria, his death, and the mourning of his people (xxxv.)—facts omitted or briefly recorded in 4 Kings.

4. Of "Esdras," it is noteworthy that the compiler of the Catena gives nothing that belongs to the canonical Ezra. After the conclusion of the above passages from 1 and 2 Chronicles, nearly two pages of illustrative matter intervene, before he proceeds "From the First Book of Ezra, according to the interpretation of the Seventy," introducing many pages of extracts, all (as above noted) from the "Greek Esdras," which the Latin and English Bibles alike class among Apocrypha. After these,—with no interval of separation, but (as in the case of 1 and 2 Chronicles) a rubric interposed "Further from the Second Book of Ezra," with the addition "from the words of Nehemiah son

* See Dr. Swete's Introduction to O.T. in Greek, p. 47; also his O.T. in Greek, vol. iii, p. 498, for its text. It is also printed in Tischendorf's V.T. Gr., t. ii, p. 589.
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of Hilkiah" (see pp. 19, 54, infr.)—come the extracts from Nehemiah. Thus, in our compiler's eyes, the Septuagintal 1 Esdras of our Apocrypha was 1 Ezra, and Nehemiah was 2 Ezra,—the Ezra of the Hebrew canon being passed over.

(a) The extracts from 1 Esdras * I have not printed in this volume, the whole Syriac text of the Book having been long since published in Walton's Polyglot, and more recently by Lagarde (see p. xiv, supr.).†

(b) The extracts from Nehemiah (the 2 Ezra of this collection) give a fair outline of the narrative of its first eight chapters:—Nehemiah's grief on learning the evil plight of Jerusalem (ch. i.); the king's permission obtained for the rebuilding (ii.); the rebuilding carried on under arms (iv.); its completion (vi.); the reading of the Law, and the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (viii.). The series ends with a brief record of a day of humiliation (ix. 1–3).

SECTION VI. The Catena which contains the B passages.

This Catena is a document of so much value that it seems expedient to give a fuller account of it.

1. It consists of a series of passages selected in order from the Books of the Old and New Testaments. The order in which the Old Testament Books are dealt with is—The Five Books of Moses, Job, Judges, The Four Books of Kings, The First and Second Books of Chronicles, The First and Second Books of Ezra [Esdras], Excerpts from Proverbs and The Wisdom of Sirach, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Koheleth, The Song of Songs, The Wisdom of Solomon, The Twelve Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and finally Isaiah. It will be seen that the compiler has passed over, of the Canonical Books, Joshua, Ruth, Esther, Lamentations; while of the deuterocanonical he gathers only from the First [Third] Book of Esdras (as above noticed), the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Sirach—leaving untouched Judith, Tobit, Baruch, the additions to Daniel, the additions to Esther, the

* These extracts are,—li. 1–6, 24, 25; iv. 34–40, 49–57; v. 47—vi. 2; vii. 6—viii. 29, 69–73; viii. 93—ix. 10, 46, 47.

† As above stated (p. xii, supr., note *) these two Bodleian MSS,—Usher's (Or. 141), and Pococke's (Poc. 391), are both of the 17th century. First Esdras is not included in Lee's Syriac Bible (1826), which is restricted to the O.T. Books of the Hebrew Canon.
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Prayer of Manasses, the second [Fourth] Book of Esdras, and the Maccabees.—The New Testament extracts are from (1) The Pauline Epistles, (2) The Gospels. Nothing is selected from the Acts, the Catholic Epistles, or the Apocalypse.—All the above are as already stated from the Peshitta text, with the exceptions above noted of the Books of Chronicles, of Esdras, and of Daniel. All are illustrated by extracts from Commentaries,—some translated from the Greek (of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and others), some cited from the Syriac of such writers as Ephraim and Severus of Antioch.—In many places the continuity of the Scriptural series is interrupted by the insertion of other matter, chosen in each case as illustrative of the preceding or following passages, or instructive otherwise to students of the Bible. Thus (a) between the extracts from the Book of Judges and those from the Books of Kings, we have a compendious note on the Greek Versions of the Old Testament, and another on the Canon of Scripture.—And (b) after the extracts from the Historical Books, a memorandum follows, of the dynasties that ruled in Judah and Israel, in Assyria, Persia, and Egypt,—and the duration of each.—Again (c) to those from Daniel is subjoined a note on the Septuagintal Version, and on its translation by Paul of Tella, the date of each being assigned.

—So finally, at the end of the New Testament selections, an account is inserted (taken from Eusebius, H.E., lib. 11) of the first preachers of the Gospel of Christ, and of the evils that befel His persecutors.

2. From a sentence in the note on the Persian dynasty of the Sasanidae, Dr. Wright infers that this Catena was compiled before the death of the last king of that line (651),*—little more than thirty years after the completion of Paul's Version, whence our Extracts from Chronicles and Nehemiah, as well as those from I Esdras and Daniel are drawn. If this inference is accepted, we have in this compilation at once the earliest existing record (outside of the actual MSS of the Version) of Paul's work, and the earliest citations from its text. But the MS itself (Add. 12168) is of the eighth or perhaps the ninth century.

3. Turning back to the facts above stated concerning the Old Testament passages presented in the Catena, we proceed to note some important points.

* Catal., pp. 905, 906.—Yet it may be that, though the memorandum was written before 651, the Catena in which it has been inserted is of later date.
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These passages are, as we have seen, from the Peshitta; except those from a few of the later-written Books (those of Chronicles, those that are described as of Ezra and those of Daniel),—for which the compiler has recourse to a Syriac Version from the LXX. That Version he, in the case of Daniel, identifies as Paul's; and there is no reason to doubt that the extracts from Chronicles, and those from Ezra, are from Paul's Version likewise.

The compiler, therefore, after following in the main the order of the Peshitta* in arranging his extracts, to the end of 4 Kings, turns (perhaps because his copy of the Peshitta was incomplete) to the later (Septuagintal) Syriac for the Books which his historic sense directed him to place next in succession—Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. It is noteworthy that this is the place occupied by "Paralipomena, Esdras" in the MS of Masius as described by him; whereas in the Peshitta (as in the Hebrew) they are relegated to the latter part of the Old Testament.—But Daniel in both Syriac Versions has his place as one of the Four Greater Prophets.—Thus the copy of Paul's Version used by our compiler must have been, as regards the order and arrangement of the Books, such a one as would be formed if the Masian MS (of the narrative Books) were restored to integrity and joined to the Ambrosian MS (of the poetical and prophetical Books).

SECTION VII. Inferences concerning 1 Esdras; its place in the LXX.

Hence it seems warrantable to draw from the character of the contents of our Catena inferences as to the character of the contents of the MS of Masius:—(As to the Ambrosian MS, we have already seen that the Daniel [after the Chisian text] which it exhibits, is identical with the Daniel represented by the extracts of the Catena.)

1. The Ezra of the Catena is, as above stated, the "First Esdras" of the Septuagint; and it is placed, as the "Esdras" of the Masian MS was placed, immediately after the Books of Chronicles; while of the canonical Ezra our compiler has given no sign of recognition. Hence arises a presumption that this "First Esdras," which as we have seen was included in Paul's Version, is to be understood as included in the "Esdras" of Masius' list.

* With the Hebrew, the Peshitta places these Books after the Prophets, far apart from the Books of Kings.
2. Further, it is to be noted that (as above stated) the compiler prefixes to his extracts from 1 Esdras the heading, \textit{From the First Book of Ezra}, and immediately subjoins to them his extracts from Nehemiah, headed, \textit{From the Second Book of Ezra}, ("from the words of Nehemiah"),—thus ignoring entirely the canonical Ezra.—Hence it follows as probable that in our compiler's copy of Paul's Version, 1 Esdras ("after the Seventy") was not merely included with, but substituted for, the Ezra of the Hebrew and the Peshitta. If this be so, we are to interpret the "Esdras" of the Masian list as meaning "1 Esdras [the apocryphal], with Nehemiah";—and to conclude that Paul in his Version not only differed from the Greek MSS of the Septuagint as regards the arrangement by which* they usually place the "Greek Esdras" first (describing it as \textit{Eσδαρας} \textit{A}), and after it the canonical Ezra plus Nehemiah (as \textit{Eσδαρας} \textit{B}),—but that he altogether omitted the "Esdras" which follows the Hebrew, and filled its place by this (so-called) "Apocryphal 1 Esdras,"—which represents the Hebrew but partially, omitting much, inserting one large episode, and paraphrasing rather than translating throughout.

3. Thus, finally, the surmise is suggested, that in this preference for the Book which is now excluded from the Canon over the canonical Book, Origen himself may have led the way in his Hexapla;—that the Catena passes over the canonical Ezra, because Paul omitted it from his Version, and that Paul omitted it because Origen substituted for it in the Septuagint column of his Tetrapla and Hexapla, the Book we reckon as non-canonical.

Section VIII. Analogy between 1 Esdras and the "Chisian" Daniel.

Elsewhere (\textit{Dict. of Chr. Biography, art. Theodotion})† I have called attention to the close affinity which subsists between the Daniel of the Hexapla (the "Chisian") and this "1 Esdras,"—in their paraphrastic style, their use of words, and the relation which they severally bear to their respective originals—an affinity such as (in my judgment) to bespeak a common translator. There is no unlikelihood in the suggestion

* So A, B, and [presumably] N.
† Vol. iv, p. 977.
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that as Origen chose the "Chisian" Daniel to stand as κατὰ τοὺς Ὀ in the third column of his Tetrapla, so he may have preferred this similar and kindred paraphrase of Ezra to occupy the like place. In the case of Daniel he acted contrary to his own marked preference, which has led him in all his extant works to cite the version of Theodotion. But in dealing with Ezra the case is otherwise. I have been unable to find a single instance in which he cites the canonical Ezra or shows himself aware of its existence.*—With him, "Esdras" means Nehemiah,† except in two places in which he cites this First Esdras,‡ once freely recognized as Scripture by writers of authority and unquestioned orthodoxy, though now classed as "apocryphal."

Against this supposition is the fact that this "First Esdras," though it contains the substance of the Hebrew Ezra, does not lie within the same limits, but begins with a chapter equivalent to 2 Chron. xxxv. 1–21; includes a large interpolation, the well-known episode of Darius and the three youths, of chh. iii. 1–v. 6; and borrows its close from Nehemiah viii.—But Origen, as we know, dealt successfully with like difficulties of imperfect coincidence in the case of his Tetraplarian Daniel.

—Moreover, it is to be remarked that our Catena cites no passage from the parts borrowed from 2 Chronicles, and from Nehemiah only the two verses (1 Esdr. ix. 45, 46) which serve as concluding extract. It may be, therefore, that Origen only inserted in his Hexapla so much of 1 Esdras as extends from ii. 1 to x. 45, thus omitting the parts which coincide with 2 Chronicles and with Nehemiah. But he certainly did not omit the above-mentioned episode, known as "the story of Zorobabel," which (as we have seen) he cites twice, and from which the Catena gives extracts.§

It would be out of place here to enter into the question between the two Greek versions of Daniel, their relative priority and comparative value,—and the like question as regards the two Greek versions of

* Dr. Field has noted (Origenis Hexapl., t. i, p. 486) that neither Montfaucon nor Parsons after him has found any vestige of Hexaplar readings recorded in MSS of the Esdras (canonical) of the Septuagint.
† So In Matth. t. xvi (xix. 12), Neh. i. 11—ii. 6. In Cant. Canttt. lib. iv (ii. 15); Neh. iv. 8.
‡ In Joannem vi. 1, and In Josuam ix. 10; from 1 Esdras iv. 37, et sqq.: 59, 60 (passages not in canonical Ezra, but in the interpolated episode).
§ See preceding note ‡; also note *, p. xviii.
Ezra,—or to trace the analogy between the two Books, and between their versions severally. I have already referred to the article in which (in D. C. B.) I have raised those points, and I desire now in closing to refer to the article Esdras, First Book of, in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i, in which Mr. Thackeray notes (p. 761) the affinity between the Chisian Daniel and our 1 Esdras, and shows a disposition to adopt my view (which he quotes from D. C. B.) that they are the work of the same translator. Dr. Swete likewise (Introduction to O.T. in Greek, Pt. i, ch. ii. 9, p. 48) regards it with favour. — The Catena with which I have dealt in these pages tends (I submit) to support this theory, by its preference for these versions over their generally received rivals, though the latter are closer to the Hebrew. And as I have shown above, through the Catena we are warranted in claiming the Hexapla, and its illustrious author, in favour of the claims to reverent acceptance, not only of the Daniel of the Chisian MS., but on like grounds those of the "First Esdras," so long and widely popular, and owned as Scripture by so many and great Fathers of the Church, but in these latter times rejected as apocryphal, and almost forgotten.
اإستمالة

قد ينفع هذا النص للدليل.

قد ينفع هذا النص للدليل.
The following Fragments, hitherto inedited, of the Syro-Hexaplar Version of the Old Testament, are derived—

(A.) The passage from Genesis (p. 3),
from a leaf prefixed to the MS Rich 7145 (British Museum), f. 1 r°. (See for it Wright's Catalogue, Appendix A, p. 1201.) Cent. ix.

(B.) The passage from Leviticus (p. 4),
from the MS Lectionary, Add. 12139 (Br. Mus.), f. 1 v°. (See for it Wright's Catal., ccxxiv, p. 154.) Dated A.G. 1311 (= A.D. 1000).

(C.) The passages from 1 and 2 Chronicles, and from Nehemiah (pp. 5 sqq.),
from the MS Catena, Add. 12168 (Br. Mus.), ff. 57 r°-61 r°; ff. 65 v°-67 r°. (See Wright's Catal., dccclii, p. 905.) Cent. viii or ix.

[The passages from Ezra that intervene in this MS, before Nehemiah, are from the Book known as 1 [3] Esdras, which is printed in Walton's Polyglot, tom. iv.; also by Lagarde, Libri V.T. Apocryphi, Syriace (1861).]
XXVI. (26) As Gen. xx. 2. | (28) So Syr.-Hxp. and Harkl., passim (e.g. Judic. vi. 23; Luc. x. 5) for הִלְכָּה.
מדודו למדת

42 לַמֵּדֶּדֶד הַגָּפֹר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הָאָמַר: לָלֶד הֶנְשֵׁא לֵאמָר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הַגָּפֹר.
43 לָלֶד הַגָּפֹר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הָאָמַר: לָלֶד הֶנְשֵׁא לֵאמָר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הַגָּפֹר.
44 לָלֶד הַגָּפֹר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הָאָמַר: לָלֶד הֶנְשֵׁא לֵאמָר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הַגָּפֹר.
45 לָלֶד הַגָּפֹר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הָאָמַר: לָלֶד הֶנְשֵׁא לֵאמָר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הַגָּפֹר.
46 לָלֶד הַגָּפֹר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הָאָמַר: לָלֶד הֶנְשֵׁא לֵאמָר יִנְשֵׁא לְשֵׁלֶד הַגָּפֹר.
I. (3) [Corr., ]

Brit. Mus.
Add.
12,168
fo. 57 r° b

II.
[1 Chr. ii. 7-iii. 5]
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III.

1 Chr. iii. 5-vi. 4]
في القسم. فسمّى البلع المصمّم. 5 اسمه جبل لعسمناطق. 6 اسمه جبل مأمون. 7 اسمه جبل خزند. 8 اسمه جبل سبلو. 9 اسمه جبل للمريض. 10 اسمه جبل للحماية. 11 اسمه جبل للفتح. 12 اسمه جبل للفتح. 13 اسمه جبل للمريض. 14 اسمه جبل للحماية. 15 اسمه جبل للمريض. 16 اسمه جبل للمريض. 17 اسمه جبل للمريض. 18 اسمه جبل للحماية. 19 اسمه جبل للمريض. 20 اسمه جبل للمريض. 21 اسمه جبل للمريض. 22 اسمه جبل للمريض. 23 اسمه جبل للمريض. 24 اسمه جبل للمريض. 25 اسمه جبل للمريض. 26 اسمه جبل للمريض. 27 اسمه جبل للمريض. 28 اسمه جبل للمريض. 29 اسمه جبل للمريض. 30 اسمه جبل للمريض. 31 اسمه جبل للمريض. 32 اسمه جبل للمريض. 33 اسمه جبل للمريض. 34 اسمه جبل للمريض.
(47) Corr., ηανσ.
XXIII. (14) *Dele a post.*

---

Note: The document contains a mix of Hebrew and Greek, likely from a religious or historical text. The text appears to be a transcription of ancient religious or historical manuscripts, possibly related to biblical or classical literature.
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[2 Chr. xxvi. 20-xxix. 36]

XXVI.

