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 (καυνόν LXX, י䁍 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: 'καυνόν is not quite exact, but may have been meant to harmonize with ver. 17.' But καυνόν is not a loose rendering. Elsewhere in Isaiah and throughout the whole of the LXX καυνός invariably stands for י_ASSIGNMENT 1, 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. מֹֽסֵר אלֶֽהָּ בָּנִ֖ים יִבְרָ֥יאִל בָּנֵ֑י יִצְוָֽא הָאֲדֹנֵ֖י אָדֹנֵּ֥י אָדֹנֵי אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֥י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֥י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֥י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֥י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֥י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדֹנֵ֖י אֲדו

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 τοὺς δὲ δουλεύοντι μικρὸ πληθυντεὶ δύομα καὶνόν, δε ευλογηθέντει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐλογηθεύων γὰρ τὸν θεόν τῶν ἀληθινῶν, καὶ οἱ δομοποιοί ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁμοίων τὸν θεόν τῶν ἀληθινῶν.

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. רַשֵׁנ, 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 רַשֵׁנ. It is true that the Greek has a relative pronoun at this point, which it is natural to equate with רַשֵׁנ, but in reality it must correspond to the article in הָאֲדֹנֵי, 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 מֹֽסֵר, ‘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—מסר. 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 מסר, 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 מָצֵּשׁ, the history of the corruption is easy to follow. The final א became attached to the following radicals, and the א of שִׁמְחָה was, as so often, read as ר: רָזָא was thus produced, and the remaining ש was naturally interpreted as the common late Hebrew (or Aramaic) equivalent for the relative רָזָא. The stages in the textual history were thus:

(1) שִׁמְחָה LXX
(2) שִׁמְחָה רָזָא
(3) שִׁמְחָה אֲרָא ש
(4) שִׁמְחָה אֲרָא אֲשֶׁר 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 criticism 1 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 בְּרֹזָא, 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 בְּרֹזָא and בְּרַזָּא have no philological connexion whatsoever. The real Assyrian equivalent to בְּרַזָּא is the familiar בְּרַזָּא'. 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 בְּרַזָּא (or more probably בְּרַזָּא) pronounced, would reproduce it, not indeed by בְּרַזָּא as pronounced by the Massoretes, but by its original form בְּרַזָּא, which appears to have been the nearest Hebrew equivalent'.

1 J. T. S. April 1910 p. 438 ff.