

ESSAYS

IN

BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC CRITICISM

VOL. II.

London
HENRY FROWDE



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

✓
STUDIA

BIBLICA ET ECCLESIASTICA

ESSAYS

CHIEFLY

IN BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC CRITICISM

BY

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD

VOLUME II

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

MDCCCXC

[*All rights reserved*]

Oxford

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE.

THE present volume is a further instalment of a number of Essays which have accumulated in a rather leisurely way since the publication of the first series of *Studia Biblica* in 1885. It is hoped that a third volume may follow shortly. It will be seen that, as in the first series, the Essays are not all of the same character. Some are a survey of work already done; others break more or less new ground. If some of the points discussed appear minute and technical, this will not, we think, need any justification to those who are accustomed to historical inquiry. It is just these minuter points which often furnish the clue for wider investigations, and so either change the face of familiar history or enable us to penetrate into regions hitherto unexplored. Neither do we feel much called upon to justify the attaching to some of the Essays both in this and the coming volume of a perhaps unusual number of *Appendices* and notes not always by the same hand as the Essay to which they belong. We hope that they will be taken as evidence (1) of a desire to keep pace with the ever-growing body of knowledge, and (2) of the spirit of co-operation in which the work has been done. In view of this spirit and of the increasing number of students who are turning their attention seriously to Theology, it is not likely that there would be any dearth of materials for future volumes if the

reception given to those which are now appearing should be such as to encourage the continuance of the series. Our hearty thanks are due to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for their willingness to undertake a publication which has but little prospect of being remunerative, however much it may serve to stimulate and promote the studies with which it is connected.

A slight addition has been made to the title of the series, so as to cover more accurately a rather miscellaneous collection of subjects. The fifth of these is part of a prize essay, read according to custom in the Divinity School; the last essay was read to a diocesan society at Salisbury, and the appendix to it before the Oxford Philological Society; the remainder were read in the manner described in the preface to the preceding volume. Many other papers have been read which have been either published in periodicals or incorporated in larger works.

Our thanks are due to Mr. C. H. Turner for help in the final correction of the proofs.

S. R. DRIVER.
T. K. CHEYNE.
W. SANDAY.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
I. The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish authorities	1
AD. NEUBAUER, M.A., Exeter College, Reader in Rabbinical Literature and Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, &c. ; May 20, 1889.	
II. The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels	59
F. H. WOODS, B.D., Tutor of St. John's College ; Nov. 16, 1886.	
Synoptic Table	98
III. The Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom	105
C. H. TURNER, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College ; Oct. 31, 1887.	
Appendix I. On a Paschal Homily printed in St. Chrysostom's works, ascribed by Ussher to A. D. 672, but really belonging to A. D. 387	130
Appendix II. Passages from Ancient Writers who employ Kalendars of the Asiatic type, giving side by side a Roman and a native dating	149
Note.—On the new matter contained in the Second Edition (1889) of Bishop Lightfoot's Apostolic Fathers (Part ii. St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, vol. i. pp. 626-722)	151
IV. The Clementine Homilies	157
C. BIGG, D.D., late Student of Christ Church ; Feb. 2, 1885.	

	PAGE
V. The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament	195
Ll. J. M. BEBB, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College; June 13, 1888.	
Note.—W. S.	240
VI. The Ammonian Sections, Eusebian Canons, and Harmonizing Tables in the Syriac Tetraevangelium .	241
G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D., Fellow of Hertford College; March 8, 1886. (<i>With facsimile.</i>)	
Appendix I	267
Appendix II	270
„ „ Note	271
Additional Note.—W. S.	272
VII. The Codex Amiatinus and its Birthplace	273
H. J. WHITE, M.A., Christ Church; Dec. 3, 1889.	
Appendix. On the Italian Origin of the Codex Amiatinus and the Localizing of Italian MSS. . . .	309
W. SANDAY, M.A., Exeter College, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis; Nov. 29, 1889.	

I.

THE AUTHORSHIP AND THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS ACCORDING TO EARLY JEWISH AUTHORITIES.

[AD. NEUBAUER.]

WHATEVER dates may be assigned to the various books of the Old Testament, there can be no doubt that the narrative parts of it contain many old reminiscences, and if so, we may take it for granted that the Hebrews from the earliest time of their settlement in the promised land made use of musical instruments, and consequently of some kind of singing. We do not intend to lay great stress upon the passage¹ in which a writer seeks to trace the invention of musical instruments to Tubal-Cain. But music was generally used in cases of rejoicing, private as well as public. Isaiah exclaimed²: ‘And the harp and the lute, the tabret and the pipe, and wine are *in* their feasts;’ and in another passage we read³: ‘The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth.’ An earlier prophet says⁴: ‘that sing idle songs to the sound of the viol; that devise for themselves instruments of music, like David.’ Here we see that the early prophet of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes ascribes to David⁵ the highest perfection in using musical instruments; this statement probably gave rise to the idea that the great king was the unlimited author of the Psalms. One of the great losses with the destruction of the first Temple is said to be, that ‘the elders have ceased from the

¹ Gen. iv. 21.

² Is. v. 12.

³ Is. xxiv. 8.

⁴ Amos vi. 5.

⁵ Unless the name has here some mythological reference, e. g. Dod.

2 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

gate. The young men from their music¹. On the other hand, one of the delights of the author of Ecclesiastes (a work without doubt written after the return from the captivity) was, as he says²: 'I gat me men singers and women singers.' Of course the use of musical instruments was not confined to the Hebrews only. It is mentioned by a prophet, writing during the exile, in connection with the Babylonians, when he says of their proud king³: 'Thy pomp is brought down to hell, *and* the noise of thy viols.' In the book of Daniel⁴ also musical instruments are mentioned on the occasion of public performances in Babylon: 'To you it is commanded, O peoples, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye will fall down and worship the golden image.' For public occasions with the Hebrews, we may refer to the consecration of Solomon as the successor of David, where it is said⁵: 'And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy.' And when Jehoshaphat returned from a successful war against the Moabites and the Ammonites, we find, at least in the Chronicles, the following statement⁶: 'And they came to Jerusalem with psalteries and harps and trumpets unto the house of the Lord.' The prophets recited their visions under the influence of music⁷, and this art was also employed to cure depression of spirit⁸. It would seem that in the earliest period the performances of music, together with dances, were given mostly by women, such as was the case with Miryam⁹, the daughter of Jephthah¹⁰, and the women who came to greet David¹¹. The same was the case in Phœnicia¹², as well as in Greece and Italy¹³. Perhaps the earliest prophecies were spoken by women, as might be concluded from the names of

¹ Lam. v. 14.

² Eccl. ii. 8.

³ Isaiah xiv. 11.

⁴ Dan. iii. 5, 15.

⁵ 1 Kings i. 40.

⁶ 2 Chron. xx. 28.

⁷ 1 Sam. x. 5; 2 Kings iii. 15.

⁸ 1 Sam. xvi. 16.

⁹ Exod. xv. 20.

¹⁰ Judg. xi. 34.

¹¹ 1 Sam. xviii. 6.

¹² Isaiah xxiii. 16.

¹³ Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, art. 'Musik.'

Miryam, of Deborah, and in later times of Huldah, whose influence must have been great, even at the time when the new book of the Law was found¹.

Whether musical instruments were employed in the service of the first Temple, we have no authentic evidence. The chronicler² informs us that David introduced a regular service in the Temple, in which the various classes of the Levites took part with different instruments at the occasion of the various sacrifices³. But the statements of the author of Chronicles, writing about 300 B. C., are scarcely an authority for the period earlier than that of the Temple built by Zerubbabel. However, with the spirit of conservatism amongst the Jews, it would not be too hazardous to suppose that the service of the Temple of Zerubbabel was in a certain respect modelled on that used in the Temple of Solomon. If it were certain that the word 'song' (שיר), in the words of the 137th Psalm, 'Sing us one of the songs of Zion,' means a Psalm, which is possible and even probable, since many of the Psalms are headed by the word 'song,' one might conclude that the captives were required to sing, accompanied with the harp, one of the Psalms used in the Temple of Zion. To speak with certainty concerning the liturgies in the Temple, it can only be said that Talmudic traditions mention a number of Psalms which were recited during the service of the Herodian Temple. It is true that these traditions were collected after the destruction of this Temple, nevertheless a great part of them were preserved orally from doctors who witnessed the service of the Temple; moreover, these traditions contain also information concerning other parts of the Temple service besides the use of the Psalms, information which agrees with the data of Josephus, who wrote as an eye-witness, and therefore the Talmudic traditions may be taken as authentic. Adding to these arguments the conservatism proper to the

¹ 2 Kings xxii. 14; Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 52.

² 1 Chron. xvi. 4; xxv. 1.

³ 2 Chron. v. 12; vii. 6; xxix. 25; xxx. 21; xxxv. 15.

4 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

Jewish nation, one may conclude that in the pre-Herodian Temple Psalms were already sung with an accompaniment of music¹. Josephus indeed speaks² of the Levite ἱμνωδοί, and according to the Talmud the singing of the Levites formed a vital part of the various services. Thus it is said in the Mishnah³: 'The moment they gave to the priest the wine of outpouring, the *Segan*⁴ stood in the corner (near the priest) with two flags in his hands; two priests, standing near the table where the fat was lying, with two silver trumpets in their hands, were blowing a loud alarm with the trumpets⁵. They then drew near to Ben Arza⁶, one on each side. When the priest bowed down to pour out the wine, the Segan gave a sign with the flags, Ben Arza beat with the cymbal, and the Levites recited the song. When they came to the end of the song (Psalm) the priests blew the trumpet, and the people fell upon their faces. This was done for each pause during the service of the daily sacrifice.' The next Mishnah enumerates the Psalms used during the week in the Temple, viz. Sundays, Ps. xxiv; Mondays, xlviii; Tuesdays, lxxxii; Wednesdays, xciv; Thursdays, lxxxi; Fridays, xciii; and on the Sabbath, xcii. Indeed the Greek translation of the Psalms has in the superscriptions most of these indications of the days⁷; the Hebrew text has only the one for the Sabbath, viz. Ps. xcii. Whether the other superscriptions were omitted purposely, as Dr. Graetz thinks⁸, or whether the omissions are the work of a careless copyist, must be left an open question. We believe the last to be the case, for no reason whatever can be given for an intentional omission, unless we accept an hypothesis which will be found later on⁹. In another Mishnah¹⁰ it is said on the occasion of the feast of

¹ Graetz, *Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen* (1882), p. 53.

² *Ant.* xx. ix. 6.

³ *Thamid* vii. 3.

⁴ The *locum tenens*.

⁵ I. e. various tunes of the trumpets.

⁶ One of the most skilful musicians.

⁷ *Viz.* 48 (47); 94 (93); 93 (92); 91 (90).

⁸ *Loc. cit.* (note 1), p. 89.

⁹ See p. 5.

¹⁰ *Sukkah* v. 4.

Waterpouring¹: 'The pious and men of good deeds² were dancing before the spectators, holding torches in their hands and reciting songs and praises. The Levites, with harps, *nabla*, cymbals, trumpets, and other instruments, were without number on the fifteen steps which lead from the hall of Israel to the hall of the women, reciting songs.' Again, for the service of the Paschal lamb, it is said in the Mishnah³ that 'batches of men one after another followed with their sacrifice, and before going out they recited the *Hallel* Psalms (exiii to cxvii).' In another Mishnah⁴ the minimum and maximum of the sounds of trumpets and of instruments used for the service of the sacrifices are given. Similar instructions are given in other Mishnahs⁵. Single Psalms were used on new-moon days⁶, on the feast of Dedication⁷, and even for the occasion when Jerusalem was enlarged⁸. One might have expected to find superscriptions mentioning these various occasions, but they were probably omitted because all the Levites knew the Psalms which were used; however, in some copies they may have stood for teaching purposes, and such a copy the Greek translators may have had before them in a foreign country, where the service was not so well known as in Palestine, and more especially in Jerusalem. Unfortunately our Massoretic text is made from copies which had not all superscriptions, as far as I can judge from the earliest Jewish translators and commentators.

Other headings have reference undoubtedly to instruments used for accompanying the singers, many of which are difficult to explain. A certain number of headings give a kind of historical introduction to show on what occasion the Psalms in question were composed. Such are Psalms iii, vii (?), xviii,

¹ John vii. 37. ² The meaning of the words מְצַדִּים מְצַדִּים is not certain.

³ Pesahim v. 7.

⁴ Erakhin ii. 3.

⁵ Rosh hash-Shanah iv. 1, 9.

⁶ B. T. Sukkah, fol. 54 b. Pss. civ and cv according to Masekheth Sopherim xvii. 11 (Dr. J. Müller's note, 40, p. 247).

⁷ Ps. xxxi according to Mas. Sopherim xviii. 2, which is most likely meant by the heading of this Psalm.

⁸ Graetz, *Psalmen* etc., p. 60.

6 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

xli, lii, lvi, lvii, lix, lx, lxiii, and cxlii. How far back the headings date it is not our object to investigate here. They are certainly added by the compiler, and before the Greek translation, which is much later than that of the Pentateuch. These translators, however, were not then acquainted with the exact meaning of them.

But before proceeding to the exposition of the titles, as given by Rabbinical and Karaïtical authors, it will perhaps be worth while to state their opinion concerning the authorship of the Psalms.

We possess no early Midrash on the Psalms; the Midrash Tilim is the earliest, of the end of the tenth century¹, and even there we find nothing concerning the authorship of the book of the Psalms. The earliest passage concerning it is the famous one in the Babylonian Talmud², relating to the order of the Old Testament and to the authors of the various books. Here it is said that David wrote Tilim with the help³ of ten elders, viz. Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah. On the question made why Ethan is not mentioned, Rab (who lived in the third century) replied that Ethan was identical with Abraham; this is explained by Agadical analogy. Another question was asked to the effect that Moses and Heman are identical according to the Agadah; Rab, however, stated the contrary.

In the Midrash on the Canticles⁴ we find the following statement: 'Ten men said the Psalms, viz. Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomo, to these five all agree. For the other five, Rab says, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, the three sons of Korah (who make one author), and Ezra. R. Johanan said, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (who make one), the

¹ Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 266 sqq. A new critical edition is expected from the skilful hand of Herr S. Buber.

² Baba Bathra, fol. 14 b.

³ The exact meaning of עֵלֵי is not certain here. See below, p. 28.

⁴ iv. 4. Belongs probably to the end of the ninth century. Zunz, *G. V.* (note 1), p. 64.

three sons of Korah, and Ezra. Elsewhere we find the opinion of Rab attributed to Johanan and *vice versa*¹, which is of no importance for our purpose. R. Hoonâ, in the name of R. Aha, speaks as follows: ‘Although ten men said Tilim, they were not reported in their names, but only in David’s name. This resembles the case of a band of singers who intended to address hymns to a king, and to whom the king answered, “You are all sweet, all pious men, all worthy to sing hymns before me, but this man will sing them for you, because his voice is so sweet.” Thus, when these ten pious men sought to recite Tilim, God said, “You are sweet, pious, and worthy to say hymns before me, but David will recite them for you all, for his voice is sweeter, as it is said, And the sweet psalmist of Israel².”’

Concerning the postscript of Psalm lxxii, ‘The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended,’ R. Meir (who lived in the second century) says³: ‘All songs and praises found in the book of Tilim were said by David, as it is written, “Then ended the prayers of David.” Do not read עָלָה “ended,” but עָלָה-לְךָ⁴ “all these” are the prayers of David.’

That David said some Psalms, or all of them, by the Holy Spirit, is not distinctly stated in the Talmudic literature, so far as we know, but it may be taken as implied in the continuation of the passage just mentioned, which is as follows⁵: ‘R. Eliezer (who lived at the end of the first century) said, David said all the Psalms on his own account; R. Joshua said, on the account of the congregation; the wise men, i.e. the majority of the school, made a compromise, saying, some of them are said on account of himself, and others on account of the congregation, viz. those Psalms in which the singular form is employed David said on account of himself, and where the plural form is to be found he said on account of

¹ See the Commentary with the title of *Mathnoth Kehunah*.

² 2 Sam. xxiii. 1.

³ B. T. Pesachim, fol. 117 a.

⁴ Perhaps עָלָה, the ך disappearing in the pronunciation.

⁵ B. T. Pesachim, fol. 117 a.

8 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

the congregation ; when the words נָצַח and נָנֹן occur, the Psalm refers to the future ; מְשֻׁבֵּל means recited by an interpreter ; לְרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ means that the Holy Spirit was resting upon him when he said the song ; מִמְנוֹ לְרוּחַ means that David first said the Psalm and then the Holy Spirit rested upon him¹. The Holy Spirit is explained by the word שְׂכִינָה. The gospels also imply the belief that the 110th Psalm was said by David in the Holy Spirit². We shall find that mediæval Jewish commentators in agreement with the rabbis attribute the Psalms to David speaking under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

For completeness sake we shall just state that in the same Talmudic passage ten classes of Psalms are spoken of. They are introduced, it is there said, with ten expressions, נָצַח, נָנֹן, מְשֻׁבֵּל, מִמְנוֹ, שִׁיר, אֲשֶׁרִי, תְּהִלָּה, תְּהִלָּה, הוֹדָאָה, הוֹדָאָה, הַלְלוּיָהּ. This last is the most important, because these Psalms contain both song and prose. Let us state at once that no real help is to be derived in the interpretations of the titles of the Psalms from Talmudic and Midrashic sources ; these contain nothing but Agadic or legendary explanations, which are quite arbitrary, and we shall see the same method followed in the Syriac translation³ of the Psalms. The Talmudic doctors were not exegetes in a strict sense. They torture a scripture text for casuistical deductions, but they are much more reckless and unphilological in their Agadic expositions, which may be compared to a kind of sermon. One of the completest collections of their interpretation of the Psalms in general is the *Yalqoot* of Makhir ben Abba Mari, probably of the fourteenth century, which embodies all the sayings of the two Talmuds and the Midrashim concerning the Psalms. It exists in a

¹ With later commentators the order of these two words makes no difference. See, for instance, Yepheth to Ps. lxxxviii and Ibn Ezra to Ps. xlviii.

² Matt. xxii. 43, where the words τῷ Ἁγίῳ are omitted but found in Mark xii. 36. In Luke xx. 42, as well as in Acts ii. 34, the Holy Spirit does not occur at all. Was it because it was a pure Judaic belief?

³ See p. 9.

unique MS. in the Bodleian Library¹, and deserves to be published.

The earliest sources for our object are the Greek translations of the LXX, of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, which we include for completeness sake, and because they must be counted as Jewish documents². The Syriac version, called Peshitto, made probably as early as the end of the second century (in the fourth century it is already considered as canonical), although made with the help of a Jew from the Hebrew text, and therefore for critical purposes important, has no value for the superscriptions, which are arbitrary. These are twofold, partly historical, partly exegetical, and are most likely, as Professors Nestle³ and Baethgen⁴ have shown convincingly, by Theodore of Mopsuestia, who, accepting some from Eusebius and Origen, made many additions of his own. In fact, Dr. Isaac Prager⁵, who aimed to show, by the analogy of Agadic passages with the contents of the Syriac, that they are of Jewish origin, is evidently wrong. For, as Professor Nestle rightly says, the Agadic passages have no kind of superscription; to which it may be added that the *Pirge de R. Eliezer*, the Midrash Tilim, the *Yalqoot*, and even the *Thanhuma*, on which Dr. Prager bases his arguments, are of a later date than Theodore of Mopsuestia, and if there has been borrowing on either side, it will be the Midrash that has borrowed and not Theodore. The Itala and the Vulgate, although made by Christians, may be considered, by the help derived from Jews, as belonging to Jewish interpretation, and are therefore given here. The Aramaic Targum is paraphrastic like Jonathan, and made probably by a Jew who had some knowledge of

¹ No. 167 of the catalogue of 1886. On Makhir's *Yalqoot* on other Biblical books, see *Revue des Études Juives*, t. xiv, p. 95 sqq.

² These are given according to Field's excellent edition of the *Hexapla*.

³ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1876, col. 283.

⁴ *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Stade), 1885, p. 66 sqq.

⁵ *De veteris Testamenti versione syriaca quam Peschitto vocant*, part I, Göttingae, 1875, pp. 52-56.

Greek¹ in the fourth century. It is certainly not based upon a Syriac translation as the Targum of Proverbs is. Samuel ben Meir (twelfth century)² erroneously attributes the Targums on the Hagiographa to R. Joseph (died 325 A. D.). Anyhow the Targum on the Psalms represents Jewish interpretation, and we give it with an English translation.

Between this Targum and the commentary of R. Saadyah³ Gaon (died 940) there is a blank. That there were earlier commentaries than Saadyah's may be seen from his contemporary Karaitic author, Salmon son of Yeroham, who gives interpretations of predecessors besides Saadyah, but without mentioning their names⁴. So does Yepheth⁵. No doubt many quotations in these authors may be taken from lexicons⁶. But Abraham ibn Ezra quotes opinions of Jeshuah⁷, who is earlier, if not much earlier, than Saadyah⁸. Indeed with the Karaites exegesis in its strict sense begins, and we know that Benjamin of Nehawend (beginning of the ninth century) wrote commentaries on Biblical books⁹, but they are all lost at present. Thus we must take as the earliest commentary we possess that of Saadyah, of which we give the translation of the titles according to the MS. in the Bodleian Library¹⁰. It seems that there were two editions of this commentary, a shorter and a longer, or a first and a second¹¹, of which the Bodleian MS. contains the shorter, to judge from the Munich MS., which comprises two prefaces, a longer and a shorter, as well as a longer commentary on the first three Psalms¹². The shorter has nothing on the titles or authorship of the Psalms; this is to be found in the longer preface, of which we give

¹ He has קרר for God, *Kúrios*, Ps. liii.

² Zunz, *G. V.*, p. 65.

³ Strictly S'adyah. See *Catal. Oxf.*, No. 1438.

⁴ See p. 39.

⁵ See p. 40.

⁶ See p. 34.

⁷ Ps. lxxxviii. See p. 54.

⁸ See *Aus. der Pet. Bibl.*, p. 7.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 6.

¹⁰ *Catal. Oxf.*, No. 104.

¹¹ See *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, No. 28.

¹² See Dr. J. Cohn's essay with the title of *Saadin's Einleitung zu seinem Psalmencommentar* in the *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, viii. pp. 1-19 and 61-91.

a translation according to the Munich MS.¹ That this preface is indeed by Saadyah has not only been proved from the agreement with his philosophic-theological book², but his Karaite contemporary Salmon actually quotes a passage agreeing with it, and refutes Saadyah's opinion contained in it³.

After having remarked that God leads man to perfection by five forms of speech, viz. by similitude, question, narration, commandment and prohibition, humble request and prayer, and that all these forms are contained in the Psalms, Saadyah says that David prepared the building of the Temple by his son, and began by entrusting the Levites with a permanent charge for the speedy continuation of the building. This is what is meant by the word לַמְנִצָּה (1 Chron. xxiii. 4), and also by הַמְשִׁרְרִים (1 Chron. ix. 33). At that time God revealed to him this book, which we call the book of praise, because it contains special songs, to be executed by special men, in a fixed place, accompanied by special instruments and with fixed melodies, as I shall explain with the aid of God. This revelation was made to David, the father of the kings and a prophet, in consequence of his great merit, as it is said⁴, 'I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him,' to the end of the chapter. The divine inspiration of David began thus at the time of his anointing, as it is said⁵, 'And the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.' This explains why so many of the titles of the Psalms refer to the period of his election as king, partly before he began to reign, and partly after that event. Thus as the wanderings of the Israelites are fully described⁶ with all their vicissitudes, in order to show how the Almighty bestows help on the

¹ A copy of this preface was put at our disposal by Dr. J. Cohn, for which we express to him our best thanks. For the collation of the text with the MS. we are indebted to Dr. J. Perles.

² See Dr. S. H. Margulies' essay, *Saadia Al-Fajâmi's Arabische Psalmen-übersetzung* (Breslau, 1884), p. i.

³ See p. 18.

⁴ Ps. lxxxix. 21 (20).

⁵ 1 Sam. xvi. 13.

⁶ Num. xxxiii to end.

one side, and punishes on the other, so in the Psalms all this is written down to be read always and everywhere for the benefit of mankind.

‘As to the use of the Psalms in the service of the Temple, we can put these in five classes, which may refer to the whole book as well as to parts of it. But at all events a divine voice revealed the whole book to David, and in accordance with that they are called by every one “the songs of David.” So it is said ¹, “to praise *and* to give thanks, according to the commandment of David the man of God, ward over against ward,” and in another passage ² it is said, “to thank the Lord, because his mercy *endureth* for ever, with the Psalms of David in the hand.” And it is moreover expressly said ³, “for so had David the man of God commanded.” Some are of opinion that others besides David, for instance, Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and Ethan, also received revelations of the contents of Psalms, or wrote Psalms themselves. But this can scarcely be the case, for many of the titles of the Psalms have two names, for instance, xxxix, lxxvii, lxxxviii, but God does not usually charge two prophets with one and the same message, except in the case of Moses and Aaron, for the Lord spake with Moses face to face ⁴, and Moses is in the position of an angel who hears the words of God and communicates them to the prophet. Thus the connection of the name of Jeduthun with that of David in some of the titles implies that David communicated the revelation to him, and he had the supervision of the singing. The same is the case with other names in the titles. “To Moses ⁵” means that the singing was entrusted to the children of Moses, who were at the king’s court, and “to Solomon ⁶” means that events which happened under Solomon were revealed to David.’

‘According to the above-given exposition of the book, it is called “Book of Praise-songs,” because the Levites made use

¹ Neh. xii. 24.

² 2 Chron. vii. 6.

³ 2 Chron. viii. 14.

⁴ Exod. xxxiii. 11.

⁵ Ps. xc.

⁶ Ps. lxxii.

of them for the Temple service, with the following five arrangements :—

‘ 1st. Each Psalm was sung in the Temple by a certain ward of the Levites exclusively, but others could simply *read* it¹. Such are Asaph and his companions, Heman, Jeduthun, the sons of Korah and Moses, Ben², and the descendants of Obed Edom, who are meant by the word הַנְּתִיתִים³.

‘ 2nd. Certain Psalms had to be recited with a particular melody, which is mentioned in the superscriptions. Thus the word נְגִינָה⁴ means one melody, and נְגִינוֹת⁵ for Psalms which were recited in various melodies. שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלֹת⁶ means with a loud voice (comp. 1 Chron. xv. 22, and the word עָלָה in 1 Sam. v. 12 and Jerem. xiv. 2). Others which have in the superscription the word עֲלָמוֹת⁷ are sung with a deep and sweet melody (comp. 2 Kings iii. 15), requiring a skilful singer. The Psalms headed “to Asaph, Ethan, and Heman” were accompanied by a cymbal (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 5 and xv. 19). Those Psalms headed עַל מַחֲלֵל⁸ are accompanied by a drum (comp. מַחֲוֹל), whilst those with לְבָן and עֲלָמוֹת⁹ are accompanied by a lyre (comp. 1 Chron. xv. 20). An elegiacal style of recitation is intended by the heading of עַל הַשְּׂמִינִית¹⁰, and those which were recited by the family of Obed Edom. And in this case they were accompanied by a harp (comp. 1 Chron. xv. 21). Possibly other melodies and instruments were used for the recitation of Psalms, which are not distinctly mentioned. Anyhow, when a musical instrument is mentioned for a Psalm no other could be substituted for it. At all events, music and song were employed only in the service in the Temple, not in the case of Psalm-reading at home or in the synagogues.

‘ 4th¹¹. Certain Psalms or verses were reserved for particular

¹ We do not translate literally.

² Ps. ix. 1.

³ Ps. viii. 1.

⁴ Ps. lxi. 1.

⁵ Ps. iv. 1.

⁶ Pss. cxx–cxxxiv.

⁷ Ps. ix. 1.

⁸ Ps. liii. 1.

⁹ Ps. ix. 1.

¹⁰ Ps. vi. 1.

¹¹ No. 3, which should contain the manner of reciting the Psalms, is not in the MS. Possibly No. 2 implies a third class. See Dr. Cohn’s article (above, p. 10, note 12), p. 66.

occasions. Some were recited at the morning sacrifice, others at that of the evening (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 37). Psalm xcii is fixed for the sabbath and Ps. c for festival days¹. From the contexts of some Psalms it would be possible to discover the occasions of their recitation, but they are not distinctly stated.

‘5th. Certain Psalms were sung only at fixed places, viz. at the four cardinal points, the Levites being divided into twenty-four sections, six of which were for each cardinal point (comp. 1 Chron. xxvi. 14-17). The regular use of the Psalms was confined to the Temple of Jerusalem, and accompanied by melodies (comp. Isaiah xxxviii. 20). The exiles therefore, when asked to sing some of the praise-songs, saying, “Sing us *one* of the songs of Zion,” refused by saying, “How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a strange land?” As to the reading of the book of the Psalms, it may be done entirely with the firm conviction and the certain belief that they were designed to advance the salvation and the welfare of men. For if the book be in the first instance a book of praise-songs, its final aim will be to promote the commandments, as I have already said². . . . Whoever reads this book may firmly believe that its whole contents, in whatever way expressed, consist of an announcement of God, by whom the book was revealed

‘I have to speak here about the sequence of the Psalms, which are not strictly in historical order. We find Psalm iii headed, “when he fled from Absalom his son;” li, “when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bath-sheba;” lii, “when Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul, and said unto him, David is come to the house of Ahimelech;” liv, “when the Ziphim came and said to Saul, Doth not David hide himself with us?” From the book of Samuel it is, however, evident that the incident of Doeg comes first, then follows that of the Ziphim, then that of the desert of Judah and the Philistines in Gath, whilst that of

¹ See above, p. 5.

² The text is interrupted at this point.

Nathan and Absalom happened last. Consequently the Psalms are not arranged according to historical tradition. I have said that certain Psalms were sung in certain places, east, west, south, and north, in the Temple ; it is therefore possible that the Psalms as we have them are arranged according to this local service. Another solution may be that, as I have said, certain Psalms were fixed for the sabbath, others for the feast days and new-moon days, perhaps also varying for each month itself, they may then be arranged according to the order of these days. Perhaps they are arranged according to the six sections of the Levites, each of which had other Psalms to sing, or to the classes of singers, the sons of Korah, Asaph, etc. Thus the Psalms which are not provided with a superscription may refer likewise to a section of the Levites. The definite solution of the order of the Psalms remains therefore an open question.¹

The following is the full text of the substance given above, pp. 12 to 14¹ (MS. Munich, Hebr. 122 ff. 7 b to 9 a):—

فلما كان الامر على ما وصفت سمى هذا الكتاب كتاب التسميه
واراد بذلك ان القوم كانوا يسبحون به في القدس على خمس شروط
التي قدّمت ذكرها. فالاول منها ان كل مزمور معنون لقوم من الלוים
يلزمهم² انفسهم ان يقول[و] ولا يجوز لغيرهم ان يقوله الا تلاوته فقط
فانما كان عنوانه لاسم في قوله اسم في بن برصيه بن שמעא واصحابه³
الذي من بني يروشلم. وما كان لهيמן في قوله الهيמן המשורر بن يואל
بن شموאל واصحابه³ الذي من بني كاهن من חברון او عموאל. وما كان
معنونا لبني كاهن الذين هم من بني كاهن خاصة. والمعنون חפלה
למשה איש האלהים في قوله بني رحبيه بن אליעזר بن משה واصحابهم.
والمزمור الذي عنوانه لايتן يقول لايتן بن [קושי בן] עברי בן מלך
בני מררי واصحابه. والمنسوب الى يדותון يقول يדותון واصحابه الذي قيل
فيهم בני ידותון גדליהו. والمنسوب الى בן قوله למנצח על מות לבן يقول
בני לוי המסّון في דברי הימים كقوله ועמהם אחיהם המשנים זכריהו

¹ We give the Arabic in the form which Saadyah most likely used in his writing.

² MS. follows הם.

³ MS. ואצחבן.

בן עזיאל ושמירמוכות. والمنسوب الى نثيث وهي ثلاث موزمور ה' אדונינו. הרנינו לאלהים עזנו. מה ירדות משכנותיך כפולה¹ בני עובר אדום הגתית المشهور. فعلى هذا تجرى الاسماء التى تجوز فى العنوان ولم يجوز لعובר اذوم ان يقول قول اسف ولا להימן ان يقول ما هو לבן انه نظير ما فى התורה איש איש על עבודתו ואל מושו או כדא. قيل فيهم ههنا והמשררים בני אסף על מעמדם והלויים על משמרתם להלל:

والشرط الثانى ان يكون من الموزمور ما يكون بلحن واحد كله لا يتغير وهو ما كان عنوانه من الكيفيات على دنيوت ففوله دنيوت هو لحن واحد منها ما يقال بالحن كثيرة² تختلف وهو ما صدره بدنيوت لان دنيوت يوجب لحنًا كثيرة². ومنها ما يقول بلحن مرتفع وهو ما كان عنوانه سיר המעלות ومما יבין ان מעלות هو رفع صوت لقולה וכנניהו שר הלויים במושא יסר במושא כי מבין הוא. وقد ينسب علوة³ الى قول اذ يقول وتعل שועת העיר השמימה. וזוהת ירושלים עלתה. ومنها ما يقول بصوت خفي⁴ رقيق وهو ما كانت الكيفية منها فيه يقول سلمות كما⁵ كان متخزن على مفارقتة لאלהיו عليه السلام⁶ طلب ملحنًا ببعض الاغان والآلات كقوله ועתה קחו לי מנגן. והיה כנגן המנגן. فما كان من המزامיר ما عنوانه לאסף فيه على לحن الصنوع كما شرح فى דברי הימים ואסף במצלחים משמיע. وكذلك ايضا ما كان לאיתן ולהימן כפולה והמשררים הימן אסף ואיתן במצלחים נחשת להשמיע. فما كان فى صدره על מחלח فهو בטבל على مشهور لفظة מחול. وما كان عنوانه לבן או עלמות فهو ضرب العود كما שרר فى דברי הימים וזכריה ועזיאל ושמירמית. وما كانت الكيفية اليم فى صدره על השמינית או عنوانه לעובר אדום הנתי فهو على طنبور كما شرح فى דברי הימים ומתחיהו ואליפלהו ומקניהו ועובר אדום. ويمكن ان يكون سائر الآلات وسائر الاغان قد انتظروا⁷ عن ذكرها فعلى هذا السبيل ايضا ما كان بدبل لا يقال בכנור وما كان במחול لا يجوز ان يقال במצלחים وكل هذين⁸ لا يجوز ان يقال على شى البتة الا ان يكون على سبيل القراءة والتلاوة: والشرط الرابع⁹ ان يكون المزمور ما هو يقال على التמיד بالغداة ومنه

¹ MS. וקו'.² MS. כתרירא.³ MS. עלות.⁴ MS. כסיה.⁵ MS. במא.⁶ MS. אלסלם.⁷ MS. אנהשרו.⁸ MS. הדיאין.⁹ See p. 13, note 11.

ما هو يقال على عולת התמיד بالعشی وهو ما رسم לדוד فی وقت حمل
 علیه הארון כקולה ביום ההוא אז נתן דוד בראש להודות לה' ביד אסף
 ואחיו. ثم قَسَمَ المزمور فی هذا السفر قسمین بعد ما جعله فی דברי
 הימים قولا متصلا فعرفنا انه لوقتین مختلفین. فمن הודו לה' קראו
 בשמו الى ולנביאי אל תרעו يقال على قربان الغداة. ومن שירו לה' כל
 הארץ الى ברוך ה' אלהי ישראל يقال على قربان العشی. وعلى ان
 القرايين انما كانت¹ בדבעון الا ان אסף ואصحابه كانوا يقولون هذه
 الفواسیق فی كل غداة وكل عشی وفي وقت قربان كقوله ويعזב שם
 לפני ארון ברית ה' לאסף ולאחיו לשרת לפני הארון תמיד לדבר יום ביומו.
 [والذى فی صدره מזמור שיר ליום השבת فكان ליום השבת خاصة. وما
 يقع على عنوانه מזמור לתורה فهو للحج خاصة كقوله בקול רנה ותודה
 המון חוגג. ويمكن ان تكون هنا اوقات اخر يخصها مزامير بعينها لم
 יثبت شرحها:]

والشرط الخامس ان يكون فصل منه نسب² الى قوم مضمين موضع
 من مواضع القدس ان يقولونه³ فی ذلك الموضع لا فی غيره وعلى انه
 فی القدس ايضا كقوله ויפל הגורל מורחה לשלמיהו ולעובד אדום לשפים
 ולחסה למערב עם שער שלכת. ثم جعل בני לוי عشرون واربع قسما
 فكل وجه من الاربع جهات ست كما شرح فصيحاً وقال لمورح הלויים
 שישה לצפונה ליום اربعة למערב الا ان جملة الكتاب لا يجوز قوله على
 انه تسبیح الا فی القدس اللهم الا ان يتلى تلاوة مرسله لان الانشוח
 الذى فيه مضمّن بالقدس كقوله لنצח על מלאכת בית ה'. وكذلك הדינות
 מضمّنة بالقدس كقوله הדינותי ננן כל ימי חיינו על בית ה'. وكذلك השיר كله
 كان ببلد القدس كما علمت ان اهل بבל سالوا الابهاء ان يقولوا تسبیح
 على هیئته فی הדלות فامتنעوا كما شرحوا وقالوا כי שם שאלנו שובינו
 דברי שיר וחוללנו שמחה שירו לנו משיר ציון فقالوا איך נשיר שיר ה' על
 אדמת נכר. ואما على سبيل القراءة فليقل قراءة تامة ويعتقد انه كتاب
 اصلاح العباد وعلى انه كتاب التسبیح انها غرضه⁴ وقصده الامر والنهي
 اللذان هما الاصلان العظيمان من هذا الفن :

We see that Saadyah believes all the Psalms to be by David, who handed them over to Asaph and other Levites ;

¹ MS. כאנא. ² MS. נצב. ³ MS. יקוליה. ⁴ Illegible in the MS.

and the titles, when not stating some historical fact or the time for singing the Psalm, refer to instruments. Next comes his Karaitic contemporary, Salmon ben Yeroham¹, whose Arabic commentary on the Psalms is to be found in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg². We shall find the Karaites referring the contents of the Psalms mostly to the present exile; in general they are much less clear in their style and meaning than the Rabbanites. Salmon believes that David is not the only author of the Psalms, but that there were prophecies communicated to others named in the superscriptions. The following extract in English will be sufficient for our purpose:—

Salmon ben Yeroham explains the title חלים from the root חל and חלחלים, which means 'height,' because the book of the Psalms contains all superior matter contained in the Law. . . . Salmon contradicts Saadyah's saying that the Psalms were not used as prayers outside Jerusalem and the Temple, showing that David himself recited Psalms outside Jerusalem, and before the town was built, as for instance lxiii, lix, and cxlii, and even outside the Holy Land. The argument which Saadyah advances from Ps. cxxxvii, says Salmon, is not conclusive, because the exiles only objected to sing the Psalms accompanied with their harps, as was the custom in the Temple. Salmon also objects to Saadyah's opinion that למשה, Ps. xc, means 'to the children of Moses,' and לשלמה, lxxii, means 'concerning Salomon.' Salmon takes these headings in the literal sense.

... ثم اقول شرح اسم هذا الكتاب الذى انا معزم على عبارته فاما الاسم فانه حלים وتفسيره عند الامة كبير شريف لان لفظة حלים تشتق من حل وحلحלים والغرض فى هذا الاسم الكبير ما فيه من المعانى العويصة الشريفة للخطر ولقد شرح فيه مما هى فى التوراة...³ وشاهدت فى عصرى رجلاً يعرف⁴ بالفيومى ذكر ان هذا السفر لا يصل⁵

¹ See *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek*, p. 10.

² First Firkowitsch collection, No. 555.

³ Fol. 27 a.

⁴ MS. يعرف.

⁵ MS. يصل.

به الا فى القدس وببلى سیر فان ظنّ ظان ان هذا حقّ فليعلم انه قد ردّ نصّ الكتاب واجماع الامة الموافق والمخالف. فاما النص فان دود اولاً صلى بهذه الفصول فى غير القدس وقيل ببناء فمن ذلك قوله موزمور לדוד בהיותו במדבר יהודה . . . وهذه الفصول كلها صلى بها قبل بنيان القدس فى ارض اسرائيل. واما הוצה לארץ فقد وصف انه صلى وشفع الى الله وعلم الامة كيف تشفع الى الله فى הגלות لقوله בהצותו את ארם נהרים . . . فقد اتّضح الآن ان דוד صلى بهذه¹ الصلوات المرسومة فى هذا הספר فى ארץ ישראל وفى غير ארץ ישראל. وان تعلق قلب احد بما تعلق قلب الفيومى من قول ان اهل بבל سألوا الانبياء ان يقولوا השיר فى הגלות فى غير القدس فامتنعوا كما شرحوا وقالوا כי שם שאלנו פקלנו איד נשיר שיר יי' על אדמת נבר פליעלם ان اهل בבל انما سألوا האבא ان يقولوا השיר בכנורות ובנבלים على رسم בית יי' لان قبل هذا يقول תלמינו כנורחמינו فلم يستجيزوا هذا الفعل الا فى בית יי' . . .² فقد اتّضح ان الصلاة بهذا הספר فى הגלות فرض ومن الاجماع فكل الامة فى جميع اقطار الاخص مصلى منه وبه فى جميع كنائسها وانما جعلوا שמנה עשרה תפלה عليه. وكذا ذكروا فى התלמוד ان اجتمعו ק"ד שינג וולפו י"ח فما كان بهذه الصورة فهو غير مقبول عندنا. واذا سالنا من יגיי من بلد الروم وفرنجة واقصاء المغرب بما ذا يصلوا مع י"ח يعرفونا انه يصلوا من תלים فى السبت وغيرها. واما ليلة כפור لا بد من الصلوة به كله من اوله الى اخره فقد اتّضح وبان ان قول من قال لا يصلى به الا فى בית יי' خطأ وغلط. وزعم الفيومى ان جميع دعا فى ספר תלים انما هى نبوات לדוד مدفوعة الى בני משה ובני לוי יסبحו بها وهذا قوله حرف بحرف. قال واما תפלה למשה فهو تسبیח לבני משה الذى كانوا بحضرة דוד לیسبحון به وهذا الباب مستعمل فى الكتب المقدسات كثيراً كما قال יהודה לשמעון אחיו עלה אתי כנורלי . . . וילך יהודה את שמעון אחיו وانما يريد به בני יהודה ובני שמעון ويقول זבולון לא חוריש وانما يريد به בני המלכה³ الاقرب فى דברי הימים قوله فى ایام דוד ואחרן ובניו מוקטירים وانما يعنى בן אחרן وقال ויהודיע הנגיד לאחרן يريد לבני אחרן

¹ MS. בהרא.

² Fol. 9.

³ MS. ואלמלה.

כذلك همنا חפלה למישה יריד לבני מישה حسب ما قال لآסף והימן וידותון وغيرهم. ואما العنوان المنسوب الى שלמה بقوله לשלמה אלהים מושפט¹ فإنه ايضا وحى اوحى الى داود نبوة على שלמה: قال داود² 'ור' שלמון בן ירוחם لما اشرفت على هذا من قول القيومي لم تسمح نفسي ان تغفل عنه لانى رايت لداود³ قد سلب د⁴ نبوة هذه وسلب ايضا جميع النبאים المذكورين فى هذا السفر نبوتهم ونسبها الى غيرهم بشبه اقامها ليس لها حقيقة عند البحث وذلك ان الاسباط ملقبين باباءهم⁵ كما ان الامة ملقبة ب⁶ ישראל وعلى ما رتبهم 'לאקם عليه السلام ويקרא 'עקב לבניו... ראובן... ויהודה فارتسم من ذاك ان يسمي كل سبط باسم ابيه الاول ولم نجد فراد من السبط يسمي اولاده على اسم:

We must next mention the lexicographer David ben Abraham³, a Karaite contemporary of Salmon. He is also the author of a commentary on the Psalms, but at present lost. We give among the expositions some extracts from his dictionary written in Arabic, taken from the MS. in the Bodleian Library⁴.

Yepheth ben Eli (Ali) follows next; he is also a Karaite, who lived towards the end of the tenth century, and wrote a commentary on the Psalms in Arabic, of which MSS. exist in the Paris⁵ and St. Petersburg Libraries; our extracts are made from the Paris MS. The preface, with the commentary on the first two Psalms, and the translation of the rest, were published with a Latin translation by the Abbé Bargès⁶. We shall here give a free translation of his introductions. Yepheth also does not attribute all the Psalms to David. He says at the beginning of ch. i:—

‘It is necessary to state how many authors there are in the Psalms. We have found three: 1st, those attributed to one person, whose name is given at the beginning of the

¹ MS. אלסר.

² MS. באבהם.

³ See *Journ. Asiatique*, 1861, ii. p. 465, and 1862, i. p. 47 sqq.

⁴ *Catal.*, No. 1451.

⁵ *Catal.*, Nos. 286–291.

⁶ *Libri Psalmorum David*, etc., Paris, 1861, and *Specimen*, etc., Rabb. Yepheth . . ., Paris, 1846.

Psalm ; they are the following : David, Solomon, Asaph, Jeduthun, who is identical no doubt with Ethan, and Moses. 2nd, those attributed to a family, of which the names are not given, such as the sons of Korah. They are, according to some, Assir, Elkanah, and Eliasaph, who lived in the time of Moses ; according to others, they signify Heman alone, as in the passage, the children of Dan, Hushim¹ ; we believe, however, that the sons of Korah signify many persons who lived at various periods, as we shall explain on the 42nd Psalm. 3rd, Psalms without names of authors at all, forty-six in number, viz. i, ii, x, xxxiii, xliii, lxxi, xci-c, cii, civ, evi, cvii, the Hallel Psalms cxi-cxviii, ten of the gradual Psalms, cxxxiv², cxxxvi, cxxxvii, cxlvi to the end. These do not include the 119th Psalm, which makes one, and two headed by למנצח, but without a name, viz. lxvi and lxvii, which latter is a part of the former. Out of the forty-six Psalms, we consider five as completing the preceding ones ; Ps. x, namely, completes ix (which, as we shall show, follows the order of the alphabet) ; Ps. xxxiii belongs to xxxii ; Ps. xliii to xlii, Ps. lxxi and civ belong to the preceding Psalms. The collector has disconnected them, for reasons which we shall explain in their proper place. Amongst these forty-six Psalms ten may be ascribed to the author mentioned in the preceding Psalms, viz. xci-c, to Moses. The last Hallelujah Psalms are connected with David, being associated with cxlv. Those headed by למנצח there is no reason for not ascribing to David. The rest of the anonymous forty-six Psalms need not be ascribed to one author or to one epoch ; it is more probable that they were composed at various times and by members of a family, and hence they are not ascribed to one author. The singers said the Psalms standing, whilst the Holy Spirit rested upon them, with the same number, the same order, and the same melody. Now those Psalms which are not provided with a name, and have no connection with the preceding one, are attributed by some

¹ Gen. xlv. 23.

² Evidently an error for cxxxv.

22 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

to Adam, by others to Moses, and by the best commentators to David, except the ten which belong to Moses. But as none of these can produce decisive arguments for their opinion, we do not think it is worth while to discuss them and to refute them.'

Yepheth then divides the Psalms into the following classes :—

1st. Psalms relating to the creation and things created, such as civ, cvi, and verses of others.

2nd. Psalms of God's benefits towards Israel and other nations, such as in Psalms civ. 27, 30, cxlv. 9, 15 ; towards Israel especially, xlv, lxxviii, lxxx. 1.

3rd. Psalms describing the signs and miracles in Egypt, in the desert, and in the Holy Land, such as xlv. 3, xlv, xlix, lxvi, lxviii, lxxii, lxxvi, lxxx. 8, 9, xev, ci, cv, eviii, and all the Hallelujah Psalms, and those of degree, as well as Psalm cxliv.

4th. Psalms referring to the rebellion against God by the early Israelites. Such are Psalms xxxi. 11, xxxii. 5, xl. 13, 19, lxxviii, eviii.

5th. Psalms relating to punishment and calamities, xliii, xlv, lxxviii, lxxix.

6th. The return of the exiles, xxxii, exix.

7th. Asking for the right direction concerning the law, exix.

8th. Prayer for deliverance from the enemy, iii.

9th. Prayer for the fulfilment of God's promises, xiii. 4.

10th. Prayer that all the inhabitants of the earth may be converted to the true religion, xlv, xlvii.

11th. Prayer for general peace, xlv. 10, lxvii. 5.

12th. The faith of the nations in Israel and the Messiah, lxxii. 8.

These twelve parts should be used as daily prayers morning and evening.

Yepheth gives then an explanation of various expressions in the Psalms referring to the meaning of prayers, such as *ומרה*, *הוריה*, *רנן*, and so on, a subject which lies out of the sphere of our essay.

At the beginning of the third Psalm, Yepheth, like David Qamhi two centuries afterwards, gives a general introduction on the expressions used in the superscriptions of the Psalms. 'The following seven words,' he says, 'occur in the book, viz. מומור, שניון, תהלה, מפלה, משכיל, שיר, מכתם, שניון ; sometimes we find two or more of them together in one heading, viz. מומור and שיר twelve times ; מפלה with שיר מומור and תהלה once ; the three other expressions, viz. שניון, מכתם, and תהלה, we find only singly. We shall state now how often each of these occurs. The most frequent term is מומור, which occurs forty-seven times ; next comes שיר, which we find twenty-nine times, of which twelve with מומור ; מכתם occurs seven times ; תהלה five times ; תהלה and שניון each once. שניון means a release from Cush the Benjamite ; מכתם means a stain, caused by a child, a king, or a fact ; משכיל means either direction or leading ; מפלה means prayer in all respects ; תהלה is praise to God for all His bounties ; as to שיר the opinions differ. Some say that each Psalm is a song of salvation, which is really applicable to all Psalms headed by this word except lxxxviii. 2, which they apply to prayers in exile ; others say that these Psalms were used for the daily and additional sacrifices. It seems to me that שיר refers to some wonderful event ; in general it bears the meaning of מומור, which is difficult to explain, and which I believe to have been accompanied with singing and musical instruments, although this can scarcely be the case with the 63rd Psalm. But if it was originally recited only, it is not at all impossible that later on it was accompanied with song and music. As to the Psalms which have no headings and those which are introduced by למנוח, הללויה, and הודו, we shall give our opinion in its proper place.' This we shall omit, not belonging to the headings strictly, but being deductions from the contexts of the Psalms which are excluded in this essay.

ينبغي ان نذكر ههنا اصول ما يجب ذكره من الالفاظ التي ذكرت
في عنوانات المزامير ونذكر معنى كل لفظة منها. فنقول انها
سبعة وهي مومور، مכתם، سیر، משכיל، מפלה، תהלה، وهذا السبع

قد تقترن بعضها مع بعض وقد لا تقترن. وذلك ان مزمور وشير يقتربا [ن] في "ب" موضع. ولفظة موشكيل تقترن مع مزمور وشير في موضع واحد وهو موشكيل להימן האזרחי. وتقترن مع חפלה وهو موشكيل לדוד בהיותו במערה חפלה فهذه الـ تقترن بعضها مع بعض. والذ الآخر اعني שניון. מכחם. תחלה وجدناها مفردة. وينبغي ان نتبع ذلك بذلك عددها فنقول. ان لفظة مزمور هي كثيرة العنوان وجملتها ذاك. ولفظة "שיר" ذاك "ב" تقترن مع لفظة مزمور وموشكيل إذ ثلاثة تقترن مع غيرها وهي רחש. להימן. בהיותו במערה. ومכחם سبعة اول في אשרי والستة في כאיל. ותחלה חמسة ולדוד اثنين. למישה. לעני. במערה. ותחלה א' ארוממך אלהי. ושניון א'. ونجب ان نبين معنى لفظ السبعة. فمعنى שניון هو سهو جرى من כו"ט בן ימיני. ومعنى מכחם فهو اثر اما ولد او ملك او فعل. وموشكيل معناها تختلف في المزامير في معنى الرشد والهدايا. ومعنى חפלה هو شخوة الخال ومسلّة الله في الخلاص وانجاز الوعد. ومعنى תחלה هي في مدبحة الله على خليفته وحسن تدبيره وبسط رزقه وعجائبه. وقد تختلف المعلمين في لفظة שיר فبعضهم قال ان كل مزمور في عنوانه שיר فهو שיר ישועה وليس ثم ما ينقص عليهم هذا الاصل غير موضع واحد وهو יי אלהי ישועה فان ليس فيه ذكر ישועה فقالوا انه שיר ישועה وانما وصفوا كيف كانوا يدعون الى الله تعالى في الدلوات. وبعضهم قال ان השיר يقال على التمام او الموصوف. والذي يقرب منا هو انه ذلك השיר تسبقه حادثة عظيمة وفي ما بين جمع وهو في كل موضع بحسب ما يحتمله المزمور. ومعنى مزمور صعب في التخریج جدا. والذي يقرب فيه انه يقول على ضرب آلة ولحن نشاكلها فان وجدناها في مواضع يظنّ فيها انها تبطل هذا الاصل مثل בהיותו במדבר יהודה. فينبغي ان تعلم ان وان كان اول ما قيل ذلك المزمور بغير آلة ولحن فليس بد من ان يكون قد اعادوه الموشורדים على ضرب ولحن. فهذا الباب قدمنا ذكره ههنا اصل مكثي فبقى علينا ذكر المزامير التي ليس لها عنوان والتي في اول הללויה والذي في اول הדוד والذي في عنوانه למנצח. ونحن نذكر كل واحد منها في اول مزمور ذكره فيه واحدة من هذه الالفاظ:

Abu-'l-Walid R. Jonah ibn Jannāh¹ does not afford much

¹ See *The Book of Hebrew Roots*, Oxford, 1875.

material for our subject, and he will rarely be quoted here. Three important commentaries are at present lost, (1) that of Joseph ibn Stanas, Santas, or Satanas (who lived in the tenth century), quoted in another commentary¹; (2) that of Judah ben Bala'm²; (3) that of Moses ibn Jiqatilia (Moses Kohen), frequently mentioned by Abraham ibn Ezra³. Solomon of Troyes, known as Rashi (who died 1105), relies much on the Agadah; sometimes we shall find him agree with those who suppose the titles to refer to instruments.

We now come to the most acute commentator, the well-known Abraham ibn Ezra, who paid a visit to London in 1157. Whilst he seeks to show by enigmatical hints that Moses cannot be the author of the whole Pentateuch, we shall find him most conservative in the Psalms, unless the anonymous view mentioned in the following preface is his own⁴. He says:—

‘This book of *Tehiloth* contains songs, with the name of either the singer or the author prefixed; many, however, are anonymous, such as i, ii, xci and the following Psalms. The commentators are divided as to the authorship of the Psalms. Some say that the entire book is by David, who was a prophet, as it is said, “According to the commandment of David, *the man of God*,” an expression which is used in Scripture of a prophet. David also says, “The Spirit of the Lord spake by me” (which means, who speaks with me), and His word was on my tongue.” When we find the name of Jeduthun together with that of David in the title to a Psalm, the meaning is that David is the author and that he gave it to Jeduthun for performance, for he was one of the chief singers. Psalm lxxii is a prophecy of David concerning Solomon, his son. Psalm xc is also by David, which he gave to the sons of Moses for performance. The same is the case

¹ See Dr. Harkavy's article with the title *הרשים גם ישנים* in the *Quarterly Review*, fasc. i, St. Petersburg, 1885.

² *Oxford University Gazette*, 1876, p. 100.

³ Ps. cx.

⁴ Printed in the so-called ‘Rabbinical Bibles.’

⁵ Neh. xii. 24.

⁶ 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

with the names of the sons of Korah and Heman. Psalms lxxix and cxxxvii are prophecies of David, similar to that of the birth of Josiah¹. Others say that there is no prophecy in the Psalms, and therefore it is put together with Job and the "Megilloth," as is shown by the expressions *song* and *prayer*. According to their opinion Psalm cxxxvii was composed in Babylonia. The same is the case with the Psalms which are headed "of the sons of Korah," which were composed by the sons of Heman in the Babylonian captivity, as is clear from the fact that these Psalms contain matter concerning this captivity, which is not the case in those of David. Asaph, the author of the Psalms, was also one of the Babylonian captives, and not identical with the contemporary of David. Ethan the Ezrahite composed his Psalms on the destruction of the empire of the family of David under Zedekiah. As to the anonymous Psalms, the compilers did not know the names of their authors; the same is the case with the "sons of Korah," when they did not know the name of the individual authors. Psalm cxix, they say, was composed by a young captive in Babylonia, who was greatly honoured² there, as appears from the following verses: "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way?" (ver. 9); "I am small and despised" (ver. 141); "Princes also did sit and speak against me" (ver. 23).

'My opinion, however, inclines towards the words of our wise men who say that the whole book was written by the Holy Spirit. As to the word "song" (שִׁיר), we find it also applied to the prophecy in Deuteronomy xxxii; the expression "prayer" (תַּפִּלָּה) we find applied to the prophecy of Habakkuk iii. 1, and Isaiah lxi. 17. Whenever we find in the superscriptions לְדָוִד "to David," it means that the Psalm is either by David or a prophecy concerning him, similar to Psalm lxxii, which was written with reference to Solomon. Psalm xci is by Moses, and the Psalms marked "to Asaph" are by Asaph, the contemporary of David, "who prophesied according

¹ 1 Kings xiii. 2.

² So MSS. and editions in spite of what follows.

to the king¹." The sons of Korah, the sons of Heman, lived also in the days of David (comp. 1 Chron. xxv. 5). As to the word לשלמה, Psalm lxxii, "to Solomon," it means a prophecy concerning him or concerning his son, the Messiah, as it is said, "And David my servant shall be king over them²." Servant here is used as in the passage, "Fear not, O Jacob, my servant³." The Psalms which have no author's name may still be by David; as Psalm cv, where no name is mentioned, is, according to 1 Chron. xvi. 7, by David, who handed over the Psalm to Asaph. As to the objection against the authorship of David, on the ground that the book is not introduced with the name of David, is it not the same with Genesis, of which no one⁴ denies that it was written by Moses, for such is the tradition, although the book does not begin with the words, "And God spake to Moses?"

'The Gaon (Saadyah)⁵ says that this Psalm was composed by David, who gave it to one of the singers to sing it constantly, according to the use of the word לנצח⁶. Others think that this word means "the chief over the singers," like ומנצחם⁷ עליהם. And this is right; the ל has a patah (denoting the *article*), because he was perfectly known. ננינת means two melodies. Others take it as an instrument. I believe that there were in Israel songs and praises in different melodies; ננינת means the beginning of the song, thus the melody is written with it; the same is the case with מעלות, עלמות, etc.'

In general Ibn Ezra takes the enigmatical superscription as the opening words of a song, to the melody of which the Psalm was sung.

Contemporary with Ibn Ezra is the Karaite Jacob ben Reuben, author of the Book of Richness, of which a MS. exists in Paris. There is not much that is new in it. The same is the case with the lexicon of Solomon Pirḥon, or Parḥon⁸ (who flourished 1169), and the Karaitic lexicographer, Ali ben

¹ 1 Chron. xxv. 2.

² Ezek. xxxiv. 23.

³ Isaiah xlv. 2.

⁴ See, however, his commentary on Gen. xii. 7.

⁵ See p. 11.

⁶ 1 Chron. xxiii. 4.

⁷ 2 Chron. ii. 2.

⁸ Edited by G. S. Stern, Pressburg, 1844.

Soleiman, who compiled his work from predecessors¹. Shortly after Ibn Ezra follows the famous David Qimḥi², who in his short introduction, after having quoted the passages of the Talmud given above³, concludes that 'David composed the Psalm with the help of the Holy Spirit, to be distinguished from prophecy. And although David, Jeduthun, Heman, and Asaph are called prophets, they are so only in a certain degree, for prophecy is classified in various degrees, the one higher than the other⁴. Daniel, for instance, who had visions in dream and when awake, did not reach the level of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets; therefore his book is included amongst the Hagiographa, which means books written with the aid of the Holy Spirit. The Psalms composed by David he gave to the singers to recite, viz. to Asaph and his brethren (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 8, Ps. cv), to Jeduthun (Ps. lxii. 1). There are Psalms which refer to events which happened to him or to Israel when fighting with their enemies; others contain prayers and thanksgivings, without allusion to any special occasion. The Psalms which are headed לְדָוִד and those without headings are by David. לְדָוִד, however, sometimes signifies "concerning David⁵." David incorporated in his book a prayer which he found and which was referred by tradition to Moses⁶; he also spoke of events after his time, e.g. the Babylonian and other captivities, and pronounced consolation in view of the restoration of the house of David to its former position. The Psalms of all kinds were recited, some with, some without, an accompaniment of music. We do not know now the meaning of the various words found in the superscriptions.' Here David Qamḥi quotes the Talmudic passage on מְנַצֵּחַ, etc.⁷

At the beginning of the third chapter he writes as follows: 'מְנַצֵּחַ is the chief musician, who distributed their parts to the singers and players. Accordingly we find always לְמְנַצֵּחַ and

¹ MS. St. Petersburg, first Firkowitsch collection, No. 75.

² Rather Qamḥi, flourished from 1160 to 1230.

³ Page 7.

⁴ According to Maimonides. See *The Guide of the Perplexed*, transl. of Dr. Friedländer, vols. ii and iii.

⁵ Pss. xx. 1, 2; cx. 1.

⁶ Ps. xc. 1.

⁷ See p. 8.

never למשורר or למנגן. Comp. Habakkuk iii. 19; 1 Chron. xxiii. 4, xv. 21. There were chiefs for the instruments called נגינות and שמינית; and with the accompaniment of these instruments the various Psalms were recited, each to some well-known melody; for music is a great science, which attracts the intelligent soul, and it is included amongst the external sciences. The instruments used in the Temple for accompanying Psalms were the nabla, harp, cymbal, trumpet, and horn, of which each was distinguished by its special style of music. One of the tunes is called עלמות¹, others are called נגינות, מושביל, נחיה, שנינות, נחילות, שנין, מכתם, עונב, and מנים, each of which is recognised by its notes, as those acquainted with this science are aware. We find (1 Chron. xxiii. 5), "And four thousand praised the Lord with the instruments which I made to praise therewith," but it is not known whether those who used the instruments also sang the praises, or whether the singers were facing the players. Comp. also 2 Chron. vii. 7 and xxix. 28. The trumpets were blown by the priests (Num. x. 8); the other instruments were played by the Levites (2 Chron. xxix. 26)².

Before returning to another Arabic commentator, we may briefly notice a commentary on the Psalms by Isaiah of Trani, the elder (who lived about 1230), which is chiefly based on Abraham ibn Ezra. MSS. are to be found in Paris (No. 217, 3) and Parma (No. 308). Some glosses are to be found in the Bodleian Library which seem to belong to the same school³.

The dictionary (MS. in the Bodleian Library, No. 1484 of the New Catalogue) of Moses of England (who lived early in the thirteenth century) will be rarely quoted here.

¹ 1 Chron. xv. 20; Ps. xlv. 1.

² Qamhi's commentary to the Psalms has been printed many times, and there exist Latin translations of it. The last edition of the first book only, by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (1883), claims to be based upon twenty MSS. and three early editions, yet it does not offer a single variation, and is therefore uncritical.

³ MS. No. 221. See Mr. H. J. Mathews' *Notes . . . on Psalms*, etc., in the *Isr. Letterbode*, iv. p. 1 sqq.

Thanhum ben Joseph of Jerusalem (who lived about 1240), although somewhat of a collector, is of importance on account of his quotations from other authors. He was a good grammarian, and holds himself free from the Agadah. Unfortunately only fragments of his commentary on the Psalms are preserved in the St. Petersburg Library¹. From the extracts which will be quoted later on, it may be concluded that he does not believe David to be the only author of the Psalms.

We have seen represented the East and Spain; there remain still to be added Abraham Remokh of Barcelona and Menahem ben Solomon Meiri of Perpignan, both Catalans. We append the text and translation of the latter's preface to the third Psalm, from which his opinion may be learnt².

'After having taken note of this preface you will remember what we said in the name of our rabbis, viz. that David wrote this book at the direction of ten elders³. That means to say that each of them composed some of the Psalms, which David incorporated in this book, together with those which he had composed himself. These ten elders are Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, Moses, and three sons of Korah; but this is only an Agadic saying. Literally said, it may possibly be the case with some Psalms, e.g. with the one headed "Prayer of Moses"⁴, which David may have found and inserted in his book; but for the other Psalms, David is the author, and gave them out to the Levites, who are called in general the "sons" of Korah, to sing them in the service before the ark. Some of the more important Levites, such as Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun and his brethren, he mentions by name. Comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 6; Ps. lxii. 1. Even "Moses" (Ps. xe) may be the name of some well-known Levite. Thus David is the author of all the Psalms provided with names, as well as the anonymous ones. The rabbis

¹ Codd. 111 and 183. I am indebted for the extracts to Magister J. Israelsohn.

² MS. Bodl. Libr., No. 325. See *Hist. litt.* xxvii. p. 528 sqq.

³ See p. 6.

⁴ Ps. xe.

have, moreover, enumerated ten terms expressive of praise, with the meaning of which the Psalms were composed¹; in our opinion, however, these are merely synonyms with one meaning. Some of the Psalms are provided with superscriptions respecting the musical instruments used when they were sung, but we do not know whether the Psalms without such title were simply recited or were also sung with musical accompaniment.' Meiri enumerates the various headings which mention instruments, although he thinks that some of them might bear another meaning, which he promises to explain when the time comes. He gives then the names of instruments used in the Temple service, but not mentioned in the titles to the Psalms. The general expression למנצח he explains as denoting the chief of the singers and the musicians, for we nowhere find the expression 'to the musician' or 'to the singer'², but only to the chief of them, who distributed the Psalms to the performers on different instruments, such as נגינות and שמינית and others, of the true meaning of which he says that he is not sure, but he will attempt to explain it in its proper place.

ואחר שתדע הקדמה זו צריך שתזכור מה שכבר קדמנו מדעת רבותי ע"ה שע"י עשרה זקנים חברו דוד ספר זה. וכוונתם שכל א' מאלו העשרה חבר קצת מזמורי וחברם דוד בספר הזה עם המזמורי שחבר הוא מעצמו וכבר ביארנו שעשרה זקנים אלו הם אדם הראשון מלכי צדק אברהם אבי אסף הימן ידותון משה ושלשה בני קרח והיו דרך דרש אלא לפי הפשט איפשר שיהיה בן בקעתם כמו תפלה למשה שאיפשר שמצאה וכתבה בספרו אבל השאר יראה שחברם דוד והיה נותנם ללוויים שהוא קוראם דרך כלל בני קרח לזמר בהן בדוכן לפני הארון והזכיר מן הלויים בפרט לרוב חשיבותם. אסף והימן וידותון ואיתן האזרחי והוא שכת' או נתן דוד בראש להודות ליי' ביד אסף וידותון ואחיו. וכן ראיה אמרו למנצח על ידותון מזמור לדוד ואף למשה איש האל"ם איפשר שהיה לוי מיוחד בדורו וכולם חברם דוד עם אותם שלא הזכיר בהם שום אדם או שהוזכר בהם לדוד לבד. ועוד דרשו רז"ל שספר זה נאמ' בעשרה לשונות של שבח בניצוח בנינון במזמור בשיר בהשכל בתהלה בברכה בהודאה באשרי בהלליה.

¹ See p. 8.

² See p. 11.

ולדעתנו כלם ענין א' במלות שונות אלא שרצ'ל דרשו ניצוח וניגון לעתיד משכיל ע"י תורגמן לדוד מזמור ששרתה עליו רוח הקדש תחלה וא"ח'ב אמ' שירה מזמור לדוד שאמ' שירה וא"ח'ב שרתה עליו רוח הקדש וכן יש מן המזמורים שנתחסה זמירתם לכלי זמר לא ידענו אם אותם שלא נכתב בהם כלי זמר היו נאמרים בשירת הפה לבד או אף אם הם כלי ניגון שלא נכתב וכן הוא חלוק שמוות בלי ניגון לא נודע לנו והנה מצאנו למנצח בנגינות וכן למנצח על הנחילות למנצח בנגינות על השמינית. שניון לדוד. למנצח על הנתיב. מכתם לדוד למנצח על אילת השחר. לדוד משכיל מזמור לדוד להזכיר. למנצח על שושנים למנצח לבני קרח על עלמות למנצח על מחלת למנצח על יונת אלם רחוקים. למנצח על שושן עדות. מכתם לדוד ללמד. שיר המעלות וכל אלו הם רובם כלי שיר ומיעוטם איפש' שפירושם בענין א' כמו שיתבאר כל א' בפרטיו ומשמות כלי הניגון עד שלא נכתבו בראשי המזמורים נבלים וכנורות ומצלתיים חצוצרות עוגב מינים עשור ומלת למנצח יראה שהיא כללית והיא נאמרת לממונה על כל המישוררים והמנגנים ולא תמצא בשום מקום למנגן ולא למישורר אלא למנצח כל' שיהא ניתן המזמור על ידו להזמר באי זה מכלי הניגון הנאות אילו לפי עניינו פעם על הכלי הנקרא נגינות פעם על השמינית. וכן בכלם וטעם השמות לא נודע ל[נ]ו אלא שבפרטים יתבאר קצת טעם בקצתם:

Remokh inclines more to philosophical interpretation, but he is interesting on account of his quotations, unfortunately all anonymous.

The last author to be noticed is Immanuel ben Solomon of Rome (Manuelo, the friend of Dante), who has still a certain originality. Finally we have to mention an anonymous commentary by a Spanish author, MS. of the Bodleian Library, No. 332, and the Arabic Dictionary of Saadyah ibn Danân (composed 1486), MS. of the same Library, No. 1492. Here we stop with the Jewish interpretation. Mendelssohn and his followers are too modern, and belong more to the beginning of the critical school.

It remains to give the interpretations of the titles according to the translators and commentators who have been enumerated. One commentator often follows another; but we shall avoid repetition as much as possible, though sometimes it will occur inevitably when full texts have to be quoted.

PSALM III.—מומור.

Ο'. Ψαλμός. Σ. ᾠδή.

I. V. psalmus.

Targum everywhere translates מומור by תושבחתא, praise. The rabbis observe that this Psalm ought rather to be headed קינה, lamentation. This remark would be satisfactorily met by Dr. Graetz's hypothesis¹, that מומור is a general expression, indicating that a new Psalm begins, when this is not done by a special heading. That is the reason why Psalms i and ii are reckoned as one, since there is no separation between them.

س. مقال لداود مجد الله به في هربه من بين يدي ابشالوم ابنه. An utterance of David's, in praise of God, when he fled before Absalom his son.

D. A. and A. W. التسبيح والتمجيد, praising.

PSALM IV.—למנצח בנגינות מומור לדוד.

Ο'. εἰς τὸ τέλος ἐν ψαλμοῖς ᾠδή, taking למנצח from נצח, eternal, end. Ἀ. τῇ νικοποιᾷ ἐν ψαλμοῖς μελωδῆμα, no doubt from נצח, to be victorious. Σ. ἐπινίκιος διὰ ψαλτηρίων. Θ. εἰς τὸ νίκος ἐν ὕμνοις ψαλμός.

I. In finem, Psalmus Cantici ipsi David. V. In finem, in carminibus, psalmus David.

Tg. לשבחה על חנינתא תושבחתא לדוד, to celebrate upon an instrument (for dance?) the praise of David.

س. قول لداود يسبح به المواظمين بالخان. A composition of David's, with which the constant (Levites; למנצח derived from לנצח 1 Chron. xxiii. 4) praise in (various) tunes.—Sy., Y. A. to the chief of the Levites to be sung with an instrument of more than one tune (comp. נגינת Ps. li. 1).

D. A. استحثاث للعمل لنצاح על ملاכת בית יי. لنצاح על עשי (so) המלאכה. والمستحثت يسمى مننצاح وقوله لدود يعنى دود عم المستحث للمشوررين المعلم لهم النشيد فيجوز ان كان رسمهم ان اذا وقف المشورر حدا موزح 'ان حضرة شي يقول من نفسه قال والا قال ما تعلمه من غيره لذلك اسمى² المعلم مننצاح نحو قوله مابين עם تلاميذ وفي ذلك يقول للمننצاح ليدوتون مومور لدود المستحث الذي له المومور دود والمستحث على القول هو يروحون والكثرة مننצחים. (נגן) وكل لمننצاح בנגינות الحان נגמات. נצח means to instigate to work (1 Chron. xxiii. 4; Ezra iii. 9), the instigator is called מנצח. The word לדוד means that David instigated the singers, by teaching them the method of recitation.

¹ Kr. Comm. Ps., p. 78.

² MS. אורסמי.

It is possible that when the singer stood before the altar he presented to him a song of his own or something which he had learned from others. Therefore the teacher is called מנצח, as in the words 'the teacher with scholar' (1 Chron. xxv. 8); and so it is said in the title of Ps. xxxix, 'to the instigated, to Jeduthun, Psalm of David,' i. e. the instigator who was the author of the Psalm was David, and the instigated for reciting it was Jeduthun. The plural form is מנצחים. נגינות means tunes.

A.W. to the chief.—P. to king David.—M.N. למנצח הוא הלוי המנגן. נצח בלי הפסק על כלי שיר כך פי' ר' סעדיה. —For Tm. see VI.—Imm. the chief of the singers on a certain instrument.

PSALM V.—למנצח אל הנחילות מזמור לדוד.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰληρονομώσης; נחילות read as נחלת, participle from נחל, to inherit. So the Agadah and Rashi, the nations taking away the inheritance. (Sy. mentions also this explanation, saying that it is against the grammar (it ought to be נחלות), and against the contents of the Psalm, where there is no reference to any inheritance.) 'A. ἀπὸ κληροδοσιῶν. Σ. ὃδὲ τοῦ Δαυὶδ ἐπινίκιος ὑπὲρ αἰληρουχιῶν.

I. pro his qui haereditabunt.—V. pro ea, quae haereditatem consequitur.

Tg. לשבחא על חננין, to praise upon (dancing?) instruments.

S. قول لداود يسبح به المواظبون المبتهلون: اننى صرفت ال النحילות. من ويحل مشه وفسرته ابتهاالا. An utterance of David's with which the indefatigably praying Levites praise, deriving נחילות from ויحل (Exod. xxxii. 11).

D. A. ومن ذل (محلله) قوله لمنצح ال النحילות للمستحث على ال اوجاع والامراض يعنى ضربات ال غلوت وعلى ما يشرح فى نفس المزمور كقوله بى لا حفن رشف احاه واشبه ذل. وقد فسروه قوم من نحله وهو قول ضعيف وان استدلل صاحب هذا التفسير بالماسرة بان فيها دل لىون نحله على بر من ال اوار كل النحילות¹ فدليلة ضعيف لان رسم الماسرة تضم الفاظ تشبه فى المنطق لا فى التفسير كما ضمت ورعه بعن ي مع ورعه لى ذات وايضا العيرة وحقيضة مع ويباو العيرة: نحילות means the instigator upon the woes and the sickness, i. e. the blows of misfortune, as is said in the Psalm itself, vv. 4, 5, and other passages. Some explain it from نحله, inheritance², relying upon the Massorah,

¹ See the Massorah, where there is the following reading, בר כן ג' אל.

² So also Jerome.

which includes נחילות under the rubric נחלה. But that is a weak argument, since it is the habit of the Massorah to put together words according to the sounds, and not according to the meanings, e. g. ורעה (Mic. v. 3 ; 2 Sam. xix. 8) ; העירה (Ps. xxxv. 23 ; 1 Chron. xix. 15).

Sy., Haya (in Qamhi), Imm., Meiri, R., S. D. explain it as an instrument, to which three of them give the derivation of the Talmudic נחיל של רבורים (*Mishnah*, Baba Qamâ x. 2), 'a multitude of bees,' i. e. an instrument sounding like the noise of bees. Sy., Y. and A. derive it from נחלה, sickness (Ezek. xxxiv. 4), 'those who are sad in heart,' i. e. Israel in exile.—Rashi and Imm. refer it to the multitude of the nations coming upon David, deriving it from נחיל as above.

J. R. נחל' נחלה מכתך כמישקל נדיבות וקרא לשארית ישראל בלשון נקבה כי הם כצאן נחילות שנ' את הנחלות לא חזקתם וי"א על נחלת ארץ כי לקחו הנשים וי"א על אבילי ציון כי הם כצאן נחילות וי"א הוא כלי נחילות. Χαλεπουμένη? Comp. נחלה (Jer. xxx. 12) ; נחילות is analogous in form to נדיבות. The remnant of Israel is spoken of in the feminine form because they are the sickly flock (comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 4). There are other opinions: 1. נחילות refers to the inheritance taken away by the heathen; 2. to the mourners of Zion (the Karaites), who are the sickly flock; 3. נחילות means a musical instrument.

A. S. נחל מן המרץ וקיל אן מנה למנצח אל הנחילות ואנה מן המרץ. את הנחלות לא חזקתם. וקיל אנה מן אתחאל מן אלה הנחלות. Some take נחילות as in Ezek. xxxiv. 4, sickness; others take it in the sense of inheritance, comp. Josh. xix. 51.

PSALM VI.—למנצח בנגינות על השמינית.

O'. ἐν ὕμνοις, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης. 'A. ἐν ψαλμοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ὀγδόης. Σ. διὰ ψαλτηρίων περὶ τῆς ὀγδόης.

I. pro carminibus, pro die octava psalmus ipsi David. V. in carminibus, psalmus David, pro octava.

Tg. לשבחא בנגינתא על כינרא דחמניא נימיא, to praise with song on a harp of eight cords.

S. قول لداود يسبح به المواظمون باللحن الثامن: انا استدلنا على ان الليوايين كان لهم في القدس ثمانية للحن كل قوم منهم متوليين واحدا منها. To praise in the eighth tune. This proves that the Levites had in Jerusalem eight different tunes, of which separate groups made use.

D. A. and Sy. an instrument with eight cords, على الـ' اوتار, —
Y. on the eighth horn, which is the Ishmaelitic dominion.

J. R. says the same : בכתו' בכנורות על שם כלי השיר בכתו' בנננות על השמינית לנצח יש בו ח' יתר' ולעתיד יהיה ב' שנ' עלי עשור. ויש שיפתור אותו על מלכות שמונית וביאורו כי דניאל ראה חיותא רביעתא ליה קרן עשר. דע כי יש לאדום י' מגדלות ב' ארצות והם. ברומה ובקוסטנדינה ובפרנציאה ובולגריאה ודרגן וגרנן ופארמן ובאסכנדרריאה ועבה ואנדוכיא. לקחו מהם בני ישמעאל ג' אנטוכיא ועבה ואסכנדרריאה נשאר להם ז'. ככתו' משתכל הוית בקרניא וכאשר לקח ג' ונהיה כא' נקרא שמונית Some explain נננות by a musical instrument with eight cords (comp. 1 Chron. xv. 21), later with ten (Ps. xlii. 4). Others refer it to the eighth kingdom, which is represented with ten horns (Dan. vii. 7). Know that the Christians possess ten fortresses (capitals) in ten countries, viz. at Rome, Constantinople, in France, Bulgaria, Darghân, Jorjân, Armenia (l. ובארמן?), at Alexandria, Acco, and Antiochia; the last three having been taken from them by the Arabs, there remained seven, and the three taken by the Arabs, taken as one, make eight, and to this event the word השמינית refers.

A. S. ממלכה ثامنة وقيل بشمانية اوتار, the eighth kingdom, or an instrument with eight cords.

Tm. שמונית קיל לחן ثامن بعد. لرأس الاخوان, chief of the tunes. سبعة للحن متقدمة قبله. والاصح انه آلة ذات ثمانية اوتار, the eighth tune after the preceding seventh; the true sense, however, is that it is an instrument with eight cords.

Imm., after having the usual opinion, adds the following: Since this Psalm refers to an illness, it is possible that שמונית means the double of a quartan fever.

PSALM VII.—שנינו לדוד אשר שר ליהוה על דברי כוש בן ימיני.

Ο'. ὁ νῆψε τῇ κυρίῳ ὑπὲρ (A. S. Θ. περὶ) τῶν λόγων Χουσι υἱοῦ Ἰεμενελ.

I. V. psalmus David, quem cantavit Domino pro verbis Chusi filii Emimi (V. Jemini).

Tg. תרגומא דאודיתא לדוד די שבח קדם יי' מטול די אמר שירתא על. תבירא דשאל בר קיש דמן שבט בנימן An expression of thanksgiving by David with which he praised God by composing a song concerning the destruction of Saul, son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin.

مقال لداود سبّح به الله تسبيح انتصار في سبب كوش بن يميني: S. انا فسرنا سنيون استنصارا لانا استخرجناه من غرض ما في هذا الفصل قوله هويعني. وهايلني واشباعهما is rendered 'asking assistance'

in the matter of Cush, without any ground except the contents of the Psalm.

Sy. renders להב לִדָּוִד, dedication to David, without reason; he gives another explanation from שגה to err, with allusion to David's repentance after cutting off the sleeve of Saul's cloak (1 Sam. xxiv. 6).—Y. also derives it from שגה, meaning Saul's injuring David.

