

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

PROLEGOMENA TO THE *TESTIMONIA* OF
ST CYPRIAN. II.

(See *J. T. S.* vi [January 1905] 246-270.)

§ 6. THE OLD LATIN FORMS FOR THE NAMES EZEKIEL AND DANIEL.

I COMMENCE this second portion of prolegomena with a supplementary note bearing on points raised in the first instalment of the series.

In § 1 (pp. 252, 253), I stated my belief that St Cyprian quoted the Book of Daniel with the formula 'apud Danihelum' ('Danielum'), and expressed a suspicion that the well marked variants 'Ezechielem', 'Ezechiel' might represent two separate attempts to get rid of a third and unfamiliar form 'Ezechielum', since the latter appears to have been the reading of the lost Verona MS, V. I should like now to call attention to the evidence of the MSS of some other Latin fathers, which seems to me to prove the point to demonstration in the case of Daniel, and in the case of Ezekiel at least to justify the enquiry.

In the Greek the forms of the two names are of course indeclinable, Ἰεζεκιήλ Δανιήλ (the form διὰ Δανιήλου in codex Bezae, Matt. xxiv 15, is doubtless due to the influence of the Latin column 'per Danielum'): and when the Latin translators of the Bible had to introduce the names into a new language, the proverbial three courses were open to them. They might either leave them, as in the Greek, without any distinction of case-endings: or they might Latinize them as proper names of the second declension, Ezechielum,¹ Ezechieli, Ezechielo, Danielum, Danieli, Danielo: or again in the third declension, Ezechielem, Ezechielis, Ezechieli, Ezechiele, Daniele, Danielis, Danieli, Daniele. And combination of these variations is so far possible that individual writers will as a matter of fact be found to use the name of the one prophet with case-endings, and of the other in the indeclinable form.

(1) In the New Testament the name Ezekiel never occurs, and that of Daniel only once, Matt. xxiv 15 'the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet': for in the parallel passage of St Mark, xiii 14, the true reading omits the reference to the name of Daniel, and it is not found in either the Vulgate or the leading Old Latin MSS.

¹ Let it be noted once for all that, even where the cases are declined, the nominative always reproduces the Greek form: Ezechielus, Danielus, are never found. It may be well to make it clear further that I am on this occasion taking no notice of variants in orthography.

For St Matthew the authorities are as follows (*k* is not extant here):—

a Daniel	<i>a b ff</i> ,
per Daniel	<i>e g</i> Iren. $\frac{1}{2}$,
a Danielo	<i>f ff</i> , <i>g</i> , Vulg.
per Danielum	<i>d h</i> Iren. $\frac{1}{2}$,

The statement of authorities in this single passage is already enough to create the presumption that both the indeclinable form and those of the second declension are older than the forms of the third declension. Yet, owing I suppose to the influence of the Vulgate Old Testament, the editors of the Fathers have hitherto almost with unanimity refused to admit the second declension to a place in the text. Even in the case of the most modern editions, it is ordinarily from the apparatus rather than from the text that the following considerable body of evidence has been amassed. I have no reason to suppose that the forms of the third declension are not original in Augustine and Jerome: but in the eleven authorities that I now proceed to cite they find singularly scanty support.¹

(2) Cyprian (outside the *Testimonia*):

ad Fortunatum § 8 (Hartel 329. 9) 'apud Ezechiel'.

ep. lxx § 12 (761. 11) 'per Ezechielem' E M P *ex silentio*, 'per Ezeziel' Q, 'per Ezechielum' B.

ep. lxx § 1 (767. 16) 'per Ezechielem' L M P Q *ex sil.*, 'per Ezechielum' C R.

¹ It would not be candid to pass over without notice or discussion the evidence of Tertullian: but it seems to me so entirely *sui generis* that it will best be treated in a note. So far as the evidence of most of the MSS can be trusted, Tertullian certainly used the forms of the third declension (I quote only those treatises which have appeared in the Vienna *Corpus* vols. xx, xlvii): *de ieiunio* 9 'redeo ad Danieleum . . . dedit deus Danieli', 'Daniel in lacu leonum esurienti', 10 'suadet Danielis quoque argumentum': *de oratione* 25 'quod Daniheli legimus observatum': *de anima* 48 'trina illa cum Daniele fraternitas': *de pudicitia* 7 'puto Ezechielis est vox': *de carnis resurrectione* 22 'secundum Iohelem et Danihelem', 29 'accipe Ezechielem', 30 'Ezechieli revelatur': *aduersus Marcionem* iv 10 'ipsi Danihel revelatus filius . . . ex instrumento Danihelis . . . apud Danihelis prophetiam', iv 16 'per Ezechielem', iv 17 'sequentia Ezechielis'. But there are three things to be said: (1) in two cases, *de ieiun.* 9, *adv. Marc.* iv 10, the indeclinable 'Daniel' is given in the MSS for the dative: (2) in the only first class MS of Tertullian, the codex Agobardinus (Paris. lat. 1622), though it is true 'cum Daniele' is found once, *de anima* 48, yet 'Danihelum' is also found once, *scorpiace* 8 'Danihelum . . . feritas leonum devorasset': (3) Tertullian's general fondness for giving to Hebrew names case-endings according to the third declension robs his evidence of much of its weight. We find in him 'Israhelis', 'Israhele', 'Aaronem', 'Samuelem', 'Saulis', 'Sionis', and the like, which can hardly have been ever in general use in Latin Christian circles, and were certainly not used by St Cyprian.

ep. lxxv § 3 (811. 21) 'Ezechielem et Danielem' E I M *ex sil.*, 'Ezechielem et Danihelum' Q.¹

[Test. iii 20 (137. 3, 5, 15: a passage found only in W, therefore not genuine, but doubtless a very early addition) 'Danihelum' *ter* W, 'Danielem' *ter* Hartel.]

(3) *de Pascha computus*, of A.D. 243, § 13 (Hartel, appendix 261. 1) 'angelum Dei meminimus Danielo dixisse'.

(4) Irenaeus, Latin version of, according to the readings of the Clermont MS (the oldest and by far the best MS of Irenaeus: the editors give consistently the third declension):

adv. haer. IV xx 10 'per Aezechiel'.

I xix 2 'et Danihelum autem hoc idem significare'.

IV xx 11 'sicut in Danielo scriptum est'.

xxvi 1 'Danihelo prophetae dicebatur'.

'quemadmodum dictum est a Danihelo'.

V xxv 2 'per Danihel prophetam' Matt. xxiv 15.

xxv 5 'quae a Danihelo prophetata sunt'.

'per Danihelum [Danihelo C*] prophetam'

Matt. xxiv 15.

'Danihelo autem angelus Gabrihel exsolutionem uisionum fecit'.

xxvi 1 'quae a Danihelo uisa sunt'.

(5) Lucifer (ed. Hartel: vol. xiv of the Vienna *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.*). The solitary MS is Vat. Reg. 133, saec. ix-x.

227. 16 'dicit Deus ad Ezechielem'.

229. 13 'percorre reliqua Ezechiel prophetae'.

164. 8 'accipe quae referat Danihel liber' ('Danihel' is *presumably genitive, and not nominative, here*).

24 'praestitit . . . Danihelo deuotissimo suo'.

165. 28 'numquid uel hos . . . per Danihelum Spiritus sanctus inauditos damnauit? legimus etenim gloriosum Danihel dixisse'.

167. 5 'per Danihel audierunt'.

273. 18 'considera . . . sanctissimi etiam prophetae Danihelis librum'.

It may be doubted whether the vagaries of usage here are due to scribes or to the author himself: I rather suspect that Lucifer wrote

¹ I may illustrate the defectiveness of our printed texts from *de op. et el.* § 11 (Hartel 382. 8), where the editor prints 'Danieli', though the apparatus notes 'Daniel S, Danihel WG': I can add from my own inspection of F, the fifth-century MS at Turin (G v 37)—I do not know whether or no it has survived the fire—that it too has 'Daniel', though Hartel's silence would have suggested that it read 'Danieli'.

'Ezechiel' and 'Danihel' indeclinably throughout, and not only, as the MS makes him do, in four out of the eight passages.

(6) Hilary, if we may generalize from the very small number of instances I have been able to find in the Commentary of the Psalms—the only part of Hilary that is yet published in the Vienna *Corpus* (vol. xxii)—used the indeclinable form for Ezekiel, the forms of the second declension for Daniel.

- in ps.* lxx § 15 (259. 11) 'ad Ezechiel'.
- cxviii PHE § 3 (508. 2) 'ad Danielum'.
- cxix § 4 (561. 14) 'secundum Danielum'.
- cxix § 3 (599. 7) 'in Danielo'.
- cxviii § 44 (775. 8) 'in Ezechiel dictum'.

(7) Optatus (ed. Ziwsa : vol. xxvi of the Vienna *Corpus*).

The construction of a consistent text for Optatus is particularly difficult, because only one of the older MSS, Remensis 221, saec. ix ineunt. (R), is complete : a Petersburg MS, saec. v-vi (P), contains the first two books : an Orleans fragment, saec. vii (A), the first part of the seventh book : a Paris MS, saec. xi (C), half the sixth and the whole of the seventh. But it will be seen that the net balance of evidence in favour of the forms of the second declension is incontestable.

- i 2 (4. 11) 'per Ezechielum prophetam' P.
- ii 5 (40. 18) 'in Ezechielo propheta' P R.
- ii 24 (61. 13) 'in Ezechielo [Ezechilo P*] profeta' P.
- 26 (66. 10) 'per Ezechielem prophetam' P *ex silentio*.
- iii 3, 10 (75. 15, 76. 5, 94. 13) R alone is extant of the four MSS named, and gives on each occasion (as it does elsewhere for Ezekiel, except 40. 18) the third declension.
- vii 1 (164. 7) 'per Ezechielum prophetam' A C.
- (164. 16) 'per Ezechielum' A C.
- iii 3 (79. 18, 21; 80. 15, 16, 21) : in these passages, the only ones which help us with Daniel, R is again the only older MS extant, but this time its evidence is preponderant for the forms of the second declension : 'Danihelo' ablative, 'Danihelo' dative, 'Danielis' (*ex silentio*) genitive, 'Danihelo' dative, 'Danihelo' ablative.

