

DOCUMENTS

CODEX TAURINENSIS (Y)¹.

[At the suggestion of the Editors of the larger Cambridge Septuagint Dr Swete's symbol (Y) has been retained, though the Codex is not an uncial.]

History of the Manuscript.

Of the origin of this manuscript nothing is known; of its history but little. It belonged formerly to the Dukes of Savoy, and was kept in the library adjoining the ducal palace in Turin. In the year 1666 a fire broke out in the palace, and much damage was done to the library, which was partially destroyed; the MS under consideration suffered a good deal, but not so severely as one might be led to expect from Stroth's account, who speaks of it as 'ein leider sehr zerrissener Codex', and adds: 'er ist aber durch die vielen Risse nicht allein sehr unleserlich, sondern es fehlt auch vieles'². In the same year the MS, together with all that was left of the ducal library, was delivered over to the care of the University of Turin. Here it has remained ever since. It has been bound in very stout leather, and is secured with brass clasps; this binding is comparatively modern, and it is in part owing to this precaution that the MS escaped unscathed in the recent disastrous fire. Fortunately its place was on a low shelf, from which it was easily snatched soon after the fire broke out; all the manuscripts on the upper shelves of the block were either wholly destroyed or very seriously damaged. The only signs on this MS of its recent narrow escape are some marks of water; but these happen to be only on such parts of the vellum as have no writing on them; the binding is considerably discoloured by water, and but for its stoutness the MS would assuredly have suffered further damage.

But though so providentially preserved from the fire of the year 1904, it nevertheless bears grievous marks of that of the year 1666. The fire must have attacked the MS at the right-hand corner, at the bottom, and must have been extinguished before it was able to make its way through; for, while on the first few pages scarcely anything of the biblical text is wanting, there are increasing lacunae as each leaf is

¹ I desire to express my hearty thanks to the Managers of the Hort Fund for their kindness in giving me a grant towards the expenses involved in the journey to and sojourn in Turin.

² Eichhorn, *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* viii pp. 202 ff.

turned; and this is continued up to the last few pages, which again become practically intact, as far as the biblical text is concerned. The damaged zone cuts diagonally across the page, respectively from right to left and left to right.

Date of the Manuscript.

Stroth¹, Pasini², and Swete³ all assign this MS to the ninth century. Though the Introduction to Theodoret's *ὑπόθεσις* is in part written in uncials, the MS itself is in cursive handwriting, with the exception of the headings to the various books, which are written in gold uncial characters. In spite of this, however, there are a number of considerations which point to the date given above, or at latest to the tenth century:

(a) The handwriting itself is certainly a very early form of cursive; it is fairly upright, for cursive. The individual letters are carefully made, the exact finish of α and δ is noteworthy, and many of the letters are not joined to one another.

(b) In accordance with the general rule which prevailed down to about the ninth century, the writing is continuous, without separation of words, or divisions of verses, or even chapters; one exception to this latter is to be found at the end of Hos. i, where a very small blank space is left. There are no coupling-strokes between parts of the same word on different lines; these being unknown before the eleventh century, one may assume that the date is at any rate not later than the tenth century.

(c) There are no signs of the division of paragraphs; occasionally, and without any assignable reason, a capital marks the commencement of a line; but this capital, though sometimes the beginning of a verse, is frequently in the middle of one; sometimes it is found in the middle of a word⁴. No proper names commence with a capital.

(d) The very frequent occurrence of the middle point (*στίγμα μέση*), which, soon after the ninth century, gave place to the comma; also the sparing use of the note of interrogation, which is only found twelve times in the whole MS. The double stop (:) occurs only at the end of a book.

(e) The square form of the breathings ($\text{ⲛ} \text{ⲛ}$) would also point to a comparatively early date.

(f) The contractions which are so marked a characteristic of the later cursives are almost entirely absent; and the abbreviations are such only as occur in early MSS (see below).

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 202.

² *Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Regii Taurinensis Athenaei* p. 74.

