

## INTRODUCTION.

IN the fourth book of Ezra (the second of Esdras in our Apocrypha) the transition from the thirty-fifth to the thirty-sixth verse of the seventh chapter must strike even a superficial reader as singularly abrupt<sup>1</sup>. That this want of coherence was felt by the earliest of modern commentators on the book, is proved by his elaborate attempt to supply a train of thought in order to bring the two verses into connexion<sup>2</sup>. It was not however till the beginning of the eighteenth century that appeal was made to another representative of the lost original. Then appeared Ockley's translation of the Arabic version<sup>3</sup>, where between the verses in question a long passage intervenes,

<sup>1</sup> vii. 33. "Et revelabitur Altissimus super sedem iudicii, et pertransibunt miseriae, et longanimitas congregabitur.

34. Iudicium autem solum remanebit, veritas stabit, et fides convalescet,

35. Et opus subsequetur, et merces ostendetur, et iustitiae vigilabunt, et iniustitiae non dominabuntur.

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

37. Et qui post eum pro Israel"...Vulg. ed. Sabat.

<sup>2</sup> "Audiens Esdras iudicium futurum, primum, et novissimum, de populo suo, maxime autem de abjectione synagogae Iudaicae, pro qua plurimum zelabat, quia in ejus locum surroganda esset sponsa ecclesia sine ruga, solícite inquirít ab angelo, si non sit relictus aliquis locus intercedendi pro eo populo, et clementiam impetrandi a pientissimo patre caelesti, cujus sunt infinitae miserationes. Si quo modo gratia implorari possit pro Israele, juxta carnem, ne omnino abjiciatur." Conr. Pellicanus, *Com. Bibl.* Tom. v. fol. Tiguri, 1538, p. 258.

B.

<sup>3</sup> Published in the Appendix to Vol. iv. of Whiston's *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*. 8vo. London, 1711. The existence of this Arabic version had been pointed out by John Gregory, who in his zeal for Oriental learning overestimated its value: "I have cause to beleive, that it is the most authenticke remaine of this Booke." *Notes and Observations upon some Passages of Scripture*. 4to. Oxford, 1646, p. 77. The Arabic text itself, however, was not printed till 1863, by Ewald, in Vol. xi. of the *Abhandlungen der k. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. Ockley's English translation has been rendered into Latin by Hilgenfeld, with H. Steiner's corrections, in the *Messias Judæorum*. Lips. 1869. Hitherto only one MS. of this version has been used, viz. Bodl. 251, which has lost two leaves (containing iv. 24—45 and viii. 50—ix. 1). Ewald (*Das 4<sup>te</sup> Esrabuch*, p. 100) hints at the existence of another MS. in the Vatican, and from Assemani's description, abridged by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* Vol. iv.), we may readily identify it with Cod. III. Assemani indeed denies the identity of 1 Ezra in this MS. with our 4 Ezra, but the order in which it

1

## 2

which carries on the thread of the narrative in an artless and appropriate manner<sup>1</sup>. In the present century the text of the Arabic has been printed, the long neglected Armenian translated<sup>2</sup>, and the apparatus criticus of the book greatly increased by the publication of the text and translation of the following versions: the Aethiopic<sup>3</sup>, the shorter Arabic<sup>4</sup> (Arab.<sup>2</sup>), and, last but not least, the Syriac<sup>5</sup>, and in all of them the hiatus

stands, the title and the beginning which he quotes, are all the same as in the Bodl. MS., so that we may regard his language as a hasty conclusion based on the absence of chapters i. ii. xv. xvi. from the Arabic version.

