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TO MY FELLOW-WORKERS

IN THE

REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION

OF THE

HOLY BIBLE AND APOCRYPHA,

THESE PAGES ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.
By the same Editor.

THE FOURTH BOOK OF MACCABEES. The Greek text with the Syriac and Latin translations; to which are added other treatises on the Maccabean Martyrs. [In the Press.

THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA. A revised text of the Latin translation, and a full collation of the two oldest MSS. [Preparing.
INTRODUCTION.

In the fourth book of Ezra (the second of Esdras in our Apocrypha) the transition from the thirty-fifth to the thirty-sixth verse of the seventh chapter must strike even a superficial reader as singularly abrupt. That this want of coherence was felt by the earliest of modern commentators on the book, is proved by his elaborate attempt to supply a train of thought in order to bring the two verses into connexion. It was not however till the beginning of the eighteenth century that appeal was made to another representative of the lost original. Then appeared Ockley’s translation of the Arabic version, where between the verses in question a long passage intervenes,


34. Judicium autem solum remanebit, veritas stabit, et fides convalescat.

35. Et opus subsequetur, et mercis ostendetur, et justitiae vigilabit, et injustitiae non dominantur.

36. Et dixi: Primus Abraham propter Sodomitas oravit, et Moyses pro patribus qui in desertto peccaverunt,

37. Et qui post eum pro Israel”…Vulg. ed. Sabat.


3 Published in the Appendix to Vol. iv. of Whiston’s Primitive Christianity Restored. 4to. London, 1711. The existence of this Arabic version had been pointed out by John Gregory, who in his zeal for Oriental learning overestimated its value. “I have cause to believe, that it is the most authentick remaining of this Book.” Notes and Observations upon some Passages of Scripture. 4to. Oxford, 1846, p. 77. The Arabic text itself, however, was not printed till 1863, by Ewald, in Vol. x. of the Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Ockley’s English translation has been rendered into Latin by Hilgenfeld, with H. Steiner’s corrections, in the Messias Jadeocorum. Lips. 1869. Hitherto only one MS. of this version has been used, viz. Bodl. 251, which has lost two leaves (containing iv. 24—45 and viii. 50—ix. 1). Ewald (Das 4th Esrabuch, p. 100) hints at the existence of another MS. in the Vatican, and from Asseman’s description, abridged by Mai (Script. Vet. Nova Coll. Vol. iv.), we may readily identify it with Cod. III. Asseman indeed denies the identity of 1 Ezra in this MS. with our 1 Ezra, but the order in which it
which carries on the thread of the narrative in an artless and appropriate manner. In the present century the text of the Arabic has been printed, the long neglected Armenian translated, and the apparatus criticus of the book greatly increased by the publication of the text and translation of the following versions: the Aethiopic, the shorter Arabic (Arab.), and, last but not least, the Syriac, and in all of them the hiatus stands, the title and the beginning which he quotes, are all the same as in the Bodl. MS., so that we may regard his language as a hasty conclusion based on the absence of chapters i. ii. xv. xvi. from the Arabic version.

1 Yet the genuineness of this portion was not immediately recognized. Dr. Fr. Lee wrote thus to Ockley: "The Arabic Copy, or Version, besides many lesser Interpolations, hath a very large one concerning the intermediate State of Souls" (An Epistolary Discourse concerning the Books of Ezra, Lond. 1722, p. 21). P. J. S. Vogel held all between vii. 25 and assummecur viii. 20, to be a later addition to the original (Commentatio de Conjecturis in Crisi Nervi Text, cui adjecta est altera de Quarto Libro Ebdus. 4to. Alterfii, 1795), but the force of his arguments was considerably weakened by a few remarks of Laurence. Hilgenfeld still maintains the theory of an interpolation, but within narrower limits, viz. vii. 45—Victrix vii. 115 (43).

2 By J. H. Petermann, for Hilgenfeld's Messias Jud. The Armenian version itself was published as early as A.D. 1666, in the first edition of the Arm. Bible, according to Masch in Le Long's Bibl. S. ii. 1, A.D. 1781, p. 175. Its existence therefore could scarcely have been unknown to scholars, as it is mentioned also by Bredehaupt (Eichhorn's Allg. Bibl. iv. a.d. 1792, p. 626), by Michel Tchamitchian (Histoire d'Arménie. 4to. Ven. 1724—86, Vol. iii. p. 660; his statement, referred to by Scholz, that Usgan, the editor of the first Arm. Bible, translated 4 Ezra from the Lat. is obviously incorrect), by C. F. Neumann (Versuch einer Gesch. der Armen. Lit. a.d. 1836, p. 39), and by Scholz (Einleitung i. a.d. 1845, p. 501). But strange to say, this version appears to have escaped the notice of the editors of our book till pointed out by Ceriani, a.d. 1861 (see Mon. Sacra et Prof. v. fasc. 1, pp. 41—44).

3 This version, which had been quoted occasionally by Ludolf, in his Lex. (see Van der Vlis, Disput. de Ezrae Libr. Apocr. vulgo quarto dicto, p. 75), was published together with a Lat. and Engl. transl. by Laurence (Primi Ezrae Libri, qui apud Vulg. appellatur quartus, Vers. Aeth. Oxon. 1829), from a MS., which is now in the Bodl. Libr. (No. VII. Dillh. Cat.). Many conjectural emendations were proposed by Van der Vlis in the treatise just mentioned; and Dillmann has given from MSS. examined by him an important list of various readings, but without specifying his authorities (Das vierte Ezrazbuch..... von Ewald, pp. 92—100); finally Fr. Praetorius has, by the aid of Dillmann's variants and four additional MSS., revised the Lat. transl. of Laurence for Hilgenfeld's Messias Jud. The materials for a critical edition of the text, which is still a desideratum, have been increased lately by the addition of the Brit. Ms. of the Magdala collection of Aeth. MSS., which contains no less than eight copies of this book (see Prof. Wright's list in the Zeitschr. der deutschen morganl. Gesellsh. xxiv. 1870, p. 590).

4 Also published by Ewald in 1863 (Abh. der k. Gesellsh. der Wisscnz. zu Göttingen, zu d. Gött. Vol. xi.), from MS. Hunt. 260 (Bibl. Bodl. Cod. MSS. Orient. Cat. ii. ed. Nicoll, p. 11), and described by him in Nachrichten von der Georg.-Ang. Univ. u. der k. Gesellsh. der Wisssen. zu Göttingen. 1863; it has been translated into German by Steiner, in Hilgenf. Zeitschrift, Vol. xi. 1868. As Dr. Guidi has supplemented for me the imperfect notice printed by Mai on Cod. Ar. Vat. CCCCLXII. (Script. V. N. coll. iv.), I am able to announce the discovery of a second MS. of this version.

5 A Latin translation of this version was printed by Dr. Ant. Ceriani in 1866 (Monum. Sacra et Prof. Vol. i. fasc. 2), and followed after a short interval by the publication of the Syriac text itself (id. Vol. v. fasc. 1, 1868) from the celebrated MS. of the Peschito (B. 21, Inf.) in the Ambrosian Library. The same scholar now proposes to reproduce by photolitho-
is found to be filled up in essentially the same way. As these versions seem generally to be of independent origin, and some are of considerable antiquity, their agreement

graphy the entire MS., which has been assigned to the sixth century.

There had long before been rumours of the existence of a Syriac version in a MS. once the property of Julius Caesar Scaliger, which Fabricius in vain attempted to discover (Cod. Pseudoiug. Vet. Text. ed. ii. Vol. ii. p. 176). The MS. in question is thus referred to by Scaliger himself: "Arcana vero multo plura continetur in libris Esdrae, atque potiora, quam quivis narratione. Eos libros, quod hoc eloquii ausus essus, suspicior te non vidisse: quorum admirabile, ac divinum compendium apud me est, Syra conscriptum lingua. In his igitur longe, uti diebat, proestantiores sententiae continetur, quam quin magnos sordissimis calamissimis, atque impurissimis impostoris Emmanuelis." Ecstaticorum Exercitationum Liber quintus decimus, de subtilitate ad Hieron. Cardamum. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1625. Erpenius probably received it from the younger Scaliger, and it is not unlikely that it was one of the libri Chaldaici in the possession of Jo. Picus Mirandula; that scholar, as we know, regarded the seventy books, above referred to, as a storehouse of mystical theology and cabalistic lore, and I know of no other Syr. MS. that could in any degree justify, from his point of view, such glowing language as this: "Ani- marunt anim me, atque adeo agentem alia, vi compulerunt ad Arabam hieros Chaldacorumque perdescendas, libri quidam utriusque linguae, qui profecto non temere, ant fortuito, sed Dei consilio, et mel saebius bone favestis Numinis, ad meas manus pervenerunt. Audi inscriptiones, vadimonium deserere: Chaldacea hi libri sunt, si libri sunt, et non thesauri. In patris Ezre, Zoracastri, et Melchiori Magorum oracula, in quibus et illa quoque, quae apud Graecos mendosa et mutilla circumferuntur, legantur integra, et absoluta: tum est in illa Chaldaeorum sapientia, brevis quidem et salebrosa, sed plena mysterii interpretationi. Erit itidem et libellis de dogmatis Chaldacorum theologice, tum Persarum, Graecorum, et Chaldacorum in illa divina et locupletissima enarratione. Vide, Marsi, quae insperata mihi bona irrepserunt in sinum"... (Opus Omnia, fol. Bas. 1601, Vol. i. p. 249).

The report with regard to a Hebrew copy of this book rests only on a vague statement of an untrustworthy writer: Tertium et quartum Esrae Hebrews adhuc ipse non videi; quidam tamen ex eis ait, eum sacer inventos Constantinopoli reperiri. Galatinus, Opus de Arcanis Cathol. contin. 1561, p. 2. Dr. Fr. Lee was entirely mistaken in supposing that the Hebrew words printed on the margin of this book in the Lat. Bible of H. Stephens Svo. Latet. [1545] were derived from a Hebrew copy, and even Laurence failed to remove all misapprehension on this point (Primi Esrae liber, corr. Acta, p. 391). The fact is that Petrus Cholinus (not Leo
on this point raises a strong presumption that the additional matter formed part
of the Greek text from which they were derived. Not only so, but there is decisive
evidence that the Latin version also once contained the passage which is now absent;
for Ambrose, in his treatise De Bono Mortis, drew largely for illustration from this
version, and especially from the missing portion. The Benedictine editors of his works
were perplexed at references which they could not verify, and suggested that a solution
might be found in the examination of fresh MSS. They casually refer to two, one
of which belonged to their own library (at St. Germain des Prés); this was in all proba-

ble the ‘MS. Sangermanensis’ (Cod. S.), which a distinguished member of this order
(Pet. Sabatier) upwards of sixty years later made use of for his great work, especially
in the fourth book of Ezra. In late years it has been collated in a few passages by
Dr. Hase for Volckmar’s Esdra Propheta, and very fully by Dr. Zotenberg for Hilgen-

Judaeas), who modernized the Latin version of this
book, occasionally added on the margin, not only in
this, but in the other apocryphal books, a Hebrew
equivalent where it seemed to throw a light on the
peculiar use of a Latin word or phrase. E.g. chap.
v. 52, De signis quotub me interroges, stands thus
in the revised text: Praesagitiones eorum de
quitub me interroges, with the marginal note
indicia, vaticinia seu praedictiones. v. 42, novis
simorum tarditas; in the revised text: posteriorum
tarditas, with the marg. note ταυταί; similarly in
other places. vii. 33, et longanimitas congregati-
tur; in the revised text: et fain impostor patientia-
e, marg. τραχεία. In the same way a Greek word
is sometimes introduced, and yet no one has ventured
to maintain that the Greek was still extant. As in
chap. x. 14, ad initic ci qui fecit eam [= terram]; in
the revised text: homini qui eam jame inde ab initio
exercuit, marg. ἔργας, facere et colore, ut et
deput. xiv. 9, convertetis; in the revised text: con-
vertereabitis, marg. ἀναρτησίᾳ.

1 "Quin etiam eundem hunc librum inter canoni-

cos descriptum in quibusdam antiqui nri MSS.

reperire est, non tamen in omnibus, nec sine discri-
mine aliqua. Namque in quodam pervetusto codi-
cie qui nostra in Bibliotheca adserveratur, compactis
in unum duobus canonicis libris Esdra, secundus a
primo capite hujusce quarti sumit exordium, haud
dubie quia ejus illud initium est: Liber Esdrae

Propheciae secundus; tum ex ejus atque tertii libri
capitibus inter se permixitis quatuor libelli confi-
ciuntur. Doctissimus Faber Ludovici XIII, pre-
ceptor quemdam ejusdem quarti libri MS. adeo dis-
crepare ab editione deprehendit, ut varias ejus lec-
tiones Card. Baronio transmittendas putaret. Quae
diversitas forte in causa est, cur nonnulla ab Am-
broso ex codem libro citata in edito minime repe-
rientur.” S. Ambrosii Opp. fol. Par. 1856, Vol. 1

388.

The following is the passage referred to from the
letter of Nic. Faber to Card. Baronius:

“Porto his litteris adiunxi exemplar donationis
Othonis tertij discipuli Gerberti qui Silvester 2.
dictus est, ex eodem illo volumine instrumentorum
cuius supra mentionem feci transcriptum: tun etiam
duorum capitum prorium libri quarti Esdra ex
manuscripto Bibliorum codice non admobum vetusto
ab editis valide dissidentium, utrumque, ut fallor,
valde subsiebatur...}

...... Duo autem illa capita, quod eam varietatem
libri licet apocryphi antiquissimi tamem, eunisse que
magi viri Clemens Alexandrinus & B. Ambrosius
auctoritatem non definerunt, doctissimis illis viris
qui elegantissimas vtriusque linguae Bibliorum edi-
tionibus praebuerunt non ingratum fore existimau-
erum, & in eo vitem quod ex isto fragmento qua-
dam in editis emendanda percepturi sit.” Nic.
Fabri Opuscula, Par. 1618, p. 107.
feld's *Messias Judeorum*, and it is now regarded by the common consent of scholars as the oldest and best authority for the Latin text of our book. It is in the second volume of the Latin Bible now numbered MS. 11504, 11505, fonds Latin, Bibl. Nat., Paris. Salatier described it as nine hundred years old at the time when he wrote (1751), and editors invariably speak of it in general terms as a MS. of the ninth century, but the precise date at which it was written is recorded in the MS. itself, viz. the eighth year of Louis le Débonnaire (= A.D. 822). Great as is the critical value of this MS., a still higher interest attaches to it in the history of the transmission of our book of Ezra, for the researches of Prof. Gildemeister lead to the conclusion that it once contained the lost verses, and that it is the parent of all later MSS. The following extract, translated from a letter which he has kindly sent me on the subject, will explain the process by which he has arrived at this important result:

"On collating the Codex Sangermanensis in 1865, I discovered that the missing passage between chap. vii. 35 and 36 was once contained therein. The verso of one leaf ends with: *et injustitiae non dormibunt,* and the recto of the next begins with: *primus* (with a small p) *Abraham propter Sodomitas et Moyses.* But a leaf which originally came between (it was the sixth of the quire, if I am not mistaken) has been cut out, leaving about half an inch of its inner margin, so that the corresponding leaf remains fast in the binding. The inevitable inference then is that all known MSS., since none have been found without this lacuna, were derived from the Codex Sangermanensis. And this I have found fully confirmed by arguments drawn from the state of the text in the MSS. themselves; for I have myself collated a considerable number in the course of many years, and have been able to trace the gradual and at the same time arbitrary changes continually going on till the appearance of the first printed edition."

These remarks set vividly before us the high importance which would attach to the discovery of a MS. of this book, at least as old as the Cod. Sangerm. The existence of such a MS. in one of the libraries of Europe could scarcely be looked on as beyond the bounds of possibility, especially when we consider how large a field remained unexplored owing to the imperfect notices of the contents of a Lat. Bible given even in some of the better Catalogues of MSS. I have therefore for several

---

1 See the ref. in *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, Vol. vi. p. 638, and especially the Comte de Bastard's costly work, *Peintures des MSS. depuis le huitième siècle jusqu'à la fin du seizième, dix-septième Livraison* (1842), which contains a fac-simile of 4 Ezra xvi. 78.
years availed myself of every opportunity of examining Latin biblical MSS. The book itself is not, according to my experience, so uncommon as is generally supposed; I found it in many Codices ranging from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, but never without the lacuna. Meanwhile an article in the Catalogue of MSS. belonging to the Bibliothèque Communale of Amiens, by Mons. J. Garnier, Svo. Amiens, 1843, had caught my eye—it runs thus:


d. r. L. Corbie. 174. A.

IXe siècle. Ecriture minuscule rapide, peu soignée et de plusieurs mains, à 2 colonnes de 30 lignes, non réglées. Le premier feuillet est à demi détruit.

Esdras est ici divisé en 5 livres. Le 1er est composé des deux livres d’Esdras, appelés Canoniques; les quatre autres comprennent le 3e et le 4e de la Vulgate.

Le 2e, du MS. est le 3e, de la Vulgate; le 3e, comprend les deux premiers chapitres; le 4e, les chapitres 3 à 15; le 5e, les chapitres 15 à 16 du 4e livre.

On lit à la fin: Finit liber quintus Esdræ profecto deo gratias ago pro hoc facto perfecto. On y lisait autrefois: Finiunt quinque libri, mais ces trois mots ont été effacés pour y substituer l’autre formule.

A la suite est la préface de St. Jérôme Utrum difficilius. C’est sans doute cette division d’Esdras qui a fait dire à l’auteur du Catalogue de Corbie, à l’article de ce MS.: Cela paraît curieux à examiner. A moins qu’il n’ait entendu par là, les mots abhinc non recipitur ajoutés en tête du 2e livre, et non adhinc non recipitur, comme on voit dans le catalogue publié par Montfaucon, qui désigne ainsi ce MS.: Item

1 Laurence thus sums up the result of his investigations: "As the fourth book of Esdras was not translated by Jerome, it is of very rare occurrence in the MSS. of the Latin Bible. I have examined in all 157 MSS., 117 of which are in Oxford; viz. 86 in the Bodleian Library, 7 in St John’s, 6 in Christ Church, 5 in Brazen Nose, 4 in New College, 4 in Magdalen, 3 in Corpus Christi, and 2 in the Radcliffe Library; the remaining 70 being in the British Museum; but I have found it in only 13; viz. in 3 at the Bodleian, in 2 at New College, in 1 at Magdalen, and in 7 at the British Museum" (Primi

2 i.e. Demi reliure de M. Le Prince, about whom M. Garnier has the following interesting notice: "M. Le Prince ainsi, qui venait de quitter le commerce, offrit de consacrer ses loisirs à la reliure de ces volumes. Dès lors il alla à Paris étudier cet art auquel il était tout-à-fait étranger, et après un apprentissage qui dura près d’une année, il se créa
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2 libri primi Esdrae semel et iterum et duo postremi semel tantum. cod. memb. suc. 9. nota quod initio 2 postremorum habetur eadem manus, Adhuc non recipiatur."

Amid the revived interest in apocryphal literature, which has sprung up in this generation, and which has been especially concentrated on the criticism of the fourth book of Ezra, it struck me as very strange that so early a MS. should remain uncollated, nay, actually unnoticed, even by the three diligent scholars, Voelckmar, Hilgenfeld, and Fritzsche, who have edited the Latin text in the course of the last twelve years. I pointed out to several learned friends the necessity of examining this copy, but, as nothing was done, I at last undertook the task myself. The perusal of a few verses served to shew the great value of this new critical aid; I read on with growing interest till I approached the place of the long-familiar chasm, then as my eye glided on to the words et apparebit locus tormenti, I knew that the oldest and the best translation of this passage was at last recovered, that another fragment of the old Latin was gathered up, and that now at last—an event which can scarcely happen again in these latter days—a new chapter would be added to the Apocrypha of our Bible.1

It will be seen that this MS. of the books of Ezra once belonged to the Benedictine Abbey of Corbie, in the neighbourhood of Amiens. The history of the library of this abbey has been graphically told by M. L. Delisle.2 It appears that it had for

un atelier, revint à Amiens et, avec un zèle et une générosité sans exemple, donna à plus de 500 volumes et à ses frais, une reliure simple, riche, solide et convenable. (Cat, p. xxxi.)

1 It would have been well if the compilers of our Articles had avoided the appearance of chaffing even the qualified approval of Jerome for the 3rd and 4th of Ezra. "And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following: the third book of Esdras, the fourth book of Esdras, etc." Art. VI. The language of Jerome here referred to is used by him expressly of Judith, Tob, the books of Macc., Wisl. and Eccles. (In Libros Solomonic, Chromatii et Heliodori, ed. Ben. t. 385, 939). He speaks in other terms of these books of Ezra: "Nec quemquam moveat quod unus a nobis editus liber est: nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somnis delectetur: quia et apud Hebreos Esdrae Nehemiaeque sermones in unum volumen coarctantur: et quae non habentur apud illos, nec de vigintiquattuor scribunt, procul abjicienda."


2 Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, 1860, on p. 438 he sums up the history thus: "La bibliothèque de Corbie, l'une des plus considérables qui aient existé en France au moyen âge, est uniquement due au zèle des moines, qui, depuis le huitièmè siècle jusqu'au quinzièmè, travaillaient sans relache à l'érudition, soit en copiant, soit en achetant des MSS. Les trésors patiemment amassés pendant près de huit cents ans sont dilapidés au seizièmè et
a long time been exposed to pillage, and when in 1636 Corbie was recaptured from the Spaniards by the troops of Louis XIII. it was thought advisable to transfer the most valuable portion of the literary treasures to the security of the capital of the kingdom. In consequence of a petition of the monks, four hundred select MSS., which had been taken to Paris, were not alienated from the order, but deposited in the Benedictine Abbey of St. Germain des Prés, *n'ayant personne qui soit si jaloux de conserver l'héritage de leurs pères que les propres enfants.* At the end of the next century these were transferred, somewhat diminished in number, to the Bibliothèque Nationale. The MSS. left at Corbie were removed to Amiens, probably in 1791, but from these again a selection was made, and seventy-five were sent to the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1803. The residuum however left at Amiens is by no means a contemptible collection, for it contains several MSS. of the ninth century, and among them the Lat. Version of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the shorter epistles of St. Paul, which till lately was thought to be unique, and the volume which has furnished materials for the present work. Thus by a strange fatality the latter MS. has been lost in provincial obscurity, for had it been despatched to Paris with the four hundred in the seventeenth century, it would certainly have been examined by Sabatier; and if sent later, with the seventy-five, it could scarcely have escaped the notice of the scholars of the present century.

No. 88, Corbie St. F. It was published (the Com. on Gal., Eph., and Philcm. entire, and various readings only of the rest, resulting from a collation with what Rabanus Maurus had introduced under the name of Ambrose, in his commentary on these Epistles) by J. B. Pitra (*Spic. Solaen. 1.* 1862), but erroneously assigned by him to Hilary of Poitiers (so cited even by Ronsch, *Itala u. Vulg. ed. 2.* p. 326). The true authorship was first discovered by Prof. J. L. Jacobi (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft u. Christliches Leben* 1854, pp. 245—253), who subsequently edited the Com. on Phil., Col., and 1, 2 Thess. in five University Programmes, Halle, 1856—66 (the 4th and 5th are both entitled *Pars iv.*). Mr. Hort, who arrived independently at the conclusion that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the author (*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, Vol. iv. pp. 302—308. Cambridge, 1859), has lately recognized the same work in an anonymous exposition of St. Paul's Epistles among the treasures of the Brit. Museum (MS. Harl. 3063); so that all seems fully ripe for a complete critical edition of this valuable commentary.
I now proceed to give a more detailed description of this Amiens MS. of our book, which I propose to call Cod. A. It consists of 84 leaves of 11 × 7 inches (32 v. and 84, r. and v. being blank), apportioned into 11 gatherings of 8 leaves each, except the 8th and 11th gathering, which have only 6 leaves apiece. The first ten gatherings have signatures by an early hand, from A to K; these signatures are on the last page, except B, which is on the first. In the pages which immediately follow this introduction, all that I have attempted, is to reproduce this portion of the MS., line for line as it now appears, so far as it can be exhibited by means of ordinary type. It is necessary to mention this, in order that it may not be mistaken for the original reading, which has been so tampered with by erasures, corrections, and additions, that it is often difficult to decipher. Further information on these points is given in the notes which follow (on pp. 51—54), where I have supplied, as far as I could, the letters which have been erased, and pointed out all that has been added by later hands. Being obliged to work at a distance from my MS., I have not been able to represent some characteristics of minor importance, such as the way in which words are spaced. These and other defects may in some measure be remedied by the printed photograph of a page (fol. 65, r. chap. vii. 97—109 (39)), which I have inserted; but it is hoped that the Palæographical Society will undertake to perpetuate by indelible facsimiles the

1 The letter A can scarcely be regarded as pre-occupied, since it has only been used by one editor (Fritzsche) to denote the Bibl. Eecles. Anicentis Velamorum, Tom. ii., e Bibliotheca Colbertina (Cat. Codd. MSS. Biblioth. Reg. Pars iii. Tom. iii. Paris, 1744, page 1, No. 1V.), which contains no more of our book than the 'Confessio Hesdrae' (chap. viii. 20—36) written in smaller characters at the end of Nehemiah.

2 This blank comes in the middle of a verse; fol. 32, r. b ends with vocate alioscentes and fol. 33, r. a goes on with the next words: et ipsi indicabant...3 Ezra iii. 16.

3 As I have lately made use of a brief vacation to collate Cod. S., it may not be thought out of place to subjoin a few additional particulars with regard to that MS. The size of a leaf is 19½ × 13 inches; the gatherings are composed of 8 and occasionally of 10 leaves; the signatures, which in the Vol. examined by me are always on the last leaf, run on continuously from Vol. i. to Vol. ii. A slight inspection sufficed to show the correctness of Prof. Gildemeister's statement with regard to the excision of a leaf, for in the gathering marked xxxvii., where 4 Ezra is found, there are only 7 leaves, of these 1 and 8 form a sheet, and so also 4 and 5; 2 and 7 are separate leaves placed together, while 3 has no fellow, for 6 has beencut out with a knife, traces of which have been left on 5; the present pagination takes no account of this defect.

4 I have inserted an asterisk to indicate an erasure (generally of a single letter), which has not been written over.

5 The preposition and the word which follows generally cohere; chap. vi. 42 is a good illustration of the confusion which may arise from this habit of writing, here instead of ut ex his stat, Cod. A. has ut exscent, and for a do, which stands both in Cod. A. and Cod. S., adeo is said to be the reading of Cod. T., and is adopted by Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche.
few precious pages, which have alone preserved this interesting fragment of the old Latin.

The character used in our MS. is the Carolingian minuscule. Capitals are occasionally introduced at the beginning of paragraphs. Two forms of the first letter are used indiscriminately, viz. a and a, the latter sometimes resembles cc written closely together (see photograph, col. 1, l. 5). The diphthong is written ae, ae or e (the lower loop in the last form is often added in different ink). The letters b, d, h and l are often thicker above and slightly curved. An instance of c joined by an upper stroke to t may be seen in the photograph, col. 2, line 28. A lengthened form of the letter e is frequently projected forward, especially on one of the letters m, n, r, f, u or x; a similar combination may be traced in the common form d, from which ee, as sometimes written, differs but slightly. The letter i coming after l or t is occasionally produced a little below the line, after m or n it is sometimes written entirely below the line (e.g. in fol. 62, v. b, line 26). The letter n sometimes takes the uncial shape, and is found so written, especially at the end of a line, in combination with a stilted T (see photograph, col. 1, l. 10), more frequently however the t in -nt has the appearance of a long sloping line notched above, springing from the last stroke of the ordinary n (see photograph, col. 1, l. 12). The stem of the r is often extended below the line, and sometimes this letter is so linked with a following t, that it might easily be mistaken for j (see photograph, col. 1, l. 28). The letter r generally takes another form when preceded by o, e.g. o2. The letter y is dotted thus: ÿ. I have given an approximation to the form of the stops as they now stand in the MS., but there are frequent traces of a corrector's hand in the signs of interpunctuation.

The following is a list of abbreviations which are found in Cod. A.

1 I notice on a second visit to Amiens, that the numbers of the chapters and also marks, shewing the beginning and end of this particular piece, have been lately added on the margin by the zealous librarian, who has taken a lively interest in my discovery.

2 A not unusual mark of interpunctuation in Cod. S. consists of a comma with two dots, thus: as, for instance, et delinquentes multis: Vide anima mea . . . chap. iii. 29 . . . et ascendit est in infernum; fugit corruptio . . . chap. viii. 53.

3 In Cod. S. we have cā, dā, diā, ē, ë, &ī, īū, īā, itāq: īri, ĭ, ĭ (for qued); the usual compendia for per, praec and pro, scā, spū, ē, superaner, nasbant: I intersected by a horizontal stroke for nel, īri: besides īns (= meus), ons with the last stroke of the m dropping below the line (= onnis), ons (= onnes), ō (= quae), secdinā, sedi, xpā; and among the corrections, fr for frater. quā is, if I am not mistaken, the uniform contraction for quoniam in Cod. S., and quā, not quum, is the reading of this MS. in vi. 5. The later sign for et (7) occurs in x. 5, but only as an insertion above the line. For quā, see p. 29.
– over a vowel generally = m, as in cū, comorantes.
- b; = -bus, as in temporib;
 m = men, as in testamentis.
 -m = -mus, as in altissimi.
 -r = -runt, as in fecé.
 t r = tur, as in tbatô.
 -t r = -tur, as in ostendet r.
 i = ter, as in tminus, diligent.
 -ü = -uit, as in plasmant.
 -x = -xit, as in dedux.

vr = autem (xiv. 24, 36).
dis = deus.
dco = deo.
dins = dominus.
dini = domini.
due = domine.
ei = eius.
e = est.
prae = prodest.
& = et.
dicet = dicet.
neq = neque.
neq = neque.
qe = qui.
qo = quod.
um = quomiam.
scm = sanctum.
scolificationem = sanctificationem.
spm = spiritum.
s = sunt.
t = tibi.
ui = uel.
uri = uestri.