...

XXIX.

...
xxx.

1. הנשא את. בהיותו כל הלילה, ישלחו עד למאורת האשה
2. שלוש. ל HDC wasting ליחן של ימים
3. תשדד לעבריה כן הכה. כי הוא בדיק. חלול שת鹚
4. לטבומע: מעבריה מ协调发展."patial המכללה ה Caul
5. סימנה: עם תבונה אותה לועה: ל потом. לטבומע: ליחן של ימים ה sooner כלל
6. מכון לה. כי כדי את אחת מחלה
13. לכודת המכללה ה כלוםLOY תשעה הトルפ
14. בלבלת נטולוCHA for 59 f° b
15. יש צעירה. לברוש ב⎪שראות מהר. על מצר.
16. אם בה novelist המכללה. לברוש ב⎪שראות מהר. על מצר.
17. מכון לה. כי כדי את אחת מחלה

XXX. (15) [See in MS.]
2 Chr. xxxiii. 2-10}

xxxiii.

... חֶלֶף הָעֵדֶה חַסֵּדֵה עִם הָיָם וְחָלֵֽלֵה נַחֲלַֽה שבֵֽין עַל יִצְבָּאֵל וְזַכַּֽהַתָּה מִלְמָתָהּ לְחָלֵֽלֵה נַחֲלַֽה. מֵחָלֵֽלֵה נַחֲלַֽהּ לָמָּה. מֵחָלֵֽלֵה נַחֲלַֽהּ לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.

לָמָּה. לָמָּה. לָמָּה.
[2 Chr. xxxiii. 10-xxxv. 21]

XXXIII.

א. כאב צל📷 ע תי לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 11
ב. רענ שלנ למלס סלמה. חסנ חסנ. 12
ג. כו. וללו ליגליג. חסנ חסנ. 13
ד. לארשי ליגליג. הלל יבשחנ. 14
ה. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 15
ו. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 16
ז. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 17
ח. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 18
ט. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 19
י. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 20

XXXV.

ו. כו. למלס סלמה. שן שן לע דלא ילב. הלל יבשחנ. 21
XXXV.


23. Then adds: Selah.


The rest of fo. 60 and fo. 61 (to v° b, line 17) are occupied by scholia from Severus, in which is contained the passage 2 Chron. xxxii. 2-4, printed p. 14 supr. Among these scholia is a note on the word τριστάτης, which belongs to 4 Reg. vii. 2, and is there given by Syr.-Hxp. (Lagarde, p. 230),—also (more concisely) at Exod. xiv. 7 (ib., p. 65). In Schleusner, s.v., a like explanation is cited from “auctor quidam graecus”; also in Steph. Thesaur. (Paris edn.), from an anonymous ms gloss.

The note is as follows:—

("Tristates: that is, third of station: he was one of those that stood on a chariot in battle: for the ancients used to make chariots for service in battles, each of which held three men; so that one should drive it, while two should fight: as also the saying of Moses in his first Canticle declares, ‘The chosen ones, and the saying and the tristatae’) [Exod. xv. 4 (ἐπιλέκτους ἀναβάτας τριστάτας, LXX;—where Syr.-Hxp. has ὅτι τριστάτας ἀναβάτας ἀναβήσεται ἐπεξέστοι]][supr.]

From 61 v° b to 65 v° a (inclusive) the extracts are from 1 Esdras,—that is, the 3 Esdras of Jerome and the Latin Vulgate and of our Sixth Article. As the Syriac [Hexaplar] text of this Book has been printed in Walton's Polyglot, and recently by Lagarde (Libri V.T. Apocryphi, 1861), they are not included in the present volume.
כ"ח

ולא שמעו נאמה ובראש

I.
1. המעלים קדם כיון הכנחתה: שמעו 1
2. הפרש קדימה סלמה 2. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה: שמעו 3
3. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה: שמעו.
4. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה: שמעו...

העשתה, קדימה, קדימה, קדימה.

II.
1. המעלים קדם כיון הכנחתה: שמעו 1
2. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה. הפרש קדימה סלמה: שמעו.

I. (1) [Marg., יונתן] | (2) [למה] [Corr., יונתן] | (3) [למה] [Marg., יונתן].
II. (2) [Marg., ḫəṣām.] | (6) [Marg., Ḫəṣām.] | (8) [Corr., Ḫəṣām. [see Suppl. N.].
IV.

7. הַכְּלָלָה מְדַלִּיתָהּ: כְּלָלָהּ מְדַלִּיתָהּ. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן.

8. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן. לָא לִבְּךָ לַעֲלַמּוֹן.

IV. (16) [Marg., מָשָׁה] | (17) [Marg., מָשָׁה] [corr., מָשָׁה]
4. וְאֵין יַעֲשָׂנָהוּ לֻכְעֹלָהָו. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
5. וְאֵין יַעֲשָׂנָהוּ לֻכְעֹלָהָו. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
6. וְאֵין יַעֲשָׂנָהוּ לֻכְעֹלָהָו. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
7. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
8. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
9. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה
10. מִי שָׂפֵט לְעָבֹד לְאָרֶץ אֵלֶּיהָו. מִמְ פִּים הַיָּמֶּל הַיַּם מְשַׁמֵּרָה | רְשָׁמֶהָו לֵבָּה. מִכְיָם מְשַׁמֵּרָה

VIII. (7) [Marg., ms. ms. (cp. ver. 9 infr.).]
VIII. (15) So MS; a form not recorded in Thes. Syr. (see cc. 4107, 4327), a fusion of the ordinary סנָא with the rarer סנָא.
xviii.

XIX.
GREEK TEXT
PREFATORY NOTE.

The method of translation adopted by Paul of Tellin this his Version of the Old Testament from the Greek—that of forcing the Syriac, with little or no regard to its idiom, into exact representation of writings in an utterly alien language—has at least this advantage, that the Greek can be recovered from the Syriac with nearly absolute exactness.

Accordingly, the reconstructed Greek text which I now present is a more faithful counterpart of the Syriac than an English or Latin rendering of it could be; and I am confident that it will be found more useful for the service of scholars who desire to obtain access to the textual evidence of this Version.

The instances where its evidence is indecisive, as between various readings of the Greek, are not many, and in no case important. Most of them are cases of insertion or omission of the definite article; or (more rarely) of preference of one or other of two nearly synonymous words. In such instances I have usually given in the text the reading of B, and recorded the variant in the Notes. But now and then I have seen reason rather to follow A, or even some one or more cursives whose text shows signs of affinity, in notable coincidences, with that which underlies our Version.
EXTRACTS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

(ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT).

GENESIS (xxvi. 26-31); LEVITICUS (xxvi. 42-46);
1 AND 2 CHRONICLES; NEHEMIAH.

GREEK TEXT

As represented in the foregoing Syriac Text.
NOTATION

OF MSS AND MSS CITED IN TEXTUAL NOTES.

Σ stands for the Greek text underlying the preceding Syriac Extracts.

N A B D E F G M N, the MSS so designated in Dr. Swete's *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*.

N (S of Tischendorf), available only in part of 1 Chron. (ix. 27–xix. 17).

A (III. of Holmes and Parsons), available throughout.

B (II. of H. and P.), \{ in all except the passage from Genesis.

N (XI. of H. and P.), \} in Genesis passage only.

D (I. of H. and P.), \{ in Gen. and Levit. passages only.

E (not known to H. and P.), \} in Gen. and Levit. passages only.

F (VII. of H. and P.), \} in Genesis passage only.

M (X. of H. and P.), \} in Levit. passage only.

P denotes text of Holmes and Parsons, in readings for which no manuscript is cited.

(No part of any of these Extracts appears in the extant fragments of C.)

The mss are numbered as in Holmes and Parsons, from whose *apparatus* their readings are borrowed,—except two (not known to H. and P.), w and x, which are recorded in the *apparatus* to Genesis, in Vol. I, part 1, of Brooke and M'Lean's *O.T. in Greek* (1906).

I have not attempted to give the evidence of the mss in full, but only of those which appear to have more or less affinity with the Σ-text.
ΕΚ ΒΙΒΛΩΝ

ΓΕΝΕΣΕΩΣ, ΛΕΤΙΤΙΚΟΤ, ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΟΜΕΝΩΝ, ΝΕΕΜΙΑ,

ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ὦ.
ΓΕΝΕΣΙΣ.

26 Καὶ Ἀβιμέλεχ ἐπορεύθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπὸ Γεράρων καὶ Οχοζαθὸς τῆς δυναμεος αὐτοῦ. 27 Καὶ έπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰσαάκ, Ἰνατί ἢλθατε πρὸς με; ὑμεῖς ἐμισήσατε με, καὶ ἐξαπεστει-28 λατέ με ἀφ' ὑμῶν. 28 Καὶ έπαν, Εἰρήνη σοι ἐωρῶμεν ὅτι ἐστὶν Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ ἐπαμεν, Γενεσθω ἀρὰ ἀνὰ μέσον ἄλληλων, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμων καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ. 29 καὶ διαθήσομεθα διαθήκην μετὰ σοῦ, ἐς, ὑμῶν κακόν, καθότι ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐβδελυγάμεθα σε, καὶ ὅν τρόπον ἐχρησάμεθα σοι καλῶς καὶ ἐξαπεστείλαμεν σε μετ'

XXVI. (26) Φιχόλ] So E M, 31 75 77 130 :—A D, 15, Φιχολ:—38, dccc, Φιχολ. | (27) ἐξαπεστείλατε] E M, many mss :—A, 20 55 59 71 75 83 106 107 134, ἐπεστείλ. (Σ uses same syr verb here as for ἐξαπεστείλατι, vv. 29, 31). | (28) καὶ (before εἶπαν)] MSS, many mss :—A few, οἱ δὲ. | εἰρήνη σοι] Σ alone,—subst for ἡδόνες [σε] of all else (MSS om σε, but many mss ins). | ἐωρῶμεν] 15 59 82 134 135 x :—MSS and remaining mss, ἐωράκαμεν. | ἐστίν] Σ alone :—all else, ἤν. | ἀνὰ μέσον ἄλληλων, καὶ (before ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμων)] Σ with 38 x :—MSS and all mss else, om. | Σ, with 15 38 72 82 135 x, places διαθήκην before μετὰ σοῦ :—MSS, and all else, after. | (29) τοιχίσειν] MSS and most mss (or τοιχίσαι, as 19 w). But Σ may represent τοιχίσεις (or —σης), as 53 79 82. | MSS and most mss place σε before οὐκ. | ἐχρησάμεθα] So apparently Σ (using same tense as for ἐξαπεστείλαμεν following; with all gr :—except Α, ἐχρημεθα. | A few mss place σοι after εὐλογ., but + ἐπ.
εἰρήνης, καὶ νῦν σὺ εὐλογημένος εἰ ὑπὸ Κυρίου. 30 Καὶ 30 ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς δοχήν, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐπιον. 31 Καὶ 31 ἀναστάντες τὸ πρῶτον ὁμοσαν ἄνθρωπος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς Ἰσαάκ καὶ ἀπῆχοντο ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ σωτηρίας.

most, with MSS, before it. | εὐλογημένος] So apparently Σ (using participle), with 18 19 44 106 134 w:—all else, and MSS, εὐλογητός. | Σ add ἔι, with 18; 25 52 54 57, ἔσγ:—MSS and all else om. | (31) ὁμο- σαν] A D M, 55 75: E, many mss, ὁμοσεν. | ἄνθρωπος] So Σ with MSS, most mss;—or perhaps ἰκαστος, as one or two mss.
ΔΕΥΙΤΙΚΟΝ.

42 Καὶ μυησθήσομαι τῆς διαθήκης μου Ἰακώβι καὶ τῆς διαθήκης μου Ἰσαάκι καὶ τῆς διαθήκης μου Ἀβραάμ μυησθήσομαι, καὶ τῆς γῆς ἡ έγκαταλειφθησεται ὑπ’ αὐτῶν. τότε προσδέξεται ἡ γῆ τὰ σάββατα αὐτῆς εἰν τῷ ἐρημωθῆναι [αὐτὴν] δι’ αὐτοὺς· καὶ αὐτοὶ προσδέξονται τὰς αὐτῶν ἀνομίας· ἀνθ’ ὅπε τὰ κρίματα μου ὑπερείδον· καὶ τοῖς προστάγμασιν μου προσώκθισαν, καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν.

44 καὶ οὐδ’ ὡς ὄντων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν, οὐχ ὑπερείδον αὐτοὺς οὐδὲ προσώκθισα αὐτοῖς ὡστε ἐξαναλώσαι αὐτοὺς· τοῦ διασκεδάσαι τῆς διαθήκης μου τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν. 45 καὶ μνησθήσομαι αὐτοῖς τῆς διαθήκης τῆς προτέρας· ὅτε ἐξῆγαγον αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτοῦ· ἐξ οὐκον δουλίας ἐναντί τῶν θεων. 46 τού εἶναι αὐτοῖς Θεός ἐγὼ Κύριος. 47 Ταῦτα τὰ κρίματα καὶ τὰ προστάγματα καὶ ὁ νόμος, ἰδον δὲ Κύριος ἀναμέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδον μέσον τῶν νιῶν Ἰσραήλ.

XXVI. (42) μον (after διαθήκης) ter] G, 58 128:—the rest om. | Σ om μυησθήσομαι(3), with 53 108 118. | (43) Σ alone, for καὶ ἡ γῆ, subst ἡ; and | after προσώκθισαν, ins καί. | Except 55, no gr pref ἐν to τῇ ψυχῇ. | (44) ὅτι ἐγώ] A B G N, 19 54 55 71 75 108 118:—F P and some mss, ἐγώ γάρ:—M, 18, ἐγώ only. | (45) αὐτοῖς] All else, αὐτῶν. | Σ om εἰμί (before Κύριος), with G M, 15 19 55 64 129 131, and most mss:—A B F N, other mss, ins. | (46) Σ om μον(1) after κρίματα with FG M N, 15 19 55 64 129 131:—A B, &c., ins. | Σ om μον(2) after προστάγματα with B’ FG M N, and mss (as (4)):—A B*, &c., ins.
ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΠΝΟΜΕΝΩΝ.

Α.

1 'Αδάμ, Σήθ, 'Ενώς, 2 Καινάν, Μαλελεήλ, 'Ιάρεδ, 3 'Ενώξ, 1, 2, 3, Μαθουσάλα, Δάμεξ, 4 Νωε. νιöl Νωε, Σήμη, Χάμ, 'Ιάφεθ. 4

17 Τιοί Σήμη: Αιλάμ καὶ 'Ασσούρ 18 καὶ 'Αρφαξάρ, Σαλά, 17, 18

25 'Εβέρ, Φάλεγ, 'Αργαύ, 26 Σερούχ, Ναχώρ, Θάρα, 27 'Αβράμ* 25, 26, 17

28 νιöl δὲ 'Αβράμ: 'Ισαάκ καὶ 'Ισμαήλ.

