NOTES ON THE MSS OF COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES.

THE Christian Topography of Cosmas, though carelessly edited by Montfaucon from a single inferior MS, is preserved in three fairly complete MSS.

V = *Vat. Gr.* 699, an uncial MS of the eighth or ninth century, contains only ten books, not eleven as Montfaucon states; and the ending of the tenth is different to that of *L*, *S*, and the edition. The beginning of the work too is different; f. 1^r contains a summary of contents much like *M*¹ p. 49, except that it ends with the title of Book X; on the verso begins the text with the words *τινὲς χριστιανίζειν νομιζόμενοι* under the title *ὑπόθεσις*. The introductory prayer, the first prologue, and part of the second prologue, are omitted. There are several gaps due to the loss of leaves.

L = *Laur. Plut.* ix 28 (s. xi) is the MS which Montfaucon copied for his edition, using *V* on three occasions to fill a gap. But in each of the three instances (after *Ἀαρὼν* 217 C, *ἀντιφώνως* 249 A, *ληρωδιάν* 405 C), with extraordinary carelessness he only inserted part of the missing text. Two other gaps (after *τέκνα* 200 D, and *χαρισαμένου* 393 C) which may be filled from *V* or *S* passed unnoticed. *L* has been corrected throughout by a later hand; and in such cases the first hand almost always agreed with *V* and *S*.

S = *Sinai* 1186 (s. xi) contains twelve books, like *L*, to which it is closely akin; but the end of the twelfth book is deficient as in *L*. The beginning differs both from *L* and *V*. On f. 1 is the prologue; on f. 2 *πίναξ σὺν θεῷ ταύτης τῆς δέλτου*, an index like that in *M* p. 49; then it continues as *V* *ὑπόθεσις*. *τινὲς χριστιανίζειν νομιζόμενοι*. Like the others it has several gaps.

The other fragmentary MSS at Vienna and Smyrna, and the biblical MSS which use sections of the fifth book as catenae, add nothing of any value, and may be neglected.

In this short description of the MSS there are several points which call for special notice.

- (1) *L* and *S* contain twelve books, *V* only 10.
- (2) The end of Book X is different in *V* and *L* *S*.
- (3) All three MSS begin differently.

To these may be added a fourth equally important point, that *V* has the paragraphs on the Prophets in Book V in the Septuagint order, whereas *L* and *S* have the minor Prophets in the order of the Vulgate, the Major being inserted among them in a more or less chronological position. I have endeavoured to shew elsewhere² that *V* indubitably

¹ The references are to Migne *Patr. Gr.* 88.

² *J.T.S.* Oct. 1906.

preserves the correct order, and that the change in L and S is due to some later editor. That in itself, combined with the incongruity of an entire book devoted to Ceylon and its beasts and birds in an argument about the squareness of the world, is sufficient to cast suspicion on the two additional books found in L and S. Fortunately the hitherto uncollated MS S verifies that suspicion by openly confessing in the summary of contents that the eleventh book is *ἐξωθεν τῆς βίβλου*, while both L and S call Book XII *ἔτι ἕτερος (λόγος L)*, not simply *λόγος* as the other books. One would be sorry, however, to rob Cosmas of the honour of the book on Ceylon, and indeed to my mind it bears too obviously the stamp of Cosmas's methods and personality for its authenticity to be seriously questioned. The most probable explanation is that after Cosmas's death some one acting as his literary executor re-edited the Topography, adding two other books from Cosmas's papers, and making, for reasons best known to himself, the transposition already mentioned. Of this later edition L and S are apparently copies, while V is a less pretentious but more faithful copy of the original simple text.

