

5thly, After all, γραμματα and φωνηεντα are the same in *Josephus* as in the *Greek* epigram in *Eusebius*¹, and they the same with φωνη the human and articulate voice, which, as *Capellus*^m observes, consists not of vowels only, but of consonants also; and both in the one as in the other, the tetragrammaton, or the name of four letters, *Jehovah* is thought to be meant; or of seven letters, four consonants and three vowel-points; hence *Scaliger*ⁿ says, “ there is no necessity
 “ by φωνηεντα to understand vowels, in
 “ the above *Greek* epigram, since *Josephus*
 “ expressly calls the four letters of the te-
 “ tragrammaton φωνηεντα, whence it appears
 “ that any letters may be so called;” and *Josephus*’s view in the observation he makes was not to tell us what sort of letters they were that were upon the mitre of the high priest, whether vowels or consonants; but that it was the tetragrammaton or name of four letters, that was written upon it, using the language of his own nation, and which continues in use to this day; wherefore both *Selden*^o and *Braunius*^p render the passage in *Josephus* thus, “ about
 “ it

¹ Præpar. Evangel. l. xi. c. 6. ^m Orat. de Nom. Te-
 tragram. p. 172. ⁿ In Fragm. ad Calcem lib. de Eimen-
 dat. Temp. p. 34. ^o De Succes. in Pontif Ebr. l. 2. c. 7.
^p De Vestitu Sacerd. Heb. l. 2. c. 22. f. 18. p. 811.

“ it (the mitre) was another golden crown
 “ bearing sacred letters, that is, the name
 “ tetragrammaton.” *Philo* calls them
 the four engravings of the name, and the
 engravings of the four letters, and this,
 says he, divines call tetragrammaton †.
 Moreover, though *Josephus* does not make
 express mention of the *Masorah* in his
 writings, yet *Arias Montanus* [¶] thinks, he
 never could have so confidently said what
 he said without the help of it; as when
 he says [‡], in such a space of time that was
 past, meaning from *Moses*, “ no man dared
 “ to add, nor to take away, nor to
 “ change *any thing* in the scriptures, chusing
 “ rather to die;” and the same says *Philo*
 the *Jew* [§], who lived in the same age, and
 a little before him, that the *Jews* in the
 space of more than 2000 years, “ never
 “ moved out of its place *one word* of what
 “ was written by *Moses*, rather willing to
 “ die a thousand times than go contrary to
 “ the laws and customs;” and that there
 was a *Masorah* before their times is ac-
 knowledged by some who have been op-
 posers

† De vita Mosis, l. 3. p. 670, 673. ¶ De Varia Heb.
 Lib. Script. & Lect. † Contr. Apion l. 1. c. 8. § A-
 pud. Euseb. Evangel. præpar. l. 8. c. 6. p. 357.

posers of the points, as before observed. The silence of *Philo* and *Josephus* about the points, is only a proof that they were not a matter of controversy, but no proof of their not being in use.

A. D. 31.

THAT the points were in use in the times of Christ may be concluded from *Mat. v. 18. till heaven and earth pass away one jot (or one Yod, as the Syriac version) or one tittle (or one Chirek, as Elias Hutter in his Hebrew version) shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled*; and so as the least letter in the *Hebrew* alphabet *Yod* is referred to, the least of the points in use, *Chirek*, is also; between which and the *Greek* word *κεραια*, used by the Evangelist, is great nearness of sound, and seems to be no other than that point made *Greek*. So Dr. *Lightfoot*^o observes that our Saviour in his words of one *Iota*, and one *Keraia*, not perishing from the law, seems to allude to the least of the letters, *Yod*, and to the least vowel and accent. The argument from hence cannot well be put more strongly

^o Works, vol. 1. p. 1014.

strongly than it is by Dr. *John Prideaux*^a, who yet was an opposer of the points; “ if the points, says he, were not at this “ time, why does the Saviour make men- “ tion of them? if they were the same “ with the consonants or only cornicular “ eminencies of them, why are they rec- “ koned here as distinct things?” and to which he makes a very feeble answer, and indeed the argument seems unanswerable: nor can the pricks on certain letters called ם׳תג׳, be designed, though very ancient, being mentioned in the *Talmud*^a, and the same letters on which they are put, and on them only and not on all; and as *Broughton*^b observes, “ these, and likewise accents, are “ no part of the word, therefore vowel- “ pricks (or points) must be meant;” and it may be concluded with *Piscator* on the place, that Christ “ so calls, i. e. tittles, what now “ go by the name of points, which in *He- “ brew* writing are variously put to letters, “ both to signify the proper sound of some “ of them, and the vowel-sounds, and also “ the accents and parts of a sentence; hence “ it appears that the holy Bible in the
time

^a Viginti duæ Lectiones, Lect. 12. p. 182.
Menachot, fol. 29, 2.

