THE BISECTION OF BOOKS IN PRIMITIVE SEPTUAGINT MSS.

(Ἑκάστη ζυγῆ βίβλος μία EPIPHANIUS.)

SOME years ago the present writer attempted to prove in the pages of this JOURNAL [1] that the Greek versions of two of the Prophetical books (Jeremiah and Ezekiel) contained indications that each book was divided into two parts for purposes of translation. In both cases a change of style was found to take place about half-way through the book.

In the present paper some evidence will be given of a rather similar kind with regard to three other books of the Septuagint. The facts here to be stated differ from those in the case of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in that they appear to indicate a division of books not for purposes of translation, but merely for purposes of *transcription*. The differences found to exist in the earlier and later portions of the books are purely orthographical, not differences of rendering. Their importance consists in their witnessing to a practice of copyists, at a date far earlier than that of our oldest MSS, of dividing the several books of the Bible into two nearly equal portions: the two portions may, it is suggested, have been written on separate rolls. The uncials have, in a few orthographical details, faithfully transmitted to us the spellings of an earlier age, and give us some insight into the *format* of the archetypal MS or MSS of which they are descendants. The clues, so far detected, are few, but so striking as to demand explanation. The recurrence of the change in orthography at nearly the same point in three books (Exodus, Leviticus, Psalms) representing two of the divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures, taken together with the fact that a change of translators occurs at about the same point in two other books representing the third (prophetical) group, seems to establish the existence of the practice beyond a doubt. The evidence as regards the first three books will now be considered.

Exodus. The clue here is found in the use or disuse of the form ἐάν for ἄν with the relative pronoun ὅς (ὅστις, ὅσος) or with a conjunction (ἡνίκα). Dr J. H. Moulton has already called attention [2] to the fact that the papyri enable us 'to determine the time-limits of the peculiarity [the use of ὃς ἐάν, &c.] with fair certainty'. To the papyri evidence we will revert later. A casual glance at the opening chapters of Exodus

[1] Vol. iv pp. 245 ff, 398 ff.

[2] *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, Prolegomena 42 f.

would not suggest that the use of ὃς ἐάν (ὃς ἄν) had any secrets to reveal. In the first half of the book both forms are used, apparently indiscriminately. But, if the investigation be carried on to the end of the book, it will be found that the forms with ἐάν are entirely absent from Codex B in the second half, while there is only a single instance of ἐάν in this part of the book in the two other uncials used in the Manual Cambridge edition (ἡνίκα ἐάν 34^{34} AF). The break comes between 23^{16}, where BAF read ὧν ἐὰν σπείρῃς and 23^{25}, where BF read ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαι (A and 'Lucian' have the relative without particle), and BAF ὅσα ἂν εἴπω. We need have little hesitation in fixing on 23^{20}, the section beginning Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, the concluding section of the 'Book of the Covenant', as marking the point where the second scribe in the archetype began his work. Excluding ὡς ἄν, ἕως ἄν, ὅπως ἄν, which are always so written throughout the book, the occurrences of the forms with ἄν and with ἐάν in the two parts in the three main uncials are as follows :—

	ὃς ἄν, etc.	ὃς ἐάν, etc.	Total.
Part I (Ex. 1^{1}—23^{19})			
B	7	14	21
A	11	10	21
F	7	8	15
Part II (Ex. 23^{20}—end)			
B	19	0	19
A	17	1	18
F	16	1	17

In Part I ἐάν is in most cases supported by at least one of the three MSS, in six instances by all three of them.[1] The evidence strongly suggests that in the parent archetype of all three MSS two scribes were employed, the second of whom used only the forms with ἄν : the first either wrote ἐάν only (the examples of ἄν in the uncials being due to later scribes), or he used both forms interchangeably. It should be added that the common ancestor of MSS containing such different types of text as are found in B on the one hand and in AF on the other must be very much older than those MSS : we are carried back to a MS which cannot well be later than the first century A.D. and may be even earlier.