To sum up the evidence for Optatus : P $\frac{2}{4}$, A $\frac{2}{2}$, C $\frac{2}{2}$, give Ezekiel in the second declension, against R $\frac{6}{7}$; but R itself gives Daniel $\frac{4}{5}$ in the same declension, and we cannot doubt that Optatus, in spite of his editor, used the forms of the second declension for the names of both prophets.

¹ It is instructive to note that the Benedictine editor of Hilary was struck by the manuscript evidence for 'Danielum', 'Danielo' : compare his notes *ad locc. cit.* (ed. Verona, i 387, 427, 453).

(8) Ambrose apparently used the indeclinable forms : see for instance in Schenkl's edition of the commentary on St Luke's Gospel (vol. xxxii, part 4, of the Vienna *Corpus*) 234. 18 'ad Ezechiel', 463. 7 'secundum Danihel'.

(9) Tyconius *Liber Regularum* (ed. Burkitt in *Texts and Studies* III i). The two MSS used by the editor are Remensis lat. 364, saec. ix (R), and Vaticanus Reginae 590, saec. x (V) : the former he is no doubt right in preferring on the whole, but he appears to have unduly depreciated the value of the latter.

p. 32 l. 13	Ezechielum V	Hiezechielum R* (** * zechielem R*)
34 15	Ezechielo V*	Hiezechielo R ¹ <i>supr ras</i> : Ezechiel V*
40 13	Ezechielo V	Hiezechielo R
43 30	Ezechielum V*	Ezechihelum R V*
65 16	Ezechihel V	Hiezechiel R
73 11	Ezechihelum V	Hiezechielem R
74 11	Ezechihelum V	Ezechielem R
74 16	Ezechihelum V	Ezechielem R
77 15	Ezechihelum V	Ezechielem R
p. 2 l. 15	rubric IN DANIELO R	
67 9	Danihelum V	Danihelem R (quotation from Matt. xxiv 15)
77 19	Danihelo V	Danihele R (quotation from Ezech. xxviii 3)
79 7	Danihelo V	Danihele R " " "
79 7bis	Danihelo V	Danihele R

Here the one MS gives both prophets regularly in the second declension, with occasional support from the other ; and considering the obvious tendency for the substitution of the better known forms (better known, that is, at the time the MSS were copied), it may confidently be claimed that, like his African contemporary Optatus, Tyconius used the forms in the second declension only. The editor, however, has preferred the third declension throughout.

(10) *Speculum* or *m* (ed. Wehrich, vol. xii of the Vienna *Corpus*). For Daniel the form 'Danihelo' is supported by all the MSS, and is beyond question : for Ezekiel the MSS, as so often in the *Speculum*, fall into two groups, S (which is, it may be noted, the same MS as A of St Cyprian's *Testimonia*) always supporting the indeclinable 'Ezechiel', while the other MSS alternate between 'Ezechiel' and 'Ezechielo'. But in no case is there any question of the forms of the third declension.

(11) Eucherius (ed. Wotke, vol. xxxi of the Vienna *Corpus*). The oldest MS of the *Formulae*, S—Sessorianus lxxvii, now in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele—gives once (with one other MS) 'in Ezechielo' 22. 7, though once also it appears to support the 'in Ezechiele' of the rest, 59. 22.

(12) The *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (ed. Bratke, vol. xlv of the

Vienna *Corpus*) gives clear evidence of the survival of the older usage well on into the fifth century: 34. 12 'Ezechielum prophetam': 13. 1 'auctorem Danihelum', 42. 9 'apud Danihelum', 52. 4 'lege Danihelum'.

The net result of this enquiry is, up to a certain point, very clear. Not till after the middle of the fourth century—if we except the confused and uncertain evidence of the MSS of Tertullian—do any indubitable traces of the forms in the third declension emerge. Perhaps Ambrosiaster is the earliest author that can be cited on this side¹: it is not till the fifth century that the new type predominates. Of older authors the indeclinable usage is that of Lucifer and Ambrose, in other words of Italy in the fourth century. On the other hand the *de Pascha computus*, the Latin translator of Irenaeus, Optatus, Hilary, the Speculum, and probably Tyconius, use the second declension in the case of Daniel, and I cannot doubt that we ought to add St Cyprian to this list: for Ezekiel the indeclinable form seems to be that of Irenaeus and Hilary, but the second declension has the support of the Africans Optatus and Tyconius, and this consideration must exercise a reflex effect on our estimate of the probabilities of its correctness in St Cyprian.

On the whole, then, in the case of Daniel the evidence, both in the Cyprianic MSS and in the early Latin fathers generally, in favour of the forms in the second declension is sufficient to remove all ground for hesitation. In the case of Ezekiel the evidence for the parallel forms, whether in St Cyprian or outside, is definitely less: it is possible that other authors besides St Hilary and the translator of St Irenaeus used the second declension for the name Daniel without doing the same thing for Ezekiel: and though I think it probable that St Cyprian wrote 'Ezechielum', I should still a little doubt whether the conclusion is certain enough to warrant an editor in introducing this form into the text.

§ 7. ORTHOGRAPHY OF PROPER NAMES IN THE BIBLICAL TEXT OF THE *TESTIMONIA*.²

[Since the publication of the first part of these Prolegomena I have re-collated myself the Crawford-Manchester MS (X), and have added

¹ I learn from Mr Souter that there is evidence both for the indeclinable form 'Ezechiel' in the ablative, *Quaest.* xli 1, cvi 9, and for the second declension 'Danihelo' in the dative, in *Rom.* iii 31, *Quaest.* xlv 14.

² Names occurring only in the formulae of quotation of biblical books are excluded, as having already been dealt with in § 1 of these Prolegomena. References given within square brackets are to passages where the names are given in St Cyprian's language and not in a definite quotation.

to my list (vi 247, 248) the readings of a second Oxford MS, U, Laud. misc. 105, saec. x.]

Aaron: see 'Aron'.

Abdenago (Dan. iii 14, nominative) 121. 14: 'Abdennago' U.

Abel [45. 21, nominative]. The name occurs also in St Cyprian in oblique cases without case-endings: accusative 421. 24, 660. 6, 668. 4.

Abennezer (1 Reg. vii 12, nominative) 84. 1. 'Abenezzer' P 'Abbenzehir' R 'Abeinnezer' U.¹

Abraham, Abrahæ.

nominative 'Abraham' [43. 17]: 43. 18 ('Abram' R): 128. 9: 150 13 ('Habraham' X*): 166. 6 ('Abraha' P 'Habraham' X).

vocative 'Abraham' 67. 8: 134. 10 ('Habraham' X*).

accusative 'Abraham' 54. 2: [67. 7 ('Abraam' P²): 127. 19 ('Habraham' X).

genitive. (1) 'Abrahæ' 44. 2 ('Habrahæ' L* 'Habrahe' M): 113. 7 ('Habrahæ' T*). (2) 'Abraham', only in the phrase 'of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob', and therefore probably by assimilation to the two indeclinable names: 87. 1 (Exod. iii 6: 'Abrahæ' P 'Habraham' R*): 145. 3 (Luc. xx 37: 'Abrahæ' P 'Habraham' X).

dative 'Abrahæ' 44. 3 ('Habrahe' M): [52. 15].

ablative 'Abraham' 44. 4 ('Abrahæ' R): 58. 16.

Among other early authorities, *k* has 'Abraham' in the ablative ²/₁, 'Abrahæ' in the genitive and dative, except Mc. xii 26 'Abraham . . . Isac . . . Iacob', thus exactly agreeing with St Cyprian. In Priscillian again the genitive is 'Abrahæ' except in *tract.* ii (37. 15) 'deus Abraham deus Isac deus Iacob'. This is a distinction which has escaped the notice of the new *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, and vitiates an otherwise valuable collection of material.

In Tyconius the ablative is 'Abraham' (ed. Burkitt 29. 15, 17), the genitive and dative regularly 'Abrahæ'.³ The Lyons Heptateuch gives 'Abrahæ' usually, 'Abraham' occasionally, for the genitive and dative.⁴

Acha or **Achas** 73. 21 (Is. vii 10: acc.) 'Acha' A* L* *ut uid.* 'Achas' O U 'Ahas' M 'Achoz' B 'Achaz' A² L² P T W X 'Achab' R: 74. 1 (Is. vii 12: nom.) 'Acha' A³ 'Adchas' A* 'Achas' M O U (V), 'Achaz' A³ B L P T W X, 'Achab' R.

It might be doubted here whether 'Achas' was not rather the right

¹ Hartel should, I think, have printed the words 'et appellauit nomen eius Abennezer id est lapis auxiliator' as a quotation. That 'lapis auxiliator' was actually in use as an equivalent of *λίθος τοῦ βοηθοῦ* is proved by Jerome's notice in his version of Eusebius's *περὶ τῶν τοικῶν ὀνομάτων* 'Abenezzer quod interpretatur lapis adiutorii [the Vulgate phrase] siue lapis auxiliator'.

² I believe I have noticed one exception, but I cannot lay my hand on it.

³ I reckon the numbers to be for the genitive Abraham ⁶/₁₁, Abrahæ ¹¹/₁₁, for the dative Abrahæ ¹⁰/₁₁, Abraham ¹/₁₁.

reading than 'Acha': but the analogy of 'Iona' and 'Iuda' is in favour of the latter alternative. On the other hand 'Achas' is found in *de Pascha computus* § 11, and in Matt. i 9 according to *k* 'Iothas genuit Achaos et Achas genuit Ezechian' ('Achaz' *af* Vulg.: def. *b d e*).¹ The oldest (sixth century) MS of Eucherius of Lyons—vol. xxxi of the *Vienna Corpus*, 142. 21—gives 'Ahac', perhaps for 'Acha'.