D. A. طلبة.—A. W. love and pleasure (so I. E.), or occupation with music. So Tm.

B. B. says (Habakkuk iii. 1): هو عندي مثل شنيون لدود وهو في ما : يظهر الغناء لحن من الحان. A song. So M. N. זמר ונעימה.

A. S. تعليم الرغبة في الدين ويجوز ان مثله وكل شנה בו كل راغب فيه وقيل في شنيون شجو ومثله قيل على شنيون وقيل ان الكل من شنيون. The wish for instruction in religion; שנה (Prov. xx. 1) may perhaps be taken in the same sense. Others translate שניון here and Habakkuk iii. 1 by 'affliction,' and others by 'humility.'

S. D. طرب ملدّ وقيل انطراب النفس, sweet music, giving pleasure to the soul.

Most explain it as the name of a musical instrument, to which Meiri adds that Cush liked it for its sweetness of tune.

Cush is taken by David Qamhi to mean Saul; so also Imm. and Tm., who say that he was called Cush, 'a negro,' in jest, because he was a most handsome man. He adds: Perhaps David called him Cush on account of the cruelty which he had shown to him and the priests of Nob.

PSALM VIII.—למנצח על הגתית.

O'. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (i. e. הגתות). 'A. Θ. ὑπὲρ τῆς γαλθίδος.

I. V. pro [I. laci] torcularibus.

Tg. לשבחא על כנורא דאתי מנת תושבחה, on the harp which came from Gath.

Qol Lidaud yisib be' mawzibim min al-eibad adom al-lyawani: قد يضرب في. To praise by the constant (Levites) of the house of Obed Edom the Levite. Opinions differ as to the word הגתית, but the right one is that which I have propounded.

D. A. للمستحث على معصار الاوتار ويقال للرقص بلا دليل وقيل على عرس معاصر الشراب والاول عندي اقرب كما يقول في غيره على. To the instigator upon the instru-

ment for pressing wine with cords. Others say for dances (see Y.),—an opinion without proof. Others say concerning the feast (?) of pressing out the juice. I agree with the first opinion, that it is a term analogous to גנינת, שמינית, etc.

Y. says it means reciting tunes (short tunes) in dancing at the time of the vintage, being derived from גת, a winepress. He mentions another explanation of גתית, referring it to the nations trampling on Israel as on the wine. Most explain it as an instrument, either of the shape of a winepress, or one which came from the town of Gath, or belonged to Obed Edom.

J. R. וי"א דוד וישחק לפני ה' באיש שידרוך בנת. וי"א ישם אויבי ישראל תחת כפות רגליהם וידריכם בנת. וי"א זה המזמור אמר אותו אחד מבני עובד אדום הגת. וי"א הוא שם כלי שמו אורגנון ימלאהו רוח ויזרו אותו כמו הגתית כמוהו עשה מלך אדום ושמו גתית. There are various opinions concerning the word גתית: 1. David danced and rejoiced before God like a man who treads the winepress; 2. David will place the enemies of Israel under their feet, and tread upon them; 3. This Psalm was composed by one of the children of Obed Edom of Gath; 4. An instrument like an 'organon,' which is filled with air, and let out as is the case with a גתית, a winepress. Such an instrument a king of Edom made, and its name was Gittith.

Tm. قيل انه اسم آلة من الآلات الطرب. وقيل انه اسم لحن من الألحان وعلى الوجهين فهو منسوب الى عوبد ادموس الغتي من اللوים والميسودרים اي انه كان له فيه لحن ما يقوله في המקדש اي انه استخرج آلة. An instrument (so also S. D.) or a tune; in both cases it must be referred to Obed Edom of the Levites, who had the speciality of them for the Temple service.

Imm. says on the melody sung at the winepress or made concerning a woman of Gath.

PSALM IX.—למנצח על מות לבן.

O'. εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ ψαλμός (עלמות from עלם, to hide). 'A. νεανιότητος τοῦ υἱοῦ μελόδημα (youth, from עלם). Σ. περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ. ἄσμα על מות (two words, on the death). Θ. E'. ὑπὲρ ἀκμῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ. ψαλμός. S'. νεανικότης τοῦ υἱοῦ.

I. propter occulta filii (like O'). V. pro oculis filii.

Tg. לשבחא על מיתותא דגברא די נפיק מביני משריתא. To praise, on the occasion of the death of the man who came out from the camp (Goliath).

Q. قول لداود يسبح به المواظبون من البن الليواني بلحن خفي.

مسترق: تفسير احد هذه الثمانية الحان لمن يقال له علמות وهو مسترق
خفى يتصرّف من نعلّم فاذا نسب صار علמות فلان وفي الليوانيين
مقدّم يقال له بن لقوله وعماهم אחיהם המשנים זכריהו بن
by the constant (Levites) of Ben the Levite, with a hidden tune.
That is, one of the eight tunes, which is called עֲלֻמוֹת, derived
from נעלם, which becomes עֲלֻמוֹת in the construct form. There was
a chief Levite with the name of בן (1 Chron. xv. 20)¹.

D. A. says²: בן means a combat. Some commentators think that
this title refers to the death of Absalom, but that is contrary to the
behaviour of David, as described in 2 Sam. xix. 1. Others refer it
to the death of the child of Bathsheba, an opinion which has
no value. Others take לבן for נבל, which I shall not even take
the trouble of refuting. Others take על מות as one word, 'youth,'
and לבן as 'white,' translating 'the youth which became white,'
this is against all grammar. I take it as follows: 'To the
instigator, on the occasion of the death of the champion Goliath
(1 Sam. xvii. 14), the ל is euphemistic, as in Arabic sometimes.
[I have explained this more explicitly in my commentary on
the Psalms, where I have shown that בן is connected with איש
הבנים, and that this last has nothing to do with the word בין.
עלמות consists of two words, viz. מות and על, 'upon the death.'
The Massorah has made it one word here and Ps. xlviii. 15, as
in על-בן (Ps. lxxx. 16), על-אם (Jer. xv. 18), and elsewhere.]

قالوا قوم تفسير على موات يريد بلى شير كقوله على علמות شير.
ويقول ايضا بنبل على علמות. ومعنى لبن اسم الموشور بن وهو رئيس من
رؤساء الموشوريم كقوله وعماهم אחיהם המשנים זכריהו بن ועוזיאל וג':
والاقرب عندي ان تفسير على موات يريد خفاياء الذنوب كقوله علמנו למאור
פניך مثل ملאו علומיו. وقوله لبن يريد بياض اى نقينا وبياضنا من
الذنوب كقوله חכבסני ומשלג אלבין وقال אם יהיו חטאיכם כשני כשלג
ילבינו: ونجوز ايضا [ان] علמות يريد ايام الحداثة والصبي يشتق من علם
وعلاמה اى ما جرى فى ايام الحداثة من الذنوب بياض واغفر ولا تذكر
كقوله חטאות נעורי ופשעי וג'. ويكون اشتقاق علמות من יחננו علמות.
وهذا القول عندي اجود من كل قول وهو قريب. ولم اذكر كل قول

¹ Dunash attributes another explanation to Saadyah, viz. upon the death of
Ben, one of the Levites, and that the ל in לבן is prosthetic. See also I. E.
This opinion Dunash may have found in the larger commentary of Saadyah.
Further on Dunash gives Saadyah's explanation as in the text. Dunash himself
takes לבן as a proper name of a warrior, who fought with his tribe against David,
and who perished. See Dr. Margulies' essay (see p. 11, note 2), pp. 22, 24.

² For the text, see *Journal Asiatique*, 1862, i. p. 383.

الناس في هذا المعنى اذ ليس فيه فائدة. Some take על מות as an instrument, and בן as a chief of musicians (1 Chron. xv. 18). Others explain עלמות 'the hidden sin' (comp. Ps. xl. 8; Job xx. 11), and לבן 'whiten,' i. e. purify us (make us white) from sin (comp. Ps. li. 9; Is. i. 18). Possibly עלמות is derived from עלם 'youth' (comp. Ps. xlviii. 15), i. e. make white from all which passed in the days of youth, forgive and do not remember it (comp. xxv. 7). I agree best with the last opinion.

Y. also reports several opinions: 1. On the death of the son, either the one born to Bathsheba, or Amnon, or Absalom. 2. Upon the death of Goliath, called איש הבנים (1 Sam. xvii. 4). 3. On the death of Nabal (לבן = נבל; so S.D.). 4. Instrument of Ben the Levite. 5. The white youth (see Sy.). 6. (Which he prefers himself), 'O Lord, make the ignorance (sin) of Israel white,' taking עלמות as one word derived from העלם יעלימו (Lev. xx. 4) and לבן an imperative form from לבן 'white.' I.E. and Q. also mention several explanations which agree with those already enumerated. In one of them the following explanation is given: On the death of a prince of the name of Labben. Rashi—after refuting some of the explanations mentioned above—says, that the Pesiqtha refers this to Amalek. Rashi himself applies the Psalm to the Messianic time when Israel will be regenerated (young) and white (without sin). He adds that Menahem ben Saruq explains, to learn to sing with the instrument of Almuth (לבן as להבין). Then follows the explanation of Dunash.

J. R. וי"א הוא בלי מבלי השיר בכתו' עלמות לנצח. וי"א עלמות נבל. וי"א הוא מהופך נבל לבן. וי"א על איש הבינים גלית ויהיה לבן הפן על מות הבנים. וי"א על מות אבשלום אשר הוא בן. וי"א על מות בן בת שבע. וי"א על עונות נעורים אשר ימי הנעורים הוא עלמות יהיה לבן ויסלח בכתו' אם יהיו חטאיכם כשנים כשלג. וי"א על מות ישראל שהוא בן לה. וי"א נביא לה' זכריהו בן על מיתת משורר ה'. The opinions given by Jacob here and elsewhere are already mentioned by older commentators. It will be therefore superfluous to quote him any more. The same is the case with Ali. The Karaitic commentators and lexicographers, as already stated¹, are less original than the Rabbanitical ones.

PSALM XVI.—מכתם לדוד.

Ο.Θ. στηλογραφία τῷ Δαυίδ (? מכתב, see Ali). Ἀ. τοῦ ταπεινός-φρονος καὶ ἀπλοῦ τοῦ Δαυίδ. Σ. (τοῦ) ταπεινόφρονος καὶ τοῦ ἀμώμου Δαυίδ

¹ See p. 27.

(both מך, תם; see Tg. to Ps. lvi). E'. S'. μαχθαμ τοῦ Δαβὶδ (transliteration of מכתם).

I. V. tituli inscriptio ipsi David.

Tg. גליפא תריצא לרוד. Straight (elegant) writing of David.

S. طرق لداود يقول فيه: ان الطرق فى لغة العرب مقام الفن. والضر من القول. Peculiar expression. No derivation is given by Saadyah.—Lacuna in Sy.

Tأثير لرود يورى ان له فى ذلك النشيد اثر وهو قوله بل اسيح. נסכיחם מדם. 'Stain of David,' showing that there is a spot in this Psalm, as it is said, ver. 4, 'Their drink offerings of blood will I not offer.'

A. W. it is possible that מכתם is derived from both, precious gold and stain.

שִׁלְמוֹ. פְּרִיסָאָדוֹ. כִּי שְׁמוֹמֹר זֶה יָקָר וְחֹשֶׁב כֶּתֶם שֶׁהוּא הַזֶּהב. כלל שבו דברים נעימים ונכונים וחשובים ויקרים כזהב וכן כלשון הזה שמעו כי ננידים אדבר, הנה כתבתי לך שלשים שר' לז' דברים יקרים וחשובים כננידים ושלשים שהם חשובים ויקרים. וכדרך שקורין לדברים החשובים והנכונים מרגליות וכן לשון עדות לאסף שפי' פאר וחמדה הוא לאסף או שהם דברי פאר וחמדה מן ועדית ערי שהוא ענין חכמים. *Salmo preciado*, i. e. this Psalm contains precious words like בתם, which means gold, as it is said (Prov. viii. 6), 'Hear, for I will speak of excellent things,' and (Prov. xxii. 20), 'Have I not written to thee excellent things?' i. e. things excellent like princes and chiefs. In the same way precious words are called 'pearls.' And this is meant by the title עדות (Ps. lxxx. 1), an ornament to Asaph, or words of ornament and delight, derived from ועדית עדי (Ezek. xxiii. 40), which has the meaning of ornament.

Y. refers this Psalm to David's dynasty, and to the child who would usurp his kingdom for a certain time, like a stain which remains in a cloth, מכתם is therefore derived from נכתם (Jer. ii. 22). جعل عنوان هذه المزمور من اجل ان فيه ذكر دولته كقوله. חבלים נפלו לי בנעימים. فمعنى مכתם هو ان الولد الذى يستحل ملكه على مد الزمان مثل الاثر الباقي فى الثوب ولهذا اللفظة نظير فى המקרא נכתם עונך לפני.

Rashi gives for this word 'crown,' or מך ותם 'oppressed and blameless,' which Meiri refers to the tune.—I. E., besides his general opinion on the subject, mentions the explanation 'lovely Psalm,' derived from פן כתם. So also Immanuel.

It is remarkable that Ali gives in his dictionary an opinion that מכתם is to be taken as מכתב, which explains the LXX (Graetz,

PSALM XXXII.—לְדוֹר מִשְׁכִּיל.

Ο'. συνέσεως τῷ Δ. 'Α. τοῦ Δ. ἐπιστήμονος.

I. intellectus ipsi D. V. ipsi D. intellectus.

Tg. לְדוֹר מִשְׁכִּיל, intelligence.

S. قول لداود يفهم به الناس ليعقلوا: ان قوله فى وسط هذا الفصل
 اشبيلך ואורך هو تفسير ما جعلته عنوانا فقال لְדוֹר מִשְׁכִּיל فجعل
 To make a man intelligent. The words in verse 8, 'I will instruct thee and
 teach thee,' explain the heading.

Meiri says it is an instrument which stirs up the heart. Sy.
 translates 'prophecy.' Y. 'the right direction.'

A. W. translates 'hope and instruction;' P. 'hope.'

Tm. to Ps. lxxiv says as follows: قيل تعقل وقيل نظر وتأمل
 والمعنيان متقربان لان التأمل للامور النظر فيها وباسبابها وفى كيفية
 الخلاف منها انما يكون بالعقل. Understanding or reflecting.
 Both meanings are near one to the other. Reflecting on and
 seeing into a matter, for discovering the reasons of its causes or
 changes, are operations of the intellect.

Anon. שלמו די אינטידימיינטו פי' מזמור שכל להשכיל כמו לְדוֹר
 להזכיר והוא שם מהכבד החמישיי ע"מ יתן אכל למכביר כל' שמשכילין
 ממנו ענינים נכונים או כמשמעו לשון מופעיל כל' שמזמור זה משכיל ומבין
 ומוזהיר לעם וכן מכתם לְדוֹר ללמד שמלמד ענינו לעם
 Salmo de Entendimiento, i. e. Psalm of understanding to make others to under-
 stand, as להזכיר (Ps. xxxviii. 1), which are both of the *hiph'il* form.
 It means either that people will learn from it right things, or
 in the usual sense, viz. this Psalm will make the nation to
 understand and be warned, as in ללמד (lx. 1), which means to
 teach the nation the matter of the Psalm.

PSALM XXXIII.—No title in the Hebrew text; most likely
 there was none in the LXX.

Ο'. ψ. τοῦ Δ. Origen says, ἀνεπίγραφος παρ' Ἑβραίοις καὶ παρὰ τοῖς
 ῥησιῶν¹. Ε'. Σ'. τῷ Δ.

I. in finem, psalmus ipsi D. V. psalmus D.

Saadyah writes as follows: ان هذا المزمور وان كان لم يجعل له
 قول משכיל عنوانا بالا قرب أن يكون معناه משכיל לְדוֹר مضمار (so) אז
 كان اكثره تاديبا وتفهيما وايضا عقل على سبيل كل משכיל
 this Psalm has not the heading משכיל, yet the contents of it would

¹ See Graetz, l. c., p. 267.

44 *The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms*

require it, for it is mostly an exhortation for improvement of conduct and development of the intellect.

PSALM XXXVIII.—*מומור לרוד להוכיר*.

O'. ψαλμὸς τῷ Δ. εἰς ἀνάμνησιν περὶ σαββάτου. 'A. μελῳδῆμα τοῦ Δ.

I. ps. D., in commemoratione sabbati. V. ps. D., in rememorationem de sabbato.

Tg. תשבחתא לרוד דכרנא טבא על ישראל. Praise of David for the good remembrance of Israel.

S. مجد لداود يذكر فيه بقة. Praise of David to be remembered continually.

A. W. translates 'praising.'—Rashi and an anonymous author explain, To remember the calamities of Israel.—Imm. says, That they may remember it, and pray in the time of misfortune.—Meiri explains it like משכיל, to wake up the heart.

PSALM XXXIX.—*למנצח לידותון מומור לרוד*.

O'. τῷ Ἰδιθὺν ῥῃ. 'A. Σ. Θ. ὑπὲρ Ἰδιθὺν μελῳδῆμα (Θ. ῥῃ).

I. Edithun. V. ipsi Idithun.

Tg. לשבחא על מטרות בית מקדשא על פמיה דידותון תושבחחא. To praise, for the watch of the Temple by the mouth of Jeduthun.

S. مجد لداود يسبح به المواظبون من اليرودتون الليوانى. Praise of David for the Levites of Jeduthun to recite.

Sy. Some say that the prophecy is by Jeduthun and David; others say the prophecy was written by David and recited by Jeduthun, who is Ethan. All agree that the Psalm was composed by David, except I. E., who mentions an anonymous opinion to the effect that Jeduthun was the author of this Psalm.

PSALM XLII.—*למנצח משכיל לבני קרח*.

O'. εἰς σύνεσιν τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορέ. 'A. Σ. ἐπιστήμονος τῶν υἱῶν Κορέ.

I. V. intellectus filiis Corae.

Tg. לשבחא בשכלא טבא על ידיהון דבני קרח. To praise, with good intelligence by the sons of Korah.

S. قول تفهيم وتعليم يسبح به المواظمين من بني كרח الليوانى. A word signifying understanding and learning with which the Levites of the sons of Korah praised.

Y. says, Know that the first book is by David, except the first two Psalms; the next book is by the sons of Korah, seven by David and one by Asaph. The collector has separated them from the other, because they are connected together. اعلم ان الجزء الاول كله لردود غير اشري האיש. למה רגשו. وهذه الجزء هي לבני كרח ولردود

ومزمور واحد لئסף فلما كانت فصول בני קרח متصلة في معانيها
فصلها المدون وجعلها فصول متصلة وافصلها من مزامير דוד.

PSALM XLV.—למנצח על ששנים לבני קרח משכיל שיר ידירות.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορὲ εἰς σύνεσιν, ᾧδῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ (ששנים as שונים?). 'Α. ἐπὶ τοῖς κρίνοισ τῶν υἱῶν Κορὲ ἐπιστή-
μονος, ἄσμα προσφιλίας. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθῶν τῶν υἱῶν Κορὲ, συνέσεως
ἄσμα εἰς τὸν ἀγαπητόν. Θ. ὑπὲρ τῶν κρίνων . . . τοῖς ἡγαπημένοις.

I. pro his quae (V. iis qui) commutabuntur, filiis Corae (V. ad),
intellectum, canticum pro dilecto.

Tg. לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין דמשה דאתאמר בנבואה על ידיהוּן.
דבני קרח שכלא טבא ותושבחתא ואודאתא. To praise the Sanhedrin
of the time of Moses, which was spoken by prophecy through the
sons of Korah, good intelligence, praise, and thanksgivings.

S. قول تفهيم في وصف محبي الله يسبح به المواظبون من بني
קרח بلكن يلقب بالسوسن: فسّرنا שיר ידירות وصف فضائل محبي
الله لان لفظة ידיר וידירות كذلك معناها فاول المحبون (so) لله خليفته
الذي اختلفه ثم اتباعهم وجمعهم اولا في اسم ידירות ثم فرد الملك
בן. An utterance of understanding, to
describe the lovers of God, with which the Levites of the sons
of Korah praise with a tune called Shushan. I have explained
שיר ידירות as a description of the advantages of those who love
God; for the meaning of ידיר and ידירות is as follows: the first of
those who love God is his successor; then his followers (l. اتباعه),
both of which the Psalmist unites in ידירות; then the king is spoken
of subsequently in the following words: 'I speak of the things which
I have made touching the king.'

للمستحق على زمان السواسن لبني קרח رشد نشيد التودّات Y.
ذكر في هذه العنوان ثلثة اشياء. احدها هو على ששנים ويشير به الى
שארית ישראל המمثלים בשושנה בין החוחים وذلك من شان السواسن
تظهر في زمان الربيع اذا بدا الزمان يصيف وكذلك חמימי דרך
يظهرون في آخر الدלות الممثلة بالشتی كقوله כי הנה הסתו עבר.
ومعنى اخر في تمثيلهم بالشושנים دون غيرها هو ان السواسن ليس
لها غير حسن فقط وكذلك שארית ישראל חמימי דרך ليس لهم في
ذلك الزمان غير حسن طاعات فقط وليس لهم لا ملك ولا نعمة في
الدלות: والثاني لفظة משכיל والمعنى فيه هو ان فيه رشد للمسيح عم
في ما يجب عليه ان يفعل حتى يستحق المواعد الجزيلة كما سنشرح
بعد: والثالث هو قوله שיר ידירות وقال ידירות בלשון רבים لانها
تودّات كثيرة منها محبة الله تعالى לישראל والمسيحه وايضا محبة

הַמְּשִׁיחַ לַלֵּלָה זָכָרָה וְלִמְתָּהּ לְזֵכֶר לֵיל שִׁיר יִירֹדוֹת: Three things are contained in this heading: 1. The lily represents Israel amongst thorns, which at the end of the captivity will make its appearance like the lily in spring; or as the lily has no beauty, so are Israel in captivity, deprived of their king and robbed of happiness. 2. The word מִשְׁכִּיל refers to the direction given to the Messiah, what he is to do in order to be worthy of the great and promised time. 3. 'Song of loves,' in the plural, for there are several loves, viz. the love of God to Israel and to his Messiah, and the love of the Messiah towards God and his nation.

Rashi refers the lilies to the wise men, like the Targum.

Tm. اسم آلة من آلات التي يقال عليها الشير. وقيل انه اسم لحن وطريقة من الطرائق: שִׁיר יִירֹדוֹת. יִירֹדוֹת صفة للشير أي انه نشيد محبوب مستحسن يرغب في سماعه. والمفسر تأوله على المحبين فقال في وصف محبتي الله. والأقرب ان هذا القول قيل في دور او سلמה وهو مديح فيه وفي الملة التي ملكها التي لشدة حسننها وعناية الله بها ولا عليها مثل هذا الملك للجليل الحسن الفضائل المستقيم السيرة المحبوب عند الله وتضمن مع ذلك دعاء له بالنصر والتأييد وهلاك اعدائه واتلافهم بسلache واسلامهم في يديه. The name of an instrument or of a tune. יִירֹדוֹת is a description of שִׁיר, i.e. a beautiful and beloved song, which is agreeable to hear. The commentator (Saadyah) applies it to lovers, i.e. to describe the lovers of God. The most probable opinion is that this Psalm is said concerning David or Solomon, to praise one of them together with the nation which made him their king. He is a king who has no equal in his qualities, and is beloved above others with God. The author of the Psalm combines with this praise a prayer to God that he may assist the king to subdue his enemies.

Meiri says it is an instrument to waken great love.—R. says it is a lyre.—Imm. It means a song of love and friendship, composed in honour of Solomon after his coronation and marriage, written with great skill, for it has also a mystical meaning, which is as sweet as a lily. He, however, says that possibly this Psalm is based on a song beginning with שִׁירֵינוּ.—Anon. says that it is a song lovely as lilies, or it refers to an instrument or a tune.

PSALM XLVI.—לְמִנְצַח לְבָנֵי קָרַח עַל עֲלֻמוֹת שִׁיר.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ τῶν νύων Κορὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων ψαλμός. 'Α. τῶν νύων Κορὲ ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων μελωδία. Σ. τῶν νύων Κορὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰωνίων ᾠδή.

I. V. [I. pro] filius Corac pro arcanis.

Tg. לשבחא על ידיהון דבני קרח ברוח נבואה בזמן דאתחכסי אבוהון. מנהון והטן אשתובו ואמרו שירתא. To praise, by the sons of Korah, by the spirit of prophecy, at the time when their father was hidden from them, and they were saved and uttered the Psalm.

S. قول يسبح به المواظبون من بني كרח بلحن خفي مسترق. Uttering with which the sons of Korah said praise in a low and subdued melody.

D. A. النشيد, an instrument.—A. W. a kind of pleasant song.—Tm. says, لحن خفي رقيق حاد محرك للنفس على الرقة, a low and subdued melody, sharp, and moving the soul by its tenderness.

Anon. סילאמינטוש די קאנקו או קנקו די סילאמינטוש שיר בבלי ניגון. שקולו ערב ונמוך ונעלם שאינו נשמע למרחוק ובער' שו"ט חפ"י ד"א שיר שעניניו נעלמים ונסתרים כי ענין המזמור הזה מדבר על ענין זמן הנאולה שזמנה נסתר ונעלם. An instrument which produces sweet and low [literally hidden] tones, which are not heard far off. Another opinion is, a song, the meaning being hidden, for this Psalm refers to the time of the redemption, which is unknown and hidden.

PSALM LIII.—למנצח על מחלת מושביל לדוד.

O'. ὑπὲρ Μαελεθ συνέσεως τῷ Δ. 'A. ἐπὶ χορεία ἐπιστήμονος Δ. Σ. διὰ χοροῦ περὶ συνέσεως τοῦ Δ. Θ. ὑπὲρ τῆς χορείας συνέσεως τοῦ Δ. Ε'. ὑπὲρ τῆς χορείας.

I. pro Abimelech intellectus David. V. pro Maeleth intelligentiae David.

Tg. לשבחא על פורענתא דרשיעיא די מפסין שמא דקרים שכלא טבא. על יד דוד. To praise concerning the punishment of the wicked, who blaspheme the name of κύριος, good intelligence by David.

S. قول لداود تفهيم حكمة يسبح به المواظبون بطبول في القدس. Spoken by David. An instruction of wisdom with which the Levites praise in Jerusalem with drums.

D. A. طبل, drum.—Sy. מחלת is an instrument, called also מוחל, although it is rather different from those. Some say מחלת refers to the dominion of the Christians (אדום) and the Arabs (ישמעאל), since Esau (אדום) married the daughter of Ishmael (Gen. xxviii. 9).—Y. mentions the latter opinion.—Anon. מן בתפלים ובמחלות ובער' طنبور והוא כמין תפ ועל כן הוא נזכר תמיד עם התוף. A kind of drum as תפ, the two instruments are therefore mentioned together.

PSALM LVI.—לִמְנַצַּח עַל יוֹנָת אֱלֹם רַחוּקִים לְדוֹר מִכַּתָּם בָּאֲחוֹ אוֹתוֹ.
פִּלְשְׁתִּים בִּנְתָּ.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων μεμακρυσμένου, τῷ Δαυὶδ εἰς στηλογραφίαν, ὅποτε ἐκράτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐν Γέθ (see Sy.).
'Α. ὑπὲρ περιστερῶς ἀλάλου μακρυσμῶν τοῦ Δαυὶδ ταπεινοῦ τελείου, ἐν τῷ κρατῆσαι αὐτὸν φυλιστιαίους ἐν Γέθ. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῆς περιστερῶς, ὑπὸ τοῦ φύλου αὐτοῦ ἀπωσμένου τοῦ Δ. τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀμώμου, ὅτε κατέσχον αὐτὸν οἱ φυλιστιαῖοι ἐν Γέθ. Θ. ὑπὲρ τῆς περιστερῶς . . . Ε'. ὑπὲρ τῆς περιστερῶς τῆς μογγυλάου κεκρυμμένων τῷ Δ. εἰς στηλογραφίαν, ὅποτε ἐκράτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐν Γέθ.

I. V. pro populo, qui a Sanctis longe factus est, David in tituli inscriptione, cum tenuerunt eum Allophyli in Geth.

Tg. לשבחא על כנישתא דישראל דמתילא ליונה שתוקא בערן די מתרחקין מן קרויהון וחורין ומשבחין למרי עלמא היך דוד מכיך ושלם כד אחדו יתיה פלישתאי בנת. To praise concerning the congregation of Israel, which is likened to a silent dove at the time when they are removed from their cities and return and praise the Lord of the world, like David, humble and perfect, when the Philistines took him at Gath.

وهذا طرق لداود يسبح به المواظبون وكان هو سبى به على س. اضطهاد الجمع الابعدين حين مسكه الفلسطينيين فى نث. A kind of song with which the constant Levites praise. He uttered it concerning the submission of the distant congregation when the Philistines seized him in Gath.

D. A. وعلى مثل هذا المعنى وقع على الجلووتين اسم الخرسه لقوله لِمَنْצַחַ עַל יוֹנָת אֱלֹם רַחוּקִים فَقَوْلُهُ يוֹנָת יִשְׁכֵּר בֶּה הָאֻמָּה הַזֵּאת הַזֵּאת הַזֵּאת יוֹנָתִי בַחֲנוּי הַסֵּלַע וְסִמָּהֶם אֱלֹם חָרַסְתֶּם עֵן قוֹל הַחֵץ נְחוּ קוֹלֵה נְאֻלְמָתִי דוֹמִיָּה. נְאֻלְמָתִי לֹא אֶפְתַּח פִּי וְכִזֵּי וְשֵׁפָה יִשְׁעֶיהָ עֵם עַן בְּעֵץ הַיִּשְׁמָרִית נִשְׁטָה וְהוּא נִעְנָה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח פִּיו כִּשֶׁה לְטַבַּח יוֹב . . . וְקוֹלֵה רַחוּקִים לְבַעֲדֵם עַן הַקֹּדֶשׁ נִזְכָּר קוֹלֵה כִּי הָרַחֲקִים בְּנוֹיִם. Thus the exiles are called 'dumb' in lvi. The dove is the nation, as in Cant. ii. 14, which is obliged to be dumb; comp. Ps. xxxix. 3, 10; Is. liii. 7. They are called 'far' because they are distant from Jerusalem, as it is said, 'Although I have cast them far off amongst the heathen' (Ezek. xi. 16).

Sy. للمستحيث على حمامة الرواق وهم بعيدين لداود اثر [1] عند اخذ. פִּלְשְׁתִּים לֹא בִּנְתָּ: קָאָלוּ מַעֲנֵי יוֹנָת אֱלֹם יִרִיד יִשְׂרָאֵל הַמִּתְלִין בְּיוֹנָה כְּקוֹלֵה וְהִיא אֶפְרַיִם בְּיוֹנָה פוֹתָה וְנָ' וְקוֹלֵה אֱלֹם רַחוּקִים הַזֵּאת הֵם בְּעִידֵין מִן קֹדֶשׁ רַב הָעָלְמִיִן. וְלֹא זָכַר אֱלֹם דוֹן הַיִּבֵּל וְדַבֵּר וְגִיר מִן הַמּוֹאֲעִים

قالوا لان ثم موضع الشفاعة والبكاء للجمع كقوله بين האולם והמזבח יבכו הכהנים וג'. وقوله רחוקים يريد جمع ישראל الذي هم قد بعدوا من هذا الموضع فيجب عليهم يذكروا باريتهم ويفزعوا الله ويذكروا الموضوع ولا ينسوا كقوله זכרו מרחוק את יי' וג': وقالوا אולם خرس يعنى هذه الحمامات الخرسا بين الملול وليس له فתחון פה כקולה ואני כחרש לא אשמע וג' وقال ايضا فى בית דוד נגש והוא נענה ולא יפתח פיו וג'. وقال דוד هذه النبوة عندما ضبطه הפלשתיים فى גת فابتدى בذكر יונת אולם רחוקים לيعرف ان باطن هذه النبوة على ישראל لانهم تحت يد اعدائهم مقبوض عليهم כקולה אסירי עני וברזל (אולם, אולם). Israel are likened to doves (Hosea vii. 11), who are far from the Temple (אולם, אולם). Others say that אולם means 'dumb,' for Israel is tortured and cannot open the mouth (Isaiah liii). This Psalm David composed when seized by the Philistines, but he began it with the dove in order that the title 'concerning Israel' should be understood.

Y. translates as Sy., and says, קולה על יונת אולם ישיר به الى דוד, الذى تمتى وقال מי יתן לי אבר כיונה. وقوله אולם רחוקים ישיר به الى موضع فى גת פלשתיים الذى اعتقلوه فيه הפלשתיים وقال المدון ان هذا המזמור هو على דוד الذى اعتقل فى حبס פלשתיים الذين هم בעידין الذى ظن דוד انه بهروبه الى פלשתיים يتخلص من שאול وهذا من قلقه فليحقه ثم خوف شديد والمعنى فى על יונת אולם רחוקים هو انه قلقه. He refers it to David, who said of himself, 'Oh that I had wings like a dove' (Ps. lv. 7 [6]). אולם רחוקים refers to a place at Gath, where the Philistines kept him bound. The redactor of the book thought that this Psalm referred to David, who was kept prisoner by the Philistines, who were far off (אולם from מאלמים?).

A. W. renders 'dove of distant castles.'—Q. says David called himself a dumb dove.—Meiri supposes it to denote an instrument which sounds like the cooing of doves.—R. the treachery (יונה from ינה) of Elam, which promised help.

Anon. קונפניא די נזניקוס פי' חברת רחוקים מושאל מן והנה אנחנו מאלמים אלומים שהוא ענין אגידה כמו שהושאל גם כן והחברה (sic) והקבין מלשון אגידה. ויהי לאגידה אחת ואמ' דוד זה המזמור בהיותו בגת על תאותו וחשקו לארצו ולמישפחתו. ודמה עצמו וסיעתו ליונה המרחקת נדוד כמו שאומ' מי יתן לי אבר כיונה. הנה ארחיק נדוד. כלומ' שהיו רחוקים מארץ ישראל. ד"א יונת אולם מענין מי ישום אולם. כלומ' שהיו נודדים מארצם כיונה המרחקת נדוד ויושבין שם כאלמים שלא היו יכולין לדבר מפחד וזה הנכון. 'A society of far distant men,' derived from (Gen. xxxvii. 7), i. e. David compares himself and his com-

panions, when in Gath, as a dove which is flying far off, being far away from the land of Israel. The right explanation is 'like a dove far away and dumb, being afraid to speak.'

PSALM LVII.—לִמְנָצָה אֶל תִּשְׁחָת לְדוֹר מִכְתָּם בִּבְרָחוֹ מִפְּנֵי יִשְׁאוּל בַּמְעָרָה.

Ο'. μὴ διαφθείρῃς, τῷ Δαυὶδ εἰς στηλογραφίαν, ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ἀποδιδράσκειν ἀπὸ προσώπου Σαοὺλ εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον. Σ. περὶ τοῦ, μὴ διαφθείρῃς, τοῦ Δαυὶδ τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀμώμου ('Α. ταπεινοῦ τελείου).

I. V. ne disperdas, David in tituli inscriptionem, cum fugerunt (V. fugeret) a facie Saul in speluncam.

Tg. לשבחא על עקתא בזמן די אמר דוד לא תחבל אחאמר על יד דרוד. To praise concerning the calamity when David said, 'Do not destroy;' said by David, humble and perfect, when he fled before Saul to the cave.

S. طرق لداود يسبح به المواظبون وكان هو سبح به وقت هربه من بين يدي في المغاري سال في (فيه) لا نهلك. A kind of song by David, with which the Levites praise, and which David composed when flying from Saul to the cave, asking in it not to destroy.

Sy. does not explain תִּשְׁחָת.—Y. takes it as an exclamation like Deut. ix. 26.—Anon. is nearly of the same opinion, saying, לשון תפלה מפני פחד שאול שהיה קרוב למות ואמ' אל תשחת כל' אל תשחיתו.—Qamhi and I. E. take it as the beginning of a song.—Meiri and R. say, David prays that he should not die.

PSALM LX¹.—לִמְנָצָה עַל שׁוֹשַׁן עֲדוֹת מִכְתָּם לְדוֹר לְלִמְדָּה.

Ο'. τοῖς ἀλλοιωθησομένοις ἔτι εἰς στηλογραφίαν τῷ Δαυὶδ εἰς διδασχὴν. 'Α. ἐπὶ κρίνων μαρτυρίας ταπεινοῦ τελείου τοῦ Δαυὶδ. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθῶν μαρτυρία τοῦ ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἀμώμου τοῦ Δαυὶδ εἰς διδασχὴν.

I. (V. pro) his qui immutabuntur, in tituli inscriptionem (V. ipsi) David, in doctrinam.

Tg. לשבחא על עתיק סהדותא די בני יעקב ולבן פרשנ על יד דוד. לאלפא. To praise concerning the old witness of the sons of Jacob and Laban, a copy by David for teaching.

S. وهذا طرق لداود يسبح به المواظبون بلحن يلقب بالسوسن وكان يسبح به ليعلم الجميع نصر الله. This is a kind of song of David with which the Levites praise with a tune called Susan, and its object is to make generally known the help of God.

Sy. لمستحى على سوسن الشهادة اثر [1] لداود للتعليم: معنى.

¹ See Ps. xvi.

על שושן עדות יריד אֲסָחָב הַמִּצְוֹת לֹאן עֲדוֹת הִי הַתּוֹרָה קְוֹלָה עֲדוֹת יוֹי' נִאֲמָנָה. וְשׁוֹשָׁן וְשׁוֹשָׁנִים אֵהֵל הַפָּאָעָה יַעֲנִי אֵן הַזֶּה שְׁלוֹת אֵהֵל הַכְּתָב הַזִּי אִתְּמָהּ דּוֹר לְתַעֲלִים יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲתִי יִכּוֹנּוּא יִשְׁפְּעוּא בְּהָּא בִּי הַלְלוֹת To the instigator upon Susan, the testimony, a blot to David for teaching. שושן עדות refers to the people who observe the commandments; this prayer is taught by David for the people in misfortune.

Y. translates as Sy. The following is his commentary: קוֹלָהּ עַל שׁוֹשָׁן יִשְׁכִּיר בָּהּ אֶל הַמָּשִׁיחַ הַזִּי יִנְבֵּט בִּי הַלְלוֹת כְּמָא יִנְבֵּטוֹן חֲמִימֵי דְרַךְ הַמִּתְלִין בַּלְשׁוֹשָׁנִים. פֹּארוּ אֵן יִנְבֵּט בִּי זְמָנֵהּם וּפִאָעָתָהּ כְּפִאָעָתָהּם וְתַעֲבֵר עֲלֵיהֶם לָדוֹת כְּמָא תַעֲבֵר עֲלֵיהֶם לְזִלְכָּא מִתְּלֵהּ בְּשׁוֹשָׁן כְּמָא מִתְּלֵהּ בְּשׁוֹשָׁנִים. וְקוֹלָהּ עֲדוֹת הִי עֲלָמָהּ תִּדֵּל עַלֵּי אֵנֶה הַמָּשִׁיחַ וְזִלְכָּא אִתָּא וְגִדְנָא מִתְּלֵהּ הַזֶּה הַלְּגָהּ בִּי יוֹאֵשׁ מֶלֶךְ יִהוּדָה קְוֹלָהּ וְיִתְּנֵנוּ עֲלֵינוּ אֵת הַנּוֹר וְאֵת הָעֲדוֹת וְהַגִּרְזָא הוּא אֲנֵהּם שְׁהִידוּא בַּלְשֵׁנָהּ . . . וְאִגְרָדָהּ אֶל זְרוּבָבֶל מִתְּלֵהּ בְּשׁוֹשָׁנִים means the Messiah and the pious men, who are likened to lilies; עדות is a proof that the passage refers to the Messiah; comp. 2 Kings xi. 12. The Messiah is either Zerubbabel or David himself.

A. W. עדות like מַכְתָּם, golden, so שושן עדות.—Rashi applies it to the Sanhedrin. See the anonymous author.—Meiri and Remokh take שושן עדות as a choice instrument (from עדו).—M. takes עדות = לְהַזְכִּיר, i. e. to stir up the heart. Thus a noble instrument chosen for teaching and to stir up the heart.—R. to teach Israel to pray.

Anon. שיר נחמד כשושן. עדות דִּי פִּירְמוֹשָׁדָא פִּי' עֵינִן פֹּאֵר וְחִמְדָּה וְכִנְשִׁיט יוֹפֵי מִן וְאֶעֱדָךְ עֲרִי כָּל' שְׁדַבְרֵיו נְחִמְדִּים וְנִפְאָרִים כְּתִכְשִׁיט. וְכִנְשִׁיט שְׁדַבְרֵיו יִקְרִים כֹּהֵב כְּמוֹ שְׁאֻמְרֵנוּ וְכִנְשִׁיט עֲלֵינוּ אֵת הַנּוֹר וְאֵת הָעֲדוֹת. ד' אֵל עֲדוֹתֵנוּ שֶׁל סְנֵהֲדִין שְׁנִמְשְׁלוּ לְשׁוֹשָׁנִים שֶׁהֵעִידוּ לְהַלְחֵם בְּאַרְם וּבִבְנֵי עַמּוֹן וּבְאַדְמוֹם כְּמוֹ שֶׁתִּפְרַשׁ לְדוֹד: לְלַמֵּד פִּי' לְלַמֵּד וְלִהְבִּין עֵינֵינוּ כְּדִי לְהַלֵּל לְהַקְבִּי'ה. ד' אֵל כְּשֶׁנֶּצֶטְרַךְ דּוֹד שִׁלְמִדְרוּהוּ מִהּ יַעֲשֶׂה כְּשֶׁנִּלְחַם עִם אֲרָם שְׁאֵל לְסְנֵהֲדִין אִם מוֹתֵר לְהַלְחֵם בָּם מֵאַחֵר שֶׁנִּשְׁבַּע (see Targum). A song pleasant like a lily. עדות means beauty and ornament, like מַכְתָּם, meaning that his words are beautiful like a jewel. Others say that עדות means the witness (decision) of the Sanhedrin, who are likened to lilies; the Sanhedrin advised David to make war upon Aram, Ammon, and Edom. לְלַמֵּד means to teach and to understand how to praise God. Others say, to learn from the Sanhedrin whether it was allowable for him to wage war upon Aram, after the agreement made between Laban and Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 52).

PSALM LXIX.—למנצח על שושנים לרוד.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων τῷ Δαυίδ¹. 'Α. τῷ νικοποιῶ ἐπὶ κρίνων τοῦ Δαυίδ. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

I. V. pro his (V. pro iis), qui commutabuntur.

Tg. לשבחא על גלות סנהדרין על יד דוד. To praise concerning the exile of the Sanhedrin by David.—S. as above².—Y. שושנים, the remnant of Israel, who are in exile and suffering.

PSALM LXX.—למנצח לרוד להוכיר.

Ο'. τῷ Δαυίδ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, ÷ εἰς τὸ σῶσαι με κύριον (τοῦτο ἐν ἐνίοις μὲν ἀντιγράφοις εἶρον, ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ οὐ· πλὴν οὔτε παρὰ τῷ Ἑβραίῳ, οὔτε παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐρίσκεται). 'Α. τοῦ Δ. τοῦ ἀναμνησκειν.

I. V. psalmus D. In rememorationem, quod saluum fecerit eum Deus.

Tg. לשבחא על יד דוד למדכר על צורך לבונתא. To praise by David to remember the use of incense.

S. *قول لداود يسبح به المواظون بذكر الله*. A composition of David's with which the Levites praise in remembrance of God.

Other commentaries as above, Ps. xxxviii.

PSALM LXXV.—למנצח אל תשחת מזמור לאסף שיר.

Ο'. μὴ διαφθείρης, ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς τῷ Ἀσάφ. Σ. περὶ ἀφθαρσίας ψαλμὸς τοῦ Ἀσάφ.

I. ne corrumpas, psalmus Asaph Canticum (V. cantici Asaph).

Tg. לשבחא בזמן די אמר דוד לא תחבל עמך תושבחתא על ידו די דאסף. ושירא. To praise at the time when David said, 'Do not destroy thy people.'

S. *مجد لداود يسبح به الاسف المواظون تشقعا يقولون لا تهلك*. Praise by David with which the Asaphite Levites praise, interceding and saying, 'Do not destroy.'

All commentators agree that David prays to God not to destroy Israel.

PSALM LXXVII.—למנצח על ידותן לאסף מזמור.

Ο'. ὑπὲρ Ἰδιθὺν ψαλμὸς τῷ Ἀσάφ. 'Α. ἐπὶ Ἰδιθὺμ μελωδῆμα τῷ Ἀσάφ. Σ. διὰ Ἰδιθὺμ ᾠδὴ τοῦ Ἀσάφ.

I. pro Idithum, huic Asaph Psalmus. V. pro Idithun, psalmus Asaph.

Tg. לשבחא על יד ידותן לאסף תושבחתא. To praise, by Jeduthun, to Asaph a Psalm.

¹ See Ps. xlv.

² See Ps. xlv.

S. وهذا مجد يسبح به المواظبون من الاسف ويدوتون. This is a Psalm with which the constant (Levites) descendants of Asaph and Jeduthun praise.

Y. The prophecy came to Jeduthun and rested upon Asaph by the Holy Spirit.—Meiri takes על ידותון as לידותון, to Jeduthun.

PSALM LXXX.—למנצח על שושנים עדות לאסף מזמור.

O'. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων μαρτύριον τῷ Ἀσάφ, ψαλμὸς [ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀσσυρίου]. 'A. Σ. ὑπὲρ τῶν κρίνων μαρτυρίας (ἀνθῶν μαρτυρία) τοῦ Ἀσάφ μελώδημα.

I. V. pro his (V. iis) qui immutabuntur (I. in) testimonium Asaph pro Assyrio (V. psalmus).

Tg. לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין די מתעסקין בסהדות אוריתא על ידוי. דאסף תושבחתא. To praise, respecting the Sanhedrin, who are busy with the testimony of the law, by Asaph praise.

S. وهذا مجد شهادة يسبح به المواظبون من الاسف بلحن ملقب بالسوسن. Praise of testimony with which the Asaphite Levites praise with a tune called Susan.

Rashi refers the Psalm to Israel, who witnessed the three captivities.—I. E. עדי, according to A. W. a beautiful thing.—Q. does not accept this explanation, but says that the meaning is unknown.—Meiri, who refers it to an instrument, quotes the opinion that חק=עדות, a fixed rule for this instrument.—Anon. quotes the opinions already given.

PSALM LXXXI.—Compare above, Ps. vii.

S. قول يسبح به المواظبون من العوادر ادم الغني والاسف. An utterance with which the constant Levites of the families of Obed Edom of Gath and of Asaph praise (in Ps. lxxxiv, and of Korah).

PSALM LXXXVII.—לבני קרח מזמור שיר.

The Greek and Latin translators treat the words 'His foundation' etc. as a separate verse (comp. A. V.).

Tg. על ידיהון דבני קרח אתאמר שירתא דמתיסר על פום אבהתא. דמן לקרמין. By the sons of Korah this Psalm is uttered, being based upon the mouth of the fathers of old.

S. مجد يسبح به المواظبون من بني كרח وهو نعت القدس الذي اساسه في جبل القدس. Praise with which the Levites, the sons of Korah, praise; a description of the Temple, the foundations of which are on the Temple mount.

Y. The basis of this Psalm is the description of the excellence of the holy mountains; comp. Ps. lxxxvii. 3. Others say the Psalm describes the foundation of the glory of God.

I. E. says that the Psalm was composed by one of the grandchildren of Samuel; the Psalm refers to the foundation of the holy mountains. So also Q.

PSALM LXXXVIII.—שיר מזמור לבני קרח למנצח על מחלת לענות
משביל להימן האזרחי.

O'. ὡδὴ ψαλμοῦ τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορέ, εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ Μαελέθ τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι, συνένσεως Αἰμὰν τῷ Ἰσραηλίτῃ. 'A. Σ. ᾄσμα μελωδήματος τῶν υἱῶν Κορέ, τῷ νικοποιῶν τῷ ἐπὶ χορείᾳ (Σ. διὰ χοροῦ) τοῦ ἐξάρχειν, ἐπιστημοσύνης τῷ Αἰμὰν τῷ Ἰσραηλίτῃ.

I. V. psalmus cantici filiis Corae (V. canticum psalmi), in finem, pro Maleleth ad respondendum, intellectus Aemat (V. Eman) Israhelitae.

Tg. שירא ותושבחתא על ידיהון דבני קרח על צלותא לשבחה שכלא טבא על ידיו דהימן יציבא Song and praise by the sons of Korah, concerning a prayer to praise good intelligence by Heman the native.

S. وهذا مجد يسبح به المواظبون من بني كרח بتطليل واجابة بفهم يجاوبونهم الهيمن الازרחي: عنوان هذا المزمور يظن انه لثلاثة انفس والامر كما قدمنا ان جملة السفر لداود وانما هذا المزمور دفعه الى بني كרח وبني هيمن يسبحون به فامر بني كרח ان يضربوا بالطبول وبني هيمن يجاوبونهم كقوله לענות وهذه اللفظة وعلى انها مدغشة فهي تصلح ان تنصرف الى الجواب مثل قوله بיום ההוא כרם חמר ענו לה. Praise, with which the Korahite Levites praise with drums, and the Hemanites give the intelligent responses. The meaning of this Psalm is that there are three composers, but it is as we said, that the whole book is by David, but this Psalm he handed over to the sons of Korah for the music, and the Hemanites for responses, which is the meaning of לענות; hence the dagesh as in ענו (Isaiah xxvii. 2).

Rashi explains לענות מחלת Israel being sick and oppressed. Heman, one of the sons of Zerah, who are called sons of מחול because they have composed Psalms.—Q. says the same.—Meiri takes מחלת as an instrument.—Anon., a well-known Psalmist.

I. E., although, as usual, explaining מחלת as the beginning of a liturgy, refers it to the sickness of the Psalmist, and explains לענות as meaning to answer; comp. קול ענות (Exod. xxxii. 18). He quotes the Karaite Joshua, who says that Heman was a grandson

of Samuel, who is called אֶזְרָח because he was familiar with the singers, most of whom spring from his family. Others say the אֶזְרָח is the same as זֶרַח, i.e. son of Zerah, his brother being Ethan. Others say that Heman and Ethan are brothers, sons of Ezra.—Tm. is of the same opinion.—A. D. renders לענות by الغناء, to sing; so also Anon. *por cantar*.

PSALM LXXXIX.—משביל לאיתן האזרחי.

O'. Αἰθᾶμ τῷ Ἰσραηλῑτῇ. "Ἄλλος Αἰθᾶμ τῷ Ζαραῑτῇ. "Ἄλλος Αἰθᾶν τῷ Ἐζραῑτῇ.

I. Intellectus Heman Istrabelitae. V. Intellectus Ethan Ezrahitae.

Tg. שיכלא טבא דאתאמר על ידא דאברהם דאתא מן מדינחאי. Good intelligence uttered by Abraham, who came from the east.

Other commentators agree that Ethan was one of the singers, except Remokh, who says that he was one of the ten elders.

PSALM XC.—תפלה למשה.

O'. Προσευχῇ I. V. Oratio

Tg. צלותא דצלי משה נביא דיי' כד חבו עמא בית ישראל במדברא. Prayer which Moses, the prophet of God, prayed when the people of Israel sinned in the desert.

S. صلوة يسمع بها بنو موسى رسول الله. Prayer with which the [Levites of the] sons of Moses prayed.

The opinions on this Psalm are summed up in the following lines of the anonymous commentator: אמרו שמא משה אמרו וכתבו: דוד בכלל מזמוריו. ויש לומר' כי דוד עשהו לבני משה הלויים לנגן בו כמו שנתן לאסף לבני קרח לירדותון. ורבו' דרשו י"א מזמור יש מכאן ועד לדוד מזמור וכלן אמרן משה וכנגדן בירך י"א ברכות לאחד עשר שבטים בסדר זאת הברכה. Some say that Moses composed this Psalm, and David incorporated it in his collection; others think that David is the author who gave it to the sons of Moses, the Levites, for recitation, just as he did with Asaph, the sons of Korah, and Jeduthun. The rabbis say that Moses is the author of this Psalm and of the following ten; and so Moses blessed eleven tribes with eleven blessings (Deut. xxxiii).

PSALM XCII.—מזמור שיר ליום השבת.

O'. ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς (Σ. ᾠσμα ψαλμοῦ) εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου.

I. V. psalmus cantici, in die sabbati.

Tg. שבחא ושירא די אמר אדם קדמא על יומא דשבתא. Praise and song which Adam, the first man, said upon the sabbath day.

PSALM CIII.—לְדוֹד.

Ο'. τῷ Δαυὶδ. I. V. ipsi David.

Tg. עַל יְדֵי דָוִד אֶתְאָמַר בְּנְבוּאָה. Spoken by David in a prophecy.

The Greek and Latin translations, as well as the Targum, kept the word הללויה LXX in some MSS. τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου.

S. سَبِّحُوا الْإِزْلَى وقولوا, praise the eternal and say.

Th. has already forestalled the modern critics. He says: معنی הללויה فی البدایة كانه یامر الجمع ویدعوهم ان یشاركوه فی التسبیح ویكونوا معه جملة وهم الیسریم والعهدة الذین سیذكرهم بقوله فی موضع اخر لכו نرننہ لی¹ وهكذا كل موضع یبتدی فیہ הללויה هذا معناه. The meaning of הללויה at the beginning is to call on the congregation to join him in the praise of God. Compare Ps. xcvi (see Graetz, *Psalmen*, etc., p. 9).

PSALM CXX.—שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת.

Ο'. Θ. ὧδῃ (Θ. ᾠσμα) τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν. 'A. Σ. εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις.

I. canticum ascensum. V. canticum graduum.

Tg. שִׁירָא דִּאתָאמַר עַל מַסּוּקִין דְּחַתּוּמָא. Praise uttered concerning the rising of the deep¹.

S. تَسْبِيحٌ لِّلَّ بِرَفْعِ صَوْتٍ. Praise with a loud voice.

D. A. الدرج, degree. All commentaries agree that these fifteen Psalms were recited by the Levites on the fifteen steps leading from the Court of the men to that of the women in the Temple.—Q. quotes an opinion that it refers to the ascent (comp. המעלה, Ezra vii. 9) from exile, by which Israel will be restored to its own God.—Remokh makes the fifteen agree with the numerical value of יה, *Yah*.

PSALM CXXVII.—לְשִׁלְמֹה.

Ο'. ὧδῃ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν (alia exempl. add. τοῦ Σολομών). 'A. Σ. ᾠσμα τῶν ἀναβάσεων Salomonis.

I. V. canticum graduum Salomonis (I. Solomonis).

Tg. עַל יֵד שְׁלֹמֹה, by Solomon.

S. وَتَسْبِيحٌ بِرَفْعِ صَوْتٍ فِي مَا يَكُونُ مِنْ سُلَيْمَانَ. Praise with a loud voice in matters concerning Solomon; probably, as I. E. says, for Solomon, who wished to build the Temple.

¹ The legend in the Babylonian Talmud (*Sukkah*, fol. 53 a) says that when David was digging to find the deep, it rose tremendously and threatened to flood the world; then David said these fifteen Psalms and the deep retired.

From all these different expositions of the titles of the Psalms it is evident that the meaning of them was early lost; in fact the LXX and the other early Greek and Latin translators offer no satisfactory explanation of most of them. Of the best Jewish commentators like Ibn Ezra and David Qamhi, the former treats them as the opening words of popular melodies, the other as names of instruments, both confessing that the real meanings are unknown. Saadyah is no more successful; the Karaitic authors refer them mostly to the present exile, which is more Midrashic than the Midrash upon which the Targum is based. Immanuel and Remokh put Averroism in them and in the Psalms. The Syriac headings are a comparatively late production and arbitrary. That titles are omitted in the Hebrew text can be seen from the LXX: 23 (24); 24 (25); 26 (27); 28 (29); 30 (31); 32 (33); 37 (38); 42 (43); 47 (48); 65 (66); 69 (70); 70 (71); 75 (76); 79 (80); 90 (91); 92 (93); 93 (94); 94 (95); 96 (97); 97 (98); 98 (99); 99 (100); 103 (104); 104 (105); 106 (107); 113 (114)—118 (119); 135 (136); 136 (137); 137 (138); 142 (143); 143 (144); 145 (146); 146 (147); 148 (149). Thus when all traditional matter is exhausted, the only remaining resource is the critical method, which, however, on the present subject has as yet made no considerable progress.

AUTHORS AND WORKS QUOTED IN AN
ABRIDGED FORM.

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------|
| 'A. = Aquila | } | (p. 9). |
| 'E. = Quinta | | |
| o'. = LXX | | |
| Σ. = Symmachus | | |
| Θ. = Theodotion ¹ | | |
- Anon. = Anonymous Commentator (p. 32).
A. S. = Ali ben Soleiman (p. 27).
A. W. = Abu-'l-Walid (p. 24).
B. B. = (Jehudah) Ben Bal'am (p. 25).
D. A. = David ben Abraham (p. 20).
I. = Itala (p. 9).
I. E. = Abraham ibn Ezra (p. 25).
Imm. = Immanuel ben Solomon (p. 32).
J. R. = Jacob ben Reuben (p. 27).
Men. = Menahem Meiri (p. 30).
M. N. = Moses ben han-Nesiah of England (p. 29).
P. = Solomon Pirhōn (p. 27).
Q. = David Qamhī (p. 28).
R. = Abraham Remokh (p. 30).
Rashi = Solomon of Troyes (p. 25).
S. = Saadyah Gaon (p. 10).
S. D. = Saadyah ibn Danān (p. 32).
Sy. = Salmon ben Yeroham (p. 18).
Tg. = Targum (p. 10).
Tm. = Thanūm of Jerusalem (p. 30).
V. = Vulgate (p. 9).
Y. = Yepheth ben Eli (p. 20).

¹ These five according to Field's *Hexapla*.

II.

THE ORIGIN AND MUTUAL RELATION OF
THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

[F. H. WOODS.]

THE subject of this paper is one upon which so much has been already written, that it may seem to some to have been fairly threshed out. That this however is not altogether the case is clear from the variety of conclusions arrived at by those who have made the work their special study. This very fact both justifies and necessitates a certain independence of judgment and treatment in any one who would solve for himself as much of these problems as seems possible. Where we have so many masters, none can claim absolute authority. This was the reason why, some years ago, I began, for my own sake and that of my pupils, to attack this subject as freely and independently as possible; and the reason why I venture now to publish the results of my work is that I found that, while they contained little that is absolutely new, they did not, as far as I could tell, exactly agree with those arrived at by others. At any rate there is, I believe, a considerable difference in some of the arguments adduced, and in the manner of treating them. It will be seen that the essential feature in the line of argument adopted is the importance attached to parallelism of sequence between the three Synoptics, as distinguished from mere resemblance in subject-matter and even language.

Though the general line of argument, and the rough draft of the Table, were in the first instance worked out independently, I afterwards obtained some valuable hints from Dr. Holtzmann's earlier work¹, and found Mr. Rushbrooke's

¹ *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863. But see p. 94.

Synopticon an invaluable help in revision. The publication of that book has rendered a service to the study of the Synoptic Gospels, which can never be too gratefully acknowledged¹.

I should be glad to take this opportunity of expressing my indebtedness to my pupils, Mr. Green and Mr. Peake, and to Professor Sanday and the Rev. R. Shann, who, partly by actual co-operation and partly by their kind sympathy and encouragement, have lightened what seemed at times an almost hopeless task.

The first three Gospels in many parts resemble each other very closely, not merely in the subjects selected, but also in the order in which these subjects are given, the way in which they are treated, and frequently also in the actual language employed. In all these respects they present an obvious contrast to the evidently independent narrative of the fourth Gospel.

The first question we naturally ask is whether any one of these three Gospels was the source of the other two? Now if St. Matthew² or St. Luke were the original Gospel, we cannot at all satisfactorily explain the omission of so much important matter in St. Mark; and on the view that any one of the three is the original source, it is difficult to account in many cases for the alterations of language found in the other two. These objections taken together seem fatal to the originality of either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the second raises at first sight a presumption against that of St. Mark.

Assuming then for the present that no one of these Gospels is the original, the next question which arises is whether we can trace in them any single common source which forms the basis or groundwork of all three; or whether the parallel passages are merely different forms of a number of scattered

¹ For some differences in arrangement of parallelism see p. 97.

² The names St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke are used throughout of the three first Gospels, or of the authors of these Gospels, without any intention of prejudging the question of actual authorship, with which this paper does not deal.

fragments of written or oral tradition, which have been pieced together by the several evangelists each in his own way. The latter alternative is rendered more than improbable from the fact that in many parts of the Gospels two of the Synoptists, and sometimes all three, follow for several chapters consecutively nearly the same order of events¹. This agreement in order is one of the most striking features in the first three Gospels; and the more closely we examine them, the greater it will be found to be. We are therefore bound to decide in favour of the first alternative. We then have to ask a further question. How far and by what methods can we trace this common basis? It is obvious, I think, that we are not justified at the outset in necessarily limiting it to what is actually common to *all three* Synoptists². This would be to assume that all three evangelists made a point of omitting nothing which they found in this original source. On the other hand it can, I think, be satisfactorily proved that in many cases the original element is only to be found in two of them, and in some few cases probably only in one.

I will now give the reasons which seem to me to prove conclusively that the original basis of the Synoptical Gospels coincided in its *range* and *order* with our St. Mark³. (1) The earliest and the latest parallels in all three Gospels coincide with the beginning and end of St. Mark. The first is the ministry of St. John the Baptist, the last the visit of the women to our Saviour's tomb. (2) With but few exceptions

¹ It is not argued that some *Sammlung* hypothesis may not conceivably be the true explanation of the first origin of the common source, but that it does not account directly for the composition of our Synoptical Gospels throughout.

² This is done by Dr. Abbott (in his article in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in which he carries out his view to all its logical absurdity).

³ By our St. Mark here and throughout is meant our present Gospel according to the best critical texts, and excluding therefore xvi. 9-20, against the genuineness of which this inquiry alone will be found to add strong evidence. No Marcan section of anything like the same importance is absent from St. Matthew and St. Luke.

we find parallels to the whole of St. Mark in either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and to by far the larger part in both. (3) The *order* of the whole of St. Mark, excepting of course what is peculiar to that Gospel, is confirmed either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the greater part of it by both. (4) A passage parallel in all three Synoptists is never *immediately* followed in both St. Matthew and St. Luke by a *separate incident or discourse* common to these two evangelists alone. (5) Similarly in the parts common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone, no considerable fragments, with some doubtful exceptions¹, occur in the same relative order, so that it is unlikely that they formed part of the original source. (6) To this we may add the fact that in the same parts the differences between St. Matthew and St. Luke are generally greater than in those which are common to all three.

Not one of these arguments is of itself necessary to prove our point. That the Synoptists should have preserved so much of the original source and of its order, is for the Gospel student a happy accident which enables him to determine its limits with a certain degree of exactness. It may be added that arguments of a like kind could not be adduced to prove the priority of a Gospel resembling St. Matthew or St. Luke.

The first argument will hardly be disputed, but its real force is only fully felt when we bear in mind that the similarity of the first three Gospels consists in the phraseology, and even the sequence of phrases, as well as in the subject-matter. The second is based, not on the number of words and phrases which St. Mark has in common with St. Matthew or St. Luke, or with both, but on the amount of parallel matter taken in block, those parts being considered parallel which contain the same subject or subjects with a marked resemblance of treatment and language. The exceptions spoken of become quite insignificant if we regard the parable

¹ Cf. Matt. xii. 22-30 with Luke xi. 14-23; xii. 38-42 with xi. 29-32; xii. 43-45 with xi. 24-26. See pp. 77, 78. Perhaps we should add Matt. xii. 33-35 compared with Luke vi. 43-45.

of the tares (Matt. xiii. 24-30) as parallel to that of the seed growing secretly (Mark iv. 26-29), and the general statement of healings (Matt. xv. 30, 31) as parallel to the miracle of the deaf man of Decapolis (Mark vii. 32-37), and covering to a certain extent that of the blind man of Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22-26)¹.

The value of the fourth and fifth arguments may seem to depend on a too arbitrary distinction between what can or cannot be regarded as distinct incidents or fragments of history; but in no case does the parallelism of St. Matthew and St. Luke beyond their co-parallelism with St. Mark extend further than a few verses². It is also noticeable that in the portions contained in St. Matthew and St. Luke alone there are, even within what are certainly separate incidents (such as the Temptation), greater variations of order than are usually found in the parts common to all three. But the full strength of these arguments, and also the sixth, can only be seen after a detailed comparison, the results of which it is difficult to tabulate.

The third argument is by far the most important, and requires some fuller explanation. When we say that the order of St. Mark is maintained either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, we mean the relative order, without taking into account the insertions by either of what is not in St. Mark at all, or the omissions from St. Mark by both. It is clear that this is all that is needed for our present argument, and adds greater weight to it than if the order had been exact. In a word, we find so general a tendency to state the facts of St. Mark in the order of St. Mark, that this order is very frequently preserved, even though the introduction of new matter or the omission of Marcan matter entirely changes the context. That there should happen to be no portion of St. Mark of which the order cannot be traced either in St. Matthew or St. Luke shows how far-reaching this tendency was. It may be added

¹ The ground for assuming such a parallelism is the order in which these passages occur (see Table). All that is intended here is that they suggest that the alternative in either case was known to St. Matthew.

² The longest is Matt. iii. 7-10 || Luke iii. 7-9.

that we do not at present think it necessary to take into account the transposition of single sentences (never exceeding a verse), such as the quotation Mark i. 3, as belonging rather to a later stage of the inquiry.

We will now test this third argument by an examination of the Table at the end of this essay. In the first place we find a long passage (*a*) Mark i. 2-iii. 6, generally parallel with Luke iii. 2 b-vi. 10. The only passage where this parallelism fails is i. 14 b-20, which St. Luke omits; but this is parallel to Matt. iv. 17-22, the position of which agrees relatively with St. Mark, Matt. iv. 13 b-16 being peculiar to St. Matthew, and Matt. iv. 12 being parallel to Mark i. 14 a. The parts of St. Matthew corresponding to *a* are contained in Matt. iii. 1-xii. 14, and occur in nearly the same order as in St. Mark. Thus, Matt. iii. 1-iv. 22 is parallel to Mark i. 2-20, Matt. vii. 28 b, 29 with Mark i. 22, Matt. viii. 14-16 with Mark i. 29-34, Matt. ix. 1 b-17 with Mark ii. 1-22. There are only three omissions from St. Mark, two transpositions, and several insertions, the largest being the episode of the Sermon on the Mount (iv. 23 c-vii. 27). The parallelism of *a* with St. Luke overlaps a new parallelism of St. Mark with St. Matthew, which begins with Matt. xii. 1 || Mark ii. 23 and continues to xiii. 34 || Mark iv. 34 a, only two passages of any importance being omitted by St. Matthew, viz. Mark iii. 14-19 a, which he had anticipated in x. 2-4, and Mark iv. 21-24, but the Marcan position of both of these omitted passages is supported by the order of St. Luke, the first corresponding to Luke vi. 13 b-16, which follows vi. 12, 13 a || Mark iii. 13; the second to Luke viii. 16-18 a, which follows 4-15 || Mark iv. 1 b-20. In connexion with the first parallel it should be noticed that the correctness of the Marcan order of iii. 7-10 immediately after ii. 23-iii. 6, is supported by Matt. xii. 15 following after xii. 1-14. This shows, what would be in itself probable from many similar transpositions in that Gospel, that St. Luke has transposed vi. 12-16 and 17 b-19. At Mark iv. 35 it is difficult at first to trace the parallelism of order; but it be-

comes evident on careful examination. It is clear enough that there is a general parallelism between Mark iii. 31-v. 43 and Luke viii. 4-56. In the last part of this, Mark iv. 35-v. 43 || Luke viii. 22-56, the parallelism is exact, and is supported moreover by Matt. viii. 18-ix. 25. But in the first part the parallel to Mark iii. 31-35 occurs in St. Luke after, instead of before, viii. 4-18 b. That here again St. Luke, and not St. Mark, has made the transposition is proved by the position in St. Matthew of xii. 46-50, which, but for insertions not contained in St. Mark, viz. xii. 33-45, follows upon xii. 31, 32 || Mark iii. 28, 29. The parallelism with St. Luke which began in Mark iii. 31-35 is continued down to Mark vi. 35-44 || Luke ix. 12-17. The only difficulty lies in Mark vi. 1-6, which is omitted by St. Luke, and its position not very clearly supported by St. Matthew. But the order of 6 b before 7-11 is confirmed by Matt. ix. 35 a before x. 1 (after the insertion of ix. 35 b-38), and that of vi. 1-6 a indirectly both by Matt. xiii. 34 || Mark iv. 33, 34 a and Matt. xiv. 1, 2 || Mark vi. 14, because all the intermediate portions, both before and after Mark vi. 1-6 a, excepting a few verses omitted altogether by St. Matthew, had already been anticipated¹. The parallelism with St. Mark continues from Matt. xiv. to xxviii. 8 a || Mark vi. 14 to the end. The only breaks of order lie in the omission of Mark ix. 38-40, xii. 41-44 (both of which are confirmed by St. Luke), of Mark vii. 32-37 and Mark viii. 22-26 (which are quasi-parallel to Matt. xv. 30, 31), of Mark ix. 50 and xi. 25 (to which quasi-parallels had occurred in Matt. v. 13 a and vi. 14, 15), and also of a few passages not occurring at all in St. Matthew, and in the insertion of several passages which are, with very few exceptions², peculiar to St. Matthew. The slight variation in Mark xvi. 8 b must be reserved for future discussion. By far the greater part of this long parallel is supported also by St. Luke, the chief variations being the entire

¹ The double parallelism of sequence with St. Mark, which is a peculiar feature of St. Matthew, is more fully discussed on p. 71.

² Such as Matt. xviii. 7 and xxi. 44, if this last is genuine.

omission of Mark ix. 41-x. 12 (excepting perhaps ix. 42), and of a few other passages, the insertion practically of Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, and several transpositions, especially in chaps. xxii. and xxiii, and the more important displacement apparently of Mark x. 42-45.

We may sum up the chief results of the previous examination thus. If we divide St. Mark into three parts, (*a*) i-iii. 6, (*b*) iii. 7-vi. 13, (*c*) vi. 14-xvi. 8, the relative order of *a* agrees exactly with St. Luke, and for the most part with St. Matthew; that of *b* with either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and in parts with both; that of *c* agrees exactly with St. Matthew, and for the most part with St. Luke. This division is merely convenient for purposes of comparison, and does not in any way point to different component parts of St. Mark's Gospel. Indeed, the way in which the parallels continually overlap and even intersect one another, shows clearly enough that St. Matthew and St. Luke depended on a whole Gospel in the Marcan order, and not on two or three evangelical records afterwards pieced together by St. Mark.

The only point in this examination to which we think any exception can possibly be taken is the argument employed to prove that the position of Mark vi. 1-6 *a* is confirmed by St. Matthew. The parallelism of order has been made out by excluding from consideration Marcan passages to which the parallels have already occurred in St. Matthew's Gospel. But we are certainly justified in doing so, because the evangelist would naturally avoid repeating what he had already related, and the position of all the omitted passages is confirmed by St. Luke, Mark iv. 35-v. 43 being parallel to Luke viii. 22-56, and Mark vi. 7-13 to Luke ix. 1-6.

It might be argued that the results arrived at by our examination would be equally accounted for on the hypothesis that the whole of St. Matthew and St. Luke existed previously to St. Mark, and that he compiled his Gospel from them¹,

¹ Such was Griesbach's view, and he has been followed by many others. The chief argument for this view depends upon some peculiar features of St. Mark's language, and lies therefore beyond the limits of our present inquiry.

adopting now the order of one, now the order of the other. But the following objections seem fatal to such a view. (1) We cannot reasonably account for the remarkable omissions which St. Mark must continually have made, such as of the Birth and Childhood of our Lord, the details of the Temptation, the Sermon on the Mount, the full ministerial directions to the Apostles or the Seventy, and above all the accounts of our Lord's appearances after His Resurrection. All these are topics which would have become of increasing interest and importance as the Church grew; and it is extremely unlikely that we should find them in the earlier Gospels, and not in the later. (2) It is almost impossible to suggest any method by which St. Mark could have made his selections. (3) This view would not account for the order of St. Mark in several passages, especially in section *b*, and would certainly not explain how it is that the parallels with St. Matthew and St. Luke so frequently overlap. (4) Lastly, this view leads us into greater difficulties than those which it proposes to solve. The relations between St. Matthew and St. Luke, which the views argued out in this paper at least partially explain, become an almost hopeless enigma, at which we can only guess. We seem therefore forced to adopt the opposite alternative, viz. that St. Matthew and St. Luke both made use of a Gospel very nearly agreeing with our present St. Mark in its subject-matter and the order of its contents. That agreement of order, let it be carefully noticed, is not limited to the larger episodes of our Lord's life, but generally extends to single incidents, and frequently even to more minute details. Our arguments have not proved either that this primary Gospel was verbally identical with our St. Mark, or that it was necessarily even written. But they certainly prove that it was a definite whole, as distinct from merely a collection of incidents in a recognized order, and give very good ground for supposing that it was regarded as an authorized account, so to speak, of our Lord's ministry. We will in future call this

primary Gospel the Marcan tradition¹, for want of a better phrase, which will not prejudge questions which have not yet been discussed.

It will now be our object to consider the relation which each of our three Synoptical Gospels bears to this original Gospel, confining our attention as before to portions of evangelical matter (not necessarily separate incidents) and their order, and not considering the minuter details or phraseology.

It is obvious at a glance that St. Matthew and St. Luke must have compiled their Gospels from other sources in addition to the Marcan tradition. Some of the passages so derived are peculiar to each Gospel, others are more or less parallel; but we find no positive proof of the existence of any one single body of narrative at all comparable with the Marcan tradition in point of size and completeness. The difference of order, and in many cases the striking dissimilarities even in matters of fact, would seem rather to point to several distinct sources, and often to only an *indirect* connexion with them. Now it is obvious that the incorporation of fresh matter would be likely to modify in some degree the form and language of the new Gospel. And this is what we actually find. The marvel is indeed that these evangelists should have left so much of the earlier Gospel which they incorporated, in its original form and order.

We may at this stage take St. Mark's Gospel provisionally as representing very nearly the Marcan tradition, and compare it severally with the two other Synoptics. If we can thus explain their method of composition, it will add very strong additional proof of the close similarity between St. Mark and this primitive Gospel, and go some way even towards proving their identity.

To begin with St. Matthew. If we divide the part of the

¹ The phrase 'triple tradition' is an unsatisfactory title for what in several places has been preserved by only two evangelists, and sometimes perhaps by only one.

Gospel with which we are concerned into three sections, (*a*) chaps. iii–vii, (*b*) chaps. viii–xiii, and (*c*) chaps. xiv–xxviii. 8, we shall find that there is hardly a single break in the *relative* order as compared with St. Mark in *a* and *c*. The slight breaks in *c* arise merely, as we have seen, from the omission of two verses, Mark ix. 50, xi. 25, to which parallels or quasi-parallels had already occurred in the Sermon on the Mount. These are both striking sayings of our Lord, which would have been frequently repeated, and the language in St. Matthew and St. Mark differs very considerably. We may therefore safely conclude that they were not derived from the Marcan tradition. The only break in *a* arises from the displacement of Mark i. 21 *a* (as Matt. iv. 13 *a*) to before, instead of after, the call of the four Apostles. The chief cause of this transposition is clearly the insertion of the quotation from Isaiah in iv. 14–16. The prophecy is naturally quoted at the first mention of our Lord's ministry in Galilee in Matt. iv. 12 || Mark i. 14, but St. Matthew wishes to connect it also with the residence at Capernaum, seeing a special fulfilment of the words ὁδὸν θαλάσσης in this sea-side village (hence the addition of the explanatory epithet παραθαλασσίαν). He therefore combines Mark i. 14 *a* and 21 *a*, but leaves 21 *b* in its original place, prefacing it by a repetition of the mention of Galilee, and inserting κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, slightly altered from Mark i. 14 *b*. By a further modification of the language, διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν for εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκε, he makes it part of the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. The general character thus given to this verse, and the introduction of the Sermon on the Mount, which gave a different reference to Matt. vii. 28 *b*, 29 || Mark i. 22, involved the omission of the special incident of the healing of the demoniac, Mark i. 23–28.

Our inquiry is now limited to chaps. viii–xiii. of St. Matthew. These chapters form the crucial difficulty in the composition of this Gospel. It is very important that we should clearly distinguish between the actual treatment of this part of the

Marcan tradition by St. Matthew and the principles or reasons which governed that treatment. The first is that with which we are now directly concerned, and is capable, as I hope to show, of definite demonstration: the latter belongs more to the special history of St. Matthew's Gospel. Our object is to prove that St. Matthew shows acquaintance with the corresponding portion of the Marcan Gospel in the Marcan order, and we can hardly more satisfactorily prove this than by showing that (supposing the Marcan tradition to have existed, for believing which we have already given good grounds) he has actually treated this in a certain way. Now if we omit from our consideration x. 15-xi, to which there is no parallel in St. Mark, we shall find that the portions before and after this, (*a*) viii-x. 14 and (*β*) xii. and xiii, form, in their relation to St. Mark, distinctly characterised sections. The second agrees relatively with St. Mark throughout, except that it omits the portions which have already occurred in *a*, whereas *a* itself differs considerably from the relative Marcan order. And yet even in this section the variations are only three in number¹. In the first place St. Matthew displaced the list of the Twelve (Mark iii. 14-19 *a*) from just before the Sermon on the Mount to x. 2-4, inserting it just before the special address to the Twelve. This change of arrangement is easily explained. The new position is extremely suitable, whereas the list would have come in awkwardly after the description of the gathering together of the multitude (Matt. iv. 24, 25), intended evidently as an introduction to the Sermon which, according to St. Matthew, was mainly addressed to the collected crowds (see vii. 28, 29). The difference of the phrase with which the list is introduced in x. 2, 'now the names of the twelve apostles are these,' as compared with Mark iii. 14, 'and he ordained twelve,' shows that St. Matthew did not intend his readers to suppose that

¹ Matt. ix. 32-34 is not the real parallel to Mark iii. 22, and Matt. ix. 27-30 is not parallel to Mark viii. 22-26, but the true parallels to these are Matt. xii. 24, and in a certain sense Matt. xv. 30, 31 (see above, p. 63).

the Apostles were then first appointed. The second and third deviations from the Marcan order were made by taking out Mark i. 40-ii. 22, and placing the first part of it, the account of the leper, Mark i. 40-44, immediately after the Sermon on the Mount, as Matt. viii. 1-4, and the last part of it, Mark ii. 1-22, beginning with the account of the paralytic, immediately after the incident of the Gadarene demoniac, as ix. 1 b-17. Even here the order of the three incidents comprising Mark ii. 1-22 is preserved, and throughout *a* there is far more agreement than disagreement with the Marcan order. Whether these three displacements are due to the influence of some other evangelical fragment or tradition, or in some way to this double revision, if we may call it so, of Mark i. 29-vi. 11, must be more or less a matter of conjecture¹. But we have still to consider the general principle according to which this double revision was made. We cannot, as is often done, regard Matt. viii-xiii as simply a collection of miracles followed by a collection of our Lord's teachings, because *a* contains in ix. 9-17 two separate teachings, and another in ix. 35-x. 14, the Mission of the Twelve (which comparison with the Marcan order, Mark vi. 6 b-11, compels us to place in *a*), and *β* contains one miracle, Matt. xii. 9-14 || Mark iii. 1-6. The true explanation seems to be that St. Matthew in writing viii-x. 14 was influenced partly indeed by the desire to group the miracles together, but partly also by the order and contents of the Marcan tradition upon which his Gospel was based. Having on this principle made selections from the Marcan tradition up to and including the Mission of the Twelve, and added a new portion, x. 15-xi. 30, from other sources, he again revised this portion of St. Mark, introducing in its proper order almost everything which he had previously omitted². The import-

¹ The presence of the doublets, Matt. ix. 32-34 (cf. Matt. xii. 22-24), and 35 (cf. Matt. iv. 23), give some ground to the first of these possibilities.

² The final omissions are: Mark i. 35-39 and 45, which of necessity dropped out through the rearrangement; Mark iv. 21-25, comprising short sayings which have their parallels in other parts of St. Matthew (viz. v. 14-16, x. 26, xi. 15, vii. 2, and xiii. 12); and Mark iv. 26-29 (the parable of the seed

ance of this modification of the theory of a collection of miracles followed by a collection of teachings, is the strong evidence it furnishes for the pre-existence of the Marcan order throughout. If the other view were absolutely correct, St. Matthew and St. Mark might have independently borrowed from two previous collections of miracles and teachings. It will have been seen that the argument hinges upon the position of the Mission to the Twelve, which is in its Marcan order if placed, as we have placed it, at the end of α , but out of its Marcan order if placed at the beginning of β , as the other view requires.