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

<sup>2</sup> By J. H. Petermann, for Hilgenfeld's *Messias Jud.* The Armenian version itself was published as early as A.D. 1666, in the first edition of the Arm. Bible, according to Masch in Le Long's *Bibl. S.* II. 1, A.D. 1781, p. 175. Its existence therefore could scarcely have been unknown to scholars, as it is mentioned also by Bredenkamp (Eichhorn's *Allg. Bibl.* IV. A.D. 1792, p. 626), by Michel Tchamitchian (*Histoire d'Arménie*. 4to. Ven. 1784—86, Vol. III. p. 660; his statement, referred to by Scholz, that Usgan, the editor of the first Arm. Bible, translated 4 Ezra from the Lat. is obviously incorrect), by C. F. Neumann (*Versuch einer Gesch. der Armen. Lit.* A.D. 1836, p. 39), and by Scholz (*Einleitung* I. A.D. 1845, p. 501). But strange to say, this version appears to have escaped the notice of the editors of our book till pointed out by Ceriani, A.D. 1861 (see *Mon. Sacra et Prof.* v. fasc. 1, pp. 41—44).

<sup>3</sup> This version, which had been quoted occasionally by Ludolf, in his *Lex.* (see Van der Vlis, *Disp.*

*Crit. de Ezrae Libr. Apocr. vulgo quarto dicto*, p. 75), was published together with a Lat. and Engl. transl. by Laurence (*Primi Ezrae Libri, qui apud Vulg. appellatur quartus, Vers. Aeth.* Oxon. 1820), from a MS., which is now in the Bodl. Libr. (No. VII. Dillm. Cat.). Many conjectural emendations were proposed by Van der Vlis in the treatise just mentioned; and Dillmann has given from MSS. examined by him an important list of various readings, but without specifying his authorities (*Das vierte Ezrabuch.....von Ewald*, pp. 92—100); finally Fr. Praetorius has, by the aid of Dillmann's variants and four additional MSS., revised the Lat. transl. of Laurence for Hilgenfeld's *Messias Jud.* The materials for a critical edition of the text, which is still a desideratum, have been increased lately by the addition to the Brit. Mus. of the Magdala collection of Aeth. MSS., which contains no less than eight copies of this book (see Prof. Wright's list in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellsch.* xxiv. 1870, p. 590).

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

<sup>5</sup> A Latin translation of this version was printed by Dr. Ant. Ceriani in 1866 (*Monum. Sacra et Prof.* Vol. I. fasc. 2), and followed after a short interval by the publication of the Syriac text itself (*id.* Vol. V. fasc. 1, 1868) from the celebrated MS. of the Peshito (B. 21. Inf.) in the Ambrosian Library. The same scholar now proposes to reproduce by photolitho-

is found to be filled up in essentially the same way. As these versions seem generally to be of independent origin, and some are of considerable antiquity, their agreement

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

There had long before been rumours of the existence of a Syriac version in a MS. once the property of Julius Caesar Scaliger, which Fabricius in vain attempted to discover (*Cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* ed. II. Vol. II. p. 176). The MS. in question is thus referred to by Scaliger himself: "Arcana vero multo plura continentur in libris Esdrae, atque potiora, quam quivis enarratione. Eos libros, quod hoc eloqui ausus es, suspicor te non vidisse: quorum admirabile, ac divinum compendium apud me est, Syra conscriptum lingua. In iis igitur longe, uti dicebam, praestantiores sententiae continentur, quam in concionibus sordidissimi calumniatoris, atque impurissimi impostoris Emanuelis." *Exotericarum Exercitationum Liber quintus decimus, de subtilitate ad Hieron. Cardanum.* 4to. Lutetiae, 1557, f. 422. Exerc. CCCVIII. 'an lectis audita jucundiora.' This can scarcely be an allusion to the 3rd and 4th books of Ezra, but rather, as Fabricius suggests, to what was supposed to be a Syriac compendium of the seventy secret books mentioned in 4 Ezra xiv. 46, 47. I believe that the very MS., which Scaliger could so safely flourish in the face of his opponent, is now in the University Library, Cambridge, marked MM. 6. 29. It treats of astrology and alchemy, and resembles, to some extent, MS. Egerton, 709, in the Brit. Mus. (described in the *Catal. of Syr. MSS.* by Prof. Wright, Vol. III. p. 1190).

