

Whatever date we assign to the latter half of the book of Baruch, we must, it seems, give a much earlier date to the first portion than that proposed by Kneucker and Schürer.

H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY.

(*To be continued.*)

A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH xli 5-7).

⁵ *The isles saw, and feared; the ends of the earth trembled: they drew near, and came.* ⁶ *They helped every one his neighbour; and every one said to his brother, Be of good courage.* ⁷ *So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smiteth the anvil, saying of the soldering, It is good: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved.*

LAGARDE'S conjecture that the passage Isa. xli 6, 7 is misplaced in all our present texts, and that its original context is to be found in ch. xl 18-20, has of late met with marked favour. Profs. Duhm (2nd edit., 1902) and Marti (1900) accept it without hesitation in their commentaries; Dr. Cheyne follows it, with some corrections of reading, in his *Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, 1899; and Prof. Skinner in the *Cambridge Bible* (1898), who does not adopt it, shows plainly that it appears to him to be a suggestion of weight.

And yet there is much to be said in favour of the present position of the two verses, and possibly not all has yet been urged which might be reasonably urged against their transposition. In the first place, though hospitality may be found for Isa. xli 6, 7 with the earlier passage, xl 18-20, it cannot be said that the new position provides a perfectly