If we now apply the same test to St. Luke, we shall get results of a similar kind. We shall again find it convenient to divide the parts of the Gospel with which we are concerned into three sections, (*a*) iii. 2 b-ix. 50; (*b*) ix. 51-xviii. 14; (*c*) xviii. 15-xxiv. 9 a. In *a* St. Luke has, with one or two trifling exceptions, followed the relative order of the corresponding section of St. Mark. The exceptions are Luke vi. 17 b-19, which should, according to the position of the parallel Mark iii. 7-10, have followed the healing of the man with the withered hand, vi. 6-11, and viii. 19-21, which according to Mark iii. 31-35 should have come before viii. 4-18. The omissions from St. Mark in this section of St. Luke are very considerable. Besides three, to which parallels occur in the second section, and which may on that account have been omitted in this (viz. Mark iii. 22-27 || Luke xi. 15-22, Mark iii. 28-30 || Luke xii. 10, Mark iv. 30-32 || Luke xiii. 18, 19), we find the following omissions: (1) Mark i. 14 b-20; (2) iii. 9-12; (3) iii. 19 b-21; (4) iv. 1 a; (5) iv. 26-29; (6) iv. 33-34; (7) vi. 1-6; (8) vi. 17-29; (9) vi. 45-viii. 26; (10) viii. 32, 33; (11) ix. 11-13; (12) ix. 15, 16, 21-24, 26-29; (13) ix. 33 a. Of these, 3, 4, 6 and 13 are notes or notices which would all, except the last, naturally fall out by the rearrangement which occurs just in these places. This may also

growing secretly), for which is substituted the more striking parable of the tares in Matt. xiii. 24-30.

be the cause of the omission of 2 and 5 (the parable of the seed growing secretly). The omissions in 12 are, with the exception of ix. 28, minute descriptions of a kind specially characteristic of St. Mark's Gospel. 1 (the appointment of the first four Apostles) and 7 were probably considered too much like other incidents recorded in St. Luke (see v. 1-11, iv. 16-30)¹ to admit of repetition. The same principle may ultimately account for the great omission of 9. The omission of the feeding of the 4000, as being too much like that of the 5000, made it convenient (in a Gospel which was probably a selection from a large mass of material) to leave out what came between the two similar miracles, and necessitated the omission of Mark viii. 13-21, the point of which incident is the reference to the two miracles in vv. 19 and 20. The eleventh and twelfth verses were naturally omitted, as parallels occurred in section *b* (Luke xi. 16, 29). The stern rebuke of a great apostle in 10 was very possibly thought likely to give offence. Probably a similar cause contributed, in addition to that suggested above, to the omission of 3. The intention of seizing our Lord under the impression that he was suffering from religious mania, and that too by those who afterwards held, some of them, distinguished positions in the Church, was a subject which would have been obviously distasteful to the early Christian teachers. The two remaining omissions in this section of St. Luke, 8 and 11, are accounted for by Dr. Abbott², as originating from a desire to subordinate St. John the Baptist to our Lord; but part of the first had already been anticipated in iii. 19, 20, and the latter may probably have been omitted, as being of little importance to St. Luke's Gentile readers.

Between the first and second sections there are three omissions of what does not occur elsewhere in St. Luke, viz. of Mark ix. 41, 43-49, and x. 1-11. Of these the first

¹ Cp. especially iv. 22-24 with Mark vi. 3, 4. There are several omissions from apparently the same cause in section *c*, and they are much too frequent to be accounted for by coincidence.

² Article 'Gospels' in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th edition.

two are probably due to the rearrangement of this part of the Gospel, the third was probably made because the saying in x. 12, which forms the pith of that discourse, occurs among a collection of sayings in Luke xvi. 18.

In *c* the relative order of St. Mark is again practically preserved. The rather frequent, but for our present inquiry unimportant, transpositions which occur, especially in chapters xxii. and xxiii, have already been noticed. Several Marcan passages appear to have been omitted, because incidents like them are related elsewhere. This seems to be the principle of almost all the omissions in this section. Thus we find omitted the cursing of the fig-tree (Mark xi. 12-14, 19-21), presumably because of the parable of the fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6-9)¹; the anointing of our Lord in the house of Simon the Leper (Mark xiv. 3-9), because of the anointing in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luke vii. 36-50); and the mocking of our Lord before Pilate (Mark xv. 16-20 a), because of the mocking before Herod (Luke xxiii. 11). In Mark x. 41-45, xi. 22-24, xii. 28 b-34 a, xiii. 21-23, the parallelism with Luke xxii. 24-27, xvii. 6, x. 25-28, xvii. 21-23, is closer, and would obviously account for the omission of these passages in their Marcan context, but not close enough to warrant us in supposing that St. Luke obtained his parallels directly from the Marcan tradition. The omission of Mark x. 41-45 involved the omission of vv. 35-40, which supplied the motive of the discourse. Excepting Mark xiv. 51, 52 (for which see below, p. 91), the only other omissions from St. Mark in section *c*, longer than a single verse, are xii. 32-34 a, xiv. 33, 34, 38 b-42, 56-61 a, xv. 4-5, 34-36, which are probably due to the rearrangement of details (not of separate events), and the introduction of fresh matter which characterizes chapters xxii. and xxiii. of St. Luke.

We have now to deal with the middle section *b* of St.

¹ There is a curious but indirect trace of the former in Luke xvii. 6; cf. Mark xi. 23, Matt. xxi. 21.

Luke. Now it is at once clear that this section cuts into the order of St. Mark, whereas the sections before and after are in their regular Marcan order. The whole section occupies the place of Mark ix. 41-x. 12, which is practically omitted by St. Luke, the only possible parallels being Mark ix. 42, cf. Luke xvii. 2, and Mark x. 11, 12, cf. Luke xvi. 18. When we consider how St. Luke in the other sections usually follows the Marcan order, this remarkable deviation creates an *a priori* probability that he derived this section from some other source or sources than the Marcan tradition. This probability is confirmed by two features which are very characteristic of this section of St. Luke, and absent or much less marked in the rest of that Gospel. (1) The frequency of doublets, i.e. of passages to which we find parallels in other parts of St. Luke, e.g. xii. 2, cf. viii. 17; xii. 9, cf. ix. 26; xii. 11, 12, cf. xxi. 12-15; xii. 40, cf. xxi. 34-36; xiv. 27, cf. ix. 23. There are also at least two cases of doublets which have their parallels within this section itself, viz. xiii. 15, cf. xiv. 5, and xiv. 11, cf. xviii. 14 b. (2) The frequent occurrence of short passages, often single verses or less, and generally sayings of our Lord, in a totally different connexion from that in which they occur in the other Gospels. These are found especially in chapters xi. and xii.

This section of St. Luke does certainly contain several seeming parallels to St. Mark, but a closer examination makes it probable that they were not directly taken from the Marcan tradition. (1) This is clearly the case with those quasi-parallels, such as the parable of the fig-tree, the anointing in the house of Simon the Pharisee¹, which are sufficiently like the similar incidents recorded in St. Mark, to cause the omission of the latter in their original sequence by St. Luke, but not like enough to have been derived from them. (2) Most of the seeming parallels are doublets in St. Luke, and the corresponding passages in that Gospel are evidently, from their position, the true parallels to St. Mark. Thus Luke xi. 33 is

¹ A complete list has been already given on p. 74.

a doublet of viii. 16 || Mark iv. 21, Luke xii. 2 of viii. 17 || Mark iv. 22, Luke xii. 9 of ix. 26 || Mark viii. 38, Luke xii. 11, 12 of xxi. 12-15 || Mark xiii. 9-11, Luke xii. 40 of xxi. 34-36 || Mark xiii. 33, Luke xiv. 27 of ix. 23 || Mark viii. 34. Less obvious doublets are Luke x. 1-17, cf. ix. 1-6 || Mark vi. 7-13¹; Luke xi. 53, 54, cf. xx. 20 || Mark xii. 13; Luke xvii. 20-37, cf. xxi. 5-36 || Mark xiii². (3) In other cases the parallelism with St. Mark is not close enough to warrant us in supposing that the passages were directly derived from the Marcan tradition, e.g. cf. Luke ix. 51 with Mark x. 32, Luke xi. 38-44 with Mark vii. 2-9, Luke xii. 1 with Mark viii. 15, Luke xii. 50 with Mark x. 38, Luke xiii. 22 a with Mark vi. 6 b. (4) Several passages, most of them short sayings of our Lord, though in language sometimes closer to St. Mark than to St. Matthew, yet agree with the latter and not St. Mark in context, and should be referred for their origin not to the Marcan tradition, but either to St. Matthew or the sources of St. Matthew. These are Luke xiii. 18, 19, cf. Mark iv. 30-32 and Matt. xiii. 31, 32; Luke xiv. 34, cf. Mark ix. 50 a and Matt. v. 13 a; Luke xvi. 18 a, cf. Mark x. 11 and Matt. v. 32 a³; Luke xvii. 2, cf. Mark ix. 42 and Matt. xviii. 6. Thus the verses following the first three and preceding the last of these Lucan passages — Luke xiii. 20, xiv. 35, xvi. 18 b, xvii. 1⁴ — are parallel to Matt. xiii. 33, v. 13 b, v. 32 b, xviii. 7, but have no parallels in St. Mark. (5) Two other sayings of our Lord, Luke xii. 10 (cf. Mark iii. 28, 29 and Matt. xii. 31, 32) and Luke xiii. 30 (cf. Mark x. 31 and Matt. xix. 30), have no contextual parallelism in either St. Matthew or St. Mark. But the first agrees much more closely in language with St. Matthew than St. Mark; and the second, though differing very much from both, agrees with

¹ See below, pp. 86, 87.

² See below, pp. 88-91.

³ It is a significant fact that Matt. xix. 9, which is the true contextual parallel to Mark x. 11, is, but for the qualifying addition *ἐι μὴ ἐπὶ πορείᾳ*, in almost verbal agreement with it, whereas Matt. v. 32 a differs considerably.

⁴ In Luke xvii. 1, 2 there is a characteristic transposition of verses, but these are so common in this Gospel that it does not seriously affect the argument.

St. Matthew in the only point in which the latter differs from St. Mark, viz. the omission of *οἱ* before the second *ἑσχατοί*.

We have still to consider two important passages in section 4, where the parallelism with St. Mark extends for several consecutive verses, St. Luke x. 25-27 and xi. 14-23. The first is the episode of the lawyer, and is to some extent parallel to Mark xii. 28-31 and Matt. xxii. 35-39. Here we may notice, (1) that the incident in St. Luke differs in almost every detail¹ from St. Mark, and was derived almost certainly from a different form of narrative; (2) that in all three Gospels we have two similar incidents recorded, or possibly two accounts of one incident. The first is contained in Matt. xix. 16-22, Mark x. 17-22, Luke xviii. 18-23. And here the three Gospels agree in context, and pretty closely in language and details. The other is Matt. xxii. 34-40, Mark xii. 28-34, cf. Luke x. 25-28. In this case St. Matthew and St. Mark agree in context, though with a serious difference of motive; St. Luke has no narrative of the kind in its Marcan order, and that under consideration has all the appearance of a combination of the two incidents², and in the parts parallel to Matt. xxii. and Mark xii, resembles St. Matthew much more closely than St. Mark. It is not, therefore, at all probable that St. Luke obtained it from the Marcan tradition. The discourse about Beelzebub, Luke xi. 14-23, which is parallel to Matt. xii. 22-32, Mark iii. 20 b-30, presents at first sight a serious difficulty; but even here there are good grounds for thinking that it was not directly derived from the Marcan tradition. (1) It has a certain contextual parallelism with St. Matthew, Matt. xii. 38-42 being parallel to Luke xi. 29-32, and Matt. xii. 43-45 to Luke xi. 24-26³.

¹ Except the words 'thou shalt love,' etc., quoted from Deut. vi. 5, and even these are by St. Luke ascribed to the lawyer instead of our Lord, and the quotation resembles St. Matthew much more closely than St. Mark.

² The question of the lawyer in Luke x. 25 is word for word the same as that of the ruler in Luke xviii. 18 b, and our Lord's answer has the same general bearing. Such a combination is most naturally explained by the influence of oral tradition.

³ According to St. Matthew this should have followed xi. 29-32, but such

(2) Contrary to what we usually find, the language of St. Luke throughout this incident is remarkably similar to that of St. Matthew¹, and differs very considerably from that of St. Mark.

(3) We find traces in this chapter of St. Luke, and partially also in St. Matthew, of a portion of evangelical history differing very widely in detail, but having a general parallelism with the Marcan tradition, appearing therefore to be related to it, so to speak, but not derived from it. At any rate the reference to the Virgin Mother, and the lesson drawn from it in Luke xi. 27-28, bear some resemblance to the interruption of our Lord by His Mother and brethren, and a similar lesson drawn from that in Mark iii. 31-35. It is to be noticed that these quasi-parallels agree in position. Here St. Matthew agrees with St. Mark, the true parallel in St. Luke having been anticipated in viii. 19-21. It seems therefore probable that St. Luke derived his account of the Beelzebub discourse from a non-Markan source, which partly influenced St. Matthew. The motive with which the discourse is introduced by St. Matthew (xii. 22) and St. Luke (xi. 14) was in all probability derived from the same source. The existence of other forms so beginning is confirmed by the abridged doublet in Matt. ix. 32-34.

Our investigations have now included all the passages in the middle section of St. Luke which have any parallel to St. Mark. It will have been seen that every one of them has also a parallel in St. Matthew, and that a closer one, especially in the matter of setting or context. We do not argue therefore that they were taken from St. Matthew, at least directly; but only that they were not taken from the Marcan tradition. The results of our inquiry then into the relation between St. Luke's Gospel and the Marcan tradition are briefly these: that sections *a* and *c* were evidently derived from that source, and that *b* almost certainly was not.

transpositions are so common in St. Luke that it cannot be considered a serious objection.

¹ Except in vv. 21, 22, where it is singularly unlike both St. Matthew and St. Mark, which are in this passage nearly agreed.

We now come to a far more difficult subject, the relation of St. Mark's Gospel itself, as we now have it, to the Marcan tradition. The difficulty of the problem is seen from the fact that those critics who agree in connecting the original Gospel with St. Mark, differ very widely in their view of the character and range of this original Gospel, or *Ur-Marcus* as it is frequently called. Some, as Dr. Abbott, would admit only a very small fraction of St. Mark as the original nucleus. Others, as Dr. Holtzmann, consider that the original Gospel was considerably larger than our present St. Mark¹. He would include in it the shorter form of the Sermon on the Mount, nearly as in St. Luke vi. 20-49, the healing of the centurion's servant, two of our Lord's appearances after the Resurrection, as in St. Matthew, and even the *pericope adulterae*. But our inquiry has already very much reduced these limits. Our principle has been to seek for the original source not merely in passages where the three agree, nor necessarily where two of them agree, but where there is also an agreement of order or context. This rests on the presumption, reasonable in itself, that the evangelists would probably keep to the order of what they were copying, unless for a purpose, and our examination has shown that they certainly generally did so. Dr. Abbott's view, which accepts as the original tradition only what is verbally common to all three, assumes, on the other hand, that each of the three would necessarily have incorporated the whole of the original tradition. We shall see that views like Dr. Holtzmann's are equally at variance with our principle in the opposite direction. We have already proved that the Marcan tradition, as far as matter and order are concerned, is very nearly identical with our St. Mark. We will now see whether, judging by comparative order, we find any evidence that St. Mark altered the form of the original tradition, whether by (1) transpositions, (2) omissions, or (3) additions, remembering that at present we are not concerned with the more minute details and phraseology, which are beyond the limits of this essay.

¹ Such are the views expressed in his earlier work. See, however, p. 94.

(1) That St. Mark did not make any serious transpositions has been indirectly shown at almost every stage of the previous inquiry. (2) We have next to ask whether he omitted anything from the Marcan tradition. (a) We cannot possibly prove that he omitted passages which are not contained in St. Matthew or St. Luke, such as the *pericope adulterae*. Indeed, the fact that this was probably found in the Gospel of the Hebrews, though perhaps in another form¹, seems to raise a positive presumption against it. (b) Nor can we prove that St. Mark omitted passages which are only supported by one of the other evangelists, such as the incident of the tribute money (Matt. xvii. 24 b-27), or that of Zacchæus (Luke xix. 1-10). Our principle raises a positive argument against the originality of any such passage, where the Gospel which agrees with St. Mark in omitting it, agrees also in a parallel continuity of context; or where the Gospel which presumably inserts it agrees otherwise in context with St. Mark. Thus the parable of the two sons, Matt. xxi. 28-32, is on both these grounds proved to be an insertion. It breaks the continuity of the Marcan tradition, 23-27 being parallel to Mark xi. 27-33, and 33-42 being parallel to Mark xii. 1-11; while on the other hand Mark xi. 27-xii. 11 is continuously parallel to Luke xx. 1-17. On the same principle a passage is proved to be an insertion, if it occurs in a context which has no agreement with the Marcan order. We must thus exclude from the Marcan tradition the parables of the prodigal son, &c., in Luke xv. 11-xvi, the context before and after having no parallel in St. Mark. This principle thus applied will be found on examination to exclude all the peculiar passages of St. Luke, and by far the most of St. Matthew. On the same grounds we must admit that Dr. Holtzmann's hypothesis² that the *Ur-Marcus* originally ended like St. Matthew, is at least not proven. But this case is quite exceptional. We cannot compare the end of St. Mark with St. Matthew, because it is almost certain that we have not got the end of St. Mark. In the first place, it is ex-

¹ See Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* iii. 39.

² See p. 94.

tremely unlikely that the Gospel should have ended so abruptly with the words 'for they were afraid' (ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ); in the second, it may be almost proved not to have so ended on our principle, for both St. Matthew and St. Luke continue the episode of the visit of the women to the tomb with their announcement of our Lord's Resurrection; or, to be perfectly accurate, it is implied in St. Matthew (xxviii. 8 b), definitely stated in St. Luke (xxiv. 9-11). And if so, how did the Marcan tradition end? In favour of Dr. Holtzmann's view, we have the fact that the language in the last episode of St. Mark (xvi. 1-8) agrees much more closely with St. Matthew than with St. Luke. On the other hand, it is remarkable that St. Luke should have omitted so much in a part of his Gospel which generally agrees with the Marcan tradition. It may be owing to that principle of selection, which clearly influenced his Gospel throughout, that he wished to give a few very remarkable appearances of our Lord, and preferred those which he actually gives. In want of further evidence we must leave the question undecided. (c) Even where a passage not contained in St. Mark is found in both St. Matthew and St. Luke, this will not of itself prove that it occurred in the Marcan tradition, unless it can be further shown that it stands in the two Gospels in a parallel sequence of narrative; but this parallel sequence must go backwards or forwards to a point where they both agreed with St. Mark. For example, it is argued by Dr. Holtzmann¹ that the miracle of the centurion's servant was part of the *Ur-Marcus*, on the ground that both St. Matthew and St. Luke agree in placing it shortly after the Sermon on the Mount. This agreement, though by no means exact, would go some way to proving his point, if it could be proved that the Sermon itself was part of the Marcan tradition. Dr. Holtzmann argues that it was so in its shorter Lucan form², (a) from the great similarity of arrangement

¹ See p. 94.

² Excepting Luke vi. 38 a, 39, 40, 45, which do not occur in St. Matthew, at least in this connexion, but including 24-26. But see p. 94.

and language in the parts common to St. Matthew and St. Luke; (β) from the similarity of its setting in the two Gospels. They both relate the ascent to a mountain and the choosing of certain Apostles before the Sermon, and add soon after it the miracle of the centurion's servant.

But on the first head we may observe, that we still have to explain the very remarkable discrepancy between the two accounts in the first section of the discourse, and on the second that there are serious disagreements on each of the three points raised by Dr. Holtzmann. In St. Luke the Sermon is most explicitly separated from the ascent to the mountain in vi. 12; in St. Matthew the names of the twelve Apostles are omitted, and the appointment of the four Apostles is not directly connected with the Sermon, and the miracle of the centurion's servant is separated from the Sermon both by vii. 28 b, 29, and by the healing of the leper, viii. 1-4. These, taken together, are certainly greater discrepancies that we usually find between St. Matthew and St. Luke, where both correspond with St. Mark. But a careful examination of the contexts as compared with St. Mark, shows Dr. Holtzmann's view to be still more improbable, if not wholly untenable. In both St. Matthew and St. Luke the Sermon is prefaced by a description of the assembling of the multitude from different regions, Judaea, Jerusalem, &c., Matt. iv. 25 || Luke vi. 17 b. This occurs in St. Mark neither after i. 21, which would have agreed with its position in St. Matthew, nor after iii. 19 a, which would have agreed with that in St. Luke, but in iii. 8. In St. Mark the object of the gathering is the healing, which is described in vv. 10-12, just before the ascent to the mountain. St. Matthew mentions the healing, but places it just before the gathering of the multitudes, and so connects the latter directly with the Sermon. St. Luke puts the healing after the gathering, as in St. Mark, but has, instead of the words 'when they heard what great things He did' (*ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίησεν*), 'to hear Him' (*ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ*). Neither mention

the actual or contemplated withdrawal from the crowd into a ship in Mark iii. 9. The most simple explanation of all this is that both St. Matthew and St. Luke, each in his own way, modified the account of St. Mark, in order to introduce the Sermon on the Mount. That St. Luke altered the original position of the gathering is placed almost beyond a doubt by the fact that its position in St. Mark is confirmed by the doublet Matt. xii. 15, which occurs in the consecutive parallel to this part of St. Mark. What Dr. Holtzmann's arguments do really go to prove is that the Sermon in St. Matthew and St. Luke does come from some common source, and that covering more ground than the Sermon itself; but that alone is no ground for assuming that it was taken from the *Ur-Marcus*¹.

We have now to consider a number of passages in which we do find a continuance of parallelism between St. Matthew and St. Luke beyond St. Mark, and which at first sight would seem therefore to be original elements of the Marcan tradition, omitted by that evangelist. Deferring for the present the consideration of those which occur in the missionary and eschatological discourses in Matt. x., xxiv. and xxv., the only remaining instances of any importance are (1) Matt. iii. 7-10, 12 || Luke iii. 7-9, 17; (2) Matt. iv. 3-10 || Luke iv. 3-12; (3) Matt. v. 13 b || Luke xiv. 35; (4) Matt. xii. 27, 28, 30, 38-42, 43-45 || Luke xi. 19, 20, 23, 29-32², 24-26²; (5) Matt. xiii. 33 || Luke xiii. 20, 21, and perhaps we should add (6) Matt. xviii. 7 || Luke xvii. 1².

Now it will be observed that in all except the first two of these passages, the Lucan parallel occurs in the middle section of that Gospel. That fact alone, if our former reasoning about that section is correct, makes it almost certain that

¹ The argument of Ewald, which Dr. Holtzmann repeats, that there appears to be a break in Mark iii. 19, proves nothing. There are many apparent breaks in St. Mark, as e.g. after ver. 12 of this very chapter, and they belong to an earlier question, the origin of the Marcan tradition itself.

² The characteristic transpositions in these passages have already been noticed. Thus Matt. xviii. 6, not 8, is parallel to Luke xvii. 2.

St. Luke did not derive them from the Marcan tradition, but from some other forms of the same incidents or discourses. It seems also likely that St. Matthew either derived or adapted them from the same source, while he continued to place them in the original position of similar passages in the Marcan tradition. We have already shown¹ that this is probably the true account of the variations in 4, the Beelzebub discourse. It is obvious that he would have preferred a form of the discourse which contained a reference to the Jewish exorcists (xii. 27). St. Luke would, for the opposite reason, have preferred St. Mark's account. That he did not adopt it was probably because he found it in the other form in the sources from which he derived this section of the Gospel. In the case of 5 it is quite possible that St. Mark may have contented himself with the general statement in iv. 33, that our Lord 'spake with many such parables,' and omitted this particular parable. On the other hand, it is at least as likely that St. Matthew and St. Luke took it from some list of parables, in which the parable of the leaven, from the similarity of its teaching, naturally followed that of the mustard seed; or, for the same reason, the two parables may have been frequently associated in the oral teaching of the Church.

In 3 and 6 the differences between St. Matthew and St. Luke are greater than they usually are in passages where both have parallels in St. Mark. The resemblances are just enough to show that they have a common origin and no more. Besides, that the first occurs in St. Matthew in the inserted Sermon on the Mount is in itself all but a proof that it was not derived from the Marcan tradition. In the account of 2, the Temptation, the difficulties are so great that it seems almost impossible to offer anything but a conjectural solution of the problem. It is important to notice at the outset that the account in St. Mark has distinct features of its own, which mark it as an independent, and not an abridged version of the narrative. The mention of the wild animals and the

¹ Pp. 77, 78.

continued Temptation (mentioned but not emphasized by St. Luke, and omitted altogether by St. Matthew), in contrast to what appears to be the continued ministry¹ of angels, forms a graphic and striking picture, all the more vivid from its brevity. On the other hand, the three specific temptations, corresponding to the three-fold temptation of Eve (Gen. iii. 6; cf. 1 John ii. 16), the forty days' fast, like those of Moses and Elijah, the angelic ministry at the close of the final triumph over the Tempter, all of which we find in St. Matthew and the first two in St. Luke, are just the sort of features which would have been insisted upon when our Lord's Temptation became the ground of homiletic discourse. The mention of the wild animals might easily have fallen out, as the preachers preferred to dwell on the spiritual rather than the natural horrors of the scene. On the other hand, it is very difficult to account for the omission by St. Mark of the details supplied by the other Synoptists, especially the fasting, if he had found them in the original source. The retention of the imperfect *δηκόνουν* by St. Matthew with a slightly different force, and perhaps a different meaning², is certainly very remarkable, and is a good illustration of the conservative spirit with which he usually treated the Marcan tradition.

In 1, the account of St. John the Baptist, the continual parallelisms in St. Matthew and St. Luke are certainly very remarkable; and it is difficult to see any other solution, except that St. Mark has omitted these verses from the Marcan tradition. The case is unlike all the others in these respects: (a) The language of St. Matthew and St. Luke in these verses is remarkably close, and the few differences look like characteristic alterations of St. Luke. (b) The context of all the evangelists, both before and after, agrees, except for the peculiar passages introduced by St. Luke, iii. 10-14, and 18-

¹ Dr. Westcott (*Study of the Gospels*, ch. vi. § iii) notices the force of the imperfect *δηκόνουν* in Mark i. 13.

² In St. Matthew the word seems to refer, as generally in the New Testament, to ministering to our Lord's bodily wants. In St. Mark, where there is no mention of the fast, it seems to have a more spiritual meaning.

20. (c) Except for the passages which are under discussion, and the words *καὶ πᾶσι*, just before Matt. iii. 12, and evidently connected with it, there are in the whole account of the Baptist very few expressions¹ common to St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark. It is not likely therefore that the agreement of St. Matthew and St. Luke in the verses omitted by St. Mark is to be explained by the influence of an independent source. There seems then a strong probability that here at least our St. Mark has omitted some verses from the original source, possibly as being not suited to his Gentile readers.

We have still to consider two examples of continued parallelism in St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark of a somewhat different kind, viz. those in the missionary and eschatological discourses, such as Matt. x. 12, 13 || Luke x. 5, 6, and Matt. xxiv. 27 || Luke xvii. 24. These two discourses, or pairs of discourses, present remarkably similar features, and the explanation in one case is pretty likely to be in principle the explanation of the other. (1) We have at least two of each of these discourses in St. Luke, only one of each in both St. Matthew and St. Mark. (2) In both cases St. Matthew, in his form of the discourse, includes a considerable quantity of matter which is not in St. Mark, but is found in those forms in St. Luke's Gospel which do not in point of order and general contents form the true parallels to St. Matthew and St. Mark.

The missionary discourses are in Matt. x., Mark vi. 7-11, Luke (α) ix. 1-5, (β) x. 1-16. Here we find that St. Matthew's account, as far as ver. 16 inclusive, differs from St. Mark by the insertion of 2-4, 5 b-6, 7-8, 10 b, 12-13, 15²-16. Of these passages the first (the list of the Twelve) has been already discussed³, the second (the direction to go to Jews only) is obviously an insertion, exactly suited to the character

¹ The only one of the slightest importance is *ἡνεώχθησαν* (Matt.), *ἀνεψυχῆσαι* (Luke), for the very singular expression *σχιζόμενος* in Mark i. 10.

² The corresponding Mark xi. b is omitted by the best authorities.

³ Page 70.

of St. Matthew's Gospel; the third has concise parallels in St. Luke α and β (cf. Luke ix. 2, x. 9), and to a certain extent also in Mark vi. 12, 13. The three last again have parallels in Luke β (cf. Luke x. 7 b, 5-6, 12-13). After ver. 16 St. Matthew has a number of sayings of our Lord, nearly all of which occur elsewhere, and by far the majority of them in the middle section of St. Luke's Gospel. The last verse but two (40) corresponds again to the last verse of St. Luke β (x. 16). St. Luke α agrees very nearly with St. Mark, but omits the injunctions to go two and two and to be shod with sandals in Mark vi. 7-9. In St. Luke β we find, besides most of what is parallel to St. Mark, and still more closely to Luke α (though carefully expanded and somewhat rearranged), the introduction of considerable additional matter, which, taken by itself, forms a sufficiently clear and connected account, bearing a general similarity to the other. We find the parallel to St. Mark mostly in vv. 4, 5 a, 7-11, the supplementary account mostly in vv. 1-3, 5 b, 6, 12, and 16¹. In the first, 7 b c-8 may fairly be regarded as a substitute for $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu$ omitted in 4, as also by St. Matthew (see below). Again, Luke x. 9 may be simply a paraphrase of Luke ix. 1, 2, which is found in Matt. x. 7, 8, and in Mark vi. 12, 13 is given not as a charge, but as a statement of fact.

The following appears to be the most probable explanation of this complicated problem. There seem to have been originally two independent short accounts, the one describing the Mission of the Twelve, the other the Mission of the Seventy. The first of these is preserved, in its original form in St. Mark and St. Luke α , and underlies St. Luke β . The first and second are found combined in St. Luke β , whereas St. Matthew appears to be a combination of St. Mark || St. Luke α , with the already composite account of St. Luke β . Otherwise it is difficult to account for the insertions in Matt. x., to which we find parallels only in St. Luke β ; whereas their

¹ 13-15 (if not 12-15) either belongs to this supplementary account or is a further insertion. Cf. Matt. xi. 21-23 (or 21-24).

appearance in St. Luke β is quite intelligible, on the supposition that that is a combined account, of which one element no longer exists separately. Of course it does not follow that St. Matthew borrowed directly from St. Luke β in the form which we now find it in that Gospel, but more probably it was from an earlier combined account, from which St. Luke himself took it¹. The discourses are just such as would have been constantly repeated, and their close resemblance would have made them specially liable to mixture.

That St. Matthew's account and St. Luke β are partially derived from the same source is further confirmed by the fact that immediately before the discourse St. Matthew inserted ix. 37, 38, parallel to Luke x. 2; and in the chapter following this discourse has inserted a long parallel to what in St. Luke immediately follows it, Matt. xi. 20-27 || Luke x. 13-15, 21, 22. Probably in the original source of Luke β this discourse, or rather collection of sayings, followed directly, as in St. Luke. Curiously enough, while St. Luke has retained what is presumably the original order, he has made the last part of these sayings refer to a different occasion by introducing the return of the Seventy, &c., in vv. 17-20.

The explanation just given of the history and mutual relation of the missionary discourses may not be correct in all its details; but enough has been shown to establish, I think, beyond reasonable doubt at least this, that we have in St. Mark the original account of the Mission of the Twelve as contained in the Marcan tradition, and that what is common to St. Matthew and St. Luke beyond that, comes from some other independent source.

The sections containing the chief eschatological discourse are, Matt. xxiv., xxv. || Mark xiii. || Luke (α) xxi. 5-36; and there are two others apparently in Luke (β) xvii. 20-37, (γ) xii. 35-48. We will first examine the earlier part of

¹ St. Luke β has quite the characteristic grace and flow of St. Luke's style. And the omission of the directions (alluded to above) in Mark vi. 7, 9 a, in St. Luke α , probably because they occurred in β , seems to show that the combination itself in the latter was not originally St. Luke's work.

this discourse contained in Matt. xxiv. 1-36 [37-41] || Mark xiii. 1-32 || Luke xxi. 5-35. What strikes us most in this part of St. Luke α , is the way in which the language of St. Mark is modified or explained so as to refer more explicitly to the taking of Jerusalem. Compare especially Mark xiii. 14 with Luke xxi. 20, Mark xiii. 19, 20 with Luke xxi. 23 b, 24. Such modifications probably arose from the natural but unconscious tendency to substitute the current explanation for the obscure words of Christ. The same cause probably accounts both for the alteration of Mark xiii. 15 (cf. Luke xxi. 21 b), and the omission of Mark xiii. 21-22. But the fact that a parallel to the first, and part of the second, of these passages occurred in St. Luke β (xvii. 31 and 23) made this treatment of them in St. Luke α more natural.

In the corresponding part of St. Matthew's discourse we have to notice, in the first place, three insertions of matter peculiar in a certain sense to St. Matthew¹, viz. xxiv. 11-12, 30 a, b, and *μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης* in ver. 31. The first of these occurs in a passage (9-14) which is a free paraphrase of Mark xiii. 9-13, all the more remarkable because the language of St. Matthew in the early part of the discourse usually follows St. Mark very closely. But a much closer parallel to this Marcan passage had already been inserted by St. Matthew in the missionary discourse (x. 17-22). St. Matthew has besides two insertions, vv. 27 and 28, which correspond more or less closely with St. Luke xvii. 24 and 37. After 36 he makes a still more important insertion, vv. 37-41, agreeing with Luke xvii. 26-30, 34, 35. It is clear, therefore, that St. Luke β will account both for the more important insertions of St. Matthew, and, to a certain extent, for the omissions of St. Luke. St. Matthew has incorporated into his narrative matter derived from an eschatological dis-

¹ xxiv. 11 is a doublet of ver. 24, and 30 a, b of 30 c, influenced by 3 b. The relation of the first and last of these insertions to 2 Thess. ii. 3-12 || 1 Thess. iv. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 52, is too large a question to be discussed here. All that need be said is that the resemblance of language is not close enough to prove the prior existence of St. Matthew's discourse.

course, of which we find part at least in St. Luke β ; and St. Luke did not wish in α to repeat passages, or forms of passages, less suited to this than to β .

St. Luke β has, besides these parallels with St. Matthew and a few peculiar expressions, two verses, xvii. 25, 33, which have doublets occurring together in Luke ix. 22, 24, where in language and context they are closely parallel to Matt. xvi. 21, 25 and Mark viii. 31, 35. But St. Luke's language in xvii. 25, 33 differs considerably, and is clearly not derived from the same source. It is thus evident that St. Luke β has a composite character, and is quite independent of the Marcan tradition. We have every reason, therefore, for thinking that so far the Marcan tradition has been preserved by St. Mark. After Mark xiii. 32 the parallelism becomes very curious and instructive. St. Mark has in xiii. 33-37 a triple injunction to watchfulness, ἀγρυπνεῖτε (ver. 33), γρηγορεῖτε (ver. 35), and γρηγορεῖτε (ver. 37), in connexion with a single short parable or trope illustrating the duty. St. Matthew has in the place of this three parables, the faithful servant, the ten virgins, and the talents (xxiv. 42-xxv. 30), which, taken together, bear out every phrase of St. Mark. The first two definitely teach the necessity of watchfulness, the injunctions to this duty being repeated almost in St. Mark's language (Matt. xxiv. 42, 43, xxv. 13); the third, after beginning very much in the language of St. Mark's parable, goes on to introduce a distinctly different lesson, but yet one suggested by the Marcan phrase, ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ (Mark xiii. 34). In St. Mark that phrase seems to refer to the division of the household duties among the servants, which they were expected to be found faithfully carrying out when their lord returned; whereas the main thought of the parable of the talents is the duty of making the best use of God's gifts. Now all these three parables of St. Matthew have parallels in St. Luke in quite other connexions, and differing considerably in form, cf. Matt. xxiv. 42-51 with Luke xii. 38-46, Matt. xxv. 1-3 with Luke xii. 35-37, Matt. xxv. 14-30 with Luke

xix. 12-27. St. Luke ends the eschatological discourse *a* in xxi. 36 with a parallel to Mark xiii. 33¹. But Luke γ not only, as we have seen, contains parallels to the two first parables of St. Matthew, but has in some points a striking resemblance to Mark xiii. 35 (cf. especially Luke xii. 38), yet not more than might reasonably be expected in two forms of an original discourse preserved orally. The most probable explanation of all this again seems to be, that St. Matthew has incorporated into his discourse elements derived from other sources preserved independently of the Marcan tradition. St. Luke, on the other hand, seems in *a* to have omitted parts of the Marcan tradition, from an unwillingness to repeat what he had already said in other forms elsewhere. It may here again be observed that the great difference between the forms of the extra-Markan parallels in St. Matthew and St. Luke is a strong proof in itself that they did not derive them from the Marcan tradition.

We have already given reasons for thinking that St. Mark did not transpose the original order of the Marcan tradition, and also that he did not make any serious omissions, except probably in the account of St. John the Baptist. It now remains, lastly, to consider whether he added anything to this original source. Now the portions of St. Mark's Gospel without parallels in either St. Matthew or St. Luke are singularly few, and most of them no larger than a single verse, and frequently much less. They belong generally to what may be called characteristic details, and are therefore beyond the limits of our present inquiry. The most important of them is the incident of the man with the linen cloth in Mark xiv. 51, 52.

Putting such passages on one side, we will examine all others that are peculiar to St. Mark in their order. Mark i. 1 proves nothing. If the original Gospel did not begin here, some sort of heading must have been added; if it did,

¹ Or it would perhaps be more correct to regard Luke xxi. 34-36 as a very free and concise paraphrase of Mark xiii. 32-37.

St. Matthew and St. Luke must equally have omitted it. It seems hardly possible to explain the prophecy in Mark i. 2 b as an insertion into the Marcan tradition, unless it be a very early marginal gloss which has crept into the text of St. Mark, but such conjectures are extremely hazardous. On the other hand, if it existed in the Marcan tradition, the necessary rearrangement of the opening verses, and the fact that the prophecy is not from Isaiah but Malachi, would quite account for its omission by St. Matthew and St. Luke. If what was said above¹ about the Sermon on the Mount is correct, the omission of Mark iii. 9 by St. Matthew and St. Luke was almost necessitated by the rearrangement of the context. Again, they very naturally omitted iii. 20, 21 when they supplied the motive of the discourse about Beelzebub from another source². And besides, the passage might, as already suggested³, have been the cause of offence; or, at any rate, it might seem awkwardly divided by the discourse from Mark iii. 31. The omission of iv. 26-29 (the parable of the seed growing secretly) by St. Matthew is probably to be explained, as already suggested, by the substitution of the somewhat similar, but more striking parable of the tares, for which an opportunity was given by Mark iv. 33. Mark vii. 2-4 is partly a motive for the following discourse, partly an explanation of the Jewish custom of ceremonial washings before eating. The latter might with equal probability have been added for Gentile readers, or omitted as unnecessary for Jewish readers. But the further omission by St. Matthew of the motive, seems to show that he made the whole omission to connect the hostile attack of the Scribes and Pharisees more closely with their mission from headquarters. Mark vii. 32-37 (the deaf and dumb man of Decapolis) is, as the context before and after shows, really parallel to Matt. xv. 30, 31, and this general statement of St. Matthew may very probably be an abridgement of this miracle and that of the blind man of Bethsaida in Mark viii. 22-26,

¹ See p. 82.² See above, pp. 77, 78.³ See p. 73.

which is also omitted by St. Matthew. This last omission may be partly also accounted for by the fact that he had already related a somewhat similar miracle in ix. 27-31.

The originality of Mark ix. 48, 49, 50 b and xi. 25 (26 is certainly spurious) may be open to question. These verses have the appearance of being detached sayings of our Lord pieced together from a general resemblance of subject, rather than parts of a connected discussion. For example, xi. 25 gives us another duty connected with prayer which has no direct connexion with the incident of the fig-tree. But this very fact may be the cause of its omission by St. Matthew, especially as in vi. 14, 15 he had already taken a very similar saying from an independent source. Mark xii. 32-34 a may have been omitted by St. Matthew, because the words of the lawyer, and what immediately followed, were partly in a certain sense a repetition of our Lord's own language, and therefore thought unnecessary, and partly a merely personal incident. Neither had any direct bearing on the theological force of our Lord's teaching, which seemed designed to show the fulfilment of the law in Christianity. The difference of the motive of the lawyer's question in St. Matthew (xxii. 35) and of our Lord's relation to the lawyer, are explicable enough if we regard Luke x. 25-28 as a modification of an independent account of this, or of a similar incident¹. St. Matthew may, while he retained the Marcan order, have modified his account in the direction of this other, with the view of making it harmonise better with the context, which describes certain attacks made by different parties against our Lord. Indeed, Mark xii. 13 || Matt. xxii. 15 seemed to require that a special attack by the Pharisaic party should be narrated². It has already been observed that there are singular points of verbal coincidence between St. Matthew and St. Luke. The difficulties in supposing that St. Mark modified his account from

¹ See above, p. 77.

² It is worth noticing that St. Matthew in vv. 34, 35 specially mentions the fact, not stated by St. Luke, that the lawyer was a Pharisee.

St. Matthew's are far more serious. It should be noticed that three of the passages which we have been discussing occur in the large section of the Marcan tradition, Mark vi. 45-viii. 26 omitted consecutively by St. Luke, and where we have consequently only the evidence of St. Matthew to go upon. Had St. Luke contained this section at all, we have no necessary grounds for supposing that he would have omitted them.

We may sum up the results of our examination of St. Mark's Gospel thus. There are a few unimportant passages where it is not unlikely, and yet by no means certain, that St. Mark modified the earlier tradition; one only where it is almost certain that he did so, viz. in the omission of Matt. iii. 7-10, 12; and there are some grounds for thinking that the Marcan tradition (or perhaps we should say St. Mark) originally contained what corresponded to Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, 16-20. We conclude, therefore, that the common tradition upon which all the three Synoptics were based is substantially our St. Mark as far as *matter, general form, and order* are concerned. Whether we can go further, and say that in point of language and the more minute details it is generally identical, is a further question which we have not attempted to settle. This may seem to carry us a very small way; but if critics could come to an agreement even upon this one point, it would at least be a definite step towards the solution of what is, from any point of view, one of the most intricate and interesting of literary problems.

Unfortunately it was not till after this essay was in the press that I had an opportunity of seeing Dr. Holtzmann's new work *Die Synoptiker*, Freiburg, 1889. It is gratifying to find that he has given up I believe all the opinions which I have ventured to criticise, especially that fundamental theory of an *Ur-Marcus* larger than our Synoptical Gospel. He now holds that St. Mark itself was the main source of both St. Matthew and St. Luke. In fact the argument on which he lays the greatest stress is just what it has been my

chief object to point out, the continuity of the Marcan order traceable in these two Gospels.

Although this work thus gives important additional support to my arguments, it would have required too much shifting of type to have made the necessary corrections; and I have felt obliged to leave the references to his earlier work as they stand.

Although I have not attempted to discuss the originality of St. Mark's Gospel *as far as language is concerned*, I may be permitted, perhaps, to add the following remarks. (1) It is certainly *a priori* probable, though not a necessary consequence, that if the common basis of the Synoptics can be found to have coincided in range and order almost exactly with our St. Mark, it did so also in language. (2) It is in itself far more probable that the graphic details of St. Mark, many of them of no importance from a religious or doctrinal point of view, should have fallen out in the more elaborate works of later evangelistic compilers, than that they should have been added by a later writer by way of embellishment, specially by one like St. Mark, who gives us little or no evidence of literary skill. (3) The differences of language between St. Matthew and St. Mark can to a very large extent be explained either by the rearrangement made in certain parts by St. Matthew, or by his desire to correct the crudities of his original. Yet we find in these respects a distinct conservative tendency. (4) In St. Luke, so remarkable for his literary skill, we naturally find alterations from both these causes more frequent: but still there is abundant evidence of the direct influence of St. Mark's language. Except in certain pretty definitely marked passages, such as the discourse about Beelzebub (see p. 78), his language resembles St. Mark more closely than St. Matthew, and but few remarkable expressions agree with St. Matthew against St. Mark.

EXPLANATION OF SYNOPTIC TABLE.

THE object of this Table is to show at a glance the relation in which St. Mark stands to the two other synoptical Gospels, and they to each other. The divisions of St. Mark are not made as a rule with any regard for the natural divisions of subject-matter; but simply so as to indicate how much of the Marcan tradition was continuously made use of by either St. Matthew or St. Luke, or by both, or by neither. Hence it has frequently been necessary to break into a paragraph or even a verse. For example, Mark ix. 33 a is separated from 33 b, because the first part of the verse, 'And he came to Capernaum,' has no parallel in St. Luke, and in St. Matthew it is separated from the second by the inserted episode of the didrachma. The relations between St. Matthew and St. Luke are less obviously shown; but that is mainly because there are so few traces of connexion except through St. Mark.

Close dotted lines mean that a Gospel contains no certain parallel to a given passage. Square brackets [. . .] show that the passage included in them is peculiar to a particular Gospel. In order to avoid the unnecessary and confusing multiplication of lines, it has often been found convenient to use these brackets in the middle of parallel sections, to show that though such sections are clearly parallel as a whole, yet one or more evangelists have smaller peculiar passages within them. In such cases all but the verses actually bracketed off must be considered as parallel. Thus in putting Mark iii. 7-[9]-11 a[11 b] as parallel to Luke vi. [17 a] 17 b-19 it is meant that Mark iii. 7, 8, 10, 11 a is parallel to Luke vi. 17 b-19, and that Mark iii. 9, 11 b, Luke vi. 17 a have nothing to correspond to them in the other Gospels. Occasionally I have included in square brackets passages which are parallel or quasi-parallel in two Gospels, as Matt. iii. 7-10, 12 || Luke iii. 7-9, 17; Matt. xv. 30, 31 || Mark vii. 32-37: but the reasons are generally pretty obvious. Round brackets

(. . .) are used where verses or small passages occur very nearly, but not exactly, in their Marcan order, and have the appearance of having been intentionally transposed. These are almost confined to St. Luke.

The passages placed in the right-hand column for comparison with sections in the Gospel columns are very variously characterised. Some are mere independent treatments of the same or similar subjects, as the genealogy in Matt. i. 1-16 compared with that in Luke iii. 23-38, and the call (apparently) of St. Peter in Luke v. 1-11 compared with the call of the four in Mark i. 16-20. Others are partial parallels with considerable difference of treatment, as Luke iv. 22, 24 compared with Mark vi. 1-6 a. Many are doublets of passages, which from their agreement with the Marcan order are placed in the Gospel columns. Thus Matt. xii. 24-26 is placed as parallel to Mark iii. 22-26, and the doublet Matt. ix. 32-34 is placed in the right-hand column. In dealing with Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, I have admitted into the Lucan column only such passages as show traces of a continuous parallelism with St. Matthew, viz. Luke xi. 14-23 || Matt. xii. 22-30, xi. 24-32 || Matt. xii. 38-45, xiii. 18-21 || Matt. xiii. 31-33, xvii. 1, 2 || Matt. xviii. 6, 7 (see pp. 77, 78, 83, 84).

Some attempt has been made to make clearer the double revision, as I have ventured to call it, of St. Mark in Matt. viii.-xiii., by placing the chapter-figures of passages belonging to the second selection a little to the left and leaving the rest in their natural position.

The chief differences between this Table and Mr. Rushbrooke's Synopticon are that I have added Matt. iv. 13 a as || Mark i. 21 a, and Matt. iv. 23 b as || Mark i. 21 b (thus showing that Matt. iv. 28 b-29 is a true contextual parallel to Mark i. 22), Matt. ix. 1 a as indubitably || Mark v. 18 a-21, and Luke xii. 11-12, as an additional parallel to Mark xiii. 11, 12; Luke xxiii. 3, 2 (not 4, 10) as || Mark xv. 2, 3. It will be seen that they arise mainly out of the stress laid on parallelism of context as distinct from mere resemblance.

SYNOPTIC TABLE,

SHOWING THE RELATION BETWEEN ST. MARK AND THE TWO OTHER SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

ST. MATTHEW.	ST. MARK.	ST. LUKE.	REMARKS.
ii. 1-[7-10] ¹ -[12] ¹ -[14, 15]-17	i. 2-11	iii. 2b-[5, 6]-[7-9] ¹ -[10-14]-[17] ¹ -[18-20] ² -22 [23-38]	¹ parallels in Matthew and Luke. ² With Luke iii. 19, 20 cf. Mark vi. 17, Matt. xiv. 3. cf. Matt. i. 1-16.
iv. 1-[3-10] ³ -12 [13b-16]	12-14a 14b, 15 16-20 21a 21b 22 23-28 29-34 35-39 40-44 45 1-22 23-iii. 6 iii. 7-[9]-11a [11b] 12 13	iv. 1-[3-12] ³ -14a [14b, 15] [16-30] 31 32 33-37 38-41 42-44 v. [1-11] 12-14 15, 16 17-38 [30] 1-10 [11] [17a] 17b-19 [20-49] 12, 13a	³ parallel. cf. Matt. iv. 23, 24; ix. 26; xiii. 54; Mark vi. 2. cf. Luke v. 1-11. cf. Matt. xiii. 53-58; Mark vi. 1-6. cf. Luke vi. 12-49; Mark iii. 7-9. with Mark i. 39 cf. Matt. iv. 23. cf. Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark i. 16-20. cf. Luke vii. 1-10. Matt. omits Mark ii. 4, Luke v. 19. cf. Matt. iv. 25, 24b. cf. Matt. v. 2-vii. 27. cf. Matt. v. 1.
xii. 1-[5-7]-14 15 16 [17-21]			

xii.	x. 2-4	14-19 a [19 b-21] . .	13 b-16		
	22, 23	22-26	xi. 14		cf. Matt. ix. 32-34.
	24-26	27, 28	15-18		
	27, 28	29	19, 20		
	30	31, 32	21, 22		
xiii.	33-35 [36, 37] . .	28, 29 [30]	23		
	38-42	31-35	xii. 10		
	43-45	iv. 1 ^a	vi. 43-45		cf. Matt. viii. 5-13.
	46-50	2-12] ⁶ -[14-15a]-[16	vii. [1-10]		⁴ cf. Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9.
	i.	-17] ⁷ -23	xi. [11-17] [36-50] ⁴ . .		⁵ transposed.
xiii.	2-12] ⁶ -[14-15a]-[16	iv. 1 ^a	xii. [27, 28] 29-32 . .		cf. also Luke xi. 27, 28.
	-17] ⁷ -23	21-24	viii. 19-21		
	25	25	viii. [1 ^a -3] 4-15		⁶ cf. Mark iv. 25. ⁷ cf. Luke x. 23, 24. ⁸ see
	[26-29]	30-32	16-18 a		Matt. ix. 35 a and references.
	33	33, 34 ^a	18 b		cf. Matt. v. 14-16; x. 26; xi. 15; vii. 2; Luke xi. 33;
viii.	34 [35]	[34 b]	xiii. 18, 19		xii. 2; vi. 38.
	36-52	35-41	20, 21		cf. Matt. xiii. 12.
	18-[19-22] ⁹ -27 . .	v. 1-21	26-40		possibly parallel.
	28-ix. 1 ^a	22-43	41-56		possibly parallel.
	ix. 18-25 ¹⁰ [26] ¹¹ . .	27-31	vi. 22-25		⁹ cf. Luke ix. 57-62.
xiii.	[32-34]	vi. 1-6 a	viii. 22-25		Matt. omits Mark v. 3-5, 8-10, 18 b-20.
	53-58	6 b	26-40		¹⁰ Matt. omits Mark v. 29-33, and most of 41 b-43.
	ix. 35 a [35 b-38 ¹²] . .		41-56		¹¹ cf. Luke iv. 14 b.
			vi. 22-26		cf. Mark viii. 22-26.
			xii. 22-24; Mark iii. 22-26; Luke xi.		cf. Matt. xii. 22-24.

ST. MATTHEW.	ST. MARK.	ST. LUKE.	REMARKS.
xxi. 1-[4, 5]-9.	xl. 1-10	xix. 29-38	¹ cf. Matt. xxi. 15, 16.
10a.	11a.	[¹ 39, 40] [41-44]	cf. Mark xi. 15.
[10b, 11]	[11b] ²	² cf. Matt. xxi. 17.
(18, 19a) ³	12-14	³ transposed.
12, 13 [14]	15 [16]-17 ⁴	45, 46 [47a] ⁴	⁴ cf. together Matt. 14, Mark 17 a (ἐξιδασκε), and Luke 47 a.
15, 16 ⁵	18	47b, 48	⁵ cf. also Luke xix. 39, 40, and vid. Matt. xxi. 11.
17	19	cf. Mark xi. 11 b; Luke xxi. 37.
19b, 20	20, 21	
21, 22	22-24	
.....	[25]	
23-27	27-33	cf. Luke xvii. 6.
[28-32]	xx. 1-8	cf. Matt. vi. 14, 15. Mark xi. 26 is spurious.
33-42 [43]	xii. 1-11	
44 ⁶	12	9-17	⁶ genuineness doubtful.
45, 46	18	
[1-10]	19	
[11-14] 15-32	13-27	cf. Luke xiv. 16-24.
[33] 34-39 [40]	28-31 [32-34 a]	20-38	cf. Luke xi. 53, 54.
(46) ⁷	34b	39	cf. Luke x. 25-27.
41-45, 47-[xxiii. 3-5a] ⁸	35-39	40	⁷ transposed
[7b-13 ⁹]	41-46	⁸ with Matt. xxiii. 4 cf. Luke xi. 46.
.....	
.....	40	⁹ cf. Luke xi. 52. Matt. xxiii. 14 is probably spurious.
[15-22]	47	
[23-36]	
[37-39]	
.....	41-44	
.....	1-8a	xxi. 1-4	cf. Luke xi. 39-51.
xxiv. 1-7a	5-11 a [11 b]	cf. Luke xiii. 34, 35.
8	8b	

9-[11, 12]-14	9-13	12-[18]-19	cf. Matt. x. 17-22; Luke xii. 11, 12.
15, 16	14	20, 21 a	cf. Luke xvii. 31.
17, 18	15, 16	21 b [22]	
19-21	17-19	23-[24 a]	
22	20	
23-26	21-23	cf. Luke xvii. 21-23.
[27, 28]	24 b ¹⁰ -33 [34-35] ¹¹	cf. Luke xvii. 24 and 37.
29 ¹⁰ -36	24 ¹⁰ -32	¹⁰ cf. Luke 24 b with Matt. 29 a, εὐθέως... ἐκείνων, and Mark 24 ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. ¹¹ cf. however Luke 34, 35 with Matt. 36, Mk. 32, 36.
xxv. {	36	cf. Luke xvii. 26-[31-33]-35; xvii. 36 is spurious.
	[37, 38]	cf. Luke xii. 35-40. ¹² cf. Luke xii. 42-46.
	¹³ cf. Luke xix. 12-26 [27].
xxvi. {	cf. Matt. xxi. 12 a, 17 a; Mark xi. 11 b, 12 a (?).
[31-46]	xxii. 1, 2	
[1] 2-5	xiv. 1, 2	
6-13	3-9	3-14	¹⁴ transposed.
14-20	10-17	(21, 23) ¹⁴	
21, 22	18, 19	¹⁵ transposed.
23	20	(22) ¹⁵	¹⁶ transposed.
24 [25]	21	(19 a) ¹⁶	¹⁷ Luke 19 b-20 is probably spurious.
26	22	15-18 ¹⁷	cf. Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-45; Matt. xviii. 1-5; Mark ix. 33-37; Luke ix. 46-48.
27-29	23-25	[24-30]	¹⁸ transposed.
.....	(39) ¹⁸	the parallel to Luke xxii. 37, viz. Mark xv. 28, is spurious.
30	26	31-34	
31-34	27-30	[35-38]	
.....	
35	31	
36	32	40	
37, 38	33, 34	
39-41 a.	35-38 a	41-[43, 44 ¹⁹]-46	¹⁹ genuineness doubtful.
41 b-46	38 b-42	

ST. MATTHEW.	ST. MARK.	ST. LUKE.	REMARKS.
xxvi. 47-51 [52-54] 55-58 59 60-63 a 63 b-75	xiv. 43-47 48-[51, 52]-54 55 56-[59]-61 a 61 b-72	xxii. 47-50 [51] 52-55 (66) 1 (67-71) ² , (63-65) (56-63) ²	1 transposed. 2 transposed.
xxvii. 1-[3-10]-12 a 12 b-14 15-[19]-[24, 25]-26 27-31 a 31 b-35 [36] 37 38 39, 40 a 40 b-42 [43] 44, 45 46-49 50 51 a-[51 b-53]-56 57 a 57 b-60 a 60 b 61 [62-66]	xv. 1-3 4-5 6-15 16-20 a 20 b-24 [25] 26 27 29 30-32 a 32 b-33 34-36 37 38-41 42 a 42 b 43 [44, 45 a] 45 b, 46 a 46 b 47 xvi. 1-[2 b-3]-8 a [8 b]	xxiii. 1, (3) ³ 2 a [2 b] [4-12] 13 [14, 15]-25 ⁴ 26 [27-32 ⁵]-[34 a] 34 b (38) ⁶ 35-37 39 a-[39 b-43]-45 a 46 ⁷ (45 b) ⁸ , 47-49 (54) ⁹ 50 a [50 b-51 a]-53 55 [56] xxiv. 1, (10) ¹⁰ , 2-[7, 8] 9 a 9 b, [11]	3 transposed. 4 order a good deal transposed. cf. Luke xxiii. 11. 5 cf. Matt. xxvii. 38; Mark xv. 27. 6 transposed. cf. Luke xxiii. 32. Mark xv. 28 is spurious. cf. Luke xxiii. 36 with Matt. xxvii. 48, Mark xv. 36. 7 adding εἰπευ-εἰπών. 8 transposed. 9 transposed. 10 transposed.

III.

THE DAY AND YEAR OF ST. POLYCARP'S
MARTYRDOM¹.

[C. H. TURNER.]

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος πολύκαρπος μὴνὸς ζανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἱσταμένου, πρὸ
 ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν μαρτίων, σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ, ὥρᾳ ὀγδόῃ· συνελήφθη
 ὑπὸ ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως φιλίππου τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος
 στατίου κοδράτου, βασιλεύοντος δὲ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ·
 ᾧ ἡ δόξα, τιμὴ, μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν.
 ἀμήν.

THE readers of this volume of *Studia Biblica* will not un-
 naturally ask why, in presence of the very numerous questions
 which might reasonably demand notice in our sphere of work,
 one so apparently trivial as the exact date of a martyrdom
 should require to be re-opened for a fresh discussion after the
 learned and exhaustive paper read before the Society by Mr.
 Randell, of St. John's, in February, 1884, and printed in the
 earlier number of the series of which the present publication
 is the second.

To this question two answers may be offered.

In the first place, on the general ground it may be asserted
 that, minute as the enquiry doubtless is, there are few prob-
 lems in the Christian history of the second century of equal
 interest and of equal importance with the precise dating of
 St. Polycarp's death. It is not only that it is a pivot of
 ecclesiastical chronology, but that on it depends largely the
 value we can place on the succession St. John, Polycarp,
 Irenaeus. Irenaeus was born not later, probably earlier, than

¹ An abstract of this paper has already appeared in print in the *Guardian*
 for April 18, 1888; and the writer takes this opportunity of thanking the
 Editor for his courtesy in consenting to what is more or less a republication
 of it.

A.D. 130. St. John lived on in Asia Minor down to the close of the first century. Between them stands Polycarp, and it is on the chronological proof of his intercourse with each of them that the issue turns. For Polycarp was eighty-six years old at the time of his martyrdom (*Mart. Pol.* § ix), and thus, after covering the at most thirty years' interval between the death of St. John and the birth of Irenaeus, more than half a century of his life remains which, if anything like equally divided between the life-time of his teacher and the life-time of his pupil, is amply sufficient to warrant him a trustworthy link between the one and the other. But when we fix the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, we fix also his birth, and therewith the length of his possible connection alike with his successor and with his predecessor.

It needs no more to show the intrinsic importance of the enquiry. But even so the re-opening of it here would be scarcely in place, were it not that the present writer—and this must be his main defence—is in a position of great advantage as compared with Mr. Randell, both because the latter's paper is ready to his hand, and even more by the intermediate appearance of the Bishop of Durham's volumes on St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp; not the least exhaustive or least conclusive portion of that memorable work being the discussion (vol. i. pp. 610–702) of the date of the martyrdom in question¹.

When Mr. Randell wrote there was, it is true, already a general tendency among English scholars as well as on the Continent to admit the soundness of the arguments with which M. Waddington had sought, by the aid of a reconsideration of the chronological notices given in the rhetorician Aelius Aristides, to fix the date of the Asiatic proconsulship of T. Statius Quadratus—under whom, according to the

¹ All references in these pages are to the first edition of Bishop Lightfoot's work unless otherwise stated: the new edition (1889) came to hand too late to be employed in the text, and I have therefore added to my appendices a note on the new matter introduced, and especially on the criticism he has done me the honour to devote to my own view.

notices of the Letter of the Church of Smyrna (known as the *Martyrium Polycarpi*) the saint undoubtedly suffered—not, as had hitherto been the case, to the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161–180), but to that of his predecessor Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161). Aristides dates events both by proconsuls and by the years of a certain malady to which he was long subject, and so, if we can find external evidence for the date of any one proconsul who is mentioned in this connection, we could then argue by the years of the malady to other proconsuls similarly introduced. Now Julianus was, says Aristides, proconsul a year and some months after the malady commenced, and an inscription fixes this proconsulship to A.D. 145. From Julianus we get to Severus, from Severus to Quadratus, who is in consequence usually placed in A.D. 154–155¹.

But there were then still those who held to the traditional view. Among ourselves, Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, in his latest work (cf. *A Church History to the Council of Nicaea*, 1881, p. 161, note²), held it, though hesitatingly; and in Germany, Keim, a writer of by no means conservative tendencies, was equally unconvinced. Now, however, by the labours of Bishop Lightfoot, the question may almost be said, at least in England, to have been set at rest. Whatever doubt may have hung over the reconstructed Aristidean chronology, when that reconstruction stood alone, has surely been dis-

¹ However, since the proconsuls held office, not from January to January, but from May to May, and because of the impossibility of arguing from one date to another without leaving a certain margin, more cannot be claimed with certainty for the ultimate result (as Dr. Lightfoot admits, p. 650), than that Quadratus came into office not earlier than A.D. 153, and not later than A.D. 155, so that the martyrdom can so far fall anywhere between May A.D. 153 and May A.D. 156; and though both the writers whose investigation into the details of this subject gives them the best claim to be heard, Waddington and Lightfoot, place the martyrdom early in A.D. 155, there are not wanting critics of the first rank, such as Hilgenfeld and Lipsius (see below), who on one ground or another prefer to place it early in A.D. 156.

² But in the latest edition (1889) the note in question has been re-written, 'in accordance with a request made by' the late Bishop before his death to the present Bishop of Salisbury. See below, note, p. 152.

sipated by the striking coincidence with it of the epigraphical evidence relative to the date of another official mentioned in the account of the martyrdom. As the first discussion started from the name of the Proconsul, Quadratus, so the later discoveries centre round the name of the Asiarch, Philip of Tralles (*Mart. Pol.* §§ 12, 21). From one Trallian inscription we learn that the Trallian games of the 'eighth Olympiad after the Restoration' took place shortly before the death of Antoninus, probably late in A.D. 160 or early in A.D. 161. The 'Restoration' must therefore have happened about thirty years beforehand, and was doubtless reckoned from Hadrian's visit to Asia Minor in A.D. 129, so that the first Olympiad would probably begin in A.D. 129, and the eighth in A.D. 157. Hence we can also fix the fifty-sixth Olympiad, if, as seems the case, that is only a magniloquent paraphrase for the sixth, to A.D. 149-153; and the fifty-sixth is mentioned in two inscriptions in connection with the Trallian games held under G. Julius Philippus, who was simultaneously 'High-Priest of Asia.' This interpretation is confirmed by a further inscription from Olympia, which speaks of Philip of Tralles as Asiarch in the 232nd Olympiad, that is, some time in A.D. 149-152. These two results so entirely coincide that no hesitation need be felt in concluding that Philip of Tralles was Asiarch somewhere in the years A.D. 150-152. Then since the Asiarchate, like the periodical games, was 'pentaeteric,' that is renewed every four years, it may either be supposed that Philip was re-elected for a second tenure of office, or more simply that he was originally elected in A.D. 151 or 152, and so did not vacate till A.D. 155 or 156. These conclusions are worked out by the Bishop of Durham (pp. 612-618, cf. ii. 987-998), and this close agreement of two independent lines of evidence to the central years of the decade, A.D. 150-160, seemed to remove any possibility of scepticism ¹.

¹ One or two suggestions may be added in completion of the Bishop's argument. Since the Asiatic year began in September (see *inf.* p. 113) it may be presumed that the 'Restoration' Olympiads date from September A.D. 129, and

Before, however, dismissing for good the older view, which connected the martyrdom with the reign of Marcus, it will be worth while to examine for one moment the grounds on which it was based. In this, as in so many other chronological matters, it is pretty clear that later writers¹ have

the sixth or fifty-sixth would not end till September A.D. 153, nor the eighth till September A.D. 161. Again, if Trallian games occurred shortly before Antoninus' death in March 161 A.D., then since they were no doubt pentaeteric, the other inscriptions relating to victories in the Trallian games two Olympiads earlier, may be fixed with great probability near the early months of A.D. 153. Future epigraphic discoveries may, one cannot help surmising, give us substantial help in this sort of way towards the Polycarpian question.

¹ Thus Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* 17) mentions Polycarp's visit to Anicetus as under Antoninus Pius, his martyrdom as under 'M. Antoninus' and L. Aurelius Commodus; apparently following Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 14, 15, where the visit is mentioned before, the martyrdom after, the accession of 'Marcus Aurelius Verus, who is also Antoninus.'

The Church historian Socrates is, however, a strange exception, for in his well-known chapter on diversities of usage in different Churches (*H. E.* v. 22, p. 238, Bright), he instances the Quartodeciman dispute, and in connection with it the visit to Anicetus of Polycarp, ὁ καὶ ὕστερον ἐπὶ Γορδιανοῦ μαρτυρήσας, that is between A.D. 238 and A.D. 244! The only point of interest in so extraordinary a blunder is the question how can it have arisen, especially as Socrates is a more than usually careful writer, and ordinarily follows Eusebius closely; indeed, the visit to Anicetus, which is the only motive for the introduction of Polycarp's name here at all, is taken from the earlier historian (though from *H. E.* v. 24, not iv. 14). It would be natural to suppose that he would have turned to Eusebius for the date of the martyrdom as well, if he had not believed himself to have other quite trustworthy authority for his statement. Either then he confused the great Polycarp with one of the other martyrs of the same name, to whose existence the oldest Kalendars witness (cf. Lightfoot, i. p. 689, Syriac K. under Jan. 27, Latin K. under Feb. 23); or, if he had, as is not unlikely, the martyrdom at his command (§ 21 μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος . . . ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στατίου Κοδράτου), the conjecture may be offered that the phrase 'in the highpriesthood of Philip the Trallian,' occurring before the Proconsul, in the place where the mention of the Emperor might be anticipated, may have originated the error. 'Ἀρχιερέως would be read αὐτοκρατόρος, or interpreted of the Emperor as Pontifex Maximus; and TPAAIANOY appears in some MSS. as TPAIANOY, the *ductus litterarum* of which is sufficiently near to ΓΟΡΔΙΑΝΟΥ. Philip and Gordian were apparently for a time colleagues in the empire; but as Philip was believed to have been a Christian, Socrates would repeat only Gordian's name as the persecutor. Or, an alternative explanation might be, that since a Philip is commemorated on coins as Recorder of Tralles in the age of the Gordians (Lightfoot, p. 960) the Asiarch Philip had in some way got confused with his later homonym, and been assigned his date.

only followed the fashion set by Eusebius, who in his *History* (iv. 15) inserts the Martyrium, or the greater part of it, immediately after the notice of Antoninus' death, and in his *Chronicle* was believed to have found a more precise date in A.D. 166 or 167. But in the latter passage, as Dr. Lightfoot, never more felicitous than when dealing with Eusebius, has conclusively shown, the historian is merely grouping together at some convenient point in this reign, as he has done in other reigns, all notices of persecutions belonging to it, but not otherwise dated. There is nothing really to suggest that for his *Chronicle* he possessed more detailed knowledge than is given in the *History*, where he even includes in the comparatively small omissions from the Martyrium the concluding section, teeming though it does with notices of time, each of which has contributed something to the modern enquiry, while none of them could have enlightened a writer destitute of our modern collections of provincial Fasti, lists of local Kalendars, and *Corpora* of inscriptions. Eusebius can in fact only be quoted as a witness to the *reign*, not to the *year*, of the martyrdom; and if we ask why he selected the reign of Pius rather than that of Marcus, it is plain that where the Martyrium itself failed to help him, he must have been thrown back on other and more general indications.

Such would be, primarily, the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus of Rome, our only piece of independent external evidence, twice quoted by Eusebius from Irenaeus (*H. E.* iv. 14, v. 24). Since the Episcopate of Anicetus is reckoned in the *History* as lasting from A.D. 157 to 168¹, and since Marcus succeeded to the throne early in A.D. 161, it was clear that there were more chances than not that, if not the visit, at any rate the martyrdom would fall under him. This conclusion would be

¹ Similarly Jerome's version of the *Chronicle*. The Armenian version does not essentially differ at this point; in any case see Lightfoot, ii. pp. 461-465, where Dr. Hort supplies good reasons for rejecting the common view that the Armenian correctly represents the original *Chronicle*—a view which necessitates the improbable hypothesis that Eusebius in his two works had two different chronologies of the Roman Bishops.

in accord with Eusebius' *parti pris* concerning the relation of the two Emperors to Christianity. According to him Pius was no persecutor, while Marcus confessedly was. On the one hand, the (spurious) toleration edict of *H. E.* iv. 13 is beyond question understood by Eusebius (whether rightly or wrongly) as belonging to Antoninus: and Melito's *Apology*, quoted in iv. 26, distinctly speaks of letters of the same Emperor to different cities in the Christian interest. On the other, he saw that the context in Melito postulates an existing persecution under Marcus, and the story of the Martyrs of Lyons (*H. E.* v. 1) belongs to the same reign¹.

Beyond doubt, then, Eusebius, if he had no other means of distinguishing, would have selected the reign of Marcus for the martyrdom of Polycarp on these *a priori* grounds, and the value of his evidence is neither more nor less than the probabilities of their correctness. But the presumptions on which, in the absence of other data, it was necessary for him to argue are nothing in face of the more definite evidence obtained from Aristides and the inscriptions; and the soundness of the conclusion of Waddington and Lightfoot is therefore established negatively as well as positively.

But if it is thus certain that the true date falls in or near A.D. 155, it is natural to ask further whether there is no means which will enable us to fix more exactly the year and even the day of the martyrdom; and the answer to the question lies in the Chronological Postscript to the Martyrium which is printed at the head of this paper. 'The Blessed

¹ One indeed of Eusebius' authorities, the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian, which he knew in a Greek translation (*H. E.* ii. 3, iii. 33), claimed all the good Emperors, and among them of course both Antoninus and Aurelius—but the latter, on the strength of the story of the Thundering Legion, with special emphasis—as protectors of the Christians. But Eusebius (erroneously) referred the Legion legend, and the consequent epistle of 'Marcus, the understanding Emperor,' to Aurelius' brother L. Verus, quoting Tertullian as an authority (*H. E.* v. 5); and either Tertullian's Greek translator (who certainly took the liberty to re-arrange Tertullian's haphazard mention of Emperors into chronological order: cf. *Apol.* 5 with *H. E.* v. 5), or more probably Eusebius himself significantly omitted the mention of 'Verus' (i. e. M. Aurelius) in the catalogue of non-persecuting Emperors.

Polyearp is martyred on the second of the month Xanthicus, the seventh before the Kalends of March, on a high Sabbath, at the eighth hour; he was arrested by Herod, Philip of Tralles being high priest, and Statius Quadratus proconsul.' Of these indications the last two, the Proconsulship and the Asiarchate have been already spoken of. There remain four, the day and month in the Asiatic reckoning; the same in the Roman reckoning; the day of the week; and the 'high' or festal character of the day. It is in this second part of the discussion that the treatment by Bishop Lightfoot is so unique in its thoroughness as necessarily to supply the material and the model for every subsequent writer. Only those who should compare the rest of this paper, paragraph by paragraph, and line by line, with the corresponding sections of the great work on which it is built, would understand how extensive and far-reaching the obligation is; and one is almost ashamed to feel that one has employed the matter so copiously supplied only in the construction of an alternative hypothesis.

(1) *The Roman day and month*: πρὸ ἐπτά καλανδῶν Μαρτίων, i. e. a. d. vii Kal. Mart., or February 23rd.

(2) *The Asiatic day and month*: μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἱσταμένου, the 2nd of Xanthicus. To help us in an enquiry into the Asiatic Kalendar of Imperial times we have (a) a 'Hemerologium of the months of different cities,' arranged to show the relation of each to the official Julian Kalendar of Rome, and preserved in two MSS., respectively at Florence and at Leyden; among the kalendars given being more than one of the Asiatic group¹: (b) three inscriptions of Proconsular Asia, which give side by side the Roman and the native dating, one of them as early as B. C. 1, the second of A. D. 104, and the third as late as 'the age of the Antonines'; this last from Smyrna itself². The evidence of these two sources, MS.

¹ See *Histoire de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, tom. 47, pp. 66-84 (1809).

² But see also the appendices to this paper, where important additional material is adduced.

and inscriptions, is completely harmonious; and its general results may be summed up as follows.

The object of the introduction of such a kalendar—it dates from very shortly before the Christian era—would be, with as little change as possible in familiar names, such as those of the months, to arrive at some intelligible fixed relation with the universal and official kalendar of Rome. It must therefore of course be solar, while the older kalendar had been lunar; and further, though no change was introduced into the *names* of the months, which still differ in different cities, their relation to the Roman (that is practically to our own) Kalendar was the same throughout Proconsular Asia. Everywhere the year begins, not in midwinter, but at the autumnal equinox; everywhere the months begin eight days before the corresponding Roman months, and each has thus as many days as the Roman month with which it for the most part coincides. These peculiarities of the Kalendar are a sign and an outcome of the extraordinary pitch to which Caesar-worship was carried from the very first in Asia. September 23rd (a. d. ix Kal. Oct.) was the birthday of Augustus; not only was the year made to begin on this day, but every month began likewise on the ninth before the Kalends, so as to give, besides the yearly, a monthly commemoration of the birthday on the first of every month. A further point to be remembered in this Asian Kalendar is, that the 31st was never used; in months of thirty-one days the 1st was repeated, so that the really second day was also called the 1st, the real third the 2nd, and so on till the month ended with a real thirty-first called the 30th: or to put it otherwise, a day was intercalated at the commencement of every such month.

Xanthicus was one of the Macedonian names for the months; but these were at this time used by two kalendars, and in the Syro-Macedonian Kalendar of Josephus, Eusebius, and the Apostolic Constitutions the months are one ahead of the Asio-Macedonian. So in Syria Xanthicus is the seventh month or April, in Asia the sixth, and roughly equivalent to

March¹. Commencing then with a. d. ix Kal. Mart. (Feb. 21), and since March is a month of thirty-one days repeating its first, the second Xanthicus is Feb. 23, or a. d. vii Kal. Mart., as given in the Martyrium.

(3) *The day of the week*: σαββάτω, Sabbath or Saturday.

The two results first obtained, though confirming one another and independently witnessing to Feb. 23 as the day and month of the martyrdom, fail to help us to the year. But when we add to these a third in the day of the week, we can proceed to ask in which of the possible years 154, 155, 156 A.D. did Feb. 23 fall on a Saturday, and it is found by calculation that it was in A.D. 155. Feb. 23, 155 A.D., is therefore the year and day for which Dr. Lightfoot concludes.

(4) *The feast*: σαββάτω μεγάλη, 'a high sabbath.'

Beyond doubt this feast was a Jewish one: the only possible Christian high sabbath would be the Saturday before the Pascha, which, at least among Quartodecimans, would itself coincide with the great Jewish feast. But about the time we require, the end of February, there is one and only one important feast, the Jewish Purim, exactly the occasion, with its memories of Esther and Mordecai, to rouse Jewish popular excitement as we hear it was roused against Polycarp. Now Purim was held at the full moon of Adar (the month before Nisan), that is, since the Jewish months began with the new moon, on Adar 14, 15; and according to Jewish use a 'high sabbath' connected with it will be the sabbath *previous* to the 14th². The 'high sabbath' of the modern Jews is the sabbath

¹ The origin of this curious variation lay, it is natural to suppose, in the difficulty of the transformation of lunar into solar months. To take a familiar instance, the Jewish month Nisan (for which Josephus uses Xanthicus as the secular equivalent) being that whose full moon fell first after the spring equinox, might in some years be nearly equivalent to the Roman solar month March, in others to April, and thus if Nisan had to be Romanized, it might have been turned into either of the two.

² This sort of use, the reverse of our own system of keeping an Octave on the Sunday after a great festival, has its survival or counterpart in the Kalendar of the Eastern Church, where Quinquagesima week, for instance, is the week before, not the week after Quinquagesima; see Burgon, *Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark*, p. 194.

before the Passover, and the Roman Jews of the present day keep the sabbath before Pentecost as a 'high sabbath.' On the high authority of Dr. Neubauer it may be added that the Jews of the second century may not improbably have similarly kept the sabbath before Purim.

But what relation did the Jewish feast of Purim bear in A.D. 155 to Feb. 23?

In that year the first full moon after Feb. 23 fell about March 7, so that even if that were (as no doubt it was) the full moon of Adar, yet since Purim would be about March 6 and 7, the 'high sabbath' before it must have been not Saturday, Feb. 23, but Saturday, March 2¹. What is to be said to this?

Dr. Lightfoot's answer would simply be, that the Jewish Kalendar of the second century was in a state of such confusion, that it would be hopeless to fix Purim, or the 'high sabbath' before the feast, by its means. Any feast might fall anywhere at all near its true time; and as the rest of the evidence seemed to point conclusively to Feb. 23, 155 A.D., he assumes that Purim must have occurred simultaneously, and has not investigated this branch of the question. But has not the Bishop exaggerated the extent to which confusion was possible in a lunar kalendar like the Jewish?

There are two natural divisions of time, the lunar month or the time from new to new moon, averaging $29\frac{1}{2}$ days, and the solar year, or succession of the seasons regulated by the sun, nearly equal to 365 days; and these two are the base respectively of the genuine lunar and solar kalendars. Both the month and year, however, are convenient divisions of time,

¹ If the discrepancy had been only one of a day or two, it might have been feasible to conceive hypotheses in explanation of it. But the one main qualification possible for the statement in the text tells the other way, for so far as the Jewish Kalendar was still based on observation, the first of the month must fall a day or so after the astronomical new moon, and the fifteenth similarly later than the true full moon. That is to say, in A.D. 155, Purim may have been still later than March 6 and 7, and February 23 falls still more decisively out of the question.

and therefore each of the two kalendars borrowed the distinctive time-division of its rival. In particular the Jewish Kalendar was from the first that we know of it in the Pentateuch a combination of this sort. Lunar, because its months were lunar, each beginning with the new moon, it was yet in practice solar as well, for the feasts of unleavened bread, of harvest, and of ingathering (Exod. xxiii. 15, 16) are connected with the cycle of the seasons. Obviously the attempt would soon be made to reduce the year and the months to a common denomination; in other words, from the moment that these solar feasts were fixed to definite months (Exod. xii. 2, 6, xiii. 4, Deut. xvi. 1, 9, etc.) it followed that the months themselves, which were lunar, must be brought into some relation with the solar year. Now it is easy enough for ourselves to correlate our months and year, because our months are only artificial divisions of the solar year, approximating to, but not identical with, the true month. The difference indeed between the lunar month and the twelfth of the solar year is comparatively minute (about a day), but twelve lunar months, instead of making 365, make only 354 days; and this divergence would of course very soon increase so far as to destroy all relation with the solar year, and therewith all connection of definite months with the feasts of definite seasons of the year. The device which the Jews employed, no doubt at an early time, as we know they did later, was simply the intercalation of a thirteenth month whenever the twelfth ended too soon for the offerings of the firstfruits of the barley harvest, which marked the feast of unleavened bread (Deut. xvi. 9, Lev. xxiii. 10), to be made in the middle of the next month at the full moon of Nisan¹. As the twelve lunar months fall short of the solar year by eleven days, this would happen on an average rather oftener than once in three years.