In the marginal and interlinear corrections are found other abbreviations, as: adäus = adversus, q = que, neq = neque, sic = sicut, and i, with a horizontal stroke through the middle, for uel. The signs of abbreviation are sometimes altered or explained,
generally by another hand, thus ostendet' is altered to ostendet² vii. 36, finiant² to finiant² xiv. 9, porregebat' to porregebat² xiv. 39, siccabit² to siccabit² xv. 50 (scrutinatur to scruti-
natur² xvi. 63). uel is substituted for ü ix. 34, ē for + vii. 87, terra for ira vii. 62, ʰ is
added over ʰ vii. 44, ᵃ over ū in quibis vii. 74, and ᵃ over ū in plasma in vii. 94. Words
to be transposed are marked thus °paradisus °ostendetur vii. 123 (53). Words to be
inserted are indicated by ′, ′, ″ or ″ prefixed¹.

It may be here mentioned that there are a few omissions in the text of this MS.,
occasioned generally by homoeoteleuton, which have not been supplied at a later period,
e.g. et amici—invenietur v. 9, 10; et incontinentia—institia v. 10, 11; the greater portion
of vii. 104, the three words at the end of viii. 39; et altare—humilitatem est x. 21, 22;
et de lingua—flammae xiii. 10; the whole of xi. 27 and of xvi. 43.

Accents are by no means of rare occurrence; the following selection will give a
fair idea of the way in which they are used²: excidi i. 20, Ioēlis i. 39, tuère ii. 20,
consūmenem iv. 15, plasmàtis v. 26, éa vii. 74, plasmatum vii. 92, adfinitis vii. 103, tene-
bris vii. 125 (53), indignéris viii. 30, considérunt viii. 30, amarisceris viii. 34, proximásti
viiii. 47, lugère x. 4, 7, 9, 11, próditi x. 22, páteris x. 50, comparére xi. 19, potúno xiv.
38, allíent xv. 60, odiát xv. 60, convéret xvi. 54.

uis vi. 32, mouérís vi. 15, loquérís vii. 38, fulgère vii. 97, coercère vii. 116 (46),
solús vii. 118 (48).

The general characteristics of Cod. A. may be gathered from the following classi-
cified lists of its principal deviations from the textus receptus on points of orthography
and grammar. As it will be convenient to have a comparative view of the distinctive
features of the two leading MSS., I have attached an asterisk to every citation where
Cod. A. and Cod. S. coincide, and have thrown into the foot-notes further examples of a
similar kind from the latter MS. I have always quoted the original reading, and have
not thought it necessary for my present purpose to record subsequent corrections.

The interchange of vowels:

a for e: disparesisti v. 28*, insaniantes xv. 30, panna xi. 12.

ė for a: castigérē v. 30, praeparetum ii. 13, treiecientes xii. 29 (treiecientes Cod. S.).

a for i: assiac iii. 15, chaemem vii. 41.

¹ In Cod. S. words to be transposed are thus marked: °terram °onnem xvi. 11; words to be
inserted have ′, prefixed.
² I subjoin a similar selection from Cod. S. á
xvi. 16, 78, áperi v. 37, éa xvi. 8, éa vi. 38, viii. 7, 37, etc. bós iv. 43, vi. 54, x. 59, xv. 45, xvi. 19, 21 ete.
bós xii. 24, ó iv. 38, vi. 118 (48), viii. 6. tás iv. 34.—
Strokes over ′: cicélcis xvi. 2, inúnum xvi. 18.

convertérís xiv. 9, éxile xii. 2, panérem x. 25, persuedére x. 20, radicis iii. 22, splendérent vi. 2.
i for a: niscoebar v. 35.
a for o: natho xv. 39 (nath Cod. S.).

aa for a: Ezraa (voc.) xiv. 2, 38.

ae for e:
adpraehendentur v. 1, aegimus xii. 41, Aegyptae xvi. 1*, aepuli ix. 47, aescas ix. 34, Aezra vii. 2, castae vii. 122 (52), conpraehendere iv. 2, depraeactio xii. 7, diae vi. 53, facie i. 11*, faemur xv. 36, falsae viii. 28, fanae xv. 57, 58, guelus vii. 41, impiae viii. 35, intellegitae vii. 37, interpraetationes xiv. 8, inuanae iv. 16, ipsae xiii. 26, malae vii. 121 (51), praetiosa vii. 57, suemum xi. 30, suemundo vi. 41, saepulchrum v. 35, splendidae viii. 29, speciae xv. 46, saenae iv. 7, uae vii. 41, usquequio vi. 59.

e for ae: Aezre i. 1, coherentes xii. 19 (quoherentes Cod. S.), meroribus x. 12.

e for i:

concidit xiii. 11, complectionem vii. 93, demedii xiii. 45, eregere xi. 25, inciderent xiii. 23, tenere xii. 45, perdedisti iii. 9, rrecieget v. 7, sede ix. 26, sterilis v. 1*, uigelaui xii. 3, and in the abl. inimitabile vi. 44.

i for e: acciperunt xiv. 30, discendentem xiii. 12, interfei i. 11*, lugio viii. 16, and in the old plur. termination -is, as accipientis viii. 56, aduencionis iv. 12, dispositionis iv. 23, tristis x. 8*, uenientis vii. 69.

-er for -ur:

viderenter xiii. 11.

for ii:
labis xiii. 10.

for i: audii vii. 2, hiis, locis xvi. 71, nolii ii. 27, tenebriis xiv. 20.

for u: corripible vii. 96, quadripedia vii. 65.

for y: abisos iii. 18, Egypto xiv. 29, Assiorum xiii. 40.

y for i: cybalunt xvi. 69, Sydonis i. 11, sydus xvi. 13.

for u:

bailans iii. 21*, edocacut xvi. 68, latibolis ii. 31, mormurastis i. 15, nus-

---

1 This change is not so common in Cod. S., it occurs however in a few other cases, besides those marked thus *: e.g. aetatem ii. 15, aegenti i. 20, aequi xv. 35 (we have ae for e in poenas ii. 8). On the other hand examples of e for ae are much more numerous in this MS, e.g. Abdiel i. 39, acute xvi. 13, aede xvi. 41, alique xi. 21, aque iv. 49, corone v. 42, deputate vi. 57, divise, dua xi. 24, leticis i. 47, meci ii. 29, passe x. 22, quarentem v. 34, spice iv. 32, with many others, especially the plurals of the 1st decl.

2 In Cod. S. abed xiv. 19, and some ablative of the 3rd decl., as de mare xi. 1, xiii. 2, 5.

for e: exili xii. 30, and in the pl. as cogitationis xvi. 55, praesentis v. 45, vi. 3, similis v. 52.

3 Comp. Schuchardt, Der Vocalismus des Vul- 

4 In Cod. S., efficierunt viii. 50.

5 In Cod. S., ite filii ii. 2; the converse, ii for i, does not seem to be so common in this MS.

6 In Cod. S., lapsos nostros viii. 17, tremor mutus xv. 36, sobessor xvi. 33.

u for o: insus omnes iii. 11, populus acc. pl. iii. 12, coaduocentia iv. 10.
centor xii. 18, tonicas ii. 39*, and in the case-endings of substantives, so that the 2nd decl. becomes substituted for the 4th, excesso x. 37*, flatos v. 37*, gemitos i. 19*, incenso (sic) v. 1, tumulto xii. 2.

\[ \text{u for } o: \text{ agricula viii. 41, butro ix. 21 (butru Cod. S.), claus v. 8*, cognoscere ix. 12, curuscabit xvi. 10, intrurus xiv. 33, nun xvi. 10, populus (acc. pl.) i. 11*, pupalam vii. 129 (59), prumptuariis iv. 35*, turmentis xii. 26.} \]

\[ \text{u for } o: \text{ clusum xiv. 41, clusit xvi. 59.} \]

\[ \text{u inserted: } \text{ continguent xiii. 32, prolonguaut xiv. 17.} \]

The interchange of consonants:

\[ \text{b for } u: \text{ praeteribit vii. 46, etc.} \]

\[ \text{u for } b: \text{ conlaudaueris x. 16*, conservauiis xiv. 46, multiplicauitur v. 2*, uniuficauit v. 45*, etc., odinalem xv. 48.} \]

\[ \text{c for } ch: \text{ cartu xv. 2 (cartha Cod. S.).} \]

\[ \text{ch for } c: \text{ Abbachue i. 40.} \]

\[ \text{c for } qu: \text{ cotidie iv. 23*.} \]

\[ \text{qu or } q \text{ for } c: \text{ conseguti ix. 10, loqutus xiii. 21.} \]

\[ \text{c for } t: \text{ iniis vii. 30*, negociantur xvi. 48, in vii. 98 fiducia has been altered to fiduitia.} \]

\[ \text{ch for } h: \text{ chaemem vii. 41, gechenae vii. 36.} \]

\[ \text{h for } ch: \text{ brakio xv. 11.} \]

\[ \text{ct for } t: \text{ complecti xi. 44 (complecta Cod. A. sec. man. and Cod. S.).} \]

\[ \text{d for } t: \text{ quando xii. 44; comp. sedes for sitis viii. 59.} \]

\[ \text{t for } d: \text{ aliuat vi. 10*, etc., apuit ix. 35, etc., istut i. 18, situs xv. 39.} \]

\[ \text{f for } ph: \text{ Eufraten xiii. 43, Faraonem i. 10, Ferezeos i. 21*, Finees i. 2*, orfanaum ii. 20*, profetiae xv. 1, Sofaniae i. 40.} \]

\[ \text{g for } c: \text{ gogitationibus xv. 3.} \]

\[ \text{h omitted*: } \text{ ininus x. 22, oras ix. 44.} \]

\[ \text{h prefixed: } \text{ habierunt x. 22, habundantiam iii. 2*, harena (sic) iv. 17 (harenne Cod. S.),} \]

\[ \text{1 In Cod. S., clussa v. 37.} \]

\[ \text{2 In Cod. S., b for p: obtubas ii. 41, obproprium iv. 23.} \]

\[ \text{ph for } b: \text{ Choroph ii. 33.} \]

\[ \text{3 In Cod. S., antiquum vii. 30 (antiquam Cod. A.).} \]

\[ \text{qu for } c: \text{ quhoerentes xii. 19.} \]

\[ \text{4 In Cod. S., inusticae vii. 35, inusticia vi. 19, inusticiae vii. 35, pudiciciam vi. 32, sicientes i. 22.} \]

\[ \text{5 In Cod. S., spud xi. 31, deliquid vii. 35, quod-quad ix. 10.} \]

\[ \text{6 In Cod. S., amidam vii. 52.} \]

\[ \text{h prefixed: } \text{ Danihelo xii. 11, helati viii. 20.} \]
Huriel v. 20 (Hurihel Cod. S.), Johelis i. 39*, Israeliii. 32, etc., Orihel iv. 1 (Horihel Cod. S.).

n omitted: contigebat xi. 19, and in participles, as: diceevii. 38, metics ix. 1*.

n inserted1: lingnum i. 23, millensima vii. 138 (68)*, praestans viii. 8*, and so the
n of the present is retained in the perfect and its derivatives, as: derelinqui x. 5, xii. 48*, derelinquisti xiii. 54, derelinqueris xii. 44* (comp. delinquat viii. 35, deligüid Cod. S.), vincerit vii. 115 (45), 128 (58).

p inserted between m and n: condempnare iv. 18*.

th for t: talamo x. 1.

th for t: notho xx. 20.

ll for l: camellì xv. 36, corruptella vi. 28, vii. 113 (43), medella vii. 123* (53), tutel-

lam i. 15.

mm for m: mammellarum viii. 10**.

nn for n: Channaneos i. 24.

rr for r: coruscationem vii. 40, errant xiii. 8, conterretur xvi. 11, exterrent xv. 43,
60, extarrvant x. 40, exterruerunt xv. 45*.

ss for s**: Assia xv. 46, bellicossum xiii. 9, cassus vii. 118 (48), etc. (but casi iii. 10*),
confusi xvi. 66, haessitemini xvi. 76, missit xvi. 62, possuit xvi. 62, possitum xiv. 20, re-
possita xiii. 18, quessivi xiii. 7, abussi ix. 9, uissionis xii. 10, xiii. 25, in uissionem xiv. 17.

On the other hand:

f for ff: difficile vii. 59.

m for mm: consämemus iv. 15*.

s for ss: abisos iii. 18, abvos viii. 23, abvsum xvi. 58, curismum vii. 104, confesi ii.
47, fisuris xvi. 29, fortasis iv. 8, misa xvi. 16, dimisa xvi. 13, emisa xvi. 16, inmissus xvi.
3, inmisa xvi. 5, inmissam xvi. 7, intermisione x. 39, promissum vii. 119 (49), presurae
ii. 27*, abscisa vii. 114 (44)*, discisa ix. 38*, sesionem ii. 23.

t for tt: commitenda i. 26*, sagita xvi. 16, sagitam xvi. 7, sagitario xvi. 7.

Non-assimilation**: adcebedant, adfines, adligabit xvi. 27, adviantia*, adposuit*, ad-
prehendere*, adpropinquavit*, adpropriauerunt, adsumitur, adhendit*.

conlaudabant*, conlident*, conmirationem*, compavyit*, componeat*, conpraahendere*.

1 In Cod. S., uident x. 42.

2 There are not many examples in Cod. S. of this
doubling of the consonant, yet there are two not
found in Cod. A., viz. Babilloneii. 28, sumam ii. 11.

3 Cod. S. has x for s: inextimabilis viii. 21.

4 In Cod. S. Non-assimilation: adferet, adlient,
adquesisti, adlaman, conbarent, comprehender, in-
matus, inreliosse.
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inlata*, inluminatus*, immensus*, inmisit*, inmortale*, inspigi*, inproperavit*, in-
properium*, inrita, irritauerunt, obprobrium (obproprium Cod. S.).
subpleam.

(Assimilation¹: accedat*, aspectus*, aspicias*, allident, apparuit*, appropinquat viii.
61*, collegi* etc., irritum*.)
s retained after ex: exspectate, extiti, exsultatio, exsurget.
s omitted after ex²: exultant*.

Substantives: opere³ for opera xiv. 21*, nubs xv. 34*, uso vii. 88 (and in vi. 56,
Cod. S.), curris for curribus xv. 29*, sonus for soni vi. 13*.
A neuter instead of a masc. termination, as: conturbatum est intellectum tuum x.
31*, crescit sensum vii. 64, unde fructum fiat viii. 6*, factum est fructum ix. 32*.
Adjectives and Pronouns: solo (dat.) iii. 14*.
Si metipsi xiii. G (comp. sihimepsos Cod. S.), tibimetipsi iv. 20*.
Verbs:
Under this head may be noticed: The frequent use of -at etc. for -et etc.*,
vice versa, as: deficiat xv. 13, ferant vii. 18, adferat xiii. 23, inducat xv. 12, rapiant
xvi. 47,—colet xvi. 25, dispergentur ii. 7, faciem i. 30, renertetur xi. 46, vivent
xiv. 22.
The fut. of the 2nd conj. in -eam, as: doceam iv. 4*, x. 38* (but docebìs xii. 38*),
respondeam viii. 25* (comp. appareas xi. 45* Vulg.).
The fut. of the 3rd conj. in -ebo, as: confidebebant vii. 98 (see note).
The fut. of the 4th conj. in -ibo, as: dormibunt vii. 35* (comp. custodiuit for -bit
xiii. 25* Vulg.).
The form poterint⁷ for -runt vii. 102 (see note).

¹ (In Cod. S. Assimilation: accedebant, annun-
cianti xii. 16, irrito, irritauercunt, supplam.)
² In Cod. S., s omitted after ex: exspectate, ex-
titi, exultatio.
³ There are more instances of this plur. in Cod.
S., e.g. viii. 33 (where the word is omitted in A., but
implied by the forms multae repositae), ix. 7, xiii.
23, xvi. 55.
⁴ In Cod. S. we have the gen. parti (for partus)
xvi. 39, tumulti xii. 2,—gen. pl. mensam vi. 21.
⁵ Illam xvi. 40* is rather a masc. (the subst. sac-
culum taking its gend. from the Greek, see p. 18)
than an archaic form for illud.
⁶ In Cod. S., bibant xv. 58, faciat xv. 56. In this
MS. -bant is often written for -bunt, as: cogitabant
xiii. 31, lugent xiv. 44, manducabant xv. 58, res-
ptulabant xii. 25; and -bant for -bant, as habita-
bant iii. 12.
⁷ Similarly in Cod. S., erint xvi. 66, 70, 72.
The following forms among the compounds of -eo: exiebat xi. 10*, xiii. 4*, exientem xii. 17*, praeterientes v. 55 (praeterentis Cod. S.), prodientem xvi. 39 (prodiente Cod. S.), prodium xvi. 40*.

The use of certain verbs as deponents¹, e.g. certus sunt vii. 92 (see note), fluctuat xvi. 12*, haesitemini xvi. 76 (esitemini (sic) Cod. S.), scrutatur xvi. 63, trepidentur xv. 29*.

The act, for the depon.², as: consules xii. 8 (consulare Cod. S.), consolare (inf.) x. 41*, consulare (inf.) x. 49, demolit xv. 42* (comp. the pass. in x. 21*, xv. 61*), dominabit iii. 28*, dominaret (inf.) vi. 57, vii. 5, dominavit xi. 32 (bit Cod. S.), dominabunt xii. 29*, interpretaret xii. 12*, zelabo xv. 52*, zelabunt ii. 28* (depon. in xvi. 49*, 50*, 51*).

Among compound verbs we find both obedientiunt i. 8, and obaudire i. 24*; both adiecerent viii. 55, proiecerent i. 8, xiv. 14, proiectur xvi. 24, reiecerent v. 7, treicierent xii. 29, et adiecerent ix. 41*, proviicium i. 30*, 33*.

**Adverbs:**

certum xii. 7*, inuanae iv. 16, iteratum v. 13, solum modum vii. 54*, utalide xiii. 8, in other places utalide.

**Construction.**

Prepositions joined to a wrong case⁵: a sidus terribile xv. 13 (a sidus terre- Cod. S.), ad dextris vii. 7, corum quem vii. 87 (see note), ut essetis mihi in populo i. 29, eram in Babilonem iii. 1*, super tenebris nigrae vii. 125 (55), qui habitant in eum xv. 14*.

Mistakes in gender⁶: luxos multos xiv. 24*, finem suam xii. 30*, fontes nuae ii. 32, labore multa ix. 46, sidus terribilem xv. 40*, somniique xiii. 53*, a multo timore quam xii. 5*. There seems to be a tendency to use factum est (cynêvero) as a fixed form, v. 19, and deals thus with other prepositions: cum laborem x. 47, de mare xi. 1, xiii. 11, xiii. 2, 5, de omne hominem viii. 15, comp. viii. 16, 55, xi. 19, xvi. 73, professus est... in civitate xii. 50, post aliis tres dies xii. 56, prae multis x. 57, pro desolationem xii. 48. Cases like cae with the gen. v. 23, 24 (Cod. A, S.), and de with the gen. xi. 29 (Cod. S., and apparently in Cod. A. originally), are in imitation of the Greek.

¹ In Cod. S., xxniuntur x. 36.
² In Cod. S., scrutatur for scrutare xii. 4.
³ In Cod. S., adiere, proie, proiectare, treicierent.
⁴ There are other instances in Cod. S., viz. viii. 5, ix. 24 (solum modum floribus, but solum modo de floribus in the same verse) and viii. 9.
⁵ The scribe of Cod. S. indulges even more freely in this species of error; he confuses a (ab) and ad, as, a te alta loquer xii. 56, ab orientamentum xv. 39, ad dextra partem x. 12, ad dextra partem x. 29, 35, xii. 29, ad lewa x. 35 (comp. ‘à droite,’ ‘à gauche’), ad eminentem xvi. 61, vade ad me v. 19, recessit ad me.
⁶ Add from Cod. S., omnis corpus xii. 3, nubes, quem xv. 39, paradiso, quam plantavit, iii. 6, est factum... casus vii. 118 (48).
independent of the gender of the subject, as: factum est permanens infirmitas iii. 22 (comp. et factum est species multus eius altera Luc. ix. 29 Cod. Amiat.); similarly, et cum (om. cum Cod. A.) adhuc esset eis apertura poenitentiae locus ix. 12*.

Sometimes the mistake in gender seems to be due to the influence of the Greek, as in the following examples: creatus est saeculum (ὁ αἰών) vi. 59, qui nondum vigilat saeculum vii. 31*, saeculum qui ab eo factus est ix. 2*, certaminis (ἀρχής) quem vii. 127 (57)*, in campum (τὸ πεδίον) quod vocatur ix. 26*, omnem peccatum (ἀμαρτίαν) xvi. 51*, hoc enim erat duorum capitis (κεφαλὴν) maior xi. 29*, multitudinem (τὸ πλῆθος) ...quod paratum erat xiii. 11*.

Among other peculiarities of construction may be noticed1: obliuisci with acc. of pers. i. 6* (with gen. i. 14*, xii. 47*); obaudire with acc. i. 24*; the double acc. with certain verbs, as: folia arborum nos teci i. 20* (comp. Ezech. xviii. 7 Hebr., and LXX. Alex., Luc. xxiii. 11, Cod. Bezae, Gk. and Lat.), ἥβε quod te potio on xiv. 38* (comp. Ps. lxix. 22 Hebr., LXX., Lat., Cod. Sangerm.); instances of twofold government, as: nolite similari (nec Cod. A., pr. n.), cum nec operibus eius xvi. 52*; the inf. preceded by ad, as: ad expugnare xiii. 28*, 34, see Rösch (It. u. Vulg. p. 430), who compares ἀ before the inf. in French; a more general use of et to introduce an apodosis after et factum est, as in et missus est vii. 1*, et feci ix. 47*; the omission of the substantive verb in a relative clause, as: hic qui nunc ix. 18*, qui cum eo xi. 31.

Very few of the anomalies exhibited in the foregoing examples have escaped revision. In both MSS. the hands of correctors, some of an early date, have been busy at work, assimilating the abnormal spelling, inflection, and construction to the classical standard of biblical Latin. Thus not only much that was rustic and rugged has been polished, but many an archaic form and phrase has been swept away, which constituted a marked feature of the original translation. Alterations meet us at every step: a letter regarded as superfluous has a short stroke or point (sometimes two points) below it (the points are often placed above in Cod. S.), or is erased. The most common corrections are o with v written above, u by a slight curve converted to o, i by a loop in lighter ink to e, and e to i by a long line drawn through it: u is changed by a continuation of its first stroke to b. The et of the apodosis was a frequent stumbling-block to the revisers, and there are many cases where it has been obscured or obliterated. The numerous corrections, and especially the erasures, form the chief difficulty

1 Cod. S. has parentes with acc. xvi. 72. 2 For arguo with double acc., see below, p. 33.
in the collation of these MSS., and sometimes I have only been able to ascertain the genuine reading by a careful comparison of the faint traces left in the two MSS.

I have thus attempted to describe in detail the chief peculiarities of these two MSS., on account of the foremost rank which they will henceforth hold in settling the text of the Latin translation of the 4th book of Ezra. Nothing remains now but to consider the particular arguments in virtue of which Cod. S. is claimed as the ultimate source of all later MSS., and then to determine the relation in which Cod. A. stands to it, and the value to be assigned to this new authority in the criticism of the book. In pursuance of the first of these objects, I now resume my translation of Prof. Gilbemeister’s important letter at the point where he adduces various examples in proof of his statement that all later MSS. may be traced back to Cod. S. The foot-notes exhibit the readings of MSS. collated by myself.

* In vi. 12, Cod. S. has sequente praecedente, the former word being dotted above as erroneous; in five1 later MSS. both these words are found. In the same verse, Cod. S. and one MS. besides have ex parte2, another has parte, which the rest have converted into partem. In iv. 23, data est, the original reading of Cod. S., has been corrected to deducta est; here one MS. gives data est deducta, the first word dotted below. In iv. 24, Cod. S. had originally nostra et pauor, but et is altered, probably by the first hand, to est (thus: ist), and most MSS. have this reading; but one has et pauor3, which was corrected in others to ut pauor, and in the printed text to...nosta stupor et pauor. In iii. 8, Cod. S. has the reading in ira4, in which it is followed by a number of MSS.; in some this passes into mira, in others into iniqua. The number of these examples might be considerably increased."

1 In the very inaccurate text of Cod. S. there are many erasures, as well as corrections, made by various hands not easily to be distinguished; a few of the latter seem to result from the collation of another MS. The MS. nearest allied to Cod. S. is one of the fourteenth or perhaps the thirteenth century, which frequently exhibits the readings of Cod. S. that have become corrupted in later copies. For example, this MS. has not oro5 vi. 12, nor oravis6 vii. 36, nor venerunt vii. 38, the first of which has

---

1 Among the later MSS. examined by me, C. 6, L. 7, O. 3, 6, and W. have sequenti precedente, C. 12 has only sequenti.
2 I have found ex parte in C. 10, 11, H. and L. 5.
3 Et pauor is also the reading of C. 6, 12, O. 3, and W., and ut pauor of L. 7. Another variant is et nita nostra pauor, found in C. 10, 11, and L. 5.
4 See below, p. 32.
5 The word oro is omitted in C. 3, 9, H., L. 3, 4, O. 1.
6 The absence of a verb in Cod. S. is now explained by the recovery of the lost part of the
been added in many, and the second and third in all other copies, in order to complete the sense; it stands alone, with Cod. S. in having all the words in the following group:

\textit{voluptate} iii. 31, \textit{delinqu} iii. 31, \textit{validis} vii. 42, \textit{anis} xi. 19 (corrupted in others to \textit{aliis, alis, illis}). The original of the MS. in question was copied from Cod. S. before some of the corrections had been inserted, and so we find there \textit{dedit} iii. 5 (comp. the Syr. and Aeth.), as also in Cod. S. pr. m., for \textit{dedisti} \textsuperscript{2} is from a second hand. In iv. 17 this MS. has \textit{harene} and \textit{eum} as Cod. S., where however the former has been altered to \textit{harena}, the latter to \textit{eum}. Again, in iv. 21 the \textit{quae} before the last \textit{super} is absent from this MS., in Cod. S. it has been added later. On the other hand, some corrections had been already introduced, e.g. in iii. 22, Cod. S. had originally \textit{malum}, and in iii. 26 and iv. 4 \textit{cor malum}, where in each case the adj. is altered to \textit{malignum}, and this is the reading found in that MS. Other copies have introduced in iii. 26 the further corruption \textit{corde maligno}.

"In attempting therefore to restore the earliest form of the Latin, we must always make Cod. S. our starting-point; all other MSS. which have the lacuna after vii. 35 are worthless. It is only an uncritical dilettantism that would construct a text, by balancing the readings of Cod. S. with the arbitrary variations of two or three MSS. which are copied from it. Cod. S. certainly offers no intelligible text, and yet it forms the only basis for conjecture."

From my own examination of Cod. S. and other MSS. I could bring forward many arguments of a like kind in support of the conclusion at which Prof. Gildemeister arrives. For instance, in ii. 40, Cod. S. has \textit{respice} altered to \textit{recipe}; the latter I have found in the majority of MSS., but the former is by no means uncommon\textsuperscript{1}. In iii. 17, Cod. S. has \textit{factus est} corrected to \textit{factum est}; the latter is the usual reading in MSS.; the uncorrected form is retained in Codil. C. 6, O. 3, T. and W. (in C. 12 we find \textit{factus es}). So \textit{jucit} has been altered to \textit{jecit} in iii. 31, Cod. S.; the original reading is again represented by Codil. C. 6, 12, O. 3, T. and W., and the correction by the majority of MSS. The untenable construction \textit{ut non ducurrent}, which Cod. S. presents in vi. 24, naturally gave rise to two readings, \textit{et non ducurrent}, C. 6, 12, L. 7, O. 3, T., W. and Vulg., and \textit{ut

---

\textsuperscript{1} I have not found a MS. with the readings of Cod. S. in all these passages, a considerable number however (C. 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, H., L. 1, 2, 3, 6, O. 1, 2, 5, 6) have the word \textit{voluptate}; C. I has \textit{delinqu}.

\textsuperscript{2} See below, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{recipe} Codil. C. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, H., L. 1, 5, O. 1, 2, 3, 5, and W.; \textit{respice} Codil. C. 7, 8, 14, L. 2, 4, 6, 7, O. 6, 7.
non deccurrunt, which proves to be correct and is found in most MSS. Again, Cod. S. had originally sed non in tempore non omnia...sauvantur, viii. 41, but the second non has been struck out; here also the uncorrected text is preserved in Codd. C. 6, 12, D., L. 7, O. 3, T. and W., the corrected text in most other MSS. A few verses lower down (viii. 45), Cod. S. has tu enim creaturae misereris, with ae added above the line after the first word; this is probably the source of the variations which are found in this passage, e.g. tu enim creat. mis. C. 5, 10, 11, O. 5, tuu enim creat. mis. C. I, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, H., L. 9, O. 1, 2, 6, and tu autem creaturae tuae misereris, C. 2, 6, 12, D., L. 7, O. 3, T., W. and Vulg. In x. 20, the word hunc, which was left out by the transcriber of Cod. S., has been supplied on the margin; as there written it stands before sermonem (the first word of the line), but a slight mark is inserted to indicate that it has been omitted after that word; hence we meet with it in both positions, hunc sermonem in Codd. C. 2, 6, 12, D., L. 7, O. 3, T., W. and Vulg., and sermonem hunc in most of the MSS. I will now give an example of another kind, but one no less convincing: in xi. 32, et dominabit qui inhabitant terram in ea is the reading of Cod. S., but the Oriental versions alone (if we had no other evidence) are sufficient to prove that terram has crept in from the preceding clause (comp. the usual formula which occurs in verse 34, xii. 23, 24, and elsewhere); but this word once introduced through Cod. S. has, in spite of all efforts to rectify the construction, remained to this day a disturbing force in all MSS. and printed editions. In xv. 36, the original reading in Cod. S. is femur, but the letter r is written with an upward flourish, so that at first sight it would be readily mistaken for an f; to make the word in some sort intelligible, an i has been drawn through the e, and thus the strange reading feminus has passed into subsequent copies.