³ *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* p. 145.

⁴ Once only does a chapter commence with a capital, viz. Hos. v.

The MS may therefore be assigned with some probability to the ninth century; there seems, at any rate, no adequate reason for regarding it as later than the tenth century¹.

General Description of the Manuscript.

The Codex consists of ninety-three leaves of fine vellum, the polished surface of which is characteristic of Italian preparation. The size of each leaf is 34 × 25 cm.; it is possible that the original sheets may have been a trifle broader. The pages have been skilfully restored by sticking triangular pieces of parchment on to the damaged parts of the original; thus the jagged edges left by the fire are prevented from being torn further. This has sometimes necessitated the covering over of letters at the end of a line; but it was clearly unavoidable.

The text is, as a rule, quite easy to read; it becomes difficult at times, however, to decipher words, or letters, at the end of a line within the damaged zone; for here it is not only the fire which has turned the vellum to different shades (from light brown to black), but water has made the ink run, so that in some instances (though fortunately only a few) decipherment was found to be impossible. This became especially annoying when it appeared from the legible portion of the line that some peculiar reading was involved². On the other hand, it happened over and over again that on portions of the MS which were almost black the action of the fire had turned the letters white, which were therefore as clear as possible. With the help of a magnifying-glass and a pocket electric light many words which at first sight appeared quite illegible were able to be deciphered.

There are generally twenty-two lines to a page, this number is of course reduced on those pages which contain the title of a new book; these titles occur at the top, in the middle, and even towards the bottom of a page. The line has thirty to forty letters; a few lines were noticed which had even less; forty is the outside limit; it may be safely said that most of the lines have thirty-two to thirty-four letters.

The accents and breathings are marked throughout, both in the uncial and in the cursive portions; in a few cases they are incorrect, e.g. Jon. iv 5 εως οὐ for εως οὐ; apostrophes (e.g. εφ') and marks of diaeresis occur but rarely; ι adscript is invariably used when the letter to which it belongs ends a word, while if a letter requiring it occurs anywhere but at the end of a word the ι subscript is omitted.

¹ Even if intact, the date which stood at the foot of the MS would not be of much value, as the writing is of much later date than that of the MS. The vellum, which is of good quality, is however not sufficiently distinctive to enable one to fix its date to a century.

² e.g. in Zech. vi 10, Mal. iii 8.

The letter η is sometimes written H. Final ν is, in the earlier parts of the MS, omitted; not infrequently it was written by the original scribe, but erased later; in the later pages final ν is often inserted, but as frequently omitted. Final ς is never used; but both ν and σ are sometimes represented by — at the end of a line above the final letter.

Abbreviations are— $\overline{\theta\sigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\sigma}$ $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ $\overline{\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\sigma}$ $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\sigma}$ $\overline{\delta\alpha\delta}$ $\overline{\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma}$ $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$ $\overline{\mu\rho\alpha}$ $\overline{\iota\nu}$ ($\overline{\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu}$) $\overline{\sigma\rho\iota\omicron\nu}$ $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$ ¹ $\overline{\iota\lambda\eta\mu}$ (on one single occasion, Zech. xiv 12, $\overline{\text{I}\epsilon\rho\nu\omicron\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu}$ is written in full), κ and once or twice the sign ς ($\overline{\kappa\alpha\iota}$) occurs. These are the only abbreviations contained in the MS.

The only itacism that occurs is the substitution of ι for $\epsilon\iota$ ($\overline{\Sigma\epsilon\iota\omega\nu}$ only occurs twice, Joel ii 15, 23, otherwise always $\overline{\Sigma\iota\omega\nu}$).

The Marginal Notes.

The marginal notes are of four kinds:—

(i) Additions to the text; made by the original scribe, apparently; there are only two of these additions. Words are in a few cases added by being placed over the line. All these are noted in the *App. Crit.*

(ii) Very short comments on some word or words in the text; they are by a later hand, and do not by any means occur on every page; moreover, many of them are too close to the binding to be read; they were apparently intended to answer the purpose of ornamentation, as well as explanation, for they all take the form of a perpendicular line intersected midway by a circle. The comments are not illuminative.