It is, however, to be remembered that in both directions the original Jewish Kalendar was formed on the principles, not of

¹ Cf. *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. p. 1804, article 'Year,' by Mr. R. S. Poole.

calculation, but of observation ; the month began when the moon was seen to be new, the year when the barley harvest was approaching ripeness, and no serious mistakes were possible. The system was free from complexity, but suitable only to a people living in an area so small (the Holy Land is not more than about the size of Wales) that the beginning of the coming month could be fixed at Jerusalem for all Palestine the day before. The difficulty indeed in the case of the months cannot have been great, even after the Dispersion, for the new moon would be usually visible on the same evening throughout the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and any one could perform the operation of observing it for himself. But the commencement of the year, involving the question of the intercalation of a thirteenth month, stood on different ground. It was impossible for a Jew of Mesopotamia or of Egypt to tell by observation when the barley harvest would be ripe in Palestine, and therefore in what month he was wanted at Jerusalem for the Passover. That could be fixed only on the spot, and the knowledge would have to be communicated to foreign Jews in time to allow of their arrival before the middle of the first month Nisan—an obviously impracticable feat. Therefore as soon as (if not before) the Jews of the Dispersion had to be taken into account as well as those of Palestine, the old empiric methods must have given place to some system of universal application. Instead then of the first ripe ears of barley harvest, the spring equinox seems to have become at some unknown period the *terminus a quo* of the Paschal full moon—the limit before which the middle of the first month Nisan might not fall—and in this way the ultimate starting-point of the Jewish Kalendar. Some such reform, even if never made before, would have become a literal necessity when the destruction of the Temple put an end to the central worship, and each community had to keep the Passover for itself. With the disappearance of the single celebration, and of the authority which regulated it, unity had for the future to be sought in the adoption of a single

self-perpetuating kalendar. But the commencement of the new year according to the equinox was not a simple matter of astronomical observation like the new moon of the month ; for (not to speak of the different dates assigned to the equinox) it was not the new moon but the full moon only of Nisan which had to fall after it, while the intercalation of a month, when necessary, would have to be determined upon some weeks earlier still. Therefore, just as the Christians found with their Easter, so the Jews with their Passover doubtless felt that the only means to secure uniformity was the universal adoption of some cycle based on astronomical calculations for a long sequence of years which should show the day of the Passover for each year, and, like a recurring series of decimals, should begin again as soon as it was finished, with the same dates. Ultimately the Jews resorted unanimously to the nineteen years' cycle. But that was long after the era of St. Polycarp. In the second century, what with the various equinoxes and rival cycles and independent observations, the Jewish Kalendar was apparently in a state of hopeless confusion.

Only, while all this is perfectly true, it will be noticed at once that the whole perplexity was concerned with the year, and with the months only in their relation to the year, not in themselves. Least of all does it cover Dr. Lightfoot's hypothesis that the Jews ever celebrated a full moon feast such as that of Purim in Adar—and if Purim in Adar, why not Passover in Nisan?—at any other time than that of full moon when the veriest tyro's observation of the heavens would prove them in the wrong¹. And there is the further presumption against it, that had so gross a mistake in the

¹ If anything could make disagreement with Dr. Lightfoot on such a point less burdensome, it would be agreement with Dr. Salmon, and it is therefore encouraging to find that the latter writer, in the article *Polycarp* in the last volume of the Dictionary of Christian Biography (vol. iv. p. 430, cols. 1, 2, note), while admitting that his own hypothesis had been disproved by the Bishop, makes the same criticism on the Bishop's theory as has been made here.

Paschal calculations ever occurred, we should surely have heard of it, if not from Jewish, at any rate from Christian sources. The Asiatic Church of St. Polycarp's day kept its Pascha with the Jews and hotly contested the view that the Christian celebration was to be connected with the day of the week rather than with the day of the month; yet they were never accused of mistaking the true fourteenth, and indeed even their adversaries started from the same fourteenth and reckoned the Sunday after it as their festival. Again, when at the beginning of the third century the Christians found out with their greater astronomical knowledge that the Jewish methods were deficient (so that their superior science combined with their growing hatred of Judaism in inducing them to strike out a new line for themselves) they have their definite gravamen against the Jews, but it is connected with the calculation, not of the month, but of the year. 'They often celebrate the Passover,' it was said¹, 'twice in the same year,' counting, that is, from equinox to equinox. In other words, the Jewish 15th Nisan did not always fall, as it should have done, after the equinox, and when it wrongly fell before, it was the second Passover held since the March equinox of the preceding year. There was no question either then or earlier of a mistake of anything less than a month. The Passover and similarly Purim (as another full moon feast) might be a month wrong, as being held at the wrong full moon; but they could only be a month wrong. An error of a fortnight, the celebration of the full moon at the new moon, is

¹ Cf. the Letter of Constantine to the Churches from the Council of Nicaea (in Socrates, *H. E. i.* 9, p. 24, Bright): *μηδὲν τοίνυν ἔστω ὑμῖν κοινὸν μετὰ τοῦ ἐχθίστου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὄχλου . . . καὶ τούτῳ τῷ μέρει τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐχ ὁρώσιν, ὡς αἰεὶ κατὰ τὸ πλείστον αὐτοὺς πλανωμένους, ἀντὶ τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπανορθώσεως, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει δεύτερον τὸ Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν.* So again the Apostolic Constitutions (v. 17, p. 149 Lagarde) *δεῖ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί . . . τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ Πάσχα ἀκριβῶς ποιεῖσθαι μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας μετὰ τροπὴν ἰσημερίην, ὅπως μὴ δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐνὸς παθήματος μνείαν ποιήσθε . . . μηκέτι παρατηρούμενοι μετὰ Ἰουδαίων ἑορτάζειν . . . πεπλάνηται γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ψηφόν, κ.τ.λ.* The same seems to be the drift of an earlier writer, Anatolius of Laodicea, a passage of whose *Κανόνες περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα* is preserved in Eusebius, *H. E. vii.* 32.

inconceivable; an error of a week little less so. Dr. Lightfoot's hypothesis requires an error of at least four or five days ¹.

It seems therefore to have been proved satisfactorily that Saturday, Feb. 23, A. D. 155, is the only possible day, and yet that it fails to satisfy an important condition. Is there no way out of the difficulty?

The thought suggested itself that in the next year, A. D. 156, Nisan 15 would fall about March 24, and Adar 15 or Purim about February 24 ², as the year was leap-year. But then of course as Feb. 23 was Saturday in A. D. 155, not Feb. 23 but Feb. 22 should be Saturday in A. D. 156, and the 'high sabbath' before Purim. We seem therefore equally at fault here, for the condition 'the seventh before the Kalends of March' is not satisfied.

But it is not inopportune to draw attention now to the fact that the primary datum is the 2nd Xanthicus, which is only explained as being the seventh before the Kalends, or Feb. 23. Was there then no possible means by which at least in A. D. 156, Xanthicus 2 might really fall on the *eighth* before the Kalends, Saturday, February 22?

It is here that the most curious phenomenon of the investigation meets us. Lightfoot gives four inscriptions as the only instances with double Asiatic and Roman dating; one of these, an Ephesian inscription of A. D. 104, is dated on the '2nd of Anthesterion,' the very same day as that of Polyæarp's martyrdom (for Anthesterion is the Athenian and Ephesian name for Xanthicus) and the equivalent given is, *not the seventh, but the eighth* before the March Kalends, Feb. 22 : $\pi\rho\delta$

¹ Dr. Neubauer, whose kindness I gratefully acknowledge, answers me that a day's error is as much as need be taken into account.

² In years where a month is intercalated, Adar is of course not the month next before, but next but one before Nisan. Happily this special source of confusion may be left out of account, as in neither of the years A. D. 155 or 156 was an intercalation necessary.

The astronomical dates are given in the text; it has been already mentioned that, if the new moon was fixed by observation, dates at least a day later must be given for the full moon feasts: but the argument is not affected.

ἡ' καλανδῶν Μαρτίων . . . Ἀνθεστηριῶνος β' σεβαστῇ¹. The coincidence is singularly striking; and if we may provisionally assume Feb. 22 for St. Polycarp's day, the two support one another, though the anomaly, even if a double one, still requires explanation, for certainly the Asiatic Kalendar was older than A.D. 104, and lived on as late as A.D. 156, and in the Asiatic Kalendar Xanthicus 2 was Feb. 23. In the case of the inscription Dr. Lightfoot supposes that the Asiatic 'double 1st' was not employed; but if not necessary at Ephesus in A.D. 104, why should it be necessary at Smyrna in A.D. 156? Here would be one defence of the date now offered, Feb. 22, A.D. 156².

But a hint worth working out is supplied by Dr. Lightfoot in calling attention to the use, in the inscription mentioned, of the word σεβαστῇ, which is used of a day of the month only in three inscriptions from Egypt—two of them simply Θωὺθ σεβαστῇ and Φαρμὸυθ σεβαστῇ, but the third Φαωφι α' Ἰουλίᾳ σεβαστῇ—and in the Leyden MS. of the Hemerology already referred to, where it stands opposite the first day of several months in the Lycian Kalendar. Clearly there is some connection between σεβαστή, Augustus' day, and the first of the month. May it not be then a sort of monthly commemoration of the Emperor on the prerogative day of each month, so that the Asiatics will have outdone their neighbours, not by a monthly commemoration of Augustus on the first, which was more widely observed, but by the unique compliment of making this commemoration coincide with his actual birthday, the ninth before the Kalends? But then the σεβαστῇ is added only to some of the Lycian months. True; to those only of thirty-one days. As Usener says—the point of whose reasoning on this subsidiary question Dr. Lightfoot seems not to have quite reproduced—there is no ground why these particular firsts should be distinguished

¹ This will be made clearer, *inf.* p. 123.

² See further on this point Dr. Lightfoot's new edition, and the note at the end of this paper.

from others in the Lycian Kalendar, an ordinary one much on the Roman model; but the distinction is full of meaning if conjectured to have been borrowed or transposed from the Asian Kalendar where it is just in these months of thirty-one days, with their double firsts, that a distinctive mark for the true first is of use. Σεβαστή, it may thus be supposed, was in Asia a title of the first or Emperor's birthday¹, specially employed in those months where his birthday needed to be distinguished from its successor, another nominal first.

Still, although February 21st, the former of the two firsts of Xanthicus, might in this way be correctly denominated α' σεβαστή, this does not prove that February 22nd can be β' σεβαστή as required. Can a clue to this further perplexity reside in the coincidence that both A. D. 104 of the Ephesian inscription and A. D. 156, the hypothetical martyrdom, were leap-years?

The leap-year system is of course the characteristic of the Julian Kalendar, which like our own intercalated a day to every fourth February, not however by adding one after the 28th, but by repeating the 24th or 6th before the Kalends, whence the name bissextile. As the Asiatic Kalendar bore a fixed relation to the Julian, it too must have incorporated the intercalated day. But how?

(a) Not in the Asiatic February or Dystrus at all. For that ended with its 28th on Feb. 20, and an intercalated or additional day would prevent Xanthicus from beginning on the ninth before the Kalends (Feb. 21) and destroy the whole schematism.

Therefore in Xanthicus², which is already of thirty-one days, and must be produced to thirty-two; but

(b) Not at the end of Xanthicus, for to end with the

¹ Dr. Lightfoot now accepts this view of Usener's, which is supported by a new Pergamene inscription. See *inf.* p. 152.

² For the discussion of a contrary theory of Archbishop Ussher that the leap-year day was intercalated in September, which has only come under my notice since the body of this paper was in type, see the Appendix, pp. 131 sqq.

30th is a principle of the kalendar. Therefore just as the 31st day was incorporated at the beginning of the month, so on some similar method must the 32nd have been. Would not the repetition of the 2nd be the natural method?

For there are two conditions which the intercalation of the extra day must satisfy.

- (1) It must be done on the existing principles of the Kalendar; and these clearly suggest the double 2nd.
- (2) It must interfere as little as possible with the normal relation of the Asiatic to the Roman Kalendar. But the Julian extra day comes in on the 24th, our hypothetical Asiatic day on the 22nd. Only then on three days of leap-year, Feb. 22, 23, 24, if we are right, will the Julian equivalent of the Asiatic day differ from that of an ordinary year.

These results will be made clearer by a table.

Normal Asiatic Kalendar.				Conjectural Kalendar for Leap Year.			
Feb. 20	[Dystrus]	a. d. x	Kal. Mart.	a. d. x	Kal. Mart.	[Dystrus]	Feb. 20
21	Xanthicus A ΣΕΒ	ix		ix		Xanthicus A ΣΕΒ	21
22	A	viii		viii		B ΣΕΒ?	22
23	B	vii		vii		A	23
				vi		B	24
24	Γ	vi		vi		Γ	25
25	Δ	v		v		Δ	26
26	E	iv		iv		E	27
27	ς	iii		iii		ς	28
28	Z	prid. Kal. Mart.		prid. Kal. Mart.		Z	29
Mar. 1	H	Kal. Mart.		Kal. Mart.		H	Mar. 1

If the conjecture hazarded as to the meaning of α' σεβαστή as distinct from α' be correct, it would follow that β' σεβαστή of the Ephesian inscription as distinct from β' meant the earlier as opposed to the latter 2nd. Certainly this 2nd had not the same connection with the Emperor as α' σεβαστή; but the transference in any case is easy and natural, and the festival which the martyrdom shows to have been proceeding, was apparently (since the Asiarch was president of the games) connected with the κοινὸν Ἀσίας, or Commune Asiae, and

therefore with the worship of the Emperors. But the *κοινὸν Ἀσίας* was arranged on a pentaeteric principle¹, that is, in periods of four years, and it becomes not impossible that one of its celebrations recurred at each leap-year.

The proposed day, Saturday, Feb. 22, the 'high sabbath' of Purim of the year A.D. 156, satisfies thus:—(i) the Proconsul, (ii) the Asiarch, (iii) the Asiatic day and month, (iv) the day of the week, (v) the festival.

It remains only to consider certain subsidiary points on which evidence might be produced in objection to, or in confirmation of, the result attained.

I. The first objection which suggests itself is the equation of the Asiatic date in the Martyrium by the Roman *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων*, the 23rd, not the 22nd February. But three alternatives are possible in answer, each of which will rob it of its force. If this equation is due to the original writers, we shall find, if we put ourselves in their position, that some Christian probably possessed a table which equated Asiatic and Julian days like the Hemerology of the MSS., but which, like that, omitted to treat separately of leap-years, and consequently gave the 'seventh before the Kalends of March' as the only equivalent of the 2nd Xanthicus. Or again the original writers may not have written *ἑπτὰ* at all, but *ὀκτώ*, which some copyist, who found that in his Hemerology the seventh and not the eighth before the Kalends was the true equivalent, altered into *ἑπτὰ*, under the idea that he was benefiting historical accuracy. Or yet, thirdly, the Roman equivalent may not have been given in the original at all, but have been added when the document was being circulated outside Asia, in countries where the Asiatic Kalendar would be unfamiliar and a Roman date would be requisite; the leap-year would of course under these circumstances be forgotten, and the equivalent of the Hemerologies inserted.

II. But in the Acts of Pionius, belonging to A.D. 250 in

¹ Cf. on points connected with the Asiarchate the appendix in Lightfoot, ii. pp. 987-998.

the Decian persecution, we are told that the martyr was apprehended 'on the birthday of the blessed martyr Polycarp' on the second day of the sixth month, for which again the Latin gives February 23. Since, however, in Smyrna, reckoning would primarily be kept by the Asiatic Kalendar rather than by the Roman, St. Polycarp's festival would be observed on the 2nd Xanthicus, on whatever Roman day that fell. And as in every year, except leap-year, Xanthicus 2 is really Feb. 23, and A.D. 250 was not leap-year, Feb. 23 was the correct date for the festival in that year.

III. The same explanation is valid if in the old martyrologies, especially in that of the great Syriac MS. of the British Museum (written A.D. 411), Shebat 23—i. e. February 23—is given as St. Polycarp's day; for the ordinary equivalent, and as soon as it was forgotten that the saint suffered in leap-year, the certain equivalent, of Xanthicus 2 was February 23.

IV. More serious is the next, and last, objection which occurs to the writer. In the already mentioned Acts of Pionius the day of that martyr's apprehension is not only the 2nd of Xanthicus, and birthday of St. Polycarp, but also a 'high sabbath.' Now, if this is to have the same meaning for Pionius as for Polycarp, it ought similarly to be tested in relation to Purim and the month of Adar. But in A.D. 250, which is all but certainly the year of those Acts, Nisan 15 fell somewhere about April 4, and Adar 15 consequently about March 6. Here again, just as in the case of Dr. Lightfoot's view in A.D. 155, it would seem that Saturday, Feb. 23, cannot be the preceding or 'high sabbath.'

But is it really probable that in the middle of the third century any Christian writer would intentionally calculate his dates by a Jewish feast? What was natural enough a century earlier, when the Church kept perhaps only two great festivals, and these at least in Asia Minor exactly synchronous with the Passover and Pentecost of the Jews—so that when the Jews calculated their Pascha wrongly, the

Christians did the same—was at this date no longer likely. The Jewish Kalendar would cease to be familiar after the second phase of the great Easter question had begun to agitate the Church, and it was realized that the Jews could not be trusted to fix the true astronomical date for the full moon of Nisan. This conviction was the *raison d'être* of the attempts of Christian scientists to calculate Easter cycles for themselves; and it seems to have been universally acted on by A.D. 250. The 'Paschal Chronicle' of Hippolytus was drawn up as early as A.D. 222, and for half a century this computation or modifications of it apparently held the field, and very probably extended to Asia¹. But whether this one or another, some Christian system, and no longer the Jewish, must surely by this time have prevailed in Smyrna.

If then it is thus improbable that the Pionian Acts should have reckoned time by the Jewish Kalendar, what explanation is to be given of the 'high sabbath'? Can it have been a Christian festival? Certainly the Eastern Churches kept the Sabbath as a feast, and possibly a sabbath coinciding with the 'birthday' of Polycarp, the patron saint so to speak of the Church of Smyrna, might be treated as a 'high

¹ It is true that the Asiatics were originally Quartodecimans, though they were so no longer at the time of the Council of Nicaea, and perhaps considerably earlier. But in any case they were not Ebionite or Judaizingly inclined Quartodecimans, and there was no reason why they should be less averse to abandoning Jewish errors than other people. Any non-Quartodeciman cycle is serviceable even to Quartodecimans; for as the day of the month (the full moon) had to be fixed before the day of the week (the Sunday after the full moon), all that a Quartodeciman had to do was to utilize the first and neglect the second part of the calculation. Thus Hippolytus formed a 112-years' cycle, after which Easter was to begin to fall again on the same series of days; but astronomically this was only a sixteen years' cycle, after which the full moon was to fall again on the same series of days of the (solar) month, and it was only because the same day of the month would, after an interval of sixteen years, fall on a different day of the week—and so on through the seven days of the week—that the sixteen-years' cycle required to be multiplied by seven before a cycle was attained in which not only the full moon but the Sunday after it fell recurringly on the same series of days of the month.

The wide circulation and adoption in the East of the cycle of Hippolytus (who wrote in Greek) would partly explain the extraordinary vitality of his fame there as compared with the West.

sabbath,' like a red letter Saint's Day coinciding with a Sunday. But a much simpler explanation is permissible. It has apparently escaped even Dr. Lightfoot's notice (at least he lays no stress on it) that the chronological data of the beginning and end of the Pionian Acts, the apprehension and the martyrdom of Pionius, are both modelled on the notice in our Martyrium, as is on comparison abundantly clear¹.

<i>Acta Pionii</i> , § 2.	<i>Martyrium Polycarpi</i> , § 21.	<i>Acta Pionii</i> , § 23.
μηνὸς ἕκτου δευτέρᾳ ἰστα- μένου [vel ἐνισταμέ- νου]	μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἰσταμένου πρὸ [ἐπτά] καλανδῶν Μαρτίων	πρὸ τεσσάρων ἰδῶν Μαρ- τίων κατὰ Ῥωμαίους, κατὰ δὲ Ἀσιανοὺς μη- νὸς ἕκτου ἐννεακαιδε- κάτῃ
σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ [MS. σαββάτου μεγάλου] ² ... συνελήφθησαν ...	σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρᾳ ὀγδύῃ· συνελήφθη ...	ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτῳ ὥρᾳ δε- κάτῃ
	βασιλεύοντος δὲ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὧ ἡ δόξα	κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς βασιλεύ- οντος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.
	ἀμήν.	ἀμήν.
	<i>Martyrium Polycarpi</i> , § 18.	
ἐν τῇ γενεθλίῳ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου μάρτυ- ρος Πολυκάρπου.	τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον.	

Now it becomes explicable that in all the recensions of the Pionian Acts, the final date, that of St. Pionius' martyrdom, is

¹ It may be mentioned in confirmation of this view that the Acts of Pionius are the only instance among some twenty parallels in the *Acta Martyrum* referred to by Dr. Lightfoot for the 'regnante Jesu Christo,' in which the hour of martyrdom is given.

² Either the original writer or a later scribe was ignorant of the meaning of *ἰσταμένου* in connection with the day of the month, and therefore altered the text so as to construct it with *σαββάτου*.

said to be a sabbath, whereas in fact it was obviously a Tuesday. But if the 'sabbath' at the end of the Acts was thus an erroneous and parrot-like repetition from the Martyrium of Polycarp, it is not difficult to believe that the 'high sabbath' of the beginning of the Acts may have had the same origin, and the same absence of justification. The apprehension of Pionius coincided alike in the day of the week and of the month with the martyrdom of Polycarp, and if the writers were ignorant, as it is natural to suspect, what the 'high sabbath' really meant in Polycarp's case, they might thoughtlessly assume it to be equally valid with the rest of the data for their own purpose.

Finally there are two arguments to be stated in confirmation of the date proposed in this paper, which seem to make A.D. 156 more probable for the martyrdom than A.D. 155.

I. L. Statius Quadratus was Consul Ordinarius in A.D. 142, and proconsul, on Dr. Lightfoot's view, from A.D. 154 to 155, on that here put forward from A.D. 155 to 156. But (though the data are too few to generalize from with confidence) there is no other instance quoted in the second century where it can be said with certainty that a less interval than thirteen years intervened between consulship and proconsulship¹; and the extra year allowed here in Quadratus' case is so far a gain.

II. Of more importance is Irenaeus' express statement, made more than once, that Polycarp visited Bishop Anicetus at Rome. But Eusebius, as has been seen, places the accession of Anicetus as late as A.D. 157, and this has to be thrust back two years to allow of a visit from Polycarp in A.D. 155 (probably in summer), even if the martyrdom is placed in A.D. 156; while if the martyrdom is put a year earlier, a three years' transposition of Eusebius' date becomes necessary. It is the serious matter of this extra year which has induced the author of the 'Chronology of the Roman Bishops,' Prof.

¹ See the list in Lightfoot, i. 640; I am assuming that it is exhaustive.

Lipsius, to adopt A.D. 156 in preference to A.D. 155¹. But then, in order to do so, since Feb. 23 was no sabbath in A.D. 156, he has arbitrarily condemned as spurious the mention of the 'high sabbath,' both in the chronological postscript and in the body of the Martyrium. If the present enquiry has achieved nothing else (and it does not pretend to have done more than to have brought forward another claimant for the true date of the martyrdom), it can at least claim to have based Lipsius' conclusion on intelligible and consistent premisses. Should any other explanation of the 'high sabbath' be put forward, the main objection to A.D. 155 will of course disappear. But so long as the identification with Purim is maintained, so long will it seem that A.D. 156 is a more probable date, and that a hypothesis which makes it a possible year from the point of view of the rest of the evidence is not destitute of support. Such as it is, it is left to the consideration and criticism of students of ecclesiastical history.

¹ But see *inf.* p. 154.

APPENDIX I.

ON A PASCHAL HOMILY PRINTED IN ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S WORKS ASCRIBED BY USSHER TO A. D. 672. BUT REALLY BELONGING TO A. D. 387.

[C. H. T.]

It was an integral feature of the theory put forward above that the intercalation of the additional day in leap-year took place in Asia almost, though not quite, at the same date as in Rome. But since the preceding Essay was in type the writer has come across an alternative view of the Asiatic intercalation, to which it would be only fair in any case that he should direct attention; but he hopes to be able to show that the fresh evidence thus adduced is really in complete harmony with what was said on pp. 122 sqq.

To Archbishop Ussher, the critic whose sagacity foretold the recovery of the genuine Ignatius, we owe also the first attempt to treat systematically of the Asiatic chronological system, and in particular to take into consideration the leap-year variations¹. It was indeed a task which without the aid of the Hemerology (and the Hemerology was not known before A. D. 1715) would probably have never met with complete success, for the intercalation of the repeated first was an expedient not likely to have suggested itself even to the acutest scholar. But unfortunately Ussher had also not perceived that the Macedonian kalendars of Syria and of Asia, though they used the same twelve names for the months, did not use them of the same months, each month in Syria having the name of the month next preceding in Asia. Thus while in Asia Xanthicus (as the Hemerology tells us) was equivalent to late February and March, in Syria it was practically equivalent to April. Of these two reckonings the Syrian was by far the commoner, and Ussher assumed it to be the only one; so that when St. Polycarp suffered on the 2nd Xanthicus, this ought to fall (not in February but) at the end of March or beginning of April. Now the Paschal Chronicle actually does place the martyrdom, not with the text of the Martyrium on a. d. vii Kal. Mart.,

¹ *De Macedonum et Asianorum Anno Solari*, reprinted in vol. ix. of Groenovius, *Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum*, pp. 1205-1268.

but a month later, on a. d. vii Kal. Apr. (March 26)¹; and Ussher following its authority, concluded that Xanthicus, the seventh month of the kalendar, commenced on March 25.

Now in a Paschal Homily attributed by Balsamon to St. Chrysostom, and printed in Savile's edition of that father (vol. v. pp. 940–949) from a MS. belonging to Gabriel, Archbishop of Philadelphia, the author is apparently addressing his congregation just before Lent began, on the subject of the date of Easter, which was falling that year later (so it was said) than had ever been known before—later certainly than the heretics or the Jews were keeping it on that occasion²—‘on the second day of the eighth month.’ April 25 is the latest day on which Easter according to any reckoning was ever made to fall; hence the eighth month cannot begin later than April 24. But the Homilist also speaks of the ‘26th day of the seventh month’ as falling exactly a week earlier (than the 2nd of the eighth month), that is, not later than April 18; from which Ussher saw that it followed that the seventh month itself cannot begin, as from the day of St. Polycarp he had deduced that it ought to begin, on March 25, but at latest March 24. Consequently he supposed that this difference of a day must be due to leap-year, the intercalation being made at Rome in February, in Asia as he conjectured at the end of the Asiatic year in September, so that all Asiatic dates between February and September will, if transposed into Roman reckoning, appear a day earlier than usual. If the Paschal Homily falls in leap-year, its seventh month would then begin correctly on March 24, and not, as in other years, on March 25. Since then in only one instance between A.D. 140 and A.D. 919—in A.D. 672—did Easter fall simultaneously on April 25 and in leap-year, Ussher concludes that this is the only admissible date for the Homily in question.

That Ussher was building on a radically unsound foundation when he supposed that St. Polycarp's death and the 2nd of Xanthicus had anything to do with March 26 we now know; and we also know from the Hemerology that in fact the seventh Asiatic month

¹ No doubt because like Ussher the chronicler writing after 600 A.D., was ignorant of any but the Syrian nomenclature for the months. In Asia the names had dropped out, and had been succeeded by numbers (‘first month,’ etc.), comparatively early; cf. Lightfoot, i. 677, 678. Numbers are used in the Acts of Pionius and by the Paschal Homily discussed below; but the (Asiatic) month Apellaeus occurs in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 51. § 24; see inf., p. 149.

² P. 940. 18: αἱρετικοὶ ἀποσκιρτήσαντες φαίνονται καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπαγγέλλονται πᾶσχα τελεῖν.

(Artemisius) began on March 24, exactly in accordance with the Paschal Homily. Cardinal Noris, writing on the same subject as Ussher, but like him before the publication of the Hemerology, was unable to make the latter correction, but (following Valesius) he rightly pointed out the distinction between the Syriac and the Asiatic Xanthicus, and restored St. Polycarp to February. At the same time, curiously enough, he accepts unreservedly Ussher's conclusions on the Paschal Homily, apparently oblivious that they too rested in the end entirely on the false Polycarpian basis.

The Paschal Homily ceases therefore to bear witness against us. But why may not it be put into the box in our own favour? It is so interesting in itself, and because its date can be fixed with such precision, that we propose to enter at some length into this byway of history, and to preface the enquiry by summarizing the contents of the Homily, which aims at supporting the scientific accuracy of the late Easter by a thoroughgoing exposition of the principles on which the Church calculations were based.

In the first place some were accustomed to ask why when Christmas and Epiphany¹ as well as the commemorations of the martyrs were fixed feasts, Easter alone should be moveable? The answer is, that in the case of Easter three conditions have to be combined; the month must be the first month—that is, the first after the spring equinox; the moon must be not less than at the full—that is the fourteenth; and three days of the week, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, have to be taken into account. Even the Jews combined what they believed to be the first month with the fourteenth day of the moon for their Passover; and they are followed by the Quartodeciman² heresy and—so far—by the

¹ Christmas on the 8th before the Kalends of January according to the Romans, i. e. Dec. 25; Epiphany on the 13th of the fourth month according to the Asians, i. e. according to the Asiatic Kalendar, as explained above, Jan. 6. See further below.

² For the Quartodecimans and Novatians cf. Sozomen, vii. 18 (p. 739, Huxsey): *πλὴν τούτων* [certain Novatians] *καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας καλουμένων τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατιτῶν ὁμοίως Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων αἱρέσεων ταύτην τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν· ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαταίᾳ σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἑορτάζουσιν, ὅθεν ὥδε ὀνομάζονται· οἱ δὲ Ναυατιανοὶ τὴν ἀναστάσιμον ἡμέραν ἐπιτελοῦσιν· Ἰουδαίους δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔπονται καὶ εἰς ταὐτὸ τοῖς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαταῖς καταστρέφουσι· πλὴν εἰ μὴ τύχοι τῇ ἰδ' τῆς σελήνης ἢ πρώτῃ τοῦ σαββάτου ἡμέρα συμπεσοῦσα, κατόπιν γίνονται τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὕσαις ἂν ἡμέραις συμβαίῃ τὴν ἐρχομένην κυριακὴν ὑστερίζειν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαταίας τῆς σελήνης.*

Novatians. The Montanists indeed reckon the fourteenth not by the lunar but by the solar month, and always take the fourteenth of the seventh (solar) Asiatic month¹; but this obviously contra-

That is, Quartodecimans kept exactly to the Jewish fourteenth, on whatever day of the week it fell. The Novatians in question, on the other hand, always observed Friday and Sunday—as the Paschal Homilist puts it, ἐπὶ τὴν τριήμερον ἔρχονται—but (1) accepted the Jewish reckoning for the 14th; (2) even assuming that to be correct, they made another fault, for if it fell on Sunday, they kept that as Easter Day. This does not apply to all Novatians, but to those of Galatia and Phrygia, who decided to ‘Judaize’ with regard to Easter at the Council of Pazu (Παζουκώμη in Phrygia) under Valens, i. e. circa 370 A. D. Those of Rome celebrated with the Catholic Church; and Socrates says the same of those of Constantinople and Nicomedia; cf. his parallel account, *H. E.* iv. 28, v. 21. A Bithynian synod of Novatians allowed either method (*Soc.* v. 21; *Soz.* vii. 18).

¹ That is, according to the Kalendar (p. 113, sup.), April 6.

Sozomen (vii. 18, quoted by Ussher) gives us similar but fuller information about the Montanist Easter. According to him, they commenced their year with the spring equinox, the beginning of creation, because the two lights, sun and moon, by which times and years are regulated, came then into being. At the end of every eight years the cycles of sun and moon will fall together at this time, eight years of the sun being equivalent to 99 lunations. Their first date they fixed on March 24, and interpreting the scriptural fourteenth of the month then begun, it would fall on a. d. viii. Id. Apr. i. e. April 6, Easter being kept on the Sunday after this day, i. e. from the 7th to the 13th of April: for Scripture says ‘from the 14th to the 21st.’

(1) Ussher, by interpolating conjecturally the words εἰ δὲ μὴ, interprets the last words to mean that if the 14th (April 6) coincided with the Sunday, that and not the next Sunday was the Montanist Easter.

(2) Ussher also asserts Sozomen to be in error in fixing the ‘fourteenth of the first month’ on April 6 instead of April 7. It was part of his whole theory that March 25 was the first of the month, and he supposes the mention of March 24 in this passage to be a copyist’s alteration, to suit the (erroneous) April 6 as the 14th; especially as the Latin Tripartite History reads a. d. viii, not a. d. ix, Kal. Apr. But we know now from the Hemerology (which was unknown to Ussher) that the Asiatic, Ephesian, and Bithynian month did begin on March 24, and that in consequence Sozomen’s April 6 and the Homilist’s 14th of the Asiatic seventh month are in perfect harmony. It is not the Greek of Sozomen, but the Latin of the Tripartite History which has suffered corruption, doubtless owing to the importance of the date March 25 in the West.

It would be unprofitable to attempt to explain the origin of the error of the Montanist computation. The sect was not a cultured one, and in despair it cut, instead of attempting to untie, the Gordian knot. One thing however is tolerably clear, that March 24 was taken as the starting-point of their first month because it began a month in the ‘Asiatic’ Kalendar.

It has been pointed out to me that Duchesne (*Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 251) comparing Hippolytus’ date for the Passion, March 25, with the Western Christmas, Dec. 25, and this Montanist date for the Passion, April 6,

dicts the record of the Passion of Christ on the fourteenth of the moon at the Jewish Passover. However, they too observed the *τρίημερος*, the Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.

The error of the Jews was that they were not really careful to fix their first month by the equinox. The wise men of the Jews—Philo, Josephus, and others¹—had stated the true method, and some of them lived even after the time of Christ, so that doubtless Christ suffered at a Passover correctly reckoned; and, as a matter of fact, the Acts of Pilate relate that the crucifixion took place on the eighth before the Kalends of April (March 25)². But after the Jews had rejected Christ, they took to rejecting also all their own ancient guides. The two and seventy³ approved translators of the Scriptures were thrown over in favour of a single proselyte⁴.

with the Eastern Christmas, Jan. 6, supposes that the two dates for the Passion suggested the two dates for Christmas. I should have thought the converse more likely in the Eastern case.

¹ On this anti-Jewish equinoctial controversy see Anatolius, Socrates, and the Apostolic Constitutions quoted above, p. 119. Anatolius (ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii. 32) names Philo, Josephus, Musaeus, and those 'even more ancient,' the two Agathobuli and Aristobulus. Sozomen (vii. 18), referring to Anatolius as 'Eusebius,' names Philo, Josephus, and Aristobulus.

² Similarly Epiphanius (*Haer.* 50. 1), who tells us that certain Quartodecimans did always observe March 25, *τῇ πρὸ ὀκτῶ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων*, as the day of Christ's death, on the strength of the same *Acta Pilati*. He adds that he had himself found copies of the *Acta* which contained the 18th of March, *πρὸ δεκάπεντε καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων*. The year of the Passion was originally given in the *Acta* as the 15th of Tiberius (A.D. 28-29) in accordance with the earliest Christian tradition (for I feel no doubt, in spite of the arguments of Lipsius' *Pilatus-Acten*, that the alternative dates, 18th or 19th Tiberius, are alterations due to the influence of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, who set the fashion for subsequent writers), and it is an extraordinarily striking coincidence that if the Crucifixion did take place in the year A. D. 29, the day must beyond question have been March 18, as pointed out in Browne's *Ordo Saeculorum*. Meanwhile the 18th of March was altered to that day week, March 25, probably under the influence of the *Chronicle* of Hippolytus, in which this was the day given for the Passion, and also because March 18 would soon be looked on as an inadmissible day, through its falling before the equinox.

³ 72 is given by the Letter of Aristeas, by Tertullian (*Apol.* 18), and by Epiphanius (*de Pond. et Mens.* iii-vi); 70 by Irenaeus (iii. 21), by Anatolius (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 32), by Jerome, and by Augustine.

⁴ That is, Aquila. Irenaeus indeed (iii. 21) calls both Theodotion and Aquila proselytes, but there can be no doubt which is meant here, for it was Aquila's translation which because of its superior literalness came into favour with the Jews, while Christian writers believed that Aquila and the Jews who followed him were animated by anti-Christian bias in their attempt to supersede a translation which favoured, and was favoured by, the Christian Church.

The equinoctial rule, though a tradition of Moses himself, was neglected, and now the Jewish Passover fell indifferently before or after, but on the present occasion (*εἰς τὸ ἐνεστῶς*) before, the equinox.

Now what was the mystical fitness of the date at which Christ suffered ?

That the equinox should mark the commencement of the first month is clear, if we think of the original creation of the world, for the first day and night would naturally have been equal : and it must have been the spring equinox, for the creation of flowers and trees and plants, symbols of spring, immediately followed. And so Scripture says that God divided equally the light and the darkness ; *ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους*. Then after the equinox on the fourth day, God created the sun and the moon—at the full ; on the sixth day, man ; on the seventh He rested ; and on the eighth, which is the first again, He suffered the now perfect universe to start on its course. So when man, created though he was in the image of God, had fallen from his high estate, and the Only-begotten Son had come to earth to restore him, He employs for redemption the same portion and period of time He had before chosen and used for creation, that the end might be harmonious with the beginning. Consequently the week of the Passion—the fulness of the times, the recapitulation of all things—must combine, just as the week of creation had done, the equinox, the full moon, and the sixth day or Friday specially devoted to man. But a week whose commencement on Sunday coincides with the equinox and contains the full moon, is an infrequent occurrence ; we read therefore in the Gospels that though the Jews had long sought Him, He had evaded them, until ‘His hour was come,’ and then He willingly suffered. After the equinox, when the light began to gain ground on and to master the darkness, but not later than the first Friday after, on which too He had created man, He suffered ; and on the Sabbath again, after the completion of His work, He rested.

But all these different data obviously cannot converge every year. They were necessarily observed in the one great Pascha, but just as that one sacrifice needs no repetition but only an imitation (*μίμημα*) in the Eucharist, so in our Pascha we need only imitate the season as far as lies in our power, combining the equinox, the fourteenth of the moon, and the three days’ celebration. Avoiding the ignorance of Jews and heretics, we find the equinox, we look

for the next full moon, and so for the Preparation, Sabbath and Lord's Day¹.

Further, the Lord fulfilled exactly the law of Moses, that on the fourteenth day between the evenings the lamb should be slaughtered: for 'between the evenings' will be at the ninth hour, as learned Jews fix it, and at the ninth hour Jesus, the Lamb of God, gave up the ghost². Again, the darkness at the crucifixion was not without its special meaning. To the Jews it recalled the prophecies of Zechariah and Amos, that it should be neither day nor night, and at eventide it should be light; that the sun should go down at midday; if the prophet added that their feasts should be turned to grief, this was actually the case, we learn from history, at the siege of Jerusalem³. By the Gentiles, the miracle of the darkness could not be explained away with Greek artifice as an eclipse, for the moon at the Passover is at the full: and by celebrating the Pascha yearly at full moon, we have a yearly reminder of the miracle for all ages and all men⁴.

¹ Cf. Eriphanius, *Haer.* 50. 3: διδ' παρατηρούμεθα μὲν τὴν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην, ὑπερβαίνομεν δὲ τὴν ἰσημερίαν, φέρομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγίαν κυριακὴν τὸ τέλος τῆς συμπληρώσεως.

² Therefore the Homilist follows the 'Johannine' view that our Lord ate only an anticipatory Passover and suffered on the 14th Nisan. This is in accordance with the almost unanimous view of early writers (Apollinaris, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus; see Westcott, *Introduction to Gospels*, p. 347), but in disagreement with an equally strong *consensus* later the other way. Even at the earliest possible date for our Homily, St. Chrysostom (a fact quite sufficient to disprove his authorship) and St. Ambrose (see his epistle, *inf.* p. 147), hold to the fifteenth; similarly Proterius of Alexandria, in his letter to Leo of Rome about the Easter of A.D. 455; and though the Paschal Chronicle, built up seemingly out of earlier materials, witnesses to a survival of the older opinion, yet in the ninth century Photius, impressed as he is with the evidence of two early writers, still speaks of them as varying from 'the Church' (*Cod.* 115, 116, *fin.*, καὶ σκοπεῖν χρή. ὁ γὰρ Χρυσόστομος καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία τότε φησὶν αὐτὸν ἐπιτελέσαι τὸ νομικὸν πρὸ τοῦ μυστικοῦ δείπνου).

³ The Homilist adds, διετὴ χρόνον ὁ πόλεμος κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπὶ πένθῃ ἀνάλωσε, p. 947. 24.

⁴ This was the argument of Julius Africanus, early in the 3rd century, (*Chronicon* fragm. ap. Routh, *R. S.* ii. 297), τοῦτο τὸ σκότος ἐκλείψιν τοῦ ἡλίου θάλλος ἀποκαλεῖ ἐν τρίτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἀλόγως (he explains about the full moon) . . . ἦν σκότος θεοποίητον διότι τὸν Κύριον συνέβη παθεῖν. Origen, who had himself explained the darkness as an eclipse (*c. Celsum*, ii. 33), in his Commentary on St. Matthew, adopted Africanus' view; cf. Routh, *l. c.* p. 479, ἵνα γὰρ μὴ εἴπωσιν ἐκλείψιν εἶναι τὸ γεγεννημένον, διὰ τοῦτο τῇ ἰδ' γίνεται, ὅτε ἐκλείψιν συμβῆναι ἀμήχανον. But Eusebius (followed by Jerome, and as usual by the later chronologers) still called the darkness an eclipse, identifying

Now to apply these investigations to the fixing of the current feast. Twelve full moons after the last Easter we naturally expect the next to fall. But if the twelfth falls before the equinox, we must intercalate a thirteenth lunar month in order to get to a full moon after the equinox¹. Thus, in the present year, the twelfth full moon or fourteenth of the twelfth month falls two days before the equinox, and we must look for the next full moon for our Pascha. We have thus settled two of the conditions, the equinox and the full moon; we have still to find the Sunday. Now the postponed fourteenth will itself fall on a Sunday, and therefore to get our three days, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, we must again defer Easter for a week, or the festival of the resurrection would fall on the 14th, which is the date of the Passion.

Of the two full moons under discussion, the first falls, as we said, two days before the equinox²; the second on the 26th day of the seventh month, and Easter exactly a week later on the second day of the eighth month³.

it with one mentioned by the historian Phlegon under A. D. 32, which thenceforward became the usual year to which the crucifixion was assigned (see Lipsius, *Pilatus-Acten*, p. 23 ff.).

¹ Since twelve lunations (at $29\frac{1}{2}$ days each) amount to only about 354 days, there is a defect of rather more than 11 days on the total as compared with the solar year. This defect goes on increasing, and when it would bring a thirteenth full moon before the spring equinox, a thirteenth or intercalary month is added to the old year.

² $\pi\rho\delta\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ —‘the day before,’ I suppose; on the analogy of phrases like $\tau\eta\ \tau\acute{\rho}\iota\tau\eta$ for ‘the day before yesterday’ (Field on Matt. xvi. 12 *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia*, p. 7) and Latin ‘ante diem tertium.’

The cycle of Hippolytus (A. D. 222) had placed the equinox on March 18, and this reckoning prevailed in Rome till the fifth century; but the cycle of Anatolius (A. D. 277) advanced it to March 19, and the Alexandrian modification of the latter cycle, prevalent in the fourth century throughout the East, placed it later still, on March 21 (Hefele, *Councils, E. T.* i. p. 320). Our Homilist argued above that the crucifixion on March 25 corresponded to the Friday or sixth day of Creation week; the division of light and darkness, that is the equinox, would then have taken place on the first day of the same week, March 20. But I doubt whether he really intended to differ from the Alexandrine computation in practice: he would, I believe, have agreed that the 21st March was the first legal day for the $\iota\delta'$, and the 22nd for Easter Day. In any case the full moon meant must have fallen on March 19 or 20, for the next fell on the 26th day of the seventh month, which on the principles of the Asiatic Kalendar (the month beginning a. d. ix Kal. Apr., i. e. March 24, and being like April a month of 30 days not repeating its first) would be the 18th of April.

³ The eighth Asiatic month begins a. d. ix Kal. Mai., April 23, and being, like May, of 31 days, it repeats its first; the second will therefore fall on April 25.

If it was argued that Easter never had fallen so late as it was now proposed to hold it, proof against this statement could be brought by witnesses of good memory (*μνήμονες μάρτυρες*). How often in the past do you suppose it has been said, 'It has never been the case' (*οὐδέποτε γέγονε*) and yet science prevails? Moreover the objectors admit that Easter has often fallen as late as the 29th day of the seventh month¹, and the difference between us is therefore narrowed down to three or four days, which they shrink from yielding to the claims of science. And if it was simply a matter of prejudice against variations in the date of Easter, why there was variation between every two successive celebrations. In the current and three following years Easter would fall (i) on the 2nd of the eighth month, (ii) then on the 17th of the seventh month, (iii) then on the 9th of the seventh month, (iv) lastly on the 29th of the seventh month².

And such variations are all direct consequences of the two rules of the full moon after the equinox and the Sunday after the full moon. As to the latter point, if the full moon or 14th falls in the middle (*πλάτος*) of the week, the matter is simple, the next Sunday is Easter; but if it falls about the Sunday, then great caution is necessary. For instance, in the present case, careless calculators tried to make out that the fourteenth of the moon fell on the Saturday [i.e. April 17] and that therefore the next day was Easter Sunday³. But they were quite mistaken; even impartial and in-

¹ That is, April 21. Cp. the preface to the Festal Letters of St. Athanasius (quoted in Hefele, ii. 159), 'the Romans stated that they possessed a tradition, as ancient as the time of St. Peter, that they were not to go beyond the 21st of April:' and cf. the Epistle of St. Ambrose, inf. p. 148. Our Homilist cannot mean that any living witnesses could testify to an Easter on April 25: for according to Ussher (l. c. p. 1228) between A. D. 140 and 919, Easter fell on that day only four times, A. D. 387, 482, 577, 672; and a period of 95 years is more than any memory could embrace. What he undoubtedly does mean is that while the objectors opposed April 25 on the ground that April 21 was the last possible day for Easter, fairly modern instances could be quoted where this limit had been overpassed, i. e. where Easter had been held on April 22, 23, or 24.

² That is, by the Asiatic Kalendar, April 25, April 9, April 1, April 21.

³ Consequently, if the 14th had fallen on Saturday, the next day would have been admitted to be Easter Sunday, even though this made the commemoration of the Passion fall on the 13th. All that was contended for was that the feast of the Sunday should fall clear of the fast of the 14th. This was the principle of the Alexandrine cycle; but Hippolytus and Anatolius (and the Roman Church still in the fourth century) would have put off Easter for a week, even if the Saturday had fallen on the 18'.

telligent pagans (σοφοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων) could tell them that as a matter of fact the fourteenth coincided with the Sunday and the night after it, almost into the following Monday, and not near the Saturday at all; so that quite obviously Easter must be postponed for another week.

Facts must be faced; disputes must be put aside; the mind must be clear for the right observation of the seven weeks of Lent, the first of which, according to the true calculation of Easter, was now just about to begin¹.

Such is a tolerably ample analysis of the Homily on which Archbishop Ussher's leap-year theory rests, and it is obvious at once that it contains sufficient marks of time—in particular the dates of four successive Easters—to aid us in a secure reconstruction of its kalendar even for leap-year. It is now proposed to treat in order (1) of the locality of the Homily, (2) of the rough date of the Homily, (3) of the kalendar employed and the year which it suggests, (4) of other special evidence pointing to the same date.

(1) The presumption raised by two mentions of Asiatic months only comes in to reinforce a conclusion which could be safely drawn even without it. The seven weeks' Lenten fast excludes—at least on the fifth-century evidence of the historians Socrates and Sozomen—Illyria, Greece, Egypt and Palestine; while it would fall in with any part of the country from Constantinople round to Phoenicia. The mention of certain heretics in connection with erroneous Paschal observances (notes on pp. 132, 133) narrows the field still further. The Quartodecimans are called by Socrates

¹ No doubt the Paschal quarrel with which our Homilist is concerned was excited in his Church by a dispute whether Lent should not have begun before.

For these seven weeks of Lent cf. Sozomen, vii. 19 (p. 743, Hussey), οἱ μὲν εἰς ἑβδομάδας ἡμερῶν λογίζονται, ὡς Ἰλλύριοι καὶ οἱ πρὸς δύσιν, Λιβύη τε πᾶσα καὶ Αἴγυπτος σὺν τοῖς Παλαιστίνοις· οἱ δὲ ἑπτὰ ὡς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει καὶ τοῖς περὶ ἔθνεσι μεχρὶ Φοινίκαν· ἄλλοι δὲ τρεῖς σποραδῆν ἐν ταῖς ἑξ ἢ ἑπτὰ νηστεύουσιν· οἱ δὲ ἅμα τρεῖς πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς συνάπτουσιν· οἱ δὲ δύο ὡς οἱ τὰ Μοντάνου φρονούντες. In the parallel passage of Socrates (*H. E.* v. 22, p. 240, Bright), I believe the historian's meaning to be that those whom he does not specify fasted for seven weeks, his point being that many people who fasted less than 40 days yet called Lent τεσσαρακοστή, which, strictly speaking, only those who fasted seven weeks continuously had a right to do. He has only therefore to mention the exceptions to this latter rule.

(v. 22), and by Sozomen (vii. 18) οἱ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ, οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας. The Novatians were powerful in Constantinople, the Hellespont, Phrygia, Paphlagonia and Galatia; but the erroneous Pascha blamed by the Homilist was adopted not by the Novatians of Rome or even those of Constantinople and Nicomedia, but by those of Phrygia and Galatia only. And lastly the Montanists, as we know and as their alternative titles of Πενουζῖται and Φρύγες (Soz. vii. 18) clearly show, were always a distinctively Phrygian sect. Our Homilist then certainly wrote in Asia Minor, and probably somewhere not far removed from Phrygia.

(2) From evidence of place we pass to evidence of similar sort for time; and here again the various sects and religions with which the Church, according to the Homily, has to deal, will first come under review¹. Of Montanism as still flourishing in Phrygia we hear in the laws of Constantine, in the council of Laodicea, and in St. Basil in the fourth century, and in the Theodosian code and the historian Sozomen during the first half of the fifth; but in the middle of the sixth century it appears to have been finally exterminated by the persecution of Justinian. Similarly the Novatians of Asia Minor were in the fourth and fifth centuries numerous and influential, as we learn from Epiphanius, Basil, and Socrates; but after the fifth century not much is heard of them. In particular the judaizing Novatians, with whom alone our Homily deals, seem after A.D. 450 to have finally coalesced with Montanism. Judaism is introduced in the Homily mainly in connection with the relation of the equinox to the Passover, a form of dispute especially characteristic of the third and fourth centuries, for it appears in Anatolius of Laodicea, at the Council of Nicaea, in the Apostolic Constitutions and in St. Ambrose. One would not imagine that references to it would be frequent later; and with every century the intercourse even of heretical Christianity with Judaism must have been growing appreciably smaller. Lastly Pagans (Ἕλληνες) are even in Asia Minor still a force which must be taken into account. Our Homilist had just been preaching against both Jews and Pagans. The annual memory of the miraculous darkness of the crucifixion is an annual rebuke to Pagan unbelief. And scientific Pagans are quoted as admitting the accuracy of the astronomical calculations of the Church for Easter. All this

¹ For the summaries on this and the following pages I am largely indebted to various articles in the Dictionaries of Christian Biography and Antiquities.

is not surprising in the fourth century ; it becomes stranger for the fifth, and it would be almost incredible later.

The Gospel chronology again shows an independence of Eusebius, which suggests a date not later than 400 A. D., after which time there were few writers who, like Epiphanius and our Homilist, were uninfluenced by the *Chronicle*. For instance, the crucifixion is placed on Nisan 14 in common with a catena of primitive fathers, but against the view of Ambrose, Chrysostom, Proterius, and the later centuries. The 25th of March is given (after the Acts of Pilate) for the crucifixion with Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Augustine. The darkness of the crucifixion is explained with Africanus and Origen as a miracle, and not with Eusebius, Malala, and the Paschal Chronicle as Phlegon's eclipse.

Finally an argument may be drawn from the fact that Christmas, Epiphany, and the commemorations of martyrs are mentioned as the feasts kept at that time in the Church on fixed days. For the saints' days parallels may be found at least as early as a Gothic fragment of the fourth century, the Syriac Kalendar in the great MS. dated A. D. 411, or the Roman lists traceable to the fourth and fifth centuries¹. Of the fixed feasts commemorative of the Gospel history, Christmas and Epiphany are also the two mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions (v. 13), while the Paschal Chronicle, for instance, in the seventh century has the Purification, the Annunciation and the Nativity of St. John Baptist; and of these three the first at least was instituted by the Emperor not later than about A. D. 540.

On the other hand it might perhaps be urged that the commemoration of the Nativity on Dec. 25 rather than on Jan. 6, is for the East an innovation which points to a date later than Chrysostom, who in an Antiochene Homily thought to have been delivered in A. D. 386 speaks of the transference of the festival as introduced from the West less than ten years before. But (i) our Homily is not earlier, as will be seen, than A. D. 387 : (ii) the change at Antioch may have taken place later than in other parts of the East; the Apostolic Constitutions give Dec. 25, and they are apparently earlier than Chrysostom : (iii) it is not unreasonable to conjecture that when our Homilist in the same context defines Christmas by a Roman, and Epiphany by an Asiatic date (*κατὰ Ῥωμαίους, κατὰ Ἀσιανοὺς*) that the former feast somehow connected itself in his

¹ Duchesne, p. 278.

mind with the West, in which case he must have lived before the origin of the December celebration was forgotten. Not even here then have we any evidence tending to suggest a date later than the fourth century for our Homily.

(3) Now if an Asiatic writer use once a Roman method of dating (and this, as we have just seen, perhaps from a special reason) for Christmas-day, but an Asiatic method (*κατ' Ἀσιανοῦς*) twice, for Epiphany and for the Montanist Easter, we shall conclude that his normal Kalendar was the Asiatic, and shall turn to it for help when we find him giving dates for several successive Easters on what is at any rate not a Roman reckoning; and we shall not be surprised that the characteristic features of the 'Asiatic' Kalendars of the Hemerology are faithfully reproduced in the Homily. The Montanist fourteenth for the Pascha was reckoned on the fourteenth of the seventh Asiatic month; the Hemerology commences the seventh month on a. d. ix Kal. Apr. (March 24), and as a month of 30 days does not repeat its first, and thus its 14th will fall on April 6th, a. d. viii Id. Apr., exactly the Roman date as given by Sozomen in the same connexion. The Epiphany festival of the Church was on the 13th of the fourth Asiatic month, which beginning on a. d. ix Kal. Jan. (Dec. 24), and as a month of 31 days repeating its first, brings us to January 6, the well-known festival of the Eastern Church¹, as

¹ Jan. 6 for the Epiphany, e. g. in Apost. Const. v. 13, ἡ ἐπιφάνιος . . . γινέσθω . . . ἔκτῃ τοῦ δεκάτου μηνός; in the Kalendarium Karthaginense (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 634), viii Idus Jan. sanctum Epifania. It is true that we do find allusions to Jan. 5, instead of Jan. 6, and it might therefore be argued that this is possibly the day intended here, the Asiatics having by this time dropped the repetition of the first day in months of 31 days. But such allusions all belong to times or places where in accordance with the earliest custom the Epiphany was celebrated in conjunction with the feast of the Nativity; and the latter was commemorated at night; cf. the 'Constitutions of the Alexandrian Church' (Diet. Chr. Ant. i. p. 359), 'in die autem Nativitatis et Epiphaniae . . . ut noctu missa celebretur'; and so Cosmas Indicopleustes (c. A. D. 550) can even say that all Christians concur in celebrating the Nativity on (Chocac 28 =) Dec. 24. Similarly Stephen Gobar (Photius, cod. 232) in his list of disputed questions names the two dates for the Nativity, one of which is Ἰανουαρίῳ ἐκὰτὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς ἥτις ἐστὶ πρὸ δεκτῶ ἐιδῶν Ἰανουαρίων, i. e. Jan. 5 and 6. Thus so far as Epiphanius (Haer. 51. 24) speaks of the 5th of January, it is to be noticed (i) that he is speaking of the Nativity only; the Baptism he placed on Nov. 8; (ii) that he explains the date πέμπτῃ Ἰανουαρίου ἑσπέρα εἰς ἔκτῃ ἐπιφώσκουσα, and as πρὸ δεκτῶ ἐιδῶν = Jan. 6; (iii) that the Egyptian, Greek, Paphian, and Arabic equivalents given in the same passage are shown by the Hemerology to apply only to Jan. 6. And similarly the Armenian Church, combining in one the

its 14th. Thirdly, the Paschal full moon of the year in which the Homily was delivered fell on the 26th day of the seventh month, while the second day of the eighth month was exactly a week later. But the seventh Asiatic month commenced on a. d. ix Kal. Apr. (March 24), and the eighth on a. d. ix Kal. Mai. (April 23); the 26th day of the seventh month (one of 30 days only) falls on April 18, and therefore that day week is April 25. But if the eighth month began on April 23, and the 2nd of it fell on the 25th, the repetition of the first in months of 31 days must still have formed an integral part of the Asiatic system.

Now however the possibility must be taken into account that the year of the Homily was a leap-year, and the intercalation of the extra day was not made in Asia till at any rate after April. If this were so, as each Asiatic day would be equivalent to one (Roman) day earlier than usual, the two dates of the Homily would become April 17 and April 24. We should then have to find a year in which, on the Alexandrine cycle, the following conditions were satisfied:—(a) full moon on April 17; (b) Easter a week later on April 24; (c) the year *ex hypothesi* a leap-year.

Taking as our guide the Paschal table of Dionysius Exiguus (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 67, p. 493), who first introduced Alexandrian calculations in a scientific form to the West, we have there given full moons and Easters from A. D. 513 to 626, those from A. D. 532 to 626 forming a complete set of 95 years¹. Now the selection of 95 years as the cycle was prompted by the desire to find a term of years after which (1) 95 being a multiple of 19, and

commemoration of the Annunciation, Nativity, and Epiphany, commenced with the Annunciation on the evening of Jan. 5, and so apparently proceeded to the Nativity and Epiphany (D. Chr. Ant. *ut sup.*). But our Homilist, unlike this, distinguished between the Nativity on Dec. 25, and the Epiphany on Jan. 6.

It is true that St. Jerome explains the date of the prophecy of Ezekiel i. 'in the thirteenth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month,' as foreshadowing Christ's Baptism in His thirtieth year, on the fifth day of the fourth (Eastern) month. But this is a forced application of a prophecy; and moreover St. Jerome was writing in Palestine, where the joint celebration of the two feasts had not yet been superseded (Duchesne, p. 248), so that the 5th would still form part of the feast. In fact his strong disclaimer, at this very point, of the union of the two, almost suggests that he is borrowing his interpretation from some previous writer who had interpreted the prophetic date of both Nativity and Epiphany. (See his Commentary *in loc.* quoted by Ussher, p. 1216.)

¹ No doubt there exists a list of all occasions on which Easter has been held; and if I had known where to find it, I might have spared myself the calculations from this point for a page onwards.

the Alexandrine lunar cycle being of 19 years, the full moons would recur on the same days of the month; (2) those days of the month too would fall usually on the same days of the week, and in any case not more than one day apart; for in 95 years we have (after the 52 weeks in each year) 95 extra days, and 23 or 24 leap-years each with a further day; in all 118 or 119 days; and as the chances are three to one that in 95 years there will be 24 leap-years, they are also three to one in favour of the larger number 119 days, or exactly seventeen weeks. Thus after 95 years, three times out of four, the full moon falling not only on the same day of the month but on the same day of the week, Easter, too, will fall the same number of days after it, that is, also on the same day of the month. Now if we want to find all possible Easters, say between A.D. 325 and 700, which fell on April 24, we turn to a cycle of 95 years and look for all Easters on that day or on one day each way—April 23, 24, 25—secure that further variation is impossible. In Dionysius' cycle there are only four such Easters. In A.D. 539 Easter fell on April 24; therefore on the same or next day in A.D. 349, 444, 634. In A.D. 550 again on April 24; so A.D. 360, 455, 645. In A.D. 577 on April 25: compare A.D. 387, 482, 672. In A.D. 607 on April 23; compare A.D. 417, 512. But of all these occasions only the four italicized years were leap-years; and all others are *ex hypothesi* excluded. Hence only A.D. 360, 444, 512, 672 can come into account. Now in A.D. 360 Easter fell on April 23, according to the Festal Letter of St. Athanasius for that year (see tables in Larsow's edition). In A.D. 444 it fell again on the same day, as stated by Proterius of Alexandria in his letter to Leo of Rome eleven years later (Migne, vol. 67, p. 510). In A.D. 512 it must have fallen on April 22; for the cycle of Dionysius commences in the next year with an Easter Sunday on April 7. And in A.D. 672 it certainly fell on April 25; see Ussher *inf.* There is therefore no single year which fulfils the conditions of Easter Sunday on April 24 in leap-year; and we may confidently conclude that even if the leap-year day was intercalated after April, at least the year of our Homilist was not leap-year, and in that case the normal equivalents between the Asiatic and Julian Kalendars must hold. *The full moon of the Homilist can only have fallen on April 18, and his Easter Day on April 25.*

But Ussher gives only four occasions between A.D. 140 and 919 on which Easter Sunday fell on the 25th of April, namely, the years

A. D. 387, 482, 577, 672. We will now put side by side our Homilist's four Easter dates in his own Asiatic months; then the ordinary equivalents of these in Roman months; and lastly the four sets of Easters (taken from Ussher, l. c. p. 1229) to one of which the Homily must certainly apply—

2nd day of 8th month	April 25	{	A. D. 387. April 25
			482. April 25
			577. April 25
			672. April 25
17th day of 7th month	April 9	{	388. April 9
			483. April 10
			578. April 10
			673. April 10
9th day of 7th month	April 1	{	389. April 1
			484. April 1
			579. April 2
			674. April 2
29th day of 7th month	April 21	{	390. April 21
			485. April 21
			580. April 21
			675. April 22

Now of the four dates given in the Homily three must of course be reckoned by the ordinary Roman equivalents, for leap-year can only affect one in four. But no less than three of the four refuse to tally with the quartet A. D. 672-675, and two with the quartet A. D. 577-580. In the third set A. D. 482-485, only one year, it is true, differs; but this one, A. D. 483, is not leap-year. We conclude that the four years of the Homily must be the remaining quartet, A. D. 387-390, and here the correspondence is exact. Even in A. D. 388, the leap-year of the four, the Asiatic and Julian equivalents are for April 9 the same as in ordinary years; and consequently the Asiatic leap-year intercalation must have been made before the month in which this day occurs.

(4) It is strictly speaking superfluous, but at the same time it will add interest to the discussion and cogency to the conclusion if finally, as the coping-stone of the present argument, we can show that our Homily, now dated independently at A. D. 387, does in fact fit admirably into the historical conditions of that year and of the Paschal disputes which marked it. Till that year, Easter had not fallen as late as April 25 since the sub-Apostolic age, and it would preeminently be such a first occasion which would excite the opposition and alarm depicted in our Homily; while

before Easter fell again so late (A. D. 482) Alexandrine calculations were accepted as a matter of course in the East, and even at Rome they were largely introduced by Victorius about the middle of the fifth century, and fully by Dionysius Exiguus in the first half of the sixth. Again, appeal is made, as we said, to 'witnesses of good memory' for Easter falling after the 21st, while objectors admit Easter on the 21st but nothing more. Now Easter as a matter of fact had fallen on April 21 only eight years before, in A. D. 379; but before April 21, it had only fallen twice within sixty years—in A. D. 349 on April 23, and in A. D. 360 on the same day—and on the first of these occasions the Alexandrines, Athanasius being then on intimate terms with the Westerns and especially with the Roman See, yielded to the Roman earlier computation¹. One instance within living memory, and that twenty-seven years before, would satisfy the contradictory assertions hazarded on the two sides.

Further we do know that in A. D. 387 the unusual lateness of the Alexandrine Easter aroused keen discussion, in which the Emperor Theodosius, with the view of reconciling the West to the Eastern practice, intervened. There is still extant the preface of a document addressed to him by Theophilus of Alexandria, whom he had consulted, as well as a circular letter which St. Ambrose from the same point of view directed to the bishops of Emilia.

Theophilus² writes that according to the Old Testament the month of the Passover was to be the first month or month of new year's produce (*μὴν τῶν νέων*) when the crops were full-grown; and the day to be the 14th, that is full moon, for the Jewish month, unlike the ancient Egyptian but like the Greek, was lunar. This month itself should be fixed after the equinox, which falls on the 25th Phamenoth, 21st of March, or according to the 'Syrians, Antiochenes, and Macedonians' 21st of Dystrus; if the previous (twelfth) month were to be taken, it would be found that the crops were not ready to cut. But when, the month being rightly fixed, its 14th falls on Sunday, Easter must be put off a week; for we may neither end our fast on the 13th nor yet fast on the Sunday—a thing no one would do but a Manichee³—while

¹ Cf. Hefele, *Councils*, E. T. ii. 159. The Easters during the Episcopate of Athanasius (A. D. 328-373) are given in Larsow's edition of the *Festal Letters*, p. 47.

² Ap. Gallandi, vii. 614.

³ *Μανιχαίων γὰρ ἰδίον πρᾶγμα τὸ τοιοῦτον.*

on the contrary, as the Lord was crucified on the 14th¹, and therefore the Resurrection fell after it then, so may its Paschal commemoration now. As to objections on the score of lateness (of April 25), why the Law itself says, if you cannot keep the Passover in the first month, do so in the second; in any case therefore it is better to have Easter too late than too early.

St. Ambrose is addressing the bishops of Emilia, after the bishops of Rome and Alexandria had expressed their opinion, and apparently with Theophilus' epistle in his hands². The Nicene fathers, he says, had instituted a nineteen years' cycle (after which the same dates for full moons were to recur) in order to secure unanimity about the night on which the 'sacrifice for the Lord's Resurrection' was to be offered³. We are to note the first month or month of new crops, and the 14th of the month; for Christ, coming to fulfil the Law of Moses, kept the Passover on the 14th (Thursday), being crucified on the 15th, and rising from the dead on the 17th. Thus the 14th as preceding the Passion, and therefore a fast, cannot be Easter day, which if the 14th is a Sunday — 'sicut futurum est proxime' — will fall a week later, and in this case will be kept on the 25th, not on the 18th, of April. So, to quote recent practice, in A. D. 373⁴ the 14th of the moon fell on March 24, and Easter a week later; in A. D. 377 the 14th was on April 9, and again Easter on the 16th.

But then, continues Ambrose, the objection is made that if

¹ Τῇ δεκάτῃ τεσσαρεσκαδεκαταίᾳ in the Greek: but the Latin 'decimaquinta,' cf. Ambrose inf. and note 2 on p. 136.

² *Ambrosii Opera* (Venice, 1751), iii. pp. 935–943. 'Post Aegyptiorum supputationes et Alexandrinae Ecclesiae definitores, Episcopi quoque Romanae ecclesiae, per litteras plerique meam adhuc expectant sententiam'; elsewhere again, 'Alexandrini quoque et Aegyptii, ut ipsi scripserunt.' Further, he not only employs the Egyptian names of months, but presents actual coincidences with Theophilus' preface just mentioned, in the 'mensis novorum' and the reference to the Manichees.

On the important position held by the see of Milan at the end of the fourth century, see Duchesne, pp. 32–39.

³ If the Gentiles observe days—'quintam esse fugiendam,' 'posteror dies vel Aegyptiacos declinare'—they do it for superstitious motives; we in order that 'consona sacrae noctis fundatur oratio.'

⁴ St. Ambrose dates the years here by the era of Diocletian, the 89th and the 93rd. This era, specially made for Egypt, and continuously in use in the Coptic Church as the 'era of martyrs,' is reckoned from A. D. 284, the year of Diocletian's accession, and as the Egyptian year commenced on August 29, the 89th and 93rd year of the era will refer to the Easters not of A. D. 372 and 376, but of A. D. 373 and 377. Even the months Pharmuthi and Pharmuthi are given as well as the Roman reckoning.

Easter is kept as late as April 25, the rule of the 'first month' is not observed. We answer—

(1) Since the full moon can obviously fall anywhere within the first solar month, if it falls quite at the end, then Easter, unless kept on the actual 14th, must fall in the next month.

(2) In the present case it is the Jews who will not observe the first month; for their Passover is to be on March 20, which belongs to the 12th month and not to the 1st¹, whether you reckon the latter as the post-equinoctial month of 31 days, from March 22 to April 21, or the Egyptian month Pharmuthi, of 30 days, from March 27 to April 25.

(3) But in reality, as scholars of the Jewish law know well, this first month is lunar; and if the first full moon after the equinox falls (as in A. D. 387) on April 18 the first new moon will fall on April 5, the nones of April², and the second therefore about the nones of May, so that April 25 falls well before it.

Moreover only two years ago Easter was celebrated as late as the 11th before the Kalends of May, the 30th of the (post-equinoctial) month³, and the few extra days between that day and the 25th of April now proposed, ought not to be a real stumbling-block.

It is sufficiently obvious that the arguments of St. Ambrose and of Theophilus are in the main identical with those employed by our Homilist, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the three

¹ In Milan, the eighth month, 'octavus secundum consuetudinem nostram, indictio enim Septembri mense incipit, octavo igitur mense Kalendae Apriles sunt.'

² Such seems to be the meaning of the words 'cum a pluribus nonis lunae cursus incipiat, hoc est, dies primus, vides nonas Maii adhuc ad mensem primum novorum computari posse': where for 'a pluribus nonis' I suspect we should read 'Aprilibus Nonis.'

³ 'Ante biennium celebraverimus paschae Dominicam undecimo Kalendas Maii, hoc est, trigesimo die mensis secundum nostram scilicet calculationem.' These figures do not seem to tally; a. d. xi Kal. Mai. is April 21, but the 30th of a month commencing on March 22 would be April 20: so for 'trigesimo' we ought perhaps to restore 'triges[imo pr]imo.' If April 21 is thus correct, the nearest year given in the tables in which Easter fell on that day is A. D. 379; and as on the other hand it seems probable (e. g. from the repeated use of '*proxime*') that the letter was not written very long before the Easter of A. D. 387, it has been proposed to read 'ante vi ennium' (i. e. sexennium) for 'ante biennium.' [I do not know whether it is possible that in A. D. 384 the full moon which fell about March 21 may have been reckoned in Milan as before the equinox, so that the Paschal moon would fall about April 19, and Easter day, instead of on March 24, on April 21.]

writers refer to the same occasion. By concurrent but independent lines of argument it has therefore been established that the four Easters of the Homily are those from A. D. 387 to 390 ; and if so, then (as we have seen) the date given for the leap-year Easter of A. D. 388 shows that the intercalation was made before Easter and before the month beginning on March 24. It was already argued in the main body of this Essay (p. 122, sup.), that the intercalation probably did take place in the sixth Asiatic month (Feb. 21 to March 23) in Asia as in Rome. So far therefore from demonstrating an alternative theory to be correct, the Paschal Homily is absolutely consistent, so far as it goes, with the theory of intercalation on which this Essay is based¹.

APPENDIX II.

PASSAGES FROM ANCIENT WRITERS WHO EMPLOY KALENDARS OF THE ASIATIC TYPE, GIVING SIDE BY SIDE A ROMAN AND A NATIVE DATING.

[C. H. T.]

DR. LIGHTFOOT has quoted (Ignatius i. 665) four inscriptions which give side by side the two methods of dating. For completeness' sake I have put together here the few instances which are quoted by Archbishop Ussher from ancient writers.

1. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 51. § 24. The Baptism of Christ, κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Ἀθύρ δωδεκάτῃ πρὸ ἑξ εἰδῶν Νοεμβρίων, κατὰ Ἑλλήνας Δίου ὀγδόῃ . . . κατὰ Παφίους Ἀπογονικοῦ ἑκκαίδεκάτῃ . . . κατὰ Μακεδόνας Ἀπελλαίου ἑκκαίδεκάτῃ.

¹ Of course (I repeat what I have said before) the correctness of this theory of intercalation does not prove that St. Polycarp suffered in A. D. 156 and not in A. D. 155. That he did suffer in the later year is made possible by it, and the possible becomes probable, if once the identification of the 'high sabbath' with the Purim feast is admitted.

Here the date intended is of course Nov. 8, and the Asiatic or, as Epiphanius here calls it, the 'Macedonian' date, Apellaeus 16, is correctly given according to the Hemerology; for Apellaeus commences a.d. ix Kal. Nov. (Oct. 24) and does not repeat its first. But a second kalendar on the Asiatic model was the Cyprian, as the Hemerology calls it, or as Epiphanius calls it (to distinguish it from the Kalendar of Salamis) the Paphian; and the Paphian date is again correctly given as Apogoneus 16.

2. Epiphanius, *ib.* The Birth of Christ, *πρὸ ὀκτῶ εἰδῶν Ἰανουαρίων* . . . *κατ' Αἰγυπτίους* *Τυβί ἐνδεκάτη, κατὰ Σύρους* *εἴτ' οὖν Ἑλλήνας* *Αὐδυναίου* *ἔκτη* *κατὰ Παφίους* *Ἰουλίου* *τεσσαρεσκαδεκάτη*. The date meant is January 6, and the 'Asiatic' date is not among the parallels here given (but cf. the Paschal Homily, p. 142, sup.): however the Paphian date recurs, and we learn (as indeed the Hemerology would tell us) that the Paphian months, though all beginning like the Asiatic months on a.d. ix Kal., did not repeat the first in months of 31 days. For 'Julius' begins a.d. ix Kal. Jan. (Dec. 24) and if it repeated its first the 14th would have been Jan. 7, not Jan. 6.

3. The panegyric entitled *Laudatio S. Barnabae Apostoli* written by a certain Alexander, a monk of Cyprus, and printed in the *Acta Sanctorum* for June 11 (June, tom. ii. pp. 431-447) gives St. Barnabas' day as *κατὰ μὲν Ῥωμαίους τῇ πρὸ τριῶν εἰδῶν Ἰουνίων, κατὰ δὲ Κυπρίους* *Κωνσταντιεῖς* *μηνὸς* *Μεσωρῆ, τοῦ καὶ δεκάτου, ια', κατὰ δὲ Ἀσιανοὺς* *ἦτοι κατὰ* *Παφίους* *Πληθυπάτου τοῦ καὶ ἐνάτου ιθ'.* The ninth 'Asiatic or Paphian' month, commencing a.d. ix Kal. Jun. (May 24) and not repeating its first, will make its 19th on June 11; but Plethypatus is, strictly speaking, only a Paphian and not an Asiatic name (Lightfoot, i. p. 682).

The rough date of this little panegyric is easily fixed; for it discusses the history of Peter the Fuller bishop of Antioch and his claim over Cyprus, so opportunely met by the discovery of the relics of St. Barnabas, and must therefore be later than A.D. 480, while it obviously precedes the Saracen invasions of Cyprus, and must therefore be earlier than A.D. 650. But since Alexander speaks of the Theopaschite addition to the Trisagion made by Peter, *ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς*, as still largely in use in his own day among the more simple-minded orthodox, I should conclude that this writing must belong to the earlier half of the sixth century. (See Dict. Christ. Ant. s.v. Trisagion: Bingham, book xiv. ch. 2,

§ 3). Photius (cod. 228) preserves an account of a letter written by Ephraïmus, Patriarch of Antioch from about A. D. 527 to 547, in which he maintains the orthodoxy both of the Easterns who used the addition (addressing the hymn to Christ) and the Westerns or Byzantines who rejected it on the ground that the hymn was really addressed to the Holy Trinity. But after this there does not seem to be any mention of the enlarged Trisagion at least in orthodox circles.

4. In the Acts of Timothy (printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, January, ii. p. 566) the saint is said to have been martyred ‘in nefanda festivitate eorum, quam vocabant Catagogiorum, quae est secundum Asianos quidem mensis quarti die tricesima, secundum autem Romanos mensis Januarii vicesima secunda.’ The fourth month commenced a. d. ix Kal. Dec. (Dec. 24) and being a month of 31 days, should repeat the first, so that the Asiatic 30th ought to be Jan. 23 not Jan. 22. It is possible therefore that at some unknown date the system of the double first was dropped, and the days in all months counted straight through, so that the Asiatic Kalendar was in fact assimilated to the Paphian Kalendar described above, in which Jan. 22 would be the 30th of the 4th month. This may be the reason why Alexander the monk, as we saw, can quote a date as *κατὰ δὲ Ἀσιανοῦς ἦτοι κατὰ Παφίους*. Unfortunately there is nothing on the face of these Acts of Timothy to fix their date; but they were read by Photius (cod. 254), while, on the other hand, the application of the title Patriarch to the Bishop of Ephesus seems to show that they are not earlier than A. D. 450. [Prof. Sanday now kindly informs me that Usener, in his edition of these Acts (which I was unable to find in the Bodleian) and Schürer, in reviewing Usener, both fix on a date some time in the fourth century; I should scarcely have thought they were so early.]

NOTE.—ON THE NEW MATTER CONTAINED IN THE SECOND EDITION (1889), OF BISHOP LIGHTFOOT’S APOSTOLIC FATHERS, (PART II. ST. IGNATIUS, ST. POLYCARP, VOL. I. pp. 626–722).

[This edition appeared when the proof of the preceding paper had all but finally left my hands, and I am therefore unable to do more than add the present note, calling attention to the chief additions to the discussion on St. Polycarp’s martyrdom. These, so

far as a rapid glance enables one to judge, seem to be mainly the following:—

(a) On p. 683 (ed. i. p. 666), a sentence is added on the inscription from Ephesus, for which cf. p. 120 sup.

(b) On p. 687 an unpublished Pergamene inscription, communicated by Mommsen, is printed so far as it bears on the Asiatic Kalendar.

(c) On p. 714 *n.* (ed. i. p. 696), the judgment on Usener's theory of the term Σεβαστή is reworded.

(d) On p. 727, Dr. Lightfoot is good enough to discuss the theory offered in the preceding pages. The Bishop of Salisbury (through Prof. Sanday) had kindly asked the present writer to send him a note on the date of the martyrdom, and this was printed in the new edition of the late Bishop of Lincoln's *Church History*. In this shape it has come under the notice of Dr. Lightfoot, who criticises its theory of leap-year intercalation, on the ground that the intercalated day must have been the same in Asia as in Rome. This may be so, though Archbishop Ussher, as we have seen, placed it at nearly six months' distance instead of only two days. The last few lines of the Bishop's criticism (where '3rd Xanthicus' occurs three times in mistake, I think, for 2nd Xanthicus) show that I did not succeed in making myself intelligible in the limits of a short abstract. I hope I may have been more fortunate in the preceding paper. C. H. T.]

The inscription from Pergamon (p. 687) is of considerable interest. It is a dedication to Hadrian by a religious college, and names the days annually to be celebrated by the three officials of the corporation. The kalendar employed is obviously Asiatic, for the names Lous, Panemus, Peritius, Hyperberetaeus, occur for various months, and the birthday of Hadrian (a. d. ix Kal. Feb. = Jan. 24) falls on the Σεβαστή or first¹ of the month Καίσαρ, the latter name being apparently substituted for Dystus (Jan. 24—Feb. 20) in honour of the reigning Emperor². The curious

¹ Usener's theory on this point, accepted above (p. 121), is now admitted by Dr. Lightfoot to be probable (p. 714 *n.*).

² It is true that the Cypriot (Paphian) Kalendar, dating from the time of Augustus, already used Caesarius for this same month; but the Ephesian Caesarius was a different month, September–October, so called obviously from the birthday of Augustus.

coincidence that the second of the two Emperors whose worship was most extravagantly practised in Asia had his birthday, like the first, on a. d. ix Kal., must have given considerable impetus to a kalendar whose ruling principle was the celebration of this Emperor's day on the first of each month. Further, we find in this inscription that in both the months Panemus and Lous, the three officials observe respectively the days $\Sigma\epsilon\beta$, β' , γ' , that is most naturally the 1st, 2nd, 3rd. Now Lous, as a month of 31 days, ought to have repeated its first, so that the three days would be $\Sigma\epsilon\beta$, α' , β' ; and there is therefore a possibility that at Pergamon in Hadrian's time, the double first was not in use, the days being numbered from 1 to 31, which would bring the Pergamene Kalendar into exact agreement with those of Bithynia, Crete and Cyprus (see Lightfoot, p. 681, and for Cyprus, or more properly Paphos, sup. p. 150), all of them different from the Asiatic on this point. A similar kalendar was in use at Attalia in Pamphylia in the third century¹, whither it no doubt travelled direct from Paphos. In Proconsular Asia itself the compiler of the (late) Acts of Timothy, presumably an Ephesian, omitted the doubled first (sup. p. 151). This alteration Dr. Lightfoot now supposes to have been made at an early date, explaining his second inscription—that from Ephesus of A. D. 104, where, as we saw (p. 120 sup.), Anthesterion or Xanthicus 2 is Feb. 22, not Feb. 23—on these lines; ‘the inconvenience of reckoning two first days must have been seriously felt and would eventually lead to the substitution of another nomenclature at this point without destroying the general framework of the kalendar’ (p. 683). Only in the first place, if all this is so, there is no antecedent reason why the 2nd Xanthicus of St. Polycarp's martyrdom fifty years later may not also be an instance where the double first has been dropped, so that the equivalent date would again be Feb. 22, not Feb. 23. It is true that this suggestion implies that the equation in the extant text (a. d. vii Kal. Mart. Feb. 23) is incorrect; but there is certainly no positive objection to treating the Roman date as a later insertion for the benefit of non-Asiatic readers, and since *ex hypothesi* both the use and the omission of the double first were current in Asia, there is nothing strange if of the two interpretations of Xanthicus 2 (Feb. 22 and 23), a later writer adopted

¹ Lightfoot, p. 684, $\mu\eta\nu\iota\ \eta'$, $\kappa\beta'$ $\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha'$, $\tau\omega\nu\ \iota'$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$, equated to May 14-23.

one as most familiar to himself, while it was the other which really corresponded to the original date.

