

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 intueri 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

sacrificia haec quae tibi ob sacramenta divini corporis offeruntur, tam acceptabilia tibi nostro facias obsequio, quam sunt divino instituta mysterio¹.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

THE WATERS OF SHILOAH THAT GO SOFTLY: A NOTE ON ISAIAH VIII 6.

WE read in Isaiah viii 6 ff: 'Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly, *and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son*; Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks: and he shall pass through Judah.' The greater part of this is perfectly intelligible; the language of the A. V., which I have quoted, is a little stiff and old-fashioned, but it does not need a learned commentary to discover that the Prophet wishes to tell his countrymen that since they have not learnt their lesson from their recent comparatively light calamities they will be exposed to the immeasurably greater calamity of an Assyrian invasion. The recent calamity had been the invasion of Judah by Israel and Damascus; this Isaiah speaks of as the little stream of Shiloah, perhaps already conducted in an artificial channel; the coming invasion would be like an inundation of a mighty river.¹ But all this does not explain why the people of Judah should *rejoice in* (or *with*) Rezin. A foreign invasion is never pleasant: even Mr Keir Hardie or Mr Redmond would hardly 'rejoice with' the Germans, if they landed in this country. It is evident that something is wrong with the text, or with our interpretation of it.

It has long been noticed that two marginal glosses or foot-notes have been incorporated into the text of Isaiah vii. From the time of Gesenius and Hitzig the words *את מלך אשור* in vii 17 and *במלך אשור* in vii 20 have been regarded as 'interpolations'. These words ('even the king of Assyria', 'by the king of Assyria') break the construction and spoil the rhythm, if regarded as part of the actual discourse. 'Interpolation' is, however, rather a hard word for them. They are rather of the nature of explanatory notes which have got incorporated with the text; for aught that appears to the contrary they may have been set down in the margin by Isaiah himself, or whoever first wrote down the discourse. Now in viii 6, 7, we have another pair of notes of the same kind; we

¹ Compare Jeremiah xlvii 2.