From fol. 116 b. to fol. 120 a. of the Cambridge MS., we have what professes to be an extract from the Book of Ezra, the wise scribe,

כִּיבָּרְכֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
 כְּמִשְׁכָּל

It commences thus:

וְכִיבָּרְכֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ  
 כְּמִשְׁכָּל כְּמִשְׁכָּל  
 כְּמִשְׁכָּל

This MS. once belonged to Erpenius, and came

into possession of the University together with his other MSS. in 1632. In the earliest printed catalogue of this collection it seems to be described as Liber theologicus mutilus, in 4. (*Petri Scriverii Manes Erpeniani.* 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1625). Erpenius probably received it from the younger Scaliger, and it is not unlikely that it was one of the libri Chaldaici in the possession of Jo. Picus Mirandula; that scholar, as we know, regarded the seventy books, above referred to, as a storehouse of mystic theosophy and cabbalistic lore, and I know of no other Syr. MS. that could in any degree justify, from his point of view, such glowing language as this: "Animarunt autem me, atque adeo agentem alia, vi compulerunt ad Arabum literas Chaldaeorumque perdiscendas, libri quidam utriusque linguae, qui profecto non temere, aut fortuito, sed Dei consilio, et meis studiis bene faventis Numinis, ad meas manus pervenerunt. Audi inscriptiones, vadimonium deseres: Chaldaici hi libri sunt, si libri sunt, et non thesauri. In patris Ezre, Zoroastris, et Melchiar Magorum oracula, in quibus et illa quoque, quae apud Graecos mendosa et mutila circumferuntur, leguntur integra, et absoluta: tum est in illa Chaldaeorum sapientum, brevis quidem et salebrosa, sed plena mysteriis interpretatio. Est itidem et libellus de dogmatis Chaldaicae theologiae, tum Persarum, Graecorum, et Chaldaeorum in illa divina et locupletissima enarratione. Vide, Marsili, quae insperata mihi bona irrepserunt in sinum"... (*Opera Omnia*, fol. Bas. 1601, Vol. I. p. 249).

The report with regard to a Hebrew copy of this book rests only on a vague statement of an untrustworthy writer: *Tertium et quartum Ezrae Hebraicos adhuc ipse non vidi: quidam tamen ex ipsis aiunt, eos nuper inventos Constantinopoli reperiri.* Galatinus, *Opus de Arcanis Cathol. veritatis.* 1561, p. 2. Dr. Fr. Lee was entirely mistaken in supposing that the Hebrew words printed on the margin of this book in the Lat. Bible of H. Stephens 8vo. Lutet. [1545] were derived from a Hebrew copy, and even Laurence failed to remove all misapprehension on this point (*Primi Ezrae libr. vers. Aeth.* p. 301). The fact is that Petrus Cholinus (not Leo

on this point raises a strong presumption that the additional matter formed part of the Greek text from which they were derived. Not only so, but there is decisive evidence that the Latin version also once contained the passage which is now absent; for Ambrose, in his treatise *De Bono Mortis*, drew largely for illustration from this version, and especially from the missing portion. The Benedictine editors of his works were perplexed at references which they could not verify, and suggested that a solution might be found in the examination of fresh MSS.<sup>1</sup> They casually refer to two, one of which belonged to their own library (at St. Germain des Prés); this was in all probability the ‘MS. Sangermanensis’ (Cod. S.), which a distinguished member of this order (Pet. Sabatier) upwards of sixty years later made use of for his great work, especially in the fourth book of Ezra. In late years it has been collated in a few passages by Dr. Hase for Volckmar’s *Esdra Propheta*, and very fully by Dr. Zotenberg for Hilgen-