As a matter of fact the reckoning of the double first did in fact survive long after the second century, as has been shown in the appendix from the use of the Asiatic Kalendar in Pseudo-Chrysostom. The martyrdom of Pionius (Lightfoot, i. 720), obviously depends on it also, for the 12th March is there the 19th of the Asiatic month. On the other hand, of the authorities quoted against the double first, the Pamphylian inscription is too far removed in place, and the Acts of Timothy in time. Then the Pergamene inscription on closer examination shows signs of Asiatic structure; the last but one of the month is still denoted $\pi\rho\delta$, and this means that the last ten days of the month were reckoned backwards, as in the Asiatic Kalendar, and in it only. If an assimilation to the Bithynian and Cyprian type had taken place, the double first would indeed have disappeared, but the backward counting of ten days (which would now have become eleven days) would probably have been dropped for simple enumeration from 1 to 31. Moreover, it is not easy to believe that within the limits of so small an area as Proconsular Asia two kalendars so like, and yet so unlike (for the change would alter by one day at least 140 days in the year), prevailed side by side. That the system of the double first existed, we know; that the contrary system also existed is not *proved* by the Pergamene inscription; and the Ephesian inscription, though compatible with it, is equally compatible with the hypothesis here suggested.

It was on the assumption that only one kalendar was in use, and in order to meet the two objections as to the pontificate of Anicetus and the high sabbath of Purim in connection with the earlier year, that Feb. 22, A. D. 156 was offered in this paper as a possible alternative to Feb. 23, A. D. 155. Dr. Lightfoot now says (p. 727), that he does not 'lay any stress on this particular solution' of the high sabbath, although he still seems to prefer it¹; and he is arguing, he tells us, in his forthcoming edition of St. Clement, that 'it is impossible with our existing data to fix the accessions of the Roman bishops in the middle of the second

¹ Dr. Lightfoot adds that 'whether in this age the Jews intercalated by whole months or by fractions of months, we cannot say': I should have thought it impossible for a lunar kalendar to intercalate less than a complete moon.

century within three or four years, though a strict reckoning would suggest A. D. 153-155 for that of Anicetus': if the first of these alternative years A. D. 153 is the true one, then the visit of Polycarp can be placed in A. D. 154, and the martyrdom early in the following year. Undoubtedly if another identification than Purim can be found for the high sabbath which will suit Feb. 23, A. D. 155; and if the accession of Anicetus can be placed as early as Dr. Lightfoot believes; and if two kalendars were simultaneously in use in Proconsular Asia; the ground is cut away from any theory such as that here presented which based itself on the explanation of the 'high sabbath' selected by Dr. Lightfoot himself, and on the chronological difficulty raised by Prof. Lipsius, the writer who had up to that time devoted most study to the episcopal successions at Rome. But until these points are satisfactorily settled there may be something to be said for the date suggested in this paper.

IV.

THE CLEMENTINE HOMILIES.

[C. [✓]BIGG.]

A CONSIDERABLE number of documents emanating from the early ages of the Church are attributed, we know not why, to the authorship of Clement of Rome. Such are the Second Epistle, the Epistles on Virginitv, a Liturgy, the Canons and the Constitutions of the Apostles. But in addition to these, and widely different from any of them, there is a most singular group of books that claims the same origin. Three are well known, the *Homilies*, the *Recognitions*, and the *Epitome*. But these three are survivors of a much more numerous family. We possess branches of the same stock in Syriac and in Arabic, and others now lost can be proved to have existed in ancient times. Rufinus was acquainted with two distinct editions of the *Recognitions*, and by the side of our unorthodox there was an orthodox *Clementina*, which in the Eastern Church seems to have ousted the other from circulation.

It is not proposed in this paper to touch upon the *Epitome*, which has no independent interest of its own. Nor will it be necessary to deal immediately with the *Recognitions*. Whatever may be the precise relation of this book to the *Homilies*, and this is a question that will be treated in its place, it seems to be nothing else than a recast in an orthodox direction of the *Homilies*. The interest that attaches to the *Recognitions* is mainly literary. A close examination of its structure may throw light on difficulties that surround the other far more interesting book; whereas the interest of the *Homilies* is mainly doctrinal and historical. Where and by whom were these strange doctrines preached? What is their origin and lineage? what their relation to the Gnostic heresies, and

to the Catholic Church? All students of the history of doctrine are acquainted with one remarkable answer that has been given to this question. The *Homilies* were the key of the position of the Tübingen School. This, said Baur, was primitive Christianity, this was 'Petrinism,' the genuine doctrine of the first followers of Jesus. The overthrow of the Tübingen School by the critical and historical methods, of which Dr. Harnack is one of the most illustrious living representatives, has relegated the *Homilies* to a place of inferior interest. Yet it is, and must remain, a book of very great importance, and any fresh light that we can get upon its date, meaning, and authorship will be of value.

The *Homilies*, or rather *Clement's Epitome of the Itinerant Preachings of Peter*, in its present shape (and even after Dressel's discovery it may be doubted whether we have the full text) consists of twenty books or chapters. Prefixed to the main work are two prefatory letters to St. James of Jerusalem. The first is from St. Peter, who begs St. James to guard with the most scrupulous care for secrecy 'the books of my preachings which I sent you.' To this is appended the Protestation to be made by all those into whose hands the books are delivered. They are to be entrusted to none but circumcised teachers, and each recipient is to make a solemn oath or protestation of a peculiar heathenish form, by the four elements, not to betray the confidence reposed in him. After this he is to partake of a remarkable sacrament of bread and salt. In the second letter Clement announces to St. James the death of St. Peter, and his own appointment by that apostle to succeed him in the Bishopric of Rome. This second epistle however is rightly regarded as belonging not to the *Homilies* but to the *Recognitions*.

The main body of the work is dictated by two different motives. The first is the debate between Christianity and Gnosticism, conducted by St. Peter and Simon Magus: the second is the debate between Christianity and Heathenism, in which the parties are Clement and his brothers on the one

side, and Appion and Faustus on the other. To the latter belongs the framework of romance in which the whole book is set. Clement, a high-born Roman youth, a relative of the Emperor Tiberius, has been left alone in the world by a series of mysterious accidents. His mother and two brothers travelled to the East, and then disappeared; afterwards his father went in quest of his lost wife and children, and disappeared also. Like many of the finer spirits of the time Clement is beset by religious doubts, and long seeks in vain for light and comfort to his soul. Relief comes to him from an unexpected quarter. In the reign of Tiberius Caesar, in the opening of the year, a rumour spreads, men knew not whence or how, that in Judaea there is One preaching glad tidings of the Kingdom of the Eternal. And in the autumn of the same year an unknown man was to be seen in the streets of Rome, preaching that the Son of God is in the Holy Land. ✓

At once the young enquirer resolves upon his course. He will go and ascertain for himself what this strange news may mean. Business delays him for some time, apparently till towards the summer of the next year; then, baffling winds drive him off the coast of Palestine into the sheltering harbour of Alexandria. Here he finds Barnabas preaching the Gospel in the streets, beset by a crowd of mocking Greek philosophers. Clement rescues the apostle from his tormentors, and takes him home to his lodging. Next day Barnabas sets sail for Palestine, inviting Clement to follow. Clement is detained in Alexandria some little time longer, to collect debts due to him in that town, but finally, in his impatience, leaves his money affairs unsettled, and takes ship. A voyage of fifteen days brings him to Caesarea, where he finds Barnabas, who introduces him to Peter. Clement attaches himself to Peter, attends him in his pursuit of Simon Magus from town to town, from Caesarea to Tripolis, the Syrian Laodicea and Antioch, and in the course of these journeyings recovers by a series of happy providences his mother Mattidia, his father Faustus, and his two brothers Faustinus and Faustinianus.

The last two had joined Peter some time before himself, under the names of Nicetes and Aquila.

The plot of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* is the same, with certain variations in detail, which have a high interest in their bearing on the question of authorship. Let us content ourselves here with a few observations. The romance assumes that St. Peter was Bishop first of Antioch, and afterwards of Rome. It accepts the tradition, not found elsewhere before Tertullian¹, that Clement was the immediate, and not the second or third, successor of St. Peter in the Bishopric of Rome. It presupposes the confusion of Simon Magus with Semo Sancus, which had already been made in the time of Justin. The belief that Clement was second Bishop of Rome implies an identification of Clemens Romanus with the Clement of the Epistle to the Philippians. But he was also identified with the Flavius Clemens put to death by his relative Domitian on a charge of atheism. This, perhaps, is why the author of the romance makes his hero belong to the imperial house, though to avoid a palpable anachronism he is obliged to connect him with the Julian, instead of the Flavian, family. The name of Mattidia is borrowed from the family of Trajan, that of Faustus from the family of Marcus Aurelius. All these traits in the narrative are indications of a certain lateness of date, though they do not afford means for any very accurate definition of time. But a story exhibiting these peculiar features can hardly have been composed before the latter part of the second century, and may be of even more recent origin. As regards composition, let us observe that the work, though cast in dramatic form, exhibits not the least vestige of dramatic ability. The characters are merely wooden puppets, left lying in a corner until they are wanted, and then shuffled awkwardly on to the stage. Personality they have none. The style is in general simple and clear, with a certain thin elegance about it, rising at times, for instance in the eulogy on the Chaste Wife, into positive beauty. It is

¹ *De Prascr. Haer.* 32.

entirely free from the affected Homerisms of the Rhetoricians. But it is certainly not the work of a born Greek. The cast of phrase is not idiomatic; the sentences are short, connected by sense not by particles; the grasp of grammar is undecided, and countless passages are obscured or disfigured by mistakes such as a schoolboy might make. Upon the whole the faults do not seem to be those that might be expected to occur in Roman Greek, and I suspect that an expert would feel little hesitation in attributing the composition to an Oriental¹. The higher qualities of style are conspicuously absent. There are occasional flashes of insight, and the author has a considerable aptitude for selecting good ideas and telling points. But his system, if system it can be called, is a dull and barbarous farrago of inconsistencies.

I propose to direct the reader's attention (I) to the Theology of the Homilies, (II) to its Hierarchical tendency, (III) to its relation to Gnosticism, (IV) to its Apologetics, (V) and lastly to its date, object, and meaning, so far as we shall be able to ascertain them.

(I) The most remarkable fact about the book, in view of the use that Baur made of it, is that, though the author has properly speaking no Trinity at all, he yet insists upon the administration of Baptism in 'the thrice blessed Invocation,' and uses the doxology. We shall see that his copy of St. Matthew contained the first chapter; it must also have contained the last. The three names have no three things,

¹ The author does not understand the use of the Greek article: *τὰς προφάσεις τῆς λουδοίας* is an instance of a fault that occurs in almost every page; *συγγνώσκω* is used with genitive, and *ἐπιθυμῶ* with accusative, iii. 5; we find strange words, like *πρώτως* and *διαφωνεῖν* (= to be choked, drowned, or speechless) xiii. 5, xiv. 9: and strange phrases, such as *προαιρέσεως ἐγενόμην* (= I was minded), xv. 10; or *θεότητος ἔστιν* (= is divine), xvii. 13. Some features have a Latin look; for instance, *ἔχει κριθῆναι, σωθῆναι et simm.*; *βίων περιγραφαί* (= *circumscriptiones*), iv. 20; *συνεστάναι* (= *constare*), xiv. 11; *ἐκδικεῖν* (= *vindicare*, to maintain), xviii. 9. For short disconnected sentences, see iii. 26. But these facts are not sufficient to prove a Western origin. The syntax constantly goes to wreck in a way that cannot be accounted for by corruption of the text.

certainly no three equal things corresponding to them, and he arranges them in his system in an order which is not that of the New Testament. Yet he durst not renounce the Catholic formula. Surely this is a most remarkable phenomenon. The sect which is represented in the *Homilies* can never have been in the humour to borrow its central confession of doctrine, its watchword—and this phrase is no less—from the Catholic Church. Whatever Christianity it possesses is of the most primitive kind, long anterior to any Gentile developments. Yet it possesses the Trinitarian baptismal formula. This fact seems to determine at once the place of the Ebionite sect in the history of the Church. It could not, by the light of its inherited traditions, find any explanation of the new faith, and it therefore gave up the attempt and fell out of the race, retaining, however, this mysterious formula as a magical charm or amulet, by which in some way the gates of heaven were opened to the baptized.

The leading phrase of the *Homilies* is the Monarchy of God¹ which is held in the strictly Jewish sense. The unpardonable sin is to teach or believe anything that derogates from the sole and incommunicable majesty of the Creator. He who made the world, and all that is therein must be One, and One only. If there were a second God, He would have created a second world. His own people would owe Him allegiance, but we could be in no way concerned with Him. The first conception of this Deity is that familiar to us in the Platonising writers². He is the Unknown and Unknowable. But here we come at once to the most extraordinary of the many absurdities of the *Homilies*. The author abominates anthropopathism³ with such vehemence that he will not hear of explaining those passages of scripture where human emotions are ascribed to the Divine by the familiar principle of condescension, but absolutely rejects them all as forgeries of the devil. And yet he is a no less vehement anthropomorphist⁴. But for this book it

¹ iii. 9. 38, 59. 61.² xix. 10.³ ii. 40 sqq.⁴ xvii. 7 sqq.

would have seemed incredible that these two opinions could exist side by side. And this is not all. The author of the *Homilies* is not content until he has attained the farthest point in the realm of nonsense ever reached by any human being. For this Deity who has the shape of man is yet infinite. Certain Stoics held that God has shape, not indeed that of man, but the perfect figure, that of the globe. But they also taught that he was therefore finite¹. But our author will have it that the Deity, though he has figure, is yet infinite, and this in order to reconcile his Stoicism with Scripture which, whenever he chooses, he treats as a forgery. He defends his anthropomorphism partly by the familiar arguments, how can God be beautiful? how can he be the object of faith or love without definite shape? partly with a dull pretence of philosophy. The only remarks we need make on his reasonings is that they give us a glimpse of the author's personality. The people among whom he lived held their peculiar creed in unquestioning faith, and did not trouble their heads about logical possibilities. All the chatter of the Homilist about primary and secondary space, and about the figured God being infinite because He is limited only by space, that is by Nothing, is a misapplication of lessons picked up at some Greek university.

Anthropomorphism was held by many Jews², though surely not by those who had come much under the influence of Greek philosophy, even though they inclined to the opinions of Zeno. Another idea prevalent in the Jewish schools, which has a mystical tinge and is quite irreconcilable with anthropomorphism, is that in the essence of the Deity are combined two elements, the masculine and the feminine³. The author of the *Homilies*, or his people, seized upon this to explain the

¹ Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 7. 37) charges the Stoics with Anthropomorphism, but it is expressly denied by Diogenes Laertius, vii. 147. Cp. Seneca, *Ep.* 113. 22, 'Si rotundam (figuram) illis qualem deo derint.'

² Gfrörer, *Jahr des Heils*, ii. 107.

³ *Ib.* i. 299.

doctrine of the Holy Ghost. God created the world, yet not strictly speaking by Himself. The words 'Let us make man' are explained not of God and the Logos, but of God and Wisdom, that is, the Holy Ghost¹. 'With this Wisdom He ever rejoiced as with His own Spirit. Wisdom, indeed, is united with God as his Soul; it is thrust forth from Him as a hand creating all that is. Therefore also one man was created, and from him proceeded the female, and being one in kind they form a dyad. For by extension and contraction the one becomes a two. Therefore I do right in ascribing all honour to God as my parents.' The idea that Wisdom is feminine, and that creation is the offspring of the mysterious wedlock between the two sides of the Divine, belongs to the author's sect, and may be found in the book of Elxai. But in that book Wisdom is an angel, an inferior and separate being. Yet doubtless our author was not alone in regarding it as an immanent portion of a dualistic whole, as the soul of God, reaching forth 'like a hand' when it deals with the material world, yet in truth always at home.

This idea, the product of Hebrew speculations upon the Hebrew Bible, was capable of being brought into easy connection with the Stoic theory of the world. There are indeed passages in the *Homilies* that remind us of Plato. We read of the visible and invisible heavens², that is of the ideal and phenomenal world. God is the 'Seal' or Form of all things³, which exist only by 'participation' in Him, and the eternity of matter is not denied⁴. But these things are not distinctive of any school in the Alexandrine age. In a remarkable place in the seventeenth Homily God is the heart of the universe, from whence stream forth six extensions (ἐκτάσεις) up and down, right and left, forwards and backwards. These are the six divine motions of the *Timæus* which our author has seized upon to explain the six days of creation. By adding to them as a seventh term the central rest of the Deity, he gets the 'mystery of the Hebdomad,' and finds a philosophical *raison*

¹ xvi. 12.² xi. 22.³ xvi. 19.⁴ iii. 33.

d'être for the Sabbath. In the sixth Homily God is the *τεχνίτης νοῦς*, who forms the World Animal by mixing the four elements in a bowl. This again is from the *Timaëus*. But in the twentieth Homily the mode of thought is entirely Stoic. God combines in His unity two antithetic elements, the material and the spiritual. Each of these is capable of self-originated change. As air thickens into water, water into earth and stones, and stones when struck produce fire, so is it with the Divine Essence. This too, when it pleases, can change itself, and, when it pleases, return into its original state. So far have we departed from Plato here that the author considers the superiority of the Father to the Son to consist precisely in the power of self-ordained mutation into lower forms of existence. God is the Beginning; He is also the End. All proceeds from Him, all is penetrated by Him, and will eventually return into Him. It is the *dernier mot* of Heraclitus and the Stoics. 'Jupiter est quodcunque vides.' The world is God, whose essence is thickened and materialised as He 'projects' it farther from His 'heart,' and refined and spiritualised as it pulsates slowly back to the centre of All. We ask in amazement, where is the place of anthropomorphism in this thoroughgoing pantheism?

And here we come to the central difference between the *Homilies* and Catholicism. Readers of Philo will recollect his doctrine of the Powers of God. Goodness, the older and better Power, stands over against Righteousness, the younger and inferior, and between the two, so as to harmonise their discrepancy, is placed the Word. The root of this doctrine is to be found in mystic rabbinical speculations on the Chariot Throne of Ezekiel's vision¹. It has been doubted whether the Powers of Philo are personalities in the strict sense of the word, whether the Logos doctrine was the creation of Philo or of some earlier Alexandrine, whether it was not even current in Palestinian schools, and if so, in what precise sense. Now in the *Homilies* we find the two Powers but no Logos.

¹ Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 212.

They are both persons. And at the same time the speculations out of which they sprang are absolutely rejected, for the writer will have none but the literal sense of Scripture, and attaches very little value to the prophets. Another curious point is, that though our author rejects the Logos doctrine, he uses St. John's Gospel. Does not this go to prove that no effective Logos doctrine ever was current in the native Jewish schools?

By the changes of God there are 'projected' ¹ two creatures of especial dignity and importance, the Son and the Evil One. Both are 'begotten,' if you please, but our author objects to the phrase as savouring of anthropopathism, and prefers 'created' or 'projected.' They are not 'brothers,' inasmuch as they do not owe their origin to the same change, and the one stands on a much lower plane than the other. The Son is the offspring of the noblest change of God, the first modification, that is, of the spiritual side of the divine Dyad. The Evil One, on the other hand, springs from a 'mixture' of the four elements 'outside' of the Deity. This last idea is borrowed from the *Timæus*.

These two Powers then are in a way antitheses, yet not so much opposed as complementary. The Son represents the Goodness, the Evil One the Justice of God. The latter is King of this world, the former of that which is to come. Satan, by his mixed material nature, has received a will that delights in evil, yet he does no wrong for fear of God. He is the instrument of the divine wrath against sin, the Saviour, we may say, of those who are kept from wickedness only by dread of the consequences. He will, with his fellow servants, the wicked angels, be sent down finally to Tartarus. But in the end he will be changed in nature and saved ². His final

¹ xx. 8.

² *Hom.* xx. 3: ὁ οὖν πονηρὸς πρὸς τῷ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος κόσμου τέλει ὑπουργήσας ἀμέμπτως τῷ θεῷ, ἅτε δὴ οὐ μιᾶς οὐσίας ἂν τῆς πρὸς κακίαν μόνῃς μετασυγκριθεὶς ἀγαθὸς γενέσθαι δύναται. The proportions in which he is mixed will be altered.

salvation is figured by the rod of Moses, which first turned into a serpent then into a rod again.

The Son, on the contrary, is the agent of the divine Goodness¹. He is emphatically 'not God,' except in that sense in which the title may be given to all mankind as sharing in the image of God, and this 'is no great thing.' He is not God, because he is not the Creator, being himself created. Nevertheless, his position is exalted far above all else in heaven or in earth. He is *ὁμοούσιος*, not with God *per se*, but with that particular modification of the divine essence by which he is engendered, and therefore *ἰσοδύναμος*, not with God *per se*, but with this same modification². He is pre-existent, and therefore eternal, because that which is before the world is before time. To him are applied expressly the promise of Jacob and the prophecy of Emmanuel³. He is the True Prophet, who knows all things past, present, and future, and teaches them not *μανικῶς*, by ecstasy, trance, or vision—this point is emphasised again and again—but by revelation⁴. He alone of all the prophets is called Son of God. He is *Θειότητος γέμων*⁵. 'To us,' it is said, 'there is but One God, who created all things and ordered all things, whose Son is Christ.' The story of the Incarnation is accepted as it is given in St. Matthew⁶. But the most remarkable feature of the doctrine of the Homilies is that Jesus, though the highest, was not the only avatar of the True Prophet. He had been

¹ xvi. 15 sqq.

² *Hom.* xx. 7: *ὁμοούσιον μὴ παρούση τροπῇ προβάλλει, ἰσοδύναμον δὲ οὐ*. Read *τῇ μεο περὶculo* for *μή*, and the passage becomes at once intelligible.

³ xvi. 14.

⁴ ii. 6 sqq.; iii. 13.

⁵ i. 6; xvi. 14.

⁶ The miraculous conception is expressly stated, *Hom.* iii. 17: *θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότος τὸ μέγα καὶ ἅγιον τῆς προγνώσεως αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ τῷ-ὑπὸ χειρῶν αὐτοῦ κυοφορηθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ δῶν τις ἐσχηκέναι, πῶς ἔτι ἐτέρῳ τῷ ἐκ μυσάρῃ σταγόνος γεννηθέντι ὁ ἀπονέμων οὐ τὰ μέγιστα ἀμαρτάνει*; With this agrees the fact that the Homilist in Matt. iii. 17 read *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγάπητος εἰς ὃν ἐδόκησα* τούτου ἀκούετε and not *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, *Hom.* iii. 53. And the Jews were mistaken in thinking Christ Son of David and not Son of God, *Hom.* xviii. 13.

incarnate before in Adam and in Moses, perhaps also in Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. How deeply this peculiar view affects the relation of the Law and the Gospel we shall see as we proceed. His death is spoken of two or three times¹, but no particular value is attached to it in respect of the salvation of man. As regards the Lord Himself His patience in suffering² is the reason why He has been 'anointed with the mercy of God,' 'exalted to be king of all things in air and earth and sea³.' Here, apparently, some sort of a *προκοπή* is intended, but it is hard to see in what precisely it consists. Of the text 'No man knoweth the Father but the Son' it is contemptuously said that it has ten thousand explanations⁴.

In the doctrine of the Fall and Restitution of man there is the same singular mixture—a few philosophic phrases overlying a mass of rabbinical crotchets, beneath which the reader catches sight of a still lower depth of abject superstition. The question, what is the origin of evil, is one of the leading motives of the book, and the answer which our author had picked up from the Apologists is that evil proceeds from the freedom of the will.

But this is only the outside. God created man in His own Image, like Him that is to say in bodily shape; and in His own Likeness, like Him, that is, in intellect and virtue⁵. Adam was a true prophet⁶, and it is blasphemy to assert that he sinned. But Eve, the woman, was of lower, emotional type⁷, and those of her descendants who resembled her were subject to lustful appetites. In their impatience they forgot the great natural law, that children born at certain seasons of the year are necessarily evil⁸. Hence there arose a wicked generation who lost the Likeness of God. This is how our author explains the Hellenic doctrine that sin is ignorance.

Of the same strain with this peculiarly degraded materialism is the demonology of the *Homilies*, by which the explanation

¹ iii. 19, 20; xi. 20.² iii. 20.³ Phil. ii. 10?⁴ xviii. 13.⁵ iii. 20; xi. 4; xvii. 7.⁶ ii. 52.⁷ iii. 24.⁸ xix. 22.

of evil, as it exists in the world, is really completed. Grieved by this revolt of man the angels of the lower sphere¹ went down to earth in the hope of winning the rebels back to their allegiance. But the world was too strong for them. They fell themselves, married the daughters of man, and betrayed to their wives for bridal gifts the secrets of heaven, magic and science. Here we have the explanation of that hatred of intellectual cultivation as a Pandora gift of Satan which Clement of Alexandria resisted with such earnestness. From these ill-assorted nuptials sprang the Giants, who, though not at first evil, fell in their turn through greediness. They tasted blood, and taught men to lust for the same accursed food. Their sin polluted air and earth, caused deadly reptiles and poisonous plants to exist, and brought the deluge upon the world. Nothing strikes the reader of the *Homilies* more than the horror of blood which pervades the whole book. To the author and his people the Bible, and the whole world, seem to reek like a charnel-house. Sin is murder; the earth is full of cruel habitations. The spirits of the dead Giants became demons², who have power over all that 'eat of the demons' table,' taking actual corporal possession of the wretched sinner, 'creeping from the brain down the marrow of the backbone.' So complete is this terrible union that death does not dissolve it. Together the wicked man and his demon are cast into the flames. And there, while the human soul, whose nature is akin to light, writhes in anguish, the demon, whose essence is fiery, bathes with delight in its congenial element. The means of deliverance from this dreadful fate are faith, fasting, mortification, prayer, and incantations, and the knowledge of these salutary remedies we owe to Revelation.

The true faith is revealed through all True Prophets, and the revelation is recorded partly in Scripture, partly in the oral tradition of the Church. But there are also false prophets and delusive revelations. A great part of the Old Testament

¹ viii. 10 sqq.

² viii. 18; ix. 9 sqq.

is peremptorily rejected. The *Homilist* lays down the Platonic axiom¹ that 'nothing unworthy is to be believed of God.' Hence, as he does not, in theory at least, allow the expedient of allegorism, he is driven to conclude that any passage of Scripture that seems to derogate from the majesty of the Supreme is false, and not to be accepted without sin. This conclusion he supports by critical reasons. The Pentateuch was written after the death of Moses², which indeed it records. It was found in the temple five hundred years after that date, and lost again in Nebuchadnezzar's siege. Nor are the canonical prophets to be received without large deductions. It is not denied that they prophesied of Christ³, but they are spoken of with contempt as 'born of woman,' deluded, that is, by trances and visions which, as we have seen, are regarded as hallucinations sent by the Evil One. John the Baptist is treated with absolute aversion⁴ as the founder of Gnosticism. All men's opinions⁵ are to be found in Scripture. Hence one of the most pressing duties of the believer⁶ is to be 'an approved money-changer,' able to distinguish the false coin from the true. This he can accomplish if he gives heed to the authorized interpreters of Holy Writ, such as were the scribes and doctors. But above all others it is the function of Christ, the True Prophet *par excellence*, to winnow genuine from false Scriptures. When he tells us that 'not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law,' it is plain that all that has been abolished—sacrifice, the rule of kings, prophecies delivered by those 'born of woman' (of a temporal bloodshedding Messiah), were vain devices, 'plants which the Heavenly Father hath not planted.' 'Hence it is impossible without his instruction to stand upon saving truth, even if one seeks for ever where the object of his search is not, as it was, and is, in the word of our Jesus.'

If we ask how we know that Jesus is the True Prophet, we are referred to the example of St. Peter, to whom it was revealed,

¹ ii. 38.² iii. 47.³ iii. 49.⁴ ii. 23.⁵ iii. 9.⁶ ii. 51.

not by trance but 'welling up in his mind he knew not how.' But to the earnest seeker a further aid is provided in the doctrine of Syzygies or Antitheses¹. God has created all things double, one against another. First we have the celestial antitheses, in which the better always precedes the worse, heaven and earth, day and night, sun and moon, life and death, light and fire, Adam and Eve. Next come the terrestrial antitheses, in which 'owing to free will,' that is to sin, the order is inverted, so that the worse precedes the better; Cain and Abel, the two spirits of Noah the Raven and the Dove, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, the High Priest and the Legislator, Simon and Peter, Antichrist and Christ. Like much else in this curious system the theory of the antitheses is only half developed. The greatest importance is attached to it, yet we nowhere see clearly in what its importance consists. It seems to be related to the paired aeons of the Valentinians, the Sephiroth of the Sohar. But its place in the system is wholly different. In the *Homilies* the antitheses are merely a mode of the divine working. The idea seems to be that the changes of the Divine Nature are inverted as they stream outwards from the centre to the periphery, and as they flow back from the periphery to the centre of all. In creation the better change precedes the worse, in this world God ever follows up and remedies the confusion caused by man. Hence, while the baser and higher types of religion are ever found in conflict, the mere order of succession is a guide to the truth. But the idea of development is not clearly seized. There is no connection between the different pairs of antitheses, each of which simply repeats the same eternal antagonism of shadow and substance. And in the highest case of all the antagonism is not sufficiently marked. For the teaching of the True Prophet is always the same. The message of Adam and Moses is substantially identical with that of Christ. Hence God accepts both Jew and Christian, provided that the Jew does not hate Christ, the Christian does not dishonour Moses². Yet it is

¹ ii. 15; iii. 16.² viii. 6, 7.

recognised that in some sense Christianity stands higher than the older dispensation. He who admits that both Moses and Christ taught the same truth 'is accounted a man rich in God.' The Gospel has the glory of calling Gentiles to a share in the promises. Again, Baptism is indispensable to salvation. For this a curious reason is given, that the water of regeneration quenches the fiery demon within us, a notion that we shall be justified in connecting with the ancient reading about the fire that burned in Jordan at the Baptism of our Lord¹.

The True Prophet² brings to man all saving truth from the cardinal doctrine of the unity of God down to the names of angels, the knowledge of astrology, of lucky and unlucky seasons, and of incantations for the cure of snake bites. But belief, though the main condition, is not of itself sufficient for salvation. Man must recover the lost likeness of God by virtuous habits, by keeping the Law.

We have already seen that these words are by no means to be taken in their vulgar sense. What we know as the Law is a forgery. The true Law was handed down from Moses orally through the Seventy. Its precepts are³ to pray; to abstain from the table of devils—that is, not to touch blood; to observe the rule of marital control referred to by Ezekiel; to keep the Gospel rule 'whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.' Abstinence from all flesh is recommended by the example of St. Peter, but not enjoined. Circumcision is not mentioned in the book itself, nor the keeping of the Sabbath, but it may with some reason be suspected that both were regarded as obligatory⁴.

¹ *Hom.* xi. 26. Cp. Justin, *Trypho* 88; *Or. Sib.* vi. 6; and Alexandre's Exc. vol. ii. p. 469; Clem. Alex. *Excerpta ex Theol.* 76. 81. Curious points of resemblance between the Valentinians and the *Homilies* occur frequently.

² iii. 36.

³ vii. 4.

⁴ Peter's Preachings (=the *Homilies*) are not to be entrusted to any but a circumcised believer, *Contestatio*. And Clement had become a Jew at Rome before he joined Peter, *Hom.* iv. 22. For the mystery of the Hebdomad, see *Hom.* xvii. 10. The phrase was familiar to Clement of Alexandria, who endeavours to substitute for it 'the Mystery of the Ogdoad,' that is, to put Sunday in the place of the Sabbath.

Other rules of conduct are incidentally introduced. The believer (he is never called a Christian) must bathe himself daily, and not eat with unbelievers. Absolute poverty is commanded¹. Τὰ κτήματα ἁμαρτήματα is the pithy formula in which the rule is embodied. Truth is not a cardinal virtue. In matters of faith it is lawful to dissemble², and even to employ treachery. Except in regard to meat, and probably wine, the standard is not ascetic³. Chastity is highly commended, but it is the chastity of a faithful wife. One chief duty of the priest is to encourage early marriages. It is laid down, as in the Ethics of Aristotle, that all the passions are good⁴ up to a certain point. But the greatest of all moral perfections is φιλανθρωπία⁵, the love of man based on his corporal likeness to God. 'Thou hast seen thy brother, thou hast seen God,' says an apocryphal Gospel of the same tinge, reminding us of the phrase of Novalis, 'I touch heaven when I lay my hand on a human body.' This and all the other virtues ought to flow from the love of God, but it is maintained⁶ against the Gnostics by the *Homilies* as by Clement of Alexandria, that the fear of God also is a high and worthy motive.

A few words may be devoted to the doctrine of the *Homilies* on the final destiny of man. The *Homilist* is no Universalist, though he believed in the ultimate salvation of the Evil One, but, as we have seen, Satan is not one of the demons. The just find eternal rest in the bosom of God. They become all light, so that they may be able to see Him who is Light. The language used does not necessarily imply absorption, though it perhaps tends that way. The wicked and unbelieving (for piety will not avail those who have rejected the truth) are punished in the fire. There are passages in which the eternity of punishment is most strongly expressed⁷, but there are others of a very different tenor. The believer will be saved eventually.

¹ xv. 7 sqq.

² xiii. 13.

³ Peter's diet is bread, olives, and herbs, *Hom.* xii. 6; but no command is laid down.

⁴ xx. 4.

⁵ xii.

⁶ xvii. 12.

⁷ E. g. xi. 11.

He may have fallen into apostasy or committed any other crime, yet repentance will save him. He must indeed be punished in strict proportion to his sins, and, if this atonement has not been completed in this life, it must be suffered to the full in the life to come¹. Those who do not repent will be tormented for the 'fifth part of a measured aeon,' and then annihilated. This is quite Stoic. Apparently the Resurrection of the Body is confined to the just alone². The view of Forgiveness explained here has, as we shall see, some, though a vague, bearing on the question of date.

II. The Church of the *Homilies* possesses a well-developed Hierarchy³ of Bishops, Priests⁴, and Deacons, to which may be added Catechists and Widows. Of the Bishop it is said that he sits in the seat of Christ. Special stress is laid on the duty of providing for the payment of the clergy. But it is unnecessary to be more particular; the clerical order is that which we find in the time of Origen. Of the Sacraments which the clergy administer, one, Baptism, is spoken of in a way that (except in one particular to be noticed hereafter) does not differ from that usual in Catholic theology; but side by side with this there is a daily bath or baptism, which evidently has a high religious value. Yet the author is not a Hemerobaptist, for he speaks of that sect⁵ with contempt. But the Eucharist is daily, is the ordinary evening meal, and consists of bread, salt, and certainly water⁶. In addition to these there is

¹ iii. 6.

² The idea seems to be that the *voûs* is the Seal or Form of the Body, *Hom.* xx. 6; cp. xvii. 7, so that man's retention of the divine Image depends on his not losing the divine Likeness beyond possibility of recovery. See also xvi. 10, 19.

³ iii. 59 sqq.

⁴ The number of Presbyters under each Bishop is twelve, *Hom.* xi. 36. The number of Deacons is not stated in *Homilies*, but *Recog.* iii. 66, it is four. For the twelve Presbyters cp. the usage at Alexandria, and *Duae Viae* in Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra Can. Rec.* ii. p. 116.

⁵ ii. 23.

⁶ For the Sacrament of Bread and Salt (neither water nor wine is mentioned, but, if any cup was used, there can be no doubt that it contained water) see *Contest* 4; *Clem. ad Jac.* 9; *Hom.* i. 22; iv. 26; xi. 34, 36; xiii. 11. At iv. 6, Clement eats this sacramental meal before he is baptized; but this is

another sacrament, an initiatory oath by the four elements, earth, air, fire, and water, to be taken by every one admitted to the sect. James is Head of the Church, but apparently this primacy is to pass to Peter and Clement as his successor. Yet by the side of the ordinary hierarchy we read of a Council of Seventy¹ who keep watch and ward over the orthodoxy of the Church, after the model of the Seventy Jewish Elders.

This is the most difficult and perplexing portion of this singular work, and it is just here that we get a glimpse into its real origin. The *Homilies* are deeply tinged by the influence of Elxai's Book of Mormon. Any one who reads the fragments of that book will feel it to be impossible that the high Catholic hierarchy² can belong to the same block as the daily bath, the communion of bread and salt, the masonic oath, and the Seventy Elders. Even in Eastern Syria we cannot believe without the clearest historical evidence that so incongruous a combination actually existed. The *Homilies* are surely the work of a Catholic convert to Ebionitism, who thought he saw in the doctrine of the Two Powers the only tenable answer to Gnosticism. We can separate his Catholicism from his Ebionitism just as surely as his Stoicism.

III. It is unnecessary for my present purpose to state in detail the argument against Gnosticism as it is delivered in the *Homilies*³. But this is the proper connection in which to

perhaps an oversight. The phrase *εὐχαριστίαν κλάσαι* occurs xi. 36, xiv. 1; but it refers to the same thing.

¹ *Ep. Petri ad Jac.*

² *Πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οὗτοι ἔχουσι*, says Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 18), *καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους. Συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν.* Let the reader compare this with *Hom.* iii. 67.

³ There are however some points in the treatment of Gnosticism in the *Homilies* which call for notice. Those who read attentively the discussion on the Evil One in Homily xix. will, I think, perceive that what Simon Magus really maintains there is that it is impossible to speak evil of Gnosticism and yet believe in a Devil; that orthodox Christians do in fact admit the existence of a bad God, and therefore *ought* to be Gnostics. I do not remember to have seen this argument advanced elsewhere. Next, the *Homilist* attributes to Simon a peculiar veneration for the moon. He is surrounded by a band of 29½ followers (29 men and one woman, Helen, of whom it is said that she is equal to half a man) corresponding to the days

speak of the author's relation to St. Paul. The view here taken of his position will help us better to understand his famous attack upon the great apostle of the Gentiles.

The attack is made from a peculiar and unexpected quarter. It is directed not primarily against St. Paul's treatment of the Law, for the *Homilist* himself is a heretic on this point, but against his Revelation. St. Peter is represented¹ as arguing the question of Ecstasy with Simon. The Ineffable God of the Gnostic is not revealed in scripture, and can therefore be known only by direct vision. But visions, the apostle maintains, far from being sent by God, are delusions of the evil spirit. 'Therefore, if to thee also Jesus was made known in a vision, He appeared to thee in a vision and in dreams because He was angry with thee as an adversary.' 'If thou wast seen of Him and made His disciple in one brief hour, preach

of the lunar month. In the *Recognitions* Helen is called Luna, and this identification so clearly underlies the *Homilies* that it was no doubt found in the *Grundschrift*. Hence also Simon keeps a curious Sabbath every eleventh day (ii. 35), on the 10th, 20th, and 30th of the month. One speaking sign of the comparative lateness of the *Recognitions* is the fact that the author of that book was perplexed by this singular usage, and mistranslates the passage where it is mentioned—i. 20, 'Differt Simon certaminis diem in undecimum mensis praesentis quae est post septem dies (in the *Homilies* we read 'Ανατίθεται Σίμων τὴν ζήητσιν εἰς τὴν αὐρίον ἡμέραν· ἡ γὰρ σήμερον τὸ δι' ἔνδεκα ἡμερῶν αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει σάββατον). Thirdly, Simon differs from Marcion, Basilides, and Valentinus, in that he does not believe in our Lord. Jesus was the Son of the Demiurge, xviii. 4, and sometimes 'did not know what he was saying,' xviii. 11. This is a cardinal point, and must baffle all attempts to represent Simon as teaching the doctrines, or maintaining the position of any one of the three great heresiarchs. Simon actually alleges that he is himself the true or eternal Christ (as opposed to Jesus), *χριστὸν ἑαυτὸν αἰνισσόμενος ἐστῶτα προσαγορεύει*. Here we have both agreement and disagreement with Hippolytus. According to that writer (*Philos.* vi. 13, 14) Simon claimed to be the *ἐστῶς, στάς, στησόμενος*, not God Himself, but the Seventh Power of God, which from eternity existed in God, and was His *εἰκὼν*. But then again, according to Hippolytus (*ibid.* 19), Simon said that he had been in Jesus. This is in direct contradiction to the *Homilies*. Add to all this that the *Homilies* represent John the Baptist as the antagonist of our Lord, the founder of Gnosticism and the teacher of Simon, and it will be seen that we have here an account of Simon quite independent of that given by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, or Epiphanius. Possibly some of my readers may be able to throw more light on these obscure and curious points.

¹ xvii. 13 sqq.

His words, explain His doctrine, love His apostles, fight not against one who lived with Him.' 'If thou callest me condemned' (the very word applied by St. Paul to St. Peter in *Galatians*), 'thou accusest God who revealed unto me the Christ.' The meaning of all this is hardly doubtful when we reflect that Simon Magus does not believe in Jesus at all, and further observe that the passage has been so remodelled in the *Recognitions* that all taint of its original virus has been neutralised. 'Lawlessness' is indeed attributed to St. Paul, again under the person of Simon. In the prefatory letter to St. James, St. Peter complains that 'certain of the Gentiles have rejected my legal preaching, and embraced a lawless and absurd doctrine of the enemy.' But 'lawlessness' is to be understood not in the sense of the orthodox Pharisaic opponents of the apostle, but in one something like that of those wholly different antagonists who are denounced in *Colossians*, and the charge rests quite as much on the way in which Adam is spoken of by St. Paul as the author of sin and death as on anything else. It is needless at this date to enter upon the Paul-Magus theory of the Tübingen school. All I need do is to place these covert thrusts at the apostle side by side with the frequent and respectful allusions to the Pauline Epistles that occur scattered up and down the *Homilies*¹. It is evident that the author had read St. Paul, and that he regarded him as a teacher of the Church, though he resented with some

¹ Many of the passages referred to by Lagarde show only a similarity of vocabulary and turns of expression. But the general result is to prove abundantly that the Epistles of St. Paul were familiar to the Homilist. Let the reader compare in particular the following passages:—*Hom.* iii. 32 = *Rom.* iv. 17; *Hom.* iv. 24 = 1 *Cor.* xv. 33 (φθείρουσιν ἡθὴ χρηστὰ ὀμιλία κακά); *Hom.* v. 26 = 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12 (ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ); *Hom.* vii. 3 = 1 *Cor.* x. 21 (table of devils); *Hom.* xiii. 18 = 1 *Cor.* vii. 3 (τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν, the text of KL and the Syriac versions: this is not noticed by Lagarde); *Hom.* xvi. 19 = *Rom.* viii. 22 (this also is not in Lagarde's list). It will be remembered that a direct quotation from St. Paul would be an anachronism. Origen tells us, *Contra Celsum*, v. 65, that neither of the two Ebionite sects which he distinguishes admitted the Epistles of St. Paul: again, *Hom. in Psalm lxxxii* apud Eus. *H. E.* vi. 38, that Ελχαὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον τέλεον ἀθετεῖ.

fierceness any attempt to set his authority on a level with that of St. Peter. Here again we trace the hand of the convert, who in passing over to his new sect has not been able to divest himself wholly of the reverence, which he had been accustomed to feel for his old master.

IV. We need not dwell at any length either upon the argument against Heathenism, though it has attracted less attention than it deserves. The author has skimmed the cream of the Apologists, and brings out all their best points with considerable skill. What strikes the reader is that the debate has already reached an advanced stage. There is scarcely an allusion to persecution¹, and no allusion at all to the old slanders of disloyalty, child-murder, indecent orgies, and so forth. Many of the topics² are of a distinctly late type—that Christians are no better than other men, that a good citizen ought not to abandon the ways of his fathers, but that it is possible to worship the true God and yet pay due respect to inferior deities, just as it is possible to obey a proconsul without disloyalty to Caesar, that idolatry is no degradation because every sensible person distinguishes between the idol and the deity of whom it is merely a visible sign. Another argument in favour of Heathenism that is here attacked is drawn from the cheerfulness of idolatry. Generally speaking the mode in which the debate is conducted points to that time when Heathenism was standing upon its defence. And arguments like these cannot have emanated from the bosom of an obscure Eastern sect. Here again we seem to catch sight of the convert, of one not unfamiliar with the books and conversation of the educated Christian world.

V. It remains for us to gather as accurate an idea as we can of the origin, date, birthplace, and purpose of this singular book. But the reader will not expect me to discuss at ade-

¹ *Ep. Clem. ad Jac.* 9 τοῖς ἐν φυλακαῖς: *ibid.* 15, ἀθηνούντες, διωκόμενοι, σκορπιζόμενοι, πεινῶντες, διψῶντες, γυμνητεύοντες. *Hom.* iii. 69, τοῖς ἐν εἰρκταῖς ὡς δυνατὸν βοηθήσετε. *Hom.* x. 8 οὐκ ἔωσιν ἡμᾶς τοῦτο ποιῆσαι οἱ τῶν ἐφ' ἐστῶτων νόμοι. Such phrases afford no indication of date. They may be merely part of the setting of the story.

² x, xi.

quate length all the intricate questions that arise. At this point we quit the firm ground of fact for the vague and conjectural. It would be an endless task to examine the endless hypotheses that have been spun about the *Homilies*. Enough will have been done, if I indicate in a general way the conclusions that appear to me most probable.

As to the origin of the main doctrinal system of the Homilies there can indeed be little doubt. The leading ideas are those described by Epiphanius as held, with variations in detail, by a community or group of communities whose principal settlement was in Batanaea and the vicinity, but whose offshoots were to be found in a sporadic way as far west as Cyprus. The region east of Jordan was a hotbed of sects, which crossed and recrossed one another in a way defying accurate classification. Where there are fanaticism and ignorance enough the most minute differences will become a *casus belli*, and so we have seen that the Homilist, though he insists upon the daily bath, is at daggers drawn with the Hemerobaptists. Epiphanius knew more about these people than anybody else, having spent much time in the neighbourhood, but he is not a scientific observer, and they made it a point of conscience to baffle enquiries even by downright lying, as the Druses do still. He calls them Ebionites, and regards this title as derived from the name of Ebion their founder. But it may mean nothing more than 'Poor Men,' voluntary poverty being, as we have seen, an article in their creed¹.

They were historically connected, no doubt, with the Essenes, but here again we are groping in darkness. For what precisely were the Essenes? According to Frankel²

¹ See Epiph. *Haer.* xviii. xxx: and, for the difficulty of accurately distinguishing the names Ebionites, Nazoraei, Nasaraei, Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiph.*

² On the subject of the Essenes the reader should consult Lightfoot's *Colossians*, where all that is known or has been conjectured with respect to this interesting people will be found. Frankel supported his view that the Essenes were merely an offshoot of Pharisaism by a host of quotations from the rabbinical books. The late Bishop of Durham has subjected these passages to a searching examination, and arrives at the conclusion that the Talmud

they were merely Pharisee ascetics, differing from ordinary Pharisees much in the same way as monks from ordinary Christians. They may well have held all those parts of the doctrine of the *Homilies* that can be traced in the rabbinical schools, Anthropomorphism, the Two Powers, the union of the masculine and feminine in God. As ascetics they would add to this foundation the initiatory oath, the practice of poverty and of abstinence from flesh and wine, and doubtless great importance was attached to the knowledge of the names and attributes of the angels. But the Essenes did not forbid sacrifice, though, as they held that the water of purification was not rightly prepared, they would not set foot in the Temple Courts. They did not however object to send sacrifices to the Temple for others to offer on their behalf. They appear also to have employed allegorism in the interpretation of Scripture, that is to say, to have accepted the whole Jewish Bible, and to have hoped by rigid self-mortification to attain to miraculous gifts, and especially

makes no mention of Essenism at all. *Non nostrum tantas decernere lites*. Yet may we not venture to think that even if the Bishop is right, Frankel, though wrong in his premisses, must be right in his conclusion? Would it have been possible for the Talmud to pass over in absolute silence a numerous (Philo says there were more than 4000 of them) sect which attracted a good deal of admiration, yet regarded the greater part of Scripture as of diabolical origin, and treated sacrifice as a sin? Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 1. 5) is generally understood to mean that they did occasionally send the usual sacrifices to be offered on their behalf in the Temple, though they would not enter the Temple themselves, and Philo's statement (ii. 457, *Quod omnis probus liber* 12) that they did not sacrifice animals need not be understood as directly contradicting this. They may have done by others what they would not do with their own hands. Again, Philo tells us (*ibid.* 458) that they were diligent expounders of Scripture, which they treated allegorically (τὰ γὰρ πλείστα διὰ συμβόλων ἀρχαιοτρόπῳ ἡλώσει παρ' αὐτοῖς φιλοσοφεῖται). This is expressly stated also of the Therapeutae (ii. 483 *de vita contemp.* 10). Now, if they allegorised, they did not reject the ceremonial law, nor can they have treated sacrifice *sans façon* as a sin. Yet their isolated life, built as it was on the exaggerated dread of pollution, and allegorism itself, would lead them in this direction, and any violent shock would precipitate this conclusion. Such a crisis might well be produced by the destruction of the Temple, from which accordingly Epiphanius dates the origin of Ebionitism proper.

to revelations in dreams. In these latter points there is a wide difference between their teaching and that of the *Homilies*.

For those Essenes who accepted Christianity a terrible crisis must have come with the destruction of the Temple. Accordingly it is to this date that Epiphanius ascribes the origin of the Ebionites¹. Jews at heart they had been and remained, but the downfall of the Temple broke the last link between them and the Catholic Church, and destroyed at the same time their old Pharisaic belief in the divine origin of the Law. Their previous isolation perhaps compelled, certainly induced them, to interpret this soul-shaking catastrophe not as a transfiguration of the past, but as the divine judgment of condemnation upon it. In the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, the *Praedicatio Petri*, the *Constitutions of the Apostles*², we find the belief that sacrifice never had been commanded by God, and was in fact a national sin, and this belief must have been current among some Jewish Christians early in the second century. Epiphanius seems to have found it also in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and in the *Ascents of James*, two books which enjoyed a high authority among the Ebionites. By those who fully accepted this view the Old Testament was necessarily interpreted as it is in the *Homilies*, and even circumcision and the Sabbath could hardly be insisted upon with the old exclusiveness. Allegorism was cast away, with its evil, but also with its good. The key to the unity of Scripture was lost. Further sympathy with Catholicism was out of the question, and Ebionitism was henceforward a withered branch.

So matters went on until the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, when new convulsions shook the

¹ *Haer.* xxx. 2.

² *Barn.* ii. 9; *Ep. ad Diog.* iii. iv.: *Praed. Petri* in *Clem. Alex. Strom.* vi. 5. 41. Irenaeus, iv. 15, distinguishes between the Decalogue, which was of eternal observance, and the ceremonial law imposed after the worship of the calf, which 'in servitutis iugo dominabatur eis.' The *Const. App.* calls the first νόμος, the second δευτέρωσις, i. 6; ii. 5. The other references are to Epiph. *Haer.* xix. 3; xxx. 16.

minds of men in these secluded districts. A crop of prophets arose about this time. For whether Elxai and Iexai, Marthus and Marthana, were real personages or not, the names are a proof of living agencies that were at work. Hence the book of Elxai, partly perhaps a mere record of existing facts, partly also a new development. Armed and animated by this revelation, the Ebionites awoke from sleep and aimed at nothing less than the conquest of the world. The book of Elxai was carried to Rome by Alexander of Apamea, somewhere about A.D. 220. It contained all that is needed to complete the original system of the *Homilies*, the Seven Witnesses, the sacrament of salt, the rejection of the Prophets, the Adam-Christ. Apamea, the starting-point of Alexander, was a place where philosophy joined hands gladly with mysticism, and is of importance in the history of Neo-Platonism.

Did Alexander write the *Homilies*? And if not, when, where, by whom, was this singular book composed? These are questions that naturally arise, and to which some kind of answer must be found. But a closer glance into the structure of the work, as it now exists, shows that there is yet another question that must, at any rate, be touched upon, before we can safely embark upon any of these. For the *Homilies* has not come down to us in its original form; and, before we can advance another step, it is necessary to form as accurate a conception as circumstances will allow, of that which preceded and underlies it.

What this was precisely it is most difficult to say, and a full investigation of all the points involved would carry us far beyond the limit of such a paper as this. It will be sufficient perhaps if those conclusions, which may be maintained with some confidence, are briefly stated.

An examination of the *Homilies* itself will demonstrate that there have been two large alterations in the plan of the book. The dispute which Peter holds with Simon Magus at Laodicea was originally represented as held at

Caesarea¹, and the dispute between Clement and Appion is a later addition².

A careful comparison of the *Homilies* with the *Recognitions* tells us something farther. There was an earlier book, which in some points is more closely followed by the *Homilies*³, in others by the *Recognitions*⁴.

Yet again there can be no reasonable doubt that the whole of the *Homilies*, as we now possess it, including the shifting of the Laodicean debate and the addition of the Appion debate, was well known to the author of the *Recognitions*⁵.

¹ There are many proofs of this. (1) The reappearance of Zacchaeus (xvii. 1), who had been left behind as Bishop at Caesarea; (2) Peter at Caesarea (iii. 10) says that the dispute with Simon *περὶ μοναρχίας* is to be held *αὐριον*. It is not however held till long afterwards at Laodicea. (3) The dispute at Caesarea is said (iii. 58) to last *three* days. It only lasts *one*. (4) Peter is said (xvii. 5) to have discoursed about Visions *ἐχθές*. We gather from *Recognitions* that this discourse was held at Caesarea, but in the present *Homilies* it comes later on, in *Homily* xvii. (5) Faustus, the father of Clement, is changed into the shape of Simon Magus (xx. 15) *one day* after he had recovered his wife and children. But in the present arrangement of the book several days of discussion intervene.

² In *Recognitions* twelve disciples are sent on from Caesarea to pursue Simon Magus, while Clement, Nicetes, and Aquila remain with Peter. In *Homilies* Clement, Nicetes, and Aquila are sent in pursuit. The object of this arrangement is obviously to provide a clear field for Clement's dispute with Appion, and avoid the awkwardness of making Peter stand by as a mere spectator. But in *Hom.* viii. 1-3 we read how Peter was rejoined at Tripolis by the *twelve brethren*, who had been sent on in advance. Dr. Salmon has noticed also that in the beginning of *Hom.* xii. it is implied that Clement had never been separated from Peter.

³ The *Recognitions* has departed from the original most distinctly by inserting the long debate on Genesis between Clement and his father (*Recogn.* ix. The sections 17-29 are from Bardesanes). For in both *Hom.* xx. 21 and *Recogn.* x. 63, this dispute is to be held at Antioch between Clement and Anubion.

⁴ The simplest proof of this is to be found in *Hom.* xii. 5 (cp. *Recogn.* vii. 5), where Clement refers to a previous saying of Peter, *εἴ τις βούλεται μοι συνοδεύειν εἰσεβῶς συνοδεύετω*. This saying is found, in its proper place, in *Recogn.* iii. 72, but has disappeared from the *Homilies*, though there is something like it in *Hom.* i. 16.

⁵ The three most remarkable peculiarities of the *Homilies* are (1) the account of the forged *περικοπαί* of Scripture, given by Peter at Caesarea; (2) the debate with Appion; (3) the debate on the Evil One at Laodicea. All three are dropped in the *Recognitions*, yet all three were well known to

Can we form any reasonably tenable hypothesis which shall reconcile these complicated phenomena? Many answers have been given which the reader, if he is not already acquainted with them, may easily learn for himself. Many as they are, perhaps tolerance may be extended to a new one.

It is this:—that the *Homilies* as we have it, is a recast of an orthodox work by a highly unorthodox editor. The evidence for this conclusion is already before the reader's eye. Why should an Ebionite have pitched upon Clement for his hero? Why should Clement be made to succeed Peter as Bishop of Rome? How can we account for the widespread popularity of the Romance, if it was first launched upon the world under these sinister auspices? Where does the Hierarchy come from, and the Apologetics, and in particular the Appion debate

the author or editor of that book. (1) The account of the forged *περικοναί* he excised as destroying the authority of Scripture, and in its place inserted the long historical episode which some have regarded as drawn from the *Ascents of James*. In this passage the history is carried down to seven years after the Resurrection. But both in the *Homilies* and in the *Recognitions* the action of the book takes place *in the year after the Resurrection*. Again, *Recogn.* i. 74, Peter winds up the passage with the words 'tū etiam scriptae legis per singula quaeque capitula quorum ratio poscebat secretiorem tibi intelligentiam patefeci.' These words can only be regarded as referring to the forged *περικοναί*, which, as has been said, are not discussed at all in *Recognitions*. Observe further that Thomas is omitted (*Recogn.* ii. 1) from the list of Peter's companions. The reason for this is to be found in the extract from Bardesanes (*Recogn.* ix. 29), where we learn that Thomas is preaching the Gospel in Parthia. The two passages were altered at the same time. (2) The debate with Appion is omitted in *Recognitions*, but it is made large use of in a later passage. Compare *Hom.* vi. 14, 15 with *Recogn.* x. 41; *Hom.* v. 13 with *Recogn.* x. 22. It does not seem to me capable of any reasonable doubt that the *Homilies* is here the more original. (3) The discussion on the Evil One is omitted in *Recognitions* for obvious reasons, yet the most peculiar of the doctrines contained in that discussion are hinted at in scattered phrases. See especially *Recogn.* ix. 9, where the singular notion of unlucky seasons of generation is enunciated. The mere omission of this discussion brings the chronology of the *Recognitions* right, so that only 'one day' intervenes between the recognition of the father of Clement and his magical transformation. But Uhlhorn points out even here a remarkable and conclusive slip in *Recognitions* x. 52, 'ingressus quidam nunciat Appionem Plistonicensē cum Anubione nuper venisse ab Antiochia et hospitari cum Simone.' This accords with *Hom.* xx. 11; but as things are narrated in *Recognitions*, Simon is at this very time at Antioch.

which is written in better Greek by a much clearer brain, and with a more lively fancy than the rest of the *Homilies*? For though where it stands this particular passage is a later addition, there is no reason why it should not have been taken from the same source that had already been laid under contribution. It is highly probable that we have the same phenomenon, the same recurrence to the original, in the *Recognitions* also; and there too, when we get a glimpse of it, the original seems to be more orthodox in tone than the recast¹.

But it will be asked, Is there any positive evidence of the existence of such an orthodox work? Undoubtedly there is. At a later date we know that there existed a catholic *Clementina*, which appears to have driven the *Homilies* out of circulation. It is to this that the Scholiast on Eusebius refers, when he expresses his amazement that any one should find false doctrine in the dialogues of Clement². It was known to Nicephorus, Cedrenus, and Glycas, and the first of these writers tells us that it was 'well received' by the Church³. It is to this probably that Origen refers in the *Contra Celsum*, when he speaks of the dispute between Clement

¹ It is a somewhat complicated theory, and involves the following propositions:—(1) that the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions* presuppose a common *Grundschrift*; (2) that the author of *Homilies* (or possibly another writer), dissatisfied with the first form of his own work, went back to this *Grundschrift* for the debate with Appion; (3) that the author of *Recognitions* had before him both the *Homilies* as we possess it and the *Grundschrift*. This theory, which is Uhlhorn's, seems to be the only one that will reconcile all the phenomena. I differ from Uhlhorn only in thinking that the *Grundschrift* was in the main a Catholic production.

² On Eus. *H. E.* iii. 38. 5 (in Heinichen). Eusebius is referring to a book recently published under the name of Clement, and containing 'dialogues of Peter and Appion.' I understand him to mean the *Homilies*, though in that case his expression is inaccurate, for the dialogue is held between *Clement* and Appion. Other references to a 'disputatio Petri et Appionis,' I regard as simply based on this careless phrase of Eusebius.

³ Uhlhorn, pp. 51 sqq. The Athanasian *Synopsis*, written shortly after the death of Athanasius (Bleek), or even later (Uhlhorn), enumerates three books—Περίοδοι Πέτρου, Κλημέντια, ἐξ ὧν μετεφράσθησαν τὰ ἀληθέστερα καὶ θεόπνευστα—and regards the orthodox *Clementina* as a recast of the *Hom.* or *Recogn.* In my opinion it was the other way about.

and his father at Laodicea on the subject of astrology. For though this dispute is found in the *Recognitions*, it is demonstrably an addition there, and may be, probably is, one of those recurrences to the original already spoken of¹. In the *Comm. on Genesis*, again, Origen quotes as from book xiv. of Clement of Rome, a passage substantially agreeing with *Rec.* x. 10-12². We see here that the book to which he is referring differed from the *Recognitions* in arrangement. Again, in the *Comm. on Matthew*, he cites from the same source words to the effect that 'good works profit the infidel in this life, but not in the life to come'³. In the *Recognitions* and in the *Homilies* the same opinion is enunciated, but as regards works of chastity alone. Origen's authority therefore differed from both, and it is surely impossible that he should have made use of either of these most singular books without a word to put the reader on his guard. Again, Jerome tells us that the *Periodi* of Clement represented Peter as bald, and as having a daughter⁴. He too says nothing about the general character of this book, which can therefore hardly have been violently unorthodox. And neither statement about Peter is found in the *Homilies* or in the *Recognitions*. It is this same book, we may believe, that is referred to also in the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*⁵. Surely the writer there cannot be making use of the *Homilies* in the very passage where he represents Peter as declaring so emphatically that Christians did not regard their Lord as 'a mere man,' as 'a holy man and prophet.'

¹ The reference is to *Philocalia* xxii. *ad fin.* But I now notice, on a closer inspection, that the concluding sentences of this chapter of *Philoc.* are not from the *Celsus*. Doubtless they were added by the editors Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.

² *In Gen. Comm.* iii. 14 (Lomm. viii. 41).

³ *In Matt. Comm. Series* 77 (Lomm. iv. 401). Uhlhorn thinks that Origen is quoting the other edition of *Recognitions* known to Rufinus.

⁴ Hieron. *adv. Jovinianum* 15 (ed. Martian. iv. 118); *Comm. ad Gal.* i. 18 (ed. Martian. ii. 235).

⁵ *Const. App.* vi. 8. Lagarde (Preface, p. 8) thinks that the Homilist made use of the *Constitutions*.

What this orthodox *Clementina* included it is difficult to say with precision. In the *Const. App.* St. Peter tells us how he held a three days' discussion with Simon Magus at Caesarea surrounded by the same followers who appear in the *Homilies*, Zacchaeus, Barnabas, 'and Nicetes and Aquila, brothers of Clement the Roman Bishop and citizen.' Nothing is said of the father and mother or the reunion of the family, but it is surely implied. Nothing is said either of any discussion except that at Caesarea, but this is an omission that may be accounted for. The story went on to tell how Peter pursued Simon Magus to Rome, how there Simon attempted to fly through the air in the theatre, how at Peter's prayer his magical powers deserted him, so that he fell to the ground and was killed. This contest in Rome was known to the editors of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, though they do no more than allude to it. But both books are, on their own showing, based on an original that gave more of the story than they do. For in both we are promised a debate on Genesis between Clement and Anubion at Antioch which never comes off. In the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* the debate at Caesarea lasts three days, as it does in the *Recognitions*, and ought to do but does not in the *Homilies*. But in the *Constitutions* the subjects are (εἰς τὸν περὶ προφήτου λόγον καὶ περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας) Christ as the Prophet or subject of Prophecy, and Gnosticism. Both are treated of in a very peculiar way in the *Homilies*, Gnosticism alone in the *Recognitions*. But just in this passage it so happens that we can show with tolerable certainty that the author of the *Recognitions* was acquainted with the *Homilies*, that he turned away from the *Homilies*, and that he reverted to an older authority. For he has dropped the Homilist's teaching about the forged Scriptures, and introduced in its place a long historical episode, ruining his own chronology by doing so. And he has taken from his other authority a fine argument against Gnostic Ecstasy, which we know that the author of the *Homilies* must have found in this place. It is probable then that the orthodox *Clementina*, in

its Caesarean section, contained the Christian argument from Prophecy, and a discussion on general and philosophic grounds of the leading topics of Gnosticism. Besides this, we are pretty certain that it contained the debate on Mythology between Clement and Appion, which has been thrust into the *Homilies* as an afterthought with some damage to the framework of that book¹. In addition, it possibly recorded a discussion between Clement and Anubion at Antioch. Beyond this it would be dangerous to venture, but any one who reads the curious farrago described in the foregoing pages, where the oil of civilised orthodoxy and the water of fantastic Ebionitism meet, but do not blend, will be able to form a pretty accurate opinion as to the source of each of these elements.

The date of the orthodox *Clementina* must not be fixed too early. It contained the Clement legend, which is not much older than Tertullian, and the argument against Heathenism is, as we have noticed, of a late type. On the other hand, it must be placed before the middle age of Origen. We shall not go far wrong if we assume it to have come into existence not much before and not much after 200 A.D. It was seized upon, altered and adapted by an Ebionite, probably a convert to Ebionitism, at a later time, we do not know when, but shortly before Eusebius wrote his History.

Can we fix the date of this recasting with more exactness? It is not easy to throw any clear light on this question. The author adhered with great strictness to his plan, and except the New Testament quotations and a reference to the worship of Antinous in Egypt², there is no distinct anachronism. There are, however, two points that may help us, one arising from the doctrine of Baptism, another from the Christology, both connected with the distinctively Ebionite portion of the *Homilies*.

It was by no accident that Alexander of Apamea set out for Rome at the time that he did. Every Oriental quack, as

¹ Uhlhorn, p. 57.

Hom. vi. 23.

Juvenal tells us, made his way to the banks of the Tiber sooner or later. But the time was peculiarly favourable for his new Gospel. Elagabalus had just built a grand temple to the god from whom he derived his name, and was anxious above all things to attract to that shrine the devotion of 'Jews and Samaritans¹.' In 222 Alexander Severus ascended the throne and placed the bust of Christ in his Lararium side by side with Apollonius, Abraham, Orpheus, and others. Clearly there was an opening for the Apamean here. He might reasonably look for his share of imperial patronage and imperial gold. And if we glance at the state of Catholicism in Rome at that time, we shall discern yet another reason that may have operated as a magnet. For at this very juncture the Church was agitated by those hot disputes on the subject of Penance which first emerged in Hermas and culminated in the Novatian schism. In the early days of Alexander Severus the contest was raging with intense heat. Callistus (possibly carrying on the policy of his predecessor Zephyrinus) had declared that absolution should not be refused to those who after baptism had been guilty of sins of impurity, on condition of course of repentance and submission to discipline. The consequence of this lenity appears to have been a temporary disruption of the Church, and the elevation of Hippolytus as the first Anti-pope. It would be in the midst of this storm that Alexander of Apamea arrived in Rome, bringing with him his new gospel, the volume which had been dictated to Elxai among the Seres of Parthia by an angel ninety-six miles high. The particular article of this revelation on which he relied for success was a Baptism which washed away all, even the most hideous sins, without any discipline or penance at all². Such an improvement on the terms of Callistus might be expected to win over many of the looser Christians, and was not unlikely to prove a tempting inducement to Pagans of the reformed school, who were familiar enough with the idea of expiatory lustrations, and would be rather attracted

¹ Lampridius, *Ant. Hel.* 3.

² *Hom.* xi. 26, 27.

than repelled by those concomitants that seem to us, as they seemed to Hippolytus, so senseless and degrading, the astrology, the oath of secrecy, the incantations for use against the bite of a mad dog. What success befel Alexander we do not know, but it is likely enough that he made converts, and by one of them, or indeed by himself, we might suppose, without absurdity, that the *Homilies* had been manufactured as a popular exposition of the new creed.

Nevertheless this does not commend itself as the most plausible supposition. We have no reason to think that the book was ever known at Rome. Such indications as we can gather point rather to the Levant as its birthplace. A case might be made out for Egypt, when we consider that the name of Clement of Rome was highly respected in that country, that many of the ideas of the *Homilies* were familiar to Clement of Alexandria¹, and that the author displays considerable acquaintance with Egyptian lore. 'I could show,' he says in one place 'the absurdity of Egyptian allegorism *if I were there*².' Is not this exactly how a romancer would write if he actually *was* there? Notice again that the number of priests attached to a Bishop is always twelve, as at Alexandria,

¹ For instance, that the Demons *ἔξείπον τὰ ἀπόρρητα ταῖς γυναίξιν*, *Strom.* v. 1. 10: the distinction between *εἰκὼν* and *ὁμοίωσις* of God is held by 'some of ours,' *Strom.* ii. 22. 13: certain heretics have raised the question, *πότερον τέλειος ἐπλάσθη ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἢ ἀτελής*; *Strom.* vi. 12, 96: *μὴ τοίνυν λεγόντων ὡς ὁ ἀδικῶν καὶ ἁμαρτάνων κατ' ἐνέργειαν δαιμόνων πλημμυλεῖ*, *Strom.* vi. 12. 98: *αἱ κτήσεις γὰρ καὶ χρήσεις τῶν ἀναγκαίων οὐ τὴν ποιότητα ἔχουσι βλαβεράν ἀλλὰ τὴν παρὰ τὸ μέτρον ποσότητα*, *Strom.* vi. 12, 99: Anthropomorphism is an *ἄθεος ἐφορία*, *Strom.* vi. 12. 114; 16. 136. The juxtaposition of the last four points suggests that Clement had in view some system in which all were maintained. Again, *Strom.* vi. 9. 72, by virtue of *νοῦς* man is *θεοειδής*, God is *ἀνθρωποειδής*. *παρ' ὃ καὶ οἱ εἰς ἀνθρώπον ἁμαρτάνοντες ἀνόσιοί τε καὶ ἀσεβεῖς*. So the *Homilies* base the obligation of justice and charity on the existence of the Divine Image in man. Common to Clement and the *Homilies* are the phrase *ἐβδομάδος μυστήριον* *Hom.* xvii. 9; *Strom.* iv. 17. 109; vi. 14. 108, and certain Scriptural quotations of a peculiar cast, notably, *γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπέζιται* and *μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοί*, *Hom.* xix. 20; *Strom.* v. 10. 63. The last is from Theodotion's translation of Isaiah xxiv. 16, but is taken by Clement from 'a certain Gospel.'

² *Hom.* x. 18.

and that the author rather goes out of his way to inform us that the gospel was first preached in the Egyptian capital not by Mark but by Barnabas. Yet I doubt if he would have spoken of want of rain as one of God's judgments upon sin in the rainless land of Egypt¹, or if he would have mentioned Alexandria only as the place where Simon Magus was indoctrinated in the black art if he had himself been a student in the Museum. Upon the whole it seems more likely that the author lived in some Greek-speaking part of Syria. He cannot have been an inhabitant of any properly Hellenic region, for he tell us that 'the rustics were unacquainted with Greek mythology².' But he surely lived within sight of the sea, or he would never have insisted with such earnestness on the efficacy of Baptism in salt water. And if he were not himself a Syrian it would be difficult to account for the curious Syriac words that occur, though but rarely, in his Greek³.

But there is still one point remaining which is more decisive than any other as to the date of his work. He considers, as we have seen above, with particular care the question whether and in what exact sense the Son may be called Homoousian with the Father, and ends by concluding that in one sense He is, and in another is not of the same substance. His substance is that of the first change of God, and in this attenuated sense the Son is Homoousian, though not equal in power or in dignity to the Father. Can it be believed that this passage, which there is no reason whatever to regard as a later addition, was written before the days of the Arian controversy? The most reasonable conclusion, in face of this remarkable passage,

¹ *Hom.* xi. 13.

² *Hom.* iv. 19.

³ *μαφόριον*, xiii. 16, xv. 5. See Lagarde's note, and Ducange or Dict. Christian Antiquities, s. v. *Mafor*; *λαμμηνοί*, ii. 1, the descriptive epithet added to the names of Ananias and Aggaeus among the companions of Peter: perhaps = יאמני which, according to Lévy, signifies 'Jemand der, obgleich nicht dem Gelehrtenbunde gehörend, dennoch beglaubigt ist dass er die Priester und Levitergaben entrichte.' This list of names contains other titles which may have an ecclesiastical signification: thus *οικοδόμοι*, applied to Rubilus and Zacharias, may mean 'learned men,' and the unmeaning *ἐταῖροι*, used of Nicetes and Aquila, may be 'doctors.'

appears to be that the *Homilies* was made up by recasting the orthodox *Clementina* at some early period in the fourth century. There is nothing in the work itself that can be alleged with confidence in favour of any earlier date, unless it be the peculiar character of the Gospel quotations, many of which diverge from the canonical text, while eight are not to be found in our canonical Gospels. But these facts do not necessarily point to an early origin in the case of a work in other ways so alien from Catholic tradition. If we suppose that we have in the present *Homilies* the production of an Arian Christian of Syriac nationality, who fancied that he found in Ebionitism a solution of the great problem—a historical and quasi-philosophical doctrine of the Arian Saviour—we should not perhaps go far wrong. And nowhere could such a man be looked for with more prospect of success than in Antioch¹.

But after all, what is most important in this singular book is neither its authorship, its exact date, nor its exact birthplace, but the light that it throws upon the origin of Gnosticism (an interesting point which space has compelled me to omit) and upon the fate of those Jewish communities which refused to cast in their lot with the Catholic Church. They maintained themselves in some sort of vitality down to Mahomedan times, and traces of their influence are to be discovered in Islam and among the Druses. The reason why they failed to exercise any wider or higher influence will be obvious enough to readers of these pages. When the Light of the World had arisen they turned aside after the marsh-fires of an idle antiquated mysticism and a gross and barbarous superstition and so fell deeper and deeper into the mire. A Mahomedan writer of the tenth century², to whom we owe a later glimpse of them, speaks of them as dwelling in the fens between the Arabian desert, the Euphrates, and the Tigris, passing farther

¹ The peculiar Judaic heresy of the Colossians, which was probably connected with Ebionitism, lingered on in that district as late as the Council of Laodicea.—Lightfoot, *Col.* p. 63.

² See Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 403; Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, ii. p. 231.

and farther from the civilisation of the West, and shrouding themselves ever more impenetrably in swamps and fogs. Readers of Mr. Gordon's *Life*¹ will find an interesting but unsatisfactory notice of the Soobies of Baghdad, who appear (if the conjecture may be hazarded) to be the last wrecks of the followers of Elxai. But little can be gathered from the account of Mr. Gordon, except that the enquirer is still encountered, as he was in the days of Epiphanius, with studied and deceitful reserve.

¹ *George Maxwell Gordon*, by Rev. A. Lewis. Seeley and Co. 1889. pp. 183 sqq.

V.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE EARLY VERSIONS
AND PATRISTIC QUOTATIONS ON THE
TEXT OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT¹.

[LL. J. M. BEBB.]

It is unnecessary, at the present time, to uphold the general proposition that Versions and patristic quotations have a value in determining the date and text of the books of the New Testament. Any one who denied it would be setting himself in opposition to the views of textual critics of every school. The first outcry which greeted the result of Mill's work in reference to the Versions, and Fell's in reference to the Fathers, has been changed into a chorus of approval, if not of the results, at any rate of the principles which guided them. But though the general proposition has been granted, there is still much divergence of opinion as to the amount of importance to be attached to the evidence of individual Fathers and Versions, and the conditions under which it is possible to draw sound inferences as to the Greek text which lay before them.

Two circumstances tend greatly to enhance the value of Versions and patristic quotations: the first is the comparative lateness of the manuscripts which are, of course, our chief authorities for the text of the Greek Testament; the second

¹ Part of the Ellerton Prize Essay for 1888, printed with the leave of the Examiners. The limits imposed by the conditions of this Prize prevented the writer from giving more than a few *illustrations* of the various possibilities of error which may occur in the use of Versions and patristic quotations. Since the essay was first written nothing has been added except some references.

is the abundantly demonstrable fact that simultaneously with the very origin of theological literature, we find such an amount of textual corruption that we can ill afford to dispense with any evidence which may help us to separate the accretions from the original text of the New Testament.

There are many points to be settled before we can be sure that we have this varied evidence in the form in which it can be safely used for purposes of textual criticism.

The first which demands consideration is how far that which passes current as the work of a Father or translator really corresponds to its original condition. We must, that is, know the critical value of our printed editions. This will be ascertained by comparing them with the manuscript authorities from which they are professedly derived. We must then examine those authorities, and see how far they have suffered: to what changes, intentional or unintentional, they have been subjected, in the course of time, by any of the many hands through which they have passed.

It is by no means unnecessary to subject our printed editions to some such scrutiny, because many of them date from a time when close adherence to the best manuscripts, or groups of manuscripts, was not regarded as the first duty of an editor, and when the materials for a critical edition were not so numerous, or so accessible as they have since become. The Peshitto will afford many instances of passages introduced by editors from general considerations, without any manuscript authority. While the first editor of the version, Widmanstadt (1555), adhered to manuscript authority, Tremellius¹, who followed him, inserted in the text the doubtful part of Matthew xxvii. 35, and in the margin a translation from Latin sources of 1 John v. 7, which Gutbir (1664) put into the text. These were kept in the well-known edition of Schaaf (1709) as well as Acts viii. 37, xv. 34, and xxviii. 29.

The largest insertion is that of the *Perikope Adulterae* in

¹ It is only fair to add that this was done from a belief that the MS. sent from the East and used by Widmanstadt was defective.

the London Polyglot edition of Walton from a manuscript which belonged to Ussher¹.

Attention should also be drawn to the fact that the Syriac Version of the four minor Catholic Epistles and Revelation bound up with the Peshitto, formed no part of the original version. That of the Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude) is probably one of the few relics of the Philoxenian recension made by Polycarp at the beginning of the sixth century. It is 'distinct from the Harklensian rendering of the same Epistles, which however is unmistakeably founded on it².' The translation of the Apocalypse Dr. Gwynn on internal evidence believes to be part of the later revision of Thomas of Harkel (A.D. 616). This internal evidence consists in (1) its graecizing character, (2) the use of asterisks, (3) the *marginalia*³. At any rate there is no doubt that, though printed with the Peshitto, the critical value is not the same as in other parts of the New Testament, and therefore it is rightly referred to with a different notation.

Again in the edition of the Armenian Version made by Uschan (1668), he confesses to having introduced several passages from the Latin without any manuscript authority, as for instance, John v. 4, John vii. 53-viii. 11, 1 John v. 7. From such errors the later critical edition of Zohrab (1805) is free.

Somewhat similar, though not so heinous an editorial blunder, was the translation into Ethiopic from Greek MSS. and the Vulgate, of the *lacunae* in the Ethiopic MS. used for the edition of 1548, printed at Rome⁴.

¹ The Syriac version of this section was first published by De Dieu in 1631 from a MS. lent him by Ussher, and probably Walton used De Dieu's text. Its history has been worked out by Dr. Gwynn, *Trans. Irish Acad.* vol. xxvii.

² Gwynn in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv. 432-3, and *l.c.* p. 29 ff. Cp. also Ridley, *De Vers. Syr. Indole*, p. 298 [the paging is that of the German edition]; Adler, *Vers. Syr.* p. 78.

³ *Id.* *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv. 1020-1 (where the literature on the point is given), and *l.c.* pp. 32, 35.

⁴ C. B. Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* p. 32.

There can be no doubt also that the printed edition of the Vulgate, to which we have seen such a tendency to conform other Versions, is something very different from the work as it left Jerome's hands. Here many circumstances have proved detrimental to the unimpaired transmission of the Version. Thus, owing to the existence of the previous Latin Version, side by side with his for at any rate two hundred and fifty years¹ (and for the first part of that time with equal authority)², it is difficult to separate the two. Further than this, it suffered very much in transmission, as will be seen by the many *Biblia Correctoria* from the thirteenth century onwards. Of the further element of uncertainty introduced by the revision of Aleuin, owing to his use of Greek and Syriac manuscripts, mention will be made later. Though the difficulties are thus great, it will be possible to approximate much more closely to Jerome's work than the text of 1592, authorised by Clement, which passes current as the Vulgate.

Nor have the editions of the Fathers fared much better, and in these the Biblical quotations (with which we are here concerned) have generally been the first part of the work to suffer. We are helped no doubt when the editors give us their authorities, even though they naively confess that they follow previous editors rather than manuscript authority. In the instance quoted from Irenaeus, iv. 37. 5, Stieren³ gives a reading which, so far as he knew, had no MS. authority. It is often his plan, whatever the manuscript authority, to conform his reading to the Itala column of Sabatier's work. What the state of Chrysostom's printed text was in his

¹ Not till the ninth century was its victory assured. Walafr. Strabo praef. gloss. ord. (cited by Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, viii. 448), says, *Hieronymi translatione nunc ubique utitur tota ecclesia Romana, licet non in omnibus libris*.

² Greg. Magn. (*Pref. in Job*) *ut comprobationis causa exigit, nunc novam nunc veterem per testimonia assumo* (quoted by Fritzsche, *l. c.*).

³ Cp., for instance, Stieren's *Irenaeus*, i. 696—*alas*] *sic scripsi cum plurimis editoribus sed Mass. e cod. Claremont. legit ascellas. In Codd. Voss. et Vet. exstat assellis; Arund. ascillis*. But i. 520, note 8, he deserts a previous editor for manuscript authority.

homilies on St. Paul's Epistles, before Field edited it, may be seen in the preface to his edition¹, where he says that, there being two recensions of text, one easier, the other harder, Savile (the first editor) combined them. Instances of previous editors accommodating the biblical quotations to the ordinary text against the authority of the MSS. are given by Field in his edition of Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew². The same complaint of editors preferring their own judgment to the authority of the MSS. is mentioned by Dean Burgon³ with reference to Cyril of Jerusalem. Some of the Fathers have been satisfactorily edited in such a way that, though the acquisition of fresh material may make it necessary to supplement what has been done, the work will not require to be re-done. But the continued outcry⁴ for critical editions of the Fathers and Versions shows that much remains to be done before we have the materials properly before us on which textual criticism is to work.