Whether the editor who was responsible for that transposition and the addition of the two books had the boldness to add anything to the text on his own account is, perhaps, more doubtful: but there are several passages where it seems the most reasonable explanation. For example, the tenth book ends in V with the words *ἀλλὰ πάντες μαρτυροῦσι τῷ ἡμετέρῳ λόγῳ* (428 c) followed by *ὅτι οὐ ξένην οὔτε ἄγνωστον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁδὸν ἐβαδίσαμεν (-ήσαμεν V) ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἔννοιαν τῆς θείας γραφῆς εἰρήκαμεν πάντα καὶ κατεγράψαμεν. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐξωθεν παλαιῶν τεθείκαμεν μαρτυρίας συμφωνούσας τῷ ἡμετέρῳ λόγῳ ὡς παραδόσεως γέννημα. θεὸς μάρτυς, εἰτα ἀπόστολοι, προφῆται, ἁγίων πατέρων πολυνύμμος χορός, ἀποσχιστῶν ἔνιοι καὶ τῶν ἐξωθεν οὐκ ἄσημοι ἄρχαιοι ἄνθρωποι, αὐτὴ ἡ φύσις τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν ἀλήθειαν προδήλως κηρύττουσα. ἀλλὰ τούτων ἅλις. λοιπόν, ὦ προσφιλέστατε, ἀσφαλῶς ἀποδείξας πάντας τοὺς προειρημένους μάρτυρας τῆς ἡμετέρας συγγραφῆς, τῷ πάντων σωτῇρι θεῷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπέμψωμεν, δόξαν τε καὶ τιμὴν καὶ κράτος τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ (-νῃ V¹) αὐτοῦ νύϋ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας καὶ ἀτελευτήτους (-τιτους V¹) αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.* Part of this is similar to the end of the book as it is found in L and S (M p. 428) but fuller; and with the preceding paragraph it forms a perfectly reasonable ending. If the quotations from the Fathers which follow in M pp. 428–441 actually existed in Cosmas's copy, there seems no conceivable explanation for their omission in V—it could hardly be due to loss of leaves in archetype, as the passage runs consecutively: but on the other hand there is every reason for their insertion by an editor who thought that he was thereby strengthening the argument.

It is possible that we find instances of his knowledge of patristic

literature in other places, though the instances are not very certain. The παραγραφή (161 c), πρῶτος συγγραφεύς—ὁ Μωυσῆς, is in L and S placed in the margin under the title σχόλιον with the addition ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὁ μέγας Ἀθανάσιος ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ ἐννάτῃ αὐτοῦ ἑορταστικῇ ἔνθα κανονίζει τὴν γραφὴν καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὅμοια λέγει ὅτι πρὸ Μωυσεὺς οὐκ ἦσαν γράμματα.¹ Possibly the title σχόλιον should apply not to the whole παραγραφή but to the latter part, which was a subsequent addition. It is noticeable that in the section on the Catholic Epistles (372 D) the reference to Athanasius (καὶ Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπος) is also absent from V. Probably we should add to the same editor's sins of commission the addition of the paragraphs on Zachariah, Elizabeth, Mary, Anna, Simeon, and Christ (277 c–280 c).

There is a puzzling passage at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth book which may also be due to his meddling; but I am not at all sure of the true explanation. One thing is certain, that after the word ληρωδιάν (405 c) the text should continue κατεγράψαμεν. ἀλλὰ πορείας (αι V) ἀστρων κυκλοφερεῖς ἀερίας, διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐκτελουμένας, θέλοντες σημᾶναι' (-αιναι V) τούτους κατεγράψαμεν ἵν' εὐσύνοπτα τοῖς θεωμένοις γίνωνται, as these words are found in V and S, and a page is here missing in L. That, however, is not the difficulty: it is the preceding passage which is in confusion in the MSS: V ends the eighth book quite appropriately at the words τὰ πάντα φιλόχρυστε (401 B); but in L and S there follows, as in the edition, a picture of the mountain round which Cosmas supposed the sun to make its nightly revolution, and a paragraph dealing with the subject of the next picture, with which Book IX begins. The picture is so out of place here that Montfaucon has thought it necessary to add a note accounting for its existence, and the paragraph is equally inappropriate as it refers in the past tense (κατεγράφη) to the book which follows. V has none of this paragraph, but fills the page after the end of Book VIII with a double picture of Hezekiah. Then follows the text of Book IX as far as ἀμὴν (405 A). The next thirty-one lines are omitted, τοὺς κύκλους κ.τ.λ. (405 c) following immediately after ἀμὴν. After ληρωδιάν is the additional passage quoted above, and at the end of it a circular picture like that in M p. 470 except that figures holding globes take the place of the fruits and herbs, while the centre is occupied by a mountain with the sun setting and rising around it (cf. Migne p. 402). In L and S Book IX begins with a picture like that in Migne p. 470, followed by the text as in the edition, except that S still has the passage after ληρωδιάν and the picture precisely as V; in L a page is missing.