Adam nominative [45. 20]: 152. 9 *bis*.

accusative 158. 4.

There appear to be no passages from which the form of the genitive and dative can be established: but presumably 'Abraham' 'Abrahae' found its parallel in 'Adam' 'Adae'. The ablative 'Adam' occurs 804. 17.

Aegyptus 39. 1 ('Egipt.' T): 39. 9: 46. 23: 68. 15: 69. 13 ('Aegipt.' W): 75. 2: 90. 16.

Aethiopum 68. 15 ('Ethiopum' P).

Amalec or **Amalech** [83. 14]: [83. 16]: [89. 10]: 89. 12: 89. 15: 89. 19: 90. 2. 'Amalech' is the form always given by A L O T, 'Amalec' by X and (where extant) P: R U give now one, now the other. 'Amalec' is also given by S (cod. Paris. lat. 10592, saec. vi) in the *ad Fortunatum*, 330. [18], 23, 331. 3, 6: so too the Lyons Heptateuch with no exception that I have noticed except Num. xiii 30.

Compare 'Enoc' and 'Melchisedech'.

Anna: accusative 'Annam' [53. 5].

Annianus 151. 2. So A L P R T W: 'Anianus' only in B M O U X. 'Annianus' is the name of the Damascene Christian of Acts ix 10–16 in the Fleury palimpsest.

Aron [38. 22]: 89. 17. The reading 'Aron' rests on few, but those the most ancient, authorities: in the first case A V, in the second A, in the *ad Fortunatum* (331. 1) S. With these agree not only the Lyons Heptateuch, but also the Munich and Würzburg fragments of the O. T.: so too the sixth-century MS of Eucherius (42. 2). As in the case of Isaac, Beelzebul, Bethleem, I believe the first Latin translators instinctively avoided the double vowel, as alien to the genius of their language. An alternative form, prompted as I think by the same instinct, is 'Aharon', which is found in the earliest MS of Optatus (ed. Ziwsa 24. 1, 60. 7) and at least sometimes in the unique MS of Lucifer (ed. Hartel 210. 18, 211. 1).

Assyriorum 69. 12 ('Asyriorum' R).

Azarias 151. 2.

Bahal 39. 11: 39. 12. In the former instance 'Bahal' is supported by A B M P² U (V), in the latter by A P U (V). The other MSS have 'Baal', except R*, which both times gives 'Bal' ['in Itala et in

¹ Add from the *Thesaurus linguae latinae Jordanes Romana* §§ 52, 53.

vetustioribus codicibus fere semper Bahal scribitur' *Thes. ling. lat.*].

The Lyons Heptateuch has always 'Bahalim' or 'Bahal': 'Bahal' also in Priscillian (19. 13), Lucifer (94. 21, 95. 19: 218. 2 'seruos Bahal': 224. 3 'excelso illi Bahal': but 223. 19 'Bahali et soli et lunae').

Belzebul 172. 2. So A O V and possibly L*: 'Beizebul' U 'Belzezul' B 'Beelzebul' R W 'Belzebub' L² P X 'Beelzebul' M T.

'Belzebul' is read by *d h k* in this passage (Matt. x 25), 'Velzebul' by *b*, 'Beelzebul' by *af*. Similarly the Greek authorities, so far as we have them, are divided only between *Beεζεβούλ* and *Beελζεβούλ*: if St Jerome in the Vulgate, and the Syriac Versions, agree independently in the rendering 'Beelzebub', this must be treated as an intentional departure from the Greek on the ground of the Hebrew form. Any occurrence of the form 'Beelzebub' in Latin may confidently be ascribed to the influence of the Vulgate. The *Thesaurus* indeed quotes Tertullian *adv. Marcionem* iv 26 'quem Beelzebub . . . dixerat'. It ought, I think, to have been possible to divine the truth even before the appearance of the Vienna edition (1906): in any case we now know that throughout the passage Tertullian wrote 'Belzebulem' 'Belzebule'.¹

Bethel 68. 12. 'Bethel' P, 'Betlem' R, 'Bethleem' W.

Bethlem. So A O P R in [60. 21]: L M P R X in [77. 3]: L M P R T U X in 77. 4: P U in 77. 8: A T U W X (and L 'Behtlem') in 98. 15. A X, wherever they do not give 'Bethlem', give 'Betlem'. 'Bethleem' (the Vulgate form) is only supported by L U W B in [60. 21], O T U in [77. 3], B O in 77. 4, L M O R T B in 77. 8, M O in 98. 15. For 'Bethlehem' the evidence is slighter still, M in [60. 21], B in [77. 3], B R in 98. 15.

k has 'Bethlem' ²/₈, 'Bethleem' ²/₈; *e* 'Bethlem' (once 'Vethlem') ²/₈; *a* 'Bethlem' (once 'Baethlem') ⁷/₈; *ff*₂ 'Bethlem' ²/₈, 'Bethleem' ¹/₈. It seems safe to conclude that, as in the case of 'Belzebul', the earliest Latin translators avoided the double e as contrary to the custom of their language: but the correction to 'Bethleem' was made early, for it is found in *b d* Lucifer. Note that St Cyprian is more consistently correct in this case than *k*.²

¹ Similarly in all the editions hitherto printed Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones* cxxvii, is made to say 'in Beelzebub eiciebat daemonia': but Mr Souter, in his forthcoming edition for the Vienna Academy, prints 'Belzebul' with one MS only, but that the best, of his author.

² The *Thesaurus* adds for 'Bethlem' *Itinerarium Burdigalense* p. 598 and Hilary in *ps.* cxxxi 13: in the passage cited from Paulinus of Nola *ep.* xxxi § 3 the oldest MS also gives 'Bethlem'. The Latin Irenaeus IV xxxiii 11 is quoted for 'Bethleem': but I notice that in III xvi 4 the Clermont MS has 'in Bethlem natus est Iudeae', while the editions give 'in Bethleem natus est Iudae'.

Daniel 155. 15 : also, for the title of the book, [42. 15] : [84. 5] : [92. 17] : [121. 13]. For the form in the oblique cases see § 1 of these Prolegomena, and § 6 *supra* (p. 62). The balance of evidence appears to favour the form 'Daniel' in St Cyprian without an aspirate (so in 155. 15 A M P U W X : 'Danihel' L O R T)¹ : and so too Priscillian $\frac{2}{3}$. On the other hand in the oblique cases the preponderance of evidence is for the aspirate, both in St Cyprian, see § 1 above, and in most other early writers. See below, 'Emmanuel,' 'Gabriel,' 'Rafael,' etc.

David nominative [83. 21] : accusative 146. 5 : genitive [60. 20], 72. 15, 72. 21, 73. 2, 74. 3, [75. 19], 76. 15, 77. 1 : dative 49. 8, 75. 21, 76. 9. In no instance is there any variant in the orthography of the name, or any case-ending.

Efrata or **Efratha** 77. 4 (Mic. v 1 [2]). Here again the variations are puzzling, and the decision between them difficult : A has 'Efrata', R 'Efrata', O 'Efratha', P X (and T *in ras*) 'Ephrata', L M U B 'Ephratha' : W is defective : why Hartel prints 'Efrata' I cannot say. The *Altercatio* (20. 1) copies St Cyprian at this point, but its MSS are divided between 'Efratha' (probably right), 'Efratha', 'Eufrata', and 'Euffrata'.

The Weingarten MS of the Prophets has 'Efrata' : in Hilary *in ps. cxxxi* the editor gives 'Ephrata', but the oldest MSS either 'Efrata' or 'Efratha' : similarly in Ambrose *de Iacob* ii 7 the edition has 'Ephratha', the earliest MSS 'Efrata', 'Efrata', or 'Efratha'.

Efrem or **Effrem** 54. 15 : 54. 16 : 69. 16. Hartel gives 'Efraim' each time, but apparently without any sort of authority : the only doubt is between 'Efrem' (so always A P T* : and on the first occasion L R W, on the second R U, on the third B L O U X) and 'Effrem' (so always V b T* : and on the first occasion B X, on the second B L M W X, on the third M W).

The Lyons Heptateuch uses predominantly the form 'Ephrem' ; but that in St Cyprian has no more authority than M $\frac{1}{3}$, O $\frac{2}{3}$, R *in ras* $\frac{1}{3}$. Priscillian gives 'Efrem' $\frac{3}{3}$. Hatch-Redpath's Concordance to the LXX cites Old Latin authorities for 'Efrem' 'Ephrem' 'Eufrem' 'Aefrem' 'Ephraem' 'Efrain'—but for the last four there is only one instance apiece. The very rarity of the form 'Effrem' inclined me to believe it genuine in St Cyprian : I had found it elsewhere only in one MS of the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (ed. Bratke 53. 5 : in 23. 1 all the MSS have 'Efrem'), which here as often elsewhere is copying the *Testimonia*. On the other hand I now see that in St Ambrose *de Ioseph* § 7 'Efrem' is the reading of the oldest MSS, 'Effrem' of the later MSS : the Vienna edition still gives 'Ephraem'.

¹ Compare also *de op. et el.* 11 (382. 8), where the two oldest MSS, FS, both have 'Daniel' : Hartel wrongly leaves it to be inferred that F has 'Danieli'.

Eleazar 165. 10 (Luc. xvi 25). So LO* P U V W X : 'et Lazarus' M, 'Lazarus' A B R (and T *in ras*): compare the fuller statement of evidence collected by me in *J. T. S.* ii 600-602, *Cypr. Ep.* lix § 3, *Tert. de idol.* § 13, *de anima* § 7, *Iren.* (cod. C) II xxxiv 1, III xiv 3, *Paulinus of Nola Epp.* xiii, xxxiv, *Carm.* xxxi 584, *Prudentius in exsequiis defunctorum* l. 38, and among MSS *ce* as well as the two Spanish MSS C T of the Vulgate. To these I can now add evidence from MSS of Eucherius of Lyons (33. 20, 'Eleazarus' one good MS: 113. 26, 'Eleazaro' the oldest MS).

