

I suggest that the Book of the Revelation is in fact a missionary book; the counterpart from an ideal standpoint of the historic matter-of-fact record of the Acts of the Apostles. Both are descriptive of the conflict between Church and World, of 'the trial and the triumph'; the one in narrative of fact; the other in 'vision', the meaning wrapt up always in it, even where what is historical underlies, in the ideal and figurative.

Both books, it may be observed, start from the Ascension; the one, however, narrating the actual event, the other portraying an august ideal picture of the Ascended Lord. Both in the forefront make the purified Church to stand forth as the divinely selected Instrument; the one by the narrative of the event of Pentecost mainly, supplemented in other ways; the other by the figures of the seven lamps or of the seven stars in the hand of Christ; both go on to exhibit the conflict between Church and world; the one in fact of history; the other in figure and ideally. Both also lead up to a certain fulfilment, a stage, but only a stage, of victory. The end of the Acts leaves us with a world-wide spread of the Gospel; the field of the world (then known) occupied, but the obedience to the faith only partial. So the Apocalypse, whilst in idea it overleaps all obstacles and already embraces the end, yet after all exhibits an incomplete issue. It shews a Church established in the world, but the nations (the nations, not, of course, as in A.V., 'of them that are saved') still in need of the healing that comes from the Church, still outside. But it is ever the Church that is the means of making the truth to conquer; the triumph, partial or final, is attained through its trial; through the 'faith and patience of the saints'.

The Book of the Revelation thus regarded is seen to be one coherent whole, and the Letters an essential part of it, occupying their right place, the only suitable one for them.

C. H. PAREZ.

### THE GREEK VERSION OF ISAIAH: IS IT THE WORK OF A SINGLE TRANSLATOR?

IN his valuable contributions to this JOURNAL,<sup>1</sup> Mr St John Thackeray has adduced weighty reasons to shew that 'the task of translating the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel into Greek was in each case divided between two translators'. He finds no evidence that a similar division

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iv 245 ff, 398 ff, 578 ff; cp. also x 301 ff and see now *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* i 10 ff.

of labour was employed in translating Isaiah : on the contrary he has drawn attention to some striking features that are common to many sections of the book, and concludes that 'the translator of the first chapter is also responsible for the last, and throughout all the intermediate portions, notwithstanding varieties of style in the original, there are connecting links of style in the Greek, producing the impression of unity of workmanship'.

Now it is well known that according to certain theories some parts of the book of Isaiah were not *written* till late in the second century B.C. ; Duhm, for example, attributes the composition of cc. 24-27 to the year 128 B.C. It is obvious that the evidence of the Greek version, if it is clear and cogent, must have a very important bearing on such theories. *If* the entire version is the work of a single hand and *if* the translation was made early in the second century or even in the third<sup>1</sup> such theories cease at once to be tenable. I am not convinced that the version is necessarily quite so early as Mr Thackeray maintains, though it would seem to me hazardous to place it as late as 128 B.C. : but if the book was translated before 128, either cc. 24-27 were written before that date, or having been written in that year they were subsequently translated and incorporated with the previously existing translation of the rest of the book. The latter alternative may not appear very probable, but it is not impossible ; only, if it were true, differences of translation should distinguish cc. 24-27 from the rest of the book, and so with any other sections which may have been written late in the first century B. C.

With these possibilities before me I have, while working at Isaiah for several years past, followed up from time to time what seemed possible clues to difference of translators, with the result that I find no evidence that cc. 24-27 or c. 33 or cc. 34-35 were translated by other hands than that which translated the rest of cc. 1-39.

On the other hand, more or less accidentally in the first instance, I discovered certain differences between cc. 1-39 and cc. 40-66, and these it is my purpose now to record. At the same time I must disclaim any intention of finally deciding the question of the unity or diversity of the version. It will be admitted that in cases of this kind differences are in general more significant than resemblances ; but the marks of unity have very probably not yet been fully presented and the differences may be capable of more than one explanation.