But in some cases the manuscripts necessary for such editions may not be forthcoming, and of course the value of our conclusions will be considerably depreciated if we cannot be sure we have the original work before us. Deficiency of MS. evidence is a common complaint among the editors, as may be seen by the references given to Otto, Hefele, and Potter, by Blunt⁵. It is where MSS. are numerous and

¹ *Bibl. Patr. Oxon.* p. xiii; but Savile's edition compares very favourably with the Benedictine edition of Montfaucon; cp. Lagarde, *Ankündigung*, p. 50.

² In Chrysostom's quotation (Hom. xlv) of Luke xxii. 35-38 ὁμοίως is omitted by the MSS., inserted by the editors; p. 589, in the quotation of Luke xi. 27, 28, the editors substitute κοιλία for γαστήρ.

³ *Last Twelve Verses*, p. 261. Dean Burgon quotes De Touttée's admission that he inserted εὐδοκίας into Cyril's quotation of Luke ii. 14, though he found εὐδοκία in the text.

⁴ E. g. Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 49; Scrivener, *Introduction*, etc., p. 419. For *Versions*, cp. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, etc., p. 2. The preparation of critical editions of the Vulgate (of which the first *fasciculus* has appeared) and Peshitto at Oxford, and of the Septuagint at Cambridge, shows that the need has been realized. The Vienna *Corpus* is also remedying the defect as far as the Latin Fathers are concerned.

⁵ *Use of the Fathers*, p. 68; cp. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 188 ff., as to Justin Martyr.

divided in their evidence that the work of the editor becomes difficult, though an inductive examination will show what manuscript or group of MSS. is to be followed. The MSS. of Cyprian will illustrate this, but it is unfortunate that Hartel in his edition for the Vienna *Corpus* seems to have followed the wrong group for the *Testimonia*. Where manuscripts are few, as in the case of Irenaeus, it may have been because the work was not in great request¹, and in such a case transcriptional errors are correspondingly few², and the lateness of our manuscripts less important. Where our existing manuscripts are derived from one Archetype, as is proved by common *lacunae* to be the case with the four MSS. of the Greek text of Origen's Commentaries both on St. Matthew³ and St. John⁴; or where, as in the case of the Curetonian Version, we have only one extant manuscript, there is no means of correcting errors which may have come in during transmission. Equally important is it that we should bear in mind the channels through which our quotations come. The value of Origen's quotations is depreciated by the consideration that much comes through Cramer's Catena, where the text is full of obvious blunders, and requires a fresh collation of manuscripts⁵. The same fact is noticed by Lipsius of Irenaeus⁶, whose Greek text has to be recovered piecemeal from the author of the *Philosophumena*, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Eusebius, and others, and has therefore been subjected to considerable dangers. It is exceptional to have extant manuscripts so near the time of the writer as that of John Damascene assigned by Tischendorf to the same century as the original⁷,

¹ Gregory the Great describes his difficulty in getting a copy, and the preface to *Cod. A* describes it as *perrarus*. *Journal of Philology*, xvii. 85.

² Even a much-used work like the Peshitto may keep comparatively free from errors of this kind; cp. Mr. Gwilliam in *Studia Biblica* (1st series), p. 161, and Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*.

³ *Dict. of Christian Biography*, iv. 111-2.

⁴ *Ib.* 114.

⁵ *Ib.* 118.

⁶ *Ib.* s. v. Irenaeus.

⁷ Tisch. *Nov. Test.* (8th edition), p. xvi, cited as *Dam^{par} cod.* Professor Rendel Harris, *Fragments of Philo*, p. xi ff., shows that these 'Parallels' have only a very slight connection with John Damascene, and are really an earlier

the Wolfenbüttel MS. of Chrysostom, cited as Chrys^{gus}, and ascribed to the sixth century. However, as we shall see later, age is no certain criterion of value.

But, though there are such difficulties as have been described to be met, it is possible by the help of available authorities to remove many errors which can be proved with more or less certainty to have come in during transmission, and therefore formed no part of the original text.

Firstly must be noticed obvious scribes' errors in the language of the Versions, misreadings of the Greek being reserved (till we come to consider the value on internal evidence of the several authorities), as dating from the time when the Version was made.

Thus the variants *iuncta* and *vineta* which we find in Augustine¹ for δέεται (Rom. vii. 2), *correptio* and *correctio* for νοθεσία (1 Cor. xii), and possibly also *curiosae* and *otiosae* for περίεργοι (1 Tim. v. 13), are cases in point. To this may be ascribed the variant *misteriorum* for *ministeriorum* (Ambr. *de Sacr.* 6) at 1 Cor. xii. 14. Another instance, important as illustrating the perpetuation of error, is the reading *quidem* for *quidam* (τινες) at 1 Cor. vi. 11, where Cyprian (*Test.* ii. 65) is followed by Ambrose and Augustine.

From the Peshitto we may quote the reading ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ at 2 Tim. iv. 10 for Κρήσκης; here a Syriac manuscript reads ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ, perhaps followed by the Arabic (see Tisch. *ad loc.*). These variants are clearly due to the confusion of ܐ and ܐ. Two other instances are given by Michaelis² from 2 Pet. ii. 17, 18, where the Erpenian Arabic (here a secondary version) makes it probable that ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ, by which it translates ὑπὸ λαίλαπος, is a mistake for ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ; and in verse 18 ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ (laughter), by which it translates ὑπέρογκα, a mistake for ܐܡܥܡܐܐܐ.

An instance from the Curetonian³ may be found at Matthew collection which he may possibly have re-arranged. He shows also, ib. p. xxi, that Tischendorf (*l. c.*) was mistaken in identifying the MS. with Cod. Rup.

¹ Cp. Ziegler, *Die lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen*, etc., p. 71 n.

² Marsh's *Michaelis*, ii. p. 20. ³ Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 8.

frequently illustrated by alterations of the quotations in the Latin Fathers from Irenaeus (*Lat.*) and Cyprian downwards. In Cyprian we may refer to Hartel's Prolegomena, p. xxiv, where general reference to the fact is made; in Ep. 55. 18 we ought to read *suffragatorem* in the quotation from 1 John ii. 1, and not *justum*, as is read by Hartel's text, following the Vulgate. So in *Test.* iii. 95 Hartel follows the wrong group of MSS. (AW) in giving the Vulgate rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 33, *Corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia mala*, instead of (with LMB) *Corrumpunt ingenia bona confabulationes pessimae*, a quotation especially liable to this kind of alteration, being a proverb in constant use. Instances might be multiplied from the *apparatus criticus* of the *Testimonia*, where on nearly every page one or more MSS. have been thus corrupted. From Augustine we get another illustration; at Rom. v. 16 he expressly rejects the reading ἀμαρτήματος, and six times we accordingly find the other reading *per unum peccantem*; but Ep. 157. 20, *per unum peccatum* (*Vulg.*); so in the *de Natura et Gratia* we get *desiderium*, Rom. i. 24 (*Vulg.*), but six times elsewhere *concupiscentia* (*Vet. Lat.*). To this cause are probably to be attributed the numerous cases of discrepancy between the text given in a Father, and the commentary on the text¹. Thus in Iren. iv. 13. 1, Stieren notices that although *sine causa* is inserted in the quotation from Mat. v. 22, Irenaeus' argument assumes its omission, and so he concludes (i. 595, n. 5), *a scribis itaque . . . addita videtur, sicut et in latinam Vulgatam irrepsit*. In Jerome such cases are particularly numerous, thus at Mat. xxi. 31 he notes that the *vera exemplaria* have *primus*, in his commentary we find *novissimus*. Westcott on St. John x. 16 gives another instance. He quotes Jerome as approving the rendering of αὐλή by *atrium* rather than *ovile*, and yet we find the latter in the Vulgate text.

The clearest proof of such a corruption is in two Munich

¹ Wetstein, *Animadversiones et Cautiones*, pp. 86-7, 90.

manuscripts of the *Enchiridion* referred to by Ziegler¹, in one of which the old Latin quotations are crossed out, and written in above we find the Vulgate text, while in the second (Cod. 6283 Lat.) the Vulgate has been substituted in the actual quotations and the Old Latin has disappeared.

Somewhat similar, in the case of Versions, is the correction of one Version by another later one, or by Greek manuscripts. It differs from the last kind of corruption in being intentional and editorial, while the last often must have been involuntary. Both alike are damaging to the critical value of the work so corrected. In some cases we have definite historical statements of such treatment; in others, we infer it from the text under examination, but in such cases there is need of caution, lest we attribute to subsequent correction resemblances which existed from their origin in the two works compared, and are due to common ancestry. We have definite statements of the use of Greek MSS. in the Harklensian Version², and in Aleuin's revision of the Vulgate (A. D. 801) by the help of Greek and Syriac manuscripts³. There are probably few Versions which have not been affected by the Latin Versions. We have already⁴ seen traces of this in the printed editions of the Armenian and Ethiopic. The Gothic has perhaps also been affected, while as to the Arabic Versions there is a division of opinion. The close agreement between the Latin and Syriac Versions is a case in which caution is needed; the Syriac Version seems comparatively free from such correction by Latin authorities, and the accusations of Latinizing made by Michaelis⁵ and Wetstein (who on this account refers it to the seventh century⁶) are explanations of an agreement which

¹ Ziegler, *Die lat. Bibelübersetzungen*, etc. p. 73.

² *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.* iv. 1017, s. v. Polycarp.

³ Fritzsche, *l. c.* p. 449; but ep. Porson, *Letters to Travis*, p. 145. Such revision, though recorded, is more than doubtful.

⁴ Cp. p. 197.

⁵ *Curæ in Vers. Syr. Act. Apost.* pp. 168-9. Cp. Lagarde, *De N. T. ad fidem Orient. Vers. Edendo*, p. 5.

⁶ As the Abbé Martin does the Curetonian, notwithstanding the date of the MS.

is due to derivation from the same early authorities¹. The Latin Versions² have in some cases been corrected by Greek manuscripts, and unfortunately it is a very difficult matter to ascertain the extent to which Jerome used his Greek manuscripts³, and recover from the Vulgate, as Bentley hoped to do, the pure Greek text of the end of the fourth century. A striking instance of the depreciation from this cause of what would have otherwise been a most valuable authority in the Old Testament is the *Codex Ambrosianus*, the oldest manuscript of the Peshitto, which on examination is found to have been corrected to the Massoretic text⁴.

Besides changes of the above kind, which are of the greatest importance, reference has to be made to changes, of less importance in regard to the Greek text, though they are extremely useful in determining the relative age of Versions in the same language, and therefore of great indirect value. Of this kind are formal changes introduced by the removal of solecisms, and hard or ungrammatical constructions or connections, and the substitution of ordinary words and phrases: thus from the Old Latin, Fritzsche⁵ instances the changes in Luke i. 49, ii. 35, and vi. 35 of *magnalia* into *magna*, *framea* into *gladius*, and *nequam* into *malos*. Such corrections would naturally be frequent in a Version which was originally *verborum tenacior*, but they are also found in the Peshitto, and such grammatical changes are noticed by Mr. Gwilliam⁶ as being for the most part the only differences between the manuscripts of the Peshitto, the text having been otherwise transmitted without much alteration.

Having taken into consideration the three kinds of changes that may have come into our authorities during transmission—viz. (i) Scribes' errors in the language of the Version or

¹ See below, p. 232.

² *Old Latin Bibl. Texts*, ii. 96.

³ Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 449.

⁴ Cornill, *l. c.* p. 145. His estimate is criticized by Rahlfs (*Zeits. f. alt. Wissenschaft*, 1889, ii. p. 180 ff.).

⁵ In Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, viii. 438, where many illustrations are given.

⁶ *Studia Biblica*, 1st series, p. 161.

Father; (ii) corruptions to suit a familiar text, or adaptations to other authorities; (iii) formal changes in style and diction—we come now to consider points for which the original author or writer, and the inevitable circumstances of the case are responsible, which cause a difficulty in getting at the underlying Greek text.

Firstly, we cannot always argue to omissions in the Greek text, because we find omissions in the Versions or patristic quotations. Such omissions may be due to the difficulty of the original Greek. Jerome (quoted by Burgon) notices this at 1 Cor. vii. 35¹. Of course where transliteration was regarded as allowable in translation, this argument does not so forcibly apply². To the difficulty of the word may be due the omission of *δευτεροπρώτῳ* at Luke vi. 1 in the many Versions quoted by Scrivener. Similarly in the Peshitto at Acts xix. 28 *ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται* does not appear, and at James i. 23 *πρόσωπον γενέσεως* appears simply as ܡܢܐܬܐ (πρόσωπον), though this may have been considered enough.

Again, things which seem to the translator irrelevant or tautological disappear. Thus Mill in his *Prolegomena*³ notices the following omissions of this kind from the Peshitto: at Mat. xii. 5 *τοῖς σάββασι* is omitted where *τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσι* follows, in Mark xiv. 68 *οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι* appears simply as ܠܐ ܝܕܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܨܬܐܝܬܐ, and similar instances are given from Mark ix. 43, and Luke xvii. 23, xix. 43. Winer⁴ gives a list of typical omissions from the Peshitto, which includes superfluous words of time or action, as for example *ἐνθὺς*, *ἰδοὺ*, *εἶτα*, *πάλιν*, *τότε*, and *λαβὼν*, *λέγων*, *εἰσελθὼν*, *ἀναστās*, and the like. The construction, particularly characteristic of St. Luke, *καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καί*, disappears at least nine times, though it is found sometimes as at Mat. xi. 1: this is the more

¹ He says (Vallarsi, ii. 261) *In Latinis codicibus ob difficultatem translationis hoc penitus non invenitur.*

² Cp. LXX passim. Thus the Harklensian (quoted by Ridley, *l.c.* p. 295) gives at St. John v. 2 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܐ ܕܥܠܐ.

³ Page 594.

⁴ G. B. Winer, *De Vers. Syr. N. T.*, etc. p. 20 ff.

peculiar, as it is a Hebraistic construction which one might have expected to find kept. *ἴδιος* is often omitted, sometimes inserted: *πᾶς* is often omitted without authority, Mark v. 12, Acts iii. 21, and elsewhere, as it is often inserted without authority. From the Curetonian Baethgen¹ gives similar omissions, thus John i. 26 and elsewhere ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε becomes simply ܐܠܗܐ (he said) where the Peshitto has in full ܐܠܗܐ ܠܚܐܘܐ: in the same way the simple ܐܠܗܐ (he said) does duty for οὐκ ἠρνήσατο John i. 20, and ἐπηρώτησε λέγων Luke xxiii. 3.

Of rather a different kind are the omissions of words and expressions inserted as explanations in the Greek, and unnecessary in the Syriac, as at Mat. xxvii. 46, where we have nothing to correspond to the τοῦτ' ἔστιν, Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου, κ. τ. λ.: so at Mark v. 41 we have simply ταλιθὰ κούμ without further explanation. Instances might be multiplied as at Mark vii. 11, 34, John iv. 25, ix. 7, and from the Curetonian John i. 39, 42. In reference to these, however, Michaelis' suggestion² should be noticed, that the evidence of secondary Versions goes to show that they were kept in the original translation, and omitted by the scribes afterwards. To such intentional omissions are to be added unintentional omissions due to *itacism*, *homoioteleuta*³, and the like, as in the Curetonian at Mat. xxiii. 18, and in the Peshitto at 2 Cor. v. 17.

The danger of arguing from omissions in the patristic quotations will be noticed later in discussing the argument *e silentio*.

Similar caution is necessary in inferring from additions in Versions or patristic quotations that anything has dropped out of the Greek text.

In the first place additions are necessary in one language to

¹ *Loc. cit.* p. 22.

² *Curae*, etc., p. 60. The answer is obvious, that the translators of these secondary Versions would insert them when translating, such explanations being as necessary for their readers as for those of the original Greek.

³ Such are particularly frequent in the later translation of the Apocalypse; cp. xiv. 11, xviii. 22, xx. 5.

supply the ellipses of another. Thus in reference to ὑποτάσσασθε at Eph. v. 22, Jerome¹ says, *hoc quod in latinis exemplis additum est 'subditae sint' in gr. edd. non habetur . . . sed hoc magis in Graeco intelligitur quam in Latino*. Similarly at 1 Tim. vi. 7² δῆλον of the *textus receptus* is proved by the variants to be corrupt and has little support: Versions cannot be used to strengthen the evidence for it, because they required some such addition to complete the grammar.

From the Curetonian Baethgen gives instances at Mat. iii. 4, where a word has to be supplied, because ܠܡܥܢ cannot be used of ἔνδυμα and ζώνην, as is εἶχεν in Greek, at Luke ii. 52, where two words, ܥܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ and ܡܥܬܐ, have to be used for the one word προέκοψεν of the Greek, and at Luke viii. 33 both the Curetonian and Peshitto have to add ܡܕܥܐ, because the construction ὤρμησεν . . . εἰς τὴν λίμνην is not Syriac.

In modern editions we can generally, though not always³, detect such necessary additions by the help of italics.

Besides such necessary grammatical additions we have also to take into account additions made to explain references to persons or places. These abound in the Syriac. At Acts xii. 1, after Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς, we find ܡܕܥܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ ܥܐ (surnamed Agrippa); at Acts xvii. 19, instead of simply Areopagus, we are told St. Paul was taken up to ܡܥܬܐ ܕܡܕܥܐ ܕܡܕܥܐ (the house of justice which is called Areopagus), so at Acts xxvii. 9, τὴν νηστείαν is described as ܡܥܬܐ ܕܡܕܥܐ (of the Jews), and in xxviii. 13 Rhegium is identified as ܡܥܬܐ ܕܡܕܥܐ (a city), and Puteoli as ܡܥܬܐ ܕܡܕܥܐ (a city of Italy). From the Curetonian we have parallel cases, thus Mat. iii. 5, iv. 15 Jordan is described as a river, and v. 18 iota is explained to be a letter.

Insertions of a somewhat different kind, to make clear the sense, are the substitutions of a proper name for a pronoun, as at Mat. i. 10, 19 (Curet.), or at the beginning of sections Jesus or Lord (both in the Peshitto and Curetonian) as at Mat. xiii.

¹ Alford, *Digest*, ad loc.

² Field, *Otium Norvicense*, iii. 127.

³ Cp. Revised Version at 2 Tim. ii. 26.

54, Luke viii. 19, or 'disciples' for *αὐτοί*, Mat. xiii. 51, Mark xvi. 19, and elsewhere in the Curetonian.

Not only is caution required in both these respects, viz. of additions and omissions, but it must be also remembered that varieties of rendering do not point necessarily to any variety in the underlying Greek text. How far it is advisable to try and keep the same word for the same Greek word was a question discussed in reference to the Revised Version. It is certain that to do so would not always give the best equivalent of the thought of one language in the expressions of another, though it would enable us to restore the Greek text much more certainly. An examination of the Versions shows that they often were content to give the sense regardless of the actual Greek before them, and so it is that we so frequently find interpretative glosses. Thus in the Peshitto at Heb. vi. 4 *φωτισθέντες* becomes ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (descended to baptism), at 1 Peter iii. 19 *ἐν φυλακῇ* is rendered ܡܝܬܐ (in Sheol), at 1 Cor. iv. 3 *ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας* is ܡܝܬܐ ܕܝܢܐ (by any man), 2 Tim. iv. 13 *φελόνην* is ܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (book-case), and Rev. i. 8 *ὁ καὶ ὦ* becomes ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (Olaph and Tau); Acts i. 12 *ὁδὸν σαββάτου* becomes ܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (seven stadia). In the Jerusalem Syriac Adler¹ gives an instance from Luke vii. 45, where *φίλημα οὐκ ἔδωκας* becomes ܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (thou didst not salute)².

In the Latin Version this custom of glosses will explain the variety of readings at Tit. ii. 3, where all are explanations of *σώφρονες*; and, were it not for the danger (less perhaps in this part of the Revelation than elsewhere) of relying on one authority only for a reading, the temptation would be great to say that all the epithets in Rev. xxii. 11, some of which have come through the Vulgate into our text, are glosses

¹ *Loc. cit.* p. 152.

² So, in the Ethiopic, Mat. xxiii. 15, *ποιῆσαι προσήλυτον ἕνα* appears as 'to baptize one proselyte'; in the Vulgate, James v. 15, *ἐγερεῖ* is *alleviabit*; cp. ib. v. 3. From the Fathers may be given Chrysostom's custom of making glosses on the text; cp. Field, *l. c.* iii. 48.

explaining *ἀνομος* and *δίκαιος*, and that the right reading is found only in the *Viennens. et Lugdun. Epist.* ὁ ἀνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι. Not only have we glossematic corruptions of this kind to take into account, but we have also to bear in mind that the translators did not keep one word for the same Greek word. Sometimes a change was necessitated by the usage of the language, sometimes it is due to the caprice of the translator. Thus in the Curetonian *ποιεῖν* is generally translated *ܥܕܐ*, but in Mat. xx. 12, where it is used of husbandry *ܦܠܐ* is substituted; *ἐγένετο* is generally translated by *ܠܐܐ*, but in John vi. 21 (where it is used of a ship drawing near to land) we find *ܠܐܐ ܡܕܐ*; *σάργ* is generally *ܕܡܠܚ*, but in John i. 13, 14, the Curetonian substitutes *ܕܡܠܚܐ*. On the other hand no explanation is to be given of two different words being used for *ἐνδύμα* in Mat. xxii. 11, 12, or *ἀνδράστας* in Mat. xxii. 28, 30. Instances from the Vulgate of St. John's Epistles are given by Dr. Westcott¹, thus *τηρεῖν* in three consecutive verses is *observare, custodire, servare*, 1 John ii. 3, 4, 5; *φῶς* is *lux* i. 5, 7, ii. 9, and *lumen* ii. 7, 10; so *γινώσκωμεν* is *scimus, cognoscimus, intelligimus*.

From James iv. 4 may be added the translation of *κόσμος* by *seculum* and *mundus*.

The number of various readings introduced into the Greek text, if this last consideration were neglected, would be very large, so that the first requisite for a safe use of any Version is an induction, carried over the whole authority to be used², in order to find out how far the evidence of versions may be available for synonymous words in the Greek, and what, as Nowack³ puts it, are the 'style of translation,' the 'peculiarities

¹ Introduction, p. xxvii.

² Lagarde, *De N. T. ad fidem*, etc. p. 7: *Duabus potius rebus opus est primum ut singula vocabula per omnes N. T. libros, quomodo vertantur, persequamur, deinde ut syntaxin sermonis Græci cum linguis Syriaca, Aethiopica, Aegyptiaca, Armeniaca comparati scribere aggrediamur; ita enim et de interpretis alicuius constantia et de editionum codicumque nostrorum fide certiores erimus, et facillime observabimus, si quis interpres in suo libro alia habuit ac quæ Codices Græci nunc superstites præbeant.*

³ *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus*, etc.

of the translator,' and the knowledge of both languages displayed by the translator.

It is of the greatest importance that we should examine these last three points, and also the genius of the language, i. e. its capability of being used to convey the thought and expression of the Greek.

The extent to which we can use a Version to recover the underlying Greek depends very largely on whether it is a literal or only a sense-translation¹. Some Versions aim at reproducing the letter of the original, sacrificing to that object the grammatical construction and idiom of their own language, and even in some cases intelligibility; some aim only at giving the thought of that which they are translating, and, so long as they attain that, disregard the letter entirely². From Aquila's Version of the Old Testament we might recover the Hebrew. From the Harklensian or Old Latin³ of the New we can generally be fairly sure of reproducing the Greek text, though we meet with violations of grammar at every turn. From the Harklensian, for example, we can often say where it read the Greek article, and where it did not; thus at Mat. x. 3 we have ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܣܝ (ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς), where the Peshitto gives simply ܐܠܗܐ. The Curetonian again is even less literal than the Peshitto⁴. In relation to the Memphitic and Thebaic Dr. Lightfoot notices that the latter shows a greater regard for Egyptian idiom than the former, so that the connecting particles are observed in the one but not in the other⁵.

¹ Kaulen, *Geschichte des Vulgata*, p. 39; Ridley, *l. c.* pp. 334-9; Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 936.

² Cp. Jerome, *ad Pamm. Ep.* 57, *ad Sun. et Fret. Ep.* 106.

³ Cp. Acts xvii. 18, *seminiverbius* = σπερμολόγος; 2 Cor. vii. 10, *impaenitentius* = ἀμεταμέλητος. This literalness often enables us to argue as to synonyms, e. g. at 1 Cor. ix. 9 we may be sure *d* and *e* reading *camum mittes* had κημώσεις and not φημώσεις.

⁴ Baethgen, *l. c.* p. 14. 'In Peschito auf Kosten des syrischen Sprachgebrauchs ein engerer Anschluss an das griechische Original erstrebt wird.' Ib. p. 12, the Curetonian is a 'sinngemässe nicht buchstäbliche Uebersetzung'; cp. ib. p. 25 *ad init.*

⁵ Scrivener, *Introduction*, pp. 390, 400.

Of the translators' knowledge of the language little need be said. Those who have gone carefully into the different Versions confirm the *a priori* probability that they would be well acquainted with both languages¹. The Ethiopic is a striking exception, unless indeed the mistakes are to be attributed to careless readings of the Greek. The following instances are given by Michaelis². At Luke viii. 29 there is a confusion of *πέδαις* and *παῖδες*, at Rom. vii. 6 of *κατηχούμεθα* and *κατειχόμεθα*, at Rom. vii. 11 of *ἐξεπάτησε* and *ἐξηπάτησε*. Whatever the cause, such mistakes have done much to lower the estimation of the Ethiopic Version for purposes of textual criticism³.

The other point, to which allusion has been made, is the necessity of knowing the genius and idioms of the language before using it for critical purposes. This suggests, as a preliminary consideration, that only those who know the language of the Version can use it. Certainly to use its evidence through the medium of a Latin translation is getting a most distorted idea of its value. This was the plan adopted by Mill⁴, Beza, and others who inaugurated the use of the Eastern languages for textual purposes, and many misstatements were the result. Tischendorf⁵ again relied absolutely on Tregelles for Eastern Versions, and the consequences have not always been good, if one may argue from the different conclusions as to Eastern evidence given by others. Thus Baethgen⁶ notices that at Luke xvii. 11 (and here Westcott and Hort are also wrong) Tregelles made the Syriac read 'ad Galilaeam,' not knowing 'that $\Delta \dots \text{ܐܠܗܐ} = (\text{Hebr.}) \text{ל} \dots \text{בין} = \text{ובין} \dots \text{בין} =$

¹ For the Peshitto, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, ii. 40; for the Curetonian, see Baethgen, *l. c.* p. 12.

² *Tract. Crit.* § 24, p. 24 ff.

³ Tregelles, *Dict. of the Bible*, iii. 1614, gives other instances.

⁴ A number of Mill's errors are given by Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* p. 45 and § 32, and also by Wetstein.

⁵ Gregory in Tisch. *N. T.* pt. iii.

⁶ Baethgen, *l. c.* p. 3, note. It is also noticed by Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* § 73, that the Persian translators misunderstood this Syriac expression.

διὰ μέσον . . . καί.' In the same way Ridley¹ notices that it is the Syriac idiom to have θεόν after σεβόμενοι, and therefore Tischendorf is wrong in quoting this as a *varia lectio* at Acts xiii. 43, and not in the other places in the Acts where it occurs. Baethgen² gives other instances where the evidence is wrongly quoted for similar reasons at Mat. xiii. 16, and Luke xii. 1 and xx. 1.

It is also important to remember that some of the distinctions of one language are not kept in another: thus Dr. S. C. Malan points out that there is no distinction of genders in Armenian; in Arabic also the place of the neuter has to be supplied. Again, the usage of a language sometimes causes an ambiguity in the evidence, thus in Syriac οὐρανοί and οὐρανός are not distinguished, the plural being always used. This is also the case with γραφή and γραφαί, the Peshitto always pointing as a plural (but see *infra*); the absence of a comparative in Syriac makes its evidence doubtful wherever this is involved in the adverb; thus the Syriac affords no evidence as between εὐθύμως and εὐθυμότερον at Acts xxiv. 10 (cf. Michaelis, *Curae*, p. 147), nor is the Latin always careful to observe the same idiomatic comparative Acts xxiv. 22, 26; xxv. 4, 10³.

An important class of instances to be noticed under this head are places where the evidence is ambiguous owing to the system of pointing. Thus at 1 Cor. xiv. 38 ܐܒܝܠܐ may be ἀγνοεῖται, or, as the Erpenian Arabic has taken it, ἀγνοεῖτω⁴. This is particularly to be noticed where the variant in the Greek is a question of singular and plural. Thus Tischendorf is wrong in quoting the Syriac at Mat. ii. 23, where that version (ܡܚܠܐ) may represent according to the pointing διὰ τοῦ προφήτου or διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. He is wrong also in quoting the Syriac for the plural στρατηγοί at Acts iv. 1, where ܡܠܝܚܐ may be singular or plural.

¹ *Loc. cit.* p. 331. This does not affect the evidence of the Syriac at 1 Tim. iii. 16 as Ridley thought (p. 306).

² *Loc. cit.* p. 16.

³ Additional examples will be found in *O. L. Texts*, ii. p. ci.

⁴ Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* § 36.

For a similar reason the evidence is ambiguous at Col. iv. 15 as to the reading there; nor have the printed editions improved matters, for the Peshitto vocalizes the noun (Νυμφᾶν) as a feminine and the affix as a masculine¹.

Finally, it should be noticed in reference to Versions that mistakes in translation may still give evidence as to the Greek text used. Thus at Luke vi. 1, if *e* reads *sabbato mane*, and *f* *sabbato a primo*, it is evidence that δευτεροπρώτῳ was found in the Greek text from which they came, though they convey a poor idea of its meaning. So if *k* at Mat. xi. 23 (*Old Latin Texts*, ii. 42) reads *ne quomodo in caelum elata es, usque ad inferos descendas*, it shows the Greek used was not ἡ ὑψωθείσα, but μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ². Again, *neglexit*, the reading of *e* at Mark v. 36 supports παρακούσας as against ἀκούσας; and similarly in the Syriac, ridiculous as is the translation at Rev. viii. 13 of μεσουρνήματι ܡܫܘܪܢܝܡܬܝ (in the middle of a tail of blood), it is conclusive evidence for μεσουρνήματι against μεσουρανίσματι (the reading of *i* and Erasmus). From the Latin other instances are given by Kaulen³.

When we turn to patristic quotations we are met by quite a distinct set of phenomena. In the first place we have to assure ourselves that the Fathers had a manuscript before them when quoting, and are not quoting from memory. Griesbach⁴ professes to have given a series of criteria for determining this, which is undoubtedly the most important point in reference to patristic quotations. We must first notice the complications that arise from their quoting from memory; a thing common enough now, and therefore much more common when books were more scarce, and the

¹ Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 256, Addit. Note. The question is between κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς.

² The reading of *k* may represent a stage in corruption not in evidence from Greek MSS., viz. μὴ ὑψωθείσα.

³ *Loc. cit.* pp. 88-9, note.

⁴ *Symbolae Criticae*, i. p. cxxxix; cp. his *Curae*, § 13, p. 27, *allegationes fideliter e codicibus de promptae may be distinguished vagis ad dicta scripturae provocationibus*.

difficulties of verifying a reference so much greater¹. The fact of quotations being given from memory explains the following phenomena in patristic quotations, none of which therefore substantiate various readings, (i) Combinations of different passages; (ii) transpositions; (iii) sense renderings, including changes of syntax, adaptation, use of synonymous terms.

Instances of combination are to be found in Barnabas v, where Ps. cxviii. 20 and Ps. xxi. 17 are combined; so in Ignatius *ad Philad.* vii, John iii. 8 and 1 Cor. ii. 10, and in Polycarp *ad Phil.* i, Acts ii. 24, 1 Pet. i. 8, 1 Pet. i. 12 are fused into one sentence. Later on, when manuscripts were more abundant, we have instances from Origen², where Acts xiii. 26, 46 are twice combined as if they were contiguous verses, and from Chrysostom³, where Matthew xiii. 55-6 has a passage from John vi. 42 inserted in the middle.

From the same page in Field we may illustrate the phenomenon of transposition; thus John vii. 4 appears as *ἐι γὰρ ταῦτα ποιεῖς δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ, οὐδεὶς γάρ τι ποιεῖ ἐν κρυπτῷ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς φανερόν εἶναι* (where *φανερός* is also noticeable); cf. also Iren. v. 10 and v. 13, and iii. 38 and v. 13⁴.

Sense renderings may be illustrated from Irenaeus, who is as a rule 'a most careful quoter⁵.' Thus we get (α) change of syntax in the quotation of Luke ix. 57-8, where (i. 8. 3) *ἀκολουθήσω σοι κ.τ.λ.* appears as a question; (β) change of singular to plural, or *vice versa*, in a reference already given to John i. 13⁶; (γ) equivalent words in the quotation of Luke ii. 28 *εὐχαρίστησεν* for *εὐλόγησεν*; Luke xiv. 27 *ἀκολου-*

¹ Cornill, *l. c.* p. 58; cp. Porson, *Letters to Travis*, p. 275.

² Lommatzsch, xv. 135, 147, *Hom. XV in Jer.*

³ Field, *Homilies on St. Matthew*, i. 558, *οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, οὐδ' ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ παρ' ἡμῖν εἰσὶ;*

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 53 is quoted correctly in v. 13, inverted in v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 55 is kept in v. 13, inverted in iii. 38.

⁵ Tregelles in Horne, iv. 333.

⁶ Compare Ign. *ad Polyc.* ii. *φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὄφεις ἐν ἅπασιν καὶ ἀκέραιοι* (Mat. x. 16); *ad Smyrn.* i. *βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (Mat. iii. 15).

θεῖ μοι for ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, in Luke xv. 4 πεπλανημένον for ἀπολωλός; (δ) change in the order of words in Luke ix. 62 (*contra Haer.* i. 8. 3), οὐδεὶς ἐπ' ἄροτρον τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλὼν; (ε) equivalent of the passage without exact quotation, in Origen's quotation of Eph. ii. 12¹.

In many cases where we should be in doubt from this cause what reading a Father had, the context makes it clear, so that even in quotations from memory we may often use the Fathers' evidence for or against a certain reading.

We may, however, be sure that under certain circumstances they would have a manuscript before them, and then their evidence becomes much more valuable. Thus the longer passages are more correctly quoted than the shorter extracts. This is true of Justin Martyr's quotations from the Old Testament². It is also true of Augustine's quotations³, and it is easily intelligible that it would be worth while to take the trouble of verifying a long reference, while a short one would be left to the memory. Much depends also on the object for which the quotation is made; thus for a polemical purpose close adherence to the letter is necessary, and so in controversial treatises we find as a rule exactness⁴, while for a preacher more freedom would be allowed, and so it is that Chrysostom's quotations are very often inexact⁵. A marked difference, again, is found to exist, in respect of verbal exactness, between quotations made from historical matter, and those made from St. Paul's Epistles or our Lord's words. This is pointed out by Ziegler with reference to Augustine.

The question is further complicated by the possibility of the Fathers having more than one manuscript before them at

¹ Lommatzsch, xx. 170; *Contra Celsum*, viii. 43 (but cp. *ib.* viii. 5) τοὺς ξένους τῶν διαθηκῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀλλοτρίους τῶν εὐαγγελίων.

² But Justin's quotations afford in any case precarious evidence, as is seen from the remarks of Dr. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 186.

³ Ziegler, *l. c.* p. 55.

⁴ Von Gebhardt would on this account use only the *Contra Marcionem* of all Tertullian's writings.

⁵ F. H. Chase, *Chrysostom*, etc. p. 86.

a time¹. This may, in some places, explain the heterogeneous character of the quotations, and makes conclusions drawn from them uncertain. It must be remembered again that when they had manuscripts before them, they did not always use them, but regarded themselves as free to use their own judgment with reference to a reading. From what has survived to us of their writings we know that few of them were destitute of critical acumen, and that they used not only external but also internal evidence². Though we have instances of the skill with which they handle textual problems, we cannot but acknowledge that the adoption of such editorial functions makes them rather judges than witnesses of the text, and that they would have been more useful in the latter capacity, had they been more mechanical in transmitting the text. We have also to take into account the *possibility* of their having adopted a conjectural reading³, and, when we consider how dangerous a weapon this may become, it is at once obvious how suspicious of unsupported readings we must be. Yet another indeterminate factor is introduced when we remember that the Fathers often knew more than their own language, and possibly may have translated for themselves. It is still an open question in the eyes of some people, how far this may explain the variations of Tertullian's quotations⁴, and he is not the only Father who has been thus accused. The problem of patristic quotations would be much simplified could we be sure that any given Father knew only the language in which he was writing.

Lastly in considering patristic quotations, the question as to the amount of importance to be attached to the argument *e silentio* must not be passed by. The argument is under

¹ Wetstein, *Animadversiones*, etc. p. 89.

² Iren. v. 30. 1. Aug. *Contra Faustum*, xi. 2; *De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 21; *Retract.* i. 7. 2. Cp. Origen as to Mat. viii. 28.

³ References are given in Wetstein, *l. c.* pp. 26, 37, 49. It must be remembered, on the other side, that there are countless instances in which they refuse to let MS. evidence be balanced by any considerations.

⁴ Zahn is perhaps the strongest supporter of this view, e.g. cp. *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, i. 51.

all circumstances precarious¹, and a *consensus* of silence can alone give weight to it. Thus to argue that Cyprian cannot have had *θεοῦ* at Acts xx. 28, because he makes no reference to the verse in *Test.* ii. 6, 'Quod Christus deus,' is by no means safe; because it is easy enough to imagine that, in collecting proofs of that statement, this, though so obvious, might have escaped him. On the other hand the *concensus* of silence as to 1 John v. 7², when such a strong statement of the doctrine of the Trinity would have been valuable, and must have occurred to some among the many Fathers of the first five centuries, is in itself sufficient to condemn the passage. When we are considering the evidence afforded by the argument with reference to single words, it has to be remembered that owing to the many possible causes of omission mentioned above, it can only very rarely be relied on. Even in longer passages the argument, though convincing to one critic, may be far from convincing to another³.

It is also not unnecessary in using the evidence of patristic quotations to accept Tregelles'⁴ caution as to assuring ourselves that the passage of Scripture in question is really the one which the Father is quoting. Thus Burgon⁵ gives an instance where Athan. (*Pasch. Syr.* 11) is said by Westcott and Hort to be quoting Mat. v. 22, whereas he is really thinking of 1 John iii. 15. Where such ambiguity exists it is well to adopt Griesbach's method, and give the passages that may be intended⁶. There are also to be taken into account the possibilities of a quotation being referred to a wrong Father⁷,

¹ Cp. Westcott, *Canon*, p. xxviii.

² See Westcott and Hort, ii. 104 (Appendix) *ad loc.* It is found in Priscillian.

³ See, for example, Scrivener and Westcott and Hort as to the weight to be attached to Cyril of Jerusalem's silence about Mark xvi. 9-20.

⁴ Horne, iv. 340.

⁵ *Revision Revised*, p. 359.

⁶ *Symb. Crit.* ii. 620, where, quoting Clem. Alex. for Rev. xxii. 12, he gives as possible references Is. xl. 10, lxii. 11.

⁷ Ziegler, *l. c.* p. 69, note, points out that a quotation of 1 Cor. iii. 5, attributed by Sabatier to Augustine, is really due to Petilianus, and that Augustine quotes the passage quite differently.

or of the rejection of the authority on the ground of the work passing under the name of one who was not its author; and, when we get our quotation indirectly, there is always the chance of the Father being wrongly quoted¹.

On all these grounds the evidence of patristic quotations merits the severest scrutiny before it is thrown into the balance on one side or the other.

In using Versions and patristic quotations alike we have to consider the possibility of many so-called *variae lectiones* having come from misreading of the Greek. Here caution is needed lest we should put on one side (as errors arising from this cause, not therefore to be counted as various readings) real differences in the Greek text, and thus unintentionally defeat our own object.

Such errors may be due to misreading abbreviations. No doubt the evidence of our earliest manuscripts points to the rarity of abbreviations, but these were no doubt a kind of *éditions de luxe*; when manuscripts had to be multiplied rapidly, abbreviations must have been much used. Several instances are given by Wetstein², and they afford plausible explanations of the phenomena, though for some of his suggested abbreviations other support would be desirable. Thus in Mark xv. 8 the alternatives ἀναβás and ἀναβοήσας—the first read by Vulg. with *a*, the second by *c*, *ff*²—may be due to two interpretations of an abbreviation (so in 2 Kings xxiii. 9 there is a similar confusion of ἀνέβησεν and ἀνεβόησεν). At Matthew xiv. 7 a similar abbreviation may explain the reading of the Syriac and B, ὤμοσεν for ὠμολόγησεν. It is questionable whether this explanation should be adopted, as Wetstein suggests, of the variants Ἱερουσαλήμ and Ἰσραήλ at Acts vi. 7, or of the variants ἀποστόλους and ἀνθρώπους at Acts v. 34. Another instance, not given by Wetstein, would be the form in which Isaiah xlv. 1 appears at Barnabas xii, Tertullian

¹ Thus Tregelles (Horne, iv. 347) shows how Germanus, quoting Irenaeus' evidence as to Mat. i. 18, has exactly reversed it.

² Wetstein, *Animadversiones*, etc. p. 34; cp. Griesbach, *Curae*, iii. § 6.

adv. Judaeos 7, and Cyprian *Test.* i. 21, in all of which the abbreviation $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ for Cyrus is taken for the more familiar $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, and in M of Cyprian the change has gone so far that $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ of the LXX has dropped out altogether, and we get *Domino Cyro* representing $\overline{\kappa\omega} \overline{\kappa\omega}$.

The most interesting variant for which this explanation has been offered is that of Tertullian¹ at Heb. vi. 5, where 'occidente iam aëro' is attributed by Semler to a misreading $\overline{\delta\upsilon\varsigma}$ (for $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), as an abbreviation of $\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\sigma\alpha\iota$ ². If Rönsch's explanation that it was due to the Latin translation used by Tertullian held good, we should expect more widely-spread authority for this strange reading.

Another class of mistakes comes from the wrong division of Greek words³ (of which we get instances in the MSS. at Mark xv. 6, Rev. xviii. 8) as in the Curetonian at John iv. 38, where $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ is rendered as if it were $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'$ $\omicron\zeta$, and John vi. 63 where η $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\xi}$ is given instead of η $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\xi}\varsigma$.

Misreadings of the Greek manuscripts due to errors of the eye must also be taken into consideration. Thus in the Peshitto $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ and $\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ are confused at 2 Cor. xi. 20, $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ and $\omicron\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ at Eph. vi. 9. Other instances are given by Scholz and Hug. From the Curetonian may be quoted the confusion of $\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and $\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (where also the Vulg. reads *sust ebibit*) at Mat. vi. 24, and of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\tau}\iota\sigma\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\tau}\iota\sigma\omega$ at Mat. xxi. 16⁴.

In the Vulgate a somewhat similar case may be the reading *minavit* for $\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (Acts xviii. 16, as if from $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$) where *e. tol.* read *abegit*⁵.

¹ Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, p. 725.

² An exact parallel is quoted by Griesbach, *Curæ in Text.*, etc. p. 83, note. Professor Sanday suggests that it may be most easily explained by the omission of a line in the MS.: thus $\delta\upsilon\nu[\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda] \omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

³ Scholz, *Einleitung*, i. 593, note. Hug, *Einleitung*, i. 329.

⁴ Cp. also in the Peshitto: $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ read as $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha$, 1 Cor. i. 6; and $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}$ for $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} \tau\acute{\alpha}$, Col. ii. 22. So also, perhaps, we are to explain $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (Luke xiv. 31), unless it is a sense reading, as Michaelis (*Tract. Crit.* § 37) suggests.

⁵ But in the Vulgate Exod. iii. 1 and elsewhere *mino* is used for 'to drive.'

Such mistakes are very frequent in the Ethiopic, as has been noticed above.

In the Fathers we have similar instances, and these cases are, probably, the strongest evidence for the assertions that they translated for themselves, to which reference has already been made. Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 54 εἰς νίκος appears as *in contentionem* in Tertullian, Cyprian, and Hilary¹; in *de Resurr.* 23, Tertullian translates Phil. iii. 14 τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως (as if it were ἀνεγκλήσεως) by *incriminationis*². Augustine's often-repeated reading of *momenti* at James i. 17 seems to imply that he read ῥοπῆς (and not τροπῆς) ἀποσκίασμα; so in *Ep.* 199. 22 he reads *caecati* at 2 Tim. iii. 4, clearly showing he had not τετυφωμένοι but τετυφλωμένοι³.

There are some cases where it is not possible to say whether the mistakes are due to misreading the Greek, or to variants in the Greek, or to corruptions in the language of the Version. Thus in Mat. ix. 36, where all printed editions of the Peshitto after Widmanstadt have ܐܝܢܐ (*soluti*), is it, as J. D. Michaelis says, a manifest *erratum* for ܐܝܢܐ (*projecti*) of the Harklensian, or does it represent a variation in the Greek text between ἐκκληυμένοι and ἐσκυλμένοι? So in the Curetonian at Luke xx. 46, is the Syriac reading due to the Greek manuscript having confused στοαῖς and στολαῖς, or is it a scribe's error as to ܣܬܘܐܝܬ and ܣܬܘܠܐܝܬ? and in John iv. 47, is there a representation of the various readings ἵνα ἴδῃ and ἵνα ἰάσῃται, or is there a scribe's confusion of ܣܠܐ and ܣܠܐܝܬ? None of these variants are, however, of any very great importance.

It is quite clear that all these kinds of error, and ambiguity as to the evidence afforded by Versions and patristic quotations, make it almost an imperative rule that no variant should be accepted on the authority of either of these kinds of testimony

¹ This may be due to their use of a common Version.

² In 2 Tim. iv. 6, Ziegler would seem to be wrong in inferring that Tertullian read ἀνελεύσεως, as his reading *deversionis* may well translate ἀναλύσεως (*l. c.* p. 36).

³ Augustine was not a good Greek scholar; cp. *Confess.* ii. 23; *de Trin.* iii. 1.

without some manuscript support. But before we come to consider the very difficult question as to the value of the evidence of Fathers and Versions in comparison with manuscripts, we have to compare our Versions together and see to what extent their evidence may be regarded as independent, and what their value is, regardless of the considerations which have been already referred to as affecting all the evidence which they give.

In estimating the critical value of our authority, *ceteris paribus*, age has the greatest weight. Tertullian's canon, 'id verius quod prius¹,' is, under certain conditions, the first to apply. We must see then the age of our Versions, and this can be fixed with less certainty in the case of Versions than Fathers. The Armenian, Harklensian, Gothic, and Vulgate are the only early Versions that can be dated with approximate certainty, on the ground of definite historical facts. In assigning the dates of the Early Syriac, Old Latin, and Egyptian Versions, we have only internal or inferential evidence. If the Syriac Old Testament is cited as early as 170 A.D. by Melito of Sardis, it is impossible² to identify his quotation with an existing Version. The same holds good with reference to Hegesippus (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22). When Ephraem quotes from the Catholic Epistles and Revelation, this is no evidence that a Syriac Version existed in his day, unless it can be proved that he knew no Greek³. Nor, again, if we could prove the existence of a Syriac translation of some part or parts of the New Testament, would that prove that a Version of the whole existed, because, at any rate, as late as Cyprian (*Pref. in Test.* iii), the different parts of the New Testament were kept separate. There is, again, as in the case of the LXX and Old Latin, the question whether the whole translation was the work of one man, as Bleek⁴ holds, or several, as Tregelles⁵ and Hug⁶ maintain. In spite of these difficulties the evidence goes to show

¹ *Contra Marc.* iv. 5.

² Field, *Hexapla*, p. lxxviii; but see Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 312, note.

³ *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv. 434.



⁴ *Einleitung*, p. 931.

⁵ Horne, iv. 266.

⁶ *Einleitung*, i. 326.

that, if the Syriac tradition that the Version was the work of Mark is an exaggeration, there was a Syriac Version made before the end of the second century. This evidence is derived from (i) the Canon it implies, (ii) its use by all sects implying an origin earlier than these sects, (iii) the evidential value of the textual corruption, (iv) the translation of such words as ἐπίσκοπος, which is not distinguished from πρεσβύτερος¹. It has to be added that by some the date of the Version is unduly brought down, as by Wetstein, who assigned it to the seventh century.

The date of the Latin Version is equally uncertain, but it is generally agreed that this also is prior to the close of the second century. If we could be sure of the date of Irenaeus' Latin translation, and assign it to almost the same date as the Greek as Tischendorf² and Massuet do, so as to be able to say that Irenaeus' Latin, Tertullian, and Cyprian were all one Version³, or if we could hold with Weiss⁴ that the agreement of Tertullian and Irenaeus' Latin showed a 'ziemlich verbreitete Uebersetzung,' then we might further infer from the variations between these Fathers' quotations that the Latin Version had a long history behind it, reaching back, it may be, almost to apostolic times⁵. We might then afford to neglect as comparatively unimportant⁶ the further question whether it was the work of one or many translators, a question on which opinion is not as yet unanimous. It must be added that the opinion of Dr. Hort is against assigning an earlier date than the fourth century to Irenaeus' Latin, and that others refuse to see, amidst the peculiar renderings of Tertullian, any evidence for a Latin Version then existing⁷.

¹ This is true so far as that at Phil. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 7, the word  is used for ἐπίσκοπος. In Acts xx. 17, 28 the words are distinguished as in the Greek. At Luke xix. 44, 1 Pet. ii. 25 and v. 2, the colourless word  is used.

² Wann wurden, etc., E. T. p. 50.

³ Kaulen, l. c. p. 113.

⁴ Einleitung, p. 631.

⁵ Kaulen, l. c. p. 141; Ziegler, l. c. p. 27 ff.

⁶ Bleek, Einleitung in das A. T. p. 554, says, 'von grosser practischer Bedeutung ist übrigens die ganze Streitfrage nicht.'

⁷ See *supra*, p. 217.

These two points make it more important to settle, if possible, the question whether there were always many independent translations, or whether there was originally only one.

The Egyptian Versions are generally referred to almost as early a date¹, and there can be no doubt that these three Versions represent the earliest efforts to translate the New Testament into foreign tongues. The evidence of Chrysostom (*Hom. I in Johannem*) is generally quoted to show that by his time there were Versions in most languages.

But though the age of a Version as of a MS. is the first criterion of value, it is by no means an infallible test. It has been abundantly proved, and is accepted by all textual critics, that age only affords a presumption in favour of the authority. Thus to Burgon's² instance of the oldest fragment of Euripides (dating from about 200 B.C.), which is also the most valueless, may be added the already-quoted instance from the *Codex Ambrosianus*³ of the Peshitto Old Testament, many illustrations from late manuscripts of the LXX, and a striking example from one of the Vienna *Corpus* Series, reviewed by Professor Sanday in the *Classical Review* for February, 1888⁴.

And, finally, it must be noticed that it is not always possible to accept the dates given in the manuscripts, as the scribes often copied those found in the archetype from which they transcribed.

To determine the age of a Version or Father is not therefore a sufficient test, and we must have recourse to others. We must examine first whether we get any traces of intentional alteration or doctrinal bias, either of which, if substantiated, would destroy the value of the authority in which it was found. Fortunately, though accusations abound from Justin Martyr onwards⁵, the only ground for them very often is the

¹ Lightfoot, in Scrivener, *Introduction*, etc.

² *Revision Revised*, pp. 321-2.

³ See *supra*, p. 205.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 19, 'There is this peculiarity about the MSS. of the treatise *de Statu Animæ* [of Claudianus Mamertus] that their value is in almost inverse ratio to their age.'

⁵ *Cum Tryph.* § 73, he accuses the Jews of cutting out at Psalm xcvi. 10.

not unnatural tendency¹, where two readings exist already, to choose that one which best suits the purpose or views of the writer. This explanation will hold good of many of the instances in which Tertullian accuses Marcion or other heretics. Thus (*de Carne Christi* 19) he ascribes the plural ἐγενήθησαν (John i. 13) to the Valentinians, while as a matter of fact the singular which he adopts has absolutely no manuscript authority, and is most probably derived from Irenaeus², who, in adapting the quotation to his purpose, substitutes the singular for the plural, as is done by Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* 2, in a passage already quoted. Of a similar nature is Tertullian's accusation against Marcion (*c. Marc.* v. 3) of corrupting the text of Gal. ii. 5 by not omitting the negative. Here it is most likely that Marcion's is the right reading³.

On the ground of intentional falsification, then, it may be allowed we have small reason to depreciate patristic evidence, and it is asserted by very many that there are few, if any, traces of it⁴. But we have to take account of the tendency to adopt the reading which best suited the argument. Tertullian, 'with his forensic and rhetorical standard⁵,' and Jerome are perhaps the worst offenders in this respect. Thus, of the former, Rönseh⁶ says that he used one translation 'obschon die vor den Augen Tertullians, weil sie mitunter seinen polemischen Schlussfolgerungen im Wege stand, nicht immer Gnade gefunden hat.' The following illustration may be given from Jerome⁷. In 1 Tim. ii. 9 he says, writing against Jovinian, that σωφροσύνη should be translated not *sobrietas* but *castitas*, as better suited to his purpose: when accused of

¹ Cp. Coleridge's story of Luther's temptation to alter readings that told against his views.

² Iren. iii. 16. 2; 19. 2; 21. 5; cp. Griesbach, *Curae*, etc. p. 83, note. The singular is also found in *b* (*Cod. Veron.*).

³ For other so-called instances, cp. John iii. 6 (Arians), 1 Tim. iii. 16 (Maced.) and Tisch. ad Heb. ii. 9 (Nest.). Pearson on the Creed, p. 526.

⁴ Westcott, *St. John*, p. 142; Simon, *Histoire des Versions E. T.* pp. 2, 3, 126; Griesbach, *Curae*, etc. p. 90; Porson, *Letters to Travis*, pp. 155, 174.

⁵ *Expositor*, i. xi. 7.

⁶ *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 3.

⁷ Simon, *l. c.* p. 58.

this by Rufinus in the Old Testament he can only defend himself (*adv. Rufin.* I) by a reference to *commentariolis ubi libertas est disserendi!*

In the case of Versions there is very little trace. In the Peshitto at 1 Cor. v. 8 we have the Nestorian reading ¹ ܡܫܠܝܐ for ἐν ἀζύμοις ἐίλικρινείας, which, however, is not to be regarded so much as a doctrinal correction, but rather as one intended to bring the language into conformity with the general Eastern custom of using leavened and not unleavened bread ². The Nestorian reading at Heb. ii. 9 (χωρὶς θεοῦ), found in later Syriac Versions, is not found in the Peshitto.

We cannot ignore in this connection the clear tendency of the Syriac Versions towards encratite views, if not in 1 Cor. vii. 2, 6, 7 ³, at any rate in reference to the virginity of Mary. This may be illustrated by the Syriac readings ⁴ (which agree with Tatian's) at Mat. i. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, and Luke ii. 48. The same tendency is noticed by C. B. Michaelis in the Erpenian and Polyglot Arabic ⁵.

The softening down of the force of δεῖ when used of Christ's Passion (e.g. δεῖ ἀποκτανθῆναι, etc.) by the use of ܡܠܝܟܐ (elsewhere used for μέλλειν), is also noticed by Baethgen as characteristic of the Curetonian. Ellicott finds a 'slightly Arian tinge in the Gothic' at Phil. ii. 6-8, but it must be remembered that the same charge has been brought against the Revisers of the English Bible on account of their reading in John i. 18 ⁶.

There would seem then to have been very slight alteration, for doctrinal purposes, of the Greek text.

We have next to consider how far our authorities are homogeneous, and so see whether we are justified in assigning them

¹ Adler, *l. c.* pp. 40-41, says our printed editions following Widmanstadt are based on Nestorian MSS.

² Adler, *l. c.* p. 37.

³ So Marsh's *Michaelis*, ch. vii. § 8.

⁴ Baethgen, *l. c.* p. 92; Renan (*Histoire des Origines*, v. 187) calls the reading in Mat. i. 17 a 'correction tout apologétique.'

⁵ *Tract. Crit.* § 27.

⁶ F. T. Bassett on Revised Version, p. 84.

the same value in separate parts of the New Testament. Canon Westcott says, 'No authority has an unvarying value, no authority is ever homogeneous¹.' It is confessedly true of our manuscript authority; thus A 'has one recension in the Gospels, another in the Pauline Epistles, another in the Acts and Catholic Epistles².' It is also true of the Versions and patristic quotations. Of the Versions some are primary (or taken direct from the Greek) in one part of the New Testament, secondary at another, or even a combination of two different recensions. Thus the *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae*³ is in the Gospels from the Harklensian, in the Acts and Epistles from the Peshitto. The Arabic Version, called after Erpenius (1616), is in the Gospels a primary Version, in the Acts and Epistles derived from the Syriac⁴. In order to settle the question of homogeneity, it is further necessary to attempt to solve the problem as to how far the translations were made simultaneously, and by one hand. It has already been pointed out that, owing to our ignorance of the conditions under which the Versions arose, this is very difficult. It is probably an open question whether the early Versions, at any rate, were not the spontaneous outcome of the want, which must have been early felt, of having the books of the New Testament in a 'tongue understood of the people.' If so, these Versions would be made in different districts, and different books would be translated as they became known. Later on in the Church's history, as organization increased, such translations would be made under authority; but in the second century it is quite possible that Ridley's⁵ account may be right, *plures a pluribus interpretibus in vulgus effusae sunt explicativae quae tandem collectae et non nunquam refectae in unum codicem vel editionem relatae sunt*. The same theory would explain Augustine's *numerositas interpretum* of the Old Latin. It is obvious that

¹ *St. John's Gospel*, p. xc.

² Griesbach, *N. T. i.* lxxxi.

³ Ridley, *l. c.* §§ 13-14.

⁴ Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* § 22.

⁵ *Loc. cit.* p. 334. He says, pp. 284, 291, the Versions were a sort of Targum intended *circumforaneis et vulgatoribus*, and the glosses were gradually removed from the text.

an appearance of homogeneity would be given by the redaction of which Ridley speaks. If this be the true account of its origin, it will explain the Targum-like additions in the way of critical or exegetical glosses which we find in the Syriac, but it will weaken the importance which we might otherwise attach to Versions as made with the best Manuscripts, and exhibiting *non unius alteriusve hominis sed totius ecclesiae interpretationem et iudicium*¹.

It is impossible to arrive at very certain conclusions as to the homogeneity of a Version for the reasons given above, and accordingly we find great divergence of opinion. Of the Peshitto it is asserted on the one hand by Bleek that in the New Testament, at any rate, it is all by one hand; while Hug and Tregelles say it is the work of several, the Acts and Epistles, for example, showing more signs of revision than the Gospels². Of the four Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, and their relation to the rest of the Peshitto, we have already spoken³. There seems to be some ground for Michaelis' assertion, based on the evidence of language—as, for example, the use of ܡܠܟܝܢ (elsewhere in the New Testament, e.g. Acts xiv. 12 for *heathen* priests) instead of ܡܡܝܢ—that the Epistle to the Hebrews is later, and by a different hand⁴.

When we turn to the Latin Version the question is equally difficult, and the earliest evidence we have on the question is opposed. Do the various fragments which have come down to us owe their diversity to changes introduced in transcription from a common archetype, and are there no differences other than those which may be traced to *vitiosi interpretes, praesumptores imperiti, and librarii dormitantes*⁵? Or have we in our present Old Latin *codices* the results of what

¹ Voigt, *de Vers. N. T. Syr.* p. 178.

² This revision may, however, have been subsequent to the original translation.

³ *Supra*, p. 197.

⁴ Marsh's *Michaelis*, ii. p. 8. The Erpenian Arabic has the same variation (*ib.* p. 5).

⁵ Jerome, *Pref. ad Dam.*

Augustine, in a well-known passage, calls the *Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas*, the *interpretum numerositas*? On this point opinion is still divided¹, though it seems to be agreed that we have two types of text, African and European, fairly well defined; and on the further question whether these were originally distinct, all the available evidence is not yet assorted, and 'premature theorizing' to be deprecated². There is no doubt when we come, a little later in the history of the Latin Version, to Jerome's time, that his work was anything but homogeneous, and though his statements on this point do not always agree with the facts as we find them, probably Rönisch unduly depreciates the critical value of the Vulgate on this account³. That further changes have been introduced into the Vulgate Manuscripts through the existence and use of the Old Latin side by side with the Vulgate for three or four centuries, has been already pointed out⁴.

These illustrations from the Syriac and Latin Versions show the need of settling where possible the homogeneity of our authorities. It is not less necessary in reference to patristic quotations. In the case of Tertullian, whom Rönisch calls the 'Gewährsmann' of the oldest Latin Bible, it is well known that his quotations are singularly erratic. It may be questioned whether it is right to attribute this to the Ishmaelitish character of the man, or whether, if, as Rönisch says, there were not only one but several translations extant, the variety in quotations may not be due to the fact that the Epistles were not as yet bound up in one volume⁵, and so he followed in various parts various types of manuscripts. It is certainly important in reference to the value of Tertullian's quotations to settle this point.

¹ The authorities on each side may be seen in Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 62, and Herzog, *R. E.* viii. 436.

² *Old Latin Texts*, ii. p. cclv.

³ *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 11.

⁴ Westcott and Hort, ii. § 114, and *supra*, p. 198.

⁵ Ziegler, p. 36, n., quotes to this effect from Münster, *De primordio Ecclesiae Africanæ*.

If we pass on to Origen, there is no doubt that (as has been proved by Griesbach¹) in his earlier work, his Commentary on St. John, he used manuscripts of what he called an Alexandrian character (BCL); in his later, his Commentary on St. Matthew, he used a Western text resembling D. The question as to the 'Einheit der Augustinischen Bibel,' is discussed by Ziegler at great length; and the importance of such a question, and the difficulties which surround it, are well illustrated there².

Before we are in a position to rightly value our authorities we must, after having examined them individually in reference to all the points which have been discussed, and assigned them their proper weight according to the results of the inductive process thus carried out, proceed to institute a sort of comparative criticism, with the object of ascertaining their dependence and independence of each other. We shall thus avoid counting as independent, authorities which examination would show to be closely related, or neglecting from identity of language and *prima facie* resemblance to notice real distinctions. On the extent to which this can be done depends the accuracy of textual criticism as a science. What Professor Sanday has said of Manuscripts is true of all textual authorities. 'It is now generally recognized that what the textual critic has to deal with is not so much MSS. taken singly as the archetypes of groups of MSS.'; i.e. as he has said elsewhere, 'Authorities must be weighed, not counted'; and if this process were complete, then it would be easy to throw them into one scale or the other, and so accept or reject a certain reading. It is, however, extremely difficult; for while authorities, in their origin locally most remote, are found to be derived from one source, so, on the other hand, those in the same language are often found to be independent.

¹ *Symb. Crit.* part ii.

² He decides finally (*l.c.* p. 76) that, in spite of apparent evidence to the contrary, there is 'unbestreitbares Zeugniß für die Einheit der Augustinischen Schrifteitate.'

The relation to each other of Versions in the same language is almost more difficult to define than that of Versions in different languages. Is the Peshitto older than the Curetonian, or are they related as the Vulgate and Itala? In spite of Dr. Hort's definition of the Curetonian as *Syrvetus*, this must still be regarded as an open question¹. And, of the later Syriac Versions, is the Harklensian merely a correction of the Peshitto (as Ridley and White), or practically a new Version (as Gregory Barhebraeus and Bernstein²)? Is the mysterious Carcaphensian, as Adler says (*l. c.* p. 33), not a different Version, but a *codex vulgatae Syriacae versionis*? Are the resemblances of the Jerusalem Syriac to the Peshitto noted by Adler (*l. c.* p. 155, note) due to connection with that Version, or are they, as Storr says, interpolations from it?

To the similar questions, in reference to the Old Latin, allusion has already been made. Are *k, e* of the same descent as *a, b, f, q*, or are they to be regarded as independent witnesses? It is only possible thus to indicate the nature of the questions involved in the relationship between Versions of the same language.

Again, in considering the relationship which exists between Versions of different languages we have to notice, first of all, the distinction between primary and secondary Versions, i.e. those made directly from the Greek, and those which come through the medium of another language. Many of the Western Versions come through the Latin, as many of the Eastern bear traces of Syrian influence.

Of the printed Persian Versions one is primary (that edited by Whelock), while that of Walton's Polyglot, which is the older Version, was made from the Syriac. So, too, of the Arabic Versions, while that of the Polyglot was from the Greek, parts, at any rate, of Erpenius' edition were from the Syriac. These considerations will show the inexactness of

¹ Cp. *Studia Biblica*, 1st series, p. 172, and Dr. Salmon's review of it in the *Academy*, 1885. Scrivener, p. 324.

² Cp. *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv. 433, 1017.

quoting the Arabic Versions without distinction, as was done by Mill and Bengel, or of not distinguishing between the two Persian Versions. It will be obvious that secondary authorities are for the most part only useful for correcting errors that may have come into the original Version subsequent to the date at which the secondary Version was made. Instances have already been given in which Michaelis uses the Erpenian Arabic to correct the Syriac, and it is only in this indirect way that it can be used to establish the Greek text.

But we have also to examine the relations that exist between Versions not traceable definitely to the same origin, and see whether the one has been conformed to the other, or whether the resemblance is due to derivation from the same early Greek archetype. What, for example, is to be said of the connection between the early Syriac and Latin Versions? Are we, with Wetstein, J. D. Michaelis¹, and Griesbach², to ascribe the resemblances to later interpolations from the Latin; or, with Bengel, to assume the use by the Syriac translator of a Latin Version as well as a Greek Manuscript; or, with C. B. Michaelis, to say that one of the Old Latin Versions was by a Syrian; or, finally, shall we accept the somewhat similar suggestion of Professor Sanday, that the Latin Version may have been made at Antioch or Caesarea? A settlement of this is obviously preliminary to a certain and accurate use of both these Versions.

Again, what is to be said of the Origenic readings in the Curetonian, as, for instance, at John i. 28? It is easy to suppose, seeing that we have only one Manuscript of the Version, that it may be a later insertion; but it is equally possible to use it as an argument for the lateness of the Curetonian Version.

What, again, is the explanation of the frequent close relation of the Thebaic with Western readings?

¹ *Curæ in Vers. Syr. Act. Apost.*

² *Hist. Text. Epp. Paul.* i. § 12.

The answers to these and similar questions as to the relations of the Versions to each other must be given, and on the probability of the explanation offered, and its agreement with all the facts of the case, depends the use that can be made of these materials.

In the same way we must examine the dependence of the Fathers on each other. From the absence of any canons of literary usage, plagiarism was not uncommon. This adaptation of a predecessor's language is seen in the way in which quotations are transmitted in a way that varies from all Manuscripts, instances of which have been already given. From the earliest times the Fathers studied each other's writings. Thus Clement of Alexandria followed Clement of Rome¹; Barnabas² was used by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria; Irenaeus, as we have already seen, was followed by Tertullian and Epiphanius, and Cyprian was a pupil and admirer of Tertullian³; and from the language used by Jerome the 'extent to which he leans on others' is obvious. The way in which the patristic evidence on Mark xvi. 9-20 may be traced through Eusebius, possibly to Origen, may be seen in Burgon's *Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark*⁴. It is obvious, too, that in many cases the Fathers who wrote in Latin are evidence only for the Latin Version, and are dependent on that for their reading. This may be clearly seen from the many cases where we have the Latin Fathers and Versions on one side, and the Greek Fathers on the other. In such cases the Latin Fathers only count as corroborating the Versions, and not as independent evidence. Worthy of notice also is the agreement in error which is found to exist between Ephraem Syrus and the Peshitto⁵.

This would make it almost certain that the evidence of Fathers, whom we have not in the Greek, is only indirectly valuable; and it is important to bear this in mind with

¹ Sanday, *Gospels*, etc. p. 17.

² Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Canonem*, pp. 74, 89.

³ Porson, *Letters to Travis*, 262-3.

⁴ Pages 509, 512-3.

⁵ Cornill, *l. c.* p. 147. *Studia Biblica*, 1st series, p. 173.

reference to the Latin Version of Irenaeus, and also such parts of Origen as we have only in Rufinus' Latin translation¹. This last point is clearly proved by the remains we have of Origen's Commentaries on the Romans. Of course under some conditions it is possible to infer from the context what Greek reading they had, as in the case of Irenaeus' readings at Mat. i. 18 (*contra Haer.* iii. 16 al.), and at Luke viii. 51 (*contra Haer.* ii. 24); but as a rule what has been said above holds good, and it may be asserted generally that the same limitations apply to the use of their evidence as to that of Versions².

It may well be said that, if so many precautions have to be taken in the use of Versions and patristic quotations, it is an open question whether they will repay the labour spent on them. Such is not, however, the opinion of textual critics.

The evidence of patristic quotations is described by Professor Sanday³ as 'the Archimedean point on which the lever of scientific criticism must be laid, and by means of which alone fixed, precise, and definite conclusions can be reached.' This is due to three special features of their evidence. Firstly, they 'settle the principles on which textual criticism must proceed, viz. in considering a few old authorities rather than many late ones⁴.' Secondly, 'they are to all intents and purposes dated codices⁵.' Thirdly, they determine the district in which any recension of text was prevalent.

They are useful to fix the locale. This may be seen from the way in which Cardinal Wiseman⁶ used the evidence of

¹ *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* iv. 116. Ziegler, *l. c.* p. 54, draws wrong inferences as to Origen's readings.

² Thus Irenaeus' evidence as to Acts xx. 28 in iii. 14. 2 is uncertain, though the Latin has *ecclesiam Domini*, because, in places where the Greek has survived as well as the Latin, we find an inexact translation of titles, e.g. i. pref. § 2; ii. 26. 1; v. 2. 3; v. 3. 2.

³ *Expositor*, i. xi. 178.

⁴ Tregelles, *Printed Text*, p. 148.

⁵ Burgon, *Revision Revised*; cp. Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* i. p. cxl, *continent igitur patrum allegationes ipsissima licet disiecta aut laxata eorum codicum Graecorum membra quibus patres illi usi fuerunt*.

⁶ Wiseman, *Essays*, etc. (edit. 1888), p. 291 ff.

Cyprian and Arnobius to prove the origin of the Latin Version in Africa, from the resemblance in style and diction, and also in the substance of the quotations which has been proved to exist between Cyprian and the African representatives (as they have been thus found to be) of the Old Latin *k*, *e*, and also between Augustine and the European Codices. We may illustrate this also by the way in which Dr. Field used the quotations of Chrysostom and Theodoret to localize Lucian's recension of the LXX¹.

They are certainly useful as to date. In the cases of both Versions and Manuscripts we have as a rule only inferential evidence on which to proceed; and sometimes, as has been seen, we have statements which are misleading. But when we find any reading in a patristic quotation, we are able at once to say approximately the date at which a certain reading was found. Thus it is important, with reference to the corruptions found in D, the Old Latin, and Curetonian, to remember that they are found as early as the second century². If this could not be proved from the evidence of patristic quotations, we should most probably have assigned these corruptions to a later period in the history of the text, even if we did not, on the strength of such corruptions, assert that the authorities which contained them must be late. But if they have this value it will not be right with Tregelles³ to use none after 320, for even if the evidence of their actual quotations may have no direct value after that time, yet indirectly they will be of value even down to the seventh and eighth centuries, and even later. Nor will it be right to confine ourselves to the Latin Fathers, as Lachmann did, who used no other patristic evidence than theirs, saving only Origen's. All the Fathers, whose date and locality we know, will be useful.

¹ *Hexapla, Proleg.* p. lxxxvii.

² Nearly all the important interpolations are found in the early Fathers; John v. 7 is an exception.

³ Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 397. Cp. Westcott and Hort, ii. p. 102. All after 320 are 'so many secondary manuscripts, inferior to the better sort of secondary uncials now existing.'

The special value of Versions depends on the fact that the best were made from Manuscript authority considerably earlier than any now extant. They are, under the limitations that have been already discussed, Manuscripts to all intents and purposes¹, and we shall see that in conjunction with Manuscript authority they may be used as evidence on points, on which, without such support, they could not have been used. Further, it is possible in cases where there is not the ambiguity which is inherent in the evidence of all Versions *quod* Versions, to use their evidence without Manuscript support, as we could not use that of patristic quotations; for we may, as a rule, be sure that all readings which have the authority of Versions have Manuscript evidence, whereas many various readings, derived from patristic sources only, are, as we have seen, sufficiently explained by the fact of their being quoted from memory. But the evidence of Versions, before it can be used, requires to have tests (of the character described above) applied to it, in order that we may see whether there is any explanation of the reading they seem to support. The value of their evidence depends largely on what we believe to be their origin. If they were authoritative translations, we may be sure they were made from the best MSS. procurable, and by competent translators; but the chances of this increase in proportion as we get later in the history of the Church, and those generally considered the oldest lack this stamp of authority, as they were probably made for out-of-the-way congregations, or the illiterate, by whom the need of them would be first felt².

We have now to consider the value of patristic evidence, and that of Versions³ when it is opposed to that of the

¹ Cp. J. D. Michaelis, *l. c.* ch. vii. § 1. The difficulties which prevent our treating Versions as MSS. are given by C. B. Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* §§ 37-48.

² See *supra*, pp. 227, 228. Fritzsch (Herzog, viii. 437) says of the translator of the Old Latin—für den Gebrauch der Gemeinde schrieb.

³ As to the opposition of Versions and MSS., see Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* § 20; Westcott and Hort, ii. § 360; cp. also *Aug. de doct. Christ.* ii. 15 *si quid in Latinis codicibus titubat Græcis cedere oportere.* Cp. *id. de civit. Dei*, xv. 13.

Manuscripts. Under certain circumstances what Walton said is true, that to correct the Manuscripts by the Versions was like correcting the sun by clocks, and like drinking of the stream when we might drink of the fountain; but unfortunately the comparison does not hold good, for in this case both the sun and the fountain require to be improved. Were the Manuscripts free from error we might agree with Walton, but as it is (unless we are prepared with Lachmann to follow the most ancient Manuscript authority, even when in error) we must correct our evidence by the best means at our disposal¹. This does not mean that we should, with Wichelhaus, make the Syriac the standard to which Greek MSS. should conform, or use the Latin² to correct the Greek, as Ambrosiaster and Helvidius, and in later times Harduin, wished to do. In the case of Versions it has been noticed that they always presuppose Manuscript authority, so that it is unlikely that a Version would support a reading which has no Manuscript authority.

In the case of patristic evidence for a reading as against Manuscript authority, it must be remembered that the early date of a Father is by itself in no way a guarantee for the value of his evidence, because contemporary with the earliest Fathers we have a great amount of textual corruption, as has been already pointed out. Holtzmann³ upholds the principle that the quotations of the Fathers are to be taken in evidence against all Manuscript authority: thus in John vi. 4 he would omit any reference to the Passover⁴, and at Mat. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 he would prefer the Fathers to the Manuscripts. Again, at Heb. xi. 4, Westcott and Hort say that Clement of Alexandria alone has probably preserved the right

¹ *Quid quod versionibus illis quinque integris uti possumus, codicibus Græcis etiam mutilis esse contenti debemus?* Lagarde, *de N. T. ad fidem*, etc. p. 4.

² Horne, *Introduction*, iv. 265; Simon, *l. c.* pp. 44, 47. This is discussed at length by the author of *Palaeoromæica*. Harduin describes the Vulgate as *sola integra et incorrupta*.

³ *Einleitung*, § 49.

⁴ Cp. Hort, in *N. T.* ii. Appendix, *ad loc.*

reading, while in Col. ii. 2 Lightfoot inserts into his text a reading which has only the authority of B and Hilary¹. It should be noticed that by accepting a reading on the authority of patristic evidence alone, we suppose that the MSS. used by the Fathers were the same, and that they and all copies derived from them have disappeared. The difficulty of this supposition becomes greater the later in time the Father lived. This should make us very loth to accept the evidence of patristic quotations alone without any other support². We have seen enough to make us feel how easy it was when once a reading had been accepted by a Father, even as a marginal gloss, for it to be adopted by succeeding writers; and though we should welcome, if it were attainable, 'the consentient voice of Catholic antiquity' to which Burgon refers, the agreement must be that of independent witnesses to a reading. A *consensus* of patristic testimony may only mean the acceptance of a reading which was originally a critical or exegetical gloss, and never had any Manuscript authority.

Lastly, we must consider the evidence of patristic quotations and Versions when the readings they imply have Manuscript authority. Under such circumstances this evidence may be used for points in which, without such additional support, they would be valueless for one or other of the reasons given above. Winer cites cases where the Syriac may be used thus: at Phil. ii. 26 with ACDE; at 2 Cor. iii. 17 to support the omission of ἐκεῖ, because omitted in ABCD; at Eph. iii. 3 for the passive, because it has the Manuscript authority of ABCDFG; at 1 Cor. vii. 36 for the singular γαμέλω on similar grounds³.

Versions and Fathers may also be used under such circum-

¹ Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 634, is inclined to favour this reading, but finally adopts one with more MS. authority.

² Cornill, *l. c.* p. 59, says they are only useful 'als Anhaltspunkte für das Unterbringen von in Handschriften überlieferten Recensionen.'

³ Of course at the present time more stress would be laid on the grouping of MSS. than on the presence or absence of the Syriac.

stances to support one reading against another of similar meaning, if (but only if) an inductive examination of the Version shows that the translator carefully distinguished the words in question. Thus at Acts xii. 7 Lagarde would read *ρύξας* instead of *παράξας*, though it is read by D only of the Manuscripts. He has not, however, here carried out the inductive process on which he himself insists¹: if so, he would have found that the Syriac word ܠܡܫܐ, though used for *ἐνύξεν* again at John xix. 34, is also used for *παράσσω* at Mat. xxvi. 31, Luke xxii. 50, Rev. xix. 15, as well as for other Greek words of varied meaning, e.g. *ῥάπισμα* ἔδωκεν, John xviii. 22; *τύπτω*, Mat. xxiv. 49, Acts xxiii. 2; *δερεῖς*, John xviii. 23. So that, from a word capable of being used so widely, it seems impossible to argue as Lagarde² would do.

So, again, he would use the evidence of Versions for the reading of *Α καταμαρτυροῦσιν* at Mark xv. 4, as against *κατηγοροῦσιν* read by B and D.

Lastly, in connection with Manuscripts, Versions may be used to remove later additions which have come into the Manuscripts after the point at which the Versions were made. This use of them Jerome suggested. Speaking of the recension which went by the name of Lucian and Hesychius, he says he will not use it *cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt*.

Without Manuscripts it is impossible to restore the Greek text from Versions or those patristic quotations which labour under the same disadvantages as Versions. Of course the evidence of the Greek Fathers stands on a somewhat different footing; and yet we have seen that we might make many mistakes and be often in doubt as to the form, though no doubt the substance might be in great measure restored even 'from the works of Origen alone³.'

How useless is the attempt to restore the Greek text from

¹ Cp. especially Winer, *l. c.* p. 15; Baethgen, *l. c.* p. 21 *ad init.*; Nowack, *l. c.* p. 21.

² *De N. T. ad fidem*, etc. p. 10.

³ See Michaelis, *Tract. Crit.* § 19, for the necessity of MSS. as a *norma*.

the Versions alone, without any help from Manuscripts, may be seen from the instance of Crowfoot's labours on the Curetonian, which resulted in the production of a Greek text in many places agreeing with no Manuscript whatever.

The whole subject is a wide one. Enough will have been said to show that very useful and important evidence may be got both from Versions and Patristic quotations, but that many precautions have to be taken before we can say that we have clear signs of a *varia lectio*. The most indispensable requisite is that the supposed *varia lectio* should have Manuscript authority of some kind, and the farther such Manuscript authority is from the possibility of any intimate relationship to the witnesses under consideration, the greater does the value of the evidence become, and the more such independent authorities for a reading, whether Manuscripts, Versions, or patristic quotations increase, the nearer may we feel we are getting to the attainment of the original text of the New Testament.

NOTE.

In reading the above abundantly illustrated and cautiously balanced estimate of the use of Versions and Fathers, it will be well to bear in mind the broad steps in the argument by which their value is established. It is a cardinal principle of modern textual criticism, that in order to recover the true text of any ancient document, it is necessary first to know its history. Especially is this the case with a text so complicated as that of the New Testament. But to the history of this text Versions and Fathers give the key. The text of MSS. is perfectly definite, but it is neither dated nor localized. It is just this dating and localizing which, in spite of their greater indefiniteness, is supplied by the Versions and Fathers. By their means the ground is mapped out: the succession of the different texts in point of time and their distribution in space are determined: and so the reconstruction of the text proceeds, not upon mere counting of numbers nor upon a subjective weighing of probabilities, but upon a firm basis of history. [W. S.]

VI.

THE AMMONIAN SECTIONS, EUSEBIAN
CANONS, AND HARMONIZING TABLES IN
THE SYRIAC TETRAEVANGELIUM,

WITH NOTICES OF PESHITTO AND OTHER MSS. WHICH
EXHIBIT THESE ACCESSORIES OF THE TEXT.

[G. H. GWILLIAM.]

IT is proposed in the following paper to give an account of the form in which the (so-called) Ammonian Sections and the Eusebian Canons are exhibited in MSS. of the Peshitto Version of the Four Gospels. The Greek form of this system of division and reference is well known, the symbols being expressed along the margin of the Greek text in such common editions as those of Mill, of Lloyd, and of Tischendorf; but the Syriac form has never been printed in any edition of the Syriac text. It was known from J. G. C. Adler's *Versiones Syriacae* that Peshitto and Philoxenian (or rather *Charclean*) MSS. frequently exhibit these divisions, and have tables of Canons prefixed, while some of the facsimiles appended to his book show a marginal notation of Section and Canon, like that found in Greek codices. So it has, perhaps, been assumed that the two systems, which are constructed on the same principle, differ only in unimportant details: certainly but little attention has been paid to the Syriac form, although it derives its origin from a very remote period¹.