34 Καὶ νιöl 'Ισαάκ: Ιακώβ καὶ 'Ησαύ.

1 Καὶ ταύτα τὰ ὅνοματα τῶν νιῶν Ἰσραήλ. 'Ρουβήλ, 1

Συμεών, Λευ, 'Ιουδά, 'Ισσαχάρ, Ζαβουλών, 2 Δάν, 'Ιωσήφ, 2

Βενιαμίν, Νεφθαλί, Γάδ, 'Ασήρ.

3 Τιοί 'Ιουδά: ∗Ηρ, Αινάν, Σηλώ, τρεῖς ἐγεννηθέσαν 3

Ι. (2) Before Καινάν, Σ om καί; with A B, 56 60 64 &c.:—N, many mss, ins. | (3) Μαθουσάλα] A, most mss:—B, Μαθονύσαλα. | (17) 'Ασσούρ] A B, many mss:—others, Ασσούρ. | (24) 'Αρφαξάρ] Σ alone (probably an error of transcription):—all else, Αρφαξάδ. | (25) Φάλεγ] B*, &c.:—A N, 56 64 106 119 158, Φάλεκ:—B*, Φάλεχ. | Αργαύ] Σ only:—MSS, 56 60 64 106 108 119 158 243, Ραγαν:—some mss, Ραγαν. | (26) Θαρά] With MSS, 60 64 106 108 158;—or, with others, Θαρρά. | (27) Σ, with 44 only, writes 'Αβράμ, with no addition, here (and in next v.):—A N, some mss, Αβραμ αὐτος Αβρααμ:—the rest, Αβρααμ (both verses).

II. (1) καί (before ταύτα)] A N, 55 60 64 71 106 119 158 243, &c.:—B and the rest om. | 'Ρουβήλ] Σ only (and so always in syr O.T., psh and hxp, and in Apoc. (both versions)) ; for 'Ρουβήν. | (3) Σηλώ]
II.

αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσαὰκ τῆς Χαναανίτιδος. καὶ ἦν Ἰρᾶη ὁ πρωτότοκος Ἰουδά πονηρὸς ἐναντίον Κυρίου, καὶ 4 ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτὸν. 4 καὶ Θαμάρ ἡ νύμφη αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ 5 τὸν Φάρες καὶ τὸν Ζάρα. πάντες νεοὶ Ἰουδά, πέντε. 5 Τιοι 6 Φάρες Ἐσρὼν, καὶ Ἰεμονηλ. 6 καὶ νεοὶ Ζάρα: Ζαμβρί, καὶ Αἰθάμ, καὶ Αἰμάν, καὶ Χαλκάν, καὶ Δάρα. πάντες πέντε.

7 καὶ νεοὶ Χαρμῆ Ἀχάρ ὁ ἐμποδοστάτης Ἰσραήλ, ὡς ἤθετη- 8, 9 σεν εἰς τὸ ἀνάθεμα. 8 καὶ νεοὶ Αἰθάν, Ζαρία. 9 καὶ νεοὶ Ἐσρὼν οἱ ἐτέχθησαν αὐτῷ. Ἰραμηῆ καὶ Ὀράμ, καὶ Χαλέβ 10 καὶ Ἀράμ. 10 καὶ Ἀράμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμυναδάβ, καὶ Ἀμυναδαβ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ναασσών ἄρχοντα τοῦ οἴκου 11 Ἰουδά. 11 καὶ Ναασσών ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλμών, καὶ 12 Σαλμών ἐγέννησεν τὸν Βοός, 12 καὶ Βόος ἐγέννησεν τὸν 13 Ὀμβηδ, καὶ Ὀμβηδ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰεσσαί, 13 καὶ Ἰεσσαί

Η. ἐγέννησεν τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτοῦ Ἐλιὰβ, Ἀβίωνάδαβ ὁ δεύτερος, Σαμαὰ ὁ τρίτος, Ἕλαδην ὁ τέταρτος, Ζαβδᾶ ὁ 14 πέμπτος, Ἀσομ ὁ ἐκτος, Δανὶδ ὁ ἐβδομος. καὶ αἱ 15, 16 ἀδελφῇ αὐτῶν Σαουρία, καὶ Ἀβιγάλ. Καὶ νῦν Σαουρία 
Ἀβισσαὶ καὶ Ἰωάβ, καὶ Ἀσάης τρεῖς. Καὶ Ἀβιγάλ 17 
ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμεσά, καὶ πατήρ Ἀμεσὰ Ἰέθερ ὁ Ἰσμαηλίτης.

III. 1 Καὶ οὕτοι ἑσαυ νῦν Δανὶδ οἱ τεχθέντες αὐτῷ ἐν Ἱ
Χεβρών ὁ πρωτότοκος Ἀμνῶν, τῇ Ἀχυάμ τῇ Ἰεραπλητίδι.
ὁ δεύτερος Δαλονίλ, τῇ Ἀβιγάλ τῇ Καρμηλίᾳ. 2 ὁ τρίτος 2 
Ἀβεσσαλὼν, νῦν Μααχὰ βυαητρὸς Θολβὶ βασιλέως Γεσσοῦρ.

[see note on syr txt]:—all else, Ἀμ[ἐ]ναδᾶβ. Σαμά] So 120 :—A, 158, Σαμαὰ :—B and most, Σαμαὰ. (14) Ναδανηήλ] Σ alone :—all else, Ναθανηήλ. Ζαβδᾶ] Σ only (but B', Ζαβδαί):—A N, 60 64 119 158, Ραδδαί :—B*, Ζαβδαί. (15) Ἀσομ] MSS, 55 56 60 64 71 106 119 243, &c. :—or, as 74 108 121, Ἀσωμ. (16) αἱ ἀδελφαὶ] 19 108 121 :—MSS, ἀδελφῆ (also most mss, some with ἦ pref.). Σαουρία (or Σουρία, or Σαυρία)] Σ alone :—all else, Σαουρία. καὶ Ἀβιγάλ (or Ἀβιγάλ)] Σ alone; but A and many, καὶ Ἀβιγαία [and so v. 17 (with B), and iii. 1] :—B om here. Ἀβισσαί] So A, 60, Ἀβισσα :—B, 55, Ἀβεσά (others variously). Ἰωάβ] B and most :—A, Ἰωβαβ. (17) Ἀμεσά (bis)] 44 71 :—A N, 56 60 64 106 119 158 243, &c., Ἀμεσὰ (bis) :—B, Ἀμεσᾶβ (bis). Ἰέθερ] Α N, 55 56 60 64 71 106 108 119 158 243 :—B, Ἰόθοβρ.

III. (1) Ἰεραπλητίδι] Σ with P (mss?):—A B, &c., Ἰσραηλ[ἐ]νατι. (Cp. 2 Reg. iii. 2 (LXX), where Α N write Ἰαραηλιτ.; but B, Ἰσραηλεῖτ., as here.] Δαλονίλ] Σ alone; but similarly Α N, 55 56 60 64 71 106 119 243, &c., Σαουρία[ε]:—B, Δαμνηήλ [and marg. of Σ, Δανηήλ]. Ἀβιγάλ (or —γαλ)] Σ:—all else, Ἀβιγαία (cp. ii. 16). (2) Μααχὰ 93 108 121 :—A B, &c., Μωά. ὅλβη] Σ [but see note on syr txt]; similarly 119, ὅλβη:—A N, 158, ὅλμει:—B, ὅλμαι. Γεσσοῦρ]
ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΟΜΕΝΩΝ Α.

III.

3 ο τέταρτος Ἀδωνιά, νίδος Ἀγγέλθ. 3 ο πέμπτος Σαβατία, τῇ 4 Ἀβιτάλ. ο ἐκτος Ἰεθραμῆ, τῇ Ἀγλὰ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ. 4 έξ ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτῷ ἐν Χεβρών. καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἐκεῖ, ἐπτὰ ἑτη καὶ ἐξάμηνον. καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τρία ἑτη ἐβασίλευσεν

5 εν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 5 Καὶ οὔτοι ἔτεχθησαν αὐτῷ ἐν Ἰερωσαλήμ. Σαμαά, Σωβᾶβ, Ναάν καὶ Σαλωμῶν, τέσσαρες,

6 τῇ Βηθσαβεῖ θυγατρὶ Αμηλ. 6 καὶ Ἰεβαάρ καὶ Ἰελισά,

7, 8 καὶ Ἐλιφαλέτ, 7 καὶ Νάγη καὶ Νάφαβ, καὶ Ἰανοῦε, 8 καὶ

9 Ἐλισαμά, καὶ Ἐλιεδά, καὶ Ἐλιφάλα, ἐννέα. 9 πάντες νιώ Ἰανίδι· πλην τῶν νιών τῶν παλλακῶν· καὶ Θημᾶρ ἀδελφή

10 αὐτῶν. 10 Τίοι Σαλωμόν· Ἄβια, νίδος αὐτοῦ. Ἀσά, νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἰωσαφάτ, νίδος αὐτοῦ. Ἰαφά, νίδος αὐτοῦ.

11 νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἰωσαφάτ, νίδος αὐτοῦ. Ἰωάς, νίδος αὐτοῦ. Ἰμασιά, νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἰαρία, νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἰωθάμ, νιὸς αὐτοῦ. Ἀχάζ,

108 119 243:—Α, 64 71 158, Γεουρ:—Β, Γεουρ | (3) Σαβατία] So B [with ει for ε]:—Α, 55 56 64 106 108 119 158 243, Σαβατίας. | τῇ 'Αβιτάλ] 56 64 71 106 119 243:—Α, τῇ 'Αβιτάλ:—Β, τῇ Σαβατία. | Ἰεθραμῆ] Ρ:—Α Ν, 93 158, Ἰεθράμ.:—Β, 'Ἰεθράμ. | Ἀγλά] Α:—Β, Ἀλά. | (4) καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἐκεῖ ἐπτὰ ἑτη καὶ ἐξάμηνον] Α, most mss (some with variations, such as μήνας έξε):—Β, 55, om. | (5) Σαμαά] A and most (or Σαμαά):—Β, Σαμάν. | Σωβᾶβ] Α and most:—Β, Σωβάν. | Βηθσαβεῖ] Σ writes in two words, as if θυγατρί| Σαβεῖ (cp. 3 Reg. i. 11):—the rest, Βηθσαβεῖ [see Suppl. N.]. | (6) Ἰεβαάρ] Α Ν, 56 60 64 93 119 158, &c.:—Β, Βαάρ. | Ἐλισά] So B ('Ἐλεωά):—Α Ν, 56 60 64 106 158 243, &c., Ελισαμα. | Ἐλιφαλέτ] Α Ν, 60 106 243, &c.:—Β, Ἐλιφαλήθ. | (7) Νάγη] Α, 64 158:—Β, Νάγη (others variously). | Νάφαβ] Β:—Α Ν, 55 56 119, Ναφεγ:—Ρ, Ναφέκ. | Ἰανοῦε] Β:—Α, &c., Ιανε. | (8) Ἐλειδα] as Α:—ορ (as B) Ἐλειδα. | (11) Ὀκοζά] 60 (Ρ, Ὀκοζά):—Α Ν, &c., Οζάς:—Β, Ὀζάς. [Op. 2 Par. xxvi., infr.] | (12) Ἀμασία] Σ:—Α Β, Ἀμασίας. | Ἀζαρί] Β:—Α, Ἀζαρίας. | Ἰωθάμ] 19 106 108:—Α, Ἰωνάθαν:—Β,
τιός αὐτοῦ. Ἐξεκάθ, τιός αὐτοῦ. Μανασσῆ, τιός αὐτοῦ. Αμών, τιός αὐτοῦ. Ἰωσία, τιός αὐτοῦ. 15 Καὶ τιόι 14, 15 Ἰωσία: πρωτότοκος Ἰωανάν. ὁ δεύτερος, Ἰωιακίμ. ὁ τρίτος, Σεδεκία. ὁ τέταρτος, Σαλοῦμ. 16 Καὶ τιόι Ἰωιακίμ 16 Ἰωχονία, τιός αὐτοῦ. Σεδεκία, τιός αὐτοῦ. 17 καὶ τιόι 17 Ἰωχονία: Ἀσίρ, Σαλαθιήλ τιός αὐτοῦ, 18 Μελχιράμ, καὶ 18 Φαλδαία, καὶ Σανεσάρ, καὶ Ἰεκενά, καὶ Σαμώ, καὶ Ναδαβία. 19 Καὶ τιόι Σαλαθιήλ: Ζοροβαβέλ, καὶ Σεμείε. 19 Καὶ τιόι Ζοροβαβέλ: Μοσολλάμ, καὶ Ἰαναία, καὶ Σαμωβί, ἀδελφὴ αὐτῶν, 20 καὶ Ἀσεβία, καὶ Ὀόλ, καὶ Βαραχία, καὶ 20 Ἀσαδία, καὶ Ἀσοβά, πέντε.

1 Τιοὶ Δευ: Γερσῶν, Καάθ, καὶ Μεραρί. 2 καὶ τιόι 1, 2


VI. (1) Γέρσων] 121 144 (or Γερσων, with Ν, 55 64 71 119 243):—Α, 93, Γεδεων:—Β, Γεδσων. | Μεραρί] Α (Β', with ἐ for ἐ):—Β*,
3 Καλόντο 'Αμμάμ, καὶ 'Ισαάρ, Χεβρών, καὶ 'Οζήλ. 3 Καὶ
νιότο 'Αμμάμ 'Ασρῶν καὶ Μωσής, καὶ Μαριάμ. καὶ
νιότο 'Ασρῶν Ναδάβ καὶ 'Αβιουδ, καὶ 'Ελεαζάρ καὶ
4 Ίθαμάρ. 4 'Ελεαζάρ δὲ εγέννησεν τὸν Φυνεύς. Φυνεύς εγέν-
νησεν τὸν 'Αβισούνα. 5 'Αβισούνα εγέννησεν τὸν 'Αβωκαί.
6 Βωκαί εγέννησεν τὸν 'Οζή. 6 Οζή εγέννησεν τὸν Ζαρανά.
7 Ζαρανά εγέννησεν τὸν 'Αμαρίηλ. 7 καὶ 'Αμαρίηλ εγέννησεν
8 τὸν 'Αμαρία. καὶ 'Αμαρία εγέννησεν τὸν 'Αχιτώβ. 8 καὶ
'Αχιτώβ εγέννησεν τὸν Σαδώκ. καὶ Σαδώκ εγέννησεν τὸν
9 'Αχιμάς. 9 καὶ 'Αχιμάς εγέννησεν τὸν 'Αζαρία. καὶ
10 'Αζαρία εγέννησεν τὸν 'Ιωανάν. 10 καὶ 'Ιωανάν εγέννησεν
tὸν 'Αζαρία ὤντο περιστερεῖς εὖ τῷ οἴκῳ τῷ φωκόνῃσεν
11 Σαλωμών ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 11 καὶ εγέννησεν 'Αζαρία τὸν
12 'Αμαρία. καὶ 'Αμαρία εγέννησεν τὸν 'Αχιτώβ. 12 καὶ
'Αχιτώβ εγέννησεν τὸν Σαδώκ. καὶ Σαδώκ εγέννησεν τὸν
13 Σαλώμ. 13 καὶ Σαλώμ εγέννησεν τὸν Χελκία. καὶ Χελκία

Μαριώτι. | (2) 'Αμμάμ] Α, 106 121.—Β, &c., 'Αμβράμ. | 'Ισαάρ|
| 44 64 158.—Α Β, &c., 'Ισαάρ. | (3) 'Αμμάμ] Α Ν, 56 60 64 71 |
| 158.—Β, 'Αμβράμ. | καὶ (before 'Ελεαζάρ)] Σ alone. | (4) δὲ (after |
| 'Ελεαζάρ)] 55 (some mss pref καὶ). | 'Αβισούνα (also ver. 5)] Σ alone:—|
| Α Β, &c., 'Αβ[θφι].so文娱. | (5) 'Αβισούνα] Σ alone [see note on syr txt]:—|
| Α Ν, 64 119 158, Βωκαί:—56 63, Βωκε:—Β, Βωι. | Βωκαί] Α Ν, 64 |
| 119 158:—the others as in last note. | (6) Ζαρανά (bis)] Σ alone [see |
| Ζαρανά (bis)] Σ alone [see |
| note on syr txt]:—Α, (1) Ζαρανά; (2) Ζαρανά:—Β (bis), Ζαρανά. |
| 'Αμαρίηλ (also ver. 7)] Σ alone:—Β, and most, Μαριώτι:—Α Ν, some |
| mss, Μαριώτι. | (7) 'Αμαρία (bis)] So Β':—Β*, 'Αμαρία (ep. ver. 11):—|
| Α, (1) Αμαρίαν; Α, (2) Αμαρίαν. | (8) 'Αζαρίας (1)] Β:—Α, 'Αζαρίας. |
| 'Αζαρίας (2)] Σ alone:—Α Β, 'Αζαρίας. | 'Ιωανάν (also in ver. 10)] B, |
| 'Ιωανάν (also in ver. 11)] B, |
| 'Ιωανάν (bis):—Α, (1) Ιωανάν; (2) Ιωανάν. | (10) 'Αζαρία (also in ver. 11)] |
| Α, Αζαρίαν; (2) Αζαρίας:—Β, (1) Αζαρίαν; (2) Αζαρία. | (11) 'Αμαρία |
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εγέννησεν τὸν Ἀζαριά. 14 καὶ Ἀζαριά ἐγέννησεν τὸν 14 Σαραιά. καὶ Σαραιά ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ιωσεδέκ. 15 καὶ Ιωσεδέκ δὲκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν τῇ μετοικίᾳ μετὰ Ἰούδα καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐν χειρὶ Ναβουχοδονόσωρ.