(iii) Originally there was a commentary in the real sense of the word, that of Theodoret², surrounding the text on three sides; nine-tenths of this has been destroyed. The bulk of this commentary was at the bottom of the page; this is seen by the commencements of the lines, of which there are eleven or twelve, whereas at the top of the page there are only about half this number; unfortunately it is just the lower half of the MS which has suffered most. The commentary is in a handwriting smaller than that of the text, but evidently both are by the hand of the same scribe.

(iv) At the top of a few pages there are the remnants of what appear to have been marginal notes to the commentary; on the right-hand side of the pages in question one sees the top of what must have been a narrow column; this column is always on the outer side of the commentary, hence the supposition that it refers to this rather than to the text.

Owing to the extremely meagre remains of the marginal notes, and

¹ $\overline{\text{I}\omega\sigma\eta\phi}$, $\overline{\text{E}\phi\rho\alpha\iota\mu}$, $\overline{\text{I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta}$ are invariably written in full.

² Theodoret's Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets is published in his complete works, edited by Schulze and Noesselt (Halle, 1769-1774), and in Migne's *Patr. Graec.* vol. lxxxix pp. 1546-1987.

the difficulty of making anything of them because of their mutilation, they have not been taken into consideration. One thing appears quite certain, however, that they are of no value from a text-critical point of view.

The Lacunae.

The lacunae, which are to be found on almost every page, in every line on most pages, vary from one letter to almost the whole line. It is always at the lower parts of the pages that the larger lacunae occur. But these lacunae are not so serious as would at first appear; the writing is so uniform that one can very nearly always tell how many letters are missing; I have again and again estimated the number of letters missing in a line, and found later on, when collating this MS with others, that in most cases the estimate was correct. It follows, therefore, that, generally speaking, missing words can be supplied by some other MS. One or two instances may be given:—

Hos. xi 10: . . . *****σθε: the words previous to this which are missing (εις πο[λιν· 10 οπισω κν]) are common to all the MSS, and therefore in the transcription they are represented by . . . ; the word of which σθε is all that remains differs from B (with which the MS was first collated), which reads πορευομαι (so too A Q); the letters were, however, most likely correctly estimated, as a number of cursives (22 36 51 62 147) read πορευεσθε.

Amos iv 15: και σ*****ψω: the reading of B A Q is συνχω, only six letters, while Y has eleven; but Q^{ms} reads και συντριψω.

As a rule, however, when a lacuna is seen to contain a various reading, the process of deciding what that reading was cannot be immediately concluded; an instance of this may be seen in

Mic. vii 1: ος του φαγειν τα πρωτ [15 litt.] = 32
η ψυχη μου· οιμοι ψν [17 litt.] = 32.

Taking thirty-two letters as constituting a line, there was clearly something in the text of Y which was wanting in B A Q, for these read:

ος του φαγειν τα πρωτογονα. = 22
οιμοι ψυχη . . .

In the former of these two lines Y had ten more letters than would be the case if it agreed with the other MSS (there might have been more, but I usually started with thirty-two); on examining this reading later on in other MSS I found that several Lucianic MSS read επεποθησεν after πρωτ[ογονα]; this gave exactly the estimated and required number of letters.

One other example may be given, again from Hosea:

viii 1: ***φαρνγ*****ωσ γη αβατος ωσ σαλπιγξ· ωσ, etc. (Y)
εις κολπον αυτων ωσ γη· ωσ, etc. (B A Q).

Here the number of letters in the line was under-estimated, as the reading of Y must assuredly have been that of the group 22 36 62 95 147 153 185 (all Lucianic): *επι φαργγι αυτων ως γη αβατος. ως σαλπυξ ως*, etc.