^a T. Bab.

^b Works, p. 204.

“time of Christ was pointed, and that
 “that punctuation was approved of by
 “him;” so *Pafor* in his *Lexicon* says, “by
 tittle here is meant a point; wherefore
 the vowel-points were in the time of
Christ; and not, as some pretend, a new
 invention.” The words of Christ expressed
 on the cross, *Eli, Eli, &c.* and the names
 of persons in the genealogies of the Evan-
 gelists, and in *Heb. xi.* and in other places
 of the New Testament, seem to confirm
 the modern punctuation. The *Dagesh*
forte appears, and is preserved in many
 words in those times, as in *Immanuel*,
Matt. i. 23. Matthew, Lebbæus, Thaddæus;
Matt. x. 3. Hosanna, Matt. xxi. 9. Eph-
phatha, Mark vii. 34. Anna, Luke ii. 36.
Matthat, Matthatbias, Luke iii. 24, 25.
Matthias, Acts i. 23. Abaddon, Rev. ix. 11.
Armageddon, Rev. xvi. 16. Sabbaton, Matt.
xii. 5. Lamma, Mark xv. 34. with others, and
 the *Dagesh lene* in *Capernaum, Sarepta*, and
 others; and even the use of the *Pathach*
Genubah appears in the pronunciation of
Messias and *Siloam* as well as the other
 points, *John i. 41.* and *ix. 7, 11.*

A. 30. Ante Christum.

ABOUT this time lived two famous doctors among the *Jews*, *Hillell* and *Shammai*, heads of two schools and of two sects, so different, that it is said^c the law was as two laws, and a fast was appointed on account of the division between them^d; the former was followed by the *Rabbanite Jews*, and the latter by the *Karaites*: and it may be observed, that *Josephus*^e calls *Pollio*, the same with *Hillell*, a Pharisee, but not *Sammeas* or *Shammai*, he mentions with him; through whom the *Karaites* derive the genealogy and succession of their doctors, and from whom they say they received the doctrine and copy of the law^f; which *Shammai* had from *Schemaiab*, and he from *Judah ben Tabbai*, in whose days the separation was made, 120 years before *Christ*, as will be seen hereafter. Now the *Karaites* with one consent declare, that the copy of the law^g they had, had the points and accents, and that such copies

^c T. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 88, 2. ^d Schulchan A-
ruch, par. 1. c. 580. ^e Antiqu. l. 15. c. 1. f. 1.
^f Dod Mordecai, five Comment. de Karæis, c. 9. p.
97. Edit. a Wolfio. ^g Ibid, c. 12. p. 150.

copies they always had and used ; as the *Hillellian* copy is also a pointed one. I have observed under A. D. 340. that some learned men take that copy to be this *Hillell's*, and I am pretty much inclined to the same opinion ; for, as *Shammai* had a copy for him and his party, so *Hillell* had, no doubt, one for him and his ; and as the *Karaites* boast of their copy, and of the antiquity of it, so the *Rabbanites* boast of *Hillell's* copy ; which must be the copy of some eminent person of that name, by which all copies were corrected ; and who so eminent as this *Hillell* ? It is indeed most generally ascribed to a *Hillell*, who lived in the fourth century, not so famous as this ; and as for the copy which *R. Zacuth* saw, and which had been written 900 years before he saw it, which, from 1500, in which he lived, carries it up to the year 600, it falls short of that *Hillell*, and still more of this. I suppose, therefore, that that was a copy taken from the original copy of the elder *Hillell*, and being the only one remaining, was valued, and made use of for correcting all other copies ; so that if this was the case, there were two pointed Bibles as early as the

date given. *Hillell* began his government as the head of an academy, 100 years before the destruction of the temple, about the beginning of the reign of *Herod*^h, with which *Josephus*ⁱ agrees, who calls him *Pollio*, as before observed.