31 Καὶ οὗτοι οὖς κατέστησεν Δαυίδ ἐπὶ χειρας τῶν ἀδόντων ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου, ἐν τῇ καταπαύσει τῆς κυβωτοῦ. 32 καὶ ἦσαν λειτουργούντες ἐναντίον τῆς σκηνῆς οἰκου 32 μαρτυρίον ἐν ὄργανοις· ἔως ὅσον ἠφιλοδόμησεν Σαλωμῶν τῶν οἴκον Κυρίου ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ· καὶ ἐστήσαν κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὰς λειτουργίας αὐτῶν. 33 Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ ἐστηκότες καὶ [οἱ] νιότι αὐτῶν· ἐκ τῶν νιῶν τοῦ Κααθ, Αἰμαν ὁ ψαλτωδός, νιότι Ἰωήλ· νιότι Σαμουήλ. 34 νιότι Ἐλκανά· 34 νιότι Ἰεραμεθή· νιότι Ἑληλ· νιότι Θοου· 35 νιότι Σοῦφ· νιότι 35 Ἐλκανά· νιότι Μαάθ· νιότι Ἀμασάθ. 36 νιότι Ἐλκανά· νιότι 36 Ἰωήλ. Τιόν Ἀζαρία· νιότι Σαβανία. 37 νιότι Θαάθ· νιότι Ἀσίρ. 37 νιότι Ἀβασίρ· νιότι Κόρε. 38 νιότι Θασάπ· νιότι Κααθ· νιότι 38
1 Chr. vi. 38-49

ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΟΜΕΝΩΝ Α.

43

39 Λευί νιὸν 'Ισραήλ. 39 Καὶ [οἶ] ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ Ἀσαφ ὁ ἑστη-
κὼς ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ Ἀσαφ νιὸν Βαραχία: νιὸν Σαμαὰ.
40, 41 νιὸν Μιχαήλ: νιὸν Μαασία: νιὸν Μελχιά: 41 νιὸν Ἀδανι-
42 νιὸν Ζαραὰ: νιὸν Ἀδαια: 42 νιὸν Ουρί: νιὸν Ζαμμα: νιὸν
43, 44 Σεμεῖον. 43 νιὸν 'Ἰωέθ: νιὸν Γηρσὼν: νιὸν Λευί. 44 Καὶ οἱ
νιὸν Μεραρί: ἄδελφοι αὐτῶν ἐξ ἀριστερῶν Αἴθαμ νιὸς
45 Κεσαῖν νιὸν Ἀβδί: νιὸν Μαλὼν: 45 νιὸν Ἀσεβί: νιὸν
46 Μαλὼν: 46 νιὸν Ἀμασία: νιὸν Χελκία: νιὸν Μαασία: νιὸν
47 Βανί: νιὸν Σεμήρ: 47 νιὸν Μαλί: νιὸν Νομουσί: νιὸν
48 Μεραρί: νιὸν Λευί. 48 Καὶ ἄδελφοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἴκους
πατρίων αὐτῶν οἱ Λευῖται οἱ δεδομένοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἐργασίαν
49 λειτουργίας σκηνῆς οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ. 49 Καὶ Ἀλφών καὶ

οἱ νῦν αὐτοῦ θυμιῶντες ἥσαν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων· εἰς πᾶσαν ἐργασίαν ἀγίαν τῶν ἀγίων καὶ ξειλάσκεσθαι περὶ Ἰσραήλ· κατὰ πάντα ὁσα ἐνετείλατο Μωσῆς παῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ.


with some:—A B, 19 55 60 64, &c., om. | (49) θυμιῶντες ἥσαν] Σ only (or, θυμίων) :—all else, θυμιῶντες only. | ἀγίων] A N, 56 64 74 106 119 120 134 144 236 243:—B, &c., ἄγια.

παραλειπομένων

B.

xvi. 16 Ἐὰν γὰρ κατίσχυσεν 'Οζίας ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία αυτοῦ τοῦ καταφθείραι καὶ ἡκηδίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ναὸν Κυρίου θυμιάσαι ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων. 17 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν οὕτως αὐτοῦ 'Αζαρίας ὁ ἱερεύς καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἱερεῖς τοῦ Κυρίου ὄγδοПодробное содержание документа в читаемом формате: 16 Ἐὰν γὰρ κατίσχυσεν 'Οζίας ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταφθείραι καὶ ἡκηδίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ναὸν Κυρίου θυμιάσαι ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων. 17 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν οὕτως αὐτοῦ 'Αζαρίας ὁ ἱερεύς καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἱερεῖς τοῦ Κυρίου ὄγδοโดยเฉพาะ ναός του Κυρίου," γαρ ἐστησαν ἐπὶ 'Οζίαν τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ ἐσταν αὐτῷ. Ὡς σοὶ 'Οζία θυμιάσαι [τῷ] Κυρίῳ, ἀλλὰ ἡ τοῖς ἱερεύσιν [τοῖς] ναοῖς 'Αρωμῶν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις, θυμιάσαι. Ξέελθε ἐκ τοῦ ἀγιάσματος, ὅτι ἀπέστησα ἀπὸ Κυρίου, καὶ οὐκ ἐσταὶ σοι τούτῳ ἐς δόξαν παρὰ Κυρίου Θεοῦ. 19 καὶ ἐθυμώθη 'Οζίας, καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἐν τῷ θυμωθῆναι αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ ἐντείλασθαι ἐκβάλλειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγιάσματος, καὶ ἡ λέπρα ἀνέτειλεν ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον τῶν ἱερεῶν ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου ἐπάνω τοῦ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων. 20 καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν 'Αζαρίας ὁ ἱερεύς ὁ πρώτος...
καὶ οἱ ἰερεῖς καὶ ὁδὸν αὐτῶς λεπτῶς ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ. καὶ
κατέσπευσαν αὐτῶν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔστησεν
ἐξελθεῖν ὅτι ἣλεγξεν αὐτῶν Κύριος. καὶ ἦν ἢ Οἰκαὶ

30 Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἑξεκίας καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τοὺς 30
Λευίταις ὑμνεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἐν λόγοις Δαυίδ καὶ Ἀσαφ
τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ ὑμνοῦν ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἔπεσαν καὶ
προσεκύνησαν. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἑξεκίας καὶ ἐλὴνεν Νῦν 31
ἐπληρώσατε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν Κυρίῳ, προσαγάγετε καὶ
φέρετε θυσίας καὶ αἰνέσεως εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου. καὶ ἀνή-
νεγκεν ἡ ἐκκλησία θυσίας καὶ αἰνέσεως εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου
καὶ πᾶς πρὸθυμος τῇ καρδίᾳ ὀλοκαυτώματα. 32 Καὶ ἐγένετο 32
ὁ ἄριθμὸς τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως ἦς ἀνὴνεγκεν ἡ ἐκκλησία-
μόσχου, ἐβδομήκοντα· κριοί, ἐκατόν ἀμοι, διακόσιοι· εἰς
ὀλοκαύτωσιν Κυρίῳ, πάντα ταῦτα. 33 καὶ οἱ ἡγιασμένοι 33
μόσχοι ἔξακόσιοι πρόβατα τρισχίλια. 34 ἀλλ' ἦ τοι 34
ἰερεῖς ὅλιγοι ἦσαν καὶ οὖν ἐδύναντο ἐκδείραι τὴν ὀλοκαὔ-
tωσιν. καὶ ἀντελαμβάνοντο αὐτῶν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ
Λευίται, ἔως οὗ συνετελέσθη τὸ ἔργον, καὶ ἔως οὗ ἡγια-
σθησαν οἱ ἰερεῖς, ὅτι οἱ Λευίται ἡγιασθῆσαν προθύμως

XXIX. (30) ὁ βασιλεὺς] Before Ἑξεκίας, Α Ν, 60 64 119:—Β, &c.,
after. | Α alone pref πάντες to οἱ ἄρχ. | (31) καὶ αἰνέσεως (bis)]
Β Ν (also Α semel), 93 119 158 243:—P with most om καὶ. | Α om
καὶ ἀνὴνεγκεν . . . . Κυρίων, by homecat. | ὀλοκαυτώματα] Σ alone [see
Suppl. N.]:—the rest, ὀλοκαυτώσεις. | (33) After τρισχίλια, Α Β* and
most ins πεντακόσια:—Β' om as Σ. | (34) ἀλλ' ἦ] Α Β, &c.; or
ἀλλ' (cp. xxvi. 18 supr.). | ὅλιγοι ἦσαν] So MSS, 19 55 60 64 93 108
119 158 243:—others transp. | ἀντελαμβάνοντο] 134:—MSS and the
rest, ἀντελάβοντο. | ἡγιασθῆσαν προθύμως] Α Ν, 60 64 119 158:—Β, &c.,
παρὰ τοὺς ἱερεῖς. 35 Καὶ ἡ ὀλοκαυτώσις πολλὴ ἐγένετο· ἐν τῷ στέατι τῆς τελειωσεως τοῦ σωτηρίου· καὶ τῶν σπουδῶν τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως. Καὶ κατωρθώθη τὸ ἔργον ἐν 36 οἶκῳ Κυρίου 36 καὶ ἡφρανθῆ Ἐξεκίας καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός. διὰ τὸ ἥτοιμακέναι τὸν Θεόν τῷ λαῷ· ὁτι ἐξάπινα ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος.

1 1 Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἐξεκίας ἐπὶ πάντα Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰουδαί· καὶ ἐπιστολὰς ἐγραφεν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἐφραῖμ καὶ Μανασσῆ ἔλθειν εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ: ποιήσαι τὸ φασέκ 2 τῷ Κυρίῳ Θεῷ Ἰσραήλ. 2 καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ: 3 ποιήσαι τὸ φασέκ τῷ μηνί τῷ δευτέρῳ: 3 οὐ γὰρ ἠδυνάσθησαν ποιήσαι αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ [ἐν] τῷ μηνί τῷ πρώτῳ· ὅτι οἱ ἱερεῖς οὐχ ἠγνοίησαν ἰκανὸ· καὶ ὁ 4 λαὸς οὐ συνήχθησαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. 4 καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος 5 ἐναντίον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐναντίον τῆς ἐκκλησίας: 5 καὶ ἐστησαν λόγον διελθεῖν κήρυγμα ἐν παντὶ Ἰσραήλ: ἀπὸ Βηρσάβεη καὶ ἔως Δάν τοῦ ἔλθειν ποιῆσαι τὸ φασέκ τῷ Κυρίῳ Θεῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὅτι πλῆθος οὐκ ἐποίησεν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν.

προθύμως ἤγγισαν. 1 (35) ἐγένετο (after παλλη)  Σ alone [quam. ἤνῖ]. 1 τῷ στεάτῳ  Σ alone:—all else, pl.

XXX. (2) ἢ (2) MSS, 55 60 74 106 108 120 121 134:—others om. 1 A B om ἐν before τῷ μηνὶ:—others ins. 1 (3) ποιήσαι αὐτῷ  Α:— or, as B, 19 55 93 108, αὐτῷ ποιήσαι. 1 [ἐν] τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πρώτῳ  Σ alone:—A B, &c., συνήχθησαν. 1 (5) καὶ (before ἔως)  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθεῖν  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθοντος:—A B, &c., συνήχθησαν. 1 (5) καὶ (before ἔως)  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθεῖν  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθοντος:—A B, &c., συνήχθησαν. 1 (5) καὶ (before ἔως)  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθεῖν  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθοντος:—A B, &c., συνήχθησαν. 1 (5) καὶ (before ἔως)  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθεῖν  Σ alone. 1 τοῦ ἐλθοντος:—A B, &c., συνήχθησαν.
Καὶ συνήχθησαν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ λαὸς πολὺς τοῦ 13 ποιήσαι τὴν ἐορτὴν τῶν ἀξίμων ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐκκλησία πολλή σφόδρα. 14 καὶ ἀνέστησαν καὶ καθείλαξαν 14 τὰ θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ· καὶ πάντα ἐν οἷς ἔθυμιόθησαν τοῖς ψευδέσι κατέστασαν, καὶ ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸν χειμάρρον Κεδρῶν. 15 καὶ ἐθυσαν τὸ φασέκ τῇ τεσσαραυστῇ 15 καιδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ δευτέρου. καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευίται ἐνετράπησαν καὶ ἠγνίσθησαν· καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν ὀλοκαυνόματα εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου. 16 καὶ ἐστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν 16 στάσιν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰ κρίματα αὐτῶν· κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν Μωσῆ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς ἐδέχοντο τὸ αἷμα ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Λευίτων, 17 ὅτι πλήθος τῆς ἐκκλησίας 17 σίας οὐχ ἠγνίσθη, καὶ οἱ Λευίται ἤσαν τοῦ θύειν τὸ φασέκ· παντὶ τῷ μὴ δυναμένῳ ἠγνισθήναι τῷ Κυρίῳ. 18 ὅτι πλήθος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ Ἑφραίμ καὶ Μανασσῆ 18 καὶ Ἰσσαχάρ καὶ Ζαβουλῶν, οὐχ ἠγνισθηκήν, ἀλλὰ ἔφαγον τὸ φασέκ· παρὰ τὴν γραφὴν. Καὶ προσηνεξάτο 'Εζεκίας περὶ αὐτῶν, λέγων, Κύριος ο ἀγαθός· ἡξιλάσθω

(13) ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 19 108; or, with MSS and most mss, εἰς 'Ι. | λαὸς πολὺς] B, &c. :—Α Ν, 60 64 158 243, transp. | (15) ἠγνίσθησαν] Α Β', &c. :—Β, ἠγνισαν. | εἰς οἴκου] Ν, 19 44 60 64 71 74 93 106 108 119 120 121 134 158 236 243 :—Α Β, &c., εν οἰκῳ. | (16) τὰ κρίματα] Σ alone:—all else, sing. | τὸ αἷμα] Σ alone:—all else, pl. | (18) πλήθος] Σ alone (as ver. 17):—all else, [τὸ] πλείστον. | καὶ (before Ζαβουλῶν)] Α, &c. :—Β om. | ἠγνίσθησαν] Α Ν, 44 55 64 71 74 106 119 120 134 158 236 243 :—Β, and some, ἠγνισαν. | After τὴν γραφὴν, B ins toῦτο; with 19 93 108 :—Α om, with 19 44 55 60 64 71 74 93 108 119 120 134 158 243. | [N.B., Some punctuate after, some before, τοῦτο.] | ὁ (before ἀγαθός)] Α, 55 60 64 74 106 119 134 243 :—B, other mss, om. |
2 Chr. xxx. 19-XXXII. 2] ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΠΟΜΕΝΩΝ Β.

XXX. 19 υπέρ πάσης καρδίας κατευθυνούσης ἐκζητήσατε Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν καὶ οὗ κατὰ τὴν ἀγνείαν τῶν ἀγίων. 20 καὶ ἐπήκουσεν Κύριος τῷ Ἐζεκίῳ, καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν λαόν.

XXXII. 2. 2 Καὶ εἶδεν Ἐζεκίας ὅτι ἦκε Σενναχήριβ καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ. 3 καὶ ἐβούλευσατο μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ [τῶν] δυνατῶν ἐμφράξαι τα ὑδάτα τῶν πηγῶν αἱ ἥσαν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως· 4 καὶ συνεπίσχυσαν αὐτῷ. 4 καὶ συνήγαγεν λαὸν πολὺν καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὰ ὑδάτα τῶν πηγῶν καὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν διορίζοντα διὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐλέγων· Μὴ ἐλθῇ [ὁ] βασιλεὺς Ἀσσύριος καὶ ἐυρή ὕδωρ πολὺ καὶ κατισχύσῃ.

XXXIII. 33 Καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἐζεκίας μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀναβάσει τάφων νιῶν Δανίδ. καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ πᾶς Ἰουδαὶ καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ· καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Μανασσής νιὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντί αὐτοῦ.

1. 1* Οὐ δεκαδύο ἔτων Μανασσή ἐβασίλευσεν καὶ πεντή· 2 κοντα [καὶ] πέντε ἔτη ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. 2 καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον Κυρίου ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν (19) ἐκζητήσατι Β, ἐκζητοῦσης. [αὐτῶν] Β, some mss.—Α Ν, 60 64 74 106 120 121 134 158 236 243, [ε] αὐτοῦ.

XXXII. (2) Σενναχήριβ[Σ] alone.—all else, Σενναχήρ[ε] Μ. | (3) αἱ ἥσαν Σ alone.—all else, αἱ ἥν. | συνεπίσχυσαν Α, &c.—Β, συνεπίσχυσεν.

(33) Μανασσής So Α* and B write here, but Μανασσής (nominat.) everywhere in ch. xxxiii (1-16).

XXXIII. (1) Α om Μανασσ. | ἐβασίλευσεν(1) Σ alone.—Α Β, &c., ἐν τῷ βασιλεύσας αὐτῶν. | (2) ἐναντίον Β, and most.—Α Ν, 19 55 60
βδελυγμάτων τῶν ἑθνῶν οὖς ἐξωλέθρευσεν Κύριος ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ὕινων Ἰσραήλ. 3 καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ὕκοδό-μησεν τὰ ὕψηλα ἄ κατέσπασεν Ἐξεκίας ὧ διατήρ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐστησεν στῆλας τοῖς Βααλίμ, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἀλση· καὶ προσεκύνησαν πάση τῇ στρατίᾳ τοῦ ὑρανοῦ· καὶ ἐδούλευσεν αὐτοῖς. 4 καὶ ὕκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήρια ἐν οἰκίᾳ Κυρίου· 5 οὗ εἰπεν Κύριος [ὅτι] Ἔν Ἰερουσαλῆμ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά μου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 6 Καὶ ὕκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον πάσης τῆς στρατίας τοῦ ὑρανοῦ ἐν ταῖς δυο ἀυλαῖσ οἰκού Κυρίου. καὶ αὐτὸς διήγη τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ἐν πυρὶ ἐν γῇ Βεενόμ. 6 καὶ ἐκλήσινιζε καὶ οἰωνίζετο, καὶ ἐφαρμακεύετο, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐγγαστριμύθους· καὶ ἐπαιοδοὺς ἐπλήθυνεν, τοῦ πούήσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον Κυρίου· τοῦ παροργίσαι αὐτόν. 7 καὶ 7 ἐθηκεν τὸ γλυπτὸν καὶ τὸ χωνευτὸν, εἰκόνα ἥν ἐποίησεν ἐν οἰκίᾳ Κυρίου· ἐν δὲ εἰπεν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς Δαυὶδ καὶ πρὸς Σαλωμῶν τῶν ὕινων αὐτοῦ· [ὅτι] Ἔν τῷ ὁ οἰκὶ τοῦτῳ τῷ ἐν Ἰερου-
οικήμα μὴν ἐξελεξάμην μοι ἐκ πασῶν ψυλῶν Ἰσραὴλ· θῆσω
8 τὸ ὅνομά μου εἰς τὸν αἴώνα· 8 καὶ οὖ προσθῆσὼ σαλεύσαι
tοὺς πόδας Ἰσραήλ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἃς ἔδωκα τοῖς πατράσιν
αὐτῶν· πλὴν ἕαν ψυλάσσωνται τὸν ποιήσαι πάντα ἀπὸ τὸ κρύμα, έν χειρὶ Μωσῆ. 9 Καὶ ἐπλάνησεν Μανασσῆς
tὸν Ἰουδα καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, τοῦ
ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἕθη· ἀν ἐξῆρεν Κύριος
10 ἀπὸ προσώπου [τῶν] ψυλῶν Ἰσραήλ. 10 καὶ ἐλάλησεν Κύριος
ἐπὶ Μανασσῆ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ οὐκ ἑπήκουσαν.
11 καὶ ἤγαγεν Κύριος ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς δυνάμεως
βασιλέως Ἀσσοῦρ· καὶ κατέλαβον τὸν Μανασσῆ ἐν δεσμοῖς,
καὶ ἐδῆσαν αὐτὸν ἐν πέδαις, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Βαβυ-
12 λῶνα. 12 καὶ ὡς ἐθλίβη ἐξήτησεν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Κυρίου
Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐταπευνώθη σφόδρα ἀπὸ προσώπου [τοῦ]
13 Θεοῦ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ. 13 καὶ προσημύζατο ἀπὸ αὐτῶν,
καὶ ἑπήκουσεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤκουσεν τῆς βοής αὐτοῦ, καὶ

A, 19 64 108 158, ἤκουσαν:—B*, ἑπήκουσαν. Note that the syr employs
a different verb to render ἑπήκουσα. in ver. 13 infr.; and cp. vv. 10, 13
of syr text, p. 16 supr. | (11) αὐτοῖς] A alone, αὐτῶν. | κατέλαβον
tὸν Μανασσῆ] So B and most:—Α, κατελάβοντο Μανασσῆ, a reading
evidently arising from corruption of the other. | (12) τοῦ Κυρίου
Θεοῦ] B, 119:—Α, Ν, 44 55 60 64 106 108 134 158 243, Κυρίου τοῦ
Θ.:—P (and mss ?), Θεοῦ τοῦ Κ. | Θεοῦ(2)] Α, Ν, 55 60 64 108 119 158,
pref τοῦ:—B and the rest om. | (13) ἤκουσεν (before τῆς βοής)] Σ alone:
ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἦρουσαλήμ ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ.
Καὶ ἔγραψε Μανάσσης ὅτι Κύριος αὐτὸς ἐστιν [ὁ] Θεὸς. 14 Καὶ ἦν ὁ λόγος κατὰ νότον ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ καὶ πορευόμενον εἰς τὴν πύλην τὴν κυκλόθεν, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ὀπλα. καὶ ὄψθον σφόδρα. καὶ κατέστησεν ἄρχοντας τῆς δυνάμεως ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῖς τειχώρεσιν ἐν Ἰουδα. 15 καὶ περὶ 15 εἶλεν τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους καὶ τὰ γλυπτὰ ἐξ οὕκου Κυρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ θυσιαστήρια ἂν ψαλοῦσαν ἐν ὅρει οὕκου Κυρίου καὶ εἰς Ἦρουσαλήμ καὶ ἐξωθεὶ τῆς πόλεως. 16 καὶ καταφθάσασεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον Κυρίου καὶ ἐθυσίασεν 16 ἑπὶ αὐτὸ θυσίαν σωτηρίου καὶ αἰνέσεως, καὶ ἐπεν τῷ 'Ἰουδα ὁ δουλεύων Κυρίω Θεῷ Ἰσραήλ.

20 Καὶ ἀνέβη Φαραώ Νεχαώ βασιλεύς Ἀγγύπτου ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλεῶν Ἀσωριῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ποταμῶν Εὐφράτην τοῦ πολε-

—all else, ἐπίκουσεν,—see above on ver. 10. | A alone om καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν . . . . βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, after βοηθαί αὐτοῦ (by homoeot.). | A N, 55 60 64 74 106 119 134 158, pref ὅ to Θεὸς:—B and the rest om. | (14) A and most write μετὰ τ. before ψαλοῦσαν:—Σ, with B, transp. | νότον] Σ with Α Β':—B*, Γεών:—others, νότον τοῦ Γεών, or the like. | πορευό-
muνον] (Or, πορευομένου), Σ alone (and alone add εἰς):—Α Ν, 55 60, πορευομένων:—Β, &c., ἐκπορευομένων. | After χειμάρρῳ and before καὶ [ἐκ]πορ., Α Β', and many, ἵνα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔσωδον τὴν διὰ τῆς πύλης τῆς Ιερουκάμης, to which Α Β' and a few add καὶ περιεκώλωσαν τὸ ἀδυνατόν, all of which Σ om with Β* Ν, 19 52 55 60 64 108 119 158. | αὐτῷ] (scil. τείχους) Α Ν, 55 60 71 158;—or αὐτήν (sc. πύλην) 44 74 106 120 121 134 236 243:—B, αὐτόν. | ὀπλα] 44 71 74 106 120 121 134 236:—B, ὀπλα:—Α Ν, 55 60 64 119 158, Οφλα (others, ὀπλα or ὀφελ). | (15) τὰ γλυπτα] Σ alone:—all else sing. | ἐξωθεῖ] Α Ν, ἐξω.
μῆσαι αὐτοῦ ἐν Χαρχαμὺς· καὶ ἐπορεύθη [ὁ] βασιλεὺς Ἰωσίας
eis syva Δν ζυν ἀυτοῦ. 21 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἂγγέ-
lous, λέγων· Τί ἔμοi καὶ σοι, βασιλεῦ Ἰουδᾶ; οὐκ ἐπὶ σὲ ἥ-
κω σήμερον πολέμοι ποιῆσαι· καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐπεν κατα-
σπεύσαι με. πρόσεχε ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ· μὴ
catafthēry se. 22 καὶ οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰωσίας τὸ πρόσωπον
αὐτοῦ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ᾽ ἡ πολεμεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκραταῖοθη, καὶ οὐκ
hcpousen tōn λόγων Νεχαώ· τῶν διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ. καὶ
23 ἤλθεν τοῦ πολεμῆσαι εἰν τῷ πεδίῳ Μαγεδώ. 23 καὶ ἐτόξευ-
san οἱ τοξόται ἐπὶ βασιλέα Ἰωσίαν· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
tōs παιὼν αὐτοῦ. Ἐξαγάγετέ με ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου ὅτι
24 ἐπόνεσα σφόδρα. 24 καὶ ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρματος· καὶ ἀνεβίβασαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα τὸ
deutereon ὁ ἧν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἡγαγον αὐτῶν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ,
καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἐτάφη μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ· καὶ πᾶς
25 Ἰουδᾶ καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπένθησαν ἐπὶ Ἰωσίαν. 25 καὶ ἐθρή-
nησεν Ἰερεμίας ἐπὶ Ἰωσίαν, καὶ εἶπαν πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες
cak ai ἄρχουσαι θρήνοι ἐπὶ Ἰωσίαν ἔως τῆς σήμερον, καὶ
εἶδοκαν αὐτῶν εἰς πρόσταγμα ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ. Ἰδοὺ γέγραπται
ἐπὶ τῶν θρήνων.

χαμύς] So 19 108 (Χαρχαμύς)· all else om. Cp. 1 Esdr. i. 23 (gr and
syr-hxp). | A, 44 60 106 134 158, pref ὁ to bas. | (21) B pref kai
to oik. —Σ om with A, &c. | poudiai]. Α Ν, 55 60 64 71 74 106 119
120 134 158 236 243. —B, &c., pulemēsai. | (22) ἥκουσεν] B, &c.:: —
A alone, ἥκουσεν. | τῶν (before da) Σ alone. | Μαγεδώ] Or, Μαγεδῶ,
as most mss: —MSS, 55 60 64 119 158 243, Μαγεδών. | (23) ἐκ τοῦ
Or, deutereon, as Ν, 44 71 74 108 120 121 134 158 236. | (25) Σ om
καὶ before idou, with Α Ν, 55 60 64 71 74 106 119 134 158 236.
ΕΖΡΑΣ Β.

ἐκ Δόγων ΝΕΕΜΙΑ νίσσο Χελκιά.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μηνὶ Ἀχσελοῦ ἐν ἐτεὶ εἰκοστῶ· καὶ ἐγὼ ἵ
μην ἐν Σουσά τῇ βάρει, καὶ ἤλθεν πρὸς [με] Ἀνανιὰ εἰς ἀτό τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου· αὐτὸς καὶ ἄνδρες Ἰουδαία· καὶ ἄρω
τεσα αὐτοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν σωθέντων οἱ κατελπη-
σαν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας, καὶ περὶ Ἱεροσαλήμ. καὶ ἐπον 3 πρὸς μέ [ὁτι] Οἱ ὑπολεξεμένοι οἱ καταλειφθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς
αἰχμαλωσίας ἐκεῖ εἰσίν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐν πονηρίᾳ μεγάλῃ, καὶ

Superscription: Χελκιά] So B (—ειαί), Μμ.: Ν Α, Ἀχαλία.

I. (1) 'Ἀχσελοῦ] Similarly Α, χασελοῦ:—Β (!) σεσεθλοῦ; Ν* Ν, σεσεθλ; Ν and others, χασελευ. [Σ mg., χανν (in syr charact.).] | ἐν ἐτεὶ εἰκοστῶ] Σ alone:—all else have ἐτοὺς εἰκοστοῦ (here, and ii. 1). | Σουσά] 71 106 107 119 134:—Α Β, Μμ., Σουσάν:—Ν, τοῖς Σουσοῖς. | τῇ βάρει] 108 121 (93, τῇ βορᾷ); (cp. ii. 8 infr., and note):—Ν Β, ἀβειρᾶ:—Α, αβειρᾶ. | (2) 'Ἀνανιὰ] So Ν, Μμ.:—Ν Α Β, Μμ., Ἀνανι. | πρὸς μέ] 93 108 (Σ om μέ, no doubt inadvertently):—all else om both words. | Σ is indecisive between Β which ins, and Ν Α which om, τῶν before ἀδελφῶν. | τῶν Ἰουδαίων] 93 108 121:—all else om. | κατελίπθησαν] As Β*;—or, as Ν Α Β', Μμ., κατελ[ε]φθησαν. | (3) ἤτι] So Σ alone; but perhaps a syr redundancy. | οἱ ὑπολεξεμένοι] 93 108:—Ν Α Β, οἱ καταλειψτόμενοι (gr verb same as in preceding sentence, whereas syr (with 93 108) varies the expression,—lit., οἱ τοῦ λοιποῦ). | οἱ κατα-
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I. ἐν δ νεωδισμῷ. καὶ τείχῃ Ἰερουσαλήμ καθηγημένα, καὶ [αἱ]
4 πῦλαι αὐτῆς ἐνεπρήσθησαν ἐν πυρί. 4 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ
ἀκούσαί με τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐκάθισα καὶ ἔκλαυσα καὶ ἐπένθησα ἡμέρας.