Very many further examples could be given, but it is unnecessary here, as plenty will be found in the *Apparatus Criticus*. But even from these few instances it will be seen that, in spite of the *lacunae*, the readings can generally be fixed with reasonable certainty.

Character of the Text.

That Codex Y gives the text of the Lucianic recension becomes obvious after a very brief examination. The main importance of the MS lies in the fact that it is the earliest known text (of the *Δωδεκαπρόφητων*) of the Lucianic recension in existence. It is unnecessary to give instances here of this textual character, a few references to the text will suffice: Jon. ii 10, Mic. i 14, iv 13, vi 13, Zech. iii 5, vi 7, xiv 7, etc., etc.

There are many points of much interest in the relations of this MS with others; but as the details of these have not yet been fully worked out, nothing more than a reference is here made. Thus, Q^{ms} often agrees with Y against BNAQ* (Γ), e.g. Mic. i 15, 16, vi 15; again, while N very frequently differs from Y, there is much affinity between N^{c-a} and N^{c-b} and Y. Very striking is the constant agreement of Y with the Lucianic group of MSS 22 36 51 62 147 153, in a somewhat lesser degree with 95 185, also reckoned as Lucianic, but with a special individuality of their own.

Contents of the Manuscript.

1. Theodoret's Introduction and Commentary commence on p. 1, under the title:

+ τοῦ μακαρίου θεολογίτου ἐπισκόπου γκρόγροϋ ἐπί τῶν προφῶν πόθεσις:

On pp. 2, 3 are miniatures of the twelve prophets, all in perfect condition. Theodoret's Introduction is taken up again on p. 4, and continues to p. 13^a: his commentary occupies the margin round the biblical text, where not destroyed.

2. On p. 13^b is a large illuminated title to the book of Hosea.

3. The text proper begins on p. 14^a and goes on uninterruptedly to the end, p. 93^b.

Before the leaves of this MS were bound a few got misplaced, thus causing some confusion in the text:

Zech. xiv 12 breaks off on p. 88^a in MS and is continued on p. 90^a in MS; Mal. i 11 breaks off on p. 89^a in MS and is continued on p. 91^a in MS.

The Apparatus Criticus.

(i) Besides the various readings of B \aleph A Γ Q, for which Swete's edition has been used, the *App. Crit.* contains readings from the following authorities:

(ii) All the Lucianic MSS at present known, viz. (Holmes and Parsons') 22 36 48 51 62 95 97 (= 238) 147 153 185 228 233. That all these MSS have undergone considerable revision in what may be called a 'Hesychian' direction scarcely admits of doubt; but this process is more strongly marked in 48 97 228 233 than in the rest; indeed, but for the fact that in some of the books, e.g. *Amos*, 48 agrees somewhat more closely with the other MSS of the group than in e.g. *Hosea* and others, it would be questionable whether 48 ought to be reckoned among the Lucianic MSS. The same must be said of 233, while 95 185 offer many individual readings of a perplexing character. As regards 97, Klostermann (*Analecta*, p. 11) has pointed out that the two Vatican numbers gr. 1153 and gr. 1154, which are parts of the same MS, are equivalent to 33 97 238 of Holmes and Parsons, these being likewise parts of the same MS; 1153 = 97 and 1154 = 33 238; of these, 33 contains Jer., Dan., 97 the Min. Proph. and Is., 238 Ezekiel. Here the number 97 is used instead of Holmes and Parsons' 238. The readings of all these MSS are taken from Holmes and Parsons, excepting 22 (Cod. Pachomianus), for which I have used the original in the British Museum (I. B. ii), and the *Amos* portions of 62 (New College, Oxford, XLIV) and 147 (Bodleian, olim Laud. K 96 nunc Graecus 30), which I have collated myself.

(iii) The Old Latin texts; these have been gathered by the writer, and can be found in the JOURNAL (vol. v pp. 76 ff, 242 ff, 378 ff, 570 ff; vol. vi pp. 67 ff, 217 ff), where the references to the patristic quotations are also given.