It seems superfluous to accumulate examples of this kind, yet the argument would be incomplete if I did not call attention to the lacunae as furnishing weighty evidence in determining the pedigree of MSS. Now wherever words have been omitted in Cod. S,

1 In vi. 34, Cod. S. has ut non properas, which has been emended in like manner to ut non properes. The reading, et non properes, retained by modern editors from the Vulg., seems not to be countenanced by the MSS.

2 C. 10 has et dominabuntur qui inhabitant terram in ea, but the effect of the insertion of terram has generally been to drive the words in ea from their position, as in Cod. T.: et dominabitur in ea his qui inhabitant terram, and they are similarly placed after the principal verb in most Codices, as C. 2, 4—8, 11, 12, D., H., L. 7, O. 2, 3, 5, 7, and W., while in C. 3, 9, O. 1, they are expelled as a hindrance to the sense.

3 A few verses lower down (xv. 45) there is a similar confusion between these two letters in the same MS.; hence the two variations, constantes in the Vulg., constantor in most MSS.

4 In some early editions it is printed femus, hence Coverdale's translation and the smoke of man unto ye Camels lyther.
they seem to have been lost for all subsequent MSS. To quote a few instances, in vii. 112 (42) the subject of orauerunt is wanting in Cod. S. and apparently in all later copies; Volckmar supplies it by the insertion of validi, which gives the sense, though, as we shall see, not the language of the original Latin. A comparison with the other versions will disclose important lacunae common to Cod. S. and later MSS. in the following passages: ix. 20, x. 60—xi. 1, xi. 2, and xiii. 22. In xii. 11, quartum has evidently dropped out after regnum, and so this indispensable epithet has ever since been absent from the Latin text. The Oriental versions point to the presence of loguar before coram te in xiv. 18; that word is not in Cod. S., nor have I detected it in any other MS. When an omission creates a void that may be felt, it is but natural that attempts should be made by copyists to fill it up; we have an instance of this in a passage already quoted, vii. 106 (36), where the removal of a leaf from Cod. S. has left the clause without its verb, and oravit has been supplied incorrectly, as we now know, in the MSS. that come after Cod. S. A more ambitious attempt to restore the text may be seen in the same chapter, verse 115 (45), where four words absent from Cod. S. are found inserted in later MSS. In this case, I think that the neque before demergere clearly indicated the loss of a clause, which was supplied ingeniously enough, but, to judge from independent witnesses, incorrectly by the words: salvere eum qui perit. It is in fact this tendency among transcribers to write what is clear and intelligible instead of what is doubtful or difficult to understand, which will explain many curious deviations of later copies from their prototype, Cod. S. To begin with an alteration manifestly incorrect: in ix. 17, Cod. S. has et qualis agricola talis et atria; the easy emendation of the last word (area for atria), proposed by Volckmar, seems not to have occurred to a scribe, and so cultura was boldly substituted, and is now the reading of most MSS.\(^1\) So in xii. 32, the inflicuit of Cod. S. reappears as incutiet in the MSS. and printed editions. In xvi. 10, surgebit, the reading of Cod. S., has been changed by later scribes to pauebit (the true word, as we shall afterwards see, is horrebit). It required no great critical acumen to replace filii a potestate, xv. 25, Cod. S., by filii apostatae\(^2\), or misericord, vii. 133 (63), Cod. S., by miserator; the change in the latter case proves that the key to the structure of the whole passage had been discovered, and prepares us for the further emendation of numeribus, vii. 135 (65), in Cod. S., to munificentus in later MSS., which might otherwise have seemed beyond the range of a simple copyist. The reading absolve, in viii. 4, Cod. S. (retained in C.10), is by a true instinct

\(^1\) C.10 retains atria from Cod. S.

\(^2\) τέκνα ἄνωστάς (Is. xxx. 1), not τέκνα ἄνωστα- 
ròv as Hilg. p. 208.
changed to *absolve* in most MSS. Sometimes a single Codex not rising above the dead level of ordinary transcripts surprises us with a happy emendation\(^1\) of an error, which had apparently taken permanent possession of the text. Thus, in C. 5, instead of the long-familiar blunder, *et non significasti, nihil me nemi, quomodo...*, iii. 30, 31, we unexpectedly come on a reading which anticipates by six centuries the certain emendation of Van der Vlis, *et non significasti nihil me nemi, quomodo...* Again, we might look long for any improvement on the reading, *quando plantasti terram*, iii. 4; Hilgenfeld assumes it to be correct in his reproduction of the Gk. ὅτε ἔφυγεν τὴν γῆν, and disregards the consensus of the other versions in favour of an original ὅτε ἐπλάσας τὴν γῆν; the natural equivalent to *ἐπλάσας* is *plasmati*\(^2\), a reading which I have actually detected in two MSS. (L. 7 and O. 6). There are some corrections now generally accepted which seem to be of comparatively recent introduction, at any rate I have only noticed them in MSS. contemporary with the earliest printed text. To this class I would refer the change of *et si to et ipsi*, viii. 56, and of *initium per consummationem to initium habet puriter et consummationem*, ix. 5. The most striking alteration of this kind which I have observed is in viii. 44; in this verse the singular reading, *hic pater et filius homo*, to judge from the evidence before me, maintained its ground in the MSS. till the invention of printing, when it became recast in the form which, with but little variation, it has ever since retained: *sae perit et similiter homo*. At the same period a lacuna of long standing in vii. 113 (43) was filled up by the insertion of *et initium*, which the context suggests and the other translations confirm.

The investigation therefore of the sources of the present text forces us to the conclusion that many manuscript readings unhesitatingly adopted by editors can only be regarded as conjectures more or less ingenious, which must always be scrutinized with the greatest caution. In each case we are thrown back on the authority of

\(^1\) On the other hand, the MSS. exhibit corruptions equally startling; these sometimes result from the tendency to substitute the known for the unknown, as *Armenii* xv. 30, C. 3, 4, 9, 0, 5, for *Carmonii Cod.* S.; *Nazareth* xiii. 45, C. 10, for *Arzareth* (that mysterious land which, after having so long baffled critics, has been discovered by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy to be nothing more than *Terra alia*, comp. ver. 40, the ΔΕΝΑΝ των of Deut. xxix. 27, stereotyped in all its vagueness as a proper noun. See the *Journal of Philology*, Vol. iii. 1870). In a few cases the religious feelings of the scribe have given a colouring to the text, as *ut et ecclesiam timeant et trepidantur omnes* xv. 29, C. 10, for *ut etiam timeant...*, even to the violation of the laws of grammar and of nature, as *et mulieres et heretics parient menstruatæ monstra* v. 8, which I have found with this interpolation in no less than three MSS. (C. 7, S. and L. 2).

\(^2\) Another instance may be quoted to shew how liable these verbs are to be confounded: in viii. 14, for *plasmatus est Cod*. II. has *plantaus est*.
Cod. S., and with advantages to which a scribe of the middle ages could not aspire, such as the light to be derived from other ancient versions and from the researches of modern criticism, we must do our best to make the crooked straight and the rough places plain. But although the theory just propounded deprives us of the help which we might otherwise have expected from the later MSS., so many of which remain still unexamined, it will be some consolation to know that we shall not be left in hopeless dependence on Cod. S.; for Cod. A., which we have kept in abeyance during this discussion, not only restores to us the portion of the book which seemed irrevocably lost from the Latin, but, as we shall soon see, will henceforth be entitled to rank as a co-ordinate authority with Cod. S. in settling the text of this very difficult book.

The great similarity existing between these two MSS. will doubtless have been already remarked from the quotations in the preceding pages; this similarity can frequently be traced in the minutest details, both in the original and corrected readings. For example, in i. 36 Cod. A. supports Cod. S. in the reading et memorabuntur antiquitatum eorum⁠[1]. The abrupt address in i. 38, Et nunc, frater, aspice cum gloria et vide populum venientem ab oriente, is attended with many difficulties; by the easy substitution of fr for fr, the reading superaspice found its way into many later MSS.⁠[2]; yet, strange to say, frater is not the original reading of either of our oldest authorities, for Cod. S. has (pr. m.) pater (patē), but p has been erased and fr written above, while the reading of Cod. A., partem (partē), differs so little in appearance from the word as first written in Cod. S., that it may be taken for a confirmation of that reading⁠[3]. In ii. 15 mater, amplectere filios tuos, educe illos cum

---

¹ So apparently in most MSS. Fritzsche indeed retains the Vulg. et memorabuntur antiquitatum eorum, but I have not observed this variation in copies written before the 15th century. The mutilated form, antiquitatum, assigned to T. (Zeitschr. d. Wissensch. Theol. vii. 334, but quoted as antiquitatem in the edd. of Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche), stands midway between the two readings.

² Further corrupted to semper in Cod. II.

³ Our first impulse is to refer the pater here and in ii. 5, ego autem te, pater, testem inuoco super matrem filiorum..., to the same person, but who is that person? Is it Ezra? The ‘Erra pater’ indeed, of modern times, occurs to us (see Addenda), but we lack evidence of the early use of such a title, not to mention that it would be singularly incongruous in an address from God to his prophet. Again, the language which immediately follows in ii. 6, 7, ut des eis confusionem...dispersantur in gentes..., looks certainly like a direct appeal to God himself. Or is it God the Father, thus addressed by the Son? It is true there is no formal introduction of Christ as a speaker, but echoes from his words meet us on every side. This explanation is well adapted to the context in ii. 3, and is there accepted by Hilgenfeld, but it will scarcely be regarded as admissible in i. 38. Can the reading in the latter passage have resulted from an error in translation? It has not been sufficiently recognized that the author of 4 Ezra i. ii. drew much of his phraseology from Baruch iv. v. Comp. e.g. ii. 2 with Bar. iv. 19, ii. 3 with Bar. iv. 11, 12, ii. 4 with Bar. iv. 17, 21, ii. 12
laetitia. Sicut columba confirmavit pedes eorum, the position given to columba naturally suggested the alteration to columnam, which has been adopted by Coverdale, ‘make their fete as fast as a piler,’ and has thus passed into the Geneva and Authorized versions; but that columba may be retained, without the unnatural association found in the Vulg., is proved by the text and interpunction common to both our MSS., mater completur filios tuos educens illos cum laetitia sicut columba, confirmavit pedes eorum. The long-standing error, imperasti populo, iii. 4, for imperasti pulueri, is already in possession of the text in Cod. A. as well as in Cod. S. Their minute agreement in the next verse enables us to observe an intermediate stage in the transformation of et dedit tibi to et dedisti, for in both MSS. the letter s in dedisti is a later insertion.

Codd. A. and S. agree in the following readings: casui iii. 10 (the i is erased in Cod. A.), derelinaus altered in both to derelinqueres iii. 15, et offerre tibi2 in eodem tuas oblationes iii. 24 (eodem altered to eadem in Cod. A.), tribus impii iv. 23 (in has been afterwards inserted before tribus in Cod. A.), de ea (for dicami) iv. 28 (so also Cod. T.); in the same verse Cod. A. has districtio (altered to destructio), Cod. S. destructio4. Again, they agree in tu enim festinas utamter (altered to inamter in Cod. A.)

with Bar. v. 8; and so also the language of the verse in question is evidently derived from Bar. iv. 36, 37, Περίπλεσαι πρὸς αναπλαζ, Ἰεροσολῦμ, καὶ ὥσ τὴν εὐφρονίαν τὴν πάρα τοῦ θεοῦ σας ἐρχομένην. ήτοι ἐρχομένης αὐτοῖς σας ἔξω αὐτὸς ἡ συνοδεύει γεγομένα ἀπὸ αναπλαζ ὡς δυσμόν τῇ βίοτο τοῦ άγιον, καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξῃ. Circumiprice, Jerusalem, ad orientem et uide... Comp. also Bar. v. 5, 6. If we assume then that the word which stood in the original Greek of 4 Ezra i. 38 was περίπλεσαι, or rather περιβλέψῃ (the latter has hitherto been quoted as the reading of the Cod. Vat. in Bar. iv. 36, incorrectly as it appears, for περιβλέψῃ (= ai) is the form given in the edition of Vercellone and Cozza, Rome, 1872), this compound might easily have been mistaken for περί βλέψῃ, which would at once account for the pater aspice of the Latin translator. To prove that the present Latin text exhibits a distorted image of the Greek, we need only compare the position of the next words, cum gloria, with the context in which μετὰ δόξης stands in Bar. v. 6.

1 C. 1 has columna (without stop), C. 9 siet columnam, confirmavit.

2 With the text thus restored: imperasti pulueri, et dedit tibi Adam corpus mortuum. comp. imperasti terrae ut crearet coram te inuentas et bestias et reptilia, et super his Adam, vi. 53, 54.

3 Such is the obvious division of the words in the et offerretib in Cod. S. (comp. in the same MS, ostendereribi = ostendere tibi iv. 3), but an early corrector has inserted the word et to ut.

4 This reading of Cod. S. has been known from the time of Sabatier, but it seems to have been regarded by critics either as too insignificant to notice, or, if quoted, merely as an eccentricity in the spelling of the word, which has been universally adopted in the text, destructio. The authority of Cod. A. will lead, I believe, to a reconsideration of the long-neglected destructio, for it better keeps up the metaphor which is expressed by the other versions. The Lexicons give no examples of destructio or of districtio in the sense here required;
cum et ipsum spiritum, nam excelsus pro multis\(^1\) iv. 34, venit iv. 35, ponderavit iv. 36, prorogas altered in both to interrogaiv. 52, conculcaverunt qui (for conc. eum qui) v. 29, credebat (for non credebant)\(^2\) ibid., aut (for an) v. 33, qui neceat v. 36 (so also C. 10, 11, and Syr.), virtuficavit v. 45, qui ante sed ministros (s on eras, in A.) statu\(^3\) v. 52, Initium vi. 1, deores (orig. -ris A.) vi. 3, et antequam astimaretur camillum Sion\(^4\) vi. 4, quae (pr. m.) vi. 23, intuebutur vi. 29, turbatur altered in both to turbabitur vi. 36, odoramentis investigabiles (-lis in Cod. S.);\(^5\) vi. 44. A word, which appears to be progenitum, is erased before seculum vi. 55, in Codd. A. and S. Both have quam vii. 20 (qua altered to quæ in Cod. A.), incorruptibile altered in both to corruptibile vii. 111 (41), Et novem mensibus patitur tua plasmatio tuae creaturae quae in eo creatu est, viii. 8, a passage which contains two anomalies of construction, apparently derived from the original. Comp. the Gk. of Hilgenfeld, καὶ ἐνεά μὴν ἄνεχεται τὸ πλάσμα σου τῷ κτίσματος τῷ ἐν αὐτῷ κτισθέντος. The following words found in the Vulg. are absent from both MSS., et initium vii. 113 (48), irascuris viii. 45 (comp. the Or. Verss.), ut vii. 49 (but added later in both, in Cod. A. before plurimum, in Cod. S. before inter), et (before miserabiles) viii. 50 (this is a step towards bringing out the right construction as found in the Syr. &c.), mali viii. 53 (not in the Or. Verss.), est (before manifesta) ix. 5, casum x. 9 (this word is not represented in the Or. Verss. and is evidently introduced to help the construction). Codd. A. and S. seem to stand alone in reading nunc vitam viii. 60 (nunc is dotted above in Cod. S.). In ix. 16 sicut multiplicaretur fluctus super

but comp. the use of distingo in the Vulg, Et fructus eius distinguit, Ezek. xvii. 9. Destructio was not the only attempt to emend the original, for we find distinctio in C. 6.

\(^1\) Cod. S. has pro multis (not permultis). In Cod. A. quae has been struck out before nam, and nam excelsus pro multis altered to ab excicio acceptis.

\(^2\) In Cod. A. a corrector has changed queque to qui qui, so that the verse may now be read thus: Et conculcaverunt qui contradicarebant sponsonibus tuis eas, qui tuas testamentis credebant, which conforms to the construction in the Syr. and 4th. versions.

\(^3\) In v. 54, Cod. A. has minoris statutis altered to minores statu estis, Cod. S. minoris statutis.

\(^4\) As a distinguished Oxford Professor has lately quoted (Fors Clarigera, Letter XLVII. Oct. 1874), without misgiving, our Authorized Version of this passage, 'or ever the chimneys in Sion were hot,' I may remark that the textus receptus et antequam astimaretur camini in Sion is utterly destitute of credit. The only two MSS. which have any authority agree in the reading which I have given above. Camillum is for secaillum 'foot-stool.' Rönesch, p. 94, gives only secaillum, though Acts vii. 49, Cod. Bezae, to which he refers, has secaillum in the nominative; so also Matt. v. 33, Cod. Clarom.(secaillum, Cod. Sang. comp. seccello Jac. ii. 3, Cod. Corb.). For the metaphor comp. Lam. ii. 1. Astimaretur is no doubt corrupt, we require in its place some such word as stabilitretur, firmaretur, or, as Hilgenfeld proposes, astitectaretur (among the guesses in MSS. we find edificarent (sic) camini in C. 6).

\(^5\) See Rönesch, p. 112. His conjecture that Cod. S. has investigabilia is correct, but unnecessary, since it does not appear that the form investigabilia has ever, as he assumes, been ascribed to that MS.
guttam Vulg., we find the reading multiplicant fructus in both MSS., the verb being here used intransitively in imitation of the Gk. πλεονάζει. Similarly in xiv. 16 tantum multiplicantur super inhabitantes mala, Vulg., the form multiplicant is found both in Cod. S. and in Cod. A. (pr. m.). A misunderstanding of this anomalous usage of the verb has led to the omission of super in ix. 16, Cod. A., and in xiv. 16, Cod. S. (supplied pr. m. in the latter case on the margin)\(^1\). In ix. 19 moribus\(^2\) (for more) is common to the two MSS. (comp. the other versions). Modern editors have without an exception retained the reading of the Vulg. o domine, te nobis ostendens ostensus es patribus nostris in deserto ix. 29. This is doubtless one of the many instances found in our book, of a well-known Hebrew idiom\(^3\), but the insertion of the acc. of the pronoun is not justified by a comparison of the analogous phrase, revelans revelatus sum xiv. 3. In fact te is one of those attempts at emendation which were introduced at the time of the first printed edition; Cod. A. and S. and apparently all MSS. before that date have in nobis. In ix. 45 Cod. A. has ancillae tuae (altered to ancillum tuam), Cod. S. has ancilliawae. Both have proditi (not perditi) x. 22, as Ambrose also quotes it (Lib. I. de Excess. Sat.)\(^4\), Uox exiebat xi. 10 (\(\ddot{u}\) stands above the line after vox in Cod. S.), and toto (not tanto) tempore xi. 16. In xi. 19, Cod. S. has omnibus anis, Cod. A. omnibus auditis. The reading of Cod. A. in xi. 37 is et audtii quomodo (comp. the Syr., Æth. and Arm.), Cod. S. has the word auditus altered to vidi and so transmitted to the other MSS. Cod. A. agrees with Cod. S. and a large majority of

---

\(^1\) In ix. 16, multiplicant C. 3, 9, 10, multiplicantur fructus C. 1. In xiv. 16, multiplicantur C. 1, 10, om. super C. 3.

\(^2\) moribus C. 9, 10.

\(^3\) It occurs, for instance, in iii. 33, iv. 2, 13, 26, v. 45, vi. 38, vii. 5, 14, 21, 67, 75, viii. 13, ix. 1, 29 (bis), x. 32, xi. 45, xiv. 3, 29, and even in the chapters attached to the end, as xv. 9; in all these examples the inf. abs. is expressed by the Lat. participle; in a few cases we find the abl. of the subst. as vi. 14, 31-32, vii. 67, and once the gerund xvi. 65. There are occasional efforts to get rid of this foreign construction, most frequently by the rejection of the participial element, as in viii. 15, x. 32, xi. 45, xiv. 29 Vulg., and in vii. 5, C. 10. In vi. 14 all MSS. had been led astray by Cod. S., and the true reading was only restored by an emendation of Van der Vlis. In vi. 31-32 auditus is omitted in C. 6, but preserved in most MSS.; in the Vulg. (and also in Cod. T.) it has been corrupted to auditis. Our English translators have generally given due force to this idiom, but not always; in v. 43, for instance, quomum uniuscumque uniuscui us te creatum creaturum in unam is translated by Coverdale ‘that thou lyynge maker hast made the creature lyynge at once,’ and the influence of this rendering is felt in the Gen. and in the A.V. In ix. 29 Hilgenfeld’s Gk. is based entirely on the faulty text of the Vulg., he claims indeed the support of the Syr. but \(\ddot{u}\) has no representative in that version, and the words ἀνικελθήσθαι ἀπεκαλύφθη would be the ordinary translation for φανερωθεί το φανερωθη, or rather ἀπεκαλύφθει ἀπεκαλύφθη.

\(^4\) proditi has passed from Cod. S. into C. 3, 5, 11, D.

\(^5\) omnibus auditis C. 10.
the MSS. in reading magiens for rugiens xi. 37, and magientem for et magientem xii. 31'. Both Codices have emittit (altered to emisit in Cod. A.) and flatum altered to flatum xiii. 10, ocurrentes xiii. 18 (-es is erased in Cod. S.), in hac for in haec xiii. 20, prae medium xiv. 12 (-um altered to -o in Cod. A.). Cod. A. has et in terram Sion xiv. 31, Cod. S. has et in terra Sion (in having been inserted). Both have plebi (with s added at the end) xv. 1, exultans (altered to exultans in Cod. S.) xv. 53'. In xvi. 33 the ones of Cod. S. has been altered to homines in later MSS, but here also Cod. A. takes its place by the side of Cod. S. with the reading eo quod non transeat ouiis per eam. In xvi. 39, the words cum perit are absent from both MSS.¹ This list might be considerably extended, but I will now close it with a few passages, where I first recovered the true reading from Cod. A., but found, as soon as I had an opportunity of examining Cod. S., that in these points also the two MSS. originally coincided. There is a striking instance of this in iii. 7, where Cod. A. reads et hic mandasti diligentiam viam tuam, et prae-teruit eam. The presence of diligentiam, that characteristic word in the Latin of the fourth of Esdras², and the harmony of the other versions, at once stamp this as the genuine text, while the reading of Cod. S. . . . diligentie viam tuam . . . . transmitted to nearly all later MSS.³ and accepted by all editors, bears every mark of an alteration made to simplify the language. If we examine Cod. S. more closely, we shall have ocular demonstration of the way in which this alteration was introduced, for the last letter of diligere is written on an erasure, and we can still decipher faint traces of

¹ C. 10 has rugiens xi. 37, but magientem xii. 31.
² in hac C. 10.
³ exultans C. 10.
⁴ cum perit is not in C. 10.
⁵ See below on vii. 37.
⁶ With the passage thus restored compare the following extract quoted in the 'Pugio fidei' of Raymundus Martini, (pp. 674, 675): אצ ארב ויהי הָכֵּ֤וּת מַלְכָּהּ֙ הַמַּשֶּׁ֔כָּהּ יִעֲבֹֹ֔ד וַיִּשֶׁ֖ר בִּ֣גְּדַ֑ר צֹ֥רֵק מְאֵ֖רָבָּהּ וַיָּתְ֥ן קָ֖שֶׁתּ֖וּת נְבֻּזָּ֣הָהּ אֲנָ֗הּ מַעֲבֹֹ֔ד אָתָּ֖הּ בַּלְּאַ֑לָּק הָיָ֥ה קַרְמָ֖נִי סָ֑רָבָּהּ וַיִּהְּעַ֥בְר נְעֻבָּרֶ֖הָהּ אֲנָ֥הּ מַעֲבֹֹֽד אֲנָּ֖הּ בַּלְּאַ֑לָּקָהּ וַיִּהְּעַ֥בְר נְעֻבָּרֶ֖הָהּ אֲנָ֥הּ מַעֲבֹֹֽד אֲנָ֥הּ בַּלְּאַ֑לָּקָהּ . . .
This is said to be taken from the Siphre; Edzardus, in his Annotat. (Wolf. Bibl. H. iv. 622) gives no other explanation than 'ex citat. Salom.' Wmshöe, who borrows the quotation (Die Leiden des Messias, p. 66), adds to the reference 'S. 121.' But I have in vain searched for it in the Siphre. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, however, who kindly lent me his aid, has succeeded in finding a similar passage, not in the Siphre, but in the Siphra, xii. § 10 (ed. Weiss, Wien, 1862, fol. 27 a, col. 1), as well as in the Yalkut (Livorno, 1650, fol. 220 b, § 479), and in Rashi on Lev. v. 17, in all of which places the words that especially illustrate the point under discussion appear with some slight variations. But should this be really the source of Raymundus Martini's quotation, it may be here mentioned that in other respects there are material discrepancies, such as the absence of all Messianic application in these three authorities; a fact which it would be well for those to consider who continue to appeal to this extract as 'ein sehr klares und bestimmtes Zeugniss von dem Verdienste des Messias;

⁷ One variation may be noted, viz. diligere mandata tua et prae-teruit ea, Cod. II.
the termination -tiam; again it will be seen that uiam results from the erasure of the second stroke of the u in the original text umam. Cod. A. has extincta in viii. 53, and this (not et tincta) is also the reading of Cod. S. Chap. xiv. 11 stands thus in the two latest editions: Duodecim enim partibus divisum est saeculum, et transierunt eius decimam et dimidium decimae partis. For decimam, Cod. A. has decem iam, and whatever difficulties still remain with regard to the calculation in this and the following verse, the construction thus obtained is confessedly more natural, for the reading of the Vulg. decima is a step in this direction, and our English translators by a happy instinct have expressed the very words of Cod. A. The reading Xam has been invariably assigned to Cod. S., but looking at it in the light thrown on the passage by Cod. A. we at once detect the erasure of an i before the a, so that here again the two MSS. concur. In the example which I will now adduce, the correct expansion of an abbreviation will bring the two MSS. into unison. In ix. 19 Fritzsche edits: tunc enim erat nemo, and remarks pro ‘nemo’ in Cod. necio quo errore legitur ‘quisque,’ but Cod. S., which is the source of this reading, has quisq; this contraction must here stand for quisquam, which is the reading of Cod. A.; but adopting this, we must proceed a step further, and, substituting nec for tunc, restore the whole passage thus: et nemo contradixit mihi, nec enim erat quisquam (oβεὶ μὴ ἣν οβείς). In xiii. 48—49 it is only a faulty interpunctuation that keeps the two MSS. apart. Cod. A. reads correctly ...intra terminum meum sanctum; erit ergo... The very same words stand in Cod. S.; but the insertion of a stop (;) before, instead of after, sanctum (fem) has produced an impression, shared alike by ancient copyists and modern collators, that the reading of that MS. is ...intra terminum meum. Factum erit ergo...

It would however be a mistake to conclude from this long catalogue of resemblances that in Cod. A. we have little more than a repetition of the text given in Cod. S. Quite as many divergences in reading might be quoted to shew that,

1 In C. 10 there is an attempt to remove this numerical confusion by reading undecimae for decimae in both verses.
2 Coverdale's translation is 'For the tymc is denyled in to twolue partes, and ten partes of it are gone all ready, and half of the tenth part.' Similarly the Gen. and A. V.
3 C. 11 preserves the abbreviation from Cod. S. In C. 10 there is a fair attempt at emendation, tunc non erat quisquam.
4 In xii. 52, sic non poterit quisque super terram uidere...Cod. S. has the same contraction, and Cod. A. has quisquam (after terram). The requirements of the construction have introduced the word quisquam into several MSS., as C. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, D.
5 Many specimens of readings peculiar to Cod. A. may be gathered from these pages; a few more are here subjoined, some of which may prevent us from overestimating the value of that authority: crescant
however close the relationship between the two MSS., they are yet perfectly inde-
pendent of each other. In proof of this we may appeal to the fact that in several
places, where there is a lacuna in Cod. S., the Latin text is found complete in Cod. A.
For instance, this MS. first supplies us with the correct form of the subject in vii. 112
(42): propter hoc orauenunt qui potuerunt pro inuialidis. The omission as usual
must be referred to homocot.1 Cod. A. first fills up the gap in ix. 20, thus:

Et consideraui saeculum meum, et ecce perditum erat et orbem meum, et
ecce erat periculum.

Comp. the Syr. It is true that here the missing words may have stood originally in
Cod. S., for a line has been erased in this place, but I think that the erasure will
be best accounted for by supposing that in the confusion arising from the similarity
of the clauses, some words were by mistake written twice. In ix. 21 Cod. S. has et
peperci eis ualde; but ualde does not fall in with the spirit of the next words, et
saluavi mihi aciwm de buru. From Cod. A. we recover the lost particle et peperci
eis uix ualde2. Through the same authority another passage which has been curtailed
by a common oversight will be henceforth restored to its proper proportions: Et
dormiui illum nocem et aliam sicut praecepit mihi. Et factum est secunda nochte
et alia sicut dixerat mihi et uidi somnium, x. 60, xi. 1. And, lastly, the kingdom
which appeared to Daniel is described more explicitly in Cod. A. as regnum quartaum
xii. 11. Enough has been said to prove the independent position which Cod. A.
occupies, but it may still be asked whether there are absolutely no readings that have
possibly filtered through, if not from Cod. A. at least from some kindred MS. now
lost, into one or other of the later copies. I confess that at first there were some

1 In verse 115 (45) of this chapter, salvare eunum qui perit is absent from both MSS., being, as
before stated, a conjectural insertion introduced into subsequent copies. But in Cod. A., the words
wq. eruertit: qui victus fuerat, which have been added on the margin to be attached to the end of
the verse, may preserve some element of the original reading; for victus fuerat comes nearer to the
Syr. and Æth. versions than the perit of later MSS.