It is interesting to note that where Hartel does give the forms 'Eleazar' 'Eleazarum'—for the Eleazar of 2 Maccabees, *ad Fort.* 341. 20, 342. 1—the oldest MSS have 'Eliezer' 'Eliezerum'.

Elias or **Hēlias** [40. 7: 3 Reg. xix 10]. A has 'Haelias' (so *a* in Io. i 25): L² M P T 'Helias': L* O R U X 'Elias', and this form is so uncommon that it must probably be original. It cannot have come in from the Vulgate, for in the New Testament at any rate the aspirate is almost universal in Vulgate MSS. Even among the Old Latin MSS 'Elias' is extraordinarily rare: it is never found in *a* or *d*, once in *f* (Matt. xvi 14), once in *ff*₂ (Matt. xxvii 49), possibly once in *k* (Marc. viii 28), three times in *δ*, four times in *ε*. Nor is it in Priscillian, who so often agrees with the best orthography in St Cyprian: *tract.* iii (47. 8) 'Helias in Regnorum ait'. But on the other side the fifth-century fragment of the *de opere et elemosynis* (Turin G v 37) has 'Helias' once (382. 7), if I may trust my notes, but 'Elias' certainly three times (386. 17, 19, 25)—a fact not mentioned by Hartel.

[**Elisabeth** ('Elisabet' P V) 73. 9 (Luc. i 41). But the name is omitted by LX(U*?), and is therefore probably not genuine in St Cyprian's text. In view of the controversy which has raged round the names 'Mary' and 'Elisabeth' in Luc. i 46, it is important to notice the perhaps not unrelated variations in verse 41. 'Elisabeth' is given twice in the ordinary texts, but the witnesses are divided as to the exact point where the first occurrence should be marked: *καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἢ Ἐλισάβητ* [al. *ἢ Ἐλισάβητ τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας*], *ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἢ Ἐλισάβητ*. Codex D, however, adds both in the Greek and Latin a third mention of the name Elisabeth by substituting, for the middle clause, *ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς Ἐλισάβηδ τὸ βρέφος αὐτῆς*. 'exultavit in utero Elisabet infans eius': while on the other hand the African Latin, as represented by both *e* and St Cyprian, omits the name after 'impleta est Spiritu sancto', and as represented by St Cyprian omits it (as we have just seen) on the first occasion also. Now if the original Latin version omitted the personal names so frequently in this narrative, it becomes possible that the name Mary may have been

omitted by it in verse 46; and the name Elisabeth may then have been inserted there, as in verse 41, at the second stage in the history of the version. This would, it seems to me, entirely explain the presence of the name Elisabeth in verse 46 in *ab* Iren. lat. Niceta. Certainly in verse 46 the name Elisabeth is not found in the earliest Latin version, any more than in the earliest Syriac: it has no claim to be considered a 'Western' reading of the best attestation.]

Emmanuel 71. 14 (Matt. i 23): 74. 6 (Is. vii 14). In the first case the evidence is clearly preponderant for this form: 'Emmanuhel' is given in the first case only by LT (against A M O P U V W X), in the second by A L O (against M P T U V X *b*). R has both times 'Enmanuhel'. Hartel's 'Emanuel' in the second case is doubtless a misprint.

In Matt. i 23 'Emmanuhel' appears to be the best attested form in the Vulgate, 'Emmanuel' in the Old Latin (so *abfk* Priscillian $\frac{1}{2}$: 'Immanuel' Priscill. $\frac{1}{2}$, 'Inmanuel' *d*).

Enoc [45. 21]: 158. 11. So both times A P X, and in the first instance R, in the second U*: the rest have 'Enoch'. In *de mortalitate* 23 (311. 16, 18) Hartel gives 'Enoch' without variant.

The Old Latin has 'Enoc' in Luc. iii 37 (*abeff*₂: *d* has 'Aenox', D Ανωχ), where 'Enoch' is the Vulgate form. Priscillian too has 'Enoc' $\frac{2}{3}$.

Esau 68. 13.

Eua 152. 9 (1 Tim. ii 13). So A P, and apparently W: O X have 'Aeua', the rest 'Eua'. Priscillian has 'Euua' $\frac{2}{3}$: and so too the best MS of the *Quaestiones* of Ambrosiaster. See also 'Leuui'.

Fennana [53. 5: 1 Reg. i 2 Φεννάνα]. So L O P U V W: 'Gennana' A, 'Fennena' M B, 'Fennenna' X, 'Fenenana' R. Hartel (against all his MSS) 'Fenenna'.

Filippus 151. 6 (Act. viii 37) A X: 'Philippus' L P R T U, 'Phylippus' O.

The form 'Philippus' is not only that of the Vulgate, but of most Old Latin MSS of the Gospels and Acts. Yet there appear to be traces of a very early stage when the Greek Φ was represented by the vernacular Latin F. So the Fleury palimpsest in Acts vi 5: *k* $\frac{1}{2}$ (Matt. 13), *k* $\frac{1}{3}$ (Matt. x 3): *d* once only (Mc. iii 18): *ff*₂ once only (Jo. xiv 8: but 'Pilippus' twice Jo. xiv 22): *bf* sporadically in the episode Jo. i 43-48: and I believe this to be genuine in St Cyprian.

Gabriel [72. 14]: [75. 10]. So on the first occasion A O U X, on the second A P T U: 'Gabrihel' the first time L P R T, the second L O R X.

The name occurs only twice in N. T., Luc. i 19, 26: *abd* all have 'Gabriel', *e* 'Grabriel', *ff*₃ 'Grabiel'.

Gog 75. 1 (Num. xxiv 7). The phrase 'exaltabitur quam Gog ipsum regnum' is the exact equivalent of the LXX *ἠψωθήσεται ἡ Γὼγ βασιλεία* [αὐτοῦ], but it caused difficulty both to Hartel, who obelized 'quam', and to the scribes of several of our MSS: thus for 'Gog' we have, besides the 'Cogi' of X, in R 'Quod', in B 'Gens', in M² 'Gygans', in O¹ 'quia Magog'.

Goliae (genitive) [83. 21].

Gomora 44. 13 (Is. i 10): 146. 16 (Gen. xix 24). For the case-endings see below under 'Sodoma'. In the orthography there are three variant forms, 'Gomorra' (= Greek), 'Gomora', and 'Gomurra': (1) 'Gomurra' A X, 'Gomora' V, 'Gomorra' the rest: (2) 'Gomurra' A, 'Gomora' R, 'Gomorra' the rest. The authority for the single r is in appearance slight; but it is so markedly confirmed by the best Old Latin witnesses that I have little hesitation in replacing it in St Cyprian's text. For the Lyons Heptateuch has 'Gomora' 'Gomoram', $\frac{1}{4}$: $\frac{1}{2}$ 'Gomora' $\frac{1}{1}$ (Matt. x 15): Priscillian 'Gomora' $\frac{1}{1}$ (*tract.* i: 7. 25).

Helcana [53. 4: 1 Reg. i 1]. So L P R T: 'Elcana' A, 'Helchana' B M^{*} O U W X.

Heli [50. 17]. 'Eli' M R: 'Elin' apparently O (possibly 'Eliā' O^{*}): 'Heliam' U.

Helias: see 'Elias'.

Herodis in the genitive twice, 77. 8: 98. 15. In the former passage M^{*} gives 'Herodes'.

Hiericho: see 'Iericho'.

{ **Hierosolima** 77. 9 (Matt. ii 1): 98. 16 (Matt. ii 1 again).

{ **Hierosolimis** 86. 3 (Io. iii 28: the words 'eis qui missi sunt ab Hierosolimis ad me' are found in *c* Cyprian, but in no other authorities).

For the feminine form 'Hierosolymam', though Hartel prints it both in 77. 9 and in 98. 16, there is little to be said: the ending in -ma is found in *abdfk*, the ending in -mam is the reading of the Vulgate. And the presumption thus created is borne out by the grouping of the Cyprian MSS: for the neuter we have in 77. 9 A B L^{*} or ²O^{*} P U, in 98. 16 A L O U V X: for the feminine in 77. 9 L^{*} or ²M O² R T X, in 98. 16 B M R T W.

Hierusalem vocative 44. 14: accusative [37. 13], [44. 5], 45. 10, 85. 22, 90. 6: genitive 85. 14: ablative 46. 11, 46. 14, 57. 21, 84. 25. As between the declinable and the indeclinable forms of the name, St Cyprian's bible no doubt simply followed the variations of the Greek text between *Ἱεροσαλήμ* and *Ἱεροσόλυμα*. The indeclinable form is that which he himself employed, as the two references [37. 13], [44. 5] suffice to shew.

Priscillian uses only 'Hierusalem' ($\frac{2}{3}$ from the bible, $\frac{1}{3}$ in his own references).

With regard to the orthography, there can be little doubt that *i* is correct in the penultimate as against *y*: it has in its favour 77. 9 A B O R X, 86. 3 A L M O R X, 98. 16 A L O R W X (in the first two passages W is not extant). And though the Old Latin MSS of the Gospels for the most part give consistently 'Hierosolyma', *k* on the other hand gives 'Hierosolima' ^{9/12}. It is more difficult to decide between *o* and *u* in the third syllable: *u* has, I think, little authority outside St Cyprian in our earliest witnesses, and is perhaps due to assimilation to the form 'Hierusalem', but it has the support of A M X in 77. 9, of A M in 86. 3, and of W X in 98. 16.

Hur: see 'Or'.

Iacob 46. 7: [52. 18]: 54. 8: 58. 16: [67. 12]: 68. 11: 69. 8: 74. 18: 76. 15: [83. 8]: 84. 23: 85. 7: 87. 2: 108. 4: 145. 4. All cases, except the vocative, are represented: nor is there any variation to record.