II. 1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μηνὶ Νισαν ἐν ἔτει εἰκοστῷ Ἀρταχεσάοθ
βασιλεῖ καὶ ἤν [ὁ] οἶνος ἐναπτον ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἔλαβον τὸν οἶνον
καὶ ἐδώκα τῷ βασιλεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἤν ἐτέρος ἐναπτον αὐτοῦ, καὶ
2 ἡμην σκυθρωπός καὶ εἶπὲν μοι ὁ βασιλεῦς, Διὰ τὶ τὸ
πρόσωπόν σου πονηρόν, καὶ οὐκ εἰ μετριάζων; οὐκ ἔστων
τούτο εἰ μὴ πονηρία καρδίας. καὶ ἐφοβήθην πολὺ σφόδρα,
3 καὶ εἴπα τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὁ βασιλεῦς, εἰς τὸν αἴῶνα ζῆτω. διὰ
τὴν μὴ γένηται πονηρόν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου οὕτω, ἄθλος,
ὁκος μνημείων πατέρων μου ἡρμομῆθη καὶ αἱ πῦλαι αὐτῆς
4 κατεβρώθησαν ἐν πυρί; 4 Καὶ εἶπὲν μοι ὁ βασιλεῦς, Περὶ
tίνος τοῦτο σὺ ζητεῖς; καὶ προσηνεξάμην πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν
5 [τὸν] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ εἴπα τῷ βασιλεῖ, Εἰ ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα
ἀγαθοῦ καὶ εἰ ἀγαθυνθῆσεται ὁ παῖς σου ἐναπτον σου
ὡστε πέμψαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰουδᾶ εἰς πόλιν μνημείων πατέρων
6 μοι καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν. 6 Καὶ εἶπὲν μοι ὁ βασιλεῦς,

(so Σ in mg., εν [ταῖς] πόλεσι, qu., whether add or subst?) —which Σ
with Α om. | B ins αι before πυλαι: —Σ Α om.

II. (1) Ἀρταχεσάοθ] Α, &c., Ἀρθασαθα: Β, Ἀρσαθαρθα: —Ν, Ἀρσαρ-
σαθα. | Ν’ Α ins ὁ before οἶνος: —Ν* Β om. | καὶ ἡμην σκυθρωπός]
Ν’, 93 108 121: —Ν* Α Β, &c., om. | (2) μετριάζων] Σ mg., ἀρρωσ-
tῶν (similarly with variations, 93 108 121, in text); cp. 4 Kings viii.
29 (LXX and syr.-hxp.). | Some mss (against MSS) ins καὶ before οὐκ
ἔστων. | (3) τὸν αἴῶνα] Ν, plur. | διὰτι] Α, διὰ τὶ; | (4) σὺ ζητεῖς]
So Β’ Π (with mss ?): —Ν, συχτείς (?) : —Α Β*, συχτείς. | τὸν (before
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καὶ ἡ παλλακὴ ἡ καθημένη ἔχομενα αὐτοῦ. Ἐως πότε ἔσται ἡ πορεία σου, καὶ πότε ἐπιστρέφεις; καὶ ἡγαθύνθη ἐνῳπιον τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἀπέστειλέν με, καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ ὅρων. 7 καὶ εἶπα τῷ βασιλεῖ, Εϊ ἔπι τὸν βασιλέα ἀγαθὸν, δῶτω μοι ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπάρχους [τοὺς] πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὡστε παραγαγεῖν με· ἔως ἠλθὼ ἐπὶ 'Ἰουδά· 8 καὶ ἐπιστολὴν ἔπι Ἀσὰφ φύλακα τοῦ παραδείσου ὦς ἔστω τῷ βασιλεῖ· ὡστε δοῦναι μοι ἥξια στεγάσαι τὰς πύλας τοῦ οἴκου τῆς βάρεως: καὶ εἰς τὸ τείχος τῆς πόλεως καὶ εἰς οἴκον ὄν εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ ἔδωκέν μοι ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς χειρ Θεοῦ ἡ ἀγαθή.

7 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἠκούσεν Σαναβαλλῆτ καὶ Τωβία καὶ οἱ Ἀραβες καὶ οἱ Ἄμμανίται καὶ Ζωτία· ὅτι ἀνεβή ἡ φυὴ τῶν τείχει Ἴερουσαλήμ· ὅτι ἥρξαντο αἱ διασφαγαί ἀναφράσεσθαι καὶ πονηρῶν αὐτοῖς ἔφανη σφόδρα. 8 καὶ συνῆχεν θησαν πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ· ἐλθέω καὶ παρατάξασθαι ἐν τοῦ·] So apparently Σ; and similarly τοὺς (ver. 7). | (6) ἔχομενα] Lit., ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν (but in iv. 18, viii. 4, ἔχομενα is rendered as if ἐγγύς,—cp. Num. xxii. 5; Job xvii. 12, syr.-hxp.). | πορεία] Α, παροσία. | ὅρων] Σ mg, ὅρκους. | (7) ἐπιστολή] All else, plur.; B (not Ν Α) places before δῶτω. | ὑπάρχους] So Σ (alone), translit from gr:—nearly all else, ἡπάρχους (93 108, στρατήγους). | Ἰουδά] B:—Ν Α, Ἰουδαν. | (8) ἐπιστολὴ] 93 108 write plur. | τοῦ οἴκου τῆς βάρεως] Lit., τοῦ οἴκου-κατοικίας τῆς β. [see Suppl. N., and note on syr txt in loc., p. 20 supr.]; similarly 93 108, τῆς βάρεως τοῦ οἴκου:—all else om.

IV. (7) Σαναβαλλῆτ] Σ alone:—MSS and nearly all mss, Σαναβαλ[λ]άτ. | καὶ Ζωτία] Σ alone:—Ν', 44 71 93 106 108 120 121 134 236, [καὶ] [οἱ] Ἀζύτων:—Ν* Α Β Ν om. | τὸ τείχει] Nearly all else, plur. | (8) Σ interpunct after αὐτό, not after πάντες. | καὶ (after
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iv. 9 Ἰερονυσαλῆμ· καὶ ποιήσας αὐτὴν ἀφανῆ. 9 καὶ προσημεύσας μεθα πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ἡμῶν· καὶ ἑστήσαμεν προφύλακας ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς· ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν.

16 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἡμῖν τῶν ἑκτεταγμένων ἐποίησα τὸ ἔργον· καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτῶν ἀντείχοντο· καὶ λόγχαι καὶ θυρεοὶ καὶ [τά] τόξα καὶ [οί] θώρακες. καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες αὐτῶν ὁπίσω παντὸς οἴκου Ἰουδα, 17 καὶ οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες ἐν τῷ τείχει, καὶ οἱ αἱροντες ἐν ὁπλοῖς ὀπλισμένοι ἕσαν· ἐν μιᾷ χειρὶ ἐκαστὸς ἐποίησε αὐτόʊ τὸ ἔργον· καὶ ἐν μιᾷ ἔκρατε τῇ βολίδᾳ: 18 καὶ οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες· ἀνὴρ ῥομφαίαις αὐτῶν ἐξωσμένος ἤν ἐπὶ [τὴν] ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ· καὶ φιλοδομοῦσαν καὶ ὁ σαλπίζων ἐν τῇ κερατίνῃ ἐχομενα αὐτοῦ. 19 καὶ εἶπα πρὸς τοὺς ἑντίμους καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐνδόξους ἄρχοντας· καὶ ἐλθὼν] Σο Α Ν, some mss:—Σ Β ομ. [ἐν] Ορ εἰς, as Ν. | MSS, 52 55 64 119 243, &c., om καὶ ποιήσας αὐτὴν ἀφανῆ:—Σ ins (as P, with some ?).

(16) ἑκτεταγμένων] So Β (cp. Ps. cxxvi. 4 (syr-hxp)):—Σ Α Ν, 44 52 58 64 71 74 106 119 120 121 124 236 (? ) 243 248, ἑκτεταγμένων. (Σ mg has as gloss a word = ἐνδόξων, “expeditorum”). | ἀντείχοντο] Lit., εἰμι εἰς τοῖν κατόντων. | Before τόξα or θώρακες, Σ gives no indication of article (which Σ Α Β and some mss ins), any more than before λόγχαι and θυρεοὶ (which are anarthrous in all). | αὐτῶν ὑπὸ] Σ ins with 93 108. | | (17) καὶ οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες All else, τῶν οἰκοδομοῦντων (to which reading Σ ought probably to be confirmed, by correction of one letter in the syr txt (daleth for vau), p. 21 supr.). | οἱ αἱροντες] All else add ἐν τοῖς ἁρτηρίων (a word of doubtful meaning); Σ gives in mg alternative rendering αἱροντες (see syr txt as above, and note), perhaps meant to express αἱροντες-ἐν-ἁρτηρίων. [See Suppl. Ν.] | ἐν ὁπλοῖς] Σ alone add ὀπλισμένοι ἕσαν. | Before ἑποίηκε, Σ alone ins ἐκαστὸς. | αὐτοῦ] So Ν′ Ν, Π (with mss ?); also 93 108 (but place after χειρί):—Α, few mss, ἐποίηκε:—Σ Β, αὐτό. | ἐν μιᾷ] Σ Α, &c.—Β om ἐν. | (18) οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες] So Σ (as last ver.):—all else, [οί] οἰκοδόμοι. | ἤν] Σ alone. | [τὴν] ὀσφὺν Or ὀσφύος, as Ν, 93 108. | (19) ἐνδόξους] Σ with
πρὸς τοὺς καταλοίπους τοῦ λαοῦ, Τὸ ἔργον πλατύν [ἐστιν] καὶ πολὺ, καὶ ἡμεῖς σκορπιζόμεθα ἐπὶ τοῦ τείχους μακρὰν ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. 20 ἐν τῷ ποῖ ὁ δὲ ἀκούσητε ἐν τῆς φωνῆς ἡς κερατίνης, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσεσθε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πολεμήσει περὶ ἡμῶν. 21 καὶ ἡμισὺν 21 [αὐτῶν] ἐποίοιν τὸ ἔργον· καὶ ἡμισὶν αὐτῶν ἐκράτουν τὰς λόγχας, ἀπὸ ἀναβάσεων τοῦ ὄρθρου, ἐώς ἐξόδου τῶν ἀστρων. 22 Καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἑκέινῳ ἔπη τῷ λαῷ, 22 Ἐκαστος μετὰ τῶν νεανικῶν αὐτοῦ, αὐλίσθητε ἐν μέσῳ Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἔστω ἡμῖν ἡ νῦς προφυλακῆς, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἔργων.

15 Καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ τείχος πέμπτη καὶ εἰκάδε τοῦ Ἑλουλ 15 ἐν πεντήκοντα καὶ δύο ἡμέραις. 16 Καὶ ἐγένετο, ἡνίκα 16 ἡκουσάν πάντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κύκλω ἡμῶν· καὶ ἐπεσεν φόβος σφόδρα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς:—Ν* Ν.—Α, Β, &c., om. | (21) ἡμισὺν] So Α, Ν, 44 52 58 64 71 74 106 120 121 134 236 243 248.—Β, ἡμεῖς.—N (?), ἡμισ. | αὐτῶν[21] Σ alone; probably due to syr idiom merely (in use of pronom. suffix); αὐτῶν[2] is differently expressed in syr, by separate pronoun. | ἐποίοιν ἐκράτουν] Lit., ποιοῦντες ἵσαν ... κρατοῦντες ἵσαν. Similarly 93 108, ἐποιοῦμεν ... ἐκράτουν:—Ν Α, Β, and the rest, write pteps. merely. | Σ om ἐως[1] (before τοῦ ὄρθρου), with all:—except Β*, which ins. | Σ alone ἀναβάσεων (plur.). | (22) ἔκαστος μετὰ τῶν νεανικῶν αὐτοῦ] Σ; so Π (mss!), (but with τοῦ νεανικοῦ):—MSS om. The word in Σ is translit (imperfectly) from gr, but with equivalent syr in mg (see p. 22 supr.). | ἡμῖν] Σ with 106 alone:—all else, ἡμῖν.

VI. (15) Ἑλουλ] Ν Α (?) Β':—Β*, Ἑδουδ. | Ν, with Ρ (mss!), add μηνός. | ἐν ... ἡμέρας] Σ with 93 108:—all else, εἰς ... ἡμέρας. | (16) πάντες (before οἱ ἐχθροὶ)] Σ with Ν Α Ν, &c.:—Β, 71, om. | ἐπεσεν] As Α, 71:—or (as the rest) ἐπέπεσεν.
VI. μοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔγνωσαν· ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθη
teleiwshtina to ἐργον τοῦτο.

VIII. 1 Καὶ ἔφθασεν ὁ μὴν ὁ ἐβδομος· καὶ οἱ νεόν Iσραηλ ἐν [ταῖς]
pόλεσιν αὐτῶν. Καὶ συνήχθησαν πάσι ὁ λαὸς ὡς ἀνήρ εἰς ἐν Ἰερονασαλήμ· εἰς τὸ πλάτος τὸ ἐμπροσθεν [τῆς] πύλης τοῦ ἱδατος. Καὶ εἶπαν τῷ Ἐξρα τῷ γραμματεῖ ἐνέγκαι τὸ
2 βιβλίον νόμου Μωσῆ· ἐν ἑνετελατο Κύριος τῷ Ἰσραηλ. 2 Καὶ ἤνεγκεν Ἐξρα ὁ ἰερεύς τοῦ νόμου ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἔως γυναικός· καὶ πᾶς ὁ συνών ἀκούειν·
3 ἐν ἡμέρα μα τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ ἐβδόμου· 3 καὶ ἄνέγνω ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπέναντι τῆς πλατείας τῆς ἐμπροσθεν τῆς πύλης τοῦ ἱδατος· ἀπὸ τῆς ὅρας τοῦ διαφωτίσαι τοῦ ἴλιον ἐως ἡμίσους τῆς ἡμέρας, ἀπέναντι τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ αὐτοὶ συνιέντες [ἡσαν]. καὶ [τὰ] ὥτα παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὸ βιβλίον
4 τοῦ νόμου. 4 Καὶ ἔστη Ἐξρα ὁ γραμματεύς ἐπὶ βήματος

VIII. (1) After ἀνήρ εἰς, Σ, with 93 108, ins ἐν Ἰερονασαλήμ (or perhaps εἰς Ἱερ.). before εἰς τὸ πλάτος. | Ν B* om εἰς after εἰς:—Α B', &c., ins. | Before πύλης, 93 108 ins τῆς. | Ἐξρα: So Α:—Β, Ἐσρά. (So ver. 2 and throughout.) | ὅν] As Ρ (with mss?) [scil., νόμον (cp. ver. 14 infr.)]:—ο, as Ν Α B, &c. [scil., βιβλίον]. | Κύριος] Σ with Ν' Α:—Ν* Β, &c., om. | (2) ἐνώπιον] Or perhaps ἐναντίον, with 93 108 (cp. xxxiii. 2, 6, supr.). | καὶ (before ἐως)] Σ with Ν Α:—Β om. | (3) ἀπενάντι τῆς πλ. τῆς ἐμπρ. τῆς π. τοῦ ἱδατος] Σ; and so 93 108 (but they read τῶν ἱδατῶν.—The syr word though plur. in form is sing. in meaning):—all else om. Note that these two mss read (ver. 1 supr.) τὴν πλατείαν τῆν, for τὸ πλάτος τὸ; but syr renders differently in that place and this; cp. for πλατεία, Apoc. xi. 8 (where syr [later version] renders as here. | ἡμίσους] So Ν* B*, also Ρ (and mss?):—Α alone, μέσον:—Ν' Β', mss 44 58 64 71 106 108 119 121 134 243, 248, μεσούσης. | ἀπενάντι[2]) Perhaps rather ἐνώπιον, as in ver. 2
NEEMIA.