Leviticus. Turning to Leviticus, we find almost exactly the same condition of things with regard to these forms. Both ὃς ἄν and ὃς ἐάν appear in the first half, ὃς ἐάν having preponderant authority in B and A: in the second half ὃς ἐάν almost entirely disappears. The break seems to come at the end of chapter 15 : it might be placed a few

[1] The evidence of the uncials is borne out by the fuller evidence available in Holmes and Parsons. Only one of the cursives, 32, sometimes supported by a few others, shews a tendency to write ὃς ἐάν in Part II.

verses earlier. The occurrences of the two forms in the MSS are as follows[1]:—

	ὃς ἄν, etc.	ὃς ἐάν, etc.	Total
Part I (Lev. 1^1—15^{33})			
B	21	3^2	53
A	24	27	5^1
F	39	14	53
Part II (Lev. 16^1—end)			
B	48	7	55
A	44	8	5^2
F	45	9	54

The examples of ἐάν in Part II of Leviticus are rather more numerous than in the corresponding part of Exodus. It is noticeable, however, that three out of the seven examples in B and four of the instances in AF fall within the last nine verses of the book. The passages where ἐάν occurs with the relative in Part II are as follows:—18^{29}F, 20^{6}BA, ^{14}B, ^{17}B, 21^{18}AF, ^{20}F, 22^{4}F, 23^{19}A, 24^{16}BA (in this passage the reading ανος ὃς ἐὰν καταράσηται is undoubtedly a corruption, through loss of the letters AN, of ανος ανος ἐὰν κατ., which is read by FGM and most of the cursives), 25^{44}F, 27^{28}AF, ^{28}BAF, ^{29}BAF, ^{32}BAF. It will be seen that in Part II BAF unite in reading ἐάν only in the concluding verses: the form might owe its existence there to the hand of a διορθωτής who made a cursory perusal of the last page of the MS.

The test applied to Exodus and Leviticus does not appear to yield similar results in other LXX books, with the possible exception of the book immediately following, viz. Numbers. Up to the end of the Balaam episode (24^{25}) ὃς ἐάν and ὃς ἄν alternate in the MSS: after that point AF have twelve instances of ἄν and none of ἐάν. B, however, continues to write both forms up to the end of the book. If the evidence of AF proves anything here, the division comes at rather a later point than is usual elsewhere.

Psalms. The evidence in the case of the Psalter is a little more complex. On the one hand, we are fortunately in possession of more than one clue, suggesting a primitive division of the Greek book into two parts. On the other hand, the distinction between Parts I and II is not attested by all the uncials, and in the case of two Psalms in Part I (20 and 76 according to the LXX numeration) the orthography is not uniform with that which elsewhere characterizes that Part. The change in the orthography is attested by B in all the three criteria to be mentioned, while there are not wanting indications that ℵ and A are also descended from an archetype containing the two modes of spelling, though the distinction between the two parts has become,

[1] Ὃς ἄν, ἕως ἄν are excluded as before: ὅπως ἄν does not occur.

in the course of transmission, somewhat obliterated. The orthography of the seventh-century MS T remains unaltered throughout.[1] The combined evidence seems to indicate that a break was made in the parent MS at the end of Psalm 77 (78 Heb.). The clues which have been detected (there may of course be others) are three in number and are as follows :—

(i) Nouns in *-ία* (Part I) or *-εία*, *-εια* (Part II).

