The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Swete's Edition of the Septuagint. Vol. II

W. E. Daniel

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 40 - 41

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184604, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184604

How to cite this article:

W. E. Daniel (1892). Swete's Edition of the Septuagint. Vol. II. The Classical Review, 6, pp 40-41 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184604

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

more conservative reading, though he has occasionally adopted emendations of Meiser, Ritter and Heraeus. In most cases he has, I think, been judicious; but in a few passages a little greater boldness would not have been out of place, *e.g.* the MS. readings—aviditate imperandi (i. 52): immutatus (i. 87): quod avidius (ii. 84 *ad fin.*): et ut proditionis ira (iii. 10): militiae legionariis (iii. 18): Asiam (iii. 54): erant et domi (iv. 12): pecunia fer...qua (iv. 46): eum qui attulerat, ipsas epistulas (iv. 75)—and some others might surely have made room for emendations. An apparatus criticus, not of course a complete one, but giving the chief MS. readings and conjectures, would have been easier to refer to than the same information given in the form of notes. On questions of interpretation I should differ from Mr. Spooner with some diffidence, but I doubt his rendering of 'nobilitatus mutuis cladibus Dacus' (i. 2): fugae ultimus erat (iii. 16): magnis consultis (ii. 4): principalis matrimonii instrumentum (i. 22): per classarios transferri—in the passage of Suetonius

cited on p. 180. In matters of orthography I have noticed such small inconsistencies as nunquam and numquam, tanquam and tanquam, Caius and Gaius, Suria and Syriaci, vicesima and vicensima, while there is a little uncertainty about assimilation or non-assimilation in compound verbs.

In a detailed criticism on any book the reviewer is obliged from the necessity of the case to deal more with defects than merits, for while a general statement of the latter will suffice, the former must be pointed out with particularity. I should be very sorry however to seem, while pointing out some imperfections on one side of the book, the side which is most interesting to me, in any way to have overlooked the undoubted merits of Mr. Spooner's work on its other sides. No other English edition can bear any comparison with his, and for the students at the Universities, and doubtless they are still many, who cannot read German notes, Mr. Spooner's help will be simply invaluable.

E. G. HARDY.

SWETE'S EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT. VOL. II.

Of this second volume an important instalment has been in the hands of the public for the last two years in the Psalter. The poetical books which form the larger part of the present volume are all stichometrically arranged, and where the MSS. differ in the arrangement of the lines, this has been recorded in the notes. The Sinaitic Codex, as suggested by Dr. Sanday, has been taken as the basis where B is deficient in the Psalms (cv. 27—cxxxvi. 7), and each page explains for itself in the outer margin what MS. gives the text printed, what MSS. supply the readings at the foot, and by the signs § and ¶ respectively the exact point where the testimony of each MS. begins and fails.

The order of the books is of course after the Vatican which arranges Job, Wisdom and Sirach after the Song, and retains Esther, Judith and Tobit as histories to come immediately before the Prophets. In Sirach ch. xxx.-xxxvi. are transposed according to the Old Latin, which preserves the original sequence, as was proved by Fritzsche, *κατακληρονομήσεις* in xxxvi. 16b being substituted for *κατεκληρονόμησα* contrary to all uncials, but with one cursive and

with the Old Latin hereditabis. The Canticles which follow the Psalter in A are of course not printed, but are mentioned in the preface, and it is interesting to observe that, excepting the Song of Habakkuk, these occur in the order of their appearance in the Horology of the Greek Church.

In Ps. xlvii. 3 *ἐνρίζω* and xci. 11 *ἐλαίω* of the corrector have been accepted for the original B readings *ἐνρίζων* and *ἐλέω*. On the other hand xvi. 14 *ὑείων* stands with B^S for *υἱῶν* of A although, since the accents do not come from the first scribe, this may be an itacism; but xliii. 13 there was no escape from the corrupt *ἀλαλάγμασιν* given by all uncials instead of *ἀλλάγμασιν*. The omission of *βασιλεὺς* Ps. ii. 6 modifies in a marked degree the Messianic significance of the Psalm. Printing *Σῶσαί με Κύριον* with a capital in lxix. tit. appears to suggest that these words were intended to mark the tune. No light is thrown on the hopeless passage lxvii. 19b.