Judaeus), who modernized the Latin version of this book, occasionally added on the margin, not only in this, but in the other apocryphal books, a Hebrew equivalent where it seemed to throw a light on the peculiar use of a Latin word or phrase. E.g. chap. iv. 52, *De signis de quibus me interrogas*, stands thus in the revised text: *Praesagitiones eorum de quibus me interrogas*, with the marginal note מפתים *indicia*, vaticinia seu praedictiones. v. 42, *novissimorum tarditas*; in the revised text: *posteriorum tarditas*, with the marg. note אחרונים; similarly in other places. vii. 33, *et longanimitas congregabitur*; in the revised text: *et finis imponetur patientiae*, marg. אסוף. In the same way a Greek word is sometimes introduced, and yet no one has ventured to maintain that the Greek was still extant. As in chap. x. 14, *ab initio ei qui fecit eam [=terram]*; in the revised text: *homini qui eam jam inde ab initio exercuit*, marg. ἐργάζεσθαι, facere et colere, ut et עבר. xiv. 9, *converteris*; in the revised text: *converteraberis*, marg. ἀναστρέψω.

<sup>1</sup> “Quin etiam eundem hunc librum inter canonicos descriptum in quibusdam antiqui aevi MSS. reperire est, non tamen in omnibus, nec sine discrimine aliquo. Namque in quodam pervetusto codice qui nostra in Bibliotheca adservatur, compactis in unum duobus canonicis libris Esdræ, secundus a primo capite hujusce quarti sumit exordium, haud dubie quia ejus illud initium est: *Liber Esdræ*

*Prophetae secundus*: tum ex ejus atque tertii libri capitibus inter se permixtis quatuor libelli conficiuntur. Doctissimus Faber Ludovici XIII. præceptor quemdam ejusdem quarti libri MS. adeo discrepare ab editione deprehendit, ut varias ejus lectiones Card. Baronio transmittendas putaret. Quae diversitas forte in causa est, cur nonnulla ab Ambrosio ex eodem libro citata in edito minime reperiantur.” S. Ambrosii *Opp.* fol. Par. 1686, Vol. I. 388.

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

“Porro his litteris adiunxi exemplar donationis Othonis tertij discipuli Gerberti qui Silvester 2. dictus est, ex eodem illo volumine instrumentorum cuius supra mentionem feci transcriptum: tum etiam duorum capitum priorum libri quarti Esdræ ex manuscripto Bibliorum codice non admodum vetusto ab editis valde dissidentium, vtrumque, ni fallor, valde sublestæ fidei...

..... Duo autem illa capita, quod eam varietatem libri licet apocryphi antiquissimi tamen, cuiusque magni viri Clemens Alexandrinus & B. Ambrosius auctoritatem non defugerunt, doctissimis illis viris qui elegantissimis vtriusque linguae Bibliorum editionibus præfuerunt non ingratis fore existimaverim, & in eo vtilem quod ex isto fragmento quædam in editis emendanda percepturi sint.” Nic. Fabri *Opuscula*, Par. 1618, p. 107.

feld's *Messias Judæorum*, and it is now regarded by the common consent of scholars as the oldest and best authority for the Latin text of our book. It is in the second volume of the Latin Bible now numbered MS. 11504, 11505, fonds Latin, Bibl. Nat., Paris<sup>1</sup>. Sabatier described it as nine hundred years old at the time when he wrote (1751), and editors invariably speak of it in general terms as a MS. of the ninth century, but the precise date at which it was written is recorded in the MS. itself, viz. the eighth year of Louis le Débonnaire (= A.D. 822). Great as is the critical value of this MS., a still higher interest attaches to it in the history of the transmission of our book of Ezra, for the researches of Prof. Gildemeister lead to the conclusion that it once contained the lost verses, and that it is the parent of all later MSS. The following extract, translated from a letter which he has kindly sent me on the subject, will explain the process by which he has arrived at this important result:

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

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

<sup>1</sup> See the ref. in *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, huitième siècle jusqu'à la fin du seizième, dix-septième Livraison (1842), which contains a facsimile of 4 Ezra xvi. 78. Vol. vi. p. 638, and especially the Comte de Bastard's costly work, *Peintures des MSS. depuis le*



years availed myself of every opportunity of examining Latin biblical MSS. The book itself is not, according to my experience, so uncommon as is generally supposed<sup>1</sup>; I found it in many Codices ranging from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, but never without the lacuna. Meanwhile an article in the Catalogue of MSS. belonging to the Bibliothèque Communale of Amiens, by Mons. J. Garnier, 8vo. Amiens, 1843, had caught my eye—it runs thus:

“10. Libri Esdrae. Vélin in-4°. 83 f.

d. r. L.<sup>2</sup> Corbie. 174. A.

