

To this original nucleus the first addition would be that of a series of mainly Frankish councils, following the councils already incorporated in strict chronological order from 535 to 549 A. D., and brought to a close by the EXPLICIT FELICETER of Berlin fol. 80 a : the second addition consists of councils from Provence, which this time form not simply a continuation but a correction to the series, since the first of them goes back again to the year 455. But as the last belongs to A. D. 554, there is no reason for doubting that the whole of our Petersburg and Berlin MS down to this point represents a collection made, or rather completed, soon after the middle of the sixth century, a century before the MS itself was written.

That our Petersburg-Berlin MS was written at Lyons there seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt. It was from Lyons that Sirmond first drew it to light : and the indications of a collection whose later additions are councils of Auvergne and Orleans on the one side, of Arles and Vaison on the other, combine excellently for the great city which lies midway between the Loire and the Mediterranean. That it was not our present MS, but only the ultimate exemplar of a portion of it, which was written at Rome, is clear—apart from palaeographical reasons—from the stages which we have seen reason to postulate in the accumulation of Gallic material, before the original Roman-Gallic collection swelled to the dimensions of our present MS.

C. H. TURNER.

TWO NOTES ON ISAIAH xli 5-7¹.

I.

I AM much attracted towards Dr. Barnes's view ; and certainly think that he has shewn that the meaning *solder* for *כֶּסֶף* rests upon a slight foundation ; one would gladly have the same meaning for it in all its occurrences. There are, however, difficulties (which I will state briefly) which make me hesitate about accepting the view as a whole. (1) Is it clear that *כֶּסֶף* is a *metal-founder* in general? The whole root (including *כֶּסֶף* Prov. xvii 3 = xxvii 21 'the fining-pot for *silver*') is so used of the *noble metals*² (and the figurative senses of *smelt*, *smelt away*, or *refine*³, and *test*⁴, seem also to presuppose this), that, though our data are of course limited, it seems to me doubtful whether it would have been used of other metals. This is my chief ground for hesitation. Less serious ones are : (2) In a description of general war-

¹ See *J. T. S.* vol. iv p. 266.

² See Jer. vi 29, Zech. xiii 9, Ps xii 7 [A.V. 6], lxvi 10; and the ptcp. (R.V. usually *goldsmith*), Jud. xvii 4 ('founder,' but the metal worked with is silver), Neh. iii 8, 32, Isa. xl 19^a, xli 7, xlvi 6, Jer. x 9, 14 = li 17, Prov. xxv 4 ('finer').

³ As Isa. i 25, xlviii 10, Jer. ix 7 (A.V. 6), Zech. xiii 9, Mal. iii 2, 3.

⁴ As Jud. vii 4, Ps. xvii 3, xxvi 2.

like equipment, is the construction of the *armour* likely to have been the particular specially selected to be made prominent and dwelt upon?
 (3) Does the proposed view give due weight to the general resemblance of Jer. x 4^b?

S. R. DRIVER.

II.

Dr. BARNES's proposed interpretation of Isa. xli 6, 7 is attractive. But if it be an allusion to the repair or manufacture of armour, it is most obscurely expressed. What precisely is meant by רבקים in 1 Kings xxii 34 is quite uncertain: but 'joints,' 'fastenings' seems to be the sense, not 'armour-plates.' At any rate the word seems more likely to be used here of the work 'soldering' or 'riveting,' 'joining parts together,' than as a specific word for armour or any part of it.

To judge from the contexts in which לֹא יִטַּח occurs, surely it is not a natural phrase to apply to the loosening of the armour-plate fastened on the leathern shirt.

It still seems to me most natural to interpret the verses by the help of xl 19, 20. The expressions agree so closely, and the writer expects his readers to remember them.

But further. Is not the earliest comment on the passage to be found in Jer. x 3 ff.? The passage is a compilation of reminiscences of Isa. xl-xliv; cp. עַן מִיַּעַר כִּרְתּוֹ with Isa. xliv 14 (xl 20); מַעֲצָד, Isa. xliv. 12. The phrase במסמרות ובמקבות יחזקום (v. 4) combines xli 7 with xliv 12; finally the stronger יִטֵּק (totter) is substituted for יִטַּח. It seems to me almost certain that the writer of Jer. x had these passages in his mind and interpreted xli 7 of idols. Wisdom xiii 15, 16 (quoted by Gesen.) may be a further reminiscence, but I lay no stress on it.

Now as to the connexion. No doubt the reference to the idol factory is abrupt; but the author expects us to remember what he has said a few lines above. His mind is full of the contrast between Jehovah and idols. I should agree very much with the analysis given of the passage; only in their alarm the nations do something much more ridiculous than mend their armour: they mend their gods. v. 5 does not read at all like a patch stuck in. יִטַּח קִרְבוֹ וַיֵּאָחֵז corresponds to יִטַּח of v. 1; very probably with LXX (ἀκαθήσει) we should read יִתְרִיד for יִדֵּר in v. 2, to which יִתְרִיד in v. 5 corresponds.

I wish one could give רבק the sense which LXX seems to do: 'a thing stuck together:' a contemptuous term for an idol: 'the joinery:' so that the suffix in יִחַקְתּוּ would refer to it.

I agree that xli 6, 7 does not fit in well with xl 19, 20: I think the writer of the note is inclined to exaggerate the difficulty of retaining the passage where it stands with the old interpretation.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.