Before proceeding to the differences I will briefly recall certain common features claimed for the entire work. In respect of style, Mr Thackeray groups Isaiah with the Pentateuch and parts of Joshua translated in the third century B. C. and with 1 Maccabees translated in the first century B. C. as translations in 'good κοινή Greek'.<sup>1</sup> Though

<sup>1</sup> Thackeray in *J. T. S.* x 303.

<sup>2</sup> *Grammar* p. 13.

a better stylist, it is claimed that the translator of Isaiah was less competent in rendering his original than the translators of Jeremiah<sup>1</sup>; the degree of justice with which this charge may be made will only be satisfactorily determined if a more thorough investigation can determine the state of the Hebrew text which the translator was called upon to render. A further common characteristic noted by Mr Thackeray is 'a strong resemblance between the vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah and that of the Hexateuch'.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to these general characteristics of the entire version, Mr Thackeray draws attention to certain specific peculiarities that recur throughout the version or parts of it. Of these the most significant is the transliteration of **צְבֹאוֹת יְהוָה צְבֹאוֹת** and similar phrases; except in Isaiah, 1 Kings (four times) and some half dozen times sporadically elsewhere, **צְבֹאוֹת** is never transliterated in the Old Testament. The occurrences of *σαβαώθ* in Isaiah are as follows:—

In cc. 1-23 there are 40 occurrences.

|       |   |   |   |
|-------|---|---|---|
| 24-27 | ” | 1 | ” |
| 28-31 | ” | 6 | ” |
| 32-35 | ” | 0 | ” |
| 36-39 | ” | 3 | ” |
| 40-55 | ” | 7 | ” |
| 56-66 | ” | 0 | ” |

The absence of *σαβαώθ* in cc. 32-35 and 56-66 is due to the absence of **צְבֹאוֹת** in these chapters of the original.

The free insertion of *καί, δέ, γάρ*, where there is no corresponding word in the Hebrew, doubtless occurs throughout the book: but other characteristics cited by Mr Thackeray occur in cc. 1-39 only: thus the four occurrences of the 'characteristic phrase' *μικρὸς καὶ μέγας* are in ix 14 (13); xxii 5, xxxiii 4, 19.

Another characteristic phrase noted by Mr Thackeray is *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον*. He observes that this occurs in Exod. xiv 13 and seven times in Isaiah. The following further facts may help to determine more precisely the significance of the usage in Isaiah. The phrase also occurs in Bar. iii 32 (cp. also *τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον* in v. 13 A Q Γ) and Judith xv 10; these are, I believe, the only occurrences outside Isaiah and Exodus; but cp. *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον* in 3 Macc. iii 29 and *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας χρόνους* 3 Macc. vii 23. The occurrences of the phrase in Isaiah are in ix 7 (6) A Q (not NB), xiii 20, xiv 20, xviii 7, xxxiii 20, xxxiv 10, 17; this phrase, then, so infrequent elsewhere, occurs several times in Isa. cc. 1-39 (34); it never occurs in cc. 40-66, although there was ample oppor-

<sup>1</sup> J. T. S. iv 583.

<sup>2</sup> J. T. S. x 302; cp. iv 583.

*tunity for its use*, and εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, a less frequent variation of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον in cc. 1-39, does actually occur frequently in cc. 40-66; another variation is ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος. I tabulate the occurrences of all three:—

|                      | cc. 1-39 | cc. 40-66 |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|
| εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον | 7        | 0         |
| εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα        | 4        | 9         |
| ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος       | 3        | 1         |

Moreover τὸν αἰῶνα occurs once in each part, but whereas in xxv 2 (pr. εἰς N<sup>c</sup>.<sup>a</sup>) it is yet another variant rendering of לעולם, in lvii 15 it renders נע, treated probably by the translator as an objective acc. after שכן.

I turn now to characteristics not discussed by Mr Thackeray.