Part I, Psalm	19^{7}	*δυναστεία*	ℵ A	*δυναστία*	B*
	[20^{14}	,,	B*ℵ A U]		
	64^{7}	,,	ℵ	,,	B*T
	65^{7}			,,	B*ℵ
	70^{16}	,,	ℵ	,,	B*
	^{18}			,,	B*ℵ
	73^{13}	,,	ℵ*		
	77^{4}	,,	ℵ	,,	B*T
	^{26}			,,	B*ℵ
Part II,	79^{2}	,,	B	,,	ℵT
	88^{16}	,,	BA	,,	ℵT
	89^{10}	,,	BℵA	,,	T
	102^{22}	,,	B	,,	ℵ*
	105^{2}	,,	BA	,,	ℵT
	^{8}	,,	BA	,,	ℵT
	144^{8}	,,	BT	,,	ℵ*A
	^{11}	,,	BA	,,	ℵT
	^{12}	,,	B	,,	ℵT
	146^{10}	,,	BA	,,	ℵT
	150^{2}	,,	B	,,	ℵAT
Part I,	25^{8}	*εὐπρέπεια*	AU	*εὐπρεπία*	B*ℵ
	49^{2}	,,	ℵ	,,	B*AT
Part II,	92^{1}	,,	B	,,	ℵAT
	103^{1}	,,	B	,,	ℵ*
Part I,	8^{2}	*μεγαλοπρέπεια*	—	*μεγαλοπρεπία*	B*ℵA
	[20^{6}	,,	B	,,	ℵA
	28^{4}	,,	ℵU	,,	B*AT
	67^{35}			,,	B*ℵ
	70^{8}			,,	B*ℵ
Part II,	95^{6}	,,	Bℵ	,,	AT
	103^{1}			,,	AT
	110^{3}	,,	ℵA	,,	T
	144^{5}	,,	B	,,	ℵAT
	^{12}	,,	B	,,	ℵAT

[1] The evidence of R, the Greek text of which is written in Latin letters, is ambiguous or valueless in orthographical matters (see Dr. Swete's text, vol. ii p. x). It is not clear whether it distinguishes between *-εια* and *-ια*.

(ii) The examples given in Dr Swete's Appendix where B writes *αι* for *ε* are limited to Part I, the last occurring at 77^{19}: from 29^{5} onwards to the point where A fails (49^{19}) B is in every case supported by A.[1] The last instance in B of the converse change (*ε* for *αι*) occurs at 74^{6}. The instances are as follows:—

(*a*) *αι* for *ε*: $23^{7.9}$ ἐπάρθηται, 29^{5} ἐξομολογεῖσθαι BA, 30^{25} ἀνδρίζεσθαι BAU, 31^{11} ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι BA, ib. κανχᾶσθαι BA, 32^{1} ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι BA, 32^{2} ἐξομολογ(ε)ῖσθαι BA, 33^{8} γεύσασθαι BA, 42^{2} μαι BA, 47^{12} διηγήσασθαι BA, ^{14} θέσθαι BA, ib. καταδιέλεσθαι BA, 48^{8} ἐνωτίσασθαι BA, 57^{3} ἐργάζεσθαι, 58^{2} μαι Bℵ, 61^{4} ἐπιτίθεσθαι, ^{11} προστίθεσθαι, 64^{12} παιδία, 67^{5} ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, 75^{12} εὔξασθαι, 77^{12} παιδίῳ:

(*b*) *ε* for *αι*: the examples occur in 9^{22} (with A), ^{28}, ^{34}, 13^{3}, 14^{4} (with A), 44^{8}, 54^{23}, 71^{7} (with T), 74^{6} (with T).

(iii) The insertion or omission of the syllabic augment in εὐφραίνειν affords a third clue: in ψ 76, as already stated, the orthography attested by the principal MSS is that which is elsewhere limited in these MSS to Part II.