2 Similarly the Syr. and Æth. versions. In the
Arab, the reading of the two MSS. is not (as Ewald
edits) نعطقئت بوجیی, but نعطقئت بوجیی.
isolated cases which perplexed me, where the bulk of the MSS. seemed to agree with
Cod. A. and not with Cod. S.1; a subsequent collation however of the latter MS. and
a careful attention to the emendations served to dispel these difficulties. Yet still it
would be possible to draw up a pretty long list of readings that are found in Cod. A.
and other MSS., but not in Cod. S. I believe that all of these will prove on exami-
nation to be mere accidental coincidences to be explained by the ordinary tendencies
that produce fluctuations in the text.

1 The following readings ascribed to Cod. S. would be clearly incompatible with the theory that
all later MSS. may be traced back to this source alone:

und sit iv. 4 S. Vulg. quare A. and the later
MSS. deditantis vii. 28 " tantis temporibus " ipsum xiiii. 38 " " tempora "
I find however in each of these places that Cod. S. really agrees, not with the Vulg., but with Cod. A.
and the rest of the MSS. In vii. 18 the insertion of in fine (which Hilgenf. adopts for his text) seems to
separate Cod. S., not only from all other MSS., but also from the Vulg. The error in this case
arose simply from not observing the difference of type in the foot-note of Salatier, where he refers to
the last word in the verse: ' MS. Sangerm. in fine non viderunt, pro non viderunt.' My collation
of Cod. S. has in several other points brought out more clearly the relation in which that MS. stands to the
rest, as the following corrections will show:

Achaei i. 2, acce iiii. 21, babilonom (in erased)
i. 28, in succedum iii. 34, per nomine in nomine iii.
36, potest iv. 9 (hence potest C. 4, 5, 10, 11; potes
C. 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11); gamma, et uidi iv. 48; super-
verunt iv. 49 (so C. 3, 4, 5, &c.); fortitudinem v. 55;
visitas v. 56; aut sequentis vi. 7, quod apparerat
uinc vi. 49 (unc is in C. 3, 4, 5, &c. and in A.);
creavit altered to creavit xi. 7. (creavit C.
3, 9); prophetis viii. 5 (so C. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, &c.);
rectum vii. 10, quac (altered to qui) fecit viii. 60; mena
ix. 19, glorificamenti ix. 31 (so C. 5, 9, 11), cum
timore x. 26, comoneretur altered to conedere
x. 26 (the latter in C. 3, 9, 10), inhabitabant xi. 46;
on om. tua xi. 43 (so C. 3, 5, &c.); renovabit xii. 23;
manducabam xii. 51, om. ut xii. 32, om. cum xii.
46; superant xiv. 12, qui cum exiit extergerunt xv. 45.

pda xv. 63.

2 This will be best illustrated by a few characteristic examples: Latitibus ii. 31 S., latitibus A.,
latitute C. 1, 3, 4, 5, &c. (We find two attempts to emend the above error of Cod. S.: (1) lateritus L. 7,
T., Vulg., and (2) latitute C. 1, 3, 4, 5, &c. The latter was successful); nubivate iii. 8 S., C. 3, 4, 10,
11, &c.; nubivate A., C. 5, 12, L. 4, 7, W. (These
words constantly interchange); sentivare iii. 36 S.,
C. 7, S. servasse A., C. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c., Vulg.; qui in-
cuscat est iv. 25 S. and most MSS., quod innocuatum
est A., C. 10, Vulg.; Hieremiel archangelus iv. 36
S., Hieremiel angelus C. 5, Hieremiel archangelus
L. 1, 2, 3, 4, Vulg., archangelus Oriel A., Oriel
archang. C. 10, Uriel archang. C. 6, Huriel arch-
ang. C. 7, S., L. 7. (Instead of Hieremielh the
name of the angel who replies to the souls of the
righteous, which occurs nowhere else in the book,
it was natural for a scribe to write Uriel, the name
of the angel then speaking with Ezra; this substi-
tution was made several times independently, e.g. in
Cod. A., in some later MSS., and also in Arab.); cypessos v. 5 S., et pressus A. and most MSS.; Spat-
thithel v. 16 S., Phaththiel C., C. 4, L. 1; sicut in
nixissimorum... nec in priorum v. 42 S., sicut non
nouis... nec priorum A. and most MSS.; uinc vii.
thesaurus immortalitis viii. 54 S., thesaurou immortal-
tatis A. and the other MSS.; habitatio in Hic-
rusalem v. 47 S., similarly C. 2, Vulg., om. in A.,
C. 1, 3, 4, 5, &c. (comp. ruina Hierusalem x. 48);
temporum finem et temporum jovissima xii. 9 S.
&c., finem et temporum omitted through homoeot. in
A., C. 2, Vulg.; ecca xii. 51 S., C. 1, 3, 4, 5, &c.,
imiki ecca A., miki ecca C. 7, ecca miki Vulg.;
abscessa in abscessis certa; hic nonit adin-
ventionem vestram xvi. 63, 64 S., terrae for certa D., T.,
I will now bring forward a few more noteworthy readings of Cod. A., some of which throw a new and unexpected light on dark passages of the Latin version.

The MSS. seem to be nearly equally divided between the readings _et in ira agebant_ and _et mira agebant_ in iii. 8. A similar parallelism in Gen. xlix. 6 might be alleged in favour of the former, but to this the other versions are opposed; they rather support the reading of Cod. A., _et impie agebant_, which is also more in accordance with the style of the translation. Comp. iii. 30, vii. 18, viii. 35. Perhaps no word in the book has been more perplexing to editors than _exterius_, which is the reading of Cod. S. and most other copies in the following passage: _et iam exterius corruput saeculo_ iv. 11. Among the few variations may be noted _et iam ex te corruput saeculo_ L. 7 (comp. T.). Volckmar thought that the original Gk. would have been best rendered by _obnoxius_; Hilgenfeld substitutes his own emendation: _et qui existis in corruput saeculo_; Fritzsche, regarding the Latin as hopelessly corrupt, has relegated it to a foot-note. Cod. A. solves the difficulty by reading _exterritus_, i.e. _exteritus_, 'worn out,' 'corrupted' (see above, p. 15, l. 15). This form of the participle of _exter_ is not recognised in Lexicons, but we have on the one hand, the perf. _exteruerunt_, as we must read it, in xv. 45, (comp. _conteruui_ Rönsch, p. 287, and J. N. Ott, _Neue Jahrbücher f. Philologie und Paedagogik_, Leipzig, 1874, p. 792), and on the other, the substantive _exteritionem_... xv. 39, Cod. S. In iv. 29, Cod. A. has _si ergo non mensum fuerit quod seminatum est_. The corrected reading _non messum_ at once commends itself to us by its agreement with the Syr. and _Æth.,_ while the original form _non mensum_ explains the curious reading in Cod. S. _non suā_, which has produced a large crop of conjectures. Instead of _...impleatur iustorum ***** areae_ iv. 39 Cod. S., we have in Cod. A. _...impleatur iustorum area_ as Hilgenfeld suggests. _Si non queres_ (not _quar_ is) the reading of Cod. S. in vii. 9; since it is quite unintelligible in the context in which it stands, it has passed through various transformations in the MSS., e.g., _si non quia_ C. 9, 10, 11,
L. 9, si nonquam C. 3, 6, and so Vulg., si nonquam D., si non C. 4, 5, 7, 8, H., L. 1, 2, sine C. 1. Now Cod. A. has the same reading as that just quoted from Cod. S., but over queres (thus deleted) the word heres has been written, so that the passage may now be read si non haeres antepositiun periculum pertransierit, quamodo accipiet haereditatem suam?, which is confirmed by the Syriac. The reading of the Vulg. in vili. 116 (46) ...sermo mens primum et nouissimus must have resulted from an attempt to improve the text, for the words ...et non nouissimus were transmitted by Cod. S. to the later MSS. This emendation in the Vulg. turns out in this instance to be correct, for it is supported not only by the Syr., Aeth., and Arab., but also by Cod. A. Again, this MS. stamps with its authority the emendation of Hilgenfeld, solam modicum (for solam medium in Cod. S.) viii. 5, and that of Van der Vlis, in nouissimis diebus (for in nouissimis diebus in Cod. S.) x. 59. The reading non comparnit, also suggested by the scholar just mentioned, emerges from the confused text of Cod. A. in xii. 2 (uit being written over an erasure). In xii. 31 the original reading of Cod. A. is loquentem ad aquilam et arguentem cum iniustitias ipsius (for ...eas iniustitias ipsius, Cod. S.). In xii. 35 Cod. A. alone has the correct reading, et haec interpretatio eius (for et haec interpretationes Cod. S.), and in xiii. 17 erunt (for erant, Cod. S.). The preposition (in) before periculums, xiiii. 19, is absent from Cod. A.; its presence in Cod. S. has effected the change of niderunt to uenerunt in the later MSS. In xiii. 40, Cod. A. has haec sunt iiiii tribus, but ...decem..., the reading of Cod. S., has been written above. Cod. A. stands alone among the MSS. in reading interpretationes quas audisti xiv. 8, as the other versions require, instead of ...quas tu vidisti Cod. S. In xv. 29, et existent nationes draconum Arabum...et sic flatus eorum...fertur super terram, we find in Cod. A. an important variation for sic flatus, viz. sibilatus5. The word contentio, xv. 33, has been accepted by editors solely on the authority of later MSS., for Cod. S. has constantia; in Cod. A. the passage stands thus: et inconstabilitio regno

1 So also C. 7, 8. (This is another illustration of agreement between Cod. A. and some of the later MSS.) Various attempts have been made to obviate the unusual construction of the verb, e.g. arguentam cum et iniustitias ipsius C. 3, 5, 9, 11, D.. T., Vulg., arguentam cum iniustitias ipsius C. 10, arguentam iniustitias eius II., and in Cod. A. cum has been expunged by a corrector. In the next verse we have an instance of arguo with two accusatives, et impietates iporum arguet illos, Cod. S., and again in xiiii. 37 Cod. A., S. and Vulg.; comp. Plant. Men. v. 37, Caecilius Stat. I. 149 (Comic. Rom. Fragm. ed O. Ribbeck), and Prov. xxviii. 23, in the Old Lat. Speculum, qui arguit hominem nius suas (Mai, Nor. Patr. Bibl. I. 2, p. 45).

2 The .Eth. has also nine tribes; in the Syr. and Arab. the number is nine and a half.

3 The only example of this word given in the Lexicon is from Caecilius Aurel. de Morb. Auct. ii. 27, adducer spirationis persecutione cum quodam
The text of xv. 51 is: *Infirmaberis...ut non possint te suscipere potentes et amatores* Vulg., but for *possint te*, Cod. S. has *possivus*, and Cod. A. *possivus*, but with the letter s written over ...nt erased; we may therefore venture to restore the passage thus: *ut non possis tuos suscipere potentes et amatores*. For *surgebii* xvi. 10, Cod. S., we read in Cod. A. *horribit*.

In a short passage of the book we get a glimpse of the Latin text of a somewhat earlier period, for the Prayer of Ezra (viii. 20—36) has been handed down as an extract in a few MSS. of the Bible, the oldest of which is anterior to Cod. S., e.g. in the Cod. Vatican. reginae Saeccum num. 1l, Saec. viii. (=Cod. Vat.), in the Bibl. Ecclesiae Anicensis Vehanorum, Saec. ix. (=Cod. Colb.), both collated by Sabatier, in a MS. of the Latin Bible in the Univ. Library of Jena, Saec. xiv. (=Cod. Jen.), collated by Hilgenfeld, in a MS. of Trin. Coll. Dubl., Saec. xiv. (=Cod. D.), and in a Bodl. MS., Saec. xv. (=Cod. O. 8), as well as in some other biblical MSS., which I shall here-after notice; it also occurs in the Mozarabic Liturgy1. Now Cod. A., although maintaining in these verses its close connexion with Cod. S., yet in a few instances rather reflects the text transmitted by the above authorities; thus we have *qui habitas in aeternum* viii. 20, Vat., Moz., Colb., Jen., Δ., O. 8, *qui habitas in saeculum* Cod. A., comp. the Syr. and Æth., while Cod. S. reads *qui inhabitat saeculum*, and in viii. 28 *qui ex voluntate tuam timorem cognoverunt*, Colb., Jen., O. 8, and Moz. (ed. Migne), *qui ex voluntate; tuam timorem cogn.* Cod. A., comp. the Syr., Æth., and Arab., ...ex voluntate tuam timorem... stands in Cod. S. and has naturally led to ...ex voluntate tua timorem... in the copies made from it. In viii. 29, Vat., Colb., Jen., Δ., O. 8, as well as Moz. (ed. Migne), have *pecorum*, which is also the reading of Cod. A., whereas *peculum* is the reading of Cod. S. In viii. 30, Vat., Colb., Moz. (as given correctly by Sabatier), Jen., O. 8, and Cod. A. have * sunt indicati*, Cod. S. has *indicati sunt* (scarcely *indicati*... for the first letter is more probably a lengthened ‘i’).2

---

1 *Liturgia Mozarabica*, Vol. ii, Breviarum Gothicum, Cant. ixxi. p. 578 (Migne. Patrologia Lat. Tom. lxxxxvi). It is singular that the Abbé Le Hir searched in vain for this quotation (Etudes Bibliques, t. p. 141); he was naturally puzzled at the reference given by Völkmann (‘Missale Romanum Mozarabicum, missa in feria post Pentecosten p. 136’ *D. 4*° Buch Ezra, p. 273), but a little consideration might have enabled him to see a confused combination of two distinct works in this ‘titre bizarre,’ viz. the Miss. Rom., where chap. ii. 36, 37 is quoted, as Basmage points out (comp. Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudoep. V. T.* Ed. 2, ii. p. 191), and the Brac. Mozarab., which contains the long quotation from ch. viii.

2 In verse 33 we read, *insti enim* Colb., Jen., Δ., O. 8, *instus* (altered to *-it*) enim Cod. A., while *insti* alone is assigned to Cod. S., but the reading of this MS. was rather *instus* or *instis* (altered to *insti*) followed by *enim* (now erased).
It is however in chapters xv. and xvi., which together form the 5th book of Esdras in the majority of MSS., that the text of Cod. A. differs most widely from that of Cod. S.; as an example we may compare xvi. 20—23 according to the two recensions:

**Cod. A.**

20 Ecce famis plaga dimissa est, et tribulatio eius - tăquam mastix; cæstigatio in disciplina.
21 Et super his omnibus non se avertent ab iniquitatibus suis nec super hæ plagas - membrantur semperna;
22 Ecce erit annona uilitas in breui super terram ut putent sibi esse directam pacem, tunc superflorescent mala super terram gladius et famis (altered to -es).
23 Et aperiant (altered to aporent) uitam super terram, et gladius dispersit (altered to disperdet) quae superauerint a fame.

**Cod. S.**

20 Ecce famis (altered to -es) et plaga et tribulatio et augustia, missa sunt flagella in emendatione.
21 Et in his omnibus se non convertent ab iniquitatibus suis, neque flagellorum memores erunt semper.
22 Ecce erit annona uilitas super terram, sic ut putent sibi esse directam pacem, et tunc germinabunt mala super terram, gladius famis (altered to -es) et magna confusio.
23 A fame enim plurimi qui inhabitant terram interient, et gladius perdet caeteros (ceteros written above) qui superauerint a fame.

Again, a few verses lower down we have,

**Cod. A.**

30 Quemadmodum relinquuntur (altered to -quantur) in oliveto tres vel quattuor uiniae,
31 Aut sicut in uinia (altered to -ea) uindimiata (altered to -dem-): & sub- remanet racemus patens - ab scrutantibus uindimiata (altered to -dem-) diligent (two letters erased at end).
32 Sic remanebunt...
COD. S.

30 Quemadmodum relinquentur in oliveto et singulis arboribus tres aut quatuor olineae,

31 Aut sicut in uinea vindemiata racini (altered to -ce-) relinquentur ab his qui diligenter uineam scrutantur.

32 Sic relinquentur...

In these two chapters we have no Oriental version to assist us in the criticism of the Latin text, and therefore quotations from early writers would be here especially welcome, yet hitherto one only has been pointed out by editors, viz. a short citation from xvi. 60 by Ambrose\(^1\); but some centuries before the date of our two oldest MSS. several verses had been quoted from 5 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. xiv., xvi.) by a writer of our own country\(^2\). It is a curious fact that the editors of Gildas have from time to time called attention to the peculiar text of these extracts\(^3\), without attracting the notice of a single writer on this book of Ezra. I now give in full the quotations in Gildas, and subjoin the passages as they stand in Cod. A., and in Cod. S. A comparison of these seems to shew that in Cod. A. we have at last discovered the recension of the text which was used by Gildas.

GILD. EPIST.

*Quid praeterea beatus Esdras propheta ille bibliotheca legis

xv. 21 minatus sit attendite, hoc modo discipitans: 'Haec dicit*

\(^1\) *Non utique de hoc tecto dicit, sed de illo: extendit caelum sicut cameram, Epist. xxix. (ed. Bened. Tom. ii. col. 909). This is evidently borrowed from 4 Esdr. xvi. 60, *qui extendit caelum quasi cameram*, and not from a somewhat similar passage in Is. xl. 22, which is thus cited by Ambrose: *qui statuit caelum ut cameram*, Hexaem. vi. § 2 (Tom. i. col. 116).

\(^2\) In the so-called 'Epistola' of Gildas, generally ascribed to the middle of the sixth century. Thos. Wright thinks, that it was rather the work of an Anglo-Saxon, or foreign priest, of the seventh century (*Biosdr. Brit. Lit. p. 128*), and his opinion is adopted by H. Morley (*English writers, The writers before Chaucer*, p. 219), but the earlier date is strenuously defended by Dr. Guest (*Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute, 'Salisbury Vol.', 1849, p. 35).

\(^3\) 'Haec Esdræ testimonia nonnihil etiam different a nullata lectione.' Gild. ed. Ioan. Jesselius, fol. 52 vers., A.D. 1568. The latest editor, the Rev. A. W. Haddan, describes the passage from chap. xvi. as 'Vet. Lat. ap. Vulg., with considerable variations,' but his attempt to account for these variations is not satisfactory: 'Gildas also quotes... 2 Esdras (16 verses), in the Old Latin retained in V. but corrected by the Greek.' (*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. by A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, Vol. i. pp. 70, 185, A.D. 1869.)

Various readings from Cod. B. (=Dd. i. 17, Univ. Library, Cambridge).³


5 Esdr.

Cod. A.²

xv. 21, 22 Haec dicit dês dês; non parcet dextra mea super peccantes nec cessavit rumphea super effundentes sanguinem innocuum super terrae, & exiit ignis ab ira eius & deuoravit fundamenta terrae & peccatores quasi stramen incensum, Uae hiis qui peccant et non observant mandata mea; dicit dês, Non parcit illis; discedite filii apostatae: Nolite contaminare sanctificationem meam. Nonit dês qui peccant in eum. Propterea tradet eos in mortem et in occasio

¹ This is still the only surviving MS. of Gildas, that can be appealed to for the extracts which I quote. Some fragments of the Cottonian MS. (Vitellius A. vn.), as Mr. E. M. Thompson has kindly informed me, escaped the fire, but these do not contain the quotations from 5 Esdras.

² In these extracts the text is printed line for line as it stands in Cod. A., and in Cod. S.
27 nem; Jam enim venerunt
sup orbem terrarū mala.

22 cessavit altered to -bit.

COD. S.

xv. 21 Haec dicit dūs dūs;
22 Non parcē dextera mea sup peccato-
res. nec cessabit rumphea sup effundentes sanguinem innocuī sup
23 terram. & exīt ignis ab ivā eius & deo-

24 quasi stramen incensum.; Uē eis qui pecc.
25 tantium & non observant mandata mea · dicit
26 dūs.; Non parcam illis.; discedite filli a potes-
tate ·; nōlite contaminare scificatioā meā.
27 tere; Jam enim venerunt sup orbem

terrarum mala.

In the following quotation from the next chapter, the agreement between the
text of Cod. A. and that given by Gildas is still more marked:

GILD. EPIST.

xvi. 3, 4, 5 Immissus est gladius uobis ignis, et quis est qui recutiēt ea?
6 nunquid recutiēt aliquis leonem esurientem in silva? aut
7 nunquid exinguēt ignem cum stramen incensum fuerit?
8 Dominus Deus mitet mala, et quis est qui recutiēt ea?
9 Et exīt ignis ex iracundia eius, et quis exinguēt eum?
10 Coruscabit, et quis non timēbit? tonabit et quis non horrebit?
11 Deus cuncta minabitur et quis non terrebit? A facie eius
12 tremet terra et fundamenta marīs fluctuantur de profundo.

5, 6, 8 recuicet B. 9. exīt B., exībit ed. Jossel. quis qui ext. B. 10. Tonabit B.
12. de superbo B.
xvi. 3

Inmiscus est gladius nobis;
& quis est qui auertat
4 eum? inmissa ≠ nobis
ignis. & quis ≠ qui extinct
5 quat eud? inmisa sunt nobis
mala. & quis ≠ qui vec-
a
6 cid eud? Numquid vecu-
tid aliquis leoō esuri-
entem in silua? Aut nū-
quid extinctit ignō eud
stramen incensū fuerit?
7 AUT numquid vecutid sagitā
inmissam a sagitario forte?
8 Dūs òmittit mala. & quis
9 vecuicet eud? & exist ignis
& iracundia eius. & quis est
10 qui extinctat eud? curusc-
cabit. & quis non timebit?
11 tonabit & quis non horre-
bit? Dūs cōminatur. quis
non conterretur? A faciae
12 eius. tremat terra a funda-
mento eius. mare fluctuat2
de æfundo.

4. inmissa altered to immissa.
6. curruntem, s apparently added above es- and then erased.
9. exist altered to exit.
10. curuscabit altered to corusc; non altered to non.
11. conterretur, con erased.
12. tremet altered to tremit; fluctuat2 altered to fluctuat.
Cod. S.


3, 4. missus altered to inmissus (bis); illud altered to illum (bis).
5. missa altered to inmissa.
6. extinguat altered to -quat.
7. repellit altered to -let.
8. repellat altered to -let.
10. corruscabit, the first 'r' partially erased.

With these extracts I bring to a close my remarks on the textual criticism of the 4th book of Ezra, and of the chapters attached to it in the Vulg. The MSS. which I have examined will be found tabulated at the end of this Introduction. None of those hitherto discovered in English libraries can be ascribed to a period earlier than the 13th century. The references scattered through the preceding pages will enable us to single out the more interesting specimens in the list: Codd. C. 6, 12, L. 7, O. 3, and W., for instance, are often grouped together as exhibiting, like Cod. T., the state of the text in Cod. S. before many corrections had been made. Cod. C. 10 and occasionally Cod. C. 11 have preserved some difficult readings, which have been replaced in most other MSS. by attempted emendations. Cod. H. also sometimes retains readings of this kind, though embedded in much that is late
and corrupt. Codd. C. 2, L. S and O. 4 may be dismissed without further remark, for the text of our book, as given by them, was probably copied from a printed edition. As it would be worth while to form gradually a complete catalogue of those MSS. of the Lat. Bible which contain the 4th book of Ezra, I will insert among the Addenda a supplementary list of all that have come under my notice. I take this opportunity of thanking numerous correspondents who have kindly assisted me in the search, and of stating at the same time that I shall be happy to receive further information on the subject from those connected with public or private libraries.

The references to the books quoted by me will, I trust, be readily understood; by Hilgenf. I denote the 'Messias Judaorum, ed. A. Hilgenfeld, Lips. 1869.' For Old Latin forms and constructions I have constantly referred to Rönsch's 'Itala und Vulgata, ed. 2, Marburg, 1875;' and the illustrations given by me may generally be regarded as supplementing his articles. As the missing fragment must henceforth be incorporated in chap. vii., I have ventured to make the necessary readjustment in the numbering of the verses; the awkward device of interpolating a chap. (vi.) in the middle of chap. vii. can scarcely be maintained any longer. In reprinting the patristic references to chap. vii. 36—103, I have not deemed it superfluous to subjoin various readings from a few MSS. which came to hand 1.

I regret that, owing to the little leisure at my disposal, the publication of this work has been delayed longer than might have been expected. It only remains for me now to return my thanks to Prof. J. Gillemieister for the letter which he has kindly allowed me to publish, to the Rev. F. J. A. Hort for examining the first proof of my notes on the Fragment and furnishing me with a series of valuable suggestions, and to Prof. W. Wright, who has been ever ready to aid me with his sympathy and counsel. To Dr. Ignace Guidi I am under special obligation for his careful collation of two Arabic MSS. in the Vatican. I will give a short account of their contents in the Addenda, reserving for a future work the full use of these important materials. M. J. Garnier also has a claim on my gratitude for the facilities afforded me during my visits to the Bibliothèque Communale at Amiens.

1 The way in which the oft-quoted passage from Jerome has been passed on from editor to editor forms one of the many literary curiosities connected with the history of this book of Ezra. Instead of 'et proponis mihi librum apocryphum......ubi scriptum est quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari,' Fabricius by a strange oversight printed '....propinavit... and ...gaudefit...; his mistake reappeared in Laurence and even in Lüke (so far as he quotes the passage, Versuch einer redet. Einleitung in d. Offenb. des Joh.), and has been repeated by Volckmar, Hilgenfeld, and Fritzschel.
LIST OF MSS.

AMIENS.
A. = 10, Bibliothèque Communale.

PARIS.
S. = 'Cod. Sangerm.', 11505, fonds Lat., Bibliothèque Nationale.

CAMBRIDGE.
C. 1. = Ec. iv. 28, University Library.
C. 2. = Dd. vii. 5,
C. 3. = O. 4. 5, St. Peter's College.
(Chapters i. ii. are not in C. 3.)
C. 4. = O. 4. 6,
C. 5. = 531 (ol. 601), Gonville and Caius College.
C. 6. = D. iii. 47, St. Catharine's College.
C. 7. = 2. A. 3, Jesus College.
C. 8. = C. 24, St. John's College.
C. 9. = I. 28,
C. 10. = 2. 1. 6, Emmanuel College.
C. 11. = Δ. 5. 11, Sidney Sussex College.
C. 13. = Ec. i. 16, University Library.
(C. 13 and C. 14 contain only chapters i. ii.)

LONDON.
L. 2. = Bibl. Reg., 1. E. 1.,
L. 3. = Harleian, 1793,
L. 4. = Harleian, 2807,
L. 5. = Harleian, 2814,
L. 6. = Burney, 6,
L. 7. = Sloane, 1521,
(In L. 9 many leaves have been cut out; 4 Ezr. begins with ch. vi. 13.)
W. = MS. of Lat. Bible (no class-mark), in the Library of Westminster Abbey.

OXFORD.
O. 1. = Laud Lat., 12, Bodleian Library.
O. 2. = Hatton, D. 4. 8,
O. 3. = Mus., D. 5. 20,
O. 4. = Canon. Bibl. Lat., 67,
O. 5. = Ii., New College.
O. 6. = CCCXVI.,
O. 7. = LIV., Magdalen College.
(0. 8 contains only 4 Ezr. viii. 20—36.)

HOLKHAM.

DUBLIN.
Δ. = A. 1. 12, Trinity College.
(Δ. contains only 4 Ezr. viii. 29—36. I am indebted for a transcript of these verses to the Rev. Dr. B. Dickson.)

ZÜRICH.
T. = 'Cod. Turicensis,' C. 16. 5, Stadtbibliothek.
(Collated by O. F. Fritzsche.)

DRESDEN.
(Collated by A. Hilgenfeld.)
non do2mi**ent ; & ap.
parebit locuf to2amenti .
& cum illo ert locuf re’
(fol. 62. r. b.)