For obvious reasons it is less easy to obtain clear evidence either of identity or of difference in the version of Isaiah than in Jeremiah and Ezekiel: the same style and the same recurrent expressions are found throughout the Hebrew text of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, whereas, as is well known, there is a most marked difference between the Hebrew style of Isa. 40-66 and the greater part of 1-39. For good tests of consistent or inconsistent renderings we are therefore reduced to one or two expressions common to all prophetic literature, and the one striking instance of an expression common to both parts of Isaiah. I take the latter first.

1. The phrase לַאֲשֵׁר שִׁרָּה is rendered in three ways:—

(a) ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

(b) ὁ ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ.

(c) ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ.

Observe also

(d) (a) τὸ λόγιον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ in xxx 11.

(β) τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἰσραήλ in xli 16.

In xxix 19, xli 14, the phrase in Hebrew was passed over by the translators, or treated in a way useless for the present discussion. Another passage, liv 5, is discussed in 2 below.

There is unquestionably a strong preference in cc. 1-39 for (a) to the almost complete exclusion of (b) and (c), and on the contrary in cc. 40-66 there is a strong preference for (b) or (c). The use and omission of the article in (d) harmonizes with this difference.

In view of the numerous textual variants in the MSS of the Greek version, any tabular statement would be misleading; I therefore give the references to the Vatican MS as printed by Swete, noting the variations given in his apparatus.

(a) ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ occurs as follows:—

i 4 (om. του, N\*), x 20, xii 6, xvii 7, xxx 12, 15 (in ver. 15 om. του A O), xxxi 1, xxxvii 23.

xli 20 (om. του, Γ), lx 9 ('improb. του Ν? (postea revoc)).'

(δ) ὁ ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ occurs in

v 19 (om. Ἰσρ., Α), v 24 (om. ἅγ., Α). Observe also τὸν ἅγιον Ἰακώβ = יַעֲקֹב בְּרַךְ in xxix 23.

xliii 3, 14; xlv 11, xlix 7 (pr. του, Q), lv 5.

(ε) ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ occurs in

xlvi 4, xlviii 17 (pr. ο Ν Α Q) lx 14.

The chief point to be noted is the marked contrast between cc. 1-39 and 40-66 in the use of the article: in cc. 1-39 τοῦ is prefixed to Israel eight times (two textually uncertain), omitted twice (both omissions open to some slight textual uncertainty); in 40-66 it is prefixed only in two places (both open to slight textual uncertainty), omitted in eight (one textually uncertain).

2. The difference between the two parts of the Greek version in the preference for the use or omission of the article extends beyond the phrase just discussed. I note

(1) The different forms of a similar phrase which generally renders לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי, but in lv 5 קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל.

(a) ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ

xxi 10, xxix 23 (om. του Ν\*), xxx 29 (om. του, Γ), xlv 15.

(b) ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ

xvii 6, xxi 17, xxxvii 16 (om. ο Ν\*), 21.

xli 17 (ὁ ἅγιος Ἰσ. Q), xlviii 2 (pr. του Ν Α Q).

(c) θεὸς Ἰσραήλ

xlvi 3, xlviii 1, xlix 7 (pr. ο Ν\*), lii 12 (pr. κς ο Ν Α Q), liv 5.

Here the double omission of the article is peculiar to cc. 40-66; the double use of it occurs in but one passage in that part of the book; but the genitive article before Ἰσραήλ which is common in cc. 1-39 in the phrase ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσ. is in this phrase more frequently absent than present.

(2) Apart from the phrases already noticed there are about fifty-three occurrences of Ἰσραήλ; though there are various readings here too, the relative preference of cc. 1-39 for the article can be represented with substantial accuracy as follows: the number of occurrences are of

|          | in cc. 1-39 | in cc. 40-66. |
|----------|-------------|---------------|
| ὁ Ἰσραήλ | 16          | 27            |
| Ἰσραήλ   | 6           | 4             |

3. The phrase אֱמֶת נֶחֱם is rendered in three ways:—

(a) τὰδε λέγει.

(b) οὕτως εἶπεν.