The *editio princeps* of the Peshitto (Widmanstadt, Vienna,

¹ The late Dean Burgon claimed to have been the first to direct the attention of Biblical scholars in general to the Syriac Ammonian Sections and Eusebian Canons. He has given a brief but clear account of them in his *Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark*, App. G. The late P. E. Pusey set them out on the margins of his *Widmanstadt* from the MSS. which he had collated for his projected revision of the text. They will be printed in the edition of the Peshitto Gospels, now in preparation at the Clarendon Press.

1555) may be supposed to imitate on its pages the very form of the MS. matter from which the type was set up, for such was the practice of the early printers. So Widmanstadt's headings and subscriptions, his inserted liturgical rubrics, and his marginal ornaments, were doubtless copied from his MSS. The ordinary division into chapters is indicated by small figures, placed in the margin so as not to disturb the Syriac paragraphs. Perhaps he was hardly acquainted with Robert Stephen's verses. But with all this careful distribution of the text, there is no indication of the Sections and the Canons. It must be concluded that the editor's MSS. did not exhibit them. They are not so frequently found in later Peshitto MSS. as they are in the earlier copies, and the MSS. employed in preparing the *editio princeps* of the Peshitto were certainly of a late type, whatever their date and origin¹. It seems useless to enquire further about them, nor would their recovery be of much importance; for we can be in no doubt of their character. It is patent on the printed pages of Widmanstadt².

The century and a half which followed the period of the first editing of the Peshitto gave birth to several other editions, in part little more than reprints, but in part also improved by the use of other MS. evidence³. But as yet no notice was taken of the Syriac Sections and Canons. Then in 1742 S. E. Assemani published his *Catalogus Bibliothecae Mediceae*. The first pages of this magnificently printed work are devoted to a full description of the most ancient MS. of the Holy Gospels in the Versio Simplex which that Library contains, the celebrated Codex Florentinus, which is dated A. Gr. 897, i. e. A. D. 586. He states that the Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus is prefixed, but does not print the text of it, although he sets out in full the Tables of the

¹ Inter alia may be mentioned ܐܝܢ for ܐܝܢ, as the word is spelled in all old MSS.; ܐܝܢܐ, in old MSS. usually ܐܝܢܐ, or ܐܝܢܐ; the full form ܐܝܢܐ very rare; ܐܝܢܐ paragogic appended to 3rd per. fem. pl., as ܐܝܢܐܐ.

² See Appendix I.

³ Besides the well-known authorities—Wichelhaus, Scrivener's *Introduction*, Leusden and Schaaf's *Preface*—see a valuable article on *The Printed Editions of the Syriac New Testament* in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxvi, July, 1888.

Canons, with their curious ornamentation. No remark is made on the differences between the Syriac and the Greek systems, although it would be obvious to any one who should compare the numbers of the Sections in any table, with those in the corresponding Greek table, that the systems are by no means identical. But in describing another codex (Plut. 1, No. 58), Assemani (*op. cit.* p. 25) speaks of a ‘*distinctio Evangeliorum in versiculos, seu parvas sectiones ab Eusebio editas, quae apud Syros aliae sunt ab iis quae in MSS. Graecis et Aegyptiacis codicibus conspiciantur*’¹.

From the materials collected by the late Mr. P. E. Pusey, supplemented by my own researches, we can now determine what were the peculiarities of the Syriac system. The following specimen will suffice to illustrate and explain the differences between the Greek and the Syriac forms. We select the first eleven verses of St. Mark, as affording a convenient and instructive comparison between the two systems. The reader is also referred to the facsimile which forms the frontispiece to the present volume, and which is described in Appendix II.

^α Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ·

^β Ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου·

^β Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου·
^α εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ·

^γ Ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα, καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται· καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο πάντες ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

Ἦν δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου, καὶ ζώην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

^δ Καὶ ἐκήρυσσε, λέγων, Ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου,
^α οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ.

¹ Of the Canons etc. in the former Codex, Assemani says: ‘*de quibus consulenda Prolegomena ad Biblia Polyglotta.*’ The reference must be to Walton’s *Polyglott*, London, 1657, albeit Walton’s description is entirely confined to the Greek form. Of the Syriac form he was probably ignorant.

It may be convenient to add the version of the above from Leusden and Schaaf [*Nov. Test. Syr. c. Vers. Lat.* 1708], changing also the Syriac numeral letters for their equivalents in figures.

Principium Euangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei ✧

¹ Sicut scriptum est in Esaia Propheta: Ecce, ego mitto nuncium
² meum ante faciem tuam, qui praeprabit viam tuam ✧

² Vox clamantis in deserto; Parate viam Domini, et exaequate
¹ semitas ejus ✧

³ Johannes in deserto baptizabat, et praedicabat baptismum resi-
¹ piscientiae in remissionem peccatorum ✧

⁴ Et exibat ad eum universa regio Judaeae, et omnes Hierosoly-
⁶ mitae, et baptizabat eos in Jordane flumine, quum confiterentur peccata sua ✧

⁵ Ipse autem Johannes indutus erat vestimento pili camelorum, et
⁶ cinctus erat zona pellicea in lumbis suis: et cibus ejus erat locustae et mel sylvestre ✧

⁶ Et praedicabat, ac dicebat; Ecce, post me venit qui validior est
¹ me, is cui non sum dignus ut me incurvans solvam corrigias calcea-
⁷ mentorum ejus. Ego baptizavi vos aqua ✧

¹ Ipse verò baptizabit vos Spiritu sancto ✧

⁸ Et factum est diebus illis, venit Jesus à Nazareth Galilaeae, et
⁴ baptizatus est in Jordane à Johanne ✧

⁹ Et statim quum ascendisset ex aqua, vidit quòd fissi sunt coeli,
¹ et Spiritum tanquam columbam, qui descendit super eum ✧

¹⁰ Et vox facta est de caelo: Tu es Filius meus dilectus, in te com-
¹ placitum est mihi ✧

MARCUS	MATTHAEUS	LUCAS	JOHANNES
1	124	87
2	8	7	10
3	7	6	2
4	10
5	9
6	12	10	12
7	13	11	17
8	15	14
9	17	15	16
10	18	16	18

On comparing the treatment of this passage in the original, and in the Syriac, we observe how much more numerous the

Syriac Sections are than the Greek. Here the former are twice as many as the latter; in some other passages the disproportion is even greater, although usually it is less. The numbers in each Gospel are respectively, in Matthew, *Syriac* 426, *Greek* 355; Mark 290 and 236; Luke 402 and 342; John 271 and 232; in all 1389 in the *Syriac*, against 1165 in the *Greek*¹. The latter sought only to place in harmony those paragraphs in one Gospel which are in historical, or perhaps only verbal agreement with paragraphs in one or more of the other Evangelists: the *Syriac* aimed at a complete tabulation of the more minute resemblances between the several statements within the compass of such paragraphs. Thus it often happens that the *Syriac* section is but a few words, only half a verse, or less, but it forms a distinct division, because it bears a resemblance to some longer or shorter passage in another Gospel, or else it is noted as being without a parallel in the other Evangelists.

It will be seen that the references in the *Syriac* text are very conveniently collected together at the foot of the page. This was not intended, however, to supersede the Tables of Harmony, for they are often prefixed to the codex as well; but whether they were given or not, *Syriac* scribes, almost without exception, collected the references, page by page, precisely as we have exhibited them above. This is distinctly a feature of the *Syriac* system: rarely is a MS., which exhibits the Sections and Canons, unprovided with the Foot-harmony. The plan was imitated by the scribe of the *Cod. Argentens*, of the Gothic Version, and was not unknown to

¹ I am not aware of any variation in the number of Sections in *Syriac* copies. The scribes performed their work with mechanical accuracy, favoured by the distinctness of the large Estrangela characters employed in the oldest MSS. It is not so as regards the Greek scheme. Dean Burgon (*op. cit.*), whose intimate acquaintance with Greek MS. Evangelia will be recognised by all, says that, while the majority of copies have for the sum total 1165, as above, it is found also to vary between 1181 and 1162. Suidas (s. v. *Κεφάλαιον*, or *τίτλος*) gives the Sections thus:—Mat. 355, Mark 236, Luke 348, John 232 = 1171. Further details of the sums total in MSS. are given by Tischendorf (*Nov. Test. Gr. ed. crit. maj.*) at the conclusion of each Gospel.

some of the Greeks; yet it is rare in Greek MSS., and apparently borrowed from Syria. This remark applies also to the Coptic MSS. If the plan of a Foot-harmony had belonged from the first to the scheme, it is strange indeed that Eusebius says nothing about it when explaining the notation which the reader would find on each page. Strange also that scribes should neglect so convenient an arrangement, so that it now accompanies the notation on the pages of a few MSS. only¹.

In looking out the references for the Greek in the Eusebian Tables we frequently find (as in the case of Section 4 above) that the passage is compared with more than one parallel in one or more of the other Gospels. In the Syriac only one parallel is given at the foot of the page; the others, if any, are noted in the Tables at the beginning of the codex. To these, therefore, we must refer for a complete conspectus of the Harmonies.

The parallel passages indicated by the different numerals in the above examples are set out, and combined, in the following Table. The Greek references can be verified from the *Novum Testamentum*, Oxon. 1889²; the Syriac parallels are derived from the unpublished materials in my hands.

¹ It is impossible at present to assign a date for the introduction of the Foot-harmonies into Greek MSS. They are found, e.g. in E (eighth, perhaps seventh century), but are not a *prima manu* in the judgment of some; in M (ninth century); in 262 (tenth century); in 199 (twelfth century); in 264 (thirteenth century)—a MS. ‘with Coptic-like letters.’ The earliest MS. which exhibits this arrangement is, I believe, the fragment T^b, probably of the sixth century (Tischendorf, *Monumenta sac. ined.* 1870 and *Proleg. in N. T.*). If its characters (‘litterae litterarum in fragg. Borgianis similes,’ i.e. *tanquam a Copto exaratae*) are an indication of its origin, it doubtless owes the Foot-harmony to the influence of Syriac Evangelia known to the scribe, for between the Copts and the Monophysites of Syria there was frequent intercourse. The *Cod. Argenteus* is by some assigned to the fifth century. The *scheme* is that of Greek MSS. If the Foot-harmony, as seems most probable, was derived from the same source, we must assign an earlier date than that suggested by T^b for the adoption of this plan in Greek codices. The extant Coptic MSS. are of much later date. Their sections are Greek, like those of the Gothic. Of the latter, there is a facsimile illustrating the features under discussion in Andreas Uppström’s *Versionis Gothicae Fragmenta*, 1854. An instructive facsimile from 262 will be found in *The Last Twelve Verses* (Burgon), p. 305.

² Or Wordsworth’s *New Testament*, where the Tables are rearranged to facilitate reference.

GREEK.

Mark	Matthew	Luke	John
i. 1, 2	xi. 10	vii. 27	
3	iii. 3	iii. 3-6	i. 23
4, 5, 6	iii. 4-6		
7, 8	iii. 11	iii. 16	i. 15; 26, 27; 30, 31; iii. 28
9, 10, 11	iii. 16, 17	iii. 21, 22	i. 32-34

The passages quoted as parallels in the above are necessarily for the most part identical, both in the Greek and in the Syriac scheme. In the latter, in accordance with the principle which is followed throughout by the Syriac Harmonist, the parallels are dissected, and the portions variously manipulated; but besides, passages are quoted (viz. John i. 6-8, Mat. iii. 13, John i. 29) of which no notice is taken in the Greek. It is strange that Mat. iii. 13 should be omitted in the Greek scheme, as it is required for a parallel to Mark i. 9. The citation of John i. 29 is interesting as indicating the compiler's opinion on a point of harmony. For it may be supposed that the verse was quoted for that purpose, although, in using the term *Harmony* in connection with these parallels, we must bear in mind the just remark that 'a very slight examination is sufficient to show that the most ancient endeavour [in the direction of a Harmony] known as the Eusebian Canons, aims as much at showing verbal as historical agreement¹.' This applies equally to the Greek and the Syriac schemes².

¹ *The Student's Gospel Harmony*, Slatter, London, 1878. The accurate compiler of this useful manual may be supposed to mean, *the most ancient Harmony which is extant in the complete and original form*. Tatian's *Diatessaron* is only known to us at second-hand. The controversy about Theophilus of Antioch and his writings arose subsequently to the publication of Canon Slatter's work. For *Harmonies* of various periods, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* iv. 5. 20; Tischendorf, *Synop. Evang.* Proleg. viii. seq.

² An instructive example is the treatment of our Lord's Discourse at Caper-

SYRIAC.

Mark	Matthew	Luke	John
i. 1 having no parallel is treated as a Title and not included in the Sections.			
2	xi. 10	vii. 27	
3	iii. 3	iii. 4-6	i. 23
4	iii. 1, 2		
5	iii. 5, 6	iii. 2 last part, 3	i. 6-8, iii. 23
6	iii. 4		
7, 8 first part	iii. 11 first part	iii. 16	i. 15; 26, 27; 30, 31; iii. 28
8 last part	iii. 11 last part	iii. 16	i. 33
9	iii. 13		i. 29
10	iii. 16	iii. 21	i. 32
11	iii. 17	iii. 22	i. 34

The Peshitto possesses this great advantage over some other ancient writings, that the true text depends in no respect whatever upon conjecture, but is fully assured by the testimony of a large amount of diplomatic evidence of great antiquity. Such also is the case with the Syriac scheme of Sections and Canons. They are so intimately connected with the text which they serve that they may almost be regarded as a constituent part of it.

The notation of Section and Canon in Syriac Evangelia is almost invariably a *prima manu*. The usual plan was to make each Section, however short, a separate paragraph, by setting in the first word far enough for the notation to stand *upon* the edge of the column of writing, and not *outside* it.

naum (John vi. 22 f.), which has clearly no historical parallel in the Synoptists, although some (as Tischendorf, *Synopsis Evangelica*, 1871, p. 73) would harmonize vv. 66-71 with the conversation which preceded the Transfiguration. And yet both the Greek and the Syriac scheme exhibit a number of comparisons between passages in vv. 22-65 (not to speak of the concluding section of the chapter) and passages in the other three Gospels—e.g. v. 38 is compared with our Lord's words in Gethsemane. The earliest labourer in this department of Gospel criticism, Tatian, produced an epitome of the Gospel history, if we may depend on Zahn's clever reproduction of the *Diatessaron*. The Eusebian system holds an intermediate place between a Gospel history, and a collection of modern marginal references. The result of employing the Sections and Canons for the construction of a harmony may be seen in a sumptuous, but useless work, entitled, *Harmonia Quat. Evang. juxta Sect. Amm. et Euseb. Can.* Oxon. 1805.

An example may be taken from Lord Crawford's MS., our No. 3, at St. Mat. xxvi. 6:—

ܐܢܬܝ ܝܫܘܥ	323 And when Jesus
ܕܒܬܢܝ	I
ܕܒܝܬܝܢ	was in Bethany
ܕܒܝܬܝܬܝܢ	in the house of Simon

But in the Nestorian codex, *Add. Brit. Mus.* 7157 (our No. 11), the text is not broken up, but the notation is inserted between the final and initial words of the Sections, in the midst of long paragraphs; and while the Section is marked, as usual, with red, the Canon is indicated by a *green* letter placed after, instead of under, the Section-number¹.

In ancient times they were well known in various parts of the Syrian Church, and are handed down to us by many witnesses, of whom we may select eleven, all written before the close of the eighth century, and one dating from the first half of the sixth.

The MSS. are these:—

1. *Vaticanus* (S. E. Assemani, *Bibl. Vat. Cat.* P. 1, t. 2, p. 27 seq.; Adler, *op. cit.* pp. 3-10; Wichelhaus, *Vers. Syr. Ant.* 1850, p. 141). Written at Edessa, A. Gr. 859=A.D. 548.

The careful collation of this valuable relic of antiquity, which Adler desired, has now been undertaken by Professors Guidi and Ugolini, through the liberality of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. It exhibits the notation of Sections with their Canons, and the Foot-harmony. The Epistle to Carpianus and the Tables were probably at one time prefixed, but at present the original writing only begins at Mat. i. 12.

2. *Tetraevangelium*² *Florentinum* I (Plut. 1, No. 56).

Assemani's account of this MS. has already (p. 242) been referred to. It was written in the Monophysite Monastery of St. John, in Beth Zagba (see Wichelhaus, p. 142; Adler, pp. 11-13) in the year 897=A.D. 586. As Adler doubted the genuineness of the epigraph, which gives the date, the following in confirmation of its

¹ See facsimiles in *British Museum Catalogues*, Forshall and Rosen, 1838, W. Wright, 1872.

² ܐܢܬܝ ܝܫܘܥ (cf. Suiceri *Thes. Eccl.* II, 1269) often occurs in the titles of MSS. of this class and age.

genuineness will be of interest. It is taken from a letter from Dr. A. Ceriani to myself, March 10, 1882, after an inspection of the MS.:—‘*Essa è di prima manu, e precisamente come sogliono i Siri scrivere la data dei codici. Anchè la scrittura del testo conviene all’età assegnata nella sottoscrizione.*’

3. *The Earl of Crawford’s Tetraevangelium.*

A noble volume, of which, through his lordship’s kindness, I have been able to make a thorough collation. The Sections and Canons, as well as the Foot-harmony, are in agreement with the same accessories in the Cod. Florentinus. The text of Mat. i. 1 begins on the second quire; the first, which is now lost, doubtless contained the Tables and Epistle to Carpianus.

The late lamented Dr. Wright, after examining this MS., wrote to Lord Crawford as follows:—‘There is no date, and no mention of the person or place to whom or which it originally belonged. Of the age of the MS. there can, I think, be no doubt. I should call it a fine specimen of Syriac Estrangēlā writing of the sixth century of our era.’

4. *Oxoniensis* (Dawkins 3).

Sections, Canons, Harmony, but wanting the Tables and Epistle. It is ascribed in the Bodleian Catalogue to the ninth century, but I understand that Dr. Wright was inclined to give it a very early date. Richard Jones, who collated it carefully at the beginning of this century (*Text. S.S. Evang. Ver. Simplicis c. duobus MSS. in Bodl. repositis collatus*, etc.), thought it was of nearly the same age as the Cod. Vat. described above. This is improbable. It is a carelessly written MS. in comparison with others of its class.

5. *Londinensis* (Mus. Brit. Add. 14,455).

Four Gospels. Sect., Can., Harm.

Apparently of the same era as Lord Crawford’s codex.

6. *Add.* 14,449.

Four Gospels. Sect., Can., Harm. Sixth or seventh century.

7. *Add.* 14,458.

Similar to last-named.

8. *Add.* 14,445.

Sixth or seventh century. Contains St. Matthew and parts of SS. Mark and Luke, with Sec., Can., Harm. in St. Matthew only.

9. *Add.* 14,450.

Seventh century. Besides the Sections and Canons it once had the Tables, similar to those of the Florentine codex, but less ornamented. The Tables of the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th Canons are still extant.

10. *Add.* 17,114.

Four Gospels, but with many lacunae, in a Nestorian hand¹, of seventh or perhaps sixth century. Sections and Canons in St. Matthew only, but no Harmony.

For the last six MSS. see *Cat. Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus.* P. 1, W. Wright, 1870.

11. *Add.* 7157 (*Cat. MSS. Orient. Mus. Brit.* P. 1, Forshall and Rosen, 1838, W. Wright, *op. cit.* Appendix A, p. 1203).

Written in A. Gr. 1079=A. D. 768, at Beth Kuka, a Nestorian monastery (v. *Assem. Bib. Orient.* iii. i. 308, 454) near the Lycus, in Adiabene. Its peculiar method of notation of Sections and Canons has been already mentioned. But though written under different influences, their numbers and the arrangement of the Foot-harmony agree with the same accessories of the other codices.

It is interesting to compare the weight of testimony which we have now adduced with the evidence in support of the Greek scheme. Of the codices anterior to the year A. D. 800, which exhibit the Greek Sections and Canons, some are only fragments; in some the numerals indicating the Canons of the Sections are not now legible, if they were ever expressed; sometimes (e. g. in the important cod. L, *Reg. Par.* 62) the Sections and Canons are so placed as to suggest that the scribe was not familiar with the use of them; again, in the Cod. Basilcensis, E, they are deemed by some critics to have been inserted by a later hand. Thus the evidence for the Greek scheme, while amply sufficient for practical purposes, is not so clear and accurate as that for the Syriac scheme, and is not so abundant. Our observation illustrates what is well known

¹ For the different styles of Syriac writing, see Assemani, *Bib. Orient.* iii. ii. 377 seq., the Plates in the *British Museum* and *Bodleian Catalogues*, J. P. N. Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, and W. Wright in Preface to *B. M. Syr. MSS. Cat.* pp. xxix-xxxii. As early as the close of the sixth century (if not earlier) a divergence of writing had arisen between Eastern and Western Syrians. A MS. (*Add.* 14,460) written among the Nestorians in the neighbourhood of Naarda, in Babylonia, A. D. 600, already exhibits that type of writing which developed such distinct characteristics in the following centuries. With this style, the hand of our No. 10 has many affinities: it has also Nestorian vowel-marks, though these are not *pr. m.*, and altogether may be considered as belonging to the same class as 7157 (=No. 11) which tells its own story. For Nestorian MSS. see Wichelhaus, *op. cit.* lib. iii. c. iv; Adler, pp. 19-39. For the computation of dates see Nicolas' *Chronology*, p. 10.

to the very few scholars who have devoted their time to the careful collation of Syriac documents. They were inscribed with almost mechanical precision, and (speaking of the Holy Scriptures) so many accurate copies of very ancient date have survived, that certainty is secured, and conjecture has no place; because the occasional itacism, or other *lapsus calami*, can almost invariably be corrected by diplomatic evidence.

The late Dean Burgon (*op. cit.*) raised the question, but left it to others to decide, whether Eusebius may not himself have published the more numerous Sections, now extant only in the Syriac¹. Bishop Lightfoot² justly objects that there are no grounds for such a conclusion, and Dean Burgon once informed the writer that subsequent study had long since brought him to the same opinion. That Eusebius should have put forth a simpler, and a more elaborate, system of parallels, is most improbable. That the Syriac form is based upon the Greek scheme no one can doubt after an examination of even the one example only which we have set out *in extenso* above. The more perfect and complete Syriac scheme is clearly a development of the Greek.

And this reasonable conclusion is confirmed by the arrangement of the *Tetraevan. Florent. I.* The scribe first gives a version (in some respects rather a paraphrase) of the Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus: then follow the Ten Tables of Canons, identical with the Greek (the numbering of the Sections, of course, being changed) except that in Canon VIII the order is Mark, Luke, instead of *Λουκας, Μαρκος*: then the Four Gospels, divided into Sections on the Syriac plan. There is no indication that the Greek Sections were different, nor a hint that the convenient arrangement of the Harmony at the foot of the page was a Syriac improvement. The reader is left to suppose that these accessories of the Peshitto text were obtained from Eusebius: he is not informed to what extent the Syriac critics have improved upon the work of the Greek historian.

¹ The date of the *Ep. ad Carp.* is not known, but about A. D. 330 Eusebius was multiplying copies of the Scriptures: see *Vit. Const.* iv. 36, 37.

² Art. 'Eusebius' in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

We cannot adduce the same amount of evidence for the *Epistle* and the *Tables* which we have for the *Sections* and *Canons*. Many ancient codices which contain the latter accessories are destitute of the former because they are now mutilated at the beginning: in their perfect state they probably exhibited the same matter which is happily still extant in the Florentine codex. Of the manuscripts described above (pp. 250-252), the *Epistle* and *Tables* are prefixed in No. 2 and are complete; in No. 9, four of the *Tables* only are still extant, and not the *Epistle*.

We have besides:—

1. *Cod. Mus. Brit. Additionalis* 17,213.

Probably a fragment of a copy of the Gospels. Contains the latter half of the *Epistle*: also *Canons* 1 and 2, much mutilated. Sixth century.

2. *Cod. Add.* 17,224.

Paper leaf of thirteenth century, containing about as much of the *Epistle* as the last-named MS. It also is a fragment of a copy of the Gospels.

3. *Cod. Parisiensis*.

Numbered 33 in the *Catalogue des MSS. Syr. de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Partly sixth, partly twelfth century. The older containing the greater part of the *Epistle*, with the *Tables* of *Canons*.

4. *Tetraevangelium Florentinum II*.

Catalogued as *Plut.* 1, cod. 58, and, according to Adler (*Vers. Syr.*), written before the ninth century. It exhibits a copy of the *Epistle*, apparently identical with that in the more famous *Cod. Flor.* already described¹.

The following is the text of the form in which the *Epistle* of Eusebius to Carpianus was known to the early Syrian Church. It is here printed for the first time, with a literal Latin translation².

¹ For information about the last two MSS. I am indebted to the courtesy of M. Samuel Berger, and of Dr. Bruto Teloni.

² The *Greek Epistle* was published by Robert Stephens (ed. 1550), and reproduced by Mill; also, with *varr. lectt.* in Tischendorf's *Test. Gr.* (Proleg.), 1884. The text seems corrupt.

כחצק נחבז אסעבש לעפונגן זי
 * * * ומאנא נחבז *

[illegible]

من مباح: أم ديه قتلها: أمها وفقيها بمباح ديه
 (أحداهم) أمة يهلكها مجلد مباحه ختموا: مباح مباحه
 حملا مباحه 15

معنى واقف: امل بالحال مع مجعده حتم: والى من معص
حما

منه، والحقنا: أملا، والحقنا له مجعده حتموا: صلب حمدا
مسلم

20 منی و اقدار: (محل و احاطه) ۱۵۱ مجده حتم: ۱۵۱ حلال من: ۱۵۱
مستم *

منى وسمعا: امبا ولاقم ۵۵ مجعه حتبوا: صلب حوما *
 منى وعلما: امبا ولاقم ۵۵ مجعه حتبوا: صلب حومه *
 منى وعلما: امبا ولاقم ۵۵ مجعه حتبوا: صلب مسم *
 منى وعلما: امبا ولاقم ۵۵ مجعه حتبوا: حومه حوما *
 منى وعلما: امبا ولاقم ۵۵ مجعه حتبوا: حوما مسم *
 منى وعلما: امبا وسم سم ۵۵ حوما حوما: ولاقم حوما:
 مسما حوما حوما حوما ۵۵ حوما حوما: صلب حومه
 حوما مسم *

[illegible]

EPISTOLA QUAM SCRIPSIT EUSEBIUS AD CARPIANUM DE
EXPLICATIONE CANONUM QUOS FECIT.

Eusebius Carpiano fratri et dilecto meo in Domino nostro,
Salutem !

Ammonius Alexandrinus, multam, ut videtur, industriam, et
amorem laboris multum huic [operi] intulit, et Evangelium Diates-
saron nobis reliquit. Operam enim impendit multam in Evange-
lium Mattai ; et sectionum, quae restabant, Evangelistarum trium
sociorum ejus eas comparavit, quae sibi concordant, secuit, ad
hunc modum collocavit¹ : ita ut fiat ut necessario perdatur nexus 5
ordinatorum verborum Evangelistarum ex composita eorum [verbo-
rum] lectione per id ipsum quod fecit. Itaque, ut conservetur corpus
totum completum plene, necnon ordo verborum Evangelistarum
quattuor, et ut tu cognoscas loca verborum Illorum, ubicunque
sibi concordaverint, en tibi sunt numeri inscripti, super Evangelistas 10
singulos, in locis idoneis : ut amicus veritatis fateor, nos a labore
viri illius, quem supra diximus, occasionem nactos esse ; et alia
ratione decem Canones tibi designavi, qui infra inscribuntur.

Canon primus : hoc continentur numeri [locorum] ubi multa
conjuncte quattuor Evangelistae dixerunt, et sibi concordaverunt,
Mattai, Marcus, Lucas, Juchanan. 15

Canon secundus : ubi tres sibi concordaverunt, Mattai, Marcus,
Lucas.

Canon tertius : ubi item tres sibi concordaverunt, Mattai, Lucas,
Juchanan.

Canon quartus : ubi item tres sibi concordaverunt, Mattai, Mar- 20
cus, Juchanan.

Canon quintus : ubi duo sibi concordaverunt, Mattai, Lucas.

Canon sextus : ubi item duo sibi concordaverunt, Mattai, Marcus.

Canon septimus : ubi item duo sibi concordaverunt, Mattai,
Juchanan.

Canon octavus : ubi duo item sibi concordaverunt, Marcus, Lucas. 25

Canon nonus : ubi duo item sibi concordaverunt, Lucas, Juchanan.

Canon decimus : ubi unusquisque ex Evangelistis quattuor sin-
gulatim, de rebus diversis, ipse solus scripsit, Mattai, Marcus,
Lucas, Juchanan.

Ita se habet res Canonum ; eorum autem clara expositio haec 30
est :—In unoquoque ē quattuor Evangelistis numerorum ordo
ponitur ; ab uno incipit, et duobus, et tribus ; et usque procedit

¹ Vel, *hoc modo collocavit, ita ut fiat.* Codex autem interpungit ut supra,
.... *ⲙⲁⲧⲁⲓ . ⲙⲁⲣⲙⲁⲓ*

ipse numerus, per totum Evangelium, ad finem libri. Et unicuique e numeris subest signum Canonis, minio depictum: et hoc
 35 indicat apud quem e decem Canonibus sit hic numerus; et ita quidem, quasi dicat aliquis, [i. e. *exempli gratia*] si designetur unus, liqueat apud Canonem primum esse; et si duo, apud Canonem secundum; et si tres, apud Canonem tertium: ad hunc modum usque [exitum] decem Canonum.

Si igitur evolvas unum e quattuor Evangelistis, et tibi sumas
 40 prima [capituli] verba, undecunque placeat; ut cognoscas quis ex Evangelistis eadem verba dixerit, utrum quattuor, an tres, an duo; atque ut cognoscas loca verborum Illorum, in quibus sibi concordaverint: sume numerum Canonis minio depictum quem ante te habes,
 45 ad signum [capituli] quod sumpsisti; et recurrens ad numeros qui in principio libri jacent, intra columnas parvas, eundem quaere in eo Canone quem signum minio depictum tibi ostendit, et inveni numeros inscriptos [quibus significatur] quis aut quam multi ex Evangelistis dixerint de eo [loco] cujus signum habes: deinde statim disces qui sint numeri principii [capituli] quod quaeris, ex eis numeris qui intra librum ipsum inscripti sunt, in margine foliorum. Et quum enumerationi versuum cum Canonibus eorum
 50 institeris, invenes Evangelistas illos quattuor, in verbis suis sibi concordantes, Mattai, Marcus, Lucas, Juchanan.

Itaque hi numeri apponuntur ne verba Evangelistarum quattuor abscondantur a verbis sequentibus, nec perdatnr nexus ordinis eorum; tantum ut numeri mutantur, alius in alium, quibus indicetur Evan-
 55 gelistas sibi concordare, et perstet lectio ordinata verborum quattuor Illorum integra, qui sunt Mattai, Marcum, Lucam, Juchanan.

Explicit Epistola Eusebii de explicatione Canonum.

The earlier part of this Syriac version of Eusebius' Epistle is a fair rendering of the original, but the latter part has become a paraphrase in the attempt to make the somewhat obscure Greek intelligible. Two places should be noticed. The Greek corresponding to ll. 11, 12 is:—τοὺς οἰκείους ἐκάστου εὐαγγελιστοῦ τόπους, ἐν οἷς κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἠνέχθησαν φιλαλήθως εἰπεῖν. The translator has punctuated after ἠνέχθησαν, and joined φιλαλήθως εἰπεῖν to what follows—... Evangelistas singulos, in locis idoneis: ut amicus veritatis fateor nos a labore illius...—Again, and more worthy of remark, ἀφορμὰς is represented by 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤍, —... nos *occasionem*

nactus esse—and the meaning intended is, that Eusebius worked out his scheme in consequence of what Ammonius had attempted. This agrees with the rendering ‘hint’ in *Last Twelve Verses*, p. 127¹.

Fabricius, writing of the Eusebian Sections and Canons², did not overstate the case when he remarked, ‘frequens illorum usus fuit in Ecclesiis Orientis pariter et Occidentis, ut ex Codd. MSS. Bib. in variis versionibus notarunt viri docti.’ Although now superseded by the modern marginal references (which are but a further development and much wider extension of the same principle), they were considered in former ages important accessories of the text³. We have spoken of the use made of them by the Copts, and in the Gothic Version. They were derived to the Ethiopic apparently from an Arabic source—of course in the Greek form⁴. The Armenian Evangelia for the most part exhibit them. They are found in Latin MSS., in a minority of those of the earlier type⁵, and in a majority of those of Jerome’s revision. To some of the latter a version of the Epistle to Carpianus is prefixed, which is also paraphrased by Jerome in his *Epistola ad Damasum*⁶.

The case of the Philoxenian, and its Charelean revision, is more immediately connected with our main subject. Of the two *Codices Ridleiani*, in the Library of New College, which

¹ For Eusebius, and his relation to the work of Ammonius, see Mill’s *Prolegomena* (ss. 658–666, 738–744, ed. Küster, 1723). Other authorities are cited by Lloyd, *Nov. Test. Gr.* (ed. 1883, p. xi).

² *Bibliotheca Graeca*, v. 4. 15. He gives a version of the *Epistle*, which Migne (*Patrol. Gr.*) has reproduced. See also Wordsworth’s *N. T.* i. 6.

³ Taking some fifty Syriac Evangelia, described in *Brit. Mus. Syr. Cat.* p. i, as a sample of works of this class, we find that Peshitto MSS. were usually furnished with these accessories during the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. Charelean MSS. exhibit them at a much later period (e.g. the Paris MS., written in the Edessene Monastery of Beth Achenaja, A.D. 1212), but not, I think, those of the Peshitto text.

⁴ *Catalogus Codd. Orient. Mus. Brit.* P. iii, ed. A. Dillmann, 1847.

⁵ Cod. Rhedig. (D), seventh century, has a Foot-Harmony according to C. R. Gregory in *Tisch. Test. Gr. Proleg.* p. 144.

⁶ See Bishop Wordsworth’s *N. T.* i. 3: for details in regard to the Armenian MSS. I am indebted to Professor Margoliouth.

The variations in the notation of Sections and Canons in the above-named MSS. are in marked contrast with the consistency of those of the Peshitto. From the testimony of the latter we infer that the Syrian system was universally, and alone, received, wherever the Peshitto Version was in use, at least as early as the sixth century. Earlier diplomatic evidence is lacking: the very few MSS.¹ of the Holy Gospels which can be assigned with any probability to the preceding century, are not furnished with these divisions. Others, however, which have perished, might have exhibited them. And indirect evidence can be adduced.

For it is known that many of the works of Eusebius were translated into Syriac at a very early period. There is a version of his 'Ecclesiastical History' in a MS. dated 462 of our era, and now preserved in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg. In the British Museum, we find in the *Cod. Add.* 12,150², among other translations from Greek authors, Eusebius' *Theophania*, *History of the Palestinian Martyrs*, and *Panegyric on the Martyrs*. This MS. is dated, according to our era, 411 or 412; but we must go back still earlier for the date of the first appearance of these writings of Eusebius in their Syriac dress. The codex is a *Collection of Treatises*; it is not an autograph *Translation of Eusebius*; in fact, the text affords in itself evidence of having passed through the hands of successive scribes³. It is reasonable to suppose that the works of Eusebius were in part, if not in whole, translated into Syriac within the lifetime of the author⁴; and for the place of such translations we turn, of

¹ Such as *Cod. Add. Mus. Brit.* 14,459 (cf. *Studia Biblica*, 1885, No. VIII), *Add.* 17,117, 'fifth, or beginning of sixth century;' *Add.* 14,453 and 14,470, 'fifth or sixth century;' *Catalogue British Museum*.

² *Cat. Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus.* ii. p. 631. Cureton, *Festal Letters of Athanasius*, p. xv f.

³ See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*; Wright, art. 'Syriac Literature' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed.—'opus plenissimum, 1237 notae marginales,' Nestle, *Syr. Gr.*

⁴ See (in reference to the *Ecclesiastical History*) A. Merx, *Atti del iv Congr. intern. degli Orientalisti*.

course, to Edessa, and its famous school. In that city was written the *Cod. Add.* 12,150, and here, besides the great original writers, like Ephrem, flourished such students as Maanes, the translator of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Proba, the Nestorian translator of Aristotle¹. One of the Bishops of this eminent Syrian See, Rabula, who died in 435, corresponded with Cyril of Alexandria², and received from him copies of his works for translation and publication at Edessa³. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Eusebius also had a friend⁴ to undertake a similar office for him in the city, which, a century before Rabula's time, had already become a chief centre of Syriac culture and biblical study. We conclude then that the critical work of Eusebius upon the Tetraevangelium was quickly known among the Doctors of the School of Edessa. And it is reasonable to suppose that their expansion of Eusebius' scheme was published before the dissolution of the school under the Emperor Zeno, towards the close of the fifth century; for we have already seen that diplomatic evidence shows that the Peshitto text was circulated in copies furnished with the Sections and Canons early in the sixth century, if not in the fifth.

It is also significant that the majority of the oldest codices which exhibit the Sections and Canons are of Western, or Monophysite origin⁵. That they are also found in some later Nestorian MSS. may perhaps indicate that these accessories were the common property of the Syrian Church, before the

¹ See Wright, *op. cit.*; Etheridge's *Syrian Churches*.

² Overbeck, *Opera Selecta* (Ephraemi aliorumque), 1865.

³ In a seventh century Brit. Mus. MS. (*Add.* 14,557, fol. 97) we find, amongst other translations of Greek writings, the Treatise *De Recta Fide*, t. ix. col. 1133 in Patrol. Gr. lxxvi, with the following inscription:—'The Tract on the Humanity of our Lord, which Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, addressed to the Emperor Theodosius, and sent a copy thereof to the holy Rabula, Bishop of Edessa, and he translated it from Greek into Aramaean,' i.e. the Edessene dialect, cf. *Thes. Syr.* col. 389.

⁴ Eusebius seems to have known Syriac: certainly he had access to Edessene writers.—*Hist. Eccl.* i. 13.

⁵ Our eleven codices (pp. 250–252) are a fair specimen of the different Collections. Only one, No. 11, is certainly of Nestorian origin. No. 10 I should class with it, but its notation of Sections, etc., is incomplete.

rupture of the fifth century, and the establishment of the Nestorian School at Nisibis¹. But, on the other hand, it is certain that these rival bodies were not unwilling to borrow, and to imitate each other's critical methods². But on either supposition, it is clear that the exegetical studies necessary for the elaboration of the Syrian harmonizing system, must have been pursued at a very early period among the Syriac-speaking Christians. Their diligence in comparing the *ipsis-sima verba* of the Tetraevangelium (for their scheme demanded an independent compilation, although on a borrowed³ design) is, perhaps, in favourable contrast with those other characteristics by which the rival sects of Eastern Christendom are more commonly known.

The subject investigated, while in itself possibly of minor importance, has suggested notices and considerations which, it is believed, are here brought together for the first time. But besides such points of antiquarian interest, the Syriac system of Sections and Canons has an absolute critical value, (I) as a witness to the integrity and antiquity of the Peshitto text; and (II) as showing the estimate in which that text

¹ For this city, see *Thesaurus Syr.* (R. Payne Smith), col. 2440. An account of the 'Syrorum schola in Nisibi' was given by Junilius Africanus in the sixth century—quoted in Westcott's *Canon of the N. T.*, Ap. D, p. 506.

² The *ܫܬܬܐ* (*sectiones majores*) of which there are in Mat. 22, in Mark 13, in Luke 23, in John 20, are found *a prima manu* in the Nestorian codices, *Add.* 14,460 (A. D. 600), 14,448 (apparently A. D. 699-700); they were added by later possessors to the Jacobite codices, *Add.* 14,470, 17,117, and several others. I do not think they are expressed *p. m.* in early MSS. of this class. Probably they were adopted from another school. Both amongst the Eastern and the Western Syrians critical studies were pursued, resembling those of the Jewish Masoretes. Wiseman (*Horae Syriacae*) describes a MS. embodying such criticisms, which is dated A. Gr. 1291 = A. D. 980. This has sometimes been called, but inappropriately, 'the Karkaphensian Version.' The Nestorian Massoretic MS. (*Add.* 12,138) is dated A. D. 899. See the *Brit. Mus. Syr. Cat.*, and various Tracts by the Abbé Martin.

³ The Divisions known as *τίτλοι* were borrowed by the Syriac scribes, but rearranged, so that each first *τίτλος* begins with the commencement of the Gospel; an improvement on the Greek plan (Mill, ed. Küster, ss. 354-360). See a good account of these and other divisions in Syriac MSS. in the *American Journal of the Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exegesis*, paper by J. H. Hall, vol. June-Dec., 1882. In our No. 11 (p. 252) the *ܩܠܡܐ* (*phimara*) are marked.

was held in the Schools and Monasteries of Syria at a very remote period.

1. In illustration of the former remark, we may consider the witness of the system in the following important places :

1. St. Mat. xxviii. 9—end is in the Greek one Section (355), in the tenth Canon : in the Syriac system it is resolved into five Sections, of which the words that follow v. 18 of the Greek, ܠܗܝܠܝܠܝܢ (and as my Father sent me, I also send you), form a separate Section in the Syriac, in the seventh Canon. The parallel Section is, as might be expected, the latter clause of St. John xx. 21. We have here evidence that this remarkable addition, which is found in every Peshitto MS., was known to Syriac critics at a period anterior to the dates of our earliest copies.

2. St. Mark xvi (of which Tischendorf says¹, 'nec Ammonii sectionibus nec Eusebii canonibus agnoscuntur ultimi versus') affords, from vv. 9—20 inclusive, nine Sections in the Syriac system, some of which are quoted in the harmonies appended to the other three Evangelists. There can be no doubt whatever that these verses formed an integral part of the Peshitto from the earliest times. It will be remembered also that they are found in the Curetonian which, for other purposes, is of great authority with those who dispute the genuineness of this passage.

3. St. Luke xxii. 17, 18. These verses are omitted in Widmanstadt, the passage being one of those to which the editor calls attention, as exhibiting a remarkable variation between the Greek and the Syriac. Syriac, to correspond to the Greek, has been introduced into later printed books, and strange to say, is given by Schaaf *without remark*, although he was so industrious in collecting variants. Had the passage been recognised by the Syriac scribes of the fifth century, it would certainly have obtained a place in Canon 10, as a Section peculiar to St. Luke. But it is unknown to the arrangement of Sections, and has no place in Peshitto MSS.

4. But while the witness of the Sections is valuable, because unimpeachable, where the text is broken into short portions, it will fail us sometimes as a test of the integrity of the text, on account of the great length of many Sections, where the matter is peculiar

¹ *Nor. Test. Gr.* in loc. This is controverted by Burgon (*op. cit.*, Ap. G) to whom C. R. Gregory (*Prolegomena in N. T. Tisch.*, 1884, p. 153) attempts to make some reply.

to one Gospel. Thus, as to the disputed passages, St. John v. 3, 4, vii. 53–viii. 11, we learn nothing from the Harmony, because each forms part of a longer capitulum in Canon 10¹.

II. And in reference to the second consideration already indicated; it will be remembered that the authors of the Syrian system of Sections and Canons were associated with those who were familiar with Greek writings, and must have been acquainted with good codices of the Greek New Testament. They could not have failed to observe that between their vernacular Bible, and various codices of the Greek text, there were not inconsiderable differences. The desire for a more accurate representation of the original induced Philoxenus and Thomas at a later period to attempt a revision of the Syriac². But we have seen that, so far from revision, those who borrowed Eusebius' Sections and Canons deliberately devoted their energies to the work of dissecting and harmonizing the ancient Syriac text³. In such an expenditure of labour upon the Peshitto, they may have been ill-advised: ignorant of the means of improving their Bible they cannot have been. They lived in intercourse⁴ with those to whom the Greek of the New Testament was still the mother-tongue. In the hands of their Greek friends and teachers were copies of the New Testament, of which some must certainly have been older than any which have survived to our days. If

¹ In Greek and Latin Evangelia many *variae lectiones* are to be traced to the Harmonists (see Scrivener, *Introduction*, 2nd ed., p. 12; Mill, *Prolegomena*, 742), but Syriac copies have not been affected by this cause to the same extent.

² This is implied in the colophons of Charclean MSS., quoted in Adler and White (*opp. cit.*), and the similar note found in the *Cod. Angelicus* (Adler, p. 59), which MS., though of uncertain age, was believed by Bernstein to exhibit the Pre-Charclean, or true Philoxenian text. See his *Heilige Evan. des Joh.* p. 3, and *De Charklen. N. T. transl.*, 1837.

³ The absence of the Sections and Canons from Cureton's MS. (*Add.* 14,451) is not evidence for the relatively greater antiquity of the Curetonian Version, because these accessories are also absent from the coeval Peshitto MS., *Add.* 14,459. The same is true of another, perhaps as old, *Cod. Add.* 14,470. The only inference from these facts is a slight presumption against the introduction of the Sectional system before the sixth century.

⁴ Rabula preached at Constantinople: part of the Sermon is in the *Cod. Add.* 14,652, and is given by Overbeck, *op. cit.*

those codices exhibited a text of the 'Antiochian, or Graeco-Syrian' type¹, and therefore in agreement with the Peshitto text for the most part, though with important differences², then can that type of text claim the authority of a great antiquity. But if the students of the Peshitto found on the contrary that the oldest and best MSS. of their Greek brethren represented rather what have survived to us as the 'Apostolic Readings of the Pre-Syrian text,' yet they clung to their own Bible; they attempted no alteration of the text; and they deliberately assigned to it the very highest value as the record of the deeds and words of the Lord³. It may be said that they were blinded by prejudice, even to the extent of regarding their Peshitto as inspired⁴. This is hard to believe of men of the character and learning of the best Syriac writers and teachers of the sixth and preceding centuries. And it is certain, though seldom admitted, that they had access to information about the antiquity and authority of the Syriac Versions, to which we cannot at present refer. For we view through long lapse of ages events from which those men were not far removed in time. Fresh discoveries, and better knowledge of what is already available, are demanded before we can, with reason, set aside their judgment.

¹ See Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, Art. iii. 257 seq., for an account of the supposed origin and history of the Pre-Syrian and Antiochian texts.

² Such as those we have noticed above: see also *Syrus Interpres c. fonte N. T. Gr.* (i. e. the *Textus Receptus*) *collatus*, J. G. Reusch, 1742. The Canon of the Peshitto differed from that of Antioch, and in the opinion of some was still more limited at an earlier period. Westcott, *op. cit.* i. iii. 221; Zahn, *Forschungen* (Tatian's *Diatessaron*), 91, 92, and *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 369; Bert, *Aphrahat's des Persischen Weisen Homilien*; Phillips, *Doctrine of Addai*, p. 46.

³ On the importance of the Peshitto in this respect, and on the great critical value of ancient versions of authors, see the opinion of the learned Dr. S. C. Malan in *St. John translated from the eleven oldest Versions*, 1862, p. vii.

⁴ A similar opinion has been held by some modern Syriac Christians, according to Buchanan, *Christian Researches* (10th ed., p. 114 and n.), and authorities quoted in *A Translation of the Peshito-Syriac of Hebrews, etc.*, Norton, 1889. Proof need not here be given that even in St. Matthew the Peshitto is a translation. On the language used by our Lord, see Dr. Neubauer's important essay, No. III, in the former volume of *Studia Biblica*.

APPENDIX I.

As regards the *Four Gospels*, Widmanstadt states that they were printed from *two* MSS., which in the *Preface* he calls 'vettissima,' and in the Colophon 'singularis fidei exemplaria.' The *Pauline Epistles*, *Acts*, and *Catholic Epistles* he treats as a second part of the work, and prefixes a different *Dedication*. Of MS. authority for this part he says nothing beyond the following, appended to the title of the *Three Epistles*:—'Reliquae S.S.S. Petri, Johannis, et Judae Epistolae una cum Apocalypsi, etsi extent apud Syros, tamen in exemplaribus quae sequuti sumus, defuerunt.'

From statements in the *Dedication* prefixed to the *Gospels* it would appear that Widmanstadt might have had access to the following authorities:—

1. The codex belonging to Teseo Ambrogio, whom he met at Reggio, and which contained the Four Gospels.
2. The Syriac Evangelia which Widmanstadt found in the Ptolemean Library at Sienna.
3. The New Testament brought by Moses of Mardin.
4. The MS. brought by Postel from Damascus.

It is not quite clear whether Teseo entrusted Widmanstadt with his MS., or only gave him extracts from it. Something considerable is implied by the 'Thesei munus splendidissimum,' and Widmanstadt does not mention any subsequent occasion on which he might have received this gift. The small portions¹ published a few years afterwards by Teseo himself, might well have been printed from 'copy' already prepared before Widmanstadt's visit. Of No. 2, Widmanstadt says that he made a transcript for himself. No. 4 is the one afterwards known as the 'Cologne MS.' Its readings were collected by Rapheleng², and differ so greatly from the Widmanstadt text, that we may conclude it was not employed for the *editio princeps*.

¹ Mat. vi. 9-13, xxii. 1-14; Luke i. 46-55; John i. 16, 17.

² See *Biblia Regia*, Antwerp, 1572, the *Heb. O. T. and Syr. N. T.* in 8vo., Plantin, 1574, and the *List of Variants* appended to Schaaf's *Syr. N. T.*; also Land's *Anecd. Syr.* i. p. 6. P. J. Bruns collated this MS., and the Wolfenbüttel cod. of A. D. 634, with the printed text. The Cologne MS. shows signs of having been conformed (itself, or its prototype) to the Greek. 'Bemerkungen, etc.,' von P. J. Bruns, in *Repertorium für Bibl. u. Morg. Litt.* xv, xvi, 1785.

It is almost certain therefore that one of the 'duo exemplaria' would be the Sienna transcript: the other might be Tesco's MS., or that of Moses. The remainder of the New Testament must have been printed from Moses' MS., but in the note to the Catholic Epistles the editor probably refers to the Postel MS. as further authority for his omissions¹.

I had supposed² that Widmanstadt's MSS. might be at Vienna, but an enquiry kindly made by my learned friend, Mr. Reginald L. Poole, has elicited the information that the only Syriac MS. in the Imperial Library (and this collection includes those formerly in the University Library) is a copy made by Moses of Mardin himself, and left as a present to the Emperor. Some of Widmanstadt's MSS. are now in the Royal Library at Munich³, but none connected with the *editio princeps* of the Syriac N. T.

It is probable that Moses took his own MS. away with him, after the edition was printed.

Adler⁴ has some remarks on supposed affinities between Nestorian copies and the Vienna edition; but many resemblances can also be traced between it and the later Jacobite copies, such as Lord Crawford's valuable MS. of the whole Syriac New Testament⁵. These affinities consist chiefly of those grammatical changes which were made in the seventh and eighth centuries in MSS. of both Schools. The Vienna edition has not the famous Nestorian reading at Heb. ii. 9 (ܐܕܡ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܥܠܡ ܕܥܠܡ = *χρῆς Θεου*), and the characters are Western, or Maronite; while the vowel-point system is that mixture of the Greek and Syriac signs, which is found in Western copies, but not, I believe, in Eastern. The Jacobite Rubrics may, of course, be attributed to Moses.

In 1539 Tesco published the portions of the Gospels named above. This was, apparently, the first Syriac printed from movable types. The letters and vowel-points greatly resemble those in Widmanstadt, though far inferior in beauty of execution. The text of the small portions is substantially the same as Widmanstadt's, but in Mat. vi. 12 he gives ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ, *our debts and*

¹ He says of Postel (*Dedic.* p. 25), 'minime vulgare nobis attulit adjumentum.'

² *Studia Biblica*, 1885, p. 153, n. 2.

³ *Cat. Munich Library*, i. 4.

⁴ *Ver. Syr.* pp. 39-41; but see *Wichelhaus*, *op. cit.* p. 217.

⁵ Of which Dr. Gwynn, Reg. Prof., Dublin, is preparing a full account. It is, of course, a different codex from the *Tetraevangelium* described p. 251 above.

our sins, for which there seems no other authority. Teseo's teachers were Maronites¹, and I am not aware that he shows any knowledge of the Nestorian characters, although his pages² exhibit a great variety of alphabets. It may fairly be concluded that Teseo's Syriac Evangelia were of Western type. The Postel MS., brought from Damascus, and that in the hands of the Monophysite Moses, wherever written, and of whatever age³, could hardly have been of a different School from Teseo's codex. The Sienna MS. is alone doubtful, but the probability is great that it also came either from the Lebanon, or from the Monophysites of Egypt.

¹ See authorities in Art. in *Ch. Quart. Rev.* quoted on p. 242 n.

² Teseo's work is a very rare book, and is interesting as an early attempt to produce a 'Manual of Languages.' But it contains much irrelevant matter, including a description of a kind of Bagpipes, which belonged to his uncle, and, *mirabile dictu!* an autograph reply by the Devil to an invocation. But alas! the reader is left in the dark about the signification of the Satanic characters. The title of the work is, *Introductio in Chaldaicam linguam, Syriacam, atque Armenicam, et decem alias linguas. Theseo Ambrosio authore.* MDXXXIX.

³ According to Masius (who in his *Josuae Imper. Hist.* first applied Syriac to the criticism of the LXX) Moses' MS. was an old copy, written at Mozul (*Introd. in Gram. Syr.*), and it is not likely that he would be misinformed. The correspondence between Masius and Moses was published by Andrew Müller, Berlin, 1673.

APPENDIX II.

THE frontispiece to this volume represents a page (fol. 91 verso) of the Vatican copy of the Peshitto Gospels, our No. 1 on p. 250 above. The negative was taken in Rome under the supervision of Drs. Guidi and Ugolini, whose kind assistance I gratefully acknowledge, and is as satisfactory a photograph as could reasonably be expected considering the condition of the MS.¹ It affords a sufficient illustration of the arrangement of *Sections* and *Canons*, and shows the *Foot-harmony* below the right-hand column; the writing at the foot of the other column is illegible. The characters are in that large and beautiful Estrangelo hand² which was in use in the sixth century, especially for MSS. of the Scriptures. It would have been easy to have selected from MSS. in England a page entirely free from the blemishes which disfigure our illustration, but the Roman MS. was chosen as being of special interest because its origin is known, and its great antiquity is fixed by exact date.

The passage exhibited is St. Mark xv. 12 . . . *will ye then*, etc., to the last word of ver. 22. The commencement of each Section is indicated by the setting in of the initial word, and by the numeral: the conclusion, by the mark [• ~ •], with more or less space, according to the exigencies of the writing. The Sections indicated in the specimen are:—

At ver. 14 ²⁴⁷₂; middle of same ver. ²⁴⁸₁; at ver. 15 ²⁴⁹₁; at ver. 16 ²⁵⁰₁; at ver. 20 ²⁵¹₆; same ver.—*and led Him out*,—²⁵²₄; at ver. 21 ²⁵³₂; at ver. 22 ²⁵⁴₁. Section 255 begins with the first word of the next page.

¹ Dr. Ugolini writes:—‘Il codice trovasi in cattivo stato, ed in ogni pagina mostra i tristissimi effetti dell’acque del Nilo.’

‘Porro quum codex hic una cum caeteris Nitriensibus mense Julio, anno 1707, in coenosis Nili vorticibus submersus aliquandiu delituisset, sic fuit luto infectus et humore madefactus, ut de admiranda scripturae venustate multum deperierit.’ *Biblioth. Vat. Codd. MSS. Catalogus*, Assemani, 1758, P. i, t. 2, p. 35.

² Bianchini in *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Lat. Vers. Antiquae*, 1748, gave a specimen page—St. Matt. ix. 18 . . .] to , ver. 28— with three facsimiles from other codices; but the plate represents very inadequately the style and beauty of the handwriting of the Vatican MS.

At Sect. 254¹ a Lesson begins, which is indicated by a mark [+] against the initial word. The other mark [#] appears to indicate the conclusion of the preceding Lesson. In the margin we read :—

॥ कथञ्चिद् दृष्ट्वा ॥

i. e. L^n of the third hour of Friday.

This, and the majority of the indications of Lessons, are in a much later hand than the text: a few, however, are inserted in the text by the first hand. In other MSS. we find some Lessons rubricated in the text, but many more indicated by later hands on the margins. Indeed in all respects the Vatican MS. bears a remarkable resemblance to the Syriac Evangelia in the British Museum, the Earl of Crawford's *Tetraevangelium*, and others of the same era.

¹ In *Mus. Brit. Add.* 17.113, and in the *Crawford Tetraevangelium*, the Lesson begins at ver. 16, the former MS. having in the text *Lesson of the Friday of the Passion at the sixth (sic) hour*. *Add.* 12.137, *Add.* 14.462, and *Add.* 14.464, mark a paragraph at the end of ver. 19: the first of these three codices has at the top of the page *Of the Friday of the Passion*, the last, *Of the sixth hour of the Friday of the Passion*. In *Widmanstadt* the Lesson begins at ver. 21, with the title *Of the third hour*.

Examples of such differences in 'Use' might be multiplied from the Syriac MSS. which we have collated. They indicate the divers circumstances and conditions under which the copies were produced, and confirm the conclusion derived from other considerations, that our extant MSS. represent several lines of independent testimony. Thus they carry back the evidence for the Peshitto text to a more remote antiquity than the date of the oldest of them, as I pointed out in Paper No. VIII in the former volume of *Studia Biblica*.

NOTE.

Since writing this paper, I have seen a work which is scarce in England, M. l'Abbé Martin's *Critique Textuelle* (Leçons professées à l'École de Théologie en 1882-3), *partie théorique*. On pp. 590-614 he treats the subject of this essay on a different plan, and gives many interesting particulars. The learned writer's remarks about the *Tables* p. 595, and *Nestorian MS. evidence* p. 610, should however be compared with what I have stated on p. 254, and on pp. 252 *n.* 1, 262 *n.* 5.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

THE arguments on pp. 265, 266 of the preceding essay are most temperately stated, and the inferences which they suggest lie near at hand when the problems of the text are approached from the side of the Peshitto. But they will perhaps be found to assume a different aspect when they are seen in connexion with a wider range of phenomena. It must not be forgotten that side by side with the Peshitto there are other versions—the Latin and the Egyptian—which compete with it in antiquity; and these too have to be taken into account, together with the texts represented by quotations in the Ante-Nicene Fathers. If it is argued that the Peshitto itself was transmitted, with especial care, and that it fell into a kind of Massoretic tradition like the Massoretic tradition of the Old Testament, still we should not be justified in supposing that this process was continued backwards in the same manner all the way to the autographs. MSS. and quotations together carry back our knowledge of the Peshitto, roughly speaking, to the beginning of the fourth century. But beyond that point more direct evidence fails us. And when we take in the indirect evidence furnished by the authorities above mentioned, we see that the Ante-Nicene period as a whole was one of rapid change and development—of change and development which become most rapid as we approach its beginning. How far the Peshitto participated in this process must be matter for enquiry; but in any case there is ample room for both the Syriac text and the Greek text out of which it sprang to have undergone considerable modifications before it acquired the shape with which we are familiar.

Again, though it must certainly be admitted that the Syriac Christians were strongly attached to their national version, and though we may well believe that they gave it a deliberate preference over other forms of text with which they were acquainted, it is another question what weight that preference will have for ourselves, and how far we can use it in our own selection of a line of text to follow. Before this question can be answered we must know more of the value of ancient criticism in general. And an inductive examination does not permit us to rate the importance of this too highly. It is true that the ancients exercised a certain amount of criticism—more perhaps than they are sometimes credited with—but even at its best it is not of such a kind that we can accept their verdicts without revision.

[W. S.]

VII.

THE CODEX AMIATINUS AND ITS
BIRTHPLACE.

[H. J. WHITE.]

I.

THE visitor in Florence who happens to be in the Mediceo-Laurentian Library when its greatest treasure, the celebrated Vulgate CODEX AMIATINUS, is out of its case, will see what is perhaps the finest book in the world. Wonderful as are the other treasures of this Library, the Orosius, the Sophocles, the Tacitus, the Virgil, the Pandects, the Codex Amiatinus surpasses them all, and, to use the words of Dr. Hort, impresses the beholder with a feeling not far removed from awe, as he contemplates this 'prodigy of a manuscript.' The book measures about 50×34 centim. ($19\frac{1}{4} \times 13\frac{3}{8}$ in.) in length and breadth, and nearly $20\frac{7}{8}$ centim. (7 in.) in thickness without the binding. It contains the whole Bible according to the Vulgate version, together with the usual prefaces, &c. to each book, and a quaternion of very valuable introductory matter at the commencement; it numbers 1029 leaves of vellum, stout but smooth and white, written in two columns to a page, and forty-three or forty-four lines to a column. The text is in a regular and beautiful uncial hand, so carefully and clearly written that it has needed but few corrections; there is no punctuation, as the text is divided into lines of varying length, technically called *cola* and *commata*, or less correctly *stichi*, which represent an ancient system of punctuation perfectly intelligible to the trained eye. The first lines of each book are written in red, but there is no

illumination in the body of the manuscript, except in the page before the beginning of the New Testament, and in the first quaternion, the paintings in which we shall discuss below.

A manuscript of this size and beauty would naturally take a high rank amongst authorities for determining the text of the Vulgate version, and we are not surprised to learn that during the Sixtine revision it was brought to Rome for the purpose of collation, by the order of Sixtus V. Till lately, moreover, it was generally dated by scholars near the middle of the sixth century, and such an early date would of course render its text of great value; but two years ago a series of facts was brought to light which has conclusively fixed the MS. a century and a half later. The links in this chain it is the purpose of the following pages to describe, though nothing has been attempted in the solution of many questions which are still somewhat obscure.

II.

The Dedication Verses.

On the reverse of the first leaf of the Codex appear the following verses, in a hand slightly larger than the rest of the writing, and surrounded by a thin illuminated border :—

CENOBIVM AD EXIMII MERITO
 VENERABILE SALVATORIS
 QVEM CAPVT ECCLESIAE
 DEDICAT ALTA FIDES
 PETRVS LANGOARDORVM
 EXTREMIS DE FINIB. ABBAS
 DEVOTI AFFECTVS
 PIGNORA MITTO MEI
 MEQVE MEOSQ. OPTANS
 TANTI INTER GAVDIA PATRIS
 IN CAELIS MEMOREM
 SEMPER HABERE LOCVM.

The four words in italics, which record the name of the monastery to which the book was at one time dedicated, and the name of the donor, are not in the original hand. They are a substitute for other names which have been carefully erased, with the exception of the *c* in *cenobium* and the *e* in *Petrus*; the marks of the erasure are plainly visible and the handwriting is evidently later, while the violation of the laws of metre would itself betray the work of one who was using material not his own¹.

But what lurks under this erasure? The words at present record the gift of the book to the Convent of Monte Amiata by a certain Peter, abbat of a Lombard monastery, who lived at the end of the ninth and beginning of the tenth centuries; but he has made use of the dedication of a previous donor; have we any means of restoring the original inscription and discovering who that donor was?

Until lately scholars had accepted the emendation proposed by Bandini, who, in his catalogue of the MSS. of the Laurentian Library², has given a long and able description of the *Codex Amiatinus*. Tischendorf indeed, who in our own days published the text of the New Testament³, did little more in his prolegomena than abbreviate this description.

Now Bandini proposed to restore the first two lines in a way which seemed to carry probability, nay certainty, with it, viz. :—

CVLMEN AD EXIMII MERITO
VENERABILE PETRI,

a restitution which not only makes the hexameter run smoothly, but also fits in excellently with the expression *caput ecclesiae*, and records the gift of the book to St. Peter's at Rome, as being the head of the Church. For the name of the donor in the fifth line, however, Bandini's suggested

¹ The MS. reads LANGOBARDORVM not LONGOBARDORVM as Bandini erroneously transcribed it, and Tischendorf, who copied from Bandini.

² *Bibliotheca Leopoldina Laurentiana*, Florentiae, 1791, vol. i. p. 701 ff.

³ *Novum Testamentum ex Codice Amiatino*, Lipsiae, 1850 and 1854.

explanation did not seem so conclusive; instead of *Petrus Langobardorum*, etc., he proposed to read

SERVANDVS LATII

EXTREMIS DE FINIB. ABBAS.

This emendation indeed hardly satisfied himself, for he tells us that at the first glance (cap. vi. p. 706) the Codex appeared to him to have been written not by an Italian, but by an *English* or German abbat—a piece of acuteness which after-events have strangely verified. The name Servandus was suggested by an inscription in somewhat barbarous Greek, by the first hand, at the beginning of the book of Leviticus, informing us that a scribe of that name had written at any rate a portion of the Bible extending so far:—

ΟΚΥΡΙC CΕΡΒΑΝΔΟC ΑΙ ΠΟΙΗCΕΝ

As Mabillon in his *Annales*¹ records a Servandus, abbat of a Benedictine monastery near Alatri, who visited St. Benedict in the year 541 at Monte Cassino, Bandini concluded that this was the scribe of the book and author of the dedication verses. Or the book might have been written by another Servandus, who lived later in the century, and was among the correspondents of Gregory the Great. A tradition preserved by Ughelli² ascribes the writing of the book to Gregory himself; and such a tradition might easily have arisen if it had been presented to him by Servandus (c.g.) upon his election to the Papal chair in 590.

The date of the manuscript then seemed fixed to the middle, or at the latest to the second half, of the sixth century; and even Tischendorf thought that the expression *extremis de finibus abbas* might be meant to describe the distance of Servandus' monastery from Rome, though it certainly seems an exaggerated way of describing a distance

¹ *Annales O. S. B.* tom. i. pp. 85, 86.

² *Italia Sacra*, iii. p. 623; and for the connection between Servandus and Pope Gregory, see Gregory's *Dialogues*, lib. ii. c. xxxv.

which, as Dr. Ranke remarks, is not greater than that between Leipzig and Berlin¹.

As time went on, critics began to grow suspicious of such an early date; and as early as 1873, Dr. Karl Hamann² maintained that it was of the eighth, not the sixth century; he also doubted whether Servandus was really the scribe of the book, on the ground that had he been so he would hardly have put the Greek inscription in the strange place it occupies—the beginning of Leviticus; nor would he have been likely to style himself *KYPIC* (i.e. *KYPIOC*, Dominus).

Nothing more, however, was said in print on the question till 1882, when Lagarde wrote a letter to the *Academy*³, stating that for some time he had felt almost certain—‘for intrinsic reasons’—that the *Codex Amiatinus* should be dated in the ninth century; and that an examination of the manuscript which he had been permitted to make in Florence, proved the external evidence to be in thorough accord with his anticipations. He urged that if a MS. of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century were placed beside the *Codex Amiatinus*, the difference between a genuine and an artificial uncial hand, between old and more modern vellum, and between the truly antique size of a book and a size chosen to make the most of the skins at hand, would at once become apparent: he suggested that the *Codex* was written at Reichenau, on the Lake of Constance, by the same scribe who wrote the copy of Jerome’s *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* (now at Carlsruhe), there being great similarity in the handwriting of the two MSS. In his own *Mittheilungen*⁴,

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1887, p. 270.

² Dr. Hamann’s criticism occurs in a review of Heyse and Tischendorf’s edition of the Vulgate Old Testament with collation of the *Codex Amiatinus* (Leipzig, 1873); see Hilgenfeld’s *Zeitschrift. f. wissenschaft. Theologie*, 1873, pp. 591–594.

³ *Academy*, Sept. 2, 1882.

⁴ *Mittheilungen*, von P. de Lagarde; Goettingen, 1884: see pp. 191–2: also a review of this by H. Roensch in Hilgenfeld’s *Zeitschrift*, 1885, p. 252: and Samuel Berger in a review of Dr. Corssen’s *Epistula ad Galatas*, *Bulletin Critique*, March, 1886.

published a little later, Lagarde still keeps to this, as it proves, too late date for the MS. ; and urges the same reasons, —namely, the difference in the size of the parchment, ink, and form of the letters, from genuine sixth century MSS. In addition he remarks that the marginal notes, which are obviously by the first hand¹, are written in minuscule character, and that some of the textual errors look as if they resulted from the careless copying of a minuscule exemplar.

III.

It was reserved however for the Commendatore G. B. de Rossi, the famous Italian epigraphist and historian of the Catacombs, to make the emendation in the fifth line of the dedication verses, the verification of which has removed the later date of the *Codex Amiatinus* from the realm of conjecture into that of fact. In the summer of 1886 he published an essay², printed in Rome at the Vatican Press, and extracted from the first volume of a description of the Palatine MSS. of the Vatican Library. In the ninth chapter of this work he drew attention to the very large traffic in manuscripts of the sacred Scriptures which was carried on in the seventh century between Rome and the various churches in northern Europe, especially that of England. As the Church spread in more distant lands, the new bishops and abbats were all anxious to obtain from Rome Bibles for their respective cathedrals and monasteries; and sometimes the demand proved greater than the supply. Thus we find Martin I. writing to one bishop, *Codices iam exinaniti sunt a nostra bibliotheca, unde ei* (the bearer of the letter) *dare nullatenus habuimus; transcribere autem non potuit, quoniam festinanter de hac civitate egredi properavit*³.

Few, however, of the bishops or abbats have such a claim on the grateful remembrance of Englishmen as Benedict

¹ Dr. Corssen thinks they may be later (*Academy*, April 7, 1888).

² *De Origine Historia Indicibus Serinii et Bibliothecae Sedis Apostolicae Commentatio* J. B. de R., Romae, 1886.

³ *Mansi Concil.* x. p. 1183, quoted by De Rossi, p. lxxiii.

Biscop, the founder of the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow in Northumberland, and his disciple and successor Ceolfrid. Students of Bede had long read with admiration of the untiring and far-sighted energy with which Benedict, from his northern cloister, made no less than five journeys to Rome, partly for devotion, but also to enrich his monastery with the finest manuscripts and pictures he could obtain, and to civilise and educate his rough island followers by introducing to them the arts of France and Italy. Benedict was a traveller and a collector from his youth; after his first journey (probably about 653 A.D.) Bede¹ tells us that *ad patriam mox reversus, studiosius ea quae vidit ecclesiasticae vitae instituta diligere venerari, et quibus potuit praedicare non desiit*. His second journey was made in 658, after which he remained some time abroad, returning at length in 669. After two years of monastic life in England, he again in 671 started on his third journey, *librosque omnis divinae eruditionis non paucos vel placito pretio emptos vel amicorum dono largitos retulit*; and it was after this journey that he obtained from Ecgfrid the gift of land which enabled him to found the Wearmouth monastery of St. Peter. To make the buildings of sufficient beauty he journeyed again to France, and procured from thence builders and *vitri factores* to adorn the windows of the chapel and refectory with the hitherto unknown luxury of glass, while the fittings for the chapel, the sacred vessels and vestments were also obtained from abroad.

Finding, however, that even the resources of Gaul failed to satisfy all his requirements, the indefatigable abbat in 678 made a fourth journey to Rome, whence he brought back *innumerabilem librorum omnis generis copiam*, a large store of relics, and also obtained the Pope's permission for the Abbat John, *archicantor* of St. Peter's, to accompany him to England, and introduce into the Northumberland monastery the order of singing and performing Divine Service according to the Roman use.

¹ Bede, *Vita quinque Abbatum*; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xciv. p. 714 foll.

A year later, Benedict founded the sister monastery of St. Paul at Jarrow, and appointed as its abbat the presbyter Ceolfrid, his faithful companion, who had accompanied him on his last journey to Rome to share his devotions and studies.

And in 684 Benedict started yet again on his fifth journey to Rome, and again returned *innumeris sicut semper ecclesiasticorum donis commodorum locupletatus . . . magna quidem copia voluminum sacrorum sed non minori sicut et prius sanctarum imaginum munere ditatus*.

But soon after, worn out, as we may well believe, not only by the asceticism of the monastic life, but also by his frequent and arduous journeys, Benedict grew ill and died; and in his last thoughts and arrangements, the library he had collected at such trouble and expense naturally occupied a prominent position: *bibliothecam quam de Roma nobilissimam copiosissimamque advexerat ad instructionem ecclesiae necessariam, sollicite servari integram, nec per incuriam foedari aut passim dissipari praecepit*. And so, after appointing Ceolfrid abbat over the two monasteries, the good man breathed his last.

Ceolfrid proved a worthy successor, and continued the work of extending the monastic buildings. During his rule of seven years over Jarrow, and twenty-eight over the combined monasteries, we read¹ of the altars, the sacred vessels, and vestments he added to the property of the church; and especially how *bibliothecam utriusque monasterii, quam Benedictus abbas magna coepit instantia, ipse non minori geminavit industria; ita ut tres pandectes novae translationis ad unum vetustae translationis quem de Roma attulerat, ipse super adiungeret; quorum unum senex Romam rediens secum inter alia pro munere sumpsit, duos utrique monasterio reliquit*. The *pandectes vetustae translationis* he must have brought with him from Rome when accompanying Benedict on his fourth journey². After a long and faithful rule over the monasteries, Ceolfrid determined to visit for the last time

¹ Bede, *Vita quinque Abbatum*, lib. ii. p. 725 ff.

² In 678 probably, see above, p. 279, and also Bede, *Ecccl. Hist.* iv. 18.

the Apostolic city, and for this purpose left England with a few followers in 716; he did not live, however, to complete his journey, getting no further than Langres, where he died on the 25th of September.

Some of his monks went on to Rome, while the rest returned at once to their monastery.

In his work *De temporum ratione*¹, c. 66, Bede furnishes us with some more interesting information about this journey. We read that Ceolfrid was seventy-four years old at the time of this last pilgrimage, and that *inter alia donaria quae adferre disposuerat, misit ecclesiae sancti Petri pandectem a beato Hieronymo in Latinum ex Hebraeo vel Graeco fonte translatus*. After his death at Langres, those of his followers who proceeded to Rome took with them the Pandect, we must suppose, and offered it to the chair of St. Peter.

We may now return to the Dedication verses in a position to understand De Rossi's brilliant emendation of the erased letters in the fifth line. He had, like Dr. Hamann before him, remarked that Servandus, were he the scribe or possessor of the whole book, would not be likely to sign his name only at the beginning of Leviticus; and Dr. Anziani, the librarian of the Laurentian Library, had remarked to him that the erasure was too long to be properly filled up by the words *SERVANDVS LATII*; the expression also *EXTREMIS DE FINIB. ABBAS* seemed less applicable to the dwellers in Latium than to such a people as the *toto divisos orbe Britannos*. Bearing this in mind, together with the incident related in Bede of the Pandect offered by Ceolfrid to the Church of Rome, De Rossi conjectured the substitution of *CEOLFRIDVS BRITONVM* for *SERVANDVS LATII*.

A fresh examination of the erasure in the Dedication verses in this new light confirmed the conjecture almost to certainty. The second letter in the fifth line, E, was, as we saw, not erased but was part of the original inscription, and

¹ Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xc. p. 571.

of course suited *Ceolfridus Britonum* quite as well as *Servandus*; in addition to this, the words *Ceolfridus Britonum* exactly fill up the space erased; the first letter has not been entirely destroyed, and shows strong indications of having once been a c instead of an s; the erasure of the fourth letter extends above the line, which looks as if L had once been there; that of the fifth extends below, which agrees well with an F. All these points together made the words *CEOLFRIDVS BRITONVM* an almost certain emendation of *SERVANDVS LATII*, and subsequent events have shown this discovery to be one of the most brilliant perhaps that have ever been made in the history of palaeography.

This much, then, might now be said to have been proved with regard to the *Codex Amiatinus*. It was in all probability the identical manuscript which had been in the possession of the Abbat Ceolfrid, at Wearmouth, in the beginning of the eighth century, and had been sent by him as a gift to the Pope. Whether it was written by him or at his order, or whether it was an older manuscript procured by him during his travels was not clear, for Bede's words simply state that Ceolfrid added to the monastic library three Pandects of the new translation, in addition to the one volume of the old translation brought from Rome. Still the discovery at any rate explained the late date which some critics had wished to give to the book, and rendered it possible, if not probable, that it was written in Ceolfrid's own days.

Meanwhile a parallel line of argument strongly supporting De Rossi's conjecture was developing from another quarter. The Bishop of Salisbury, whilst collating MSS. for his edition of the Vulgate, had been for some time struck by the resemblance in text between the eighth and ninth century British manuscripts and the *Codex Amiatinus*, a resemblance for which there seemed no means of accounting on the prevailing supposition of the latter having been written in Italy. This was notably the case with the St. John of the *Durham Gospels* (A. II. 16) of the seventh century, the exquisite *Stonhurst St.*

John (sixth or seventh century) found in the coffin of St. Cuthbert, who died in 687, but most of all with the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (Brit. Mus. Nero D. IV.) of the beginning of the eighth century; in a less degree with the *Rushworth Gospels*, an Irish text of the beginning of the ninth century, now in the Bodleian Library, with the Gospels from *St. Augustine's Canterbury* (sixth or seventh), both at Oxford and at Cambridge, and the first hand of the *Echternach Gospels* (Paris, Lat. 9389), a MS. written in an Anglo-Saxon hand, and placed by M. Delisle in the eighth or ninth century. The *Lindisfarne Gospels* indeed present a text of that puzzling nature which falls short of being an actual transcript of the *Amiatinus*, and yet argues the very closest connection short of this; there are indeed differences between the two MSS., often in spelling, sometimes in reading; but in spite of this the general agreement between them is most noticeable, and not unfrequently a reading is shared by them against all other Vulgate MSS. hitherto examined. The explanation of this extraordinarily close affinity in text between the two MSS. is of course simple enough on the supposition that the *Codex Amiatinus* itself enjoyed for some years a place of honour in the library at Wearmouth or Jarrow.

IV.

The conjecture of De Rossi and the evidence in its favour borne by the texts of the MSS. were brought before English readers in a letter from the Bishop of Salisbury, published in the *Academy* of Feb. 12, 1887, and in the *Guardian* of Feb. 9; the correspondence was continued by other writers, amongst whom Prof. G. F. Browne proposed to read *Anglorum* instead of *Britonum* in the erased line of the Dedication verses; and M. Samuel Berger also suggested the same correction in a private letter to the Bishop. The last link in the chain, however, was supplied by Dr. Hort (*Academy*, Feb. 26), who contributed the one additional piece of evidence needed to complete the identification. Bede, it is

now generally recognized, drew many of his details respecting Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid from a valuable little tract known as the *Anonymous Life of Ceolfrid*. This has not been printed on the continent, but was first published by J. Stevenson in 1841¹, and curiously enough it contains two passages which supply just the required information. The first describes Ceolfrid's provision for the furniture and enrichment of the two monasteries as follows :—

‘Itaque monasteria quibus praeerat et extrinsecus abundanter opibus et non minus locupletavit internis. Nam et vasis quae ad ecclesiae vel altaris officium pertinent copiosissime ditavit et bibliothecam quam de Roma vel ipse vel Benedictus attulerat nobiliter ampliavit, ita ut inter alia tres Pandectes faceret describi; quorum duo per totidem sua monasteria posuit in ecclesiis, ut cunctis qui aliquod capitulum de utrolibet Testamento legere voluissent in promptu esset invenire quod cuperent, tertium autem Romam profecturus donum beato Petro apostolorum principi offerre decrevit.’

The second relates the journey of the monks to Rome after Ceolfrid's death :—

‘Sepulto igitur patre quidam ex fratribus qui eum deduxerunt patriam rediere, narraturi in monasterio ipsius ubi et quando transiret e corpore; quidam vero dispositum Romam iter peregere, delaturi munera quae miserat. In quibus videlicet muneribus erat Pandectes, ut diximus, interpretatione beati Hieronymi presbyteri ex Hebraeo et Graeco fonte transfusus, habens in capite scriptos huiusmodi versus :

Corpus ad eximii merito venerabile Petri
Dedicat ecclesiae quem caput alta fides
Ceolfridus, Anglorum extimis de finibus abbas,
Devoti affectus pignora mitto mei,
Meque meosque optans tanti inter gaudia patris
In caelis memorem semper habere locum.’

¹ Stevenson published it for the English Historical Society in the Appendix to Bede's historical works from a Harleian MS. (3020) of the 9th or 10th century; it was reprinted ‘with the correction of a few errors’ by Giles, in 1843, in vol. vi. of his *Bede* (416 ff.): see Dr. Hort in the *Academy*; the passages here cited occur in Giles, p. 423 and 430, Stevenson, p. 325 and 332.

These verses we at once see are those of the *Codex Amiatinus*; for the transposition in the second line, and *extimis* for *extremis* in the third, are both probably slips made by the author of the *Anonymous Life*. As regards the first erased word, a fresh examination of the Codex shows the original word to be *corpus*, not *culmen*, as Bandini supposed; for the second letter, which is only half erased, appears to have been an *o* rather than an *u*¹; in the third line De Rossi's 'admirable conjecture' stares us in the face, and there is only the slight change, before suggested by Prof. Browne and M. Berger, of *Anglorum* for *Britonum* (*Ceolfrīdūs Anglorum*, not *Ceolfrīdūs Britonum*), an emendation again which a fresh examination of the erasure renders more probable. And thus is proved without the shadow of a doubt the identity of the *Codex Amiatinus* with the Pandect, which, amongst others, Ceolfrid ordered to be written in England at the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century, and sent as a present to Pope Gregory II.