(v. 36)
quiUtionis; & chiamif gesben
nae ofendo & contra
eam rocunditaef paradi
histor & dic& tune altiflin.
ad exesatat gentef, undice &
intellegeste que negatif
uif vel cui non feressi-
vel enim diligientia pre
uif vel, undice contra &
in contra hoc rocunditaef
& requief & ibi ignif &
tozmenta, haec autem
loquefis dicif ad eif; in
die uideam haec tali& qui
neq; solem neque lun&
(v. 40) neque stellaf neque nu-
bem neq; tomtrum neq;
co0rufcationem neq;
uentum neq; aqua neq;
neque aere neque
nebraf neq; sero neque
que mane neque aestef
stem neque uae neque
que efus neq; *h&m&
neq; gaefi neque frir
guif neque grandhen
neq; pluam neque
roze neque merudem
neque noctem neque
ante lucem neq; mtoze &
(fol. 62. v. a.)
neque claritaf neque lux:
mif solamodo splendozem
claritatif altiflimi unde
omnef requifant uedere
que ante posita sunt, spatii
um enim habebit ficut ebdo
mada^ annozum; hoc eif
uideam meum et confupitut;
o enim t& ante foli ofendi
haec. Et respondi tune &
dixi & due & nune dico; beati
praefentef & obscurantef
quae autem comituta f sed
& qua; his erat ozato mea.
quif enim eif de prenfb; &
qui non peccavit quif
natuf qui non preteribat
spontio& tueam & et nune un
deo quif ad paucf plnebif
futurif eiaechi rocunditaef
decer Allocum et nectrif
futurif & mulif enim 20m

ta, inerat enim in nof co2
mahum quod nof abhima
ab his & dedux nof in corrup
tionem & itineri m20f; of
tendt nobif semtaf pufionif
& longae fest nof a uita,
& hoc non paucif sed paene
omnef qui creati sunt, & rel
pondit ad me & dixt,
(fol. 62. v. b.)
audi me & fruum te & de sequentii corripiam te,
(v. 50) Propter hoc non sufficit altissimo unum facelum sed duo, tu enim qua dixit ti non esse multof inuutof sed paucor . impor vero mult ticipiar & audh ad haec; lap des elector si habueri pau cor. valde ad numerum eozii componens cof tibi, pluminum autem & fictile habundat, & dixi; dice quomodo pote rit & dixit ad me, non hoc solum modum sed intero

45 ga terram & dic & tibi - adula aut quod rarum naeitur, & dixi; dominato2 dne . qd *abundat unusf & quod enm enm raruf pra&nofoif Æ, & respondit ad me & dixit In te . stant . pondera quae cogtatis quim qui hab& quod difficile ë gaud& sup eum qui hab& habunden tua; &c & amare promii (v. 60) la creatura, rocunda

50 bo2 enm sup pauco & qui salabunur ; propterea quod ipfi sunt qui glo2nam meani nune dominatio nem fecerunt . & per quoq nune nomen meani nominatum est . & non confirmi tabo2 sup nul titudinem eorum qui pe rerunt , ipfi enm sunt qui uoom nune aelima ti sunt & flanmæ ë ad similatæ fumo adaequa

55 ti i & exarierunt ë ferbe runt & extimem suft, & respondi & dixi , O tu * ter ra quod peperifi . si senfif *** factui Æ de pulaire sicut & c&era creatura 1-

(fol. 63. r. a.)

aut quod rarum naeitur,
melius enim erat ipsum
puluerem non esse natum ·
ut non senfur unde hered,
nunc autem nobiscum cret
sit senium · & propter hoc
torquemur · quin feientef
(v. 65) permutf · lugeat hommnm
genum · & agrestef benece
la & centur · lugeant · omneef
qui nati sunt · & quadrupedia
uero · & pecora rocundent
 tur · multum enim meli
us eit nihil quam nobif
Non enim sperant uidi
cum · nee enim fecunt
crucamenta · nee salutef
post mortem repromi
fam fibi · Nobif autem
quid prodet · quiu habiat
saluabtur · ftd tomt
 to tomentabtur ·
Omneef enim qui nati sunt ·
commixtis sunt misqua
tib; · & plenae · f peccatif ·
& gravati dehetif · & fi
non effemuf post mor
tem · uideo uementifi
· melius fortisfif nobif
(v. 70) uenunif · & respondit
ad me · & dixit · & quan
(fol. 63. v. a.)
do altissimus faeculent
faciebat faeculum: a
dam · & omnes qui eit co
uenerunt · primai prae
param autem · & quae
sunt uiden · & nunc de
fermomb · tuif intelle
ge · quiu dixit · qua
nobiscum credit · qui
ergo cromantef sunt
in terra · luce crucen
tur · quiu senium
habentef · quinquatetem
seceef · & mandata aec
ceptef · non seruare
runt ea · & legem con
sequi · fraudaver
caam qui aceeperunt,
& quid habebant dicere
in uideo · vel quomo
do respondebunt in
nouissimus temporeb · !
quattu · enim tempus &ex
quo longamnumatem
habent · altissimus
lusif qui mlabi
tant faeculum ·
& non &pmt coe fed &pmt
ca quae pmidit tempora ·
& respondi · & dixi ·
si muem gratiam co2ā

tatur iterum ad eum quod

dedit adorare gloria al
tiūlim-primum; & si quidē
eas eorum qui

veiner nam altissim

& cozum qui contemplē

stān eui. & eorum quod

erunt eoi. quin timent eum

haes miratione m ha

bitatione non ingredit

tur. sed nagantur erunt

anodo m cruciamentū

dolentē temp & triētē,

ua primē quae sprener

legem altissimū. faecum
da mā quan non posuēnt

reuerfione bonā facere

ut unant, tertia mā

dent repofitum mercedem

hū qu te fentīntū altissi

nu crediderunt, quarta

ua quae confiderantū

mā nonfliūs repofitum

crucias tum. quintet mā

udentēs ahozum habita

culū ab angelī confuerunt

cum silentio magno, sexta

mā quae udentēs quē ad modū
dex de eif perānīntem eruea

(fol. 64. r. a.)
mentum, septima cruci
amittum unā & omnūn quē
supra dictae sunt uarū
maio2 quīn dēcābeʃeʃt
in confusionem & confu
mūn in horrorib; & mar
ecen in timoribus ui
dentef glozam altissim
co2ā quē uendetef pecca
uerunt & coram quo in
cipent in nōuissimī tem
porib; uedcar, Nam eo
rū qu uaf seruauerent
altissim 02d0 hic; quan
do mequē seruari a ua
iro co2ruptui in eo tem
pozo cōmozatae serue
runt cum labo2e altissimo,
& omni hoza suʃtuer
periculum ut plectae
uododret legitato2if
(v. 90) legem propter quod lce
de hīf sermo, imprīmī
uendet cum exultatione
multā gloram cuf quī
fulccep caf; requerfcent
emn p lepem ordinēf,
Ordo prūn quīn cum la
boe multo uerat fuit
ut uncerent cum caf plāʃma
(fol. 64. v. a.)
tum cogitamentī malā .
ut non eaf seducet a ui
ta, Item fæcundus 02d0
quīn uendet complecari
onem in quo uagant2 um
pico2ā ammae & quae
in eʃ manʃ punitio;
tertuf o2d0 uendetef teʃi
monum quō teʃtica
tuf ez eʃ q plāʃmae eaf quo
uendetef seruauer quē
p fideʃ data lex, quar
(v. 95)
tuf ordo intellīgentef re
quem quēn uunc in
promptuarif congreʃga
ui requerfcent eʃ filen
tio multo ab anhelī con
seruati & quē in nouʃ
sumī co2ā manentem glο
ram, quintuf o2d0 ex
ultantef quomodo eor
riptile effugerent uunc
& futurum quomodo
hereditatem possesser,
adhuc autem uendetef
angufiam & plenum
quīn liberati sunt &
spatium recerpere
fru neʃcenset & immo2
talef, sextuf o2d0
(fol. 64. v. b.)
quando eis ostendit quo
modo meps uultuf
eorum fulgere heut fol &
quomodo meepent
stella adiunlarium luum
quomodo n coiprnt,
septum fodo qui est om
mb; supradiet manus:
quin exultabant eum si
dulta & quin confident
bunt non confusi & gau
de bunt non reuertentes,
sefinant emm ut fimtum
ceu servant unentes
& a quo incipunt glozie
si mercedem recipere,
hoc ordo ammarum uft
vam ut amodo ainti
entur pibaeae maec cru
cratuf quod patunt a
modo qui neglexernt,
(v.100) et respondi & dixt,
rego dabit tempus an
mabat poiquam sepa
rat quiuerent de corub;
ut undeant de quod mihi
dixeth & dixit sep
tem dieb; erit libertas
carum ut undeant qui
pshet s fermoner
(fol. 65. r. a.)

& polertia congregabant
m habetaeuf sufli; & repson
dh & dixt si uuent gratiam
ante oculorum tuo demonstr
mihi adhuc seruo tuo si in
due uident mihi impoef excu
fare poterint s depeari

ef altissimum; si patris
p fit & nel filium parentig si
fratres p fratrib; si a
fines p proximae si uiden
tef pro carissimae nel p si
do carissimae ut p eo
intellegat aut dozzmat
aut mandae & aut ueret;
se niqua nemo p alquero (v.105)
gabit, Omne emm posta
bunt unque quo que tune in
mutual suad aut uultipal,
& respond & dixt; & quo
modo uenient modo qnm
roga pm abraham ppt
fodoirit & movief

(fol. 65. r. b.)
NOTES.

fol. 62, r, b, l. 28 The original reading was probably do2mmbunt as in Cod. S. Comp. a similar change in fol. 65, r, a, l. 10, 11.

fol. 62, v, a, l. 1 geshennae—c has been erased before h. Similarly gechennam chap. ii, 29.

" " l. 2 oftend−c was originally written as an inverted comma.

" " l. 6 intellegt−e—a erased.

" " l. 7 fer−r— erased.


" " l. 24 hæm−c erased.

" " l. 25 gaelus—f erased.

" " l. 28 ro2c—2 written over an erasure.

fol. 62, v, b, l. 5 que—the c below the e added in darker ink.

" " " polita—i seems to have been added above n and afterwards effaced.

" " l. 7 ebdomadas—appar. f erased.

" " l. 9 v^— " has been added later.

" " l. 12 A word, probably quo, was prefixed to this line and afterwards erased.

" " l. 20 futurā—ū orig. ū.

fol. 63, r, a, l. 4 altissimo—mo orig. m.

" " l. 11 componei—m orig. n.

" " l. 12 An erasure after fictile.

" " l. 13 poterit—e written over an erasure, and r added at the beginning of l. 14.

" " l. 17 narrabat—b orig. u.
fol. 63, r. a. l. 26, 27 plumbū—b orig. m. Du Cange gives the form 'plumnum' from a Charter of the 13th century. Comp. in English 'plummet,' and the surname 'Plummer.' A like assimilation takes place in 'commurat,' 'commusta' (=comb-), and in 'ammulanibus' (=amb-). Schuchardt, Vocal. des Vulgärlateins, i, 183, iii. 318.

" " l. 28 haec erased at the end of this line.

fol. 63, r. b. l. 3 *abundat—probably h erased.

" " l. 4 prâ&nôif—the final f orig. r.

" " l. 6 The two stops in this line written faintly by a later hand.

" " l. 11 neundâbō—orig. neundâbō.

" " l. 19 corâtris tabō2—divided thus in the MS.; for the spelling comp. 'constris-tatus' Mark x. 22, Cod. Bobbiens. (Wiener Jahrbücher der Lit. Vol. 121.)

" " l. 22 wapor is the result of an early correction, the last letter is retouched.

" " l. 25 ferbērunt—b orig. u.

" " l. 27 Prob. ï has been erased; ter is added in larger letters beyond the line.

" " l. 28, 29 Similarly suf has been added after the end of l. 28, and appar. the same syllable erased at the beginning of l. 29.

" " l. 30 c&era—c&e written over an erasure.

fol. 63, v. a. l. 7 lugeat—e orig. i.

fol. 63, v. b. l. 18 acceperunt—orig. acceperunt.

" " l. 23 quâtū° has been added later.

" " l. 25 habūt—b has been retouched, ut is written over an erasure, and appar. ÷ erased at the end of the word.

" " l. 26 hís—i erased.

fol. 64, r. a. l. 5 reddimuf—i orig. e, altered by a later hand.

" " l. 8 æque—final e written over an erasure.

" " l. 15 noh—appar. i erased. So noh chap. xi. 27, vi. 10, ix. 13, x. 34, 55. 'nolii' Matth. i. 20, vi. 2, 7; John xii. 15, xx. 27, Book of Deer (ed. for the Spalding Club by J. Stuart, 1869). Luke viii. 49, 50.

fol. 64. r. a. l. 17 connumerer—orig. connumerer.
   " l. 21 apud—orig. aput.
   " l. 28 rece* «den—the second e is due to an old corrector, and den is added beyond the line.

fol. 64. r. b. l. 3 A stop erased before primum.
   " l. 4 quod—e has been retouched.
   " l. 10 haes—e written over an erasure; appar. e erased after it, as also in chap. xiii. 40.
   " " inspiratonef—e orig. i.
   " l. 29 una—a orig. a.

fol. 64. v. a. l. 2 Appar. † erased, and ‡ substituted.
   " " quo added later beyond the line.
   " l. 6 horror求助—orig. horribis; Comp. Ecclus. i. 14, where Cod. Amiat. has "horribis" and ed. Sistino-Clem. "honorable," and Mal. i. 14, where the former has "horaible" and the latter "horrible." (See Bibl. S Lat. V. T. ed. Heyse et Tischendorf.)
   " l. 10 quo—no written over an erasure.
   " l. 19 futnumer—orig. e (corr. by later hand).
   " l. 20 ut†—appar. final i erased.

fol. 64. v. b. l. 10 plafina—orig. plafina, ‡ added in lighter ink.
   " l. 15 promptumnf—0 orig. u.
   " l. 18 qu*e—a partially erased.
   " l. 22 corriptible—e orig. i.
   " l. 23 futuram—a orig. u.

fol. 65. r. a. l. 5 stellar—there is a trace of a mark of abbreviation above r.
   " l. 10 fiduta—t orig. c.—NT (written in a compound form) added at the end of the line.
   " l. 11 confus†—there is a slight trace of a written above u.
   " l. 20 quof—o seems to have been orig. a.
fol. 65. r. a. l. 30  ἱθετα—prob. e erased.
fol. 65. r. b. l. 7  Prob. & erased in this line—uel substituted in the margin.
    " "  l. 9  uel written over an erasure.
    " "  l. 11  ἀδνυετ—e orig. t.
    " "  l. 12  uel written over an erasure.
    " "  "  p fi—added beyond the line.
fol. 65. r. b. l. 13  do—o orig. u—final f erased.
    " "  "  carifimuf—final f written over an erasure—m erased.
    " "  l. 15  cur&—orig. cur&—Et dix; added at the end of the line.
    " "  l. 17  rogabt—b orig. u.
    " "  l. 21  muenimus—uen written over an erasure.
    " "  l. 22  roga—orig. rogaū, added in lighter ink.
4 EZRA VII. 36—105.

36 Et apparebit lacus tormenti, et contra illum erit locus requisitionis; et elibanus gehennae ostendetur, et contra eum iocunditatis paradisus. Et dicit tune Altissimus ad excitatas gentes: uidete et intelligite quem negastis, uel cui non

(In the notes immediately below the text both the original readings and the later corrections found in the MS. are printed in Italic).

36. lacus locus. contra illum cum illo. requisitionis requisitionis, cum cans

36. If we possessed only the Lat. vers., the locus tormenti of our MS. might pass unchallenged (comp. Luke xvi. 28, Cod. Bezae Lat.); but there can be no doubt that locus is an echo from the following clause, (as the second nonae is from the preceding clause in chap. iv. 7, where the MSS. have nonae...nonae for nonae...uiae), and that, with the authority of the other versions, we must read lacus tormenti. With this comp. cum deducetum cum ad infernum cum his qui descendunt in locum, Ezek. xxxi. 16 Hicron. Vet. Lat. (a chap. from which other reminiscences may be traced in 4 Ezra), and de locu miseriae, Ps. xxxix. 3 (so conversely in Rev. xviii. 17, qui in locum navigat, Cod. Amiat. et Fuld., has been corrupted into qui in locum non, ed. Sisitnino-Clement.): This phrase is rendered ὁ κόλπος τῶν βασιλεῶν in Hilgenfeld's attempted restoration of the Greek: but ὁ κόλπος is derived solely from the Syr. and is scarcely satisfactory; for this I propose to read ʿputenus, ʿfonna' = ʿbāb of the Arab. Compendium (Arab. ?). For another instance of the confusion of the letters ʿ and ʿ in the MS., see chap. xi. 37, Ceriani's note. By these two slight emendations, the Lat., Syr., Eth., and Arab. versions are brought into harmony with one another, and all point to an original ὁ λάκως τῆς βασιλείας.

et contra illum erit locus requisitionis [The Syr. and Eth. vers. suggest this emendation; requisitionis was probably first corrupted into requisitionis, and the introduction of this new word involved the further change of contra illum to cum illo. In the Arab. vers. מִזְרָחָה (not מִזְרָח) = Syr. מִזְרָחָה. See Fleischer, Zeitschr. d. D. M. G., vol. xviii. p. 291, and Com. de Bandissin, Transl. Ant. Arab. Libri Iobi quae supers. p. 111.

locund. parad.] = ὁ τῆς τροφῆς παράδεισος. Comp. the LXX in Gen. ii. 15 (Cod. Vat.), iii. 23, 24; Ezek. xxxi. 9, Joel ii. 3; the pl. τῶν τροφῶν in Hilgenf. rests only on the ribbon of the Syr.

37. For Hilgenfeld's Gk. καὶ ἐρεί τότε ὁ ὕψωτος κατὰ τῶν λιῶν τῶν ἐξερθόντων I would substitute κ. ἐ. τ. ὁ ὕψ. προς τὰ ἑθνα τὰ ἐξερθομ, which best explains all the versions, not excepting the Syr., for πρὸς may be well rendered by ἀπελθεῖν in such a context, comp. Luke xviii. 9 Pesh.
38 seruiistis, nel cuius diligentias sprenistas. Uidete contra et in contra: hic iecunditas et requies, et ibi ignis et tormenta; haec autem loqueris dicens ad eos in die iudicii. Hic talis qui neque solem [habeat] neque lunam, neque stellas, 38, 39. dicens ad eos in die iudicii; Hic talis... dicens ad eos... in die iudicii: hac talis...

For *populis* *resunturorum*, in Hilgenfeld's emended translation of the Arab., read *populis qui resunturorum sunt* (according to Ockley's construction), which is the correct rendering of the vulg. Arab. *hailam*, and agrees with the other versions.

The word *diligentiam*, which occurs in chap. iii. 19 in parallelism with *legem*, has been a source of much perplexity to commentators; we have here another instance of the same peculiar use of this word. It naturally came to mean scrupulous attention to commands, and particularly to religious duties. Comp. *diligentia mandatorum taurum*, Cig.; *sacerorum diligentia*, id.;... *tantum* *diligentiam suam etiam ipsi Deo praeverentibus*, Iren. iv. 11, Old Lat. trans.: just as, on the other hand, *indiligentia* is used for neglect of duty, or trespass, in the old Lat. vers. of Leviticus, ed. by Lord Ashburnham (1869): e.g. in chap. v. 16, 18, vi. 6, where the Gk. is *περιμελέας*; similarly chap. v. 19, *insuper enim habebat indiligentiam* (not *quaescusque diliguerit*, as quoted by Ranke, *Par Politica*, Worms, p. 231) *indigentia* *ante Deum*, where the Gk. is *ἐπιλεξάθη γερ περιμελεία εἰς τοῦ κυρίου*. Comp. also v. 15. In other passages of this vers. *περιμελέας* and *περιμελεία* are represented by *negligere* and *negligentia*. In these instances the Greek word doubtless suggested this translation, in accordance with the etymology which we find set forth at length by one who fondly clung to the Old Lat. vers. *Et περιμελέας similic non excet negligentia: nam Graece negligentia ἀδελεα διειφτ, quia curae non est quod negligentur. Sic enim Graecus dicit, Non curae, ut meli mi. Particula *pro quo* adhibens plēv, ut dicatur περιμελέας, praeceter significant, ut ἀδελεα quod negant negligentia, nihil autem sine carae περιμελεία praetere carum, quod pene tantumdem est. Hinc et quidam nostri περιμελεῶν non delictum, sed negligentiam interpretari nuntiant. In latīna autem linguā quid aliud negligentur nisi quod non legitur, id est non eligitur? Unde etiam legem a legendo, id est ab eligendo latini autore appellatum esse dicerat. August. quæst. in Levit. § xx. The word *diligentiam*, as used in the 4th book of Ezra, by a natural transition takes the meaning of that which is to be observed,—an observance; just as *περιμελεία* by a similar process becomes associated with laws and ordinances. Gen. xxvi. 5; Dent. xi. 1. Comp. also observations, Lev. xviii. 30 (Ashb.). In a paper read by me before the Cambridge Hebr. Soc. in 1869 I pointed out that *neligere* *viam tran* ch. iii. 7 (Syr. = mandatum, Ἐθ. = mandatum iustitiae), must stand in close connexion with *diligentiam*, iv. 19 (Syr. = mandata, Ἐθ. = mandatum). I now find my conjecture confirmed by Dodd. A. and S., both of which have in the former place *diligentiam unam tran* see p. 28.

38, 39. The Syr. and Ἐθ. vers. suggest the following reading: *haec logetur ad eos in die iudicii, dies cuius iudicii talis qui* ...

39. neque solem...] The Arab. alone inserts an additional noun here: *In illo die non erit neque sol, neque lux, neque luna, neque stella, neque rubes*... (ince dies appended to sol in the Arm. seems from the context to be a mere expletive). We find the same sequence in Eccles. xii. 2 *ante quam ten/out sol, et luna, et luna, et stellar, et reverulant rubes*...

[habeat] The insertion of some such verb is required by the structure of the sentence, and introduces less disturbance than the substitution of *cui* for *qui* and of the nom. for the accus. in the following nouns. Of the nine MSS. of the Ἐθ. vers. in the Brit. Mus. one only (Or. 490) has the reading *albātā dāḥayā* *non labeit* (dies ind.) *solem*. The reading of the others *albā dāḥayā* *non est sol* favours the conjectural emendation of Yan der Vlis, yet they do not all (see especially Or. 489) consistently maintain the nom. case throughout the series.
40 Neque nubem, neque tonitrum, neque coruscationem, neque neutum, neque aquam, 
neque aerem, neque tenebras, neque sero, neque mane, Neque aestatem, neque 
uer, neque aestum, neque hiemem, neque gelu, neque frigus, neque grandi-

41 neque, pluiani, neque reorem, Neque meridiem, neque noctem, neque ante 
lucem, neque niterem, neque claritatem, neque lucem, nisi solummodo splendorem

41. aestum = estus altered to estū. gelu = galo accelerated to golu.
42. claritatem = claritas altered to claritatem. neque lucem = neque lux altered to neque lucem.

40. neque tonitr., neque corusc.] This is also the 
order in Ambrose (see extract A.). In the Syr. and Eth. vers. it is inverted.

sero] This form is probably due to the predo-
minant adverbial use of such words; serum might be 
thought to range better with the nouns in the list, 
but though we have such phrases as quia serum crud 
dici, Liv. vili. 8, in serum diinitione protracta, Suet. 
Aug. 17, and serum as an occasional variant for sero 
in the formula sero factum est, e.g. in Judith xii. 1, 
Cod. Pech. (Sab.), Mark iv. 33, Cod. Pal. (ed. Tischendorf), 
Wiener Jahrbücher der Lit. Vols. 121, 123), yet it 
would be difficult to find in the Latin of this period 
examples of serum used absolutely like its modern 
derivatives 'sera,' 'soir,' as an equivalent for vespers, 
the word which Ambrose substitutes in his para-
phrase of this passage. Isidore of Sevilla (Sacc. vii.) 
seems to bring us nearer to this use of the word, in 
the curious etymology which he proposes: serum voca-
tum a cclusio serio, quando nox venit, ut unaquis-
que sono tuitur init. Orig. Lib. v. 30. 17.

41. In attempting to explain the variations of the 
different versions in this long enumeration, we 
must make some allowance for the idiom of language, 
which groups words together according to an 
aturnal affinity. The two seasons which come first in order 
are thus represented by the three leading author-
ities: Lat. aestas, uer; Syr. aestas, hiemis; Eth. 
hiemis, aestas. Now, referring to Zach. xiv. 8 and 
Ps. lxxiii. 17 ἵππος ἱπποῦ, LXX. ἵππος ἱπποῦ, we find in 
the Old Lat. (Sab.), the Syr. (Pesh.), and the Eth. 
respectively, the same two seasons linked together 
as in the corresponding translations of this verse.

Again, the Syr. and Eth. verss. have three sea-
sons, the Lat. two only, unless we suppose hiemem
B.

to be displaced. Comp. the paraphrase of Ambrose, 
neque aestas neque hiemis neque variabund tempor-
um, but this cannot be pressed. The present posi-
tion of hiemem after aestum is probably due to its 
second signification 'storm' (χειμία). In some copies 
of the Eth. there is a similar comparison, since after 
aestum (for which sudor is unfortunately given both 
in Laurence and Hilgenf.) follows proceda according 
to the Berlin MS. (Practorius) and the majority of the MSs. in the Brit. Mus. Similarly in the Arab. 
a word for 'storm' comes immediately after the 
seasons. For aestus (before autumnis) in the Lat. 
transl. from the Arab. we must read aestas.

Ewald explains لَنَفْسُ لَنَفْسَ as the pl. fract. of لَنَفْسُ = nafs. I may notice, however, that this word 
has been altered in the MS.; the base of the is 
been apparently retouched, the j was originally ]1, 
and j has been erased before . The lencma of 
Hilgenf. can scarcely be accepted as an adequate 
translation of the term; it would rather, I conceive, 
be illustrated by the λαμμάδες of Exod. xx. 18. But 
in the absence of any other example, the existence 
of such a word in Arab. must be regarded as 
doubtful.

42. ante lucent] The other verss. lead us to 
expect a noun here as above in v. 40, and it is not 
improbable that in the original text of the Lat. there 
stood the rare word antelucum. We have a trace 
of this form as a var. for antelucum, Apul. Met. 1. 
14 (ed. Hildebr.); and examples of the ablative are 
found in Apul. Met. 1. 11, and 9. 15. It is worth 
noticing in connexion with the reading of our MS. 
that in both these passages we find as a var. for 
antelucio the easier expression ante lucem. In
claritas Altissimi, unde omnes incipiant uideres quae anteposita sunt. Spatium
enim habebit sicut ebdomada amorum. Hoc est iudicium meum et constitutio eius,
tibi autem soli ostendi haec. Et respondi tunce et dixi: domine, et nunc dice:
beati praesentes et observantes quae a te constituta sunt; Sed et [de] quibns
erat oratio mea, quis enim est de praesentibus, qui non peccavit, uel quis natus,
qui non praeteriuit sponsonem tuam? Et nunc uideo, quoniam ad paucos per-
tinebit futuram saeculi iocunditatem facere, multis autem tormenta. Inerent enim

43. ebdomada ebdomadas.
44. a te autem altered to a te; so also in chap. xiv. 21.
46. Sed et [de] quibns erat...praeteriuit sed et quib; his crat... preteribit.
47. futuram futurâ altered to futurâ. autem enim.

Eccles. xxiv. 44 we have antehacunum as a rendering of εφορον.
43, 44. horum verum (16), and horum omnium (17), should change places in the Lat. transl. from
the Arab. (Hilgenf. p. 341).
44. et constitutio eius]. Comp. hanc est constitutio legis, Num. xix. 2, Cod. Ashburnh. In the Syr.

45. The Syr. suggests the transposition of the words tunc et, and is besides more flowing: Et re-
spendi et dixi: Dominator Domine, etiam tunc dixi, et nunc iterum dicens; while in chap. ix. 15,

et hic locutus sum is not represented in the Syr.

praesentes et obs. gives the sense of the Arab.

46. Sed et [de] quibns erat oratio mea]. It is diffi-
cult to decide between the various possible com-
binations of the Lat. words in our MS., but de quibns
(or de his) seems to be the simplest emendation.
Erald's restoration: Doch meine Frage an dich ist
dich, is based on the Eth.; while the Lat., the Arab.
and also the Syr. (comp. μη δοκεῖ in vii. 102, 106
(36)), require the noun in the Gk. to be δείγμα rather
than ἡ δείγμα. Perhaps an orig. of the form: ἰδίω
cē πρᾶξιν (or πρᾶξιν τόνωμ) ἡ δείγμα μου would best
account for this divergence in translation, together
with the difference in tense. The same sentiment
47. quoniam ad paucos pertinebit] From the
Syr. vers. we may restore the original Greek thus:

where the word δείγμα has occasioned much embar-
rassment. Ceriani originally regarded it as cor-
rupted from δοκεῖ fortassì; he afterwards was in-
clined to retain the MS. reading with the render-
ing 'simul,' 'conjunction,' though the difficulties of
construction did not escape him. In the Lat., now
published, we first meet with a corresponding par-
ticle, pene; this might seem rather to favour the
emendation proposed by Ceriani, but there would
still be an objection to the -s following δοκεῖ, so
that we are driven to reconsider the δείγμα of the
MS. Now this reading (if we disregard the upper
in nos cor malum, quod nos abalienavit ab his, et deduxit nos in corruptionem, et
in itinera mortis, ostendit nobis semitas perditionis et longe fecit nos a uita; et hoc
non paucos, sed pene omnes qui creati sunt. Et respondit ad me et dixit: audi
me et instruam te, et de sequenti corripiam te: Propter hoc non fecit Altissimus
unum saeculum, sed duo. Tu enim, quia dixisti non esse multis iustos, sed paucos,
impios nero multiplicari, audi ad haec: Lapides electos si habueris paucos ualde,

48. et in itinera & itinera.
49. instruam instruam.
50. non fecit Altissimus non suffect Altissimus -mus altered to -mo.
52. paucos ualde, ad num. paucos ualde ad num.

point) is strongly supported by a similar construction in the Syr. of Eccles. xxx. 4, which has hitherto been obscured by a mistranslation. The verse stands thus in the Gk. and Syr. versions from the lost Hebr.: εὐθείατροσ αὐτῶν ἡ παρθή, καὶ ύστερον (καὶ οἷς ὑπὲρ τ. κ. ἡ παρθήνιον (οἷς χάριβδοι

The Syr. is thus interpreted in the Par. and Lond. Polyglots: 'Defuncto ipsius patrie, superest alter hand mortuus; quandoquidem similim sui post se reliquit.' The itinera here (for so we are directed to write the word, in the recession of the text by Jacob of Edessa, Brit. Mus. MS. Rich. 7158 fol. 81 h, 1, 11) is evidently inaccurately represented by superest alter,' and the true sense of the clause might be correctly expressed in the words of the Old Lat.: et quidem non est mortuus.

In fact itinera (or . . . itinera when a noun does not immediately succeed) = 'companion of,' 'allied to,' seems to pass into the meaning of 'well nigh,' 'as if, 'one might almost say.' The use of τῆς in Prov. xxviii. 24 may be looked on as the germ of this formula. As, however, in the absence of other examples, the existence of such a particle must still be considered doubtful, I leave these few hints to be confirmed, or otherwise, by subsequent research.

49. instruam] For the earlier reading struam comp. de quibus structure es, Luke i. 4, Cod. Bezae, and the ref. to Tert. in Rönschl. p. 389; also ad in stiruedos (rar, stiruedos) istine nos, Cyp. Epist. xliv. 1 (ed. Hartel). In chap. v. 32, where the same phrase occurs, instruam is without a variant.

et de sequenti corripiam te] Prob. from the Gk. καὶ εἰς δευτέρου ταυτάρατον καὶ. For de sequenti (Syr. = secundus), comp. demus, de integro, de futuro, de praeterito, &c. Sequens=secundus vi. 7, 9, xi. 13.