IX<sup>e</sup>. siècle. Ecriture minuscule rapide, peu soignée et de plusieurs mains, à 2 colonnes de 30 lignes, non réglées. Le premier feuillet est à demi détruit.

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Laurence thus sums up the result of his investigations: “As the fourth book of Esdras was not translated by Jerome, it is of very rare occurrence in the MSS. of the Latin Bible. I have examined in all 187 MSS., 117 of which are in Oxford; viz. 86 in the Bodleian Library, 7 in St John's, 6 in Christ Church, 5 in Brazen Nose, 4 in New College, 4 in Magdalen, 3 in Corpus Christi, and 2 in the Radcliffe Library; the remaining 70 being in the British Museum; but I have found it in only 13; viz. in 3 at the Bodleian, in 2 at New College, in 1 at Magdalen, and in 7 at the British Museum” (*Primi Ezrae libri...versio Aeth.* p. 283). My researches among the libraries at Cambridge give a higher average. I have examined a little more than 100

MSS. of the Latin Bible, and have found it in 12; viz. in 2 at the University Library, in 2 at St. Peter's, in 2 at St. John's, in 1 at Gonville and Caius, in 1 at St. Catharine's, in 1 at Jesus, in 1 at Emmanuel, in 1 at Sidney Sussex, and in 1 at the Fitzwilliam Museum; besides this, chapters I. II., alone, are found in one MS. of the University Library and in one of Magdalene.

<sup>2</sup> i. e. Demi reliure de M. Le Prince, about whom M. Garnier has the following interesting notice: “M. Le Prince aîné, qui venait de quitter le commerce, offrit de consacrer ses loisirs à la reliure de ces volumes. Dès lors il alla à Paris étudier cet art auquel il était tout-à-fait étranger, et après un apprentissage qui dura près d'une année, il se créa

*2 libri primi Esdrae semel et iterum et duo postremi semel tantum. cod. memb. saec. 9. nota quod initio 2 postremorum habetur eadem manu, Adhuc non recipitur.*"

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> It would have been well if the compilers of our Articles had avoided the appearance of claiming even the qualified approval of Jerome for the 3rd and 4th of Ezra. "And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following: the third book of Esdras, the fourth book of Esdras, etc." Art. VI. The language of Jerome here referred to is used by him expressly of Judith, Tob., the books of Macc., Wisd. and Ecclus. (*In Libros Salomonis, Chromatio et Heliodoro*, ed. Ben. i. 938, 939). He speaks in other terms of these books of Ezra: "Nec quemquam moveat quod unus a nobis editus liber est: nec apocryphorum tertii et

quarti somniis delectetur: quia et apud Hebraeos Esdrae Nehemiaeque sermones in unum volumen coarctantur: et quae non habentur apud illos, nec de vigintiquatuor senibus sunt, procul abjicienda" (*Ad Domnionem et Rogatianum in Esdr. et Neh. Praef.*). Again, of the 4 Ezra: "Et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitur...quem ego librum nunquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod Ecclesia non recipit?" (*Adv. Vigilantium*, ed. Ben. iv. 283).