(c) οὕτως λέγει.

Here there is much less uncertainty due to various readings: nevertheless in xxx 12 B has phrase *a*,  $\aleph^a$ , <sup>b</sup> A Q phrase *c*. In order not to enhance the difference between the two parts I adopt the latter reading in tabulating the usage

|                 | in cc. 1-39 | cc. 40-66 |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
| <i>a</i> occurs | 12 times    | 6 times   |
| <i>b</i> „      | 4 „         | 0 „       |
| <i>c</i> „      | 5 „         | 23 „      |

Note also οὕτως ἐρείτε = כה תאמרו in xxxvii 6.

Here the first point to note is that whereas in cc. 1-39 כה is rendered more frequently by τὰδε than by οὕτως, in cc. 40-66 οὕτως is all but four times as frequent as τὰδε; and next that *b* never occurs in cc. 40-66.

Next the distribution within the two main sections may be noted: of the twelve occurrences of *a* in cc. 1-39, eight are in cc. 36-39, and of the six in cc. 40-66, five are in cc. 56-66. If we separate cc. 36-39, then the case stands thus: each of the three phrases occurs an equal number of times (four) in cc. 1-35, but in cc. 40-66 *b* does not occur at all, and *c* is four times as frequent as *a*.

In cc. 40-55 *a* occurs once (lii 3), *c* occurs twenty-one times.

The significance of these facts is rather increased when they are considered in connexion with

4. The renderings of דנא. These are

- (a) τὰδε λέγει.
- (b) λέγει.
- (c) εἶπεν.

Here the difference between cc. 1-39 and cc. 40-66 is very striking: *a* is the regular rendering in the former, *b* in the latter; of *c* there are only two well-attested readings, lvi 8, lxvi 17; it is also read by  $\aleph^*$  in lxvi 22 and in Q<sup>mg</sup> in lix 20 where other MSS do not render the phrase at all. It is worth questioning whether even in lvi 8, lxvi 17, εἶπεν may not be due to contamination of the Greek text.

There is only one other matter of text that need be noticed: in xxx 1, B reads λέγει, but  $\aleph$  A Q Γ τὰδε λέγει: the latter reading may be reasonably adopted, and in lxvi 22 I retain λέγει against the εἶπεν of  $\aleph^*$ . The usage of *a*, *b* (*c* may be neglected) can now be tabulated: the occurrences are

|                | cc. 1-39 | cc. 40-66 |
|----------------|----------|-----------|
| (a) τὰδε λέγει | 11       | 2         |
| (b) λέγει      | 1        | 7         |

The two occurrences of *a* in 40-66 are in a single verse—lii 5; the single occurrence of *a* in cc. 1-39 is in xiv 22, where *b* also occurs. There was not improbably another occurrence of *b* in the original text of xliii 12; cp. the Hebrew with the Greek variants.

5. The synonyms *ἐναντι*, *ἐναντίον*, *ἐνώπιον*.

Here the main fact is that cc. 1-39 shew a marked preference for *ἐνώπιον*, cc. 40-66 a still more marked preference for *ἐναντίον*. In detail: *ἐναντίον* occurs but once (xxxvii 14) in cc. 1-39, *ἐναντι* thrice<sup>1</sup>—twice in a single verse—xxiii 18 (A\* omits one occurrence) and in viii 4. The form *ἐναντι* never occurs in cc. 40-66, except in two readings (xlix 4, 5), peculiar (in Swete's apparatus) to N; on the other hand *ἐναντίον* occurs in cc. 40-66 twelve times, or, if N\* should preserve the original text in xlviii 19, lxxv 6, fourteen times. *Ἐνώπιον* occurs seven times in cc. 1-39, six times, or, adopting the readings of N\* just referred to, only four times, in cc. 40-66.

*Ἐνώπιον* is nearly twice as frequent as *ἐναντίον* and *ἐναντι* together in cc. 1-39, it is but half, or perhaps less than a third, as frequent as *ἐναντίον* in cc. 40-66 (where *ἐναντι* does not occur).