Part I,	15^{9}	ηὐφρ.	BAU	εὐφρ.	ℵ
	29^{3}	,,	B*ATU	,,	ℵ
	34^{18}	,,	BA	,,	ℵ
	44^{9}	,,	BℵAT		
	72^{21}	,,	Bℵ*		
	[76^{4}	,,	T	,,	Bℵ]
Part II,	88^{43}	,,	T	,,	BℵA
	89^{16}	,,	T	,,	BℵA*
	^{16}	,,	T		
	91^{8}	,,	T	,,	BℵA
	93^{19}	,,	A	,,	T
	96^{8}	,,	AT	,,	Bℵ
	104^{38}			,,	BℵAT
	106^{30}	,,	AT	,,	ℵ
	121^{1}			,,	ℵAT

Two results so far have been obtained. (1) The slight but significant differences in orthography between Part I and Part II of the three books under consideration seem to indicate a division of the clerical labour of transcription, not a change of translators. This is quite clear in the Greek Psalter which has a somewhat peculiar vocabulary running right through the book. In Exodus and Leviticus no indications have been noted of a new style beginning at the points where the change in orthography takes place. In Exodus, however, it should be stated that the last six chapters have been held by some critics to be the work of a

[1] It should be added that A has other instances of the interchange of *αι* and *ε* in both parts of the Book.

second translator.[1] (2) The division of the Greek books into two parts, made or found already in existence by the scribes of the lost archetype, is based in each case on the same principle. Bulk, rather than subject-matter, is the determining factor. Each book is divided into two portions of nearly equal volume: the break is in each case placed *a little after* the middle point.

The Masoretes, we know, among other laborious calculations, ascertained which were the middle words in each book of Scripture: the points of bisection are indicated in our printed Hebrew Bibles. We may, thus, compare the Masoretic division of the books with that of the early scribes of the LXX. In each case it will be seen that the Greek scribes make their division a little later than the Masoretes. In Exodus the MT division comes at 22^{27}, that of the Greek copyists at 23^{19}. Leviticus[2] is divided by the Masoretes at 15^{7}, by the LXX scribes at 15^{28}. In the Psalter the Greek division is made irrespectively of the early partition into five books: on the other hand, it should be noted that the Masoretes place the middle of the book in the very same Psalm which closes Part I in the LXX, at the thirty-sixth verse of ψ 78 Heb. (77 LXX).[3]

Let us now consider the form and appearance which the parent archetype or archetypes of our uncial MSS must have presented. The common ancestor of BAF carries us back, as was said, to a period much earlier than the fourth century A.D. That century witnessed the transition from papyrus to vellum as the material used for literary writings.[4] Before that change took place there is reason to suppose that the MSS of Biblical (and secular) writings were 'usually small, containing only single books or groups of books', 'small portable MSS of limited contents'.[5] If we find, then, that the scribes of a primitive ancestor of BAF, in fixing the limits of their clerical labours, have taken the single book (not any larger collection such as the Law) for the unit, this is only what we should expect. The papyrus roll did not, as a rule, contain more than a single book. We may contrast with this division

[1] Robertson Smith ap. Swete *Introduction* p. 236.

[2] It may be noted, though the coincidence is no doubt accidental, that the LXX division of Leviticus (1–15: 16–27) corresponds with a division of the book into an equal number of Synagogue lessons according to the arrangement of the Babylonian lectionary (five lessons in each part). See Ryle *Canon of O.T.* 236.

[3] According to another calculation, attributed in the Talmud to 'the ancients', the middle point was placed two verses later: *Kiddushin* 30a cited by Strack in Hastings BD iv 729b.

[4] Kenyon *Palaeography of Greek Papyri* 121.

[5] Westcott and Hort *Introduction to N.T.* 10, 268. Cf. 223.

of labour the large portions of Scripture transcribed *en bloc* by the three[1] scribes who produced Codex Vaticanus or the two[2] hands of the Codex Alexandrinus. But may we not go further and say that the employment of two scribes for each book suggests that the unit was not the single book, but the half-book, in other words that at least Exodus, Leviticus, and the Psalter occupied two rolls apiece? As Dr Kenyon says,[3] 'no papyrus roll of Homer hitherto discovered contains more than two books of the Iliad', i.e. on an average about 1,500 hexameter lines. Now, the shortest of the three LXX books under consideration, Leviticus, contains (according to the Stichometry of Nicephorus)[4] 2,700 *στίχοι*, i.e. nearly twice the ordinary complement of a papyrus roll, the *στίχος* being the length of a hexameter. A subdivision of even so short a book as Leviticus is therefore perfectly natural.