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 1860, on p. 438 he sums up the history thus: "La bibliothèque de Corbie, l'une des plus considérables qui aient existé en France au moyen âge, est uniquement due au zèle des moines, qui, depuis le huitième siècle jusqu'au quinzième, travaillèrent sans relâche à l'enrichir, soit en copiant, soit en achetant des MSS. Les trésors patiemment amassés pendant près de huit cents ans sont dilapidés au seizième et

a long time been exposed to pillage, and when in 1636 Corbie was recaptured from the Spaniards by the troops of Louis XIII. it was thought advisable to transfer the most valuable portion of the literary treasures to the security of the capital of the kingdom. In consequence of a petition of the monks, four hundred select MSS., which had been taken to Paris, were not alienated from the order, but deposited in the Benedictine Abbey of St. Germain des Prés, *n'ayant personne qui soit si jaloux de conserver l'héritage de leurs pères que les propres enfants*. At the end of the next century these were transferred, somewhat diminished in number, to the Bibliothèque Nationale. The MSS. left at Corbie were removed to Amiens, probably in 1791, but from these again a selection was made, and seventy-five were sent to the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1803. The residuum however left at Amiens is by no means a contemptible collection, for it contains several MSS. of the ninth century, and among them the Lat. Version of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the shorter epistles of St. Paul<sup>1</sup>, which till lately was thought to be unique, and the volume which has furnished materials for the present work. Thus by a strange fatality the latter MS. has been lost in provincial obscurity, for had it been despatched to Paris with the four hundred in the seventeenth century, it would certainly have been examined by Sabatier; and if sent later, with the seventy-five, it could scarcely have escaped the notice of the scholars of the present century.

au commencement du dix-septième siècle. Beaucoup de MSS. de Corbie passent alors dans différentes collections particulières. Restaurée par les religieux de la congrégation de St. Maur, la bibliothèque de Corbie est menacée d'une suppression complète à la suite de la reprise de la ville de Corbie en 1636 par les troupes de Louis XIII. En 1638, quatre cents MSS., choisis parmi les plus importants, sont envoyés à Saint-Germain des Prés; de là ils arrivèrent à la Bibliothèque nationale en 1795 et 1796, à l'exception d'environ vingt-cinq volumes, qui avaient été volés en 1791, et qui doivent être pour la plupart à St. Pétersbourg. L'abbaye de Corbie conserva jusqu'à la Révolution près de quatre cents MSS. qu'on n'avait pas jugé à propos de porter à Paris en 1638. Cette suite de MSS., dans laquelle soixante-quinze volumes ont été pris en 1803 pour la Bibliothèque nationale, forme le fonds le plus curieux de la bibliothèque d'Amiens."

<sup>1</sup> No. 88, Corbie 51. F. It was published (the Com. on Gal., Eph., and Philem. entire, and various

readings only of the rest, resulting from a collation with what Rabanus Maurus had introduced under the name of Ambrose, in his commentary on these Epistles) by J. B. Pitra (*Spic. Solesm.* i. 1852), but erroneously assigned by him to Hilary of Poitiers (so cited even by Rönisch, *Itala u. Vulg.* ed. 2, p. 526). The true authorship was first discovered by Prof. J. L. Jacobi (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft u. Christliches Leben* 1854, pp. 245—253), who subsequently edited the Com. on Phil., Col., and 1, 2 Thess. in five University Programmes, Halle, 1855—66 (the 4th and 5th are both entitled 'Pars iv.'). Mr. Hort, who arrived independently at the conclusion that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the author (*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, Vol. iv. pp. 302—308. Cambridge, 1859), has lately recognized the same work in an anonymous exposition of St. Paul's Epistles among the treasures of the Brit. Museum (MS. Harl. 3063); so that all seems fully ripe for a complete critical edition of this valuable commentary.



I now proceed to give a more detailed description of this Amiens MS. of our book, which I propose to call<sup>1</sup> Cod. A. It consists of 84 leaves of 11 × 7 inches (32,<sup>2</sup> v. and 84, r. and v. being blank), apportioned into 11 gatherings of 8 leaves each, except the 8th and 11th gathering, which have only 6 leaves apiece. The first ten gatherings have signatures by an early hand, from A to K; these signatures are on the last page, except B, which is on the first<sup>3</sup>. In the pages which immediately follow this Introduction, all that I have attempted, is to reproduce this portion of the MS., line for line as it now appears, so far as it can be exhibited by means of ordinary type. It is necessary to mention this, in order that it may not be mistaken for the original reading, which has been so tampered with by erasures<sup>4</sup>, corrections, and additions, that it is often difficult to decipher. Further information on these points is given in the notes which follow (on pp. 51—54), where I have supplied, as far as I could, the letters which have been erased, and pointed out all that has been added by later hands. Being obliged to work at a distance from my MS., I have not been able to represent some characteristics of minor importance, such as the way in which words are spaced<sup>5</sup>. These and other defects may in some measure be remedied by the printed photograph of a page (fol. 65, r. chap. vii. 97—109 (39)), which I have inserted; but it is hoped that the Palæographical Society will undertake to perpetuate by indelible facsimiles the