In numberless instances, as Dr. Hatch pointed out in this *Review*, the ordinary editions said to be *juxta exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum* fail to exhibit B, following more or less accurately the Sixtine

edition : e.g. Ps. lxiv. 7 ὄδωρ for κύτος ; lxxii. 18b omitted ; Wisd. ii. 19 δικάσωμεν for δοκιμάσωμεν ; v. 3 στενάξονται for στενάζοντες ; v. 14 χνοῦς for χοῦς ; viii. 7, xiv. 2 τεχνίτης for τεχνίτης ; x. 7 ἦς ἐπὶ for οἷς ἐπὶ ; xiii. 13 ἀνέσεως for συνέσεως ; 18 τὸ νεκρὸν for τὸν ν. ; 19 om. τῷ before κρατοῦντι ; 25 τάραχος for παραχή ; 31 ὀμνυμένων for ὀμνομένων ; xv. 14 ins. οἱ before καταδυναστεύσαντες ; xvi. 6 σύμβολον for σύμβουλον ; xvii. 19 κοιλόστητος for κοιλοτάτων ; xix. 5 πειράση for περάση. By the addition of ι subscript xv. 18 ἀνοία and xix. 18 ἦψε, and its omission xiv. 2 σοφία with the reading τεχνίτης, the editor having no guidance from the MS. improves the sense, and in the last instance has Clemens Alex. with him.

Out of the confusion of B and its corrections in Wisd. xii. 5 the editor reads ἐκ μέσου μύστας θιάσου helped by N. In xvi. 3 the MS. appears to read δειχθείσαν, though Mai printed the intelligible εἰδέχθειαν, which is the reading of the Codex Ephr. In xvii. 4 the original B text ἦχοι δ' ἐκπαράσσοντες is given for the usual ἦχοι δὲ καταράσσοντες which follows the corrector. In xii. 20 δέησεως stands ratified as the Vatican text, although δέσεως of N appears a preferable reading. In xvii. 2 οὖν is confirmed, not οὖ of A, 'because they (the Israelites) had suffered,' i.e. done with suffering. In xix. 15 ἦ τις is an ingenious solution of the universally attested reading which is usually printed ἦτις ; while conversely xiv. 23 ἐξάλλων appears as one word instead of two.

Tobit appears in a double form, N being printed at length because of its wide variations from B, answering to a great extent to the Itala of Sabatier. Numberless details are here added to the story. For instance, ii. 11 Anna's work is specified to be weaving, though the margin of English A.V. draws spinning out of ἡριθεύετο. v. 3 the writing is in two parts like an indenture, one part being kept by either party. The transaction is dated twenty years before.

v. 6 Ecbatana in the plain is two days' journey from Garra or Argæ (Rages) in the mountain. vi. 6 some of the fish is salted down. vii. 1 Raguel is found seated at the

door of his courtyard. 9 ἐλούσαντο καὶ ἐνέψαντο before eating. viii. 13 the maid strikes a light ; 19 bread and oxen and rams are provided for the feast. ix. 6 Raphael departs with four, not two, servants, and on returning finds Tobias at table, ἀνακείμενον. xi. 1 they part from Sara at Caserein (Itala, Charam) over against Nineveh. xii. 20 of the angel we are told καὶ ἀνέβη. xiv. 1 Tobit at his death is 112 years old ; 4 the prophecies are against Ather (It., Assur, called Ἀθούρεια xiv. 15) as well as Nineveh, and the prophet named is Nahum not Jonah.

In Tob. xi. 4 συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος of N is evidently a misreading for ὁ κύων, the addition καὶ τοῦ νιού αὐτῆς coming from the end of the next verse. In xiv. 4 perhaps πάντων λογισθήσονται (It., dispergentur) is a mistake for π. ὀλιγωθήσονται. It is observable that iii. 16 the prayer goes up ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπεστάλη Ῥαφαήλ, not as in B ἐν τῆς δ. τοῦ μεγάλου Ῥαφαήλ, and xiv. 15 the captivity of the Ninevites is attributed to Achiachar King of Media, not Nabuchodonosor. Also that in B Sacherdon is called i. 22 υἱὸς ἐκ δευτέρας according to Dr. Swete's pointing. Should we not rather take ἐκ δευτέρας with κατέστησεν ?

ii. 10 ἔως οὗ ἐπορεύθη seems to demand correction to -θη according to N πρὸ τοῦ αὐτὸν βαδίσαι.

iii. 16 εἰσηκούσθη προσευχῆς is evidently a conflated reading of N εἰσ. προσευχή and A. εἰσηκούσεν κύριος τῆς π.

vii. 16 ἀπεμάτατο of N yields better sense than ἀπεδέξατο.

The student has to thank the editor for relegating itacisms to the appendix ; however necessary for completeness, the record of these variations would have crowded the foot of the page inconveniently.

It is pleasant to note how cordially Dr. Swete applauds 'the vigilance of the readers and the attention of the workmen' as well as officers of the University Press, classes of fellow-labourers to whom the scholar is not always ready to accord the due meed of praise.

W. E. DANIEL.