50. non fecit Altissimus] I have ventured to substitute these words for the present reading of our MS., non suffect Altissimus; for a recurrence to the original Altissimus involves a change of the verb (comp. hoc saeculum fecit Altissimus, chap. viii. 1), and by this emendation the Lat. is brought into conformity with all the other versions.

51. impios nero multiplicari] This clause is represented in the Arab., Arab. (Cod. Vat.), and Arna., but not in the Syr. There is a lacuna in the Æth.

52. ad numerum corum...abundat] The Lat. has been here interpolated; it should rather run thus: ad numerum corum compones tibi plumbam et fictile. The words eos, autem and abundat distort the argument and find no place in any other version. The comparison implies that the number of the elect (to borrow the epithet used in the Lat.) cannot be increased by the addition of baser elements; this sense is best expressed by the Arab. The pron. corum is not absent from any of the versions, although omitted in the Lat. translations of the Æth. and Arab. In the Æth. the latter part of v. 51 and the beginning of v. 52 have fallen out through homeoteleut. The problem of making a leading vessel out of clay is a difficulty merely introduced in Laurence's transl.; the correct rendering, make for thyself a vessel of lead and clay, reflects the same original as
ad numerum eorum compones eos tibi, plumbum autem et fictile abundat. Et
dixi: domine, quomodo poterit? Et dixit ad me: non hoc solummodo, sed interroga
terram, et dicit tibi, adulare ei, et narrabit tibi, Dices ei: aurum eam et
argentum et aethereum, et ferrum quoque et plumbum et fictile; Multiplicatur
autem argentum super aurum, et aethereum super argentum, et ferrum super
aethereum, plumbum super ferrum, et fictile super plumbum. Aestima et tu,
quae sint pretiosa et desiderabilia, quod multiplicatur aut quod rarum nascitur.
Et dixi: dominator domine, quod abundat ulius, quod enim rarum pretiosius est.
Et respondit ad me et dixit: In te stant pondera quae cogitasti, quoniam qui habet
quod difficile est, gaudet super eum, qui habet abundantiam; Sic et a me repromiss

54. adulare seems to import a needless intensity into a simple appeal; no stronger word than 
55. Dices for dicens, and ei for et, I have brought this Latin clause into harmony with the other versions. A
56. strong sense is required. The original may be rendered thus: sic et a me repromissa creatura sic & amare 

57. solummodo solummodum. 58. Dices ei: aurum eam dicens; eam & aurum eam.
59. quae quae have altered to have quae.
60. enim enim. et. pretiosius pretiosius altered to pretiosius.
61. Sic et a me repromissa creatura sic & amare repromissa creatura.

by supposing the original to have been, as Mr. Hort 

suggests, ζητοστάτησις, which might be rendered 
either by one word or by two, and which is used in 
this metaphorical sense by Lucian, De Hist. Compend. 
c. 49: καὶ ζητοστάτησιν τότε ὀσποψ ἐν τρισάγι τού 


It may be worth while to mention another attempt to account for the presence of stant. In the 
Syr. the clause stands thus: ὧκρε ἰς ἱματα 

Φιλα. The same phrase is found in chap. iv. 

31, where the Lat. is: aetim autem (=δύ, Hilgenf.) apud te. Now the Tironian sign for autem, 

which was probably not very familiar to our 
scribe (I have noted only two instances of it in this 
book), might have been here read as it. Whichever 

be the solution, it is clear that the termination -aut 
originated from a copyist (possibly influenced by 
chap. xiv. 14) mistaking the imperative pondera for a 
plural noun.

The corresponding clause in Ewald’s ‘Wiederher-
stellung des Buches,’ es ziemt dir wohl so zu denken, 

seems to have been derived solely from Laurence’s trans. of the Αθ. Τε ἵππο id dignum sit, quod cogi-
tasti (retained in Hilgenf.). This version, however, 

if correctly rendered, would conform to the Syr., and 
to the orig. Lat. vers. See Dilh. Lex. s. voc. 1. 6.
60. Sic et a me repromissa creatura] I have
creatura, iocundabor enim super paucis et qui salubruntur, propterque quod ipsi sunt qui gloriam meam nunc dominatiorem fecerunt, et per quos nunc nomen meum nominatum est; Et non contristabor super multitudinem eorum qui perierunt, ipsi enim sunt qui uapori assimilati sunt et flammae, fumo adaequati sunt et exarerunt, ferucrant et extincti sunt. Et respondi et dixi: O tu terra, quid peperisti, si sensus factus est de pulvere, sicut et cetera creatura! Melius enim crat ipsum puluerem non esse natum, ut non sensus inde fieret. Nunc autem nobiscum crescit sensus, et propter hoc torquemur, quoniam scientes perimur. Lugeat hominum genus, et

60. dominatiorem dominationem.
61. uapori apparently unu altered to uapori. fumo adsimilatus fumo.
62. ferucrant ferucrant altered to ferucrant.
63. sensum sensum altered to sensus.

thus attempted to emend the sic et amare promissa creatura of our MS., but the sense is still unsatisfactory, and a comparison with the other versions shows that this is another instance of the confusion between κρίσεις and κρίσεως in the Greek of our book. Comp. Hilgenf. pp. xl. xli. A still earlier form of the Lat., to judge from the Syr. and Arab., was repromissio creaturae, the original being probably φύετως καί ἡ παρ' ἐμοί ἑναγγελία τῆς κρίσεως (var. lect. κρίσεως).

qui gloriam meam nunc dominatiorem fecerunt] The Syr. and Arab.2 = qui nunc gloriam meam confirmant. The Eth. = quoniam illi assignetur gloriam meam. The Gk. κρίσεως would explain both these renderings, but the verb κρίσεως seems too remote from the Gk. vocabulary of the Eth. translator. It might be urged in favour of the retention of the MS. reading dominationem, that the phrase in the original was possibly κρίσεως τινάκ, and that our translator took the former word for κρίσεως; but the construction of the clause requires us, I think, by the change of a single letter, to read dominationem, a word used as equivalent to κρίσεως in the old Lat. translation of Irenaeus, e.g., II. 5. 4 (ed. Stieren), aliquin necessitatem maniorem et dominatiorem faciunt quam Deum. The corruption in the MS. is well illustrated by a passage in Tert. adv. Marc. i. xxviii. (ed. Oehler): Credo, sulphurationem eis gehomum praeperabiti, where the analogous form sulphurationem has for a variant the abstract sulphurationem. And so also timorator, which is Volkmar's acute emendation for the common reading timor acrior in 4 Ezra xii, 13, appears in our MS. as timoratio.

61. The Arab. has مَتَّى مَسْتَرْجَعُ من اللَّفَر 'have proved worthy of,' 'are condemned to the fire;' Ockley, are bound to hell. Fabricius, unskilled in Eng. idiom (by an obvious association he translates orare by vires in verse 92), has rendered this lig
t ad infernum (retained in Hilgenf).

62. O tu terra, quid peperisti] The Syr. gives this in an expanded form: O quid facieti, terra, quasi nisi malii sunt et e te ambulant in perditionem, comp. chap. x. 10. The Ara. sums up this and the two following verses in a similar expression: O terra, quare gannisti hominum? nam cruciatibus aeternatis traditum est.

63. In this verse the Latin gives no countenance to Le Hir's interpretation of the Syr. (see Monum. sacra et prof. ed. Coriani, vol. v. p. 110); the word however, to which he gives the inadmissible translation indicium, is certainly not of place; omitting this, and a superfluous in in A, we might restore the original thus: κρίσεως γὰρ (—γὰρ Syr.) ἤν εἰ οὐκ ἐγερήθη (καὶ καὶ Syr.) αὕτως ὁ χῶς ὡς μη γένηται ὁ νόμος ἔκδοθει. But we cannot expect perfect conformity between the Lat. and the Syr., as the addition of an extra clause to verse 62 in the latter has disturbed the balance of the sentence.
agrestes bestiae laetentur, lugeant omnes qui nati sunt, quadripedia uero et pecora
ioceundur. Multum enim melius est illis quam nobis, non enim sperant iudicium,
nec enim sciunt cruciamenta nec saltem post mortem repromissam sibi. Nobis autem
quid prodest, quoniam salutati salvabimur, si tormento tormentabimur? Omnes enim
qui nati sunt, committiti sunt iniquitibus, et pleni sunt peccatis, et grauati delictis;
Et si non essemus post mortem in iudicio unientes, melius fortassist nobis uenisset.
Et respondit ad me et dixit: et quando Altissimus faciens faciebat saeculum, Adam
et omnes qui cum eo uenierunt, primum praeparavit iudicium et quae sunt iudicii.
Et nunc de sermonibus tuis intellege, quoniam dixisti, quia nobiscum crescit sensus;

65. omnes omnes altered to homines.
66. quoniam quum altered to quod. si sect altered to si.
67. in iudicio unientes "iudicio unientes.
68. intellege...crescit sensus; Qui intellege "vet mutam...crescit, qui ...

66. Multum enim melius] In like manner our MS. has multum (for multo) plus uae his, chap. xiii.
16. This use of 'multum' with a comparative, not unknown in classical authors, as Plaut. Most. iii. 2.
x. 1. 94, is of rare occurrence in biblical MSS. According to Vercellone, some authorities have multum
as a variant in Ruth iv. 15, et multo tibi melior est.
The same construction in Gk. is more familiar from Homer downwards; comp. also 4 Macc. i. 8, ii. 6,
2 Cor. viii. 22, 1 Pet. i. 7 (text. rec.), and πολὺ (text. rec., πολλὸν πάλιν Heb. xii. 9, 25. This should not be
confounded with πολὺ πάλιν ἴδι in Num. xiv. 12,
Deut. ix. 14, which is an attempt to represent the
Hebr. idiom for the comparative of the adj. See
Is. liv. 1, LXX.

In Arab.2 we must read with the MS.
الكثير (not "الكثير ")
The other versions have no particle corresponding
to the third enim in this verse.

68. committiti sunt iniquitibus] Perhaps συμπεπαιδήμων εἰσὶν ἀνθρώπως; at least there is a strong
probability that some form of πεπαιδήμων stood in the original of this clause, for the
φαρμακείων of the Syr. (comp. the Syro-Heb. of Is. xiv. 19, Lam. iv. 14
Sym., Ezek. xvi. 6, 22, Job vii. 5, xxx. 14, xxxix. 30,
Jer. iii. 2), and the
مديونين (="πεπαιδήμων") of the Arab., both point in this direction. The Gk.

69. in iudicio uenientes] Instead of in iudicium uen.

70. sim eo] According to the Syr., Ethis., and Arab.,
ex eo. Comp. ex eo, iii. 21, vi. 54, vii. 118 (48), A. and S.
71. sensus is omitted in the MS. after crescit,
and the corrector in perplexity has inserted vel sensum after intellege.
72 Qui ergo commorantes sunt in terra, hiunc cruciabuntur, quoniam sensum habentes iniquitatem fecerunt, et mandata accipientes non seruauerunt ea, et legem consequiti fraudauerunt eam quam acceperunt. Et quot habebant dicere in iudicio, vel quo modo respondebunt in nouissimis temporibus? Quantum enim tempus ex quo longanimitatem habuit Altissimus his qui inhabitant saeculum, et non propter eos, sed propter ea quae prouidit tempora! Et respondi et dixi: si inueni gratiam coram te, domine, demonstra, domine, seruo tuo, si post mortem uel nunc quando reddimus unusquisque animam suam, si consenueri conservabimus in requie, donecueniant temporis illa, in quibus incipies creaturam renouare, aut amodo cruciamur. Et respondit ad me et dixit: ostendam tibi et hoc; tu autem noli commiseri cum eis qui spreuerunt, neque connumeres te cum his qui cruciantur. Etenim est tibi thesaurus operum repositus apud Altissimum, sed non tibi demonstrabitur usque in nouissimis temporibus. Nam de morte sermo est: quando protectus fuerit terminus sententiae ab Altissimo ut homo moriatur, recedente inspiratione de corpore ut dimittatur iterum ad eum qui dedit adorare gloriam Altissimi primum. Et si quidem esset corum qui spreuerunt et non seruuerunt uiam Altissimi, et eorum qui contempererunt legem

75. demonstra, domine, demonstra dnc. reddimus reddemus altered to reddimus.

78. est $e$ added above the line.

79. spreuerunt inspirauerunt.

72. et legem consequiti fraudauerunt cam] This reading is probably correct; comp. nec enim uidentur voluisse fraudare edictum, Digest. 29, ii. 42; fraudandae legis gratia, id. 35, i. 64; though the Syr. $\text{ןוֹכַל}^\prime$, pointing to $\text{רְשָׁרָאָא}$ rather suggests frustrauerunt. Comp. Ps. cxxiii. 11, LXX., Valg., and Syro-Hex., and the use of frustrari in a similar context, Iren. iv. 9, 3, 12. 1 (ol. Stieren), Tert. Apol. v.

In the Arab. we must translate thus: 'have set up for themselves an opposite law;' and not with Ockley (and Hilgenf.), $\text{have set up their pleasures as an opposite law;}$ for the word in question should be read $\text{לְגָּדוֹתָא}^\prime$ and not $\text{לְגָּדוֹתִּמ}^\prime$.

75. ...domine, demonstra, domine, seruo tuo] The domine which is placed in direct antithesis to seruo tuo is struck out as superfluous in the MS.; yet it probably represents a Gk. word, for where the former domine stands, the orig. according to the Syr. would be $\text{διότοις καὶ}$, but there are signs of variations in the Gk. text, for these words have no equivalent in the Eth. and Arab., while the Lat. translator seems to have divided them between the two clauses. The formula is correctly rendered dominator domine in a similar context, chap. vi. 11, xii. 7, 8.

78. The Syr. supplies hic before sermo.

79. spreuerunt] The MS. has inspirauerunt, which is unintelligible, and can only be a mechanical repetition from verse 78. Both the Syr. and Eth.
eius, et eorum qui oderunt eos qui timent eum. Haec inspirationes in habitaciones non ingredientur, sed uagantes erunt amodo in cruciamentis, dolentes semper et tristes.

81. Uia prima, quia spreuerunt legem Altissimi. Secunda uia, quoniam non possunt reversionem bonam facere ut uiant. Tertia uia, uident repositam mercedem his qui testamentum Altissimi crediderunt. Quarta uia, considerabunt sibi in nouissimis repositum cruciamentum. Quinta uia, uidentes aliorum habitaculum ab angelis conservari cum silentio magno. Sexta uia, uidentes quenadmodum de eis pertransient in cru-

80. hae haece altered to hae. inspirationes inspirationis altered to -nies.
84. considerabunt considered to considerabunt.
86. pertransient in pertransientem altered to pertransientes.

Refer us to ἀλέξιος, which a common equivalent is speror. 1 have therefore substituted spreuerunt.


The recocente inspirationes of ver. 78 smoothes the way to the use of inspirationes in the sense of disembodied souls. For the controversies which originated from identifying inspiratio with anima, comp. Diod. on Gen. ii. 7: ίππαξον ζων κακώς, το τραφέρη του θεοι γεγενήθη ψυχή τήν ἀδύνατον, κ.τ.λ. (Catena in octet. et libr. Reg. Lips. 1772), and Philostrinus de haeres. chap. 98: Αιτα εστι haecres, quae dicit inspirationem animum esse, non inspirationem (v.1. ne) in animam datum fasisse .. Further references may be found in the note of Fabricius on the passage last quoted.

sed uagantes erunt] Since the Arab. as rendered by Ockley, bound up with (Hilgenf. ligabullum cum), has been used by Volkmar to construct a highly improbable theory with regard to the verb in the original, it may be noticed that this version has simply खसौरा 'numbered (or, reckoned) with' in Arab.2 tristes We miss per septem uias after this word. Comp. verse 91. It is represented in all the other versions.

83. testamentia Altissimi The words (comp. chap. iii. 32, r. 29) are absent from the Syr. Corresponding words are found in the Ehd. and Arab.

84. The Syr. alone makes an addition at the end of this verse, which is thus rendered by Ceriani: in quo corripientur animae inspiratorum; quia cum habentem tempus operationum, non subissent se praeceptis Altissimi.

84, 85. Hippolytus (ex eis prius "Ελληνας λόγου του ἐπεγγραμμένου κατά Πλάτωνος περί τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς airias) has worked out these ideas in detail: οἱ ἔργα δὲ τοῦ μιν θραυμαθείσες ἀποκαλοῦσιν καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀτρομο ὁκ ἀμοφοίζουσι, αὐτὴς δὲ τῆς ἐργούς ὅρφων τῆς ὑβεροῦ καὶ ὑφεβαλλόντως ἐπικαὶ ἔμεν τοῦ πυρὸς ἀρκας καταπελείγα, τῇ προσομοίᾳ τῆς ἀκρον, προεον κράσας ὧδε δυνάμει κολαξίμενον, ἀλλά καὶ σύν τὸν τῶν πατρῶν χρόνον (ær. lect. χρόνον) καὶ τοὺς ἐκαίσαις ὄροις, καὶ εἶ αὐτῷ τοῦτο κολαξίμενον. (Ed. de Lagarde, p. 60)

86. quenadmodum de eis pertransient in cruciamentum There is great diversity in the transla-
87. ciamentum. Septima uia est omnium quae supradictae sunt uiarum maior, quoniam detaebescit in confusione et consumentur in honoribus et marcescit in timoribus, uidentes gloriain Altissimi coram quem uidentes peccauerunt et coram

87. uia crucis. Uia. in confusionem. consumentur consumentur altered to consumentur. honoribus honoribus altered to horribus. coram quem coram quem altered to coram quO. uidentes uidentes.

...tions of this passage; in the Syr. (quia uident, quod amodo eis preparatum est, crucis, crucis) it is little more than a repetition of verse 54, but just as the via VI adds to the via III the part borne by the angels, so we might expect in the via VI a corresponding addition to the via IV, and this idea is expressed by the use of the causative form of the verb in the Eth. quod cognit [sc. Angeli] eos circumire et uider e, quod amodo eis contingi, crucis, crucis. Now the main difference between the Lat. and the Eth. may be accounted for by supposing them to have been derived from the Gk. αιτίων διακοιμηθέντων εις τον λαθραυσμόν, the verb having been taken as mid. (comp. διακοιμηθέντων, διελθών, Hesych. and Suid.), in the one case, but more correctly as pass., in the other; the same compound is used by Plato in a similar context: τίνες δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν προσέκουσαν τιμωρίαν είναί εὗθελα μίην εἶναι καὶ εἰσάκουσθαι εἰς καὶ τῶν εἰς ἀγρότητας εἰς διακοιμηθεῖσας τις, De Legibus, lib. x. p. 906.

The twofold office thus assigned to the Angels in ver. 55, 86 is set forth at length by Hippias in the work quoted above (ed. de Lagarde pp. 68, 69): ταύτα τὸ χωρίον (ἐκ αὐτῶν) αἰτίων διακοιμηθέντων εἰς τὸν λαθραυσμόν, the verb having been taken as mid. (comp. διακοιμηθέντων, διελθών, Hesych. and Suid.), in the one case, but more correctly as pass., in the other; the same compound is used by Plato in a similar context: τίνες δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν προσέκουσαν τιμωρίαν είναί εὗθελα μίην εἶναι καὶ εἰσάκουσθαι εἰς καὶ τῶν εἰς ἀγρότητας εἰς διακοιμηθεῖσας τις, De Legibus, lib. x. p. 906.

The Bodl. MS. of Arab. has here بَرَّاح, also بَرَاح in v. 83, both agreeing with Steiner's conj. For the former the Vat. MS. has بَرَّاح.
88 quem incipient in novissimis temporibus iudicari. Nam corum qui uias seruaue-

87. coram quem coram quo -no written over an eras.

205, and Wolfflin, Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein, Philologus Bd. 34, pp. 161, 162. With the orig. reading detab, in confusionem comp. et consummatur in confusionem, Jer. xx, 18, Cod. Amiat. The corresponding verb in the Arab. has been rendered shall be overthrown, Ockley (superfunditur, Fabr.), superannuatur in Hilgenf. But the word is evidently connected in meaning with the detauban of the Lat. version. Comp. the cogn. root ταντοιος, and P.L. ivii. 9. Castell (Lex. Hebtl.) gives 'πανδιακος (cf. manusit... ut effusus, protensus fuit. BB.' (the reference is to Bar Bahliu sub voc. Theor. κεφαλαία) gives 'πανδιακος. ουτός]' Cod. Cantab.)

Arab. has here diocecell sie in der Schande gerichtet worden. Steiner. For the second word I would read 'shall be made to pine away.' This slight alteration brings the above compendium into harmony with all the other versions.

in honoribus] It is not easy to explain satisfactorily the origin of the MS. reading honoribus (pr. m.), honoribus (o corr.). The plur. of honor is not in the Vulg., but we find in the Old Lat. hororum (Gk. φόνμ), Job xxxiii, 16, Cod. Maj. Mon. (Sabad.). By the correction this clause is drawn into parallelism with the following, both the Syr. and Edh. versions lead us to expect in pudore, synonymous with the preceding in confusionem. Ambrose also in his reference to this passage has et pudorem et confusionem. So that the Gk. had most likely the words αἰρείσις...αναπαθής, which are found together in the LXX, Ps. xxxiv, 26, xliii, 16, lviii, 26, cviii, 29, also Is. ix. 7, Thoed.; the corresponding verbs occur more frequently in parallelism. The Armenian is thus rendered by Petersmann: quia mcærimentur et consummatur pudore et ignominia et circumdatae sunt intellectu et timore. It may be mentioned here that the order is different in the Arm. version, the above vii mine being placed after the vii mine animaram instauram.

coram quem...et coram quem] Our MS. has in the first case, quem pr. man, and in the second, quo with the last two letters written over an eras. I conclude, therefore, that quem was the original reading in both places. In like manner, coram nos is written, but nos is altered to nobis iv, 14, Cod. A. and S. Comp. also vi. 36, xix. 28, Cod. S. Rönsch (p. 409) quotes only one example of 'coram' with the accus., viz. 1 Thess. iii. 9, Cod. Clarom. To this may be added, Lev. xxvi. 7, Num. viii. 22, xix. 3, xxv. 6, Cod. Ashburnh.; Acts iv. 19, viii. 32, xix. 9, Cod. Land. (ed. Tisch.); Deut. iv. 8, 1 Reg. xii. 2, Old Lat. Speculum (Mai, Not. Patr. Bibl. i. 2, pp. 60, 114); Jer. xiv. 9, Par. Palimps. Wirceburg. (ed. Rame); Acts vi. 8, Cod. Par. Lat. 6400 G. (Old Lat. palimp. fragments at Paris, A. A. Vansittart, Journ. of Philol. ii. p. 244); 1 Kings xi. 19, Cod. Reg. Suec. 1462 (Blanchini, Vind. Can. cccxl); Juvenecus, Sol. Fragm. xxvi. (Pitra, Specil. Seldm. vol. i. p. 248.)

For with the MS. has uidentes here, and again in verse 94: on the other hand, in uidentes, chap. i. 37, and uidenti, chap. ii. 45, the 'd' is the result of a correction, having been originally written as 'a'.

88. Nasi corum qui ...(89) commorando. So also in the Syr. MS. the masc. pl. ανα — is followed by the fem. pl. ανα —. Possibly the first clause in the original was so constructed that the gender of the subject would not be immediately apparent, as, for instance, ταν χρω τα ταν υψιστον δεσμων φαλαξιων. But from the nature of the case, we find in the Lat. as in the other versions great fluctuation of gender pervading the succeeding verses, and I have not attempted to introduce uniformity.

nasi also occurs vi. 56 Cod. S. For examples of nasi and nasi, see Rönsch, p. 260 (the ref. to Lure. vi. 233 should have been given on the authority of Marc. Capella, as nasi, not nasi, appears to be the reading of the MSS). Add nasi, Lev. xiii. 59 Cod.
89 runt Altissimi ordo est hic, quando incipient sermoni a uaso corruptibili. In eo tempore commoratae seruentur cum labore Altissimo, et omni hora sustinuerunt periculum, uti perfecte custodirent legislatoris legem. Propter quod hic de his sermo: Imprimis uident cum exultatione multa gloriam eius qui suscipit eam. 92 requiescent enim per septem ordines. Ordo primus, quoniam cum labore multo certati sunt, ut sineerent cum eis plasmatum cogitamentum malum, ut non eas soducat a uita in mortem. Secundus ordo, quoniam uident complicationem, in qua

88. incipient incepit altered to incipient. uaso uaso altered to uaso.
89. sustinuerunt sustinerunt altered to sustinuerunt. uti uti altered to ut.
91. multa multa.
92, 93. in mortem. Secundus... Item secundus...
93. complicationem complicationem altered to complicationem. qua quo.


89. In eo tempore commoratae] According to the Syr.: In ullo tempore quo commoratae sunt in eo. Similarly the Eth.

cum labore] So the Syr. and Eth. In the Arab, this gives place to the usual phrase in timore (om. eius in Hilgenf.).
91. I have altered multa to multa on the authority of the Syr. and Eth. versions.

ordine] The versions are equally divided with regard to this word. From the Lat., Eth. and Arab., we might infer that ra'as was used for the series that follows, while the Syr., Arab. and Arum require the same word as that used in the former series, viz. ëas. Comp. especially the three leading versions in verse 99, where the two series are mentioned together; the Syr. is consistent in obliterateing the distinction between the words, the Eth., as well as the Lat., in maintaining it.


In the Arab, is rightly rendered by Ockley, through the deceitfulness of, and Steiner's correction impictae is included for; see the verb in verse 48 (Ew. 45); comp. also Job xix. 4, Transl. Ant. Arab. (ed. Comm. de Boeclissin), and especially Cast. Lex. s. v. For ut eos deflectere, in the translation of the Arab., read ut declinarent.

In justification of my departure from the MS. reading, a uta. Item secundus, I may remark that a comparison of the other verses in this and the former series shows that Item is an intruder before the ordinal, while the consent of the Syr., Eth. and Arab. versions goes far to prove that it is corrupted from in mortem, which is to be appended to the preceding sentence.

93. quoniam uident] Instead of تَروُون, the MS. of Arab. has تَأْروُون; comp. the beginning of the neighbouring verses.

et quae in eis manet punitio] We can scarcely doubt, if we regard the context together with the Syr. and Eth. versions, that the Gr. text would be more correctly represented by et quae eis (or in manet punitio; this, I believe, was the original form of the Latin, the preposition having crept in by the force of association. A like faulty reading meets us in the Old Lat. vers. of Job xx. 26, Et omnes tendebant in eo maneat, Cod. Maj. Mon. (Sabat.), from the Gk. σὰν δὲ συνὸν αὐτῷ ὑπομείνα. Comp. also Ps. xxxii. 29, Animam nostram patientem est.
94 uagantur impiorum animae, et quae in eis manet punitio. Tertius ordo, uidentes testimonium quod testificatus est eis qui plasmuit cas, quoniam uidentes serua-

94. quod quod quae uidentes uidentes.

_in Domino_, Cod. Sangern., where other MSS. omit _in_ (Sabat.) , the Gk. being _η ψυχή ημῶν_ νεωτίας τό_ Κυρίος_. The construction of 'manet' with the accus. and also with the dat., being rare in biblical Latin, would be especially liable to give way to a more familiar use of the word. A few examples of each may be quoted, not inappropriate to the matter in hand: (a) for the accus., _Acts_ xx. 23, Vulg.; _Iactant_. _Instit_. _Epist_. _cap_. _LXI_. et _illos aeternam poenam manere_... _see Bönenmann's note_. (b) for the dat., _Acts_ xx. 23, Cod. Bezoe, _magnus_ mi (sic), and the following passages, both from the translation of Rufinus, et _illos silent in iudicio gratiora manere supplieia_, Clem. _Recogn._ ii. 13: _Immortales tibi crede manere in iudicio et honores et poenas_, Sext. Sententiae, No. 14 (ed. Gildemeister). Comp. also the note on verse 35.

94. quoniam uidentes servavercunt quae per fidem data est lex. The original of this sentence, owing to the varying shades of meaning in _pistis_, has received different interpretations, which may be conveniently arranged in two classes according to the construction of the word in question:

(1) where it is connected with the 'giving of the law,' as in the Lat., and in the Syr. also, where the two words have become blended in the verb _δοθηκεν_ , 'the (law) which was entrusted to them,' or, 'with which they were entrusted.'

(2) where it is connected with 'the keeping of the law,' as seems to be the case in the Arm., from _Petermann's transl._: _quod magna fide servavit, quae datae ei sunt_, leges. In the Arab. also it is mixed up with this clause. To the same class we might refer the _Eth._, as exhibited in Laurence's transl.: _quod servauerunt fideli in uita sua lege_, _quae iis data est_. But when literally rendered it will run thus: _g. s._ _in u. s. lege_ _quae in fide iis data est_. If the former of the relative pronouns be omitted as superfluous, this version would range with class (2), if the latter, with class (1). Neither Dillmann nor Pretorius supplies variants, but on referring to the MSS. of the _Brit. Mus._, I find that one only (Or. 490) supports the double relative of the printed text, while all the others (Add. 16,138, Or. 459, Or. 492, Or. 502, Or. 503, Or. 504, Or. 506) omit it in the second place, and thus give their authority in favour of ranking this version with class (1). We may pass over the Arab., compendium and the paraphrase of Ambrose, for ' _pista_' disappears in the brevity of the one, and in the diffuseness of the other. It will, perhaps, satisfy all the requirements of the case, if we assume that the words _in pista_ were so placed in the sentence, that they could be joined grammatically, either with the subordinate, or with the principal verb, as in the two classes just described. Although the Lat. and the Syr. versions both belong to the former class, yet in the one the words in question were taken to denote the state of mind in which, or the means whereby, the law was received, _per fide_, while in the other they seem to have been understood in the sense of ' _in trust_,' ' _as a charge_,'- 'they kept the law which was given them in trust;'_ comp. _Rom_. iii. 2; _1 Tim_. vi. 20; _2 Tim_. i. 12, 14; _Herm_. _Past._ _Mand_. ii. et al. When construed with the principal verb the same expression naturally took the sense of ' _in good faith_,' ' _faithfully_,' as in 2 _Kings_ xxii. 7, _πιστείς_ ὁ πρεσβύτερος _καὶ ἐπισκόπως_ = _δι' ἐν πιστεῖ αὐτοῦ πιστεύω_, LXX. The whole clause, constructed as we have supposed, receives a remarkable illustration from a passage in the Shepherd of Hermas ( _Vis._ i. 3), which seems to be a reminiscence of the one before us, and which in like manner has given rise to two different interpretations; it stands thus: καὶ πάντα ὅμοιοι γίνοντο τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτῶν, ἢα ὅποια ἂν τῆς ἐπισκόπου ἢν ἐπισκόπευσε μετὰ πολλῆς δόξης καὶ χαρᾶς, ἐὰν περίσσως τὰ νόμιμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἄπαν τὰ παράλαβον ἐν μεγάλῃ πίστει (ed. _Hilgenf._ 1866, p. 7, comp. add. p. 175); in the Old Lat. transl._...si servauerunt legitimae dei, quae accipierunt in magna fide_ (ed. _Hilgenf._ 1873). Translators and editors have generally attached the last three words to the verb which immediately precedes, and so Zahn: _dass die Christen_.
95 uerunt quae per fidem data est lex. Quartus ordo, intellegentes requiem quam nunc in promptuariis congregati requiescent cum silentio multo ab angelis conservati, †atque in nonissimis corum manentem gloriam.† Quintus ordo, exultantes quomodo corruptibile essigerint nunc, et futurum quomodo hereditatem possidebant.

