

THE CAMBRIDGE SEPTUAGINT OF 1665 AND 1684.
A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL QUERY.

THE Catalogue 'Bible' of the British Museum describes under 'Old Testament, Greek' (col. 261):

Ἡ Παλαια Διαθηκη κατα τους Ἑβδομηκοντα. Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex versione Septuaginta interpretum: juxta exemplar Vaticanum editum. [With a preface by J. P., i.e. Dr John Pearson.] pp. 19, 755, 516, 273. J. Field: Cantabrigiae, 1665. 12°.

There are three copies in the British Museum, bearing the press-marks 676. *a* 6, 7, 8 (2); 1003. *b* 5, 6; 218. *b* 17, 18 (2).

The next editions of the Septuagint described are: Amstelodami, 1683. 8° and Oxonii 1707-20.

To the first edition attaches a curious history, which seems to be little known. I do not remember to have found it mentioned lately.

In a letter signed T. B., i. e. Dr Thomas Brett, Oct. 17, 1729, and printed in London 1743, entitled: 'A Letter Shewing why our *English* Bibles Differ so much from the Septuagint, though both are translated from the *Hebrew* Original', we read (p. 47 f):

'It was also printed at *Cambridge* by John *Field*, 1665, in 12°. To this Edition the learned Bishop *Pearson* prefixed an excellent Preface. And *John Hayes*, who succeeded *Field* as Printer to that University, reprinted the *Septuagint* there in the Year 1684. But as he took care to print it Page for Page, and, I suppose, Line for Line with *Field's*, so he put *Field's* Name to it, and dated it as *Field's* was, 1665. By which he put a Cheat upon the World: His Letter being not so clear, nor his Book so correct as *Field's* is. This Edition of *Field's* and *Hayes's* does more exactly give us the *Roman* Edition, than that of London in 1653, though both differ in some Particulars.'

In a later, much enlarged edition, entitled: 'A Dissertation on the Ancient Versions of the Bible; Shewing why our *English* Translation differs so much from them. . . In a Letter to a Friend. The Second Edition, prepared for the Prefs by the Author before his Death, and now printed from his own Manuscript. By the late Rev. Dr. Thomas *Brett*. London, 1760': the passage concerning these impressions runs (p. 84 f):

'But I must here observe, that this *Cambridge* Edition, which Dean *Prideaux* (from whom I have chiefly taken what I have here said of the three eminent Editions) says was twice printed, first by *John Field* in the Year 1665, and then by *John Hayes* in the Year 1684. But *Hayes* (who succeeded *Field* as Printer to the University) put *Field's* Name to his own Impression, and dated it 1665 as *Field's* was, and printed it

Page for Page like *Field's*, and so put a Cheat upon the World, to make it pass for *Field's* Edition, though the Print was not so clean and neat, and I question also whether so correct as *Field's*. As I was admitted at *Cambridge* within a Year after *Hayes* reprinted *Field's Septuagint*, and was well acquainted with *Hayes*, I remember I asked him how he came to set *Field's* Name, and the Date of 1665 to a Book himself had just printed? He only smiled, and made me some slight Answer, intimating I shewed myself a Stranger to the World, by asking such a Question.'

This new impression is mentioned in *Graesse's Trésor des livres*, 'Cambridge, Hayes 1684, contrefaçon de 1665'; but nowhere have I found a more accurate description, which would make it possible to distinguish the two editions. I therefore beg to put the question: Is the story of this 'Cheat' true, and how may the two editions be distinguished from each other? My own copy, which I bought as complete, omits the third part, containing the Apocryphal books. On the last page of the Preface is the 'Index Librorum Veteris Testamenti', running from pp. 1 to 745 and 1 to 512, containing no clue that a complete copy has a third part of 273 pages.

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

[With the help of the officers of the University Press and Mr Worman of the University Library, and after examination of various copies of the LXX, all bearing *Field's* name and the date 1665 (one in the University Library, four in *Pembroke College* Library, and others in other College Libraries and in private hands), it is only possible to give a somewhat uncertain answer to Dr Nestle's questions, though the evidence seems to point to some positive conclusions.

The books examined shew that the title-page and the preface were set up three times. The three editions may be distinguished: (a) probably *Field's* own original edition, bearing on the title-page the mark which is commonly found in his books, viz. a plain long oval, the symbolic figure having the arms full extended, and the motto 'Hinc lucem . . .' beginning at the bottom on the left side and running left to right; (b) probably the edition of *Hayes*, with the mark which (though he also still continued to use *Field's* mark) is found often in his books, viz. a smaller and rounder oval, with a scroll round it, the figure having the arms uplifted, and the motto beginning at the top of the right side and running right to left; (c) probably printed abroad, the printer's mark being like those which were used by a Paris printer, C. Wechel, a century before, and not known in books printed in England.