(iv) Hexaplaric readings; these are gathered from Field *Hexapla* (Oxford, 1875); Klostermann *Analecta* (Leipzig, 1895); G. Morin *Anecdota Maredsolana* III, parts i-iii (Maredsous, 1895-1903). To these have been added the readings of the hexaplaric MS, Cod. Barberinus.

(v) The readings of Chrysostom, gathered from Montfaucon's edition (Paris, 1839), and of Theodoret, Migne *Patr. Graec.* vols. lxxx-lxxxiv.

In order to avoid any ambiguity as to whether any of these authorities support or differ from Cod. Y, it should be added that, as regards (i), where B is wanting Γ supplies its place, namely in the following passages: Hos. x 2^b-9^a, Amos i 3 ($\epsilon\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$) -10 ($\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\alpha$), Zeph. ii 11 ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) -iii 9 ($\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$), Hag. ii 4-18 ($\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$), Zech. i 21 ($\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$) -ii 4 ($\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu$), iv 9 ($\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$) -viii 16 ($\tau\omicron\nu$), ix 7 ($\omega\varsigma\ \Gamma^0$) -xi 6 ($\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$), xi 17 ($\tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\omicron\nu$) -xiv 21, Mal. i 11 ($\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$) -iv 6; \aleph is wanting in the whole of

Hosea, Amos, Micah ; A Q have all the books complete. Regarding (ii) it will be noted that all the Lucianic MSS have the Minor Prophets complete, excepting 153 which lacks *Zechariah*. As regards (iii), the Old Latin texts are noted when they differ from Cod. Y as well as when they support it ; for references to the Old Latin authorities recourse must be had to the numbers of the JOURNAL cited above. All the Hexaplaric readings (iv) which have been gathered are added, whether they agree with the text of Y or not ; an exception to this is made in the case of Cod. Barberinus (86), where the same system is followed as in (ii)¹ : it contains all the books of the Minor Prophets complete.

Lastly, as regards the patristic quotations (v), references will be found below the text, as was done in earlier numbers of the JOURNAL with the Old Latin texts.

The following symbols are used :

B = Cod. Vaticanus.

Σ = Cod. Sinaiticus.

A = Cod. Alexandrinus.

Γ = Cod. Cryptoferratensis.

Q = Cod. Marchalianus.

Aq = Aquila.

Σ = Symmachus.

Θ = Theodotion.

Quint = Quinta.

Sext = Sexta.

OL^w = Cod. Weingartensis.

OL^h = Cod. Wirceburgensis.

OL^c = Old Latin texts from Cyprian.

OL^t = " " " " Tyconius.

OL^s = " " " " Speculum (Pseudo-Aug.).

OL^{sa} = " " " " Speculum (Augustine).

OL^{tert} = " " " " Tertullian.

OL^{ce} = " " " " Collatio Carthaginiensis.

OL^f = " " " " Contra Fulgent. Donat. (Donatist quotations).

OL^m = " " " " Mozarabic Breviary.

OL^{am} = " " " " Anecdota Maredsolana (ed. G. Morin).

OL^b = " " " " the MS Auct. F. 4, 32 in the Bodleian Library.

ℒ = the entire group of Lucianic MSS.

86 = Cod. Barberinus.

¹ For this MS Holmes and Parsons' collation and Field's notes have been used, excepting for Hab. iii, for which Klostermann's has been found very valuable (*Analecta* pp. 50-60) ; cf. Field's *Hexapla* ii p. 1007.

Theod = Quotations in the writings of Theodoret.

Chrys = " " " Chrysostom.

Dots (. . .) point to a lacuna in which there is every reason to believe that the MS agreed with B. Asterisks (***) indicate the estimated number of letters missing. The chapter and verse divisions in the text follow those of the Cambridge text of B.

I take this opportunity of expressing my indebtedness to the authorities of the Turin Library for their courtesy and kindness in a number of ways.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.