A. 40. Ante Christum.

ABOUT this time lived R. *Nechuniab Ben Kanah*, as the *Jewish* chronologers^q generally place him. I suspect him to be the same whom *Grotius*^r calls R. *Nebumias*, who, according to him, was fifty years before Christ, and who then openly declared, that the time of the *Messiah* signified by *Daniel*, would not be prolonged beyond those fifty years. To this *Rabbi* the book of *Bahir* is generally ascribed by the *Jews*: Could the authenticity and antiquity of it be established, it would furnish out a very early proof of the points; for R. *Bechai*^s, a celebrated writer with the *Jews*, has a quotation out of it to this pur-

^h T. Bab. Sabbat, fol. 15, 1. Juchafin, fol. 19, 2. Ganz Tzemach David, par. 1. fol. 24, 2. ⁱ Antiqu. l. 15. c. 1. f. 1. & c. 10. f. 4. & Josipp. Heb. l. 5. c. 13. ^q Juchafin, fol. 20, 1. Ganz Tzemach David, par. 1. fol. 24, 2. ^r De Ver. Relig. Christ. l. 5. f. 14. ^s Apud Buxorf. Tiberiad. c. 9.

purpose, “ Letters are like to the body,
 “ and points to the soul, for the points
 “ move the letters as the soul moves
 “ the body, as our R. R. expound in
 “ the book of *Babir* ;” but seeing such
 antiquity of this book is doubtful as as-
 cribed to it, I lay no stress upon it; though
Buxtorf^t says, it is the most ancient of all
 the *Rabbinical* books, and if so, it must
 be as ancient as it is said to be ; since *Jo-*
nathan Ben Uzziel, who wrote on the
 prophets, was cotemporary with the sup-
 posed author of it.

A. 120. Ante Christum.

IN the times of *John Hyrcanus*, and *Ale-*
xander Jannæus his son, sprung up the sect
 of the *Karaites*^u in opposition to the Pha-
 risees, who had introduced traditions, and
 set up the oral law, which these men re-
 jected. In the times of the said princes
 lived *Simeon Ben Shetach*, and *Judab Ben*
Tabbai, who flourished A. M. 3621. these
 two separated, the latter from the former,
 because he could not embrace his inven-
 tions

Q₃

^t Bibliothec. Rab. p. 319. so Groddeck de Script. Rabbin.
 f. 74. p. 26. ^u Cosri, par. 3. f. 65. Maimon. in Pirke
 Abot, c. 1. f. 3. Juchasin, fol. 51. 1.

tions which he formed out of his own brain; and from him the *Karaites* sprung, who were first called the society or congregation of *Judah Ben Tabbai*^k, which was afterwards changed into the name of *Karaites*: for that they had their rise from *Anan* and *Saul*, who lived in the eighth century after Christ, and so after the *Talmud* was finished, as say *Morinus*^l and others, is very false; for mention is made of them in the *Misnah*^m compiled in the 2d century; they were only the restorers not the authors of *Karaim*, which must be near as early as *Pharisaim*; and that, according to *Josephus*ⁿ, was as early as the times of *Jonathan the Maccabee*. Now these men, the *Karaites*, adhered to the scriptures only, whence they had their name, which signifies *Scripturarians*, the same, as some think, with the *Scribes*, γραμματεῖς, *letter-men*, and these the same with the lawyers in the New Testament, who kept to the letter of the scriptures, *Matt.* xxiii. 13. compared with *Luke* ii.

52.

* *Dod Mordecai*, c. 2. p. 12, 13, 14. ^l *De Sincer.*
Heb. Text. l. 2. *Exercit.* 7. c. 1. f. 6. ^m *Megillah* c. 2.
 fol. 24. 2. *Amstelod. Ed. vid. Houting.* in *Misn. Roshhash-*
nah, c. 2. f. 1. & *Trigland. de Sect. Karæorum*, p. 20,
 21. ⁿ *Antiq.* l. 13. c. 5. f. 9.