Iericho 86. 11 (Jos. v 13). So B O P T X and *ex silentio* V: 'Ierico' M*: 'Hiericho' A L M³ R U. The combination A L is rarely not decisive: but 'Hiericho' is clearly the later (Vulgate and some Old Latin), 'Iericho' the earlier, orthography, at least in the Gospels. 'Iericho' is supported by *a* ^{1/4}, *b* ^{1/4}, *d* ^{4/6}, *e* ^{3/4}, *f* ^{2/4}, *k* ^{1/1}, *ff* ^{1/6} ('Iherico' ^{3/3}), and by the Lyons Heptateuch as well. [Jerome *de situ et nominibus* ranks 'Iericho' under the letter *i*, but then he does the same thing with 'Ierusalem'; so that he may have been simply copying the Greek arrangement of the names under *iota*.]

Iesse 56. 5: 76. 5. 'Iessae' O* or ² P R in the first instance, L P R in the second.

Iesus (Iesum, Iesu).

- (1) Iesus Naue. (nom.) 82. 19: [83. 14]: 86. 11: 86. 15: 89. 19. (acc.) [45. 16]: 45. 16: [82. 17]: [86. 7]: 89. 12.¹
(gen.) 90. 2; but 'eius' is perhaps right here, see note ³ further on. (abl.) [83. 16]: [89. 11].
- (2) Iesus sacerdos. (nom.) 78. 19. (acc.) 78. 17. (gen.) 82. 15.
- (3) Dominus Iesus Christus. (nom.) 70. 11: 73. 2: 77. 7: 79. 8: 98. 14: 98. 19¹: 99. 3: 111. 15: 111. 18: 113. 6: 149. 19: 159. 5: 173. 4.¹
(acc.) 72. 17: 73. 15: 76. 13: 82. 2: 124. 5.

¹ The words 'dixit Moyses ad Iesum' in 89. 11 are part of the quotation: in Prolegomena § 3 (*J. T. S.* vi 263) I wrongly gave them (following Hartel) as part of the *lemma*. The same is true of 98. 19 'dixit Iesus' (Jo. xviii 36), and 173. 4 'dixit Iesus' (Jo. xix 11): in both cases *e* has 'dixit' with St Cyprian for the Greek *ἀντιπρόη*.

(gen.) 79. 7: 83. 2: 124. 8: 149. 17: 165. 13: 168. 4¹: 169. 11: 174. 14.

(abl.) 94. 14: 159. 6.

In all instances of the nominative the form 'Iesus' is certain, and in all of the genitive and ablative the form 'Iesu'.¹ For the accusative the form 'Iesum' is equally certain in all instances under (2) and (3), and so too in the two instances under (1) which belong to the biblical text 'ad Iesum', 45. 16 and 89. 12: but in the formulae of quotation from the book of Joshua, 'apud Iesu Naue' was shewn to be right in Prolegomena § 1 (*J. T. S.* vi 248).

Priscillian has in the nominative once 'Hiesu Naue' *tract.* i (31. 6), once 'Iesus Naue' *tract.* iv (61. 3).

Iob 127. 8.

{ **Iohannis** or **Iohannes**, nom. [47. 16]: 82. 2 (Jo. i 29): 87. 3 (Jo. i. 26).

{ **Iohannem** or **Iohannen**, accusative 46. 8 (Matt. xi 13).

For the nominative A gives in each case 'Iohannis' (but Hartel is wrong in citing L for the same form in [47. 16]): and 'Iohannis' may possibly be right, for though *ê* has it only once (Matt. xi 18), it is the predominant form in *e*, and Priscillian has it ²/₇.

'Iohannen' is the form of the accusative given by M* T* in 46. 8: see further Prolegomena § 2 (*J. T. S.* vi 258), on the formula 'cata Iohannem' or 'cata Iohannen'.

Iona, nominative, and **Ionæ**, genitive, 92. 12 (Matt. xii 39. 40). For the genitive 'Ionæ' there is no variant: for the nominative LX are alone (P is defective) with 'Iona', as against 'Ionas' of the rest. But 'Iona' is read here by *ê*, and in verse 41 by the best MSS of Irenæus

¹ The opportunity may be taken here in passing of ridding St Cyprian's text of Hartel's strange reading (which the apparatus criticus shews to be no misprint) 'Domini Iesu nostri Christi'. L O P R T U X *b* read 'Domini Iesu Christi': A M B (V) 'Domini nostri Iesu Christi'.

² In 83. 14 A reads 'Hiesum Naue' for 'Iesus Naue'; and in 149. 19 the same MS has *ihus* for 'Iesus'—apparently correcting 'ihū' into 'ih̄s'. In 90. 2 L B O T U X read 'eius' for 'Iesu'. I am afraid I have not exhaustively noted the exceptions to the normal contractions *ih̄s ih̄t ih̄m*: but my impression is that the scribes meant to distinguish the sacred name from the others by confining to it the use of the contracted forms. Certainly for Joshua the name is generally written in full, and at least in most of the MSS (I can speak definitely for L) in the form 'Iesus'. I do not think 'Ihesus' ever occurs.

But all that is here written must be tentative until we are in possession of the final word on the subject in Dr Ludwig Traube's treatise on the *Nomina Sacra*. Of what Dr Traube's too early death means to his friends and to the cause of learning, I cannot trust myself to speak: it is some small satisfaction to know that the treatise to which I have referred was left by him all but ready for publication.

(*Har.* III xxi 8 'plus quam Salomon aut plus quam Iona habere' codd. AC, IV ix 2 'plus quam Salomon et plus quam Iona donat hominibus' codd. AC, IV xxxiii 4 'plus quam Solomon aut plus quam Iona habebat'): and I do not doubt that it is the true reading in St Cyprian. Compare 'Acha' ('Achas') and 'Iuda' ('Iudas').

Iordanen or **Iordanem**, accusative, 56. 8 (Is. viii 23 [ix 1]), 'Iordanem' A W X, 'Iordanen' L M O P R T U. The ending in -en is supported in the Gospels by *dk* and predominantly by *abeff*, as well, in the Heptateuch by the Lyons MS, and, though it is true that in orthography A W X is a strong combination, is perhaps right here. But, if so, the reading -em requires explanation: and I am inclined to believe that 'Iordanem' is the true reading in the Vulgate, though nowhere accepted by Bishop Wordsworth. The evidence is as follows: Matt. iii 5 F of the Vulgate and the best MS of Augustine *de consensu evangelistarum*¹: iii 13 L M X* of the Vulgate and Aug.: iv 15 B E J (H Q) of the Vulg.: iv 25 B J Q and the best MS of Aug.: xix 1 M and the St Gall fragments (saec. v-vi) of Vulg. and the best MS of Aug.: Marc. iii 8 G M X (not St Gall) of Vulg.: x i G M R T V Ept. of Vulg.: Jo. i 28 G M of Vulg.: iii 26 B G M of Vulg.: x 40 G J M of Vulg. The authorities are few but weighty: for M J and the St Gall fragments are the oldest Italian MSS of the Vulgate Gospels, and the combination G M is a particularly good one. It seems possible that St Jerome tried to introduce the Latin form of the declension, but that custom, in this as in other small matters, ultimately proved too strong for the change.

Ioseph. nom. 54. 14: 54. 16: 54. 17. voc. 72. 14. acc. [53. 3]: [72. 14]. P ordinarily gives 'Iosef'; L in the Old Testament references (pp. 53. 54) 'Iosep', X three or four times (but not always in the same places as L) the same form. Priscillian, however, has 'Ioseph' both in O. T. and N. T.: and the Lyons Heptateuch appears to have 'Iosep' only once. 'Iosep' is found in one MS (Reichenau, saec. viii) of Primasius in Apoc. vii 8: and also (I owe the reference to Haussleiter's Primasius) in the pseudo-Cyprianic *de laude martyrii* 29 (Hartel appendix 50. 10) according to our MSS L Q.

Isac [52. 17] A M O* P: 54. 8 A L* M O* T*: 58. 16 A O P R T: 87. 1 A P T*: 127. 20 A L P R: 145. 4 A R T: [166. 8] A O* P. So also our oldest MS (S) in *de bon. pat.* 10 (Hartel 404. 5). Compare above 'Aron'.

There can be little doubt that the form 'Isac', given consistently by A, is genuine in St Cyprian. It is found also in the fifth-century palimpsest of Leptogenesis, Milan Ambros. C 73 inf. (p. 79) 'et dixit

¹ Prof. Burkitt has pointed out that this treatise, composed about 400 A. D., uses the Vulgate text of the Gospels: and it is now accessible in a critical edition in the *Vienna Corpus* vol. xliii.

Isac'. The Lyons Heptateuch has it always: so has Priscillian ⁶/₄. I notice it once in Lucifer (211. 31) and in one (7th cent.) MS of Eucherius (111. 9: 173. 7). More than once the diorthota of the best MS of Tyconius substitutes 'Issac' for 'Isaac' (13. 10, 20: 29. 25). Of the Old Latin MSS of N. T., *abde k* ($\frac{f}{2}$) and the Fleury palimpsest have 'Isac' wherever they are extant: *fg* and the Vulgate have 'Isaac'—that the St Gall fragments of the Vulgate Gospels have 'Isac' ²/₂ is a mark of the traditional spelling surviving in an early Vulgate MS.

The Jew Isaac, contemporary of pope Damasus, probably spelt his name 'Isac', for 'Isatis' is found in the genitive, 'Hisacem' in the accusative, in references to him: Morin, *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* (1899) iv 101 n. 1.

Istrahel 39. 8: 39. 11: 40. 9: 40. 19: 41. 2: 44. 20: 45. 17: 46. 20: [[66. 14, 66. 16, 67. 5]]¹: 67. 17: 68. 19: 69. 8: 72. 19: 74. 19: 77. 6: 81. 2: 82. 23: 83. 2: [83. 25]: 89. 15: 126. 11: 152. 13. All cases except the vocative occur, and there are no instances of case-endings. The spelling 'Istrahel' is given consistently by A (save where the abbreviation Ishl̄ is employed, 41. 2, 44. 20, 67. 5, 67. 17, 72. 19, 152. 13), though the second hand has corrected to 'Israhel' in 68. 19, 69. 8, 74. 19, 77. 6, 81. 2: but I do not think 'Istrahel' is found in any other MS. 'Israhel' is regular in LO PRUX, 'Israel' in Hartel.