The same fount of type seems to have been used in (a) and in (b), with the exception of one or two letters, but the setting of a few of the lines in the preface is different. The title-page of (b) has the misprint *διαθηχη* for *διαθηκη*, but the preface seems to be accurately set up. The paper used throughout both books appears to be the same. On the other hand the paper of the title-page and preface of (c) is different from the paper of the rest of the volume (which appears to be the same

as that of (*a*) and (*b*)), and there are misprints in the preface, such as 'ab eam' for 'ad eam' in the first sentence, and בדר for בדר in the second page, and the Hebrew type all through is different—a bold staring type much too large to suit the type of the rest of the page.

But in all the books examined—(*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) alike—the Greek text of the whole of the O. T., including the Apocrypha, so far as I have examined them, is identical, page for page, line for line, and word for word, and there seems to be no doubt that all the sheets belong to one impression. Certain curious errors in pagination are found in all the copies: e. g. in the O. T. (1 Kings) the pages run 444, 445; 446, 447; 446, 447 (repeated); 450, 451; 450, 451 (repeated); 454, 455; 454, 457. And again (1 Chronicles) 646, 647; 648, 647; 648, 649; and (2 Chronicles) 688, 689; 690, 691; 692, 693; 694, 685; 686, 687; 688, 689; 690, 691. And in the Apocrypha (3 Maccabees) there is a similar error, the pages running 262, 263; 464, 265; 266, 267; 268, 469; 470, 471; 472, 273. But apart from this evidence, the officials of the Press are of opinion that it would be impossible for any compositor, even if he used the same type, to follow his copy so minutely and exactly. It appears, then, that all the sheets of the Greek text are of Field's printing; that a smaller number of the title-page and preface were originally printed (*a*) (or else that the stock was mislaid), and that the type was set up again (*b*), and that some of the sheets of the text passed into the hands of some one abroad who set up the title-page and preface for himself and issued the book as Field's (*c*).

In any case it seems clear that no real 'cheat' was perpetrated; and if the text of all editions was the actual text, the actual sheets, of Field's original printing, we have the explanation of Hayes's smile and his 'slight answer'.

With regard to Dr Nestle's other question: the book was printed in three parts—(1) Genesis—Esther pp. 1–755, sheets A–kk; (2) Job—Malachi pp. 1–516, sheets A a a–y y y, with τέλος τῶν προφητῶν at the end; (3) Esdras—3 Maccabees pp. 1–273, sheets A–z. Parts (1) and (2) were frequently bound together in one volume. Part (3) was issued separately, but commonly bound up in one volume with Duport's Greek Version of the Prayer Book (with the LXX version of the Psalms in the middle), and the New Testament in Greek, making a volume of the size of parts (1) and (2) together. Otherwise the whole is divided into three volumes of nearly equal size—(1) being found alone, (2) and (3) forming the second volume, while the third comprises the Prayer Book and the New Testament. These other contents of the volume also were printed separately in parts: the Prayer Book pp. 1–126 (ending with the Communion Service); the Psalms, Special Forms of Prayer, and Ordinal pp. 1–171; and the New Testament pp. 1–419.

The Psalms (the LXX version, arranged according to the divisions of days and verses in the Prayer Book; the titles of the LXX being retained and supplemented, in place of the Latin headings of the Prayer Book) had been printed as a separate volume, with title-page and last page bearing the printer's (Field's) mark, in 1664; and the sheets of

this impression, title-page and all, were used for the 1665 edition of the Prayer Book, the pages of the version of the 'special forms of prayer' and the Ordinal being numbered continuously with the last page of the Psalms.

I have before me the two-volume edition of the whole in its original binding, and a copy of the Prayer Book and of the N. T. (not the same setting as in the original two or three volume editions of the whole) each in one volume; but I have not seen a copy of the Apocrypha by itself. The copy of the N. T. (belonging to one of the Readers of the Press) contains the advertisement of the London agents of the Press in and about the year 1698 as follows: 'The Septuagint Bible in *Greek*: the *Greek* Apocrypha: the Common-Prayer in *Greek*: Printed in the same Volume with this; and making two equal Volumes when bound together; are Sold compleat or separately, by *A. and J. Churchill*, in *Pater-noster row*.'

It may be of interest to add that, whatever the facts are with regard to Field's edition of the Old Testament, there is no doubt that the Prayer Book was set up and printed more than once. The two copies before me bear Field's name and the date 1665 (αχξε), but there are numerous small differences in type and setting. The Psalms, however, in both books seem to be the same impression, viz. that of 1664, as they purport to be, with the same minute displacements of single letters and other resemblances which it seems impossible that a compositor could have reproduced. There appears, therefore, to have been a larger impression of the Psalms of 1664 than of the Prayer Book of 1665; and the history of impressions of the Psalms and the Prayer Book in Greek—so far as we can recover it—seems to furnish a parallel to that of the LXX and the preface¹.—J. F. B-B.]

¹ The Amsterdam edition of 1683, which Dr Nestle mentions, reprints Pearson's *Præfatio Parametrica* without acknowledgement, omitting the signature J. P. In the Zürich edition of Grabe (1730-1732) Pearson's Preface is also printed, but as his, with an appendix by the Editor. The London Edition of 1653, mentioned by Dr Nestle, was also printed by a Cambridge printer, whose patent was cancelled for neglect in 1650.