52. and *Matt.* xxii. 35. with *Mark* xii. 28. but the Scribes and Pharisees are not only put together, but as agreeing with each other, and so they might in some things agree against the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, See *Acts*, xxiii. 9. and might differ in other things ; but what makes most against the Scribes being the same with the *Karaites*, is their joining with the Pharisees in the point of traditions, *Mat.* xv. 1. 2. *Mark* vii. 1—5. and on the other hand what seems most to favour the notion that the Scribes and Lawyers differed from the other sects, is the text in *Luke* xi. 45. and certain it is, that Christ does speak more favourably of the Scribes than of others, *Matt.* xiii. 52. and xvii. 10, 11. *Mark* xii. 28, 34. and he is sometimes compared with them, though with some difference, *Matt.* vii. 29 ; and *Orobio*, a *Jew*, of the last century, said ° our *Jesus* was a *Karaite*, and a *Rabbinical Jew*, out of ill-will to the *Karaites*, feigned a letter † from them to the other *Jews*, asserting that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* agreed with them, and exhorted his followers to re-

Q 4

ceive

° Apud Trigland. ut supra, c. 6. p. 66. † Apud Huldric. Not. ad Toldos Jeschu, p. 82, 83.

ceive their rites, and not those of the *Rabbanites*; and that their ancestors had no hand in his death, and that they were the *Rabbanites* that slew him, and were only answerable for it; but it is evident that the Scribes were concerned in the death of Christ, *Matt.* xvi. 21. and xx. 18. xxvi. 3. xxvii. 42. though after all, it may be reasonably thought that the *Karaites*, some of them, were among the Scribes, of which scribes there were some in every sect, and included in them⁹; for as there were Scribes on the side of the Pharisees, *Acts* xxiii. 9. so mention is made in *Jewish* writings, of the Scribes of the *Sadducees*^r, and of the *Samaritans*. Now the sentiments of these men, the *Karaites*, were from the beginning of them, constant and uniform; they made the scripture their only rule, would not admit of any innovation in it, nor addition to it, nor that the inventions and traditions of men should be made equal to it, and much less set up above it. The testimony therefore of such men for the points, must be very considerable.

Bux-

⁹ Vid. Drusium de Sect. Jud. 1. 2. c. 13. Alting. Shilo, 1. 4. c. 8. Trigland. ut supra, c. 6. ^r G. Ursin. Antiqu. Heb. Academ. c. 9. p. 227.

Buxtorf^w, the younger, indeed, does say of the *Karaites*, that they rejected punctuation as a species of the oral law, and of tradition; greatly mistaking the author of the book of *Cofri*, who from the *Karaites* admitting the points, urges their admission of tradition; since he, and other *Jews*, thought punctuation, from the times of *Moses* to *Ezra*, was delivered by tradition, and therefore, says he ^x, ‘if so it is, both we and the *Karaites*, are bound to admit tradition;’ to which king *Chosroes* is made to answer, so the *Karaites* indeed will say (i. e. with respect to the necessity of the tradition of the points and accents to read the book of the law); but when they have found or got a perfect law (a copy with points and accents) they will deny that they have any further use of tradition, i. e. for the explanation of it.’ Now though this writer may go too far in ascribing traditions to the *Karaites*, though they did allow it in some sense; yet it is plain he took it for granted, that they were for using, and did make use of pointed copies of the law; and so *Morinus* * himself understood it, and owns it;

^w De Punct. Antiqu. par. 1. p. 300. ^x *Cofri*, par. 3. f. 33, 34. * *Epist. Buxtorf. ep. 70. in Antiqu. Eccl. Orient. p. 362.*

it ; but this is still more clear and manifest from their own writings : in a book ^v of theirs, in great repute with them, it is observed, that the patrons of tradition explain *boughs of thick trees*, used in the feast of tabernacles, *Lev. xxiii. 40.* of a tree whose leaves are treble, according to *Exod. xxviii. 14.* but, says the *Karaites* writer, this is contrary to the nature of the language, for this ע (in עבת) is with a *Kametz*, but that is with a *Sheva* ; so in another work * they say, the *Rabbanites* affirm, that what is written in the law needs explanation by tradition, but we don't believe so ; but that what is written, its explanation goes *along with it*, meaning in the vowel-points ; and a little after some pointed words are used. The *Karaites* own, that their copies of the Bible agree with those of the *Rabbins*, because the disposition and order of the books of scripture were made by *Ezra*, who lived before the schism ; and as to the various readings of *Ben Asber* and *Ben Naphtali*, many of which are about the points and
ac-

* Addareth Eliahu apud Trigland. de Sect. Kar. p. 32.