'Istrahel' is universal, I think, in the Lyons Heptateuch, in Priscillian, in *a* and *b*: *d* varies between 'Istrahel' and 'Israhel'. *ff*² has 'Istrahel' ¹⁹/₂₈, 'Strahel' once (Luc. iv 25) and 'Israel' thrice. The specially African authorities for the Gospels appear to affect 'd' rather than 't': for while the Fleury palimpsest has 'Israel' ¹/₃, *e* has regularly 'Isdrahel', while *k* varies curiously between 'Isdrael' ⁶/₁₁, 'Isdrahel' ²/₁₁, 'Isdrahel' ¹/₁₁, 'Israel' ¹/₁₁, 'Istrahel' ¹/₁₁. In Eucherius of Lyons 88. 1, 160. 23, the sixth-century MS has 'Istrahel': and the same form occurs twice in the Karlsruhe MS of Pelagius on St Paul (Souter *The Commentary of Pelagius* p. 15).

Istrahelitaë 70. 15 A*: 'Israhelitaë' A²LOPRT(U). See preceding paragraph. The Lyons Heptateuch gives always 'Istrahelitaë'; in Io. i 47 *a b* have 'Istrahelita', *e* 'Isdrahelites'.

Iuda or Iudas, patriarcha. nom. 148. 19. voc. 54. 21: 55. 1. gen. 45. 10: 46. 20: 77. 1: 77. 5: 85. 14. abl. 55. 3. In all the

¹ These three references come from a passage which is of doubtful authenticity, as it is absent from the MSS LPRVXB. It is, I think, the only passage in the *Testimonia* about which it is impossible to say off-hand that it is genuine or spurious. It distinguishes itself from the obvious interpolations, not only by the relative number of MSS which contain it, but by the presence of the proper key-word of the chapter, in this case 'manus Domini' (67. 4).

oblique cases the form 'Iuda' is without variant, and I have assumed that in 55. 1 'catulus leonis Iuda' (where all MSS, including V, give this form) the case meant is vocative. If so, the only instance of the nominative is in 148. 19 (Gen. xxxviii 15), and here P alone gives 'Iuda', the rest 'Iudas' (A* 'iudicas'). In spite of the adverse testimony of the best MSS, I suspect 'Iuda' may be right: compare 'Iona' (and perhaps 'Acha') above.

The Lyons Heptateuch has 'Iuda' (in the nominative) once only, Gen. xxxvii 26: elsewhere always 'Iudas'. Priscillian ap. Orosium (*Commonitorium* § 2, 153. 20) has 'Iuda' nom.: in his own *tractatus* he happens to use only the genitive ('Iudae' ¹/₄, 'Iuda' ²/₄) and ablative.

Iudas traditor. nom. 80. 4: dat. [173. 9]. In the former passage 'Iudas', in the latter 'Iudae' are without variant.

Iudaea (Iudeae). gen. 77. 8: 98. 15 (both Matt. ii 1). abl. 57. 21 (Is. iii 1). In the ablative the termination in -aea is certain (so ALPUX): in the two other passages, 'Bethlehem of Judaea,' there is more variety of text. Some MSS—in 77. 8 MPX; in 98. 15 MORWX²—give 'Iudae', which is certainly wrong and perhaps derived from Vulgate MSS, in which 'Iudae' is a common reading. 'Iudaeae,' on the other hand, is hardly represented at all either in the MSS of St Cyprian or of the Vulgate: it would seem that there was an instinctive aversion to the four vowels or double diphthong. In 77. 8 L, in 98. 15 X, give 'Iudae': but the converse reading 'Iudeae' appears to be right both in the Vulgate (ABFHJTYZ²) and in St Cyprian (77. 8 ABOTU: 98. 15 ALTU²). If Vb are quoted in both places from Latini's notes in favour of 'Iudaeae', this is decisive as against their reading 'Iudae', but not decisive in the matter of orthography between 'Iudeae' and 'Iudaeae'.

At the same time the evidence of the older Old Latin MSS is rather in favour in this passage of 'Iudaeae' (adk) than of 'Iudeae' (bfg).

Lasarus: see 'Eleazar'.

Leui (157. 17: Mal. iii 3). So AP: and see above on 'Euua'. The rest have 'Leui'.

Lugd. gives 'Leuii' in Exodus, 'Leui' in Num. Deut. Jos.: in Genesis both forms appear. I have found 'Leuii' also in f at Luc. iii 29, and of the apostle in one early MS of Eucherius (144. 4): it occurs also in the best MS of Ambrosiaster's *Questiones*.

Lia [53. 1]. Most of our MSS read here 'Liam' ('Lia' O), but MPT* 'Lian', which may possibly be right. But Lugd. gives the accusative 'Liam'.

Mannasse gen. 54. 17 (Gen. xlviii 17). The MSS vary: A 'Manasse', P 'Manasses', X 'Manassem', LMORTU 'Manasse'.

The double n is given by A only of our MSS: but it corresponds to the Greek *Μαννασση* of the codex Alexandrinus of the LXX, and appears in two of the three forms, 'Mannasse' 'Manasse' 'Mannase', used by the Lyons Heptateuch. The case-endings in the Lyons Heptateuch are very puzzling: outside Genesis only the genitive is found, and that always in -e: but in Genesis we have nom. 'Manasses' $\frac{1}{4}$, acc. 'Manassem' $\frac{2}{4}$, 'Manasse' $\frac{1}{4}$, genitive 'Manasses' $\frac{1}{4}$ (or if 'Manasse' in Gen. xvi 20 is genitive and not dative, $\frac{4}{4}$). In Priscillian the nominative is in -es (101. 13), ablative in -e (102. 4), genitive in -e (51. 5: but this refers to Manasse king of Judah).

Maria (**Mariam, Mariae**). voc. 76. 12: acc. 72. 15, [75. 11]: gen. 73. 9.

Melohisedech. [45. 24]: 50. 17. In the former passage P has 'Melchisedhaec': in the latter W 'Melchisedech', PUX 'Melchisedec', T 'Mechisedec'. See also 'Amalec' 'Enoc'.

Misac 121. 14. B 'Misach'.

Misahel 151. 3.

Moses nom. [38. 3] LX*: 38. 23 L: [39. 1] L: 43. 1 L: [45. 13] L: [51. 5] L: 51. 16 L: [83. 13] L: [86. 18] L: 86. 22 L: 88. 17 L: 89. 11 L: 89. 14 L: 145. 2 LP. All other MSS have 'Moyses'.

Mose voc. 86. 24 (Exod. iii 4) LT*: 'Moysse' X, 'Moysen' U, 'Moyses' the rest.

Mosen acc. [37. 18] L ('Mosem' X): 39. 5 L: [46. 3] L: [51. 8] L: [80. 23] L: [89. 11] L: 90. 1 L ('Moysem' X*): [90. 13] L: 92. 7 L: [106. 20] LT* ('Moysin' X*): 126. 8 (not L): [178. 9] L. The rest 'Moysen'.

Mosei gen. 43. 5 ('Mosy' L): 89. 16 L ('Moyssei' W): 89. 18 L* ('Moses' L* 'Moysis' O* 'Moyssei' X). The rest 'Moysi'.

Mosi dat. 51. 17 LR: [146. 1] L. The rest 'Moysi'.

No name in the *Testimonia* is more doubtful than this, the commonest of them all. After much hesitation I have elected to follow what is practically the consistent testimony of L, reinforced very occasionally by some other MS.¹

With regard to the spelling, 'Moyses' predominates not only in Old Latin but in Vulgate MSS: and we can therefore hardly explain the 'Moses' of L as due to Vulgate influence. But 'Moses' is universal in $\frac{1}{7}$: and Bishop Wordsworth shews that it was the original reading of the Vulgate, though it is represented only in a minority of the MSS.² We have therefore here the not very usual phenomenon of a feature of the earliest Latin version, obliterated in all later forms of the

¹ In the spelling of the name of Cyprian's correspondent, the Roman presbyter and confessor, the 'Moses' of L is supported also by Q: see 545. 2, 565. 4, 576. 2.

² To those used by Bp. Wordsworth I can add the St Gall fragments $\frac{1}{6}$.

Old Latin but reproduced by St Jerome. And on the strength of the agreement with *h* I venture to think that L here represents alone the true text of St Cyprian.

Having followed L in the orthography, it was natural to follow it in the case-endings. Only the vocative and genitive come here into question: about the nominative in -es, the accusative in -en, and the dative in -i there is no doubt, and the ablative is not represented in St Cyprian's quotations. For the vocative in -e, L is supported by T* X, and this form agrees with the Greek: but the Lyons Heptateuch has 'Moyses': I do not know any other authorities which cite the vocative case. For the genitive in -ei, L has again support from WX, and the form is occasionally found in the Old Latin MSS—*e* in Matt. xxiii 2, *d* in Luc. xxiv 44.

Perhaps it may be worth while to add something about the varieties of declension under which the name 'Moses' ('Moyses') appears in Latin authorities.

(1) *h* is quite unique with nom. 'Moses' ('Mosei' ¹/₄), gen. 'Moseos', dat. 'Mosi', abl. 'Mose'.

(2) The other Old Latin authorities are, except in regard to the ablative (there is no instance of the vocative in N. T.), more or less consistent with one another in the following declension—

nom. 'Moyses' ('Moysi' *e* in Luc. ix 30: 'Moeses' *b* in Mc. xii 19: 'Moises' oldest MS of Eucherius).

acc. 'Moysen' (Fleury palimpsest 'Monsen' in Act. vi 11, 'Mossem' in Act. vii 44).

gen. 'Moysi' ('Moysi' *e* in Matt. xxiii 2, *d* in Luc. xxiv 44: 'Moysis' *f h* in Matt. xxiii 2: 'Moysen' Lugd. ²/₂₁, Num. iii 1, x 29).

dat. 'Moysi'.

abl. 'Moysen' *a* ²/₃, *b* ²/₃, *d* ²/₄ (and 'Mosen' ¹/₄), *e* ²/₃, *f* ²/₃, Lugd. ²/₆, Fleury palimpsest ¹/₁: 'Moysi' *a* ¹/₃, Lugd. ¹/₄: 'Moyses' *b* ¹/₃, *d* ¹/₆ *f* ²/₃, *f* ¹/₃, Priscillian (but not in quotations) ²/₄.