[NEH. viii. 4-7]

viii.

ευλίνου' ὁ ἐποίησαν εἰς τὸ δημηγορῆσαι τῷ λαῷ. καὶ ἐστήσαν ἔχομενα αὐτοῦ Μαθαιᾶ καὶ Σαμαϊᾶ καὶ Ἀνανία καὶ Ὀυρία καὶ Χελκία καὶ Μασσία ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ· καὶ εἰς ἀριστερῶν' Φαδαιᾶ καὶ Μυσαῆλ καὶ Μελχιᾶ καὶ Ὀσίμ καὶ Ἀσαβδία καὶ Ζαχαρία καὶ Μοσολλάμ. 5 καὶ ἤνοιξεν Ἕξας τὸ βιβλίον ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· ὥστε αὐτὸς ἦν ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἤνικα ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ, ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς. 6 καὶ ἤνόλγησεν Ἕξας [τὸν] Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τὸν μέγαν, καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ εἶπαν, Ἀμὴν. Καὶ ἤκυψαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. 7 καὶ Ησίον καὶ Βαναῖα καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ὀαβανα καὶ Σαρανία 7 ἦσαν οἱ ἐγείροντες· καὶ Ἀκαίς καὶ Σαβαθαία, καὶ Καμπτάς,

supr., which is there rendered by the syr word here employed. | (4) ἐστήσαν So Ν':—Ν Α, Β, έστησεν. | ὁ ἐποίησαν εἰς τὸ δημηγορῆσαι τῷ λαῷ] So (but with ἐποίησεν, and ἐν ins before τῷ λαῷ) 93 108; other mss om these latter words, as does lat vg:—MSS om the whole. | Μαθαιᾶ Σ alone:—Α Β Ν', Ματανίας:—Ν*, Ματανία. | Ἀνανία] Β, Ἀνανία:—Ν Α, Ανανίας. | Χελκία] So Ν Α:—Β, Ἐλκεία. | Μασσία] So Α:—Ν Β write —σαία, Β also doubles σ. | After Μελχία, Σ ins καὶ Ὀσίμ:—Ν Α, καὶ Ὀσίμ:—Π (and mss ?), καὶ Ἀσίμ:—Ν* Β om. | Σ further ins καὶ Ἀσαβδία:—Ν', καὶ Ἀσαβδανα:—Δ, καὶ Ἀσαβααμα:—Π (mss ?), Ἀσαβδαμά, others variously:—Ν* Β om. | After Ζαχαρία, Σ, with Ν' Α, &c., ins καὶ Μοσολ[λ]αμ:—Π (mss ?), καὶ Μοσολλάμ, others variously:—Ν* Β om. | (6) Ἕξας So Α Ν' (see note on ver. 1 supr.):—Ν* Β om. | τὸν (before Κύριον)] Β, 55:—Ν Α om (as Π, &c. ?). | After Ἀμὴν, Α Ν' ins ἐπάραντες χεῖρας αὐτῶν:—Σ om, with Ρ* Β, 55. | αὐτῶν (after πρόσωπον)] Σ alone. | (7) After Βαναίς, Σ alone ins καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ὀαβανα:—93 108 ins instead, καὶ [οὶ] νοὶ αὐτοῦ:—all else om. | 93 108 further add καὶ Ἱαμείν. | Σαρανία] Σ alone, for Σαραβαί of the rest. | οἱ ἐγείροντες] Σ alone:—all else, συνετέζοντες (without οἱ),—and this reading Σ mg ins (with οἱ). | After this, Ν Α Β proceed, τὸν λαὸν εἰς τὸν νομον:—but before these words Σ interpol, καὶ Ἀκαίς καὶ
καὶ Ἀζαρία, Ἰωζαβαδάμ, Ἀνανί, Φαϊνές, καὶ οἱ Λευίται, ἐδίδασκον τὸν λαὸν ἐκ τὸν νόμον· καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ στάσει 8 αὐτοῦ, 8 καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν ἐν [τῷ] βιβλίῳ [τοῦ] νόμου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐδίδασκεν Ἔξας καὶ διέστελλεν ἐν ἐπιστήμη 9 Κυρίου, καὶ συνήκεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει. ἐπιπλέον Νεεμίας καὶ Ἐξας ὁ ἰερέας καὶ γραμματεύς, καὶ οἱ Λευίται, οἱ συνετίζοντες τὸν λαὸν· καὶ εἶπαν πάντι τῷ λαῷ. Ἡμέρα ἁγία ἐστὶν [τῷ] Κυρίῳ [ἡμῶν], μὴ πενθεῖτε, μηδὲ κλαίετε· ὅτι ἐκλαίεις πᾶς ὁ λαὸς, ὡς ἦκουσέν τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου. 10 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορεύεσθε φάγετε λιπάσματα καὶ πίετε γλυκάσματα· καὶ ἀποστειλάτε μερίδας τοὺς μὴ ἐξουσιοῦν· ὅτι ἡ ἡμέρα ἁγία ἐστὶν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ μὴ διαπέσητε· ὅτι ἡ χαρὰ Κυρίου αὕτη ἐστὶν ἵσχυς ἡμῶν. 11 Καὶ οἱ Λευίται κατεσιώτων τὸν λαὸν λέγοντες· Σιωπᾶτε· ὅτι [ἡ] ἡμέρα ἁγία ἐστὶν· καὶ μὴ καταπίπτετε. 12 ἐπὶ ἀπήλθαν Ἀβαβανία, καὶ Καμπτᾶς, καὶ Ἀζαρία, Ἰωζαβαδάμ, Ἀνανί, Φαϊνές, καὶ οἱ Λευίται, ἐδίδασκον. Σome mss (52 64 74 93 106 108 119 120 121 134 236) ἵνα similarly, but with variations, of which the most notable are, Ἀναφανεί (for Ἀνανί Φαϊνές), ἐπεδίδασκον (for ἐδίδασκον). 8 οἱ συνετίζοντες Σ with 64 93 108:—against MSS, &c. 9 τῷ Κυρίῳ Σ with 74:—A B, with 93 106 119, have Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ,—also Σ (with τῷ before Κυρίῳ). ἡμῶν Σ with 74 106 108 120 121 134 236 243:—N2 B, with P (&c.?), plur. 10 μερίδας Σ with Σ Α, P (&c.?):—B, μερίδα. ἡ χαρὰ Κυρίου αὕτη Σ with 93 (but it subst εὐφροσύνη for χαρὰ,—cp. ver. 17 infr.) 119 243 248,—also (but om αὕτη) 52 64, lat vt vg:—P (and some mss?) read Κύριος only:—Σ Α B, 55 58, om. ἡμῶν Σ with Σ Α, P (&c.?):—Σ Α, ἡμῶν. 11 A pref πάντα to τὸν λαὸν:—Σ, with Σ Β, &c., om. Το ἡμέρα, B, 74 106 108 134, pref ἡ:—Σ Α, P (&c.?), om. ἐστίν] Σ alone.
πᾶς ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν· καὶ ἀποστέλλειν μερίδας
toῖς μὴ ἐξουσιω· καὶ ποιήσαι εὐφροσύνην μεγάλην· ὅτι
συνήκαν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οἷς ἐγνώρισεν αὐτοῖς. 13 Καὶ ἐν 13
tῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν
παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· οἱ οἰρεῖς καὶ οἱ Δευταῖ πρὸς Ἑζραν τὸν
γραμματέα· ἐπιστήσαι πρὸς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου.
14 καὶ εὐροσαν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὁ ἐνετείλατο Κύριος 14
tῷ Μωσῆ· ὅπως κατοικήσωσιν οἱ νῦι· Ἰσραὴλ ἐν σκηναῖς
[ἐν] ἐορτῇ ἐν μνῆ τῷ ἐβδόμῳ. 15 καὶ ὅπως σημάνωσιν σάλ- 15
πιγξὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.
Καὶ ἐίπεν Ἑζρας, Ἑξέλθατε εἰς τὸ ὀρος· καὶ ἐνέγκατε
φύλλα ἐλαίας καὶ φύλλα ξύλου κυπαρισσίου καὶ φύλλα
μυρσίνης καὶ φύλλα φοῖνικος καὶ φύλλα ξύλου δασέως·
ποιήσαι σκηνὰς κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον. 16 Καὶ ἔξῆλθαν ὁ 16
λαὸς, καὶ ἤγεγκαν, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς σκηνὰς· ἀνήρ ἐπὶ
τοῦ δόματος αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν [ταῖς]
αὐλαῖς οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τῆς πόλεως·
καὶ ἢως οἴκου Ἐφραίμ. 17 Καὶ ἐποίησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλη- 17
σία οἱ ἐπιστρέψαντες ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας σκηνὰς· καὶ
ἐκάθισαν ἐν σκηναῖς· ὅτι οὐκ ἐποίησαν ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν Ἰησοῦ

(12) ἀπῆλθαν | Σ alone:—all else, sing. | τοῖς μὴ ἐξουσιω | Σ alone. | (13) παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ | Σ with 93 108:—Β, σὺν τῷ παντὶ λαῷ,—also Α Ν, 55 64 74 106 119 134 236 243 248 (but om σὺν). | (15) Σ rather favours σημάνωσιν (of Ν' Λ), for σημάνωσιν, of Β and the rest. | φοίνικος | Σ alone:—all else plur. | Α alone ins αὐτοῖς after σκηνὰς. | (16) ἔξῆλθαν | Σ alone:—all else sing. | αὐτοῖς | Β, ἵνα τοῖς. | οἴκου (before Ἐφραίμ) | Α, 44 52 58 64 71 74 106 119 120 121 134 236 243: | Α Ν, &c., πέλας. | (17) ἐποίησεν | Σ alone:—all else plur. (but Α
ναυν Ναυήν οὕτως οί νιοί Ἰσραήλ· ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης. 18 καὶ ἐγένετο εὐφροσύνη μεγάλη. 18 καὶ ἄνεγνω ἐν βιβλίῳ νόμου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέραν ἐν ἡμέρα· ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης· ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἐσχάτης. καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑορτὴν ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας. καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὑγδόῃ ἐξόδιοι, κατὰ τὸ κρίμα. 1

1 Καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εἰκοστῇ καὶ τετάρτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦτον συνήχθεσαν οἱ νιοὶ Ἰσραήλ ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ἐν σάκκοις καὶ 2 κόνις ἐπὶ κεφαλῶν αὐτῶν. 2 καὶ ἐκκυμονεῖσαι οἱ νιοὶ Ἰσραήλ ἀπὸ παντὸς νιοῦ ἄλλοτρίου καὶ ἐστησαν καὶ ἔξεγόρευσαν τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν τῶν 3 πατέρων αὐτῶν. 3 καὶ ἐστησαν ἐπὶ [τῇ] στάσει αὐτῶν καὶ ἄνεγνωσαν ἐν βιβλίῳ νόμου Θεοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἦσαν ἐξάγορευοντες τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ προσκυνοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ αὐτῶν.

ἐποίησα, by inadvertence). | (18) κατὰ τὸ κρίμα] Ν' Α, Ρ (&c.?) :— Ν* Β, 55, om.

IX. (1) καὶ κόνις ἐπὶ κεφαλῶν αὐτῶν] Σ with 93 108; similarly (but with στόδον for κόνις) Ρ (&c.?) ; but all except Σ read κεφαλῆς (for —λῶν) ;—all else om. | (2) τὴν ἀνομίαν] Σ alone :—all else plur. | (4) Θεῷ] So Ν* Β :—Ν' Α, Ρ (&c.), pref Κυρίῳ.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES

ON THE ABOVE SYRIAC AND GREEK TEXTS.
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES.

In the attempt to render back into Greek the proper names which occur in the foregoing extracts, much difficulty has been found, and certainty seems unattainable.

The usage of the LXX varies, even in treating one and the same name: sometimes it is reshaped by the addition of a Greek termination; sometimes it is merely transliterated (e.g., for ἶλη we find Μακασγ, Μακασγς),—and in such transliteration no definite rules appear to have been followed.

The Syro-Hexaplar version in its turn is similarly inconstant in its method of forming Syriac representatives for the names as exhibited in the LXX.

Semitic words do not readily lend themselves to be expressed in Greek letters: the differences between the Greek alphabet on one hand, and the Semitic (Hebrew or Syriac) on the other, stand in the way. The gutturals especially of the Semitic, which occur so often, are the main hindrance.—For heth (at the beginning of a word), the aspirate sometimes stands in Greek—but it may also stand for he: or χ may be employed—but it more properly represents kaph. Still more difficult is it to deal with the peculiarly Semitic 'ain ('e). It has no possible equivalent among Greek consonants, and its presence can only be denoted by a modification of the vowels of the syllable to which it belongs; but this is done with no uniformity. So the labial vau may pass not only into v or ov, but into av, o, or even o.

Conversely, in the counter process of rendering into Syriac the names as they are found in the Greek, the difficulty recurs. The Syro-Hexaplar translator, in reproducing in Semitic dress the graecized names, is similarly hindered, and equally far from uniform. Sometimes he is content to transliterate, but with little consistency in his choice of letters; sometimes he seeks more or less fully to restore to the names their original Hebrew shape.
The present attempt, therefore, to recover the Greek forms which underlie the Syriac, is in many cases merely conjectural. There is not much guidance to be found in it from the Greek manuscripts of the LXX, which vary among themselves too much to be relied on. The practical rule followed in each case has been: among the Greek variants to select the one (if there be any such) which seems to come nearest to the Syriac, and to transliterate the Syriac into as close agreement with that Greek variant as it admits of.

When the Syriac fails to determine between two or more readings of the Greek, I have usually adopted that of cod. B; but in some places, when the immediate context shows signs of other influences, I have preferred to follow A, or the group of cursives (19, 93, 108 . . .) with whose text that represented by our Syriac had (as our Apparatus shows) a close affinity.

GENESIS.


Ib. I fill the gap in the MS before λευσ, by ἄτι, to represent ἄρχιστράτηγος of LXX,—as 3 Reg. ii. 32 (LXX and Syr.-Hxp.).

27. The MS does not prefix α (= καὶ) to ἀκροβ λ (= ἔμεις), but leaves room before ἀκροβ λ for either α or ἄτι (= δέ). I have printed [ατι],—agreeing with δέ, which all Gr. write here. A stop is to be inserted before ἀκροβ λ.

31. The reading οἰκία (= ὁμοσαυ, as most Gr.) may safely be accepted, though but imperfectly legible in MS,—in preference to ἡμοσαυ (= ὁμοσαυ, as E).

1 CHRONICLES.

I. 24. ἡδαίσνα] sic in MS; but no doubt ἡδαίσνα is intended.

II. 3. ἀνάλο (ἐν ἄναλο) (= τῆς θυγατρίδος Ἰσααὶ) The Syr. may as probably represent Ἰσααὶ (see note on Gr. text, p. 37 supr.). If our
translator referred from his Gr. text to the Hebrew, which reads  "Aχαρ (Iσραηλ), he might readily mistake it for the familiar* "Aχαρ (Iσραηλ). But it is more probable that his is to be corrected into  Σαβας or Σων of the LXX (A, or 19, 108).