‡ R. Caleb, Afarah Maamarot, MS. apud Trigland. Ib. p. 117.

accents, they rather agree with the latter; but it greatly displeases them that in some places the points are changed and others put in their room for modesty-fake^a, as in 1 *Sam.* v. 6. 9. 12. and vi. 4. 2 *Kings* vi. 25. by which it appears they are very tenacious of the points, and are not for altering them on any account; which they would never be sticklers for, could they be thought by them to be the invention of the *Rabbins*, and additions to the scriptures made by them. *Mordecai*, the famous *Karaites* in 1699, and his associates, are unanimous for the antiquity and coevity of the points with the letters; his words in answer to some questions sent him by *Triglandius* are these*,

“ all our wise men with one mouth affirm
 “ and profess, that the whole law was
 “ pointed and accented, as it came out of
 “ the hands of *Moses* the man of God:”

how false then is it what *Morinus* † says, that “ all the *Jews*, the *Karaites* also, tho’
 “ enemies of the traditions, and the *Kabala*,
 “ believe, as a most certain tradition, that
 “ the book of the law which *Moses* deli-
 “ vered

^a Chillouk MS. apud Trigland. Ib. p. 189, 190.

* Dod Mordecai, c. 12. p. 150—157. † Epist. Buxtorfio in Antiqu. Eccles. Orient. Ep. 70. p. 394.

“vered to the *Israelites*, was without points
 “and accents;” but F. *Simon* * is against
 him, and affirms, that the *Karaites* readily
 receive the Bible with the vowel-points, ac-
 cents, and *Masorah*. The above *Karaite*
 goes on and says, “far be it that the in-
 “vention of points and accents was made
 “after the finishing of the *Talmud*, for
 “this is largely to be confuted; for the
 “division of the *Rabbans* and *Karaites*
 “was long before the finishing of the
 “*Talmud*, as has been proved; and if
 “there were no points nor accents in
 “the time of the division, but were found
 “out only after the finishing of the *Tal-*
 “*mud*, then there would be different co-
 “pies of the law and of the prophets in
 “our hands; that is, copies in the hands
 “of the *Karaites*, pointed different from
 “the pointing of the copies in the hand
 “of the *Rabbans*; for in the places where
 “the *Rabbans* have contradicted the vowels
 “and the accents, and say, don’t *read so*,
 “*and so*, they would not have said, *don’t*
 “*read*, but absolutely they would have
 “pointed according to their will and
 “and sense;” of which he gives instances
 in

* *Disquisit. Critic.* c. 4. p. 25. & c. 12. p. 93, 95.

in which they might have so done ; and observes, that many of the *Rabbans* assert, that the points and accents were equally as ancient as the letters ; as R. *Azariah* in *Meor Enayim*, and R. *Samuel Arkevolti* in *Arugat Habboshem* : and he goes on and says, that “ the copy of the scriptures which we have is the same that the *Rabbans* have ; in this there is no division, no difference between us ; for the disposition or order of the scriptures was from the men of the great synagogue, those good figs, on whom be peace, at which time there was no division between them ; wherefore with us there is nothing full and deficient, neither first and last, no *Keri* and *Cbetib*, but what are in the order of the scriptures which is now in the hands of the *Rabbans* ; and the most correct books are the most in esteem with us, and we follow, or depend upon the reading of *Ben Naphtali* :” and it is certain their Bibles had the same *Masoretic* notes and observations in common with the *Rabbanites* ; so it is observed by them *, that
the

* Menachem in Dod Mordecai, c. 10. p. 130. that Menachem was a Karaite, vid. Trigland. de sect. Karæorum, c. 11. p. 187.

the letter ם in twenty places is written at the end of a word, but not read, which agrees with the present *Masorab*. R. *Aaron*, a *Karaite*, published a *Hebrew* grammar in 1581, in which he never deserts, as can be observed, the modern punctuation of the Bible, and consults the *Masorab* in words written defectively, or in any other irregular way, and is full of *Masoretic* observations, such as the *Rabbanites* produce * ; and a *Karaite* †, of the same name, who wrote a commentary on the law in 1294, frequently refers to the points, and makes mention of the names of them, as, *Tzere*, *Pathach*, *Sheva*, *Hataph-camets*, *Cholem*, *Shurek*, *Dagesh*. This sect, the *Karaites*, would never have admitted the present punctuation, if they had not believed it obtained in the Bible of old, and came from God himself; and as others relate^c, they strongly affirm, that the vowel-points of the *Hebrew* Bible are from *Moses* and the prophets. The sense of the *Karaites* about the points is with me an invincible