(3) The Vulgate has systematically the declension 'Moses', 'Mosen', 'Mosi', 'Mosi', 'Mose'.

The two most remarkable features of this evidence are the ablative form 'Moysen', and the genitive 'Moysi'—the latter so persistent and universal as to have been left unaltered even by St Jerome. What the explanation of this form is, I am quite unable to say.

As to the orthography in -o and -oy, it corresponds of course to the difference between the Greek forms Μωσῆς and Μωυσῆς. On Dr Hort's principles there could be no doubt that the latter is the correct form in the Greek Testament: in the Gospels and Acts Μωσ. is given by AC pretty regularly, by NL occasionally, but by B only thrice (Lc. xvi 31, Jo. ix 28, Act. xxvi 22) and by D only thrice. On the

other hand, there can be equally little doubt that *Μωϋσῆς* corresponds more closely to the Hebrew *Mōsheh*. This correspondence would of course explain sufficiently the appearance of 'Moses' in the *Vulgate*: St Jerome may have restored it from the Hebrew, as in the case of 'Beelzebub'. But it leaves unexplained the 'Moses' of *k* (and, if I am right in relying here on L, of St Cyprian): are we in presence once more of a case of the original reading of the Greek Testament having to be restored from the African Latin?¹

Nabucodonosor 121. 14 (Dan. iii 16). So A W: the rest 'Nabuchodonosor', except X (and C in Ep. vi § 3 [483. 13]) 'Nabugodonosor'. In *ad Fort.* § 11 (337. 12) S has 'Nabucodonosor', R 'Nabucodonossor' (and so also in Ep. vi), V apparently 'Nabucchodonosor'.

Natham acc. 49. 7, 75. 20 (both quotations = 2 Reg. vii 4). This reading is only that of R in 49. 7, A R in 75. 20, as against 'Nathan' ('Natan' ²/₃ X) of the rest: but it is supported by Priscillian *tract.* iii, 50. 13 'Natham profetam' (cf. 50. 21 'in uerbis Nathae profetae').

Nazoreus or **Nazareus** 83. 2 (Act. iv 10): 165. 13 (Act. iii 6). For 'Nazoreus' we have in 83. 2 A* T* U *b*, in 165. 13 A: for 'Nazareus' (-aeus L) in 83. 2 L M O P B, in 165. 13 L M O P U B T* V W²: for 'Nazarenus' in both places apparently R T², and also in 165. 13 W* (yet I suspect that 'Nazoreus' may have been W's original reading): it is clear, therefore, that Hartel's 'Nazarenus' cannot stand, and the problem is to decide between the two other forms. But this cannot be done without looking somewhat further into the whole question.

Four Latin variations of the name occur: 'Nazoreus' 'Nazareus' 'Nazorenus' 'Nazarenus'. Of these the second and third are independent attempts at conflation between the other two: *Ναζωραῖος* and *Ναζαρηνός* are the only ultimate Greek originals. The triumph of the form 'Nazarene' has been so complete both in Latin and English that it is not easy to realize that not only do both forms go back to the New Testament writers themselves, but that two out of the four Evangelists used exclusively, and a third by preference, the form *Ναζωραῖος*. Our Authorized Version, indeed, paraphrases with the noun 'of Nazareth', except in Matt. ii 23 'he shall be called a Nazarene' and Acts xxiv 5 'the sect of the Nazarenes': the Revised Version is less consistent, adopting 'Nazarene' also in Matt. xxvi 71, Mc. xiv 67, xvi 6, but leaving 'of Nazareth' elsewhere. But it is to the *Vulgate* that we really owe the word 'Nazarene': and St Jerome uses 'Nazarenus' to the exclusion of all other forms, save in Matt.

¹ My colleague, Mr A. E. Cowley, tells me that the form *Μωϋσῆς* may be due to the erroneous etymology from the Coptic (*Μωϋ* = water: *εϋσῆς* = such as are saved) found in Josephus *Ant.* II ix 6, cf. *contra Ap.* i 31.

ii 23, 'Nazareus,' where we may suppose that his knowledge of the Hebrew bible led him to reproduce the exact form used by the Evangelist, rather than definitely to interpret the word as equal in meaning to 'Nazarene'. For the rest the conjecture may be permitted that he wished to make a distinction between 'Nazareus'—'Nazarene' in the literal and biblical sense, 'of Nazareth'—and 'Nazareus', the form which he was in the habit of employing in reference to the contemporary Judæo-Christian sect.¹

But, as has already been indicated, there is no such uniformity in the Greek text of the Gospels. St Matthew (ii 23: xxvi 71), St John (xviii 5, 7: xix 19) as well as the Acts (ii 22: iii 6: iv 10: vi 14: [ix 5]: xxii 8: xxiv 5: xxvi 9) use invariably Ναζωραῖος: St Mark as regularly (i 24: x 47: xiv 67: xvi 6) Ναζαρηνός. In St Luke's Gospel alone does the usage vary between the two: iv 34 Ναζαρηνός, xviii 37 Ναζωραῖος, xxiv 19 Ναζωραῖος A D Sahidic, Ναζαρηνός B L. And up to a certain point this diversity of usage is reflected in the Old Latin MSS, though it is complicated further by the cross-forms 'Nazareus' and 'Nazoreus'. I do not think anything short of a table will make the matter clear.

	'Nazoreus'	'Nazareus'	'Nazoreus'	'Nazareus'
Mt. ii 23	<i>abq</i>	<i>fk</i> Vulg.		
xxvi 71		<i>ff</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>abfk</i> Vulg.
Mc. i 24			<i>dq</i>	<i>beff</i> , Vulg.
x 47	<i>ff₂q*</i>		<i>dq*</i>	<i>abfk</i> Vulg.
xiv 67	<i>ff₂</i>		<i>dkq</i>	<i>af</i> Vulg.
xvi 6	<i>ff₂k</i>		<i>g</i>	Vulg.
Lc. iv 34			<i>eff₂q</i>	<i>abdf</i> Vulg.
xviii 37	<i>bdfff₂q</i>		<i>e</i>	<i>a</i> Vulg.

¹ These 'Nazarenes' first emerge, so far as I know, under this name in Epiphanius *Haer.* xxix Ναζωραῖοι, and Philaster *Haer.* viii 'Nazaraei'. Jerome's own references to them are frequent: *de Viris* § 3 about the Hebrew Gospel 'mihi quoque a Nazaraeis . . . describendi facultas fuit'; *Comm. in Matt.* xii 13 'in evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraeni [*legit* Nazaraei] et Ebionitae'; *Ep.* cxii ad Augustinum § 13, the Ebionites 'quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant'; *Comm. in Isaiam* ix i 'Nazaraei hunc locum ita explanare conantur', xi i 'evangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legitur Nazaraei'. On the other hand he uses 'Nazareus' when speaking of the inhabitants of Nazareth, *Comm. in Matt.* xiii 54 'mira stultitia Nazaraeorum'.

An interesting passage is the reference to Nazareth in the *de situ et nominibus* 'Nazareth, unde et dominus noster atque saluator Nazaraeus vocatus est; sed et nos apud veteres quasi pro opprobrio Nazaraei [one MS "Nazorei"] dicebamur, quos nunc Christianos vocant'. But we cannot tell how far in this case the form in Jerome is influenced by the original Greek of Eusebius: nor can we be at all sure that our only authority for the Greek text, Vatic. gr. 1456 saec. xii, has reproduced it correctly, Ναζαρίθ, ὅθεν ὁ Χριστὸς Ναζωραῖος ἐκλήθη καὶ Ναζαρηνοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν Χριστιανοί.

	'Nazoreus'	'Nazareus'	'Nazorenius'	'Nazarenus'
Lc. xxiv 19	<i>d</i>	<i>bff</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>a e</i> Vulg.
Io. xviii 5	<i>befq</i>			<i>a</i> Vulg.
	7 <i>bfg</i>		<i>e</i>	<i>a</i> Vulg.
xix 19	<i>eff₂q</i>			<i>a b</i> Vulg.
Act. ii 22	<i>d</i>	Iren.		Vulg.
iii 6	<i>d</i> Cypr. <i>codd</i> A	Cypr. <i>codd</i> L V etc.		Iren. Vulg.
iv 10	<i>d</i> Cypr. <i>codd</i> A etc.	Iren. Cypr. <i>codd</i> L etc.		<i>h</i> Vulg.
vi 14	<i>d</i>			<i>h</i> Vulg.
ix 5				<i>h</i> Vulg.
xxii 8				Vulg.
xxiv 5				Vulg.
xxvi 9				Vulg.

On a review of the evidence and of the probabilities as a whole, I think that the reading of A in St Cyprian, 'Nazoreus', has good claims to be considered original.

Neptalim 56. 7 (Is. ix 1 [viii 23]). V P U 'Nepthalim': and this, with remarkable regularity, is the reading of the Lyons Heptateuch [not, as Hatch-Redpath say s.v. *Νεφθαλείμ*, 'Nepthalim']. But 'Neptalim' is also given by Primasius in Apoc. vii 6.

Noë [45. 22].

Or 89. 17 (Exod. xvii 12). So A U V W X* *b* (M*? R*?): and so V S in *ad Fort.* 8 (331. 1). This is indubitably right against 'Ur' of L M² R² X² and 'Hur' of B T: O omits.

Paulus 127. 13.

Petrus 165. 11.

Pilatus 99. 3.

Pontici [148. 16]: [148. 23]: [149. 6]. See Prolegomena § 2 (*J. T. S.* vi 258).