The MS of Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* affords an illustration of the division of a literary work and the employment of several scribes. There we find at the end of the first century A.D. a division into four rolls, upon which four scribes have been employed. Three of the scribes are responsible for a roll apiece: the remaining roll is partly the work of the fourth scribe, partly of two of the others.[5]

Now, it has been shewn elsewhere that the Greek books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are divided in just the same way into two parts, the break occurring in each case, as in Exodus, Leviticus, and Psalms, a little after the middle point: but with this distinction, that the break in the Prophetical books introduces a change of style and a second translator, not merely a change in orthography and a fresh scribe. It appears probable, therefore, that the practice of writing each of these two Prophetical books on two rolls goes back to the date of their translation, the second century B.C. It seems a natural inference that a division of Exodus, Leviticus, and the Psalter, made on the same principle, which must in any case go back some centuries earlier than the date of Cod. B, should also be referred to the time when the translations were first made, i.e. to the third and second centuries B.C.

It is, of course, not necessary to ascribe the same antiquity to the

[1] Swete *O.T. in Greek* vol. i p. xix.

[2] Dr Kenyon tells me that one hand wrote the Octateuch, the Prophetical books, Maccabees, and Job-Sirach: a second hand wrote the remaining books.

[3] *Op. cit.* 122.

[4] The number is supported by several cursive MSS. Swete *Introduction to O.T.* 346, 349.

[5] Kenyon's edition, pp. x ff. The rolls, it may be noticed, decrease in size, the first two being longer than the last two.

actual orthography which we have traced to the parent of our uncial MSS. If the practice of copying the several books on two rolls apiece continued for some centuries, the spellings which characterize the two parts of Exodus, for instance, may be the spellings of scribes of some intermediate date, say between 100 B.C. and 100 A.D. It will be worth while to examine two of the orthographical distinctions in the light of the large range of evidence obtainable from the papyri, namely, the writing of ὃς ἐάν for ὃς ἄν and the interchange of ε and αι.

(i) ὃς ἐάν—ὃς ἄν.[1] An investigation of the papyri, made independently of Dr Moulton's, and with the advantage of some recent publications (the Hibeh Papyri and the Leipzig collection of 1906) which were not available when he wrote, gives the following results.[2] The addition of + to a number indicates that, where a form is repeatedly found in one and the same document, the number of occurrences in that document have not been counted: ++ indicates that there are several such documents. Moulton's abbreviation for centuries, viz. iii/B.C.=3rd century B.C., is adopted.

	ὃς ἄν, etc.	ὃς ἐάν, etc.
iii/B.C.	43 + +	(!) 4[3]
ii/B.C.	32 +	6[4]
i/B.C.	3	6 +
i/A.D.	5 +	39
ii/A.D.	13	79 + +
iii/A.D.	5	13 +
iv/A.D.	7	12 + +

It appears from these statistics that in iii/ii/B.C. down to 133 B.C. ὃς ἄν was practically universal: at that date ὃς ἐάν begins to come to the front, and from i/B.C. onwards is always the predominant form. The figures in both columns decrease in iii/iv/A.D., when the use of the indefinite relative in any form appears to have been going out. Papyri of i/B.C. are unfortunately very scanty. Until the appearance of Grenfell and Hunt's latest volume, the Hibeh Papyri, ὃς ἐάν might almost have been called non-existent before 133 B.C. We now know that it was a possible, but very unfashionable form, in the third century B.C.

[1] Cf. J. H. Moulton *op. cit.* 42 f; Mayser *Gramm. der Griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 152 f.

[2] The Berlin Papyri have not been completely examined for the period from i/A.D. onwards. But such a large number of documents have been investigated for this period that this omission could not affect the relative proportion in the use of the two forms.