* Vid. Wolfii Access. ad Notitiam Karæorum, p. 37. & Biblioth. Heb. p. 119. † Vid. Simon. Disqu. Critic. c. 12. p. 95, 96. vid. Maffechet Sopherim, c. 6. f. 4. ^c Le-geri Epist. Hottinger. in Thesaur. Philolog. p. 54.

ble proof of the great antiquity, and against the novelty of them; for from the time that this sect rose up, it was not possible for the *Pharisees, Rabbanites, Masoretic*, or traditional *Jews* call them by what names you will, to have introduced such an invention as the vowel-points, in any period of time whatever, but these men would have objected to them as such, and would never have received them; it is to me a demonstration that the vowel-points were in being before the schism was, which was about the time before given, and were universally regarded by the *Jews* so early, as of a divine original.

A. 164. Ante Christum.

The *Keries* and *Cetibs*, of which *Elias* says ^d there are 848, are various readings, or differences of the marginal reading from the written text. That these are of great antiquity is certain; since they are not only mentioned in the *Babylonian Talmud*^e, but in the *Jerusalem Talmud*^{*}, particularly the various reading of *Hagg. i. 8.* and in the

^d Præfat. 3. ad Masoret. ^e T. Bab. Nedarim, fol. 37, 2. Sopherim, c. 6. f. 5. 8. & c. 7. f. 1, 2, 3, 4. & c. 9. f. 8. * Maccot, fol. 32, 1.

the book of *Zohar*^f; though when these marginal readings were first made or began to be made, is not certain: the *Jews* say^g, they are a tradition of *Moses* from mount *Sinai*; but that cannot be, since his books were not then written, and much less the books of the prophets; some Christians indeed are of opinion, as *Broughton*, *Ainsworth*, and *Wasmuth*, that both the text and marginal reading are of divine inspiration; and it must be owned, that in many places they may be both taken into the sense of the passage, and much enrich it, and both are taken in by our translators in *Prov.* xix. 7. and in the margin of *2 Sam.* xxiii. 13. and in other versions; but they are by others supposed to be put by *Ezra* and the men of the synagogue, on the return from the captivity, who, upon revising the books of scripture, and several copies of it, observed various readings; so *Kimchi*, on *1 Kings* xvii. 14. says, the copies were perplexed or disturbed in the captivity^h; they found one copy so, and another so; and some they did not understand,

^f In Deut. fol. 119, 3. & 226, 3. ^g T. Bab. Nedar. ut supra, Schulchan Aruch. par. c. 141. f. 8. ^h Vid. Ben Chayim Præfat. ad Bibl. Heb, col. 1.

stand, and some of which they did not chuse to put into the text, nor to cast away, and therefore put one within in the text, and the other without in the margin, to be used at discretion ; and in his preface to the former prophets he observes much the same : “ In the first captivity the copies
 “ were lost or removed out of their place,
 “ (were out of order) and the wise men
 “ that knew the law were dead ; and the
 “ men of the great synagogue, who re-
 “ stored the law to its former state, found
 “ variations in the copies, and they went
 “ after the greater number (of copies) ac-
 “ cording to their judgment ; and a place
 “ which they could not clearly understand,
 “ they wrote the word and did not point
 “ it ; or they wrote it without (in the
 “ margin) and did not write it within (in
 “ the text) and so they wrote in one way
 “ within, and in another way without.”
 It is said in the *Jerusalem Talmud* ^a “ they
 “ found three copies in the court, (not with
 “ *Ezra*, as *Morinus* ^b renders it,) in one
 “ they found it written *בְּעֵינַי*, *Deut.* xxxiii.
 “ 27. in two *בְּעֵינַי* ; they confirmed the
 “ two (as the true reading) and rejected
 R “ the

^a Taanioth, fol. 68, 1. ^b Exercit. 1. 2. exerc. 12. c. 3.