95. quam quem altered to qua. †atque et quae altered to atque.
96. corruptibile corripiibile altered to corruptibile. futurum futurum altered to futurum. possidebunt possider.

sie [die Gesetz Gottes] in gesamten Glauben empfingon haben (‘Der Hirt des Hermas untersucht,’ p. 176). He also refers in connexion with the subject to another passage from the same work: aétos γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῶν εἰς τὰς καρδίας τῶν πιστῶν, Simil. viii. 3. (From this point of view reference might also be made to the following quotation from Papias: αὐτῆς τὰς ἀλληλογίας ἑτολᾶ ἰσομοιότατος, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῆς πίστει δεδομένα καὶ ὅπερ αὐτῆς παρηγορώμενοι (v. 1. ἡς) τῆς ἀληθείας. Eus. Hist. Eccl. iii. 39.)

On the other hand the structure of the preceding clause, and the presence of the strong epithet before πᾶσας, might be urged in favour of connecting these words with παραχθῆναι, and accordingly we find the passage thus rendered by the latest English translator: if they shall keep with firm faith the laws of God which they have received (The Shepherd of Hermas, transl. by C. H. Hods, 1879).

lex] Attracted, like punctum in the preceding verse, to the case of the relative. See Winers Gr. xxiv. 2 (ed. Monlout). Examples of this construction (occasionally altered by later scribes) are found in iv. 23 (populus Cod. A., S., populus C. 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, H.), vi. 54, vii. 52 (animalis Cod. A., S., animalis C. 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, H.), xxiii. 49 (where Cod. A. has gentes pr. m., gentium e corr.). Comp. also the next example.

95. †atque in nonissimis corum manentem gloriam.] Want of familiarity with the particular usage of ‘manet’ mentioned above (see note on v. 95) seems here also to have introduced corruption into the text of the Lat. It will be seen that atque was in the first instance written as et quae; if we take this as the clue to the original construction, we may restore the passage thus: et quae in nonissimis cora (or eis) manet gloria. This emendation will bring the clause into harmony with the Syr. and .Eth., and will better explain the epithet which Ambrose uses in his paraphrase of this verse: et futurum sui gloriam praeider. Comp. especially his language in Extr. C.: Alius manet poena, alias gloria.

96. I have recourse to the original reading futurum (= to mullo), which is supported by the Syr. and .Eth. The correction to futurum was made at a later time, to help the reader through a construction which had become obsolete. Among the early attempts to get a Latin equivalent for the Greek compound λαργομαίνει, one was, to resolve it into the two words hereditatem possidebant, followed by an accusative; e. g. et sentam eius hereditatem possidebit terram, Ps. xxiv. 13 Rom. Martinael. Corb. et Coislin. (Sabal.), ipi hereditatem possidebant terram, Ps. xxxvi. 9 MSS. Sancerna. Coislin. et Corb. (id.), hereditatem possideamus nobis sanctuarium Dei, Ps. lxxxi. 12 MS. Sancerna. Psalt. Corb. et Mozar. (id.). Again in the Old Lat. Specimen: ut beneficitionem hereditatem possideatis 1 Pet. iii. 9 (Mai, Nov. Patr. Bll. t. 2, p. 16), but when quoted again it stands thus: ut ben. hereditate poss. (id. p. 24). Comp. also Jer. aix. i. and Ezek. xxxiii. 25 in the Cod. Amiat. In all these instances we find a second and an easier reading, hereditate poss., which, confirmed as it was by the weight of Augustines authority, succeeded ultimately in supplanting the other. In a short discussion on the best way of rendering λαργομαίνει, that father says: Melius ergo dixeris hereditatem integer sensus; sine dicatur, Hereditate posside; sine dicatur, Hereditate acquisitis; non hereditatem sed hereditate, Enarr. in Ps. cviii. 111. There is one other passage in the 4th book of Ezra, where this archaic
bunt, alhuc autem uidentes angustum et [labore] plenum, quioniam liberati sunt, 
97 et spatiosum, [quod incipient] recipere fruniscendos et immortales. Sextus ordo, 
quando eis ostendetur, quomodo incipiet ultus eorum fulgere sicut sol, et quomodo 
incipient stellarum adsimili lumini, amodo non corrupti. Septimus ordo, qui est 
omnius supradiectis maior, quioniam exultabunt cum fiducia et quioniam confide-

97. ostendetur ostenditur. amodo quomodo. 
98. fiducia fiducia altered to tia. confidebant confidebant altered to confidunt.

expression originally stood, though now disguised by successive corrections, viz. chap. vi. 59, quare non haereditatem possidemus cum sacculo? (ed. Fritzsch). Here the pos. nostrum sacculo of Cod. S. leads us halfway back to the true reading, pos. nostrum sacculos, which is required by the versions, and preserved in Cod. A. alone. In the latter part of this verse it will be found that the Lat. has been much corrupted. I have attempted to emend it by the aid of the Syr., the .Eth, and the extract (19) from Ambrose, where he again takes up the fifth order, and professes to give a verbal quotation. The sense would be still clearer if, as the Syr. suggests, a quo were substituted for quioniam.

{fruniscendos] This rare word has been corrupted in the MS. to frui nescientes, and replaced by the simple form fruentes in Ambrose. Besides the examples given in Lexicous, the verb occurs in Tob. iii. 9, MS. Regin. Suec. (Rönsch, p. 236), and Commodianus, Instr. xxxvii., Carin. Apol. 298 (Pitra, Spic. Seleusm. i, pp. 29, 540).

97. Comp. Dan. xii. 3. Matth. xiii. 43. 
amodo] The quamodo of our MS. seems to have been suggested by the preceding clauses. The Syr. and Eth. are in favour of the change to amodo. Comp. Ambrose also, who has qui tamen fulgor eorum corruptibilim iam sentire non possit.

98. cum fiducia] The MS. of the Arab. has here. The latter word has occasioned some difficulties. Ockley says: There is no such Arabic word that I know of, as occurs here in the MS. He accordingly left a lacuna in the translation which was filled up by Fabricius thus: (in mag-

nitive) beatitatis. Ewald remarks: نايل ver- 
schrieben für d. i. dāl: ich bemerke dies nur Ockley's wegen. Steiner follows with a new conjecture: Für نايل ist nicht (wie Ewald will) 
, sondern نايل zu lesen: dass sie sich freuen werden über die Grösse seines (Gottes) Wesens... There can be no doubt, however, that so far as the correction to نايل is concerned, Ewald is correct, though by translating it mit höchster Lust, in his 'Wiederherstellung,' which is here based on the Arab., he fails to bring out the special meaning of the word. After all, the form نايل is given in Castell's Lex., referred to the root دال fut. o. It occurs in Bar Bahlul as the explanation of the corresponding Syr. word in this passage, دال, and it stands in the Arab. of the Polygl., where the Gk. has πανοραμα, throughout the Epistles of St. Paul and St. John, except in Eph. vi. 19, Phil. i. 20, and Col. ii. 15, where كلام is used, which is the constant equivalent in the Acts of the Apostles, as كلام is in the Gospels.

confidebant] So ostendebebit vi. 25 Codd. A. and S. and surgyebit xvi. 10 Cod. S.; for verbs of the 3rd conj. with fut. in -bebo see Rönsch, pp. 291, 591, and J. N. Ott, Neue Jahrbiicher für Philol. v. Pädagog. 1874, p. 538. Add, from the Cod. Ashburnah, confidebant Num. x. 5; from the Old Lat. Speculum, confidebunt Is. xxxiv. 4 (Mai, Nov. Patr. Bibl. i. 2. p. 36), Prov. xvi. 2 (id. p. 48), Matth. xxiv. 29 (id. p. 37); metebebit Eccles. xviii. 27 (id. p. 49): from the Cod. Dobbien, resurgibit Mark x. 34 (Wien
bunt non confusi, et gaudebunt non reuerentes, festinant enim uidere uultum 99 [eius], cui seruiunt uinentes et a quo incipiant gloriosi mercedem recipere. Hic ordo animarum iustorum, ut amodo adnuntiatur, praecliae uine cruciatus, quas 100 patientur amodo qui neglegentur. Et respondi et dixi: ergo debitur tempus animabus postquam separatae fuerint de corporibus, ut uideant de quo mihi 101 dixisti? Et dixit: septem diebus erit libertas carum, ut uideant qui praeclii 102 sunt sermones, et postea congregebantur in habitaculis suis. Et respondi et dixi:

Jahrbücher der Lit. Vol. 121, cxvurgebil Mark xiii. 12 (id); from the Cod. Amiat, canebit Hos. ii. 15. The frequent use of this form is a marked feature in the verses translated from the Gk. which are interspersed throughout the Vulg. of Isaiah publ. by Jos. Cozza (Sac. Bibl. Vetustis. Fragm. ex Palimp., Codd. Bibl. Cryptoferratensis, Romae, 1867); e.g. apponebit xvi. 8, ascendebit xxxiv. 10, bibebunt xix. 5, canebit xxii. 25, clauidebet xxix. 10, confidebunt xvii. 8, currebunt xlv. 31, deponebit xxxiii. 23, descendebis xiv. 15, dicebit xix. 11, ponebit xxii. 18, supponebi xix. 16.

non reuercntes] The parallelism requires us to read thus, by the omission of a single letter; similarly in Eccles. xlii. 19, Cod. S. Theod. has reuerti-mini for reuercntias. Compare the phrase con-fundantur et reuercntur; Ps. xxxiv. 4 (and verse 26 in Jerome, from the Hebr.), xxxix. 13, lxi. 3, in which places axiosphqecv (καρανοχ—Ps. xxxix. 15), eivparcayecv stands in the LXX, similarly Ps. lxx. 24. This emendation is also supported by the paraphrase of Ambrose, et sine trepidatione habitu- tur. Referring to other versions we find that the above clause is either absent or obscured.

uultum[eius] The pronoun has been inserted from the paraphrase of Ambrose supported by the Syr., the .Eth., and Arab., as the following clauses would be harsh without it.

gloriosi] A rendering of θεοβαεωνμεν by its adjectival θεος (e.g. 1 Pet. i. 8), instead of its strict participial sense (comp. ἡςας). The use of gloriosi here may be illustrated by cases where it interchanges with a passive form, as quam gloriosum fact, 2 Sam. vi. 20, whilst the same passage as quoted by Ambrose in Ps. cviii. stands thus: quid alique honorificatus est (Τύθεοβαεων, LXX), so also gloriosus apparet, 2 Sam. vi. 22, glorificator, in Ambr. (ib.). Again, nomen nunc gloriosum est, Hieron. in Mal. i. 11, glorificatum est in the quotation of the same verse by Hieron. in Is. lix, Tert. ad Marc. iii. 22, iv. 1, Aug. Epist. 93, 155 (see Salat.). Comp. also I Macc. ii. 61.

99. The text of our MS. is here corrupt. I have made a few slight changes, but something more is necessary in order to disentangle the two clauses. If we refer to the other versions, both the .Eth. and the Arab. suggest the insertion of et haco before praecliae, a correction which might be proposed with confidence if it were favoured by the Syr. also, but this version would lead us to reconstruct the Lat. thus: et praecliae uine cruciatus patientur aumo... If we look merely at the Lat. text, the addition of sunt might be accepted as a solution of the difficulty, e.g., praecliae sunt uine cruc. quas, etc. For neglererint see note on diligentia, verse 57. At the end of this verse the Syr. repeats, with a few verbal variations, our eightieth verse (= end of verse 39 Syr.). In the Aram. vv. 79—87 are transferred to this place (after uitorum).

100. tempus] The Syr. alone has an unnecessary addition, locus aut tempus.
si inueni gratiam ante oculos tuos, demonstra mihi adhuc seruo tuo, si in die
103 iudiciei iusti impios excusare poterint uel deprrecari pro eis Altissimum. Si patres
pro filiis, uel filii pro parentibus, si fratres pro fratribus, si ad fines pro proximis,
104 si fidentes pro carissimis. [Et respondit ad me et dixit: quomiam inuenisti gra-
tiam ante oculos meos, et hoc demonstrabo tibi: dies iudiciei dies deceretius est,
et omnibus signaculum ueritatis ostendet; quemadmodum enim nunc non mittit
pater filium, uel filius patrem, uel dominus seruum], uel fidus carissimus, ut pro

102. poterint poterint altered to poternunt. uel et altered to uel.
104. [Et respondet—seruam] is not in the MS. uel carissimus altered to provido carissimus.

102. impios excusare] In the Syr. ἡμικοινον ὑπερ τον ἑαυτόν on which Lo Hir remarks:
"Interrogare impios." Gr. ἑτερον περὶ uel ὑπὲρ, his translatus est in Syr., pars falso per "interrogare,"
denide rectius uoce ἱστομάτως, petere. The Syr., however, does not deviate from the Lat., for the
verb must be taken as Aphel and rendered excusare. We have an instance of this rare use of
the form in Luke xiv. 18, 19, Curt. Syr. ἀπέκτεινεν = τις με παράγγειλον habe me excusatum.
i. iii. 45, iv. 7, 31, v. 9, etc. Cod. Ashburnh.

103. fidentes] This word corresponds to fidus in the next verse, similarly fidicntes is opposed to
perfidis in datur velocius tutela fidicntes, perfidis poena, Cypr. de Mortal. xv. We have instances of
participial forms used as substantives in discipulis = discipulus μαθητής, e.g. in Acts vi. 5 Cod. Par. 6400
(Journ. of Philol. n. p. 243), audienst = auditor ἀκουόντης, Jae. i. 25 Cod. Corb. (Sabat.). For other reff.
see Rönsch, It. u. Vulg. p. 107, D. N. T. Tertullianus, p. 628, and Hartel's Ind. to Cypr. sub Participia.
The word fidentes seems to be merely a peculiarity of the Lat.; there is nothing in the Oriental vers,
suggestive of any other reading than filio. Comp. for the argument, Hippolytus in the work before
quoted: τούτου...οὐ παράγιντα συγγελην μετατε-
νιαν ὁλησα (ed. de Lagarde, p. 71), and for the
language, Constil. Apos. ii. 14: Εἰ δὲ πατέρα ὑπὲρ τίκων ὅπι τιμωρόντα, οὔτε νικὸ ὑπὸ πατέρα, δίκην
ὡς οὔτε γυναικίν ὑπὸ ἄδορα, οὔτε οἰκίαν ὑπὸ δε-
σποτῶν, οὔτε συγγελην ὑπὸ συγγελην, οὔτε φίλοιν ὑπὸ φίλοιν,
οὔτε δίκαιον [var. lect. δίκαιον] ὑπὸ δίκαιον
Ἄλλο ἐκατος ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου ζηρού τὸν λόγον ὀπίσωγ-
θησαν. οὔτε γὰρ ὅτι... Hilgenf. quotes an illustration
from Apocal. Esdrae, p. 27, ed. Tischend.

104. Et respondit—vel dominus seruam] This passage is omitted in our MS., and the construc-
tion of the following words has been adapted to the con-
text by a corrector. The lacuna is here filled up
by the aid of the other translations.
signaculum ueritatis] = σφραγίς τῆς ἀληθείας, and in accordance with this
the Arab. كَمَّلَ الْعِقَمَ الْعَلِيمَ 'like the seal that
confirms the truth.' I therefore see no reason for
accepting the conjecture γνῶσις dem die
Wahrheit entscheidenden Beschluß, which is prop-
osed by Steiner (Hilgenf. Zeitscr. xl. p. 429), and
embodied in the translation given by Hilgenf.

intellegere] According to the Syr. and Eth., the
original would be οὐν ὅτι, for which there seems to
have been a various reading, οὐν ὅτι, which is repre-
sented in the clearest way by the Lat. and Arab. Examples of a similar confusion are not uncommon,
e.g. Chrysos. Hom. in Matth. 692 A, νοσθήματα μανιά (ed. Bened.), where Field restores νομήσατα, and Seve-
105 eo intellegat, aut dormiat, aut manducet, aut curetur; Sic nunquam nemo pro ali-quo rogabit, omnes enim portabunt unusquisque tunc iniustitias suas aut institiarias.
106 (36) Et respondi et dixi: et quomodo iuenimus modo, quoniam roguit primus Abraham propter Sodomitas, et Moyses...

104. curetur curd*.
105. Sic Et diz added later before sic. rogabit roguit altered to rogabit.

rus, hom. CIII. (Mai, Scriptorum vet. notae coll. ix. 731) Tόν τάς κεφαλάς πολέμ, τόν πρώτον νοσαντα τό παιδίν τής παιδέας και πάτηρ πάντες σχολιατος [leg. σκλ.], where Jacob of Edessa must have read νοσαντα, as appears from his translation:

\[\text{κόπα : κόπα καθαρόν καθαρόν καθαρόν} \]


105. omnes enim portabunt...] The Arab. has بل كل أحد نقيتي نجمة, which is translated by Ockley: But every one shall stand for all (that he hath done). Steiner would alter the last word to بكمmondn jeder Einzelne steht ein für sein Thum. I prefer to read بل 'each shall stand with his burden,' this would involve less change, and at the same time preserve an idea which is expressed in the oldest versions.
EXTRACTS FROM AMBROSE AND JEROME.

(A) Comp. 4 Ezra vii. 36—42.

Ibimus eo ubi paradisus est iucunditatis\(^1\), ubi nullae nubes, nulla tonitrua, nullae coruscationes\(^2\), nulla ventorum procella, neque tenebrae, neque nesper, neque aestas, neque hyems uices uariabunt\(^3\) temporum. Non frigus, non grando, non pluiae, non solis istius erit usus, aut lunae, neque stellarum globi: sed sola Dei fulgebì claritas. Dominus enim erit lux omnium.... Ambr. de bono Mortis xii. (Ed. Bened. I. col. 411).

\(^1\) *par. iucund. est.* GMPQ. \(^2\) *nullae coruscationes sunt* P. \(^3\) *narrabunt* Q.

(B) Comp. 4 Ezra iii. 5; vii. 78.


(C) Comp. 4 Ezra vii. 80—87.

Ergo dum expectatur plentitudo temporis, exspectant animae remunerationem debitam. Alias manet poena, alias gloria: et tamen nec illae interim sine iniuria, nec istae sine fructu sunt. Nam et illae\(^1\) uidentes\(^2\) seruantibus legem Dei repositam esse mercedem gloriae, conservari carum ab Angelis habitacula, sibi autem dissimulationis et contumaciac suppliance futura, et pudorem et confusionem; ut intuentes gloriæ Altissimi, erubescent in eius conspectum ueniæ, cuius mandata teremauerunt\(^3\). Ambr. de bono Mortis x. (Ed. Bened. I. col. 408).

\(^1\) *Nam ille* Q. \(^2\) *uidentes altero* to *uident* E. \(^3\) *temerauerunt* GMPQ.
(D) Comp. 4 Ezra vii. 91—101.


Hic ordo, inquit, animarum, quae sunt iustorum, quas etiam immortales non dabituuit dicere in quinto ordine; eo quod spatium, inquit, incipiat recipere fruentes et immortales. Hac est, inquit, requies earum per septem ordines, et futurae gloriae prima perficio, prinsuam in suis habitacionibus quietae congregationis numere perfrauantur. Unde ait Prophetae ad Angelum: Ergo dabitur tempus animabus, postquam separatæ fuerint de corporibus, ut uideant ca quomodo distici. Et dixit Angelus: Septem dies erit libertas earum, ut uideant, in septem diebus, qui praedicti sunt ser-

(E) Comp. 4 Ezra vii. 102—

Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum uniusmus, mutuo pro nobis\(^1\) orare possimus\(^2\), postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio, praesertim cum Martyres ultionem sui sanguinis obscecrantes, impetrare non quiuerint\(^3\). . . .  

Tu uigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis: et proponis\(^4\) mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te, et similibus tuis\(^5\) legitur: ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro alis audiat\(^6\) deprecari: quem ego librum nunquam legi. Qualiquin necesse est in manus\(^7\) sumere, quod Ecclesia non recipit? nisi forte Balsamum mihi, et Barbelum\(^8\), et Thesaurum Manichaei, et ridiculum nomen Leusiborae proferas\(^9\), et quia ad radices Pyrenaei habitas, nicinuesque es Iberiae, Basilidis antiquissimi haeretici, et imperitae scientiae, incredibilia portenta prosequeris\(^10\), et proponis\(^11\) quod totius orbis auctoritate damnatur.  *Hieron. contra Vigilantium.* (Opp. ed. Vallarsius, ii. col. 392, 393).

\(^1\) om. pro nobis ABCDU.  \(^2\) possimus BCDU.  \(^3\) impetr. nequiereit ABCDU.  \(^4\) propius Fabr. Laur. Volekm. Hilg. Fritzeche.  \(^5\) tui V.  \(^6\) gaudeat Fabr. Laur. Lücke Volekm. Hilg. Fritzeche.  \(^7\) in manu EF.  \(^8\) barbelo ABCDEFU. barbellà V.  \(^9\) om. proferas CEFU.  \(^10\) persequeris ABCDUY. perqueare EF.  \(^11\) propones EF.

ADDENDA.

Page 1, note 3. The Vatican MS. of the Arabic vers. (=Cod. V.), written apparently in the 16th century, proves to be a copy of the Oxford MS., Bodl. 231 (=Cod. B.), which is dated Anno Martyrum 1051 (= A.D. 1335). The relationship of these two MSS. might have been suspected from comparing the lists of their contents, e.g. 1 Ezra (=4 Esdr. III.—XIV.), Ezra, Neh., Tobit, appear in the same order in both, (comp. Mai, *Script. Vet. N.C. IV.* p. 3 with Nicoll, *Cat. Codd. MSS. Ox. Bibl. Bodl.* p. 13). But Dr. Guidi's collation furnishes conclusive evidence of the origin of Cod. V.; e.g. in VII. 94 (Ew. 75, p. 33, l. 11) the word يَا is nearly obliterated in Cod. B., it is absent from Cod. V. In VII. 95 (Ew. 75, p. 33, l. 13) the word السامة in Cod. B. has lost portions of its last two letters, and in its mutilated form resembles السك, which is the reading of Cod. V. In VII. 96 (Ew. 75, p. 33, l. 17) there are some defects in the MS., where the word stands, which Ewald takes to be العشت, in Cod. V. it is written العشت, and from the traces that still remain, we may infer that this was the original reading of Cod. B. In VII. 97 (Ew. 75, p. 33, l. 18) some strokes have been rubbed out from the middle of مستوردة in Cod. B., the word consequently appears as مستوردة in Cod. V. There is a hole in Cod. B. at the end of VII. 100 (Ew. 77), so that the last word is imperfect, but the points below the line are rather in favour of the reading تَبَعَ, as Cod. V. gives it, than of نزل, as Ewald edits. The words لا تَنَبَع اخِطَالاتُ يا أدم are written by a later hand in Cod. B., at the foot of the page, where the last word is أدم, (Ew. 90), they stand after the same word in the text of Cod. V. The latter MS. differs from the printed text in reading لَا بِالعالم encircling the verb in VII. 70 (Ew. 62), هُدَا التَّمْرٌ in VII. 75 (Ew. 66) and فائت إذا in VII. 76 (Ew. 67), but it has been found on inspection to represent in these cases also, with but slight deviations, the text of Cod. B. In one respect the copy varies from the original, viz. by the introduction of a greater number of errors in orthography and
grammar: it has, for instance, د for nearly always, ض for ٍ,ل for َ, and sometimes for ك as in Ex. 39 (Ew. 27). Again, ابْنَل ل for سل in Ex. 40 (Ew. 39), ابْنَل ل for لب in Ex. 41 (Ew. 40), ابْنَل ل for لب in Ex. 42 (Ew. 41), etc. But though exhibiting a debased form of the language, the Vatican copy will be of some service in supplying what has been obliterated or lost in the MS. of the Bodleian.

Page 2, note 2. Possibly another version has in like manner been printed and neglected; for the list of books contained in the Georgian Bible, fol. Moskau, 1748, seems to include the 4th of Esdr., disguised by a different enumeration. It would be interesting to have some trustworthy information on this subject. The Georgian translation of the Old Test. is said to have been made in the sixth century, from the Greek, and to have been subsequently corrected from the old Slavonic.

Page 2, note 4. The Vatican MS. of Arab., is stated to belong to the 14th century. It differs in many respects from the Bodleian MS., but especially in exhibiting an unabridged form of the text, so that it will prove an important contribution to the criticism of this particular version. A few examples of its readings are given below.


Dr. A. Neubauer has kindly forwarded to me the following specimen of this translation:

(1) هب قرئن
(2) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون
(3) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون
(4) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون
(5) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون
(6) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون
(7) لفط نون نون نون نون نون نون

I have just received, through the kindness of the Abbate Pietro Perreau, a transcript of the entire chapter, but the sample which I have printed will, no doubt, be thought sufficient. This Hebrew version of Chap. XIII. appears to have been made from an early printed edition of the Latin Bible, in which the abbreviations were not always understood by the translator, e.g. he probably found in verse 36 ὁνέτα (\(=\) ostendetur), which he took for an active verb\(^2\), and in verse 55 μηρὲμ (\(=\) matrem), which he expanded into \textit{minorem}, and paraphrased\(^3\).

Page 5, line 7. The date of Cod. S. is inserted in the initial letter O, at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus, (see \textit{Nouve. Traité de Diplomatique}, iii. p. 128).

Page 6, line 10. \textquoteleft non régloes\rq rather \textquoteleft régloes a la pointe sèche\rq, but the traces of the ruling are scarcely visible in some sheets.

Page 8, note 1. My friend, the Rev. H. B. Swete, B.D., Fellow of Gonv. and Cai. Coll. Camb., has, at my suggestion, undertaken an edition of the Comm. of Theod. Mopsuest. on the shorter epistles of St Paul. From his collation of the two MSS., I will insert in these Addenda a few further illustrations of peculiar forms and constructions.

Page 10, note 3. Add to the list of contractions found in Cod. S. dieb;, dir, ei', \(\overline{en}\), \(\overline{ir}\), \(\overline{i}\), \(\overline{om\-}\), \(\overline{selm}\), \(\overline{wob}\).

I have been able to glean a few readings from some of the MSS. mentioned below (p. 82, seq.).

Page 19, note 1. \textit{sequenti precedente} vi. 12, Codd. Arras, Cambrai.


\(^1\)Πάτρος is again the rendering of \textit{regio} in verse 45.

\(^2\) The words \textit{Syon autem veniet, et ostendetur (ονέτα')} omnium parata et edificata are thus translated:

\(^3\) The two contractions, here referred to, occur in a Venice Bible of 1478.
Page 19, note 5. om. or o vi. 12, Cod. Dou., om. or o ut, Cod. Orl.

Page 20, note 1. volupstate iii. 8, Codd. Orl., Dou., pro validis vii. 112 (12), Dou.

Page 20, note 3. recipe ii. 40, Cod. Dou.

Page 20, line 25. factus est iii. 17, Cod. Arr.

Page 20, line 26. faciit iii. 31, Cod. Arr.

Page 21, line 7. tue enim creature miseraris viii. 45, Cod. Dou.

Page 21, line 12. hunc sermonem x. 20, Cod. Cambrai, hoc sermonem hunc, Cod. Arr.

Page 21, note 2. om. in ea xi. 32, Cod. Dou.

Page 23, note 1. The following observations on the word 'Arzareth,' xiii. 45, made by an English writer of the 17th century, seem to be unknown. I print them that they may hold their proper place in a résumé of opinions on the subject.

"... True it is indeed that I find the City of Arsaratha, mentioned both in Berosus fragments (t. lib. 3 t), and in Ptol. (Geogr. l. 5, c. 13, et in Tab. 3 Asiae), placed near the issue of the river Araxes into the Caspian sea: and it was perhaps one of the Israelitish Colonies, planted in the confines of the Empire of Assyria: for it may well be that Arsaratha is but Assyriam (leg. Arsæratha), or that is the City, or the hill of the remainder: or perhaps Assürāšt (the last letter of the first word cut off in the Greek pronunciation for sounds sake), the Land of the remainder: but the tale of eightene moneths journey, will no more agree with this City, then the region of Arzareth doth, with Geography or History." (Enquiries touching the diversity of Languages, and Religions, through the chief parts of the World by Edw. Brerewood, lately professour of Astronomy in Gresham Colledge, 4to, London, 1635, pp. 107, 108.)

Page 24, note 3. I refer in this note to the well-known couplet from Hudibras:

"In mathematics he was greater
Than Tycho Brahe, or Erra Pater."