[3] Hibeh Papyri 96. 10 and 28 ὃι ἐὰν ἐπέλθῃ, 259–258 B.C. (NB. ἐὰν ἐπέλθῃι, where ἐάν is hypothetical, occurs in the same context, line 9): *ib.* 51. 3 ἃς [ἐ]άν, 245–244 B.C.: Petrie Pap. Part II 39 (g)? iii/B.C.

[4] None earlier than 133 B.C., the earliest being Brit. Mus. Pap. vol. ii 220 col. 2, lines 6 and 8.

The last third of ii/B.C. (133–100 B.C.) was a period of transition when both forms appear in one and the same document. To that period or to the following century might very well be ascribed an archetype of our LXX uncials written by two scribes, one of whom wrote ὃς ἐάν and the other ὃς ἄν.

(ii) The interchange of ε and αι appears in some dozen instances in papyri dated B.C., beginning about 165 B.C.,[1] but does not become common till towards the end of i/A.D. The examples of this interchange in Part I of the Psalter might therefore conceivably go back to the autographs, though we should perhaps be safer in referring them to scribes of a slightly later date.

A further question remains. Did the bisection of the books, which in two cases at least goes back to the time of the Greek translators, originate with them, or did they find it already in the Hebrew originals? We cannot of course answer this question with certainty, but it seems to the present writer that there are some grounds for believing the practice to have been taken over from the Hebrew MSS. Two considerations in favour of this theory may be mentioned. (1) The Masoretes, at a much later date, calculated the middle points of the separate books. The motive for counting the number of words or of letters in a complete book is obvious, namely, to preserve the text from interpolations or omissions. The motive for bisecting the books is not so clear. May not this practice, which they appear to have inherited from an earlier age,[2] have arisen out of a primitive custom of transcribing each book on two separate rolls? (2) It may be accidental, but if we calculate the lengths of Parts I and II of the five books, which have been considered, *in the Masoretic text*, we find that the division is made on a definite principle. Part I bears practically the same proportion to Part II in each case. Part I, it appears, exceeds Part II by an amount equal to a fraction varying between one-fourteenth and one-sixteenth of the whole book. If, on the other hand, we make the same calculation *from the Greek text* in the Codex Vaticanus, this proportion is lost; in the longest of the books in the B text the excess of Part I over Part II is less than in the case of the shorter books. Of course this argument is open to objections, in particular to the objection that the MT does not exactly represent the Hebrew which the translators had before them. But the fact remains that we *can* trace a certain principle in the division of the books if we take the Hebrew text as our criterion. The following table, shewing the number of pages in an ordinary Hebrew printed Bible

[1] See Mayser *op. cit.* 107.

[2] See note 3 on p. 93.

occupied by Parts I and II of the five books, will indicate what is meant. The books are arranged in order of length.

	Pages.	Total.	Excess of Pt. I over Pt. II.
Psalms			
Part I (1–78 Heb.)	$50\frac{1}{2}$	$93\frac{1}{2}$	$7\frac{1}{2}$
Part II (79–end)	$43\frac{1}{2}$		
Jeremiah			
Part I	49	$92\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$
Part II[1]	$43\frac{1}{2}$		
Ezekiel			
Part I (1–27)	$44\frac{1}{2}$	$83\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$
Part II (28–end)	39		
Exodus			
Part I (1–23^{19})	$38\frac{1}{4}$	$72\frac{1}{4}$	$4\frac{3}{4}$
Part II (23^{20}–end)	$33\frac{3}{4}$		
Leviticus			
Part I (1–15)	27	$50\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$
Part II (16–end)	$23\frac{1}{2}$		

In conclusion, it is suggested that we may find in this primitive practice of allotting two rolls to a book a clue to the origin of the tradition (ὡς ᾄδεται λόγος), which first appears in Epiphanius, that the translators were divided into pairs, and that *to each pair was allotted a single book*. This appears to describe fairly accurately what happened in the case of two books: in the case of others the Greek text seems to warrant merely the existence of a pair of scribes. Epiphanius's words[2] will bear repeating here: ἑκάστῃ δὲ ζυγῇ βίβλος μία ἐπεδίδοτο, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἡ βίβλος τῆς τοῦ κόσμου Γενέσεως μιᾷ ζυγῇ, ἡ Ἔξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῇ ἄλλῃ ζυγῇ, (τὸ) Λευιτικὸν τῇ ἄλλῃ καὶ καθεξῆς ἄλλη βίβλος τῇ ἄλλῃ.