For the words of the anonymous life, *ita ut tres pandectes faceret describi*, show further that this Pandect was not an old manuscript obtained by Ceolfrid during his travels, but a new one written at his order, and thus the date of the writing is fixed a full century and a half later than Bandini and Tischendorf imagined, and the place is again fixed, as definitely, to one of the two northern monasteries. It is not of course so certain that the hand which wrote it was English; as a Roman musician was brought over to teach the English monks to sing, so an Italian scribe may well have come to instruct them in writing, and the Amiatine Bible may be the work of a foreigner though written in England. Dr. Hort² inclines to this opinion, and Dr. Hamann³ urges on the ground of orthography, that

¹ The left limb of an uncial *u* has always a slight horizontal stroke to the left finishing it off; but there is no sign of such a stroke having been erased here, as the student may observe in the facsimile of the page given in the Palaeographical Society's Second Series (Plate 65).

² *Academy*, Feb. 26, 1887.

³ *Academy*, May 7.

either the scribe himself was an Italian, or that at any rate he copied from an Italian exemplar. To Italy, he says, and to no other country, are we directed by such orthographical forms as *senes* for *senex*, *senia* for *xenia*, and *optimantium*, *gigans*, *ancxius*, *uncxit*, *sussaltastis*, *ammirata*, *quemammodum*, *cluserunt*, *hostia*, *tophadius*, *agusto*, *ascultabant*, *clodum*, *adtractaverit*, *redemet*, *histriatarum*, *espendebat*, *scandescet*, *Spaniae*, *totum belli impetu*, *in tantum arrogantiae tumore*, *incidemus in manu Dei et non in manus hominum*, etc.

But the handwriting of this, almost the largest Biblical MS. in existence, shows, strange to say, a remarkable similarity in form to another which may claim to be nearly the smallest—the *Stonyhurst St. John*. The resemblance in *text* between the two books has been noted above (p. 282). Dr. Hort¹ in calling attention to this, suggested that as the *Codex Amiatinus* was apparently written by an Italian scribe in Northumbria, the *Stonyhurst St. John* might have had a similar origin; for more than one scribe may have been brought from Rome, or the Northern monks may themselves have proved apt pupils.

If the scribe came back with Benedict in his *fourth* journey in 678, there would be ample time for him, or a pupil, to write the book and to send it as a present to Cuthbert in his retirement at Farne, so that we need not reject the legend (which goes back to the thirteenth century), that it was found in his coffin, and was therefore in his possession before 687; nor, on the other hand, need we suppose the book to have been written before the writing-school at Wearmouth was established².

It remains to mention some other specimens of writing

¹ *Academy*, Feb. 26, 1887. The Palaeographical Society's editors indeed (Series I. pl. 17) suppose it to have been written on the continent, but there seem to be more distinct British characteristics in the hand-writing than in that of the *Codex Amiatinus*; the F especially—with its upper horizontal bar curved, and the lower straight—seems Anglo-British. See the Bishop of Salisbury in the *Academy*, Feb. 26.

² Dr. Sanday in the *Academy*, Feb. 19, 1887.

which probably came from the same place and at the same date as the *Codex Amiatinus* and the *Stonyhurst St. John*. Two fragments of manuscripts are bound up at the end of the famous Utrecht Psalter¹, containing prefatory matter to the Gospels, the capitula to St. Matthew and chapters i. i-iii. 4 of that Gospel; also St. John ii. 1-21. The greater part of these fragments is written in a hand very strongly resembling the *Amiatinus*, though Mr. Thompson² does not think it to be actually the same; the student, however, will be especially struck with the peculiar form of the small capital L which stands for St. Luke in the *Ammonian Sections* in both manuscripts, and is, I believe, extremely rare. The *capitula* after the first three letters are in a hand which, though larger, seems to be identical with that of the *Stonyhurst St. John*. And lastly, there is a fragment of St. Luke bound up in one of the Durham MSS., which not only presents the text of *Amiatinus* almost word for word, but also strongly resembles it in handwriting, and would seem to be a sister MS. There was then a large and flourishing school of calligraphy at Wearmouth or Jarrow in the seventh and eighth centuries, of which till lately we had no knowledge at all. It produced manuscripts such as the *Codex Amiatinus*, which have never been equalled for grandeur, and such as the *Stonyhurst St. John*, which have never been equalled for delicacy and grace; and we have to thank the Commendatore De Rossi for both fixing a date and a place to one of the most important Vulgate MSS., and for giving to England the credit of a writing school which more than rivals that of Tours.

V.

We have mentioned above that the first quaternion of the *Codex Amiatinus* contains some extremely interesting prefatory matter; this consists of three arrangements of the

¹ Dr. Sanday in the *Academy*, March 5.

² *Academy*, March 12, 1887.

books of the Old and New Testament with separate prolegomena, a two-page representation of the Tabernacle, and another of Ezra working in his study. The order of the leaves has been twice disturbed; for that given by Bandini in his description is evidently not the order in which they originally stood, while since Bandini's time, probably when the book was last bound, the order has been again changed. At present it is as follows¹:—

Fol. 1 is blank; 1 *b* has the Dedication verses; 2 is blank; 2 *b* and 3 contain a large bird's-eye view of the Tabernacle (this is usually spoken of as 'Solomon's Temple'), drawn with great intricacy and painted with deep rich colours; 3 *b* is blank; 4 contains the prologue to the contents of the MS., and 4 *b* contains a list of these contents; this page is stained on both sides with a fine purple, and the writing, in yellow pigment, is arranged in tables with a double arch of twisted rope-pattern; 5 has an interesting picture of Ezra seated at work on a stool in front of an open bookcase; 5 *b* is blank; 6 contains the Hieronymian division of the Sacred books; at the head of the page is represented the Golden Lamb, from which hang seven *tabellae* as Bandini calls them, three of them containing the Old and four the New Testament; 6 *b* is blank; 7 has the Hilarian and Epiphanian division of Scripture, underneath the head of a monk, supposed by Bandini to be meant for a portrait of Pope Gregory; 7 *b* is of vellum stained bright yellow; the greater part of the page is occupied by a large circle filled in with purple, and with a yellow circumference; inside this again are five other circles disposed in the form of a cross, with intertwined circumference of green, and around these seven other still smaller circles; the colours of this page are not used in the other three pictures; 8 contains the Augustinian division of Scripture; here we have again a picture intersected by a circle; a dove has its wings outspread, and is surrounded by flames; two fillets are suspended from its beak, and from

¹ Prof. G. F. Browne, *Guardian*, Apr. 27, and *Academy*, Apr. 30, 1887.

these hang the six divisions of the sacred books, a cross being placed at the beginning and end of each division; finally, 86 is blank, and looks like an outside sheet.

Such is the arrangement of the quaternion at the present time; in Bandini's time it was so far different that the second leaf of 'Solomon's Temple' stood seventh, the rest of the leaves standing as now.

We must, however, before discussing the original order of the leaves consider an important question, to which attention was drawn in 1883 by Dr. P. Corssen of Jever¹, the relation of the contents of this quaternion to the earlier Bibles described by Cassiodorus in his *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*. In that treatise Cassiodorus describes at length his nine MSS., containing the books of the Old and New Testaments, with commentaries on these books by Jerome and other fathers. In Chapter XII he describes one volume which contained the sacred books according to Jerome's division; in the thirteenth chapter the Augustinian division; and in the fourteenth that of the *Antiqua Translatio*. This latter was written *inter alias (divisiones)* in a *Codex Grandior*, a fine volume containing 95 quaternions or 760 leaves. The Old Testament was a Latin translation from the LXX, in 44 books, the text being corrected throughout in accordance with St. Jerome's version.

The three lists in the Amiatine *Prolegomena* bear a striking resemblance to those of the *Codex Grandior*, as we shall see by printing at length the contents of the first quaternion of the Codex, and placing in a parallel column those passages from Cassiodorus which cover the same ground.

The first sheet, after the Dedication verses, which contains writing, is fol. 46; this has the Prologue to the contents of the MS. It is as follows:—

'Si diuino ut dignum est amore flammati ad ueram cupimus sapientiam peruenire et in hac uita fragili aeterni saeculi deside-

¹ *Die Bibeln des Cassiodorius und der Codex Amiatinus*, in the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, Leipzig, 1883.

ramus imaginem contueri Patrem luminum deprecemur ut nobis cor mundum tribuat actionem bonae uoluntatis impertiat¹ perseuerantiam sua uirtute concedat, ut Scripturarum diuinarum palatia, ipsius misericordia largiente possimus fiducialiter introire, ne nobis dicatur Quare tu enarras iustitias meas et adsumis testamentum meum per os tuum sed inuitati illud potius audiamus Uenite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis et ego uos reficiam. Magnum munus inaeestimabile beneficium, audire hominem secreta dei et quemadmodum ad ipsum ueniatur institui. Festinemus itaque fratres ad animarum fontem uiuum salutaria remedia iusionum. Quisquis enim in terris Scripturis talibus occupatur paene caelestis iam regni suauitate perfruitur. Nec nos moueat quod pater Augustinus in septuaginta unum libros testamentum uetus nouumque diuisit; doctissimus autem Hieronymus idem uetus nouumque testamentum XLVIII sectionibus comprehendit. In hoc autem corpore utrumque testamentum septuagenario numero probatur impletum, in illa palmarum quantitate forsitan praesagatus (*sic*) quas in mansione Helim inuenit populus Hebraeorum. Nam licet haec calculo disparia uideantur, doctrina tamen patrum ad instructionem caelestis ecclesiae concorditer uniuersa perducunt. Amen.²

4 b contains the Amiatine list arranged in two columns with the hexameter lines at the bottom of the page as follows:—

‘In hoc codice continentur ueteris et noui testamenti Libri Ñ
LXXI.

‘Genesis, Exodus, Leuiticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Iosue, Iudicum, Ruth, Samuhel, Malachias², Paralypomenon, Lib. Psalmorum, Prouerbia, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum, Lib. Sapientiae, Ecclesiasticum, Esaias, Hieremias³, Hiezechiel, Danihel, Osee, Iohel, Amos, Abdias, Ionas, Michas, Naum, Habacuc, Soffonias, Aggeus, Zaccharias, Malachias, Iob, Thobias, Iudith, Hester, Ezras⁴, Machabeorum lib. duo.

Euangelium secundum Mattheum, secundum Marcum, secundum

¹ *impertiat*, Cod.; *impertiat*, Bandini: see Corssen, p. 625.

² An obvious mistake for *Malachim*, i.e. *Regum*. *Malachim* is frequently found in Latin lists, cf. Isidore of Seville, Johannes Sarisburiensis, Hugo de S. Caro, in Hody, *De bibl. text.* etc. pp. 653, 656.

³ Containing also Lamentations and the prayer of Jeremiah; cf. Bandini, p. 720.

⁴ Including Nehemiah; Bandini, p. 721.

Lucam, secundum Iohannem, Actus Apostolorum, Epistulae Pauli Apost., ad Romanos I, ad Corintheos II, ad Galatas I, ad Ephesios I, ad Philippenses I, ad Colosenses I, ad Thessalon. II, ad Timotheum II, ad Titum I, ad Philimon I, ad Hebreos I, Epist. Iacobi I, Petri I¹, Iohannis III, Iudae I, Apocalypsis Iohan. Amen.

Hieronyme interpretes uariis doctissime linguis
Te bethlem celebrat te totus personat orbis
Te quoque nostra tuis promet bibliotheca libris
Qua noua cum priscis conditis donaria gazis.'

Fol. 5 contains the Ezra picture, with the couplet over his head, possibly added later :

'Codicibus sacris hostili clade perustis
Ezra deo feruens hoc reparauit opus.'

In the open book-case by which he is sitting, are arranged various volumes of Scripture, entitled² OCT. LIB.—REG. LIB.—HEST. LIB.—PSAL. LIB.—SAL. . . .—PROP. . . .—EVANGEL. IIII.—EPIST. AP. XXI.—ACT. AP. APOCA. Here the coincidences with Cassiodorus begin, for these titles, as Dr. Corssen notes, correspond with only one exception to the nine MSS. described by Cassiodorus in the earlier chapters of the *Institutio* ; these were

'c. i. Primus scripturarum diuinarum codex est *Octateuchus*. c. ii. In secundo *Regum* codice. c. iii. Ex omni igitur *Prophetarum* codice tertio. c. iv. Sequitur *Psalterium* codex quartus. c. v. Quintus codex est *Salomonis*. c. vi. Sequitur *Hagiographorum* codex sextus. c. vii. Septimus igitur codex . . . quattuor *Euangelistarum* superna luce resplendet. c. viii. Octauus codex *Canonicas Epistolas* continet *Apostolorum*. c. ix. Nonus igitur codex *Actus Apostolorum* et *Apocalypsin* noscitur continere.'

Fol. 6 contains, in tables depending from the Lamb, the Hieronymian division of the sacred books ; and the likeness between this and the Hieronymian division of the *Institutio* c. xii, will be seen by printing them side by side. It is indeed far closer than Corssen imagined, for he had only

¹ Only one Epistle of Peter is noticed in this list ; the *Codex* itself of course contains the second as well.

² *Academy*, Apr. 7, 1888.

the printed text of Cassiodorus to go by, which is known to be in a wretched state. Dr. Westcott collated the British Museum MSS. of the *Institutio* for c. xiv. in his *History of the Canon*, ed. 5, p. 573; and a comparison of the text thus amended with the Amiatine *Epiphanian* and *Hilarian* list (see next page) showed the two to be so near to each other that I have thought it worth while to collate these MSS. for the other lists also. They are Reg. 13 A. xxi. 7 (α); Cotton Vesp. (not Claud. as Westcott cites) B. 13. 8 (β); Reg. 10 B. xv. 2 (γ); Reg. 5 B. viii. 6 (δ).

I have formed the text throughout from α, which seems the closest to the Amiatine text; giving the variants of the other MSS. and of the printed texts, except in cases of mere orthography, below.

CASS. DE INST. DIV. LITT. c. xii.

Auctoritas diuina secundum sanctum Iheronimum in testamentis¹ duobus ita diuiditur id est in uetus et nouum. In lege² id est in³ Genesim, Exodum, Leuiticum, Numerorum, Deuteronomium. In prophetis⁴ Iesu Naue, Iudicum, Ruth, Samuel, Ysayas, Iheremias, Ezechiel⁵, libri duodecim prophetarum. In agyographis⁶ Iob, David, Salomon, Proueria, Ecclesiastes⁷, Canticum Canticorum, Uerba dierum, id est Paralipomenon, Ezras, Hester. In Euangelis⁸, Matheus, Marcus, Lucas, Iohannes⁹. Epistole Apostolorum, Petri due, Pauli quatuordecim, Iohannis tres, Iacobi una, Iude

AMIATINUS, p. 6.

Auctoritas diuina continetur in testamenta duo id est in uetus et in nouum.

In lege: Genesis, Exodum, Leuiticum, Numerorum, Deuteronomium.

In prophetis: Iesu Naue, Iudicum et Ruth, Samuhel, Malachian, Esaias, Hieremias, Hiezechiel, Liber duodecim prophetarum. In agiographis: Iob, David, Salom., Proueria, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum, Danihel, Uerba dierum id est Paralip., Esras, Hester. In Euangelis: Matheus, Marcus, Lucas, Iohannes. Epist. Apost.: Pauli Apostoli xiiii, Petri Apost. ii, Iohann. Apost. iii, Iacobi Ap.

¹ testamenta duo *edd.* ² legem βγδ *edd.* ³ om. in βγδ *edd.* ⁴ prophetas βγδ *edd.*; + qui sunt *edd.* ⁵ + Daniel *edd.* ⁶ Hagiographos + qui sunt *edd.*

⁷ Ecclesiasticum βγδ, Ecclesiasticus *edd.*

⁸ Euangelistas + qui sunt *edd.*

⁹ + post hos sequuntur *edd.*

una. In Actibus Apostolorum¹.
In Apocalipsi Johannis². . . .

Huic (i.e. to the Old Testament, which Jerome divided into twenty-two books, the number of the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet) etiam adiecti sunt Noui Testamenti libri uiginti septem, qui colliguntur simul quadraginta nouem. Quo³ numero adde omnipotentem et indiuisibilem Trinitatem, per quam hec facta et propter quam ista praedicta sunt, et quinquagenarius numerus indubitanter efficitur, quia⁴ ad instar iubilei anni magna pietate beneficii debita relaxat et pure penitentium peccata dissoluit.

Fol. 7 contains the Hilarian and Epiphanian divisions, written under the human or quasi-human head; here again we may compare Cassiodorus:—

CASSIODORUS' ANTIQUA TRANSLATIO, c. xiv.

Scriptura sancta secundum antiquam translationem in testamenta duo ita diuiditur id est in uetus et in⁵ nouum. In Genesim, Exodum, Leuiticum, Numerorum, Deutronomium, Iesu Naue, Iudicum, Ruth, Regum libri⁶ quatuor, Paralipomenon⁷ duo, Psalterii⁸, Salomonis libri quinque id est Prouerbia,

i, Iudae Ap. i. Act Apost.: Actus Apostolorum Liber unus. Apocalypsi: Apocalypsin Liber unus.

Sic fiunt ueteris nouique testamenti secundum Hieronymum libri quadraginta nouem quibus adde dominum Christum de quo et per quem ista conscripta sunt fit quinquagenarius numerus qui ad instar iobelei anni debita remittit et paenitentium peccata dissoluit.

AMIATINUS, p. 7.

Scriptura sancta diuiditur in testamenta duo id est in uetus et in nouum. Genesi, Exodum, Leuiticum, Numerorum, Deutronomium, Iesu Naue, Iudicum, Ruth, Regum libri iiii, Paralipomenon libri ii, Psalmorum lib. v, Salom. lib. v id est Prouerbia, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticum, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum, Pro-

¹ Actuum Apostolorum *edd.*; + Lucae liber unus γδ *edd.*; + Lucae unus liber β. ² In Apocalypsin Johannis liber unus βγδ; et Apocalypsis Joannis liber unus *edd.* ³ cui *edd.* ⁴ qui *edd.* ⁵ om. in *edd.* ⁶ libros *edd. et infra.* ⁷ libros duos *edd.* ⁸ + unus βγδ; + librum unum *edd.*

Sapientie, Ecclesiasticum, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum. Prophete id est Ysayas, Iheremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Amos, Micheas, Iohel, Abdias, Ionas, Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachim qui et angelus, Iob, Tobis, Hester, Iudith, Ezre duo, Machabeorum duo.

Euangelia quatuor id est Mathei¹, Marci, Luce, Iohannis, Actus apostolorum; epistole Petri ad Gentes²; Iacobi³, Iohannis ad Parthos, epistole Pauli ad Romanos una, ad Chorinthios due, ad Galathas una, ad Philipenses una, ad Ephesios una⁴, ad Colossenses una, ad Hebreos una, ad Thesalonicenses due, ad Timotheum due, ad Titum una⁵, ad Philemonem una, Apocalipsin Iohannis . . . Translatio ueteris Testamenti in libris quadraginta quatuor continetur. Cui subiuncti⁶ sunt noui Testamenti libri uiginti sex, fiuntque simul libri septuaginta; in illo palmarum numero fortasse presagati quas in mansione Helim inuenit populus Hebreorum . . . nos omnia tria genera diuisionum iudicauimus affigenda ut inspecta diligenter atque tractata, non in pugnare sed inuicem se potius exponere uideantur. Unde licet

phetæ id est Esaias, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Danihel, Osee, Amos, Micheas, Iohel, Abdias, Ionas, Naum, Ambacum, Sofonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachim qui et Angelus, Iob, Tobis, Hester, Iudith, Esdrae libri duo, Machabeorum libri duo. Euangelia iiii id est Matheus, Marcus, Lucas, Iohannes, Actus Apostolorum, Epist. Petri ad Gentes, Iacobi, Iohannis ad Parthos, Epist. Pauli apost. id est ad Rom. i, ad Corint. ii, ad Galatas i, ad Philip. i, ad Colos. i, ad Ephesios i, ad Thessalonicenses ii, ad Timotheum ii, ad Titum i, ad Philemonem i, Apocalypsim Iohannis euangelistæ.

Sic fiunt ueteris nouique Testamenti sicut diuidit sanctus Hilarius (Hilarius *m. p.*) Romanæ urbis antistes et Epiphanius Cyprius, quem latino fecimus sermoni transferri Libri lxx in illo palmarum numerum fortasse praesagati quas in mansione Helim inuenit populus Hebreorum.

¹ Euangelium quatuor id est matheus βγδ; Post hæc sequuntur euangelistæ quatuor i. e. m. *edd.*; *deinde* marcus lucas iohannes βγδ *edd.* ² + iudæ *edd.* ³ + ad duodecim tribus *edd.* ⁴ ad Ephesios duæ δ; *om. edd.*

⁵ *tr.* ad Tit. una ad Tim. due β.

⁶ subiecti βγδ.

multi patres, id est Sanctus Hy-larius Pictauensis urbis antistes, et Rufinus presbiter Aquilei-ensis, et Epiphanius episcopus Cipri, et sinodus Nicena uel [et *edd.*] Calcedonensis non contraria dixerunt sed diuersa; omnes ta-men per diuisiones suas libros diuinos sacramentis competenti-bus aptauerunt.

Cf. c. v. Epiphanius antistes Cyprius totum librum graeco sermone uno volumine sub bre-uitate complexus est. Hunc nos ut alios in Latinam linguam per amicum nostrum uirum diser-tissimum Epiphanium fecimus, Domino iuuante, transferri.

Fol. 7 *b* contains the Pentateuch circles described above (p. 16). In these circles is disposed the following writing:—

- 1st circle. Manifestissima est Genesis in qua de creatura mundi, de exordio humani generis, et gente usque ad Aegyptum scribitur Hebr.
- 2nd circle. Patet Exodus cum decem plagis, decalogo, cum mys-ticis Scripturis, diuinisque praeceptis.
- 3rd circle. In promptu est Leuiticus Lib. in quo singula sacrificia et uestes Aaron et totus ordo Leuiticus spirant caelestia sacram.
- 4th circle. Numeri uero nonne totius arithmeticae et mensura terrae, et xl duarum per heremum mansion. mysteria continent.
- 5th circle. Deuteronomium quoque secunda Lex et euangelicae legis praefiguratio, nonne sic ea habet quae propria sunt ut tamen noua sint omnia de ueteribus.

Fol. 8 contains the Augustinian division of Holy Scripture (under the Dove); here again we may compare with Cas-siodorus:

CASS. c. xiii.

AMIATINUS, p. 8.

Scriptura diuina secundum beatum Augustinum in Testamenta¹ duo ita diuiditur, id est in uetus et in nouum². In historia³ libri uiginti duo id est Moyses libri quinque, Iesu Naue liber unus, Iudicum liber unus, Ruth liber unus, Regum libri quatuor, Paralipomenon libri duo, Job liber unus, Tob⁴ liber unus, Hester⁵ liber unus, Iudith liber unus, Ezre⁶ libri duo⁷, Machabeorum libri duo. In Prophetis libri uiginti duo, Dauid Psalterium⁸ liber unus, Salomon libri tres⁹, Iesu filii Sirach libri duo¹⁰, Prophete maiores quatuor, id est Ysayas, Iheremias, Daniel¹¹, Ezechiel; et minores duodecim, id est Osee, Iohel, Amos, Abdias, Ionas, Micheas, Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Zacharias, Aggeus, Malachim.

In epistolis Apostolorum¹² id est Pauli apostoli ad Romanos una, ad Corinthios due, ad Galathas una, ad Ephesios una, ad Philipenses una, ad Thessalonicenses due, ad Colosenses una, ad Timotheum due, ad Titum una, ad Philemonem una, ad Hebreos una, Petri due, Ioannis tres, Iude una, Iacobi una. In Euangelis quatuor, id est secundum Matheum,

Scriptura sancta diuiditur in uetus in nouum. In Historia libri N. xxii id est Mosi lib. v, Ihesu Nane lib. i, Iudic. lib. i, Ruth lib. i, Reg. lib. iii, Paral. lib. ii, Iob lib. i, Tobⁱ lib. i, Hester lib. i, Iudith lib. i, Esdrac lib. ii, Machabeor. lib. ii.

In prophetiam libri N. xxii, id est Dauid Psalm. lib. i, Sal. lib. iii, Iesu filii Sirach lib. ii, Prophetarum id est Osee, Iohel, Amos, Abdias, Ionas, Micheas, Naum, Habacuc, Sofon., Zach., Agg., Mal., Esaias, Hier., Dan. et Hez. lib. N. xvi.

In euangelia quatuor secundum Mattheum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Iohannem. In Epistolas Apostolorum xxi, id est Pauli Apost. ad Rom. i, ad Cor. ii, ad Gal. i, ad Efes. i, ad Phil. i, ad Thessal. ii, ad Col. i, ad Tim. ii, ad Tit. i, ad Fil. i, ad Heb. i, Petri duae, Ioh. iii, Iudae i, Iac. i. In Actus Apostolorum lib. i. In Apocalypsin Iohan. lib. i.

¹ Testamentum β.² in uetus et nouum *edd.*³ + sunt *edd.*⁴ Tobiae *edd.*⁵ Esther *edd.*⁶ Esdre βγδ; Esdrae *edd.*⁷ liberunus α^cβγδ.⁸ psalmorum *edd.*⁹ quatuor *edd.*¹⁰ liber unus *edd.*¹¹ ezechiel daniel *edd.*¹² + uiginti una *edd.*

secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Iohannem. In Actibus Apostolorum liber unus. In Apocalipsin¹ liber unus. Beatus igitur Augustinus secundum praeatos nouem codices, quos sancta meditat^r Ecclesia, secundo libro de doctrina Christiana, Scripturas diuinas septuaginta unius librorum calculo comprehendit: quibus cum sancte Trinitatis addideris unitatem fit totius libre² competens et gloriosa perfectio.

Sic fiunt ueteris nouique Testamenti sicut pater Augustinus in Libris de doctrina christiana complexus est simul libri N. lxxi quibus adde unitatem diuinam per quam ista completa sunt fit totius Librae competens et gloriosa perfectio; ipsa est enim rerum conditrix et uitalis omnium plenitudo uirtutum.

At the top of the page:—

Eloquium domini quaecumque uolumina pandunt

Spiritus hoc sancto fudit ab ore deus.

The reader will not fail to notice the striking similarity between the lists of Cassiodorus and those of the Amiatinus. In the Hieronymian division the differences are only of the smallest nature; Cassiodorus has *Iudicum Ruth* instead of *Iudicum et Ruth*, omits *Malachian* and *Danihel*, and in the New Testament places St. Peter's Epistles after, instead of before, St. Paul's; he obtains the required total of forty-nine then by counting *Iudicum* and *Ruth* as two books, while Amiatinus takes them as one; his real total however is forty-eight. Amiatinus, by the addition of *Danihel* and *Malachian*, obtains the full total of forty-nine. In both cases *Salom.* (whether *Salomon* or *Salomonis*) appears to be an introductory title, covering *Prov. Eccl. Cant.*

In the Augustinian division, which Cassiodorus tells us he took from the *De doctrina Christiana* ii. 13, he places the four greater prophets before, instead of after, the lesser (here the Amiatinus agrees with the order of the *De doctrina*); and in the New Testament he has the Evangelists after the Epistles.

In the third division, the Hilarian and Epiphanian of the Amiatinus, the *antiqua uersio* of Cassiodorus, the differ-

¹ apocalypsi edd.

² libri edd.

ences are more noticeable. Cassiodorus counts one, not five, books of the Psalms; and in the New Testament places Ephesians before Colossians, and inserts the Epistle to the Hebrews, which the Codex omits. Both the lists, Dr. Corssen notes, have *Iohannis ad Parthos*, without any intimation of the number of St. John's Epistles; and as in this list the numbers are usually added, where more than one Epistle is reckoned, it would seem probable that this canon included only one Epistle of St. John, especially as the expression *Epistula ad Parthos* is frequently used for the first Epistle, but does not seem known as a title for all three. Both lists emphasise the number seventy as the sum of the books of the Old and New Testaments, but we must add them up on different principles in each case, to obtain the required total. Cassiodorus gives us forty-four books in the Old Testament, counting the Psalms as one book; the remaining twenty-six in the New Testament being obtainable only by counting three epistles of St. John. Amiatinus, on the other hand, counts five books of the Psalms, making forty-eight books in the Old Testament; to bring the total down to seventy then we must reduce four books in the New; this can only be done by counting one Epistle of St. John, and one of St. Peter (*Epist. Petri ad Gentes* having no number added), which with the omission of the Hebrews enables us to obtain the required number. Cassiodorus indeed was aware of the five-fold division of the Psalter, as he states it was known to Jerome, though Epiphanius preferred to speak of the book of the Psalms as one ¹.

Even more marked are the variations in the explanatory matter. The Amiatinus refers the list to the combined authority of Hilary and Epiphanius; Cassiodorus does not state his

¹ Cass. in *Psalterium* c. xii. Dr. Corssen notes that the reference is incorrect, for Jerome, *Praef. in Libr. Psalm. ad Sophronium*, rejects the five-fold division on the authority of the Hebrew, and of the Apostles, who in the New Testament speak of it as one book; similarly Hilary, *Prol. in Libr. Psalm.*, mentions the five-fold division only to reject it: *Nos secundum apostolicam auctoritatem 'Librum Psalmorum' et nuncupamus et scribimus.*

source, and introduces the two fathers in a somewhat different connection, hinting that each had his own method of dividing the sacred books, though these were *non contraria sed diversa*. The Amiatine citation of Hilary and Epiphanius again does not agree with its omission of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Hilary held to be of Pauline authorship, nor would its *Psalmorum lib. v.*, commend itself to his views as to the Psalter¹; while Epiphanius adhered to the Canon of Athanasius, and in the order of books in the New Testament agreed with Jerome's list *ad Paulinum*².

What can be then the relation of these lists to each other? Their agreement shows it to be a close one, their variations would seem to prevent it being that of direct copying. But we have at any rate shown that Cassiodorus possessed a *Codex Grandior*, which must certainly have been a Latin Bible, for the whole context of c. xiv. of the *Institutio*³ shows this, and distinguishes it from the *Graecus Pandectes* mentioned later; this Latin *Codex Grandior* possessed three lists of the sacred books, and the *Codex Amiatinus* presents also three lists, almost, if not precisely, similar.

We have, however, to notice yet another mark of affinity between the two books. Folios 2*b* and 3 of the Amiatinus contain a carefully-drawn view of the Tabernacle; Cassiodorus in the *Institutio*, c. v., mentions a certain blind man named Eusebius, who, as a compensation for his loss of sight, was gifted with a wonderfully retentive memory; this Eusebius *commonuit etiam tabernaculum templumque Domini ad instar caeli fuisse formatum quae depicta subtiliter lineamentis propriis in 'Pandecte Latino corporis grandioris' competenter aptavi*; so that Cassiodorus' *Codex Grandior* also contained a page with the Tabernacle, for it would seem to be almost certain that the Codex thus mentioned is identical with that in

¹ See note on last page.

² *Epiph. adv. Haeres.* iii. tom. 1, haer. 76, conf. 5; Jerome, *Ep.* liii; cf. Westcott, *Canon*, pp. 554, 567 ff.

³ Dr. Hort in *Academy*, Feb. 26, 1887.

c. xiv¹. Here again another link between this book and the *Codex Amiatinus* is supplied us by Bede. Dr. Hort² quotes two passages from Bede's minor works; in his tract on the Tabernacle³: *Quomodo in pictura Cassiodori senatoris, cuius ipse in expositione Psalmorum meminit, expressum uidimus*; and again in his tract on Solomon's temple⁴: *Has uero porticus Cassiodorus senator in Pandectis, ut ipse Psalmorum expositione commemorat, triplici ordine distinxit*, adding below *Haec ut in pictura Cassiodori reperimus distincta*. Dr. Hort justly remarks that this is the language of a man who had seen with his own eyes the identical representation of the Tabernacle and the Temple which Cassiodorus inserted in his Pandect; and there is no evidence that Bede was ever in Italy, or indeed further south than York. The conclusion would therefore seem to follow that the *Codex Grandior* of Cassiodorus must have been brought to England and to the library of Wearmouth or of Jarrow, and there possibly have been placed on the same shelf with the *Codex Amiatinus*.

A still further supposition seemed at one time possible both to Dr. Hort and Dr. Corssen⁵; might not the first quaternion of the *Amiatinus* be not a transcript but actually a part of Cassiodorus' *Codex Grandior*? There is much which strikes one at first sight in favour of such a view; the parchment is not quite so tall as that of the other gatherings, and certainly seems somewhat darker and thicker; the gathering is not signed, and the second quaternion beginning the Bible is marked I; and the writing of the lists and pre-fatory matter is in a different hand from that of the body of the book. Further, there is only one other page in the book which contains pictorial representation; this is fol. 796 b, the page which divides the Old from the New Testament, and the picture is that of our Lord with the Evangelists and

¹ Cf. *Expos. in Psalm. xiv*: *Dei tabernaculum . . . quod nos fecimus pingi et in pandectis maioris capite collocari.*

² *Academy*, Feb. 26, 1887.

³ ii. 12 (vii. 307 Giles).

⁴ c. 16 (viii. 314 f. Giles); the references are in the first instance from De Rossi.

⁵ *Academy*, June 11, 1887.

their symbols; this is in the judgment of Prof. Browne¹ quite different in style from those in the first quaternion, and looks like a late and poor copy of earlier work, the drawing being inferior and the colours bad. The ornamentation, too, of the first quaternion, and especially the Ezra picture, could not at any rate have been *designed* in England. If Dr. Hamann is sure from the general orthography of the MS. that it was copied directly from an Italian, not a North-British exemplar, Prof. Browne is equally convinced that the draughtsman of the Ezra picture shows in his peculiar ornamentation the immediate influence of Ravenna or Rome. 'It seems fairly certain,' he says, 'that the Ezra picture was drawn in Ravenna, the home of Cassiodorus for so many years;' and he suggests that a mosaic in the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia supplied the features, the book-case, and the stool on which Ezra is sitting: 'it seems impossible to doubt that Ezra's book-case was copied from this.'

If we examine the contents of the Prologue also, and the Amiatine list of books, we find that here too they do not agree with the actual books of the Manuscript; the Prologue (p. 290) lays stress on the mystic number 70 as being the total of the books of the Bible, but the next page (3 *b*) begins the Amiatine division with *In hoc codice continentur ueteris et noui Testamenti Libri No. lxxi*; the list itself, if we count Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Esdras as two books each, gives us a total of 70, and in the Codex itself, which inserts the Second Epistle of Peter, omitted in the list, we have again 71²; thus the list and Prologue agree neither with themselves nor with the actual contents, and may well be as truly Cassiodorian as the other lists: Corssen, indeed, noted long ago³ that the Prologue seemed to have nothing to do with the present *Codex Amiatinus*, and might well be a piece of true Cassiodorian work, and the reference to

¹ *Academy*, April 30, 1887.

² Ranke, in *Theol. Literaturz.*, 1887, p. 272.

³ *Die Bibeln des Cass.* p. 625.

the palm-trees at Elim seems certainly to be a reference to the *Institutio*, c. xiv.

Here certainly is much which makes for the view that the first quaternion was bodily transferred from the *Codex Grandior* to its present place. The *Codex Grandior* was certainly in North Britain, for Bede saw it there. It may well have been the *Pandectes vetustae translationis* which Benedict Biscop or Ceolfrid brought from Rome; and it would be quite in keeping with the times had Ceolfrid, in presenting his magnificent new Pandect to the Holy See, tacked into it the quaternion, which had hitherto stood at the beginning of Cassiodorus' own Old-Latin Pandect.

Difficulties however meet us as we examine this hypothesis closely. The first indeed which suggested itself to Dr. Corssen was a chronological one; it was that Bede's language shows him to have seen the Cassiodorian Pandect himself, while the *Codex Amiatinus* left England in 715; but as Bede was born in 674, he would have had ample time to have seen the pictures in their original place and to have described them, before they left England. But the other arguments in favour of the identity are not really so strong as they seem; though the parchment of the first quaternion struck Prof. Browne¹ as looking somewhat darker and older than that of the rest of the MS., this, as Dr. Hort remarks², is but a trifling matter, and it can hardly be expected that in such a large MS. as this, it would be of the same quality throughout. The fact of the gathering being without a signature proves nothing, as in other MSS. the gatherings are sometimes without signatures for the prefatory matter³. A more important point is the difference of writing. That the handwriting in the first quaternion is different from the body of the work is certain; whether it be earlier is not quite so sure a point; and Dr. Corssen is of

¹ And also the present writer when he examined the MS. in May, 1887.

² *Academy*, Jan. 19, 1889.

³ As in the *Echternach Gospels*, Paris Lat. 9389, where the first signature is on f. 24 at the beginning of the Gospel, the prefatory matter being written on unsigned gatherings.

opinion that the three biblical lists resemble in their style the *writing of the corrections and marginal notes of the text*. Of course if they can be proved to be in the same hand the question is settled, and the preliminary quaternion may be later, or possibly contemporary, but certainly not earlier than the rest of the book; but on this point we still await the judgment of a skilled palaeographer.

The inferiority, again, of the picture in the middle of the book to those in the first quaternion is no argument for dating the latter a century earlier; it only suggests that two scribes were at work on the volume, and that the second, who may have been at work only a few months after the first, was a less skilful artist. The argument from the Italian character of the ornamentation is somewhat stronger, as British scribes were not often in the habit of slavishly copying foreign work; still a Roman scribe may have copied this ornamentation, as we saw reason above to suppose he may possibly have written the rest of the book (p. 285). At any rate all that the ornamentation proves is that it was *designed* in Italy; it may have been *copied* in England.

If we examine the contents of the quaternion, especially the Prologue and Amiatine list, we find that if they do not suit well with the actual present MS., neither would they suit the *Codex Grandior*. The first quaternion gives us, we must remember, *four* divisions of Scripture; Amiatine, Hieronymian, Hilarian and Epiphanian, and Augustinian; the *Codex Grandior*, according to the *Institutio*, c. xiv, would seem to have contained only three, and the actual books of the Bible followed the order of the *antiqua translatio*. In any case, then, the *Prologue* and *Amiatine list* must have been added later, and could not have formed part of the original *Codex Grandior*.

A still further difficulty awaits us as we examine Bede's words and those of Cassiodorus with regard to the Tabernacle and the Temple. Fols. 2 and 2*b* of the Amiatinus contain, as we saw, a carefully drawn bird's-eye view of the

Tabernacle, but there is no representation in the quaternion as we now have it of Solomon's Temple; Cassiodorus, however, in the *Institutio*, c. v, speaks very distinctly of the *Tabernaculum Templumque Domini*, though in the treatise on the Psalms he speaks only of the Tabernacle.

Bede, in describing (see above, p. 300) the Temple, referred to, as he says, in Cassiodorus' Exposition of the Psalms, mentions some features—the triple portico—which are not found in the Amiatine picture¹. De Rossi's explanation of this difference seems all that could be desired, but it proves, at any rate, that the first quaternion of the *Codex Amiatinus* cannot have been 'bodily transferred,' as was at first supposed, from the *Codex Grandior*. Bede, he supposes, is citing from memory, and so confuses together the two distinct passages of Cassiodorus, that in the *Institutio*, mentioning the Tabernacle and Temple, and that in the Psalms, mentioning only the Tabernacle. It would appear that the *Codex Grandior* originally possessed the two pictures; but what has become of the Temple sheet if, or when, it was transferred to the Amiatinus? The loss of such a valuable sheet is a serious difficulty in the way of the identity of the two quaternions. Bede's description of the Tabernacle, again (*De Tabernaculo*, c. xii), does not quite, though it does very nearly, suit the Amiatine picture. He says:—

'Erat contra arulam ostium in pariete altaris orientalis unde uel ligna ad alendum ignem immitti uel carbones et cineres possent egeri; quomodo in pictura Cassiodori Senatoris, cuius ipse in expositione psalmorum meminit, expressum uidimus (or uidemus); in qua etiam utrique altari, et holocausti uidelicet et incensi, pedes quattuor fecit. Quod utrumque eum, sicut et tabernaculi et templi positionem, a doctoribus Judaeorum didicisse putamus.'

Here, as De Rossi remarks, the description of Bede agrees with the Amiatine picture, with the exception of the *ostium* in the side of the altar, which is omitted in the picture.

¹ De Rossi, *La Bibbia Offerta*, etc., Roma 1887, p. 19 f., and *De Origine*, etc., *Bibl. Sedis Apost.* p. lxxviii.

This certainly is a difficulty, but we must remember that there may be two solutions of it: one, that the picture described by Bede was neither the Amiatine nor its immediate exemplar; another, that Bede was describing from memory in this passage, and consequently was not perfectly accurate. This is indeed likely if Bede was writing towards the end of his life, and the Codex with the picture of the Tabernacle had left England in 715; and it is just possible, as Prof. Browne suggests, that the missing *Temple* sheet was taken out of the quaternion in order to make room for the sheet with the Amiatine Prologue and list of contents, and remained at Wearmouth and Jarrow: there it would be often seen afterwards by Bede, and his curious difference of expression *reperimus distincta* of the Temple, *expressum uidimus* of the Tabernacle, would meet with an explanation¹. The language of Bede, then, would seem to leave us in doubt as to the identity of the Cassiodorian and Amiatine picture; the question must be solved on other grounds.

We now have to consider the last and most intricate point of all, the original order of leaves in the quaternion, though this again, however interesting as an exercise in reconstruction, cannot have, I venture to think, the decisive influence imagined by some writers, on its relation to the *Codex Grandior*. The order of leaves, as we saw (p. 288), has been twice disturbed. At present it is Fol. 1 blank, Fol. 1 *b* Dedication verses; 2 blank, 2 *b* and 3 Tabernacle picture; 3 *b* blank; 4 Prologue and 4 *b* contents (purple sheet); 5 Ezra picture, 5 *b* blank; 6 Hieronymian division (Lamb), 6 *b* blank; 7 Hilarian and Epiphanian division (Man), 7 *b* Pentateuch circles; 8 Augustinian division (Dove), 8 *b* blank². Fols. 1 and 8 are one piece; 2 and 3 are one piece, mounted

¹ Dr. Corssen (*Academy*, Apr. 7 and May 26, 1888) doubts the existence of the two pictures, and is convinced, from the language of Cassiodorus, that the Tabernacle and Temple are identical; I am bound to say, however, that De Rossi's explanation seems to me the more natural.

² *Academy*—Prof. Browne, Apr. 30, 1887, Dr. Hort, June 11, 1887, Dr. Corssen, April 7, 1888, Prof. Browne, May 5, 1888, Dr. Hort, Jan. 19, 1889.

on a guard not sewn in ; 4 is a single page on a guard with 7 mounted on the same guard and pasted on to the heel of 4 ; 5 and 6 are one piece, and the sewing is here ; 6 b has at one time stood next to 8, for part of the couplet on the top of 8, *Eloquium domini* etc., has been impressed backwards on 6 b ; as a consequence of this, 5 must have also come after 1 ; the Tabernacle sheet 2 and 3 must have stood 4 and 5, as the middle sheet of the quaternion is the only position in which the picture could have been seen. We are certain, then, of the exact position of fols. 2 and 3, and of the relative positions of 1 and 8, 5 and 6 ; and if 1 and 8 originally stood outside, as the condition of 8 b suggests, then 5 and 6 stood 2 and 7, and the remaining two leaves, separate but sewn together again, 4 and 7, must have stood 3 and 6. Such was the order proposed at first by Prof. Browne, and partly agreed to by Dr. Hort, who argued however that the Pentateuch circle (7 b) would have come more naturally after, not between, the lists, and that the Hilarian list (7) is placed last in Cassiodorus ; he then placed 4 and 7 at 1 and 8, and the present 1 and 8 at 2 and 7, 5 and 6 going 3 and 6, and 2 and 3 as before, at 4 and 5. He imagined the Pentateuch circles to be later than the rest of the quaternion, except of course the Donation verses and contents. Dr. Corssen, however, maintained the writing of the Prologue to be the same as that of the Contents, and the Pentateuch circles the same as that of the Hilarian division, founding on this an argument for the post-Cassiodorian origin of the whole quaternion ; for if 4 and 7 were originally the same sheet, cut in two and sewn together again, as he imagined, by the last binder of the book¹, it would follow that the writing of the Prologue, lists, and Pentateuch circles was the same as that of the contents, that is, not earlier than that of the rest of the MS. ; he agreed, however,

¹ Prof. Browne, in horror at the bare idea of such barbarism, exclaims, 'the modern binder *still lives*, and is still allowed to visit the Laurentiana!' (*Academy*, May 5, 1888.)

with Prof. Browne that 1 and 8 were probably still in their original places.

The final disquisition on the original order was given in the *Academy* of Jan. 18, 1889, by Dr. Hort, beyond which perhaps no one can attempt to go. We can hardly do more than give outlines of it in this Essay, which has already grown too long. Following a suggestion of Corssen's that the human head over the Hilarian division might be possibly intended for a representation of the first Person in the Trinity, he proposed to place that list first, the Hieronymian division with the Lamb, or symbol of the Second Person, coming next, and lastly, the Augustinian with the Dove, the symbol of the Holy Spirit: this will again make the order of the lists the same as that originally suggested by Prof. Browne; the difficulties of the Pentateuch circles on 7 *b*, and the single purple sheet 4 he would resolve by supposing that they were transposed by the North-British scribe when he copied the Cassiodorian MS. Prof. Browne's supposition here seems more probable, that 4 and 7 were *not* originally the same sheet, but two separate sheets sewn together, the purple sheet being substituted by Ceolfrid for the lost Temple sheet. Dr. Hort, however, thinks the arrangement to have been a deliberate transposition by Ceolfrid, when he was obtaining a direct copy (for such he would seem to think it) of the Cassiodorian matter for his own Bible. The Cassiodorian quaternion was as follows:—
1 and 1 *b* blank; 2 Ezra, 2 *b* blank; 3 Prologue, 3 *b* blank; 4 and 5 Tabernacle; 6 Hilarian list, 6 *b* blank; 7 Hieronymian list, 7 *b* blank; 8 Augustinian list, 8 *b* blank. Now Ceolfrid in a Vulgate Bible would naturally wish to place the Hieronymian list first, and in this endeavour would alter the arrangement as follows. The first row of numerals represent the present position of the leaves, the second their supposed original order:—

4	Prologue. (1)	1	blank. (2)
4 <i>b</i>	Contents. (1 <i>b</i>)	1 <i>b</i>	Donation verses. (2 <i>b</i>)

5	Ezra. (3)	6	Hieronymian list. (6)
5b	blank. (3b)	6b	blank. (6b)
2	blank (4)	8	Augustinian list. (7)
2b	Tabernacle. (4b)	8b	blank. (7b)
3	Tabernacle. (5)	7	Hilarian list. (8)
3b	blank. (5b)	7b	Pentateuch Circles. (8b)

And with this arrangement we may rest satisfied. It seems to suggest that the first quaternion was at any rate a direct copy of the lost *Codex Grandior* of Cassiodorus ; but the difficulties of the lost Temple sheet, and of the present state of fols. 4 and 7, do not seem entirely answered by it, and perhaps never can be.

APPENDIX

ON THE ITALIAN ORIGIN OF THE CODEX AMIATINUS AND THE LOCALIZING OF ITALIAN MSS.

[W. SANDAY.]

THE tests put forward by Dr. Hamann (p. 286 *supra*) in proof of the Italian origin of the *Codex Amiatinus* possess an importance which extends beyond the history of this particular MS. If they should be found to hold good, they would supply us with a welcome means of identifying other MSS. as Italian, and would so contribute to a process which is likely to be characteristic of the stage of textual criticism on which we are now entering.

It is coming to be realised more and more that in order to restore the text of an ancient document, especially of one with wide diffusion and attestation, much copied and therefore much corrupted, it is necessary first to know its history. And it is coming also to be realised that the external history of a text and its internal history must go hand in hand. They mutually strengthen and support each other. By pursuing both at once, relations are often suggested which would otherwise pass unperceived. Thus the first thing that we need to know about a MS. is when it was written, where it was written, and where its ancestors were written. Anything which helps us to find out this is of value.

We have several means at our command for ascertaining the birthplace of a MS. The most obvious is the occurrence of notes connecting it with a particular library or owner. These, however, far more often apply only to the later stages of its history, which are of less importance. A larger step is gained when an extant MS. can be identified with one of those in the ancient lists, e.g. in Becker's *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*. The palaeographical test is more delicate, and it is probable that as our knowledge of the different shades of handwriting increases, more use will be made of this than has been made hitherto. The last test is that

which is supplied by the occurrence of forms either of grammar or spelling which can be traced to some definite locality. This test, however, greatly needs more exact definition than it has yet received; and it is this which constitutes the interest of any fresh contribution to it.

These points of grammar and orthography are clearly a branch of the larger question of provincial Latin in general. In regard to this there may be said to be two schools: one, of which Schuchardt may be taken as the representative, admits indeed the distinction between literary Latin or the Latin of cultivated society and the vernacular Latin of common speech, but regards the latter as generally diffused throughout the whole of the Roman Empire, and not dialectically varied—or at least with no recognisable variations—in different localities¹; the other maintains and lays stress upon these peculiarities. The only book with which I am acquainted directly dealing with the subject, Sittl's *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* (Erlangen, 1882) takes this line.

It is much to have opened the subject and attacked it systematically, and Sittl deserves credit for bringing together a quantity of useful material; but any one who reads his book will, I think, rise from it with the sense that there is still a great deal to be done, and that stricter logic will have to be applied before assured conclusions can be arrived at.

The one great caution which seems to me to be most often forgotten is the difficulty of proving the negative side of the propositions involved. It is comparatively easy to prove that a certain usage existed in a certain locality; but then, before it can be said to be characteristic of that locality, it must be also proved that it did not exist or existed only sparingly in other localities. Nor is it enough simply to say that we have no evidence of it. That absence of evidence may be due to nothing more than the defects of our knowledge and scantiness of our materials. For instance, it is constantly asserted that such and such a usage is African because it occurs in Fronto or Apuleius or Tertullian or Cyprian or Arnobius. But how much of this turns upon a bare *argumentum ex silentio*, where the witnesses moreover are of necessity silent for the simple reason that they do not exist? For the two

¹ 'Dieses (das rustike Latein) erscheint auf den Denkmälern aller Gegenden eigentlich immer als ein und dasselbe' (*Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, i. 92; quoted by Sittl, p. 44).

centuries, roughly speaking, from the year 120 A.D. to the year 320 A.D., the great mass of the extant Latin literature is African. How easily might the balance be altered if we had as much literature from Italy or Gaul or Spain as we have from Africa! This is a consideration for which I do not think that nearly enough allowance is made.

On the other hand, there is a caution which must be observed on the opposite side. Isolated examples of a particular form or of a particular usage are consistent with the hypothesis that they are really foreign to the district in which they are found. To take a clear case: no inference can be drawn from the Latin inscriptions found in the East. These must proceed from travellers or immigrants who would bring with them the customs of their own homes; and, so far as we can tell, their homes might be anywhere in the Latin-speaking half of the Empire. So, too, there would be Italian settlers in Gaul or Spain, and African legionaries might find their way into Illyricum or Britain. In like manner we may know for certain that a MS. is Irish, English, or Merovingian, and yet it may contain forms which belong neither to France nor to any part of the British Islands, but which have been perpetuated from some other MS. of an altogether different and distant origin. The evidence is hedged about with drawbacks and qualifications of all kinds; and all that we can do is to bear these well in mind and discount our inferences accordingly.

The materials at our disposal are accumulating daily. First and foremost is the splendid *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, backed by other collections, such as those of Le Blant for Gaul and De Rossi for Christian Rome. Then come the critical editions with an apparatus ample enough for the purpose, such as would be preeminently the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Many single works would of course have to be added—notably Ribbeck's *Virgil*—and a most important contribution to this side of the subject is made by the appearance of the first fasciculus of Bishop Wordsworth's *Vulgate*. Some relevant statements of value may be extracted from the grammarians, but these must not at once be assumed to be trustworthy, because the range of observation on which they depend was often limited. And lastly, the Romance scholar will have an important voice in the matter, because he will be able to determine from existing forms the older forms which must have preceded them.

I very much hope that the subject may be systematically taken up. It is one to which, as it seems to me, a young scholar might devote himself both with interest and profit. The result of his work would be to furnish criteria which would be useful in many directions, and in the process of forming them he would acquire a great variety of knowledge. On a subject which lies somewhat outside my own department I may perhaps be forgiven for going to the more accessible sources, and for collecting some of my data in a rather desultory fashion. I confine myself for the present to testing the points put forward by Dr. Hamann.

The points so put forward as proving that *Codex Amiatinus* was either itself written in Italy, or at least copied from an Italian exemplar, are as follows:—

S = X: homo senes, Jud. xix. 16, 17; senia (ξένια), Ecclus. xx. 31.

N inserted: gigans, Job xvi. 15; optimantium, Jer. xxv. 36.

C inserted before X: anxius, Ps. cxlii. 4; unexit, 1 Reg. x. 1.

Sub assimilated before S: sussaltastis, Ps. cxiii. 6.

Ad assimilated before M: ammirata, Apoc. xiii. 3; quem-
ammodum, Luc. viii. 47.

A = AU: agusto, 2 Par. xv. 16; asculabant, Act. viii. 10.

O = AU: clodum, Matt. xviii. 8.

U = AU: cluserunt, 2 Par. xxix. 7.

A = E: adtractaverit, Gen. xxvii. 12.

E = I: redemet, Ps. liv. 19.

Vowel prefixed to S impure: histriatarum, 3 Reg. vii. 24.

S = EX: ? espendebat, Judith xiii. 8; scandescet, Sap. v. 23.

Vowel dropped before S impure: Spaniae, 1 Macc. viii. 3.

PH = P, DI = Z: tophadius (topazus), Ezech. xxviii. 13.

Dropping of final M: totum belli impetu, 2 Par. xxxii. 2; in tantum arrogantiae tumore, Esth. xvi. 12; incidemus in manu Dei et non in manus hominum, Ecclus. ii. 22.

We will take these points in order.

S = X. From Campania, Bruttium and Lucania there are three examples of *visit* (= *vixit*); from Calabria and the Eastern side of the peninsula four examples; from Latium four examples (two each of *visit* and *bisit*); from Cisalpine Gaul two examples, *conius* and *sestum*; from Sardinia three examples, *coius* twice and *visit*. From Spain we get only one extremely doubtful example of *es* (= *ex*); but from Gallia Narbonensis there are several, *coius*, *Santippa*, *sesta* (from a Christian inscription ascribed by Le Blant

to the sixth century), *supples* (also Christian) *viset*, *bisit*. In Africa, too, there are six examples (two each of *conius* and *visit*), besides the proper name *Estricata* five times¹.

Turning to MSS. there are two or three examples in Ribbeck's MSS. of Virgil² which may be presumed to be Italian. There are also two examples (*senes* and *senis*), which appear to be original in the text of Jordanes, who wrote in Italy. Many MSS. of Sedulius, including the oldest, the famous Turin MS. in capitals of the seventh century (Zangemeister and Wattenbach, *Exemp. Codd. Lat.* pl. 16), in *Pasch. Carm.* iv. 2 read *maestum*, one MS. of the eighth century *mestum*. Huemer has printed *mixtum*, on much inferior authority, because of the parallel passage of Juvencus; but it does not follow that because Juvencus in Spain wrote *mixtus* before 337 A. D. therefore Sedulius may not have written *mistus* or *maestus* in a different region and more than a century later. Sedulius may be taken to represent Italian usage. One group of MSS. has a note to the effect that he taught philosophy in Italy, but wrote his heroics in Achaia: and there is more reason to believe than to doubt the first part of this statement. I have not been able to find another instance of this interchange in his works, but I will not say that there are none. The one writer of whom it seems clear that he habitually wrote *senes* or *senis* is Venantius Fortunatus. These forms occur no less than twelve times in his poetical works, with a strong preponderance of MS. authority. There is a more even balance between *senes* and *senis*, but *senes* throughout seems to have been rightly admitted into the text. If Venantius Fortunatus had stood alone there might have been a doubt whether the tradition which he represented was Italian or Gallican. He was born in North Italy, near Treviso, but spent the greater part of his life in a monastery at Poitiers. We have, however, already had the evidence of inscriptions for the neighbouring province of Gallia Narbonensis. There is also at least one well attested example of *senes* in Gregory of Tours; *senes*

¹ Corssen (*Aussprache*, i. 297) remarks on the tendency for the guttural element in *x* to be lost before *c* and *t*: *Estricatus* and *Estricata* are among his instances; he gives a number of others, most of which appear to be derived from Italy or Africa.

² The true Latin form is of course *Vergilius*, but in English it seems best to keep the familiar 'Virgil.' Besides the objections to innovating in such a matter, to write 'Vergil' would be to obscure the history of the name and to make it appear as if it had been introduced into our literature at a different period and by a different method from that by which it was really introduced into it.

also occurs in a French MS. of the Vulgate (*G*) at Luke i. 18 ; and the tenth century MS. *C* of the *Heptateuch* of Cyprian, bishop of Toulon, has three instances of *hesternus* for *externus*, and one of *sescentos* (ed. Mayor, p. xlviii). It does not appear that this poem ever passed through Italian hands. The *Codex Trivultianus* of Corippus, an African writer of the age of Justinian, has as many as seven examples. The MS. itself is of the fourteenth century, but it may very well have been made from an ancient archetype, as the work does not seem to have been much copied.

There is also decisive evidence for the writing of *s* for *x* in Spain. A ninth century MS. of Cassian, which Petschenig, the editor, calls 'Lombardic,' but which is really Visigothic from the monastery of Silos, near Burgos¹, is characterized by the forms *ansietas*, *ausilium*, *justa*, *senes*².

The Appendix to Probus³, among its directions as to orthography, says that *senes* is to be written and not *senis* (ed. Keil, iv. 198).

On the whole, though we have thus sufficient evidence of the prevalence of this corruption in Italy, there is also reason to think that it existed in Africa, and satisfactory proof of its existence in Gaul.

N inserted. We may dismiss the many instances of words in which the insertion of *n* is both correct in itself, and supported by a large amount of early authority, though it has dropped out of common use. Such would be *totiens*, *quotiens*, *vicensimus*, *conjunctæ*, and we might add also *formonsus*, which is spelt thus both in MSS. and inscriptions. Here the *n* appears to be etymologically right, and similar to that which has dropped out of *χαπίε* (for *χαπίεϛ*)⁴. Not so correct in itself, though equally well attested by early and good MSS., is the form *thensaurus*: it is more assured in MSS. of the Old Latin than in those of the Vulgate. On much the same footing as this would be the form *occansio*, which has also a large amount of early attestation. It is found in *Codex*

¹ The MS. is described by M. Delisle in *Mélanges de Paléographie*, &c. p. 78 f.

² *Ioh. Cassiani Opp.* ed. Petschenig, p. xxxvii (Vienna, 1888). I was convinced from the orthography that this MS. was Visigothic, and had little difficulty in identifying it.

³ Sittl originally held that this was a compilation which did not represent any particular province (*Die lok. Verschied.* p. 35 n.), but he has recently expressed the opinion, on what seem to be good grounds, that it belongs to Africa (*Archiv f. lat. Lexikog.* vi. p. 557).

⁴ *Virosus* is said to = *virosus*, from a root-form *viro-uensso-* = *viro-uent-to-* (V. Henry, *Précis de Grammaire comparée*, p. 169).

Vercellensis (a), which palaeography and tradition alike refer to the fourth century¹, and in *Codex Veronensis* (b), which is said to be not more than a century later. Both of these are probably Italian MSS. The form occurs no less than nine times in *Codex Fuldensis* of the Vulgate (Bp. Wordsworth's *F*), which we know to have been written in Campania just before the year 546. It occurs even more often in *Codex Claromontanus* (*D* Paul.), for which Dr. Corssen has recently claimed an Italian origin. This may very possibly be right, though the arguments made use of point rather against Africa than definitely for Italy as compared with other localities where a Graeco-Latin MS. might be written. The common view is that the companion MS., *Codex Bezae* (*D* Evv.), was written in Southern Gaul. The place of origin of these early Graeco-Latin MSS. is an interesting subject of enquiry that has not yet been brought to any settled conclusion. *Occansio* does not occur in the N. T. portion of *Codex Amiatinus*. It occurs in a *v. l.* of the French MS. *E* at Mat. xxvi. 16. It is found once, with three other instances of *n* inserted, though not before *s*, in Jordanes.

Some curious examples occur sporadically in the inscriptions: *herens* in Macedonia and Southern Gaul, *sciantis* (= *sciatis*) in Calabria, *supestens* in proconsular Asia, *memoriens*=*memoriae* in Dalmatia, and the proper name *Crenscens*, which is found repeatedly, but, strange to say, is the only example except *coniunx* in Africa. Very remarkable is the form *Monse*, which is characteristic of the sole existing fragmentary MS. of the *Assumptio Moyseos* which is assigned to the sixth century, or possibly earlier (Fritzsche, *Libr. Apoc.* p. xxxiii., after Ceriani). The nearest parallel to this with which I am acquainted is *Heronde* in the Lichfield or St. Chad's Gospels (Bp. Wordsworth's *L*) in Matt. ii. 22. Less anomalous than these are the vernacular forms *finctus* (= *fictus*), which is found in Priscillian (ed. Schepss, p. 21. l. 16), and *finctiosus* (= *ficticius*), which is rightly restored by Miodónski in the text of the *De Aleatoribus*, c. 7. Also nearer to the beaten track are the two examples from *Cod. Amiatinus*, *gigans* and *optimans*. Plenty of parallels may be found for the first of these. The Calabrian inscriptions have *Atlans* and *Thoans*. *Atlans* is found generally in the MSS. of Virgil, while single MSS. have *Acragans*, *Pallans*: *superstens*, *increpitans* (for *increpitans*) and *flectens*, *praemens* as futures are also found. It is in this latter class that we must look for analogies to

¹ M. Berger questions this early date, but I believe it to be on the whole probable.

optimans. We note that *redundans* for *redundas* occurs in MSS. of Venantius Fortunatus (iii. 24. 15), though in a group which appears to avoid the form *senes*. In Gregory of Tours there are several examples of *n* inserted before *s* like *accensus* (= *accessus*), perhaps from confusion with *ascensus*. The only identical examples that I have found of *gigans* are quoted by Georges in his *Lex. d. lat. Wortformen*, both from the *Amplonian Glossaries*. These are important for the point directly at issue. So far there would seem to be a preponderance of evidence for Italy as the centre from which these forms had radiated. These glossaries, however, in the form in which they have come down to us, would seem to be widely removed from Italy. The MSS. of both glossaries are said to contain notes in Anglo-Saxon¹. Still, if we went far enough back, the forms might have come in upon Italian soil. With no great centre were the first English scholars in such frequent communication as with Rome. On the whole the view that this inserted *n* favours an Italian origin seems to me, if not proved, yet perhaps rather more probable than not.

CX=X. For this there are nine examples in Cisalpine Gaul, ten in the rest of Italy outside Rome; but the same number in Gallia Narbonensis, three in Sardinia, three in Spain, and many (about thirty-six) in Africa. The like phenomenon occurs several times in Jordanes and in the MSS. of Paulus' *Historia Langobardorum*, at least once in Orientius (Mr. Ellis prints *extincxit* in *Comm.* i. 356), once (*sancxit*) in Gregory of Tours, once, if not more, in an Anglo-Saxon MS. of Sedulius dating from the eighth century, and several times, not to say frequently, in the group of Irish MSS. published by Prof. T. K. Abbott (*Ev. Vers. Antehieron.* pp. vi, xxi). In Matt. xi. 17 *planccixisti* occurs in *R* (Irish), and *planccixistis* in *E* (French with Irish affinities). I imagine that the wide diffusion of this usage will not be disputed. There is hardly one of the Latin-speaking provinces from which there is not evidence for it.

Sub assimilated before S and Ad before M. The assimilation of prepositions is a subject on which it is dangerous to generalise. Each word must be taken by itself, because a writer will assimilate one word and not another which seems to be exactly analogous to it. Instances of the assimilation of *sub* before *s* are comparatively rare. Those that I have been able to find are all Italian: *suscriptione* from Tusculum, *suscripsi* from Cannae (both quoted by Sittl, p. 71), and *suscriptum* from

¹ Loewe, *Prodromus Glossariorum*, p. 114 f.

the Calabrian volume (*CIL*. ix. 5420). So far as it goes this evidence would favour Dr. Hamann's conclusion, but it is too slight to build an induction upon. The assimilation both of *sub* and *ad* before *m* is more common. Yet neither is found in the Campanian volume, and only *ammissus* in the Calabrian, along with numerous instances of non-assimilation. Non-assimilation appears to be also the rule in Latium: there are no examples of either *sub* or *ad* assimilated. In the province of Asia *im memoriam* occurs twice, in Dalmatia once, with *im bello*, *im praetorio*: in Africa there is one example of *amministrare* dating from the fourth century. In the MSS. of Virgil, where we should rather expect to find it, there is only one imperfect example of *ad* assimilated before *m*: A MORSÖ Cod. Med. *Georg.* ii. 379. Assimilation of *sub* and *in* before *m* is much more frequent (*ommutuit*, *summersum*, *summittere*, *summovere*, *im magnum*, *im mare*, *im me*, *im medium*, &c.). Similar assimilations appear to be characteristic of the Vatican MS. (*V*), which dates from the seventh century, of the *Excerpts* of Eugippius; and they are still more marked in two ninth century French MSS. *P* and *T* of the same author. They would, in fact, seem to be carried back, if not to Eugippius himself, to the original copy of the *Excerpts*. So large a work, consisting merely of extracts from St. Augustine, would probably not be written out by the abbot¹ himself, but by some of his monks. In the *Vita Severini*, which we may suppose that Eugippius would write with his own hand, there are no very striking examples until we come to Cod. *N*, a MS. of the tenth or eleventh century, which has *quemammodum* throughout. There is strong evidence for the usage in Victor Vitensis, where Petschenig reads *ammoneret*, *ammonere*, *ammissi*—in all six times. In Jordanes it occurs twelve times. In Sedulius it is probably not original but characteristic of two MSS. *M T*, both probably Italian. Arndt has admitted *amminiculo* once into the text of Gregory of Tours (p. 166. l. 4). Assimilation is common in Cod. *Casiniensis* (*A*¹) of this writer, a MS. of the eleventh or twelfth century in broken Lombardic, said to show signs of having been copied from a Merovingian exemplar. It is however probable that forms like *ammirabilis* are really Italian. Gregory adopts the commoner forms of assimilation, but he more often does not assimi-

¹ There is much to be said for the spelling 'abbat,' which has had a continuous existence in our literature from the twelfth century onwards ('abbad' occurs c. 889), but as 'abbot' is also perfectly legitimate (see Dr. Murray's *Dictionary* s.v.) the usage of the majority may decide.

late. Assimilation is rare in Alcimus Avitus and Venantius Fortunatus (there are no instances of *suss-* or *amm-*): it is very slight in the specimens of Visigothic writing: and, speaking generally, it may be said that it is avoided by the writers of the Caroline period as represented in the two volumes of *Poetae Medii Aevi*. The same would hold good for the two books of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which are all that has been critically edited of the works of Bede.

In the Vulgate *ammirabantur* seems to be assured in Matt. vii. 28: it occurs in eleven of Bishop Wordsworth's MSS. (in one case as a correction) of very varied origin: *summiserunt* is also decisively attested in Mark ii. 4. There is a division of authorities in Acts ix. 25, x. 11: in the first of these places the Campanian MS. *F* does not assimilate.

In the grammatical treatise of Cassiodorus assimilation is distinctly recognised: *ammonet* and *amminiculo* are given as examples, also *summovit* and *sumministrat* (ed. Keil, p. 162 f.). In this part of his treatise Cassiodorus is quoting from an earlier writer, Papirianus; but he himself wrote in the same manner (e.g. *ammonui*, p. 146).

Taking all the evidence together, a better case appears to be made out than we have as yet had. There is, I think, a presumption that the less usual forms of assimilation are Italian.

A = AU. Corssen would confine this usage during the early centuries to proper names (*Aussprache*, i. 663 f.). According to him it begins in Greek inscriptions of century I (ΚΑΑΔΙΟΥ, ΑΡΟΥΣΤΕ), then in Latin. It is found most frequently in De Rossi's Roman inscriptions; but it also occurs three times in Cisalpine Gaul, once at Puteoli, once in Sardinia; also twice in Spain (*Cladius*, *Glacus*), and three times for the name of the month (*id.* and *kal. Agust.*) in Africa. Besides *Agusto*, *atem* also occurs in *Codex Monacensis* (q), a Freising MS. of the seventh century, which is thought to have been written in the eastern half of the Merovingian dominions; and two instances of *agurior* for *auguror* are given by Caspari, *Hom. de Sacril.* p. 53 (Christiania, 1886). Knoell notes a single instance in the Vatican MS. (saec. vii) of the *Excerpts* of Eupippius. He remarks upon this (p. vii), as he says that the confusion is very common in some of his MSS. Unfortunately he does not tell us which; but we may infer from the specimen given on p. xxv. that *Q* was one of them. As a near ancestor of *Q* was written at Naples in the year 581, it is possible that the peculiarity may be Italian. When however we turn to the Vulgate of Luke ii. 1

we find that *agusto* is read in *DLQRTY*, of which *DQR* are Irish, *LY* English, and *T* Spanish. Not only *agusti*, *aguste*, but also *agures* (*bis*) occur in specimens of Visigothic writing of the eighth century (Ewald and Loewe, tabb. viii, xi). Similar forms appear both in French and English MSS. (Pal. Soc. ii. 35; *Cat. Anc. MSS.*, pp. 60, 61; Arndt, *Schrifttafeln*, tab. 16). *Agustus*, *Agustidunum* are the common forms in Gregory of Tours. The grammarian Caper lays down *auscultā non asculatā* (ed. Keil, vii. 108), which shows that both forms were current. And if turning to modern usage it is argued that the Italian form is 'Agostino,' it may be replied that the Spanish is also 'Agustin.'

O = AU. *Clodus* is no doubt the vernacular spelling. We are reminded of the story about Vespasian's pronunciation of *plaustra* as *plostra* (Sueton. *Vesp.* 22), which was apparently a provincialism derived from his Sabine birthplace. *Clodus* is widely attested in MSS. of the Old-Latin Version, in both its forms, African and European. This, however, would not be decisive, as the form which is called African need not have been African in its origin, circulated outside Africa, and is extant in MSS. which are probably not African. Yet there can be no doubt that *clodus* was really current in Africa: it has an assured place in the text of Cyprian. *Clodus* and *claudus* are found side by side in Irish MSS. of the seventh or eighth centuries. Gregory of Tours certainly wrote *clodus*: so too Venantius Fortunatus: the majority of the Vulgate MSS. have it in Matt. xv. 30, 31.

U = AU. The forms *clusi* for *clausi*, *clusum* for *clausum* are also very widely diffused. They are found in MSS. of all kinds, both of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate (e.g. Luke xiii. 25 *clausērit c f ff₂ δ*, *cluserit b d e i l q*; Matt. vi. 6 *clauso codd. plur.*; *cluso* $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{L}^*\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{O}^*\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{Z}$; Matt. xiii 15 *clausērent BKM TVWXZ**, *cluserunt ACFH O JMO*Y*). Examples like these show the presence of the *u*-forms in every region where the Bible was copied. They also occur in Apuleius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lucifer Calaritanus (several instances in each), also once in Salvian of Marseilles, though not apparently in Claudianus Mamertus, Eugippius, Orientius, or Sedulius.

A = E. Not uncommon in inscriptions in the word *consacrare*; but a more exact parallel to the *adtractaverit* of *Codex Amiatinus* is supplied by Gregory of Tours, where three of the oldest and best MSS. (two of the seventh century and one of the eighth) read *contractans*. I see too that Mr. Ellis reads *detractans* in Avienus,

xxviii. 19, with Jeep in Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* i. 156, observing that *retractare* is invariable. We might also point to Cyprian, *Ep.* lxvii. 9, where all Hartel's MSS. have *detractores* or *detractatores*.

E = I. The single example of this *redemet* (= *redimet*) need not detain us. Numbers of such cases might be quoted from the inscriptions or MSS. of every region. It is so frequent in the British MSS. of the Vulgate as almost to be regarded as a characteristic of these islands; but it is too clearly attested elsewhere. I pass over for the same reason the aspirate in *hostium*.

Vowel prefixed to S impure. More interesting than the last examples is the form *histriatarum* (= *striatarum* in 3 Reg. vii. 24). The prefixing of a vowel to *s* impure is of course not rare in the Romance countries. In the Spanish inscriptions there are four examples like *Ischolasticus*; in Africa four examples, and many proper names; in Calabria one example of *i* prefixed and two of *e* (*espiritum, explendidus*). Le Blant quotes a number of examples (*Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, p. cxviii). Jordanes has *expectaculum* (which is also found in Priscillian) and *expoliatum*; and there are similar examples in Gregory of Tours. Some curious forms occur in the single extant MS. of Arnobius, *Codex Parisinus*, saec. ix. in., copied from a Lombardic (? Merovingian) original, where *a* is prefixed in this way (e.g. *aspiritu, ascauros, adscribuntur* for *scribuntur*; ed. Reifferscheid, p. x), and what I suppose is still more peculiar, *instructum* for *structum*, *inscientia* for *scientia*, *inspecuali* for *spectaculi*, &c., in all five examples, and yet others. Nearer to the particular form in question would be *hispatii*, which occurs on p. 53 of the *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta*¹, which is thought to be work of an Aquitanian lady named Sylvia, and appears to have been written in 385–388 A. D. The MS. in which the form occurs is Lombardic of the tenth century. We have, however, a still more exact parallel in the form *histriaturis* for *striaturis*, which is common to all the six leading MSS. of Apollinaris Sidonius (*Ep.* iv. ix. 4; p. 60. l. 6, ed. Luetjohann). It would thus go back at least to the archetype of these MSS., and perhaps even to Sidonius himself or the scribe whom he employed. In any case the form must have been in use in Gaul as well as in Italy.

The converse case of *Spania* for *Hispania*, on which Dr. Hamann also tries to base an argument, is of frequent occurrence.

¹ Ed. Gamurrini; cf. Wölfflin, *Archiv f. lat. Lexikog.* iv. 260.

It is found in Spanish inscriptions, and in the specimens of Visigothic writing (Ewald and Loewe, tab. xiv): it occurs in the Muratorian Fragment (which is probably Italian) and in the MS. of Arnobius (once): it is well authenticated in Gregory of Tours and is the constant spelling (thirty-six times) in Jordanes.

S=EX. I hardly know whether we need seek a parallel for *espendebat* which Dr. Hamann quotes from Judith xiii. 8. In the MS. both the intrusive letters are marked for omission. They might possibly represent a reading *expendebat*. The Clementine text has *pendebat*, which is doubtless right.

The form *scandescet* for *excandescet* in Sap. v. 23 has many analogies in that remarkable MS. *Cod. Bezae* (*D* Evv.). The forms which occur so frequently as to be characteristic of this MS., *sconspectu*, *scoruscatio*, *scoruscus*, appear to mark a still further stage of development. They must, I suppose, have arisen from *ex conspectu*, *excoruscatio*, though the preposition has entirely lost its force (the reading in Acts vii. 46 is *in sconspectudī*). It were much to be wished that we knew where *Cod. Bezae* itself was written. The common view, as we have seen, assigns it to the South of France. In favour of this would be the curious form *sonium* (= μέριμνα, Luke xxi. 34), which is naturally compared with 'soin'.

PH=P, and DI=Z. The spelling *tophadius* is another interesting point. The aspiration of *p* is not very common and does not seem, so far as I can judge, to be local. The spelling *topadium* occurs in the leading MS. (*M*) of the genuine *Speculum* of St. Augustine (ed. Wehrich, p. iii): this MS. is of the ninth century and came from St. Emmeran's at Ratisbon. *Cod. Bobiensis* (*k*) of the Old Latin has *baptidiator* in Matt. xi. 11 (*baptiziator* five times elsewhere). Mr. Maunde Thompson believes that *k* was written in Italy; but, however this may be, *baptidiare* occurs four times in the *Peregrinatio* (Wölfflin, *Archiv*, iv. 260), and we have also *rabidiare* (Ronsch, *It. u. V.* p. 171), *exorcidiare* (ib. p. 458), *catomidiare* (Georges). And even though we should suppose, what would be difficult to prove, that all the MSS. in which these forms occurred were Italian, there would still remain other instances which could not be thus accounted for. The corresponding change of *z* for *di* (especially in the form *zabulus*) is very widely distributed

¹ See, however, especially Ducange s. v. 'soniare,' which appears to be found in glossaries on the *Leges Langobardorum*, but was also current in France. Ducange's glossaries have *somnium*, φροντίς, ἰδιωτικῶς: *somnior*, μερίμνῳ.

—from Commodian (in Palestine?) to the Irish Books of Kells and Durrow.

The dropping of **M** is the last of Dr. Hamann's instances. It is, however, too common to furnish any criterion. There are many examples in the Spanish and African inscriptions besides those in Italy; and instances similar to those quoted from *Cod. Amiatinus* are plentiful enough in other MSS.

To sum up. The results of this enquiry must be confessed to be disappointing; they are for the most part negative rather than positive. Many of the points which we have been discussing (*c* inserted before *x*, *u*=*au*, *a*=*e*, *e*=*i*, *ph*=*h*, dropping of final *m*) hardly seem to have even a *prima facie* case in their favour. We should add to these *o*=*au* in *clodus*, but for the story about Vespasian. It is possible that this form may have been Italian in its origin, but at least from the third century onwards it is common in other provinces. Perhaps the same may be said of *a*=*au* in *Agustinus*, &c. This too may have come originally from Italy, but it is also firmly established in Spain and found its way frequently into the North. The accretion or suppression of vowels before *s* impure, and the substitution of *s* for *x* are not so much characteristic of Italy as of the Romance countries in general. There remain the epenthesis of *n*, as in *gigans*, assimilation of prepositions, and *di*=*z*. In regard to these, the evidence collected has been of course far from exhaustive: its proportions might easily be altered by wider enquiry: there is also some uncertainty as to the localities to which the different items of evidence are to be referred. It is a delicate question of the weighing of evidence on which I am by no means sure that my own impression is right: still I am inclined to think that there is some ground for Dr. Hamann's contention, and that the examples are strewn more thickly as we approach Italian soil.

It must not be thought that all the branches of this kind of enquiry are equally inconclusive. The type of Visigothic writing stands out very distinctly. Extreme examples of it may be seen in *Cod. Cavensis* (*C*) of the Vulgate, and in the Paris MS. (*O*) above referred to of Ioh. Cassianus. More normal examples would be the common readings of *CTΘ* in the Vulgate, and some of the specimens of writing in Ewald and Loewe's collection. Nowhere but in Spanish MSS. have I found *mici*=*mili*, and the substitution of *qu* for *c* (as in *quur*) is more common than elsewhere.

Some characteristics also come out in the Irish MSS. Extreme examples of these would be the *Book of Armagh* and Dr. T. K. Abbott's *Cod. Usserianus II*, more normal examples the Books of Kells and Durrow and the Rushworth Gospels. There is a very common tendency in Irish MSS. to the doubling especially of *s* in forms like *possitus*, *nissi*. Nowhere but in the *Book of Armagh* have I found the curious form *anguelus* (= *angelus*): forms like *diciens*, *vidiens* are marked in *Cod. Usserianus*, and it is a curious coincidence that *diciens* occurs also in *Cod. Bobiensis* (*k*), which, although it belonged to St. Columban's monastery, is possibly older than St. Columban himself, and at least not Irish (*O. L. B. T.* ii. pp. clxi, clxv.). The Visigothic MS. of Cassian, however, has *concupiscientia*, *inpudians*.

I rather believe that the doubling of consonants in the penultimate, as in *obtullit*, is characteristic of Northern France, including the Valley of the Loire.

A few more facts of some interest may be adduced in regard to the assimilation of *d* before *m*. This is not original in the writings of Cassian. The form *quemadmodum* occurs frequently in both the Institutions and the Conferences without variant. Assimilation is characteristic of a particular MS. *N* (Cod. 483 of the Arsenal at Paris of the 10th or 11th century) of the treatise *Contra Nestorium*. It is equally characteristic of the archetype of all the extant MSS. of Sidonius (cf. the preface by Leo to Luetjohann's edition, p. xxxi). This archetype appears to have been written in the eighth century (*ibid.* p. xxvii). It does not follow that Sidonius himself assimilated, and to judge from his text the editor appears to think that he did not. Arguing from Cassian on the one hand, and from Gregory of Tours on the other, the presumption might be thought to be in this direction; but we might, on the other hand, suppose that Sidonius derived a tendency to assimilate from his Italian connexions. An interesting MS. of Primasius on the Apocalypse (Bodl. Douce 140) repeatedly has *quemammum*. This MS. was probably written in England in the eighth or ninth century, but there is some reason to think that it was copied from a Merovingian exemplar. It is possible that Primasius him-

self may have written *quemammodum*. If so, his evidence would hold good for Africa in the time of Justinian. The practice of assimilating in this way might have been brought over from Italy. But the instances just quoted might suggest the conclusion that it was introduced into some French centre not later than the eighth century. I believe that *quemammodum* is a good test word, and that a fairly clear generalisation might be made out about it; but more material must be collected.

THE END.