

question and answer : for in commentaries of that sort not the question but the answer is the really important thing, whereas the converse is the case with dialogues 'after the manner of Plato'.

6. **Didymus, presbyter of Alexandria** and head of the catechetical school, born about A. D. 309, died between 392 and 400. Few figures even among the churchmen of the fourth century present greater fascinations than the indefatigable scholar and theologian, who, in spite of total blindness from early childhood, mastered all the secular and sacred science of the day, and was appointed by Athanasius to the post that had been held by Clement and Origen. At the great catechetical school he numbered among his hearers both Jerome and Rufinus. It was to the exegesis of scripture that Didymus especially devoted himself: Palladius *Historia Lausiaca* § 4 tells us that he 'interpreted Old and New Testament phrase by phrase'; Jerome, *de viris* 109, after cataloguing some ten works, nearly all of them commentaries, adds that there were countless others 'quae digerere proprii indicis est', and the same writer in his prologue to the *Comm. in ep. ad Ephesios* says that he went to Alexandria to see Didymus and to question him on any points of doubt over the whole of the Scriptures. That a commentary on St Matthew was among his writings is made certain by Jerome's statement both in the *de viris* and in the *prol. ad Comm. in Matt.* Yet none of the printed catenae appear to have preserved any citations from it : another proof that to have been an Alexandrine and a follower of Origen entailed in the circles of catenists and scribes a more stringent ban than open Arianism or Apollinarianism or Nestorianism in the more favoured writers of Antioch.

C. H. TURNER.

'A NEW NAME' (NOT 'ANOTHER NAME'),

ISAIAH LXV 15.

THE two readings in this passage (*καιόν* LXX, מִן M.T.) present practically the same meaning. Indeed the fact that the LXX does represent a Hebrew variant has commonly been overlooked. Thus Mr Ottley writes : '*καιόν* is not quite exact, but may have been meant to harmonize with ver. 17.' But *καιόν* is not a loose rendering. Elsewhere in Isaiah and throughout the whole of the LXX *καιός* invariably stands for מִן, and presumably it does so here. Though the sense remains almost unaffected, whichever reading be adopted, the way in which the one reading seems to have been evolved out of the other is not without interest. The explanation here given elucidates moreover another small textual point in the context.

The passage contains a contrast between the servants of the Lord and those that forsake the Lord. The latter are to leave their name for a curse unto the Lord's chosen: the formula of the curse which follows 'Then may the Lord God slay thee' is thought (Marti) to be a marginal gloss which has crept into the text. The passage proceeds:—

M.T. ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר : אשר
המתברך בארץ יתברך באלהי אמן
והנשבע בארץ ישבע באלהי אמן

R.V. And he shall call his servants by *another name*: so that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth ; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth.

LXX τοῖς δὲ δουλεύουσίν μοι κληθήσεται ὄνομα καινόν,
ὃ εὐλογηθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εὐλογήσουσιν γὰρ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν,
καὶ οἱ ὁμύοντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁμοῦνται τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν.

The LXX translator has gone astray at the beginning of the second line, but there is more than one indication that he was working upon a Hebrew text superior to the Massoretic. The context shews that his *μοι* is right: the insertion into the text of the words of the curse has no doubt, as Marti says, occasioned the alteration of the suffix into 'his' in the M. T. **אשר**, R.V. 'so that', is not wanted and is omitted as a prosaic gloss by the commentators, who compare Deut. xxxiii 29. They do not, however, give any reason for its insertion in this place. Here again, the text represented by the LXX is superior, for it has no equivalent for **אשר**. It is true that the Greek has a relative pronoun at this point, which it is natural to equate with **אשר**, but in reality it must correspond to the article in **המתברך**, which the translator has mistakenly interpreted as a *neuter* participle with passive meaning.

The origin of the M.T. reading is easily explained if it is permissible to suppose that the word **שם**, 'name', was, at one time in the course of the textual transmission, written with a final guttural in the form which became normal in later Aramaic—**שמא**. Though there are not wanting indications of Aramaic influence in the Hebrew text which lay before the Greek translators of Isaiah, we can hardly postulate quite so early a date for the spelling **שמא**, as the Biblical Aramaic keeps the biliteral form of the noun. The spelling might, however, conceivably have found its way into a text of the first century A.D. In the following century the M.T. reading is well established, being supported by Aquila

and Symmachus. Granted the spelling שׁמנ, the history of the corruption is easy to follow. The final ם became attached to the following radicals, and the ך of חדש was, as so often, read as ר: אחר was thus produced, and the remaining ש was naturally interpreted as the common late Hebrew (or Aramaic) equivalent for the relative אשר. The stages in the textual history were thus:—

- (1) שׁמ חדש LXX
- (2) שׁמנ חדש
- (3) שׁמ אחר ש
- (4) שׁמ אחר אשר M.T.

The LXX phrase is that contained in both texts in the parallel passage, Isa. lxii 2.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

THE PROPHECY IN ISAIAH IX 1-7.

(A reply to Dr Burney)

DR BURNEY in his criticism¹ of my article in *J. T. S.* vol. vii pp. 321 ff, entitled 'The Prophecy in Isaiah ix 1-7', makes some assertions which call for a reply.

In the first place it may be pointed out that a statement made in accordance with the opinion of one of the first Assyriologists in England, deliberately pronounced with reference to a case in point, would not usually be described as made 'on hearsay'. Since, however, the source of a statement is of small importance compared with its intrinsic probability, I may pass on to consider Dr Burney's remarks on this point. With reference to the word שׁנׁ, Dr Burney writes, 'It is not improbable that the word was ordinarily unused in Hebrew, and that Isaiah intentionally used the native word applied by the Assyrians to their military boots'. He maintains that 'šunu and שׁנׁ have no philological connexion whatsoever. The real Assyrian equivalent to שׁנׁ is the familiar šēnu'. And in a later footnote he says, 'Here I assume that the operation of the law which governed the interchange of vowels was constant, and that Isaiah, hearing šēnu (or more probably šēn) pronounced, would reproduce it, not indeed by שׁנׁ as pronounced by the Massorettes, but by its original form sa'n, which appears to have been the nearest Hebrew equivalent'.

¹ *J. T. S.* April 1910 p. 438 ff.