H. St. J. Thackeray.

PS. In Exodus a further distinction between Part I and Part II is afforded by the appearance in the latter of the unclassical ἔναντι (for ἐναντίον). The statistics for the two forms are as follows:—

	ἔναντι		ἐναντίον	
	Part I	Part II	Part I	Part II
B	1	16	36	14
A	0	20	37	8
F	1	21	21	7

Ἔναντι in Part I is confined to 6^{15} B, 6^{30} F: elsewhere BAF or BA (where F is wanting) consistently write ἐναντίον. In Part II, on the

[1] Omitting chap. 52, which appears to be a later addition (see *J. T. S.* iv 260). Parts I and II are the portions in the Heb. corresponding respectively to chaps. 1–28 and 29–51 in the Greek version.

[2] *De mens. et pond.* 3. The passage is quoted in Wendland's edition of Aristeas, p. 140.

other hand, there are only four passages where the three MSS combine in reading ἐναντίον (25^{29} $33^{12.19}$ 40^{32}): ἔναντι occurs in 24^{17} A, 27^{21} AF, 28^{19} BAF, &c.

The distribution of the two forms in the remaining books of the Pentateuch is noteworthy. Genesis consistently has ἐναντίον. Ἔναντι is the predominant form throughout Leviticus and Numbers: in Deuteronomy it is written almost invariably by AF, while B usually has ἐναντίον.

In the historical books later than the Pentateuch both forms give place to ἐνώπιον.

SOME NOTEWORTHY READINGS OF THE FLEURY PALIMPSEST.

THE most striking reading in the Catholic Epistles is found in 1 St John ii 28, 29 *Et nunc filii manete in eo ut cum uenerit fiduciam habeamus et non confundamur ab eo. In praesentia eius si nostis eum qui fidelis est scitote quoniam omnis qui facit ueritatem de eo natus est.* 'And now, children, abide in Him, that when He shall come we may have confidence, and not be put to confusion by Him. If in His presence ye have known Him who is Faithful, know that every one that doeth the truth hath been born of Him.'

The text as given in the Palimpsest obviates two difficulties of the Received Text: (1) The apparent redundancy of *in praesentia*, which is in the Authorized Version mistranslated 'coming'. (2) The expression 'born of Him' in the Received Text can only refer to the Christ, and there is in the New Testament no parallel to the expression 'born of the Christ'. In the text of the Palimpsest 'born of Him' refers naturally to the Father (*qui fidelis est*).

Again, the terms *qui fidelis est* and *qui facit ueritatem* are strictly cognate, while the latter phrase is peculiarly Johannine and occurs elsewhere in the Epistle (i 6) and also in the Gospel (iii 21).

The subscription to 1 St Peter, *Incipit apostoli petri ad gentes epistola secunda*, is worthy of note as regards the authorship of 2 St Peter—especially since the text of the Palimpsest in the Catholic Epistles appears older than the text either of the Acts or of the Apocalypse. The old abbreviation n̄ (= *non*), found also in *k*, remains in the Catholic Epistles, but disappears in the rest of the Palimpsest. So also 1 St Peter v 5 *minores natu*, which has been corrected by a later hand to *adulescentes*.[1] In fact, the Palimpsest was badly handled in its

[1] The old form *pos* = *post* survives in 2 S. Peter i 15, but has been made to disappear elsewhere. Also *anim* is found for *enim*, *mendas* for *mendax*, *Salutaris* for *Saluatoris*.