¹ This phrase does not occur in the part of the 39th letter which is preserved in Greek, but it is found in the Coptic version published by Schmidt from a Paris MS. (f. ροζ) **ἐπιπαραφη γραφη γραφης**.

The debateable point is the picture and paragraph found in L and S at the end of Book VIII. There, as I have said, they are unnecessary and inappropriate; and though they would be appropriate enough in Book IX, the words *κατεγράφη ἐν τῷ ἐννάτῳ λόγῳ* preclude the possibility of its being a loose sheet escaped from that book. It is probable, then, that it is a later addition; and an examination of the pictures supplies a plausible reason for the addition. The picture in V, which I have already described, is composed of two parts, a representation of the months and seasons and of the nightly revolutions of the sun. The two additional pictures in L and S represent these two things separately, and that is probably the only reason for their existence and for the insertion of the explanatory paragraph.

The omission of *καὶ ταύτας το ἐργάσατο* in V need not detain us: the passage is closely connected with the picture which follows, and as such passages are frequently compressed and written in a smaller hand to make room for the illustration, they are easily liable to omission as mere scholia. For the same reason they are occasionally omitted or transferred to the margin. For example, the short paragraph *ὁ οὐρανὸς . . . σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου* (337 B) is omitted by V, and *εἰς τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς . . . χῶροι δύο* (184 A) transposed to after *πλάτος τοιόνδε* (185 A) below a picture to which they are not applicable. On the contrary V preserves in the text, after an illustration between 188 D and 189 A, the words *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὅσον ἐδέχετο (ὡς ἐνεδέχετο L) διαγραφῆναι πεποιήκαμεν ἀκολουθῶντες τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ. διαγράψωμεν τοίνυν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἕξω τὴν σφαῖραν καὶ ἴδωμεν εἰ δυνατόν κατὰ φάσιν κινεῖσθαι*. In L the same words are relegated to the margin as a scholium; while in S a page is missing.

Again, before a picture of the Tabernacle (212 D), both V and S have *ἐνταῦθα τὴν αὐλὴν καὶ μέσσην τὴν σκηνὴν διεγράψαμεν ἐσκεπασμένην καὶ ἀποτεταμένιν (sic) τοῖς κάλοις εἰς τοὺς πασάλους (sic), καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον τῆς αὐλῆς κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων χρωμάτων ἔχουσιν τὰ ἱστία, τῆς δὲ ὅλης αὐλῆς ἀπὸ βύσσου καὶ μύνης*. These and many similar instances are due, no doubt, to the connexion of the paragraph with an illustration; but even when there is no picture in the case, the presence of the overwhelming number of notes, for which Cosmas himself apologizes (57 B), has naturally caused considerable confusion. The larger number of these notes would appear from phrases like *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον λοιπὸν ἐπανέλθωμεν* (124 D), *παραγραφὴ κατὰ παρένθεσιν κειμένη* (after *πατέρα* 257 B in V), and *ἐπανάληψις τῶν προτέρων* (so V 257 D instead of *τὸ κείμενον*) to have been written in the text, only marked off by the title *παραγραφὴ*; but it is quite clear from the occurrence of some of them as *σχόλια* in one MS and *παραγραφαί* in the text in another (e.g. *ἐνταῦθα πρῶτον . . . τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* 160 C is in L and S a scholium, and so too is the *παραγραφὴ. τινὲς ἔφασαν . . . Ἐξεκίου* 165 A) that many of them were added

in the margin, even some of the longest, if we may draw such an inference from the transposition of *μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν* (136 C) . . . *πιστοὶ ἀναφέρονται* (137 B) in V to after the word *Αἴγυπτον* (140 B).

Naturally this system of marginal notes has led to the omission of many of them in one or more of the MSS; for example, in the passage last referred to V omits the second short *παραγραφὴ* (137 C). In such a text the collation of several MSS is absolutely necessary; and, as Montfaucon used only one, the other two, V and S, contributed a number of hitherto unprinted notes. At times, of course, it is difficult to determine whether they are genuine notes or mere scholia; but the probability is always in favour of their authenticity,¹ as Cosmas was so profuse in adding notes as to leave little opening to any one else. Some of these additional passages are of considerable length, but for shortness' sake I will give only two.