7. [H]ere the Syr., in its rendering of "Aχαρ ὁ ἐμποδοστάτης Ἰσραήλ (LXX), restores the paronomasia of the Hebrew,  עלר ירבר ישראיל, which is unavoidably lost in the Gr. (as in the English, "Achar the troubler of Israel").

But this paronomasia in the Hebr. is effected by changing the name of the person here mentioned, from  שלב (of Joshua vii. 1, &c.—"Achan) to  ירבר ("Achar) as here.—It was no doubt suggested by the words of Joshua (vii. 25) to Achan, חא עלברנו עלבריה רות ("Why hast thou troubled us! the LORD shall trouble thee"); yet neither Syr.-Hxp. (which uses  יִהְיָה), nor Pesh. (מַלָּא) introduces the Syr. equivalent (χαρ) of  עלבר in that place. The rendering of the LXX is  ἀλήθρευσας, which Syr.-Hxp. represents.—All Gr. codices read Ἀχάρ here: B (influenced no doubt by this passage) reads Ἀχάρ in Jos. vii. also; while A in both places adheres to the Hebr. (reading Ἀχάιν in Jos., Ἀχάρ here).

'Εμποδοστάτης, the LXX rendering of  עלבר in this verse, in turn rendered  προσεχος by our Syr. (Pesh., προσεχος), is a word found only in late writers, and very rare,—nowhere else in LXX. But the verb ἐμποδοστάτω occurs once,—Judic. xi. 35 (as read by M N, and some ms., with slight variation,—and by A in a corrupt form),† where Jephthah's words to his daughter, ἱνά ρω ἔλθη γεννάρ ("thou art among them that trouble me"), are rendered ἐμπεποδοστάτηκας με [or μοι]; and in Syr.-Hxp., אֶּלֶּהֶהֶהֶה אֱּלֶּהֶהֶה.‡ Thus the Syr. at once adheres to the Hebr. in employing the root הָלַך (לך), and closely reproduces the Gr., by rendering as if ἐμπόδιον ἔστηκας μοι. (Note that of the above three verbal nouns from this root, אֱּלֶּהֶהֶה and אֱּלֶּהֶהֶה stand for ὅ ἐμποδιζών, אֱּלֶּהֶהֶה for τὸ ἐμποδιζών.) Thus

* The name is so written in these later Books.
† A writes εἰμποδοστάτης καὶ σέμνοτατη. For καὶ, read—κας;—for σέμνο—, σου μοι, and omit the—τατη (repeated from before καὶ), and the sentence, ἐμποδοστάτηκας σοῦ μοι is restored, nearly as in the other codices. See further in Field's Origens Hexapli., in loc.
‡ See Skat-Rördam, Libri Judic. et Ruth, in loc.
the passage Judic. xi. 35, teaches us to understand here ἐπιθετητής, as = ἐπιθετῶν ἑστηκὼς.

The verb ἐπιθετητῶ is explained by the Lexicons as = ἐπιθέτων γένομαι, ἐπιθέτων ἑστηκών, &c., and is cited from Diogenes Laert., x. 25 (οὕτω ἐπιθετηται). I find it also in a papyrus of B.C. 117, in the sense of "obstructing" (Tebtunis Papyri, 24, col. 3).

II. The ῥιββίοι over κ αί is a mere scribe's error, as in other cases in our MS;—see notes (Syr. text) on iii. 1, vi. 46, 47 infr. A like remark applies to the substitution of α for ά, of which examples are noted under ii. 13, iii. 2.

16. Here, and ver. 17, as in the parallel, 2 Reg. xvii. 25, the Gr. gives Ἁβραάμ (all codd.) ; and similarly where the other Abigail is named (1 Reg. xxv. 3, &c.; xxx. 5; 2 Reg. ii. 2; iii. 3. But Syr.-Hxp. here (it is not extant in 1 and 2 Reg.), with the Hebrew (followed by Pesh.) in all these places, writes the final lōmad.—Possibly the Gr. form of the name may be an early copyist's error, in misreading Α for Λ.

III. 5. Βηθσαβε] In this place, and everywhere (2 Reg. xi. 3; xii. 24; 3 Reg. i. 11, 15, 28, 31; ii. 13, 18, 19; Ps. l.[li.] 2[heading]) B writes Βηθσαβε: A writes Βηθσαβε: in the first four places (in 2 and 3 Reg.); but in the rest and here, as B: so too Ν in Ps. l. (Ν is not extant in Reg., or here). Our version here writes ᾱσαβε ( = θβ-γατὴ Σεβά) ; as also 3 Reg. i. 11 (marg. [Symmachus]) and i. 28 (txt). The Hebr. is in this place לָשתְרַב (cp. ii. 3, supr.); elsewhere always לָשתְרַב. It can hardly be doubted that Βηθσαβε, though so strongly vouched, is an early error, arising from confusion of the woman's name with the familiar place-name.

20. There is some Gr. authority for Ὄολ (see Parsons' note in loc.), and it agrees with the Hebr. לַתַּפ. It may be that the Syr. לַפ does not need to be corrected as suggested in note to p. 7; and that the Ὄοα of A and Ὄοα of B are corruptions due to the similarity of A and Λ (as in Note supr. on ii. 16).

2 CHRONICLES.

XXVI. 16. I have inserted ἑτδιασεν, in place of ἑδικησεν which all Gr. MSS and mss read here, as the word represented by the Syr. אֲמָה. My reasons for venturing on this emendation are as follows:
(a) In the places (but six in all) where the rare verb ἀκηδιῶ occurs in LXX, it is uniformly rendered in Syr.-Hexp. by ὧν ἐμοί.

(b) The verb ἀδικῶ (which is common) is nowhere so rendered, nor would such rendering be admissible.

(c) The marginal reading Ἰαῦς, which is a proper and usual rendering of ἰδίκησεν, indicates that either our translator, or the scribe of our MS or of some one of its ancestors, knew ἰδίκησεν as a variant and recorded it as being suitable to the context.

(d) The resemblance between the two Gr. words is sufficiently close to account for the substitution of the familiar ἰδίκησεν for the comparatively unusual ἱκηδίασεν,—perhaps unknown to the scribe.

It is to be added that the verb ἀκηδιῶ fairly represents the verb ἦν, which, followed by the prefix ἦν, expresses in the Hebr. of this passage the offence of Uzziah against the Lord in his irreverent intrusion, whereas ἀδικῶ is inadequate. No instance however of ἀκηδιῶ = ἦν in LXX is forthcoming.—But the question here is not whether the LXX translator wrote ἱκηδίασεν here, but whether it was so written in the copy of LXX followed by his Syriac translator.

There are two (but only two) examples in LXX of ἀδικῶ = ἦν,—(1) Ezech. xvii. 20, ἀδικῶ ἦν ἰδίκησεν ἐν ἐμοί (A Q with #,—not B); and (2) Ezech. xxxix. 26, ἀδικῶ ἦν ἰδίκησαν. Note that in the former instance we have also a parallel (ἰδίκησεν ἐν ἐμοί) for the unusual construction of our marginal reading, ἰδίκησεν ἐν Κυρίῳ in the present verse. The dative after ἐν, following ἀδικῶ, properly expresses the matter in which—not the person against whom—offence is committed.—Possibly the two passages in Ezech. ought to be similarly emended by reading ἀκηδίαν . . . ἱκηδίασεν [—σαν]. But in both places the Syr. reads = ἴαςτε . . . Ἰαῦς.

XXIX. 31, 32. In these verses our translator distinguishes between ἀλοκαύτωσις and ἀλοκαύτωμα. The former he represents by ἴαςτε (vv. 32 bis, 35 bis) = "completion of burnt offering," i.e., the act of offering,—the latter by ἴαςτε ἱππα (ver. 31 ; xxx. 15) = "entire burnt offering," i.e., the sacrifice offered. But in the earlier Books of Old Test. he is not careful to mark this distinction.

XXXIII. 3. ἀλογη] Here, and throughout, the Syro-Hexaplar follows the LXX when it uses ἀλογε (as it normally does) to render the
Hebrew רָקְבָּא or רָקְבָּאשָׁל,—whence the "lucus" of the Old Latin* and the Vulgate, and the "grove" of A.V.—Accordingly in this place ἁλογη is represented by רָקְבָּא [this use of רָקְבָּא is idiomatic].—

lit., ὀἰκὸν φυτευμάτων = φυτευτήρα ("plantaria," "plantations").

But it is to be noted that, whereas the LXX uniformly employ ἁλογος (not φυτευτήροις or ἁλης or δρόμοις) in this peculiar acceptation, our translator—though in the earlier Books (Exodus, Judges—his Deuteronomy is not extant) he renders it as here by רָקְבָּא—in 3 and 4 Reg., in every instance, substitutes רָקְבָּא. [The places are,—

(a) Exod. xxxiv. 13; Judic. iii. 7; vi. 25–30; (b) 3 Reg. xiv. 15, 23; xv. 13; xvi. 33; xviii. 4; xxi. 3, 7; xxxiii. 4–15.] Even in 4 Reg. xxi. 3, which is parallel and almost identical verbally in the Greek with the verse of 2 Chr. we are now engaged on, we find רָקְבָּא instead of רָקְבָּא. There is no apparent reason for this change of rendering, which is contrary to the translator's habitual practice of uniformity. The noun רָקְבָּא denotes "a thicket" merely, whether natural or other; while רָקְבָּא rather implies "a plantation" (artificial), and thus may better express an ἁλογος dedicated to use in worship. But this consideration applies alike to all the places above referred to, and does not account for the variation from the latter to the former and back again.—In the Prophets, there is but one example of ἁλογος thus used (Mic. v. 13 [14]) ; and here Syr.-Hxp. has רָקְבָּא. Except in that place, the use of this rendering is found in no book in the Syr.-Hxp. after Judges, until we find it here in 2 Chron. We may reasonably infer that it was similarly used in the lost parts of this Book.—

In 1 Reg., the LXX employ ἁλογη to render יֹאָר (vii. 3, 4; xii. 10). Neither 1 nor 2 Reg. is now extant in Syr.-Hxp.; but the Syr. Pecul. of Masius testifies (s.v.) that his manuscript in 1 Reg. xii. [10]—and, we may infer, in the other places likewise—gave the rendering רָקְבָּא.

The Peshitta renders רָקְבָּא variously, but nowhere as LXX and Syr.-Hxp.; in Exodus and Deuteronomy and the Books of Samuel and

* See Lucif. Calar., De non Conv. e. Haeret., 221.

† The above facts suggest the enquiry whether the hand of a collaborator may not be traced in the Books 1-4 Reg. It is to be noted that our translator in his subscription to 4 Reg. specially acknowledges the "labour and care" of 'Mar Thomas, Syncellus of the Patriarch Mar Athanasius" (not improbably Thomas of Harkol), in helping him in the work (De Lagarde, Bibliothecae Syricae, p. 256, line 32, edn. 1892. See also D.C. B., vol. iv, p. 1015).
Kings, by Καλαχ (= φόβος or φόβητρον, thence σεβασμα);—in Judges, by Εχαρά ( = ἀστάρτη); in 2 Chron. vaguely by such words as Καλά (= εἰκών), or (as here, strangely) by Ἐχαρά ( = πάρδαλις (!)).

6. The rendering of our version, ἔν γὰρ Βεεν-νόμ, represents the text of A; and is of course a corrupted form of the ἐν γάρ Βαρέ Εννόμ—the transliteration by which B endeavours to reproduce בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּل בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּل בָּל בָּל בָּל בָּl b...
But as the words stand in our MS, they seem unmeaning,—[אנהנה]

tοῦ oικητηρίου τοῦ οἰκου. I have therefore ventured to assume that אנהנה (= τῆς βάρεως, see last note) is to be read for אנהנה,—so as to represent a reading, τᾶς πυλας τοῦ oικητηρίου [or οἰκου] τῆς βάρεως,—nearly reproducing the words read (as above) by 19, 93, 108, and the corrector of נ.

IV. 17. אנהנה אנהנה אנהנה אנהנה] Here our Syr. in its last three words (= ἐν ὀπλοὶς ὀπλισμένοι ἡπαν) represents a Gr. text which diverges widely from the Gr. of the LXX (καὶ οἱ αἱροντες ἐν τοῖς ἀρτήροις ἐν ὀπλοῖς [or, ἐνοπλοι]) ; and the Gr. no less widely from the Hebr. original (הוֹרִיאָּאְה הָבְּבָל עִמְּשְׁ דָּוָה).

(a) The Hebr. is obscure: it is literally rendered, "and they that bare in the burden, carrying [or, loading]." But it appears that ישנה (="to bear") with ב prefixed to its object, means "to take part in bearing" (of which construction, Ezek. xviii. 19, 20 bis ; Job vii. 13, are examples). Thus the meaning will be, "They that (collectively) bare the burdens, each of them while carrying, [as he worked with one hand held a weapon in the other]."

But (b) the Gr. translator has taken the noun בִּלְלָל with prefix ב to denote not "the burden borne," but "the instrument [pole, or thong] by which it was borne." As pointed, בִּלְלָל has no such meaning, but it seems possible that with other points it might be so rendered, as the LXX must have understood it when they represented it by τοῖς ἀρτήροις. The word ἀρτήρο is rare ; but is used by a late writer of uncertain date (Josephus, distinguished as "Christianus") to express* the "staves" (בָּרֵךְ ; LXX, ἀναφορεῖς, Exod. xxv. 12 (13),—again, ἰωστῆρες, ib., xxxvii. 4) by which the Ark was borne.—So far, then, the LXX rendering can be accounted for; but the following words, ἐν ὀπλοῖς,—or even the variant ἕνοπλοι (of some mss, including 93, 108), are utterly remote from בִּלְלָל, which would properly be rendered φοροῦντες (or the like), or else ἐπιγεμίζοντες,—One is inclined to suspect that the LXX text is corrupt, that ἐν ὀπλοῖς is a dittograph for ἐν τοῖς ἀρτήροις (ὀπλα being used in its primary sense of "implements"), and that the equivalent for בִּלְלָל has dropped out.

(c) The Syro-Hexaplar translator has been misled, apparently by this aberration of the LXX, into writing אנהנה (=? ἐν ὀπλοῖς) as

* Hypomnesticum, lib. v., cap. 3.
sufficient (see above under (b)) to represent ἐν τοῖς ἀρτησιν—for which latter word no equivalent may have presented itself to his mind. But we are still at a loss to account for his ἔνοπλοι, unless it stands for ἔνοπλοι, which his exemplar may have read as an addition to, not a variant for, ἐν ὅπλοις,—so that the Gr. as known to him would be ἐν ὅπλοις ἔνοπλοι.

(d) The Peshitta agrees with LXX in its interpretation of בְּסַכְלָ, which it renders כָּכַסִּים,—the noun being the same by which, in the above-cited places of Exod., it renders בִּרְי, as does also Syr.-Hxp. in those places. But Pesh. avoids the error of LXX as to לְכַסִים, which it renders with substantial correctness, but not happily, by כָּכַסִים, the same participle which it employs just before as = נִלְנָאי. Inasmuch, then, as the Syr.-Hxp. translator, who no doubt had the Pesh. at hand, could have followed it in rendering ἀρτησιν by כָּכַסִים, it appears probable that in his Gr. exemplar ἐν ὅπλοις was read for ἐν τοῖς ἀρτησιν. This consideration tends to confirm the suggestion that his Greek may have read ἐν ὅπλοις ἔνοπλοι, as above, under (c).
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