There seems to be no good reason for supposing with Dr Z. Grey¹, that Wm. Lilly (1602—1681) is alluded to in this anticlimax. At any rate the bare assertion of some modern annotators of Hudibras, that such is the case, has the effect of keeping completely out of view the popular astrological tract, which under the name of 'Erra Pater' was frequently reprinted at London in the 16th and 17th centuries. A copy in the

¹ The principal argument on which he relies is an expression found in the 'Memoirs of the years 49 and 50,' p. 75 (publ. in the 2nd Vol. of The Post-

humous Works of Sam. Butler, 1715), "O the infallibility of Erra Pater Lilly!"
Brit. Mus. is entitled, "The Pronostycacion for ever of Erra Pater: A Jewe borne in Jewery"... (Robt. Wyer) London, [circa 1535]. The significant addition to the name, and above all the fact, that we find essentially the same matter ascribed to the Prophet Esdras, in old French (clxxviii. 11, St John's Coll. Oxford, see Coxé's Catalogue), in Latin (MS. Hh. vi. 11 (11), Univ. Libr. Cambridge), and in Greek (Notices et Extraits des MSS. de la Bibli. du Roi. xi. 2, p. 186, and Tischend., Apocalypses Apocryphae, p. xiv.)¹ lead to the conclusion that 'Erra' is a corruption from Ezra².


Page 26, note 4. et antequam estuarent chamini in Syon vi. 4, Cod. Arras, ...chimino Syon, Cod. Dou.

Page 31, line 5. Should these coincidences in reading between Cod. A. and later MSS. prove in the end to be too marked and too numerous to be explained by the considerations which I have suggested, then we must assume, that, when Cod. S., in its mutilated form, was adopted as the basis of the text, some other MS., allied to Cod. A., was occasionally consulted in difficult readings. The fact that the lacuna was not filled up from this source will be best accounted for by the supposition that the passage was suppressed for dogmatic reasons.


Page 32, note 3. non in usum fuerit iv. 29, Cod. Arr., non euulsum fuerit, Cod. Dou.

Page 40, line 8 from below. There is an early date in a record of bequest inserted on fol. 1 of Cod. C. 8 (one of the three MSS. containing the curious interpolation et heretici v. 8, see above, p. 23, note 1), which is not noticed by Dean Cowie in his Catalogue of the MSS. of St John's Coll. Cambridge. It runs thus: "Clausa testamenti Magistri Roberti de Pykering quondam decani Ecclesiae Beati Petri Eborum, qui leguit hunc librum prioratui de Gyseburn, et obiit die Josuis ultimo die mensis Decembris, Anno Domini milliö cccxxxvi xxxiiib. Itu delego (altered to do lego) prioratui de Gyseburn Bibliam meam meliorem, pro eo quod libri monasterii fuerunt combusti in combustione

¹ Compare especially in all these places the section which in the English begins thus: "In the yeare that Janyvero shall enter upon the Sondaye the wynter shal be colde, and moyst."

Ecclesiæ sue
ita quod faciant anniversarium meum singulis annis in perpetuum in conuenta."

Page 41, line 5. Here follows a supplementary list of MSS. which contain 4 Esdr. i.—xvi., or any part thereof.

Bibliotheca Sussexiana.

Lat. MSS. No. 43 Bibl. Lat. 8×5 inches. Ff. 513, Sacc. xii.—xiii. ... 'there are the four books of Esdras, and the prayer of Manasseh at the end of 2 Chron.' (Pettigrew's Cat. I. 1. 1827, pp. lxx., lxxi).

The British Museum, London.


The Minster Library, York.


The Cathedral Library, Hereford.


The Cathedral Library, Salisbury.

No. 127. Bibl. Lat. 10×7 inches. Sacc. xiii.—xiv. 3 Esdr. comes between 4 Esdr. i. ii. and 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv. (Communicated by the Rev. H. W. Pullen).

1 From an entry in a MS. missal of Giseborne, it appears that this fire took place A.D. 1289. (Catal. of the MSS. at Ashburnham Place. Appendix, No. 44.) Comp. also Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, last ed. Vol. vi. p. 265.

2 This MS. appears also as No. 32 in one of Thorpe's Catalogues for 1844.

3 The word secundas, i. i, is absent from this and from the following MSS., A. C. 4, 5, 9, 10, II, II., L. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, O. 1, 2, Edinb., Orl., Reims, Dou. This is another point, in which many later MSS. coincide with Cod. A. and not with Cod. S.

4 Of the two Latin versions of 3 Esdr., viz. the 'Versio Vulgata' (Et fecit Josias Pascha—secundum testamentum Domini Dei Israel), and the 'Versio altera' (Et egit Josias Pascha—secundum dispositionem Domini Dei Israel), the latter, which was first published by Sabatier, is by no means uncommon in MSS. I have observed it also in the following: C. 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, L. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, O. 2, 5, Chartres 15, Orléans 3, 6, Reims 2, and Douai 3. In Orléans 10, the commencement is Celebravit Josias Pascha. No. CXX., Bibl. Senat. civ. Lips., dated A.D. 1273 (Et legit Josias Pascha), seems, from the short specimen forwarded to me by Mr. C. R. Gregory, to present a mixed text.
The University Library, Edinburgh.


The Library of All Souls’ College, Oxford.


Bibliothèque Publique d'Orléans.

No. 6. Bibl. Lat., fol. maj. Said to date from A.D. 1179 (Cat. par A. Septier, 1820), I was not able however, on glancing through the pages, to verify this statement. ...1, 2 Paralip., 1 Esdr. (= Ezra and Neh.), 2 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. i. ii. 'Liber Esdræ prophetae filii Sarai'), 3 Esdr. ('Et egit Josias'), 4 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. iii—xiv.), 5 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. xv. xvi), Judith...

Bibliothèque Communale de la Ville d'Amiens.

No. 2. Bibl. Lat. 8vo. Saec. xiii. Abb. de St. Acheul.—'On y trouve tout l'ancien et le Nouveau Testament, avec... le 3e. et le 4e. livres d'Esdras.' (Catalogue... par J. Garnier. Amiens, 1843).

Bibliothèque de Tours.

No. 15. Bibl. Lat. pars. 4to. Saec. xiii. Saint-Martin, 5. ...1, 2 Paralip., 'les quatre Livres d'Esdras,' Tob. i—iii. 4. (Catalogue... par A. Dorange. Tours, 1875).

Bibliothèque de Troyes.


Bibliothèque Publique de Reims.

No. 2. Bibl. Lat. fol. Saec. xiii—xiv. ...1, 2 Paralip., 1 Esdr. (= Ezra and Neh.), 2 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. i. ii. 'Hic est liber Esdræ prophetae filii Sarai'), 3 Esdr. ('Et egit Josias'), 4 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv.), 5 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. xv. xvi.), Judith...
Bibliothèque de la ville d'Arras.


Bibliothèque de Douai.


Bibliothèque de Camerai.

No. 270. Bibl. Lat. in 5 vols. fol. Sac. xiv.—xv. ... 1, 2 Paralip., Or. Man., 1 Esdr., Neh., 2 Esdr. (= 3 Esdr. ‘Et fecit Josias’), Esdr (= 4 Esdr. I.—xvi.). Tobias...

Bibliothèque de Valenciennes.


Universitäts-Bibliothek, Erlangen.


Universitäts-Bibliothek, Leipzig.

No. 4. Bibl. Lat. fol. min. Sac. xv. ... 1, 2 Paralip., Or. Man., Esdr., Neh., Confessio Esdr., 3 Esdr., 2 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. I.—xvi.) 2 Thob. .... (Communicated by Mr. Caspar René Gregory).

1 In the Catalogue of the MSS. of the Douai Library by H. R. Duthilleul, Svo., Douai, 1846, no mention is made of the presence of 4 Esdr. in this MS., but on the other hand No. 10, Bibl. Lat. pars, fol. Sac. x. is stated to contain... ‘Paralip. (duo libri), Esdras (quatuor l.), Hester’.... As a MS. of this age would rank next in importance to Codd. A. and S., I made a point of examining it, while this sheet was passing through the press, and found that it never included more of Esdras than the two canonical books (Ezra and Neh.).

2 From the omission of ego Salathiel qui et Esdras, III. I., and the presence of cubiculo for cubiti, ib., coupled with the fact that the whole is divided into xvi. Chapters, I conclude that this MS., like those mentioned above, p. 41, l. 1, merely represents the printed text of the Vulgate.
BIBLIOTHECA PALAT. VINDBON.

Bibl. Lat., Svo. min. Saec. xiv. 'Post L. Neh. fol. 247 reperiuntur duo Esdrae apocryphi, qui hic Secundus et Tertius inscribuntur.' (Codd. MSS. Theologici... Lat. ... rec... M. Denis. II. 1. No. xxix. Vindob. 1799).


Bibl. Lat., 4to. Saec. xiv. '.... Paralip., subjecta in marg. Manassius Oratione, Esdras et Neh., Confessio Esdræ desumta ex eius Libro iv. apocr. c. 8. a v. 20—37. non sine varietate ab editis. Tum Prov.'... (Id. II. 1. No. xvii.).

Bibl. Lat. pars I., fol. min. Saec. xv. 'Post Libr. Neh. Incipit confessio Esdræ, quae nihil est alium, quam Excerptum ex apocrypo eius Libro iv. c. 8. a v. 20. ad v. 37. rarissime in aliis Codicibus obiurum, et dictionem varians ab Editis1.... Hanc Confessionem excipit Lib. III. Esdræ hic dictus ii.' (Id. II. 1. No. xliii.).

D. MARCI BIBLIOTHECA, VENET.

Cod. V. Bibl. Lat., 4to. min. Saec. circ. xv. 'Esdrae Liber iv. mutilus est fine, et varios exhibet ab editis lectionem.' (Latina et Italica D. Marci Bibliotheca Codicum MSS. 1741.)

At least 5 MSS. of 4 Esdr. were consulted for the Vulgate edited by the theologians of Louvain, Antwerpiae, 1573 etc. The scanty list of various readings selected is reprinted in Walton's Polyglot, vol. vi.

On one occasion MS. authority is expressly quoted on the margin of our Auth. Vers. (see marginal note to iv. 51).

The position which 4 Esdr. occupies in the MSS. may be here briefly noticed. It is generally found in company with the other books of Esdr. after Chron. (the prayer of Manasseh frequently intervening). In C. 5 the books of Esdr. come after Malachi,

1 The text is of the same type as that of the MSS. mentioned above, p. 34. This may be seen from the specimen which is given:

Domine, qui habitas in eterno, eius oculi datus et superiora in aere, eius thronus inseptima-
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and in L. 4, O. 1, after Esther. In C. 8, the 1st, 2nd (= Neh.), and 3rd of Esdras are in their usual place after Chron. and Or. Man.; while 2 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. i. ii.), 4 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv.) and 5 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. xv. xvi.), form an Appendix at the end of the New Test. On the other hand, in C. 9 the Canonical books of Ezra and Neh. have been omitted in their proper places, and are supplied in a different hand at the end of the Volume.

The order of sequence in the several books of Esdr., which Cod. S. presents, is as follows: (1, 2 Paralip.), 1 Ezra (= Ezra, Neb.), 3 Ezra iii. iv. v. 1—3 (this extract is written in smaller characters, and fills one page only), 2 Ezra (= 4 Esdr. i. ii.), 3 Ezra (= 3 Esdr. i. ii. 1—15), 4 Ezra (= 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv.), 5 Ezra (= 4 Esdr. xv. xvi.), (Hester).

The peculiar way in which chapters from the 3rd book are here distributed seems to be hinted at by the Benedictine editors of Ambrose, in the vague description which they give of a St. Germ. MS. which I have proposed to identify with Cod. S. (see above, p. 4, note 1). The ambiguity thus created with regard to the place in which this book should stand, was probably the origin of its varying position in later copies.

In many cases 3 Esdr. comes after 2 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. i. ii.), and before 4 Esdr. (= 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv.), as in Codd. C. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, L. 1, 2, 5, 6, O. 1, 2, 5, also in the Cott., Hereford, Salisb., Edinb., All Souls, Orl., Reims, Douai and Vindob. (xvi.) MSS.

In other cases 3 Esdr. precedes 4 Esdr. i. ii., (which is then followed immediately by 4 Esdr. iii.—xiv.), as in C. 6, 12, D., L. 4, 7, O. 3, 6, 7, T., W., and in the Troyes, Arras, Cambrai, Leipzig and Vindob. (xviii.) MSS. (3 Esdr. also comes before 4 Esdr. i. ii. in C. 13, 14.) This is also the order of the books in Cod. A. (see above, p. 6)

It is interesting to notice that the MSS. (C. 6, 12, L. 7, O. 3, T., W., Arras and Cambrai), which were grouped together by internal evidence, have also this external distinction in common.

Page 42. H. A notice of this MS. may be found in an 'Account of the MS. Library at Holkham, by W. Roscoe' (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, Vol. ii. (1834), p. 356).

Verse 37. In Araḅ. Cod. Vat. has لَى لَى for لَى لَى Cod. Bodl.
Verse 38. in contra, see Rönsch, pp. 235, 519. Comp. in palam xiv. 45.
Verse 38. In Araḅ. after الكبیر the day ins. from Cod. Vat.
Verse 40, note 2. In a late Latin version of the 'Historia septem sapientum,' the style of which is thus characterized: "die ganze Schrift ist durch und durch romanisch, speciell italienisch, gedacht und nur die äussere Hülle lateinisch," we meet with the expressions de sero and uno autem sero. (Mussafia, Beiträge zur Lit. der Sieben weisen Meister—Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad. 1868, pp. 96 and 114).

Verse 41, note 3. The Vat. MS. has ηεσιν for λατινός, thus giving another proof of its dependance on the Bodleian MS., for the additional point in qi has been left from the ; which is erased in the latter MS.—It is just possible that Ockley in rendering this word by 'blast,' may have had in view a supposed form λίλεσις, which closely follows the ductus literarum.

Verse 41. The order is different in the Cod. Vat. of Arab5, which reads ροι ηεσιν for Cod. Bodl.

Verse 42. In Arab5 Cod. Vat. has ηεσιν for Cod. Bodl.

Verse 47. Instances of confusion between μέλει and μέλει are very common. See the various readings in Matth. xxii. 16, Mar. iv. 38, etc., Euseb. Eclogae Proph. iii. 30 (p. 132, l. 13, ed. Gaisford), Chrysostom. Hom. in Matth. 723 E., 833 D. (ed. Field). Comp. also Chrysostom. Hom. in Epist. ad Rom. 583 C. (ed. Field), and Alb. Jahn's Methodius Platonizans (1865), p. 65.

Verse 69, note 1. This old plur. termination -is would naturally give rise to some confusion. I seem to see an instance of this in XIII. 4 qui audibant voces eius, where the original text was probably vocis eius, (the gen. after audio in imitation of the Greek, see Rönsch, p. 438)1, which was mistaken for a plural. The oriental versions all have the subst. in the singular.

Verse 82. uversionem bonam facere. The construction of this clause is peculiar to the Lat. The Syr. ('converti et bona facere') no doubt represents the orig. The error of the Latin translator might easily have arisen from mistaking επιστρέφειν γινομαι (or, ...γινομαι) for επιστροφήν γινομαι.

Verse 87. 'Septima uia est omnium quae supradictae sunt viarum maior.' The construction is varied in verse 98, thus: 'Septimus ordo, qui est omnibus supradictis

---

1 Similarly, exaudiet me Deus, ancillae [le S.] sermonum meorum vii. 19 Codd. A. (pr. m.), S. tuae ix. 45, Codd. A. (pr. m.), S, and et intellige (Comp. σύνες τῆς κραυγῆς μου, Ps. v. 1.)
maior". In the other chapters also the comparative is followed either by the gen.,
as in Gk. (v. 13, vii. 31, xi. 4, 29, xii. 13, 45, xiv. 13), or by the abl. (viii. 30, so
also vii. 43).

Verse 87, note 1. In the Arab. version Cod. V. has ينسلا اًرلا instead of
پنسلا اًرلا. There are other examples of erroneous transposition of letters in this copy, as

Verse 89, note 1. In eo tempore commoratae servierunt...As the clause at present
stands, it is not unlikely that commoratae was taken by the scribe as equivalent to
commorationis. I have not found elsewhere an instance of commorata used as an
abstr. subst., like the analogous forms: defensa, extensa, missa, remissa, puncta, etc.,
see Rönch, p. 83, and the remarks of J. N. Ott in Neue Jahrbücher f. Philologie
v. Pädag. 1874, pp. 782, 783. In xiv. 13, Cod. S. has corrupte, where Cod. A. has
corruptio\textsuperscript{ii} and the Text. Vulg. corruptulae.

Verse 89. \textit{uti} (=\textit{ut}). This older form occurs again, chap. xl. 46, also in Num.

Verse 93. \textit{complicationem}. Only two authorities have hitherto been cited for the
use of this substant. viz. Cael. Aurelian. 4 Chron. 26, and Augustin. i. Music. n. 19.

Verse 93, note 2. The original reading of Cod. A. in iii. 22, \textit{mansit in malignum}
is another illustration of this tendency to insert in after maneo. To the examples
under (a) may be added: \textit{Si quidem et [Codd. Amb. Harl.] illos, si sollemmodo non
obedierunt fidei, poena maneat, quanto magis illos qui....} Theod. Mopsuest. in
1 Thess. v. 8.

Verse 96, note 1. The Latin and Anglo-Saxon Psalter of the Univ. Library,
Cambridge, Saec. xi. (Ff. l. 23), as well as the Rom. version in the Canterbury
Psalter of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, Saec. xii. (R. 17. 1), have likewise \textit{haereditatem}
altered to \textit{haereditate} in Ps. xxiv. 13. The latter has also \textit{haereditatem} in Ps. lxxxii.
13. The Psalt. Veron. has \textit{haereditatem possessdunt terram} in Ps. xxxvi. 22 (Blanchini,
\textit{Vind. Canon.}).

Verse 102, note 2. The form \textit{poterint} occurs in both the MSS. of the Lat.
transl. of Theod. Mopsuest. on the shorter Epistles of St. Paul; in the Amiens MS.,
\textit{poteriunt} 1 Tim. v. 10, and \textit{poteriunt} 1 Tim. v. 24 (Comp. \textit{erint} 1 Tim. v. 15), in the
Harl. MS., Gal. i. 1, and \textit{poterient} 2 Thess. ii. 6.

\textsuperscript{1} The two constructions stand in juxta-position in the Lat. of Cod. Bezae, Luke vii. 28, John xiii. 16,
Matth. xii. 41, 42. (Comp. Cod. Bezae, ed. Scrineer, p. xxxix.)
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corrected, 62 n., 65 n., 66 n., 67 n.
readings of the Cod. Vat., 65 n., 86, 87
Armenian version of 4 Ezra, 2 n.
Arzareth, 23 n., 80
Attraction of the antecedent to the case of the relative, 69 n.
Augustine, 56 n., 69 n.
Bar Bahlul, 66 n., 79 n.
Baruch iv., v., copied by the writer of 4 Ezra i., ii., 24 n., 25 n.
the Apocalypse of, 62 n. (his).
Brerewood, Edw., 80
Confessio Esdrae, 9 n., 34, 84, 85 n.
Constitutiones Apost. (ii. 14), 72 n.
Corbie, the Abbey of, 7...
Curzopian Syriac (Luke xiv. 18, 19), 72
Diodorus (on Gen. ii. 7), 64 n.
Ezza Pater, 24, 80
B.
Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. vii. 7, 2), 62 n.
Ezra, Book iii., the two Latin versions of, 82 n.
Faber, Nic., 4 n.
Future of the 2nd conj. in -eram, 16
3rd -ibae, 16, 70 n.
4th -iba, 16
Gender, mistakes in, 16, 17, 18
Genitive with the comparative, 87
Georgian version of the Bible, 78
Gildas, 'Epistola,' 36—38
Gildemeister, Prof. J., letter from, 5, 19
Grecisms, 17 n., 18, 26, 27, 87
Gyseburne priory, 87
Hebrew, report of a Hebr. copy of 4 Ezra, 3 n.
version of 4 Ezra xiii. (Cod. De-Rossi), 78
Heretic interpolation of 'et heretici' (4 Ezra v. 5), 23, 81
Hermene Pastor (Vis. ii. 3), 68 n.
(Vis. ii. 2, 3), 62 n.
(Mand. III.), 68 n.
(Sim. viii. 3), 69 n.
Hieronymus, 41 n., 76
on the Apocryphal books, 7 n.
Hippolytus, 64 n., 65 n., 72 n.
Infinitive abs. in Hebr., its Latin equivalent, 27
Interchange of consonants in Codd. A. and S., 14
vowels
Jacob of Edessa, 59 n., 73 n.
MSS. of the Lat. vers. of 4 Ezra, 6 n., 40, 55, 56
the Amiens MS., 6, 9
the Paris MS. (Sangerm.), 4, 9 n.

12
MSS., list of MSS. collated, 42
— supplementary list, 82—85
Mirandula, J. Picus, 3 n.
Mozarabic Liturgy, 34

Nouns and pronouns, irregularities in, 14, 16

Omissions in Cod. A., 12
— Cod. S., 22, 30

l'apias (Eus. Hist. Ecle. iii. 39), 69 n.
Philastrius (de lacres, § 95), 64 n.
Plato (de Legibus, p. 903), 65 n.
Plural ending in -is, 13, 87
Prepositions joined to the wrong case, 17

Raymundus Martini, 28 n.

Scaliger, J. C., 3 n.
Severus (hom. cxi.), 73 n.
Siphura, 28 n.
Syriac version of 4 Ezra, 2 n., 3 n.
—— corrected or explained, 55 n., 58 n., 61 n., 62 n., 72 n.
Theodorus Mopsuest. on the shorter Epistles of St Paul (Lat. vers.), 8 n., 79, 87, 88
Tironian symbol for autem, 11, 60 n.

Verbs, irregularities in, 16
— depon. for act., 17
— act. for depon., 17
— substantive verb omitted, 18
— compounds of -eo, 17, 65
— — — — — — iaio, 17
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LATIN.

de sequenti, 59 n.
demoto, 17
diestrictio (or distr.), 25 n., 81
detabescent, 65 n.
diligentia, 25
diligentias, 56 n.
domino, for dominor, 17
dominiorem, 61 n.

crint, 72 n., 88
c in apod., 18
cexterito, 32
cexteritus, 32
4 Ezra (eoo.), 13

ererunt, 61
fideites, 72 n.
frudanerunt (legem), 63 n.
frumiscentes, 70 n.

gaeus (pr. m.), 57
gloriosi, 71 n.
haec (fem., pl.), 64 n.
hæsitor, 17
hereditatem (or -tate) possidere terram, 69 n.
hiems, 57 n.
horroribus, 66 n.
in with acc., 58 n., 66 n.
in contra, 86
inconstabilitio, 33
inspirationes, 64 n.
intellego with gen., 87 n.
interpretavi, 17
inuanae, 17
inuestigabilis, 26 n.
ipso (sibimetipso), 16
iteratum, 17
lacus and locus conf., 55 n.
manet eis or eas, 67 n., 69 n., 88
mastix, 35
multipicat (intrans.), 27
multum melius, 62 n., 87
neglexerint, 71 n.
nolii (imperat.), 52
nbs, 16
obaudire with acc., 18
obliuisci with acc. of pers., 18
observationes, 56 n.
opere for opera, 16
parce with acc., 18 n.
parti (= -tus), 16 n.
patior with gen., 26
pertransient, 65 n.
plantasti and plasmasti conf., 23
plumbum for plumbum, 52
poterint, 72 n., 88
potiono with 2 acc., 18
requitionis and requisionis conf., 55 n.
reuerentes and reuerentenses conf., 71 n.
scrutinor (dep.), 17
scruto, 17 n.
sequeus (= secundus), 59 n.
soro or serum, 57 n.
sibilatus, 33
simulari with double const., 18
solo (dat.), 16
solummodum, 17
soynior (dep.), 17 n.
somus for somi, 16
struo for struo, 59 n.
subremanet, 35
tego with 2 acc., 18
termimus sententiae, 63 n.
timoratior, 61 n.
trepidor (dep.), 17
tamulti, 16 n.
tamultas, 14
uui (= ut), 88
valde (= valde), 17
naso, 66 n.
uidentes and uinentes conf., 66 n.
uix valde, 30
zebo, zelar, 17

GREEK.
dakomiaqer sme, 66 n., comp. 71 n.
εὐγενεία, 60 n.
καταγείρει, 60 n.
μὲλει and μῆλει conf., 58 n., 87
νῆι and νῆι conf., 72 n.
πλημμέλεια = indiligentia, negligentia, 56 n.
πτυχεψμον = commixti, 62 n.

SYRIAC.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page.</th>
<th>4 Ezra i.</th>
<th>4 Ezra ii.</th>
<th>4 Ezra iii.</th>
<th>4 Ezra iv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.....</td>
<td>82 n.</td>
<td>19.........</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
<td>37.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.....</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td>21.........</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td>39.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.....</td>
<td>18, 30 n.</td>
<td>22.........</td>
<td>18, 20, 88</td>
<td>48.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20......</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.........</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24......</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.........</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29......</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.........</td>
<td>17, 31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36......</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.........</td>
<td>10 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37......</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
<td>31.........</td>
<td>20 (bis), 23, 30 n., 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38......</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.........</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>5.....</td>
<td>34.........</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.....</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td>36.........</td>
<td>31 n. (bis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15......</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20......</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27......</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28......</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31......</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32......</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40......</td>
<td>29, 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43......</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48......</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>1.....</td>
<td>4.........</td>
<td>20, 31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4......</td>
<td>23, 25</td>
<td>5.........</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5......</td>
<td>20, 25, 74</td>
<td>9.........</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7......</td>
<td>28, 56 n.</td>
<td>10.........</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8......</td>
<td>19, 29, 31 n., 32, 80, 81</td>
<td>11.........</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10......</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.........</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14......</td>
<td>16, 50 n.</td>
<td>14.........</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15......</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.........</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17......</td>
<td>29, 80</td>
<td>16.........</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18......</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td>17.........</td>
<td>14, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.........</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.........</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.........</td>
<td>19, 25, 69 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.........</td>
<td>19, 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.........</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.........</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.........</td>
<td>32, 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.........</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.........</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.........</td>
<td>26, 31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>31 n., 70 n.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td>91-101,75</td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58 n., 76, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>21 n.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>26, 66 n.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36, 19, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>9 n.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13, 26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42, 20, 22, 30, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>25 n.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>69 n.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>16, 66 n.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>66, 31 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>18, 70 n.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17, 27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>72 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31 n., 58 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26, 65 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>62 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>69 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>42, 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31 n., 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>87 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36, 34, 85 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12, 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>16 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>61 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14, 63 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>17 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>17, 30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1……..30</td>
<td></td>
<td>34……..18</td>
<td></td>
<td>42……..17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4……..88</td>
<td></td>
<td>36……..79</td>
<td></td>
<td>43……..15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10……..27</td>
<td></td>
<td>37……..33 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45……..15, 21 n., 31 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16……..27, 88</td>
<td></td>
<td>40……..33, 64 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>46……..13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19……..20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>45……..23 n., 80</td>
<td></td>
<td>51……..34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27……..12</td>
<td></td>
<td>46……..31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>53……..28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29……..17 n., 18, 88</td>
<td></td>
<td>48, 49 …..29</td>
<td></td>
<td>60……..12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31……..18 (Corr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49……..69 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>63……..31 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32……..17, 21, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>52……..29 n., 30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35……..17 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>53……..17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37……..27, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>54—58…79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40……..31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>58……..31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43……..31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 2……..13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44……..14</td>
<td></td>
<td>5……..30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45……..27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8……..39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9……..4 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11……..29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12……..28, 31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13……..88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16……..27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18……..22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24……..11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29……..27 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31……..28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33……..14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36……..11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38……..12, 13, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40……..58 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45……..86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46, 47 …..3 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 1—9 ..78, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 1……..28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. xiv. 12 …..62 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4……..87</td>
<td></td>
<td>11……..12 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. xxix. 27 …..23 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6……..16</td>
<td></td>
<td>13……..17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth iv. 15 …..62 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8……..15, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>14……..17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kings xxii. 7 …..68 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10……..12, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>20……..15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job xx. 26 …..67 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11……..15</td>
<td></td>
<td>21—27…36—38</td>
<td></td>
<td>— xxxii. 16 …..66 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14……..30 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25……..22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps. v. 1 …..67 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16……..62 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>29……..16, 17, 23 n., 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>— xxiv. 13 …..69 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17……..33</td>
<td></td>
<td>30……..23 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>— xxxii. 20 …..67 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18……..25</td>
<td></td>
<td>33……..33</td>
<td></td>
<td>— xxxix. 3 …..55 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19……..33</td>
<td></td>
<td>35……..13 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20……..28</td>
<td></td>
<td>36……..13, 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28……..18</td>
<td></td>
<td>39……..13, 17 n., 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32……..31 n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40……..15, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORRIGENDA.

Page 3, col. 2, line 24 from below. For In patris (ed. Bas.), the Bologna ed. (1496) has correctly In primis.

Page 13, line 16. For iv. 23 read iv. 23*.

— note 2. Dele cogitationis xvi. 55.

Page 14, line 17. For xvi. 48 read xvi. 48*.

Page 15, line 19. For quessiui read quaessiui.

Page 18, line 19. For cum eo read cum ea.

Page 36, lines 2 & 4. Cod. S. has relinquuntur.

— line 2. For et singulis read in singulis.

— lines 2 & 3. For quatuor read quattuor.

Page 40, line 14. Transfer & from line 15 to the end of line 14.

— line 15. Dele ? at the end of the line.

Page 41, line 25. For Ignace read Ignazio.

Page 42, col. 2, line 11 from below. For A. r. 12 read A. r. 14.

Page 67, line 4. For Imprimis read Inprimis.

Page 82, note 3. For Edinb. read York, Edinb.