Both V and S preserve at the end of Book V—the end, that is to say, of the original Topography—a passage which is lost in L. In S it is separated from the rest of the text by the heading ΕΥΧΗ in gold letters. It runs as follows:—*Θεὲ ἀγαθέ, εὖσπλαγχνε, μακρόθυμε, πολυέλεε, ἐλέησόν με τὸν ἀνάξιον δοῦλόν σου καὶ μὴ με κατακρίνης ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις μου ὅτι σοι μέλει περὶ πάντων καὶ ἐπίστασαι ἐκάστου τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν διανοιῶν ὅτι πόθω τῷ εἰς σε τῶν σῶν οἰκτιρμῶν. αἰτηθεὶς οὐκ ἀπέκρυψα τὴν παραδεδομένην μοί σου εὖσπλαγχνίαν καὶ ἀγαθότητα καὶ οἰκτιρμοὺς πρὸς ὠφελείαν τῶν ἀναγνωσκόντων ἐκ τῶν σῶν ὧν ἐχαρίσω μοι διδασκάλων πρόνοια τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.* S alone preserves after *ταύτην* (217 C) the words *παραγραφὴ εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου*

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου ἔσωθεν τοῦ καταπετάσματος οὕσα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ σκηνῇ, εἰς ἣν ἔσωθεν ἔκειτο ἡ στάμνος ἡ χρυσὴ τοῦ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥαβδὸς Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης, καὶ ὁ ὄφης ὁ χαλκοῦς, καὶ ἐπάνω αὐτῆς πέταλον χρυσοῦν λεγόμενον ἱλαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἐχρησμοδοῦντο οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς εἰσιὼν ἕκαστος κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπαξ λαμβάνων ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν τῷ λαῷ τῶν ἀγνοημάτων αὐτῶν, ἐπάνω δὲ αὐτοῦ δυο

¹ For example, a passage occurring actually within the rim of one of the illustrations of L has every appearance of genuineness. Unfortunately V and S are both lacking for this passage at the end of the fourth book (192 B) in the open spaces of a picture like M p. 465 no. 2:—

οἱ παρὰ τοῖς ἔξω λεγόμενοι ἀντίποδες as title, followed by *ὁρβίου ὄντος τοῦ σχήματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ ταύτην οἱ τέσσαρες ἰστάμενοι πῶς οὐκ εἰσὶν ὄρθιοι, ἀλλ' ὅπου δ' ἂν στρέψῃς αὐτοὺς οἱ τέσσαρες οὐκ εἰσὶν ὄρθιοι· πῶς οὖν δυνατόν δεῖξασθαι τὰς τοιαύτας ψευδεῖς ὑποθέσεις; πῶς δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς τέσσαρας κατὰ ταύτην δυνατός ἕτερος γένεσθαι; ὅπερ οὖν ἡ φύσις καὶ ὁ νοῦς οὐ παραδέχεται τί μᾶλλον ὑποτίθεσθαι.*

Several passages in Montfaucon's text are in a similar position: for example, *μαρτυρεῖ...δρόμον* (328 A) is in V written on the left side of the picture, which is represented on the previous page of the edition; and the words which follow (*εὐδηλον...δείκνυσιν* 328 A) are on the right side. The *παραγραφὴ* 185 D is also under a diagram, without any heading.

χερούβιμ δόξης κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον. αὐτὸ οὖν τὸ ἱλαστήριον τύπον εἶναι λέγει τοῦ Δεσπότην Χριστοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. ἵνα εἴπῃ ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὸ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτριῷ παρέιχε τὴν ἄφεσιν, οὗπος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι ἐποιήσατο τὴν ἄφεσιν τῷ κόσμῳ. In L there is a page missing here. Fol. 109 ends at Ἀαρὼν, f. 110 begins at οὕτως οὖν. We know from the other two MSS that a picture is also missing, but that picture and three and a half lines of text would not fill both sides of a page. So L must have had this paragraph too.