Rachel or **Rachiel** [53. 2]. A has 'Rachiel', *b* 'Racel', the rest 'Rachel'.

Lugd. has 'Rachel' [Hatch-Redpath, s.v. *Ραχήλ*, wrongly '*Lugd.* Rachael']—generally indeclinable, but sometimes 'Rachelem' 'Rachelis' 'Racheli': only in Gen. xxix 6 'Rachae'.

Rafael or **Rafahel** [53. 16]. X has 'Rafael', A T 'Rafahel', L O P U 'Raphael', R 'Raphahel'.

Rebecca [166. 7], dat. **Rebeccaë** 51. 22. For the dative in 51. 22 P R give 'Rebecchae'. Lugd. has regularly 'Rebecca' 'Rebeccam' 'Rebeccaë': Priscillian, in the nominative, 'Rebecca.'

Sabain 68. 15 (Is. xlv 14). So A O P R T U W X and perhaps L*: 'Sabaim' L², 'Sabam' B M², 'Sabann' M*. *Σαβαίν*, N*.

Sabaoth 44. 11 (Is. i 9): 57. 21 (Is. iii 1): 68. 14 (Is. xlv 14): and probably elsewhere. In the first and third passages X has 'Sabahot', in the first M 'Saboth', in the third R 'Sabath'.

Samuel or **Samuhel** [53. 6]: [53. 9]: [84. 1]. The MSS vary as follows—

53. 6 'Samuel' A L P U: 'Samuhel' O R T X: 'Samuehel' M.

53. 9 'Samuel' L P R T U X: 'Samuhel' A O.

84. 1 'Samuel' P U: 'Samuhel' A L O.

Sarra [52. 16]. So too the Lyons Heptateuch and Priscillian.

Satanas, acc. **Satanan**. 144. 1 (Act. v 3): 145. 13 (1 Cor. vii 5): 173. 6 (3 Reg. xi 14: Hartel gives the reference as xi 23, but that verse is absent from the text of B, whereas xi 14 is found in both the A and B texts). The first two passages are in the nominative, and present no variant: the third is in the accusative, and here the form 'Satanan' is guaranteed by A L O P R U (V) W X (possibly 'Satana' X*), as against 'Satanin' M 'Satan' B. Hartel against all his MSS 'Satanam'.

Sedrac 121. 14. So A M* U, and Σεδράχ LXX: 'Sidrac' L O P R* T W X, cf. Vulgate: 'Sedrach' B, 'Sidrach' R*.

Sileas 127. 13 (Act. xvi 25). So all our MSS, except P* and the second hands of M O R. So in Act. xv 27 the MSS of Irenaeus (III xii 14) have 'Sileam', the editors 'Silam'. For further evidence in favour of 'Sileas' see Souter *A Study of Ambrosiaster* p. 208.

Sina: see 'Syna'.

Sion 44. 10: 46. 10: 46. 13: 82. 6 (omitted by A): 84. 24: 90. 17: 93. 5: 95. 3: 96. 15: 97. 6. In these passages the accusative genitive and ablative cases are represented: and nowhere is there any variant in the indeclinable form.

In Tertullian a declension of the name with case-endings is found: but Priscillian has 'Sion' in dative (84. 13) and ablative (66. 8).

Sodoma nominative 44. 12 (Is. i 9)—no variants on 'Sodoma . . . Gomorra'.¹ **Sodoma** or **Sodomam** accusative 146. 16 (Gen. xix 24): here A U V X b (L?) give 'Sodoma et Gomorra', L* M O P R T W 'Sodomam et Gomorram'.

The root of the difficulty appears to lie in the fact that in the Greek O. T. Σόδομα was a neuter plural, Γόμορρα a hybrid between neuter plural and feminine singular. The declension Σόδομα, acc. Σόδομα, gen. Σοδόμων, dat. Σοδόμοις, is without exception in the Greek of both Testaments. On the other hand Γόμορρα makes its accusative invariably Γόμορρα (Gen. xiii 10, xix 24; Amos iv 11: Is. xiii 19: Hier. xxvii 40), but its genitive as invariably, at least in the Old Testament, Γομόρρας (Σοδόμων [καὶ] Γομόρρας Gen. x 19, xiv 2, 8, 10, 11,

¹ For the orthography see under 'Gomora' above, p. 74.

xviii 16, 20, xix 28 : Deut. xxxii 32 : Is. i 10).¹ In the New Testament Rom. ix 29 and Jude 7 are nominative: 2 Pet. ii 6 follows the LXX use, *Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας*: but in Matt. x 15 we find, besides the traditional form, a double attempt at assimilation, *Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων* in $\aleph B a b c f$ Vulg., 'Sodomae et Gomorrae' in $\mathfrak{f}_1 k$ Iren. lat. (IV xviii 1).

This assimilation to the feminine form is in fact characteristic of the earliest Latin version, and that not only in the genitive, but throughout the declension. Priscillian has 'Sodoma' in the ablative (7. 24): Tyconius has 'Sodomam et Gomorram' in the accusative (85. 3), and Ambrose 'Sodomae . . . Gomorrae' in the genitive *de Elia et ieiunio* 14. The Lyons Heptateuch is not quite consistent: but it has for the nominative 'eversa est Sodoma et Gomora' in Deut. xxix 23, and for the accusative 'super Sodomam et Gomoram' in Gen. xix 24. It seems clear that where both names occur together, the earliest translators habitually treated them together as feminine: and this is so rare in later authorities that the neuter is much more likely to have been substituted for the feminine in the Cyprianic MSS than *vice versa*. On the witness of the MSS alone one might have accepted 'Sodoma et Gomora': but the outside evidence, when brought into consideration, seems almost decisive for 'Sodomam et Gomoram'.

Solomon [167. 1]: 173. 7 (3 Reg. xi 14). The name is regularly declined in -em, -is, -i, -e.

With regard to the orthography, I expressed myself with some confidence in the first section of these Prolegomena (*J. T. S. v* 251) as to the correctness of the form with o in St Cyprian. I am not inclined to retract that view: but it may be useful to bring into account here some notice of the evidence at large, which makes the variation between 'Solomon' and 'Salomon' almost more baffling even than that between 'Moses' and 'Moyses'. In the first place the witness of the Greek Old Testament is in direct contradiction to the witness of the Greek New Testament. In the latter Σολ- is practically universal: in the former the witness of AB in the Books of Kings and of $\aleph B$ (though not of A) in the titles of the Sapiential Books, and of ABC (but not of \aleph) in the text of the Song of Songs is regularly for Σαλ-. The Hebrew (I am told) offers no assistance in deciding: in the text as it was vocalized the first vowel is the weak *shawa*, which corresponds rather to ε than to α or ω.

I confine myself, therefore, to a brief statement of Latin evidence. Of the Old Latin MSS of the Gospels and Acts, *abdehqqff*, and the

¹ In Hier. xxiii 14 (for *ὡσεὶ Γόμορρα* of the rest) \aleph reads *λαδς Γόμορα*—apparently an indeclinable genitive. This is also the only occurrence of the single ρ in the great uncials.

Fleury palimpsest have (without exception save once in *a* and once in *b*) 'Solomon': so too Priscillian ²/₃, and the sixth-century MS of Eucherius: so also the best MS of the *Quaestiones* of Ambrosiaster. On the other hand *k*, just as in the case of 'Moses', distinguishes itself from the other Old Latin MSS by giving 'Salomon' ⁵/₈: and so *f* and the printed texts of the Vulgate.¹ Again, therefore, as in the case of 'Moses', we have *k* with L of St Cyprian against the majority of the older Old Latin witnesses: but I feel a little less inclined on this occasion to accept the combination as pointing to the genuine reading in St Cyprian. If a reason is wanted for attaching more importance to the 'Moses' of L than to its 'Salomon', it may be found in the distinction that the name Solomon is mentioned as a rule in the *lemmata*, the name Moses in the text: and it is in the biblical text that the supreme importance of L indubitably lies.

Syna or **Sina** 92. 10 (Exod. xix 11, accusative): 179. 4 (Exod. xix 18, nominative). In both cases A T have 'Syna', the rest 'Sina'. Lugd. invariably 'Sina'.

Thamar 148. 18 (Gen. xxxviii 14, nominative). So all our MSS: in the dative, Gen. xxxviii 13, Lugd. has 'Thamari'.

Thomas 70. 10 (Jo. xx 28), nominative: **Thoman** or **Thomam** [70. 9], accusative. A O R U give 'Thomam': L M P T* W X 'Thoman'. The name occurs in N. T. twice in the accusative, Mc. iii 18, Lc. vi 15: and the authorities are about evenly divided, for 'Thoman' *a* ²/₁, *d* ²/₁, *g* ²/₂, for 'Thomam' *b* ¹/₁, *e* ¹/₁, *f* ²/₁, *ff*. The Vulgate has 'Thomam' in St Mark²: in St Luke the MSS are about equally divided between -m and -n.

Tobiae 109. 4 (Tobit ii 2), dative. M has 'Tobias', but Q, the sister MS of M, agrees with the 'Tobiae' of the rest.

Ur: see 'Or'.

Babulon 56. 7 (Is. viii 23 [ix 1]), genitive. 'Babulon' R* ?

Zacharias 72. 18 (Luc. i 67). Priscillian (47. 7, 12: from Luc. xi 51) has 'Zaccharias'. (Cf. Prolegomena § 1, *J. T. S.* vi 254.)

C. H. TURNER.

¹ I do not feel quite certain that 'Solomon', in spite of the small authority for it, may not be right in the Vulgate N. T. 'Solomon' is read by the St Gall fragments ²/₃, and by GM (an excellent combination) in St Luke and St John, and by G in Acts. And there seems no possible doubt that 'Solomon' is the true reading throughout the *Chronicle* of St Jerome, which preceded by only three or four years his translation of the Gospels.

² Yet even there 'Thoman' is the reading of the Harley Gospels (Z*) and of the St Gall fragments.