<sup>1</sup> The letter A can scarcely be regarded as pre-occupied, since it has only been used by one editor (Fritzche) to denote the *Bibl. Eccles. Aniciensis Velaunorum*, Tom. II., e *bibliotheca Colbertina* (Cat. Codd. MSS. Biblioth. Reg. Pars III. Tom. III. Paris, 1744, page 1, No. IV.), which contains no more of our book than the 'Confessio Hesdrae' (chap. viii. 20—36) written in smaller characters at the end of Nehemiah.

<sup>2</sup> This blank comes in the middle of a verse; fol. 32, r. b ends with *uocate adolescentes* and fol. 33, r. a goes on with the next words: *et ipsi indicabunt...* 3 Ezra iii. 16.

<sup>3</sup> As I have lately made use of a brief vacation to collate Cod. S., it may not be thought out of place to subjoin a few additional particulars with regard to that MS. The size of a leaf is 19½ × 13 inches; the gatherings are composed of 8 and occasionally of 10 leaves; the signatures, which in the Vol. examined by me are always on the last leaf, run on continuously from Vol. I. to Vol. II. A slight

inspection sufficed to shew the correctness of Prof. Gildemeister's statement with regard to the excision of a leaf, for in the gathering marked xxxviii., where 4 Ezra is found, there are only 7 leaves, of these 1 and 8 form a sheet, and so also 4 and 5; 2 and 7 are separate leaves pieced together, while 3 has no fellow, for 6 has been cut out with a knife, traces of which have been left on 5; the present pagination takes no account of this defect.

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

<sup>5</sup> The preposition and the word which follows generally cohere; chap. vi. 42 is a good illustration of the confusion which may arise from this habit of writing, here instead of *ut ex his sint*, Cod. A. has *ut exissent*, and for *a dō*, which stands both in Cod. A. and Cod. S., *adeo* is said to be the reading of Cod. T., and is adopted by Hilgenfeld and Fritzche.

few precious pages, which have alone preserved this interesting fragment of the old Latin<sup>1</sup>.

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

The following is a list of abbreviations which are found in Cod. A.<sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> A not unusual mark of interpunctuation in Cod. S. consists of a comma with two dots, thus ; as, for instance, *et delinquentes multos*; *Udidit anima mea* . . . chap. iii. 29. . . *et abscondita est in infernum*; *fugit corruptio* . . . chap. viii. 53.

<sup>3</sup> In Cod. S. we have *cū*, *dēs*, *dñs*, *ē*, *z*, *&*, *ih̄s*, *isrl*, *itaq*; *n̄ri*, *q̄*, *q̄t* (for *quod*), the usual compendia

for *per*, *prae* and *pro*, *sc̄a*, *spm*, *s*, *superauēr*, *uastabunt*, *l* intersected by a horizontal stroke for *uel*, *ur̄i*: besides *m̄s* (= *meus*), *on̄s* with the last stroke of the *m* dropping below the line (= *omnis*), *om̄s* (= *omnes*), *q̄* (= *quae*), *sec̄dm*, *secl̄i*, *xps*; and among the corrections, *fr̄* for *frater*. *qm̄* is, if I am not mistaken, the uniform contraction for *quoniam* in Cod. S., and *qm̄*, not *quum*, is the reading of this MS. in vi. 8. The later sign for *et* (7) occurs in x. 5, but only as an insertion above the line. For *quisq* see p. 29.