Such marginal additions were naturally liable to be inserted in the wrong place: and in that case V is invaluable, as belonging to a different edition to L and S. It shews, for example, that 125 D—128 B the παραγραφὴ really only consists of ἐν τῇ ᾧ ἡμέρᾳ—καὶ πάνυ βέβλαπται (128 B) and should be transposed to follow τούτων μὴ ἐλπίζοντες 128 C (V omits ποτε γενέσθαι). Again the παραγραφὴ. ἐνταῦθα Μωυσῆς—τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ (205 C) should precede the passage entitled τὸ κείμενον (204 D), while the section which follows (ἐτι ἵσως πάλιν κ.τ.λ. 208 C) is another παραγραφὴ so entitled in V. It may be noticed that here too there is an illustration in the case. Equally frequently the notes are not separated from the text. For instance V rightly marks a παραγραφὴ before Σημᾶναι (117 B), and before καὶ οὕτως (224 A); and παραγραφὴ κατὰ παρένευσιν κειμένη before ὅτε μετεμορφώθη (257 B). Before the words οὗτός ἐστι Νῶε (232 C) a division should be made, and the heading Νῶε inserted. Such misdivisions are especially frequent in the case of small additional notes tacked on to another note by ἐτι or ἐτι παραγραφὴ. In such cases they are invariably in red ink in V, and should be given a separate line in an edition (e. g. at 204 A, ll. 6 and 9, 189 B, 229 C, 232 B, 240 D, 244 D, &c.).

A similar instance of transposition is the clause ὁ στήσας, εἶπεν—οὐ δύναται 77 B, which in the MSS precedes the quotation on which it is a comment (καὶ πάλιν ὁ κατέχων κ.τ.λ.). V shows the reason, as it reads Παραγραφὴ. καὶ πάλιν ὁ στήσας, L also has καὶ πάλιν at the beginning of both clauses.

At 76 D the clause ἐπισημαντέον . . . τὸν οὐρανόν in the MSS absurdly precedes the word Ἡσαίας. Here L comes to the rescue with a marginal note σχόλιον. ἐπισημείωσις ἐνταῦθα. At 132 C τὸ εἰσθίκει . . . περιγραπτῶν εἰσιν is misplaced in L and the edition: it should follow καὶ φύλακα nine lines below as it does in V, reading τὸ οὖν εἰς—. Though perhaps it can hardly be counted as a transposed note, V is undoubtedly right in transferring the sentence εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἔλαβον . . . ἐπιπτον (125 C) to between Σατανᾶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα ὡς ἀστραπὴν (so V) and χωρὶς γάρ five lines lower. Again at 165 C—D in V the explanatory sentence ὅπερ καὶ τοῦτο . . . ἔκλειψεν ἡλίου is placed before τὴν γενομένην ἔκλειψιν and headed παραγραφὴ. The ἐτι παραγραφὴ which is printed on the next page is in

both L and V placed after ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστός. Probably both notes were in the margin and should be printed together, the second being really a note on the words ἐκλειψις ἡλίου. A stranger case is that on p. 389 c. There V reads δι' ἐκατέρων γὰρ ἐδιδάχθη ἐταζόμενος μὴ εἶναι ὁ Χριστός, ὡς ὑπώπτευσαν ἑαυτόν. εἶτα συνίεις κ.τ.λ. omitting the passage of eleven lines (ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα . . . βασιλείας σου) which is inserted in L and S, and the edition between Χριστός and ὡς. As the insertion makes ὡς ὑπώπτευσαν ἑαυτόν untranslatable there is little doubt it is a marginal note wrongly inserted.

Now one might at first sight be inclined to imagine that this theory of marginal additions supports Montfaucon's view that L and V represent two different recensions by the author. But, if one examines the instances more closely, I think one will find that they are rather opposed to than in favour of that theory; because on his assumption one would expect to find the additional passages in L and not in V, whereas in fact there are just as many in V as in L. Nor can they be assumed to be later additions in V because in cases where they appear in one MS in the text, in the other in the margin, it is almost invariably V which has them in the text and L in the margin. Still more conclusive evidence against it are the instances given above of marginal notes wrongly inserted by both MSS in the same place in the text, because they imply at least one common ancestor later than Cosmas's autograph copy for all the MSS. On the other hand all these objections fall to the ground if we assume V to be a tolerably careful copy of the work as left by Cosmas, L and S representatives of an edition made after his death.

There remains, however, a serious difficulty—that all three MSS begin the book in a different way. V's beginning is the simplest, an index of the ten books followed by Ὑπόθεσις. τινὲς χριστιανίζειν νομιζόμενοι κ.τ.λ. S differs from V only in extending the index to the twelve books, and in prefixing to it the first prologue, which is printed in Migne p. 53.

L omits the index and begins as the edition begins, with a prefatory prayer, a first prologue, and a second prologue. There is, however, one important variant from the text of the edition which I will notice later, taking the points in order: the introductory prayer preserved only in L need not detain us, as it is not of the smallest interest whether it is genuine or not; and it is just such a thing as might have been added by any monkish copyist. The genuineness of the first prologue I do not think any one will impugn, in spite of the fact that it is omitted by V. If in V's archetype as in S it preceded the index, the leaf containing it may have well been torn off or become illegible or may simply have been overlooked. The real crux is the second prologue of L, which ultimately joins with the ὑπόθεσις of the other MSS, though that

title and the first few lines of the *ὑπόθεσις* as it is found in the V and S do not exist in L at all: so that Montfaucon's reading is a composite reading made up from L and V. L's reading is the same as the edition as far as πολλῶν γὰρ βολίδων καὶ κρανῶν καὶ ἀσπίδων, καὶ πολέμων κινηθέντων κατὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (V, 6 A); then, after an erasure of four or five letters, it continues καὶ πρόσθεν δηλωθήσεται ἀκριβεστέρως ἐκ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ὑποτιθεμένης, which obviously cannot be correct, as the two parts of the sentence do not fit at all. Montfaucon, finding the *ὑπόθεσις* of V beginning τινες Χριστιανίζειν νομιζόμενοι καὶ τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν μηδὲν λογιζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ περιφρονοῦντες καὶ ὑπερφρονοῦντες, κατὰ τοὺς ἔξωθεν φιλοσόφους, σφαιρικὸν εἶναι τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐκ τῶν ἡλιακῶν καὶ σεληνιακῶν ἐκλείψεων πλανώμενοι. Πᾶσαν τοίνυν τῆς βίβλου τὴν ὑπόθεσιν εἰς πέντε μέρη ἀρμοδίως διειλόμην. πρῶτον πάντων πρὸς τοὺς εἰρημένους καὶ πλανωμένους ὁ πρῶτος λόγος ἐγένετο, ὡς οὐ δυνατὸν τὸν χριστιανίζειν ἐθέλοντα ἀπάγεσθαι τῇ πιθανῇ τῶν ἔξωθεν πλάνῃ ἕτερα τῆς θείας γραφῆς ὑποτιθεμένης, contrived to patch up an intelligible sentence by placing this immediately after *ἐκκλησίας* and excising the words καὶ πρόσθεν δηλωθήσεται ἀκριβεστέρως ἐκ from L's reading.

Now since V and S, which, as I have shewn above, are representatives of the two different recensions here, for once agree in omitting that dedication to Pamphilus which forms the opening part of the second prologue in L, one cannot help suspecting its genuineness, and the impossible manner in which it is made to join on to the *ὑπόθεσις* rather confirms one's suspicions. It may at first seem strange that, if we refuse to accept the present suspicious passage, the work is not formally dedicated to Pamphilus until the beginning of the second book; but if one reads more carefully one will find that that is quite appropriate. The first book is an address to all right-minded Christians, while in the second book he begins to deal with the subject which Pamphilus had requested him to treat (τελέσαντες τοίνυν, ὦ θεόφιλε, τὸν πρῶτον λόγον περὶ τῶν πεπλασμένων Χριστιανῶν . . . ἐφαπτόμεθα νυνὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας κελεύσεως (73 D)). That being so I think there is little doubt that the beginning of the second prologue in L is due to a misconception on the part of some scribe or editor who thought a special dedication to Pamphilus was indispensable at the beginning of the work, and who therefore concocted one by paraphrasing the genuine dedication at the beginning of the second book. The difficulty is that one can hardly refer it to the same editor who transposed the prophets and added the last two books, because in that case it should be found in S as well as L—unless indeed we assume that he added it in the margin, an assumption which would easily account for its omission by S and for the bungling manner in which it is inserted in L.

E. O. WINSTEDT.