6. I now tabulate the usage of certain particles that occur exclusively or almost exclusively in cc. 1-39. The numbers in brackets give the number of cases marked as uncertain in Hatch and Redpath.

|        | cc. 1-39 | cc. 40-66          |
|--------|----------|--------------------|
| πάλιν  | 7        | 0                  |
| δὴ     | 7 (1)    | 1 (1) <sup>2</sup> |
| διότι  | 22 (7)   | 1 (1)              |
| τοίνυν | 4        | 0                  |

On *διότι* see Thackeray *Grammar* p. 139, where the use or avoidance of this particle will be seen to distinguish parts of Ezekiel and Jeremiah proceeding from different hands.

7. An otiose use of *ἄνθρωπος* in rendering Hebrew adjectives occurs with some frequency in cc. 1-39 (xxv 3-5 (more than one instance), xxix 11 (cp. xxix 12), xxxi 2, see also viii 2); but never in cc. 40-66. I discuss this usage more fully in a note that will appear in a forthcoming number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*.

I cannot, for the present at all events, carry this investigation further; but taken in combination the differences to which I have drawn attention may I think be regarded as making a certain prima facie case for the conclusion that the Greek version of Isaiah was not the work of a single hand. Before that conclusion could be safely used a more exhaustive

<sup>1</sup> Note also *κατέναντι* once (xxxviii 20) and *ἀπέναντι* twice (i 16, xvii 13).

<sup>2</sup> I cannot trace this instance: the reference to xlvii 13 in Hatch and Redpath must be a misprint.

proof would certainly be desirable; but meantime, until the differences have been explained, it would be unwise to base much on the opposite assumption of unity of workmanship throughout the entire translation.

In conclusion I remark that much that suggests the possibility of difference of origin for cc. 1-39 and cc. 40-66, increases at the same time the probability previously established of identity of origin of the various parts of cc. 1-39.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

### ‘PER OBSEQUIUM PLEBIS TUAE.’

IN the last volume of the JOURNAL (vol. xi p. 575) Dr Feltoe, rightly as it seems to me, criticizes Dr Gore's rendering of the words ‘per obsequium plebis tuae’ in the prayer *Sanctificationum omnium auctor* of the *Missale Francorum* and the *Gelasianum*. Dr Feltoe himself finds a difficulty in the phrase, and only reaches the vague conclusion ‘that the words mean that the loyal co-operation of the laity is a necessary element in the consecration of the Elements’. But I conceive that the meaning is something much more definite than this. The ‘obsequium’ of the people is surely their offering of bread and wine—or at least the ‘rationabile obsequium’ (Rom. xii 1) which is expressed by their ‘obsequia’—by which the presbyter is supplied with the matter of the sacrament and is so enabled to consecrate. It would scarcely have occurred to me that the phrase had any other meaning, even if it stood alone and no like use of ‘obsequium’ could be quoted. The use is not a common one; but in *secretae* of the masses of the *Leonianum* we have ‘huius oblationis obsequium’ (ed. Feltoe 6); ‘obsequia munerum’ (*ib.* 54); ‘omnium nostrum Domine quaesumus hostias propitius intuere ut et quod actum est per obsequium deputatum et fidelium vota populorum tua potius dignatione firmetur’ (*ib.* 130)—in which last perhaps the ‘obsequium’ is that of the priest in offering the ‘vota’ of the people. In the *post nomina* of a *missa dominicalis* of the *Missale Gothicum* (Neale and Forbes *Gallican Masses* 146) we have ‘suscipe nomine (*leg. nomini*) tuo debita honoris obsequia’; and in the *post nomina* of the Mozarabic mass of St Andrew's day (Migne *P.L.* lxxxv 150) ‘offerentium obsequia a te clementer accipiantur’. And the use of ‘obsequium’ in general relation to the offering is illustrated by the Mozarabic *post nomina* of the third Sunday after Easter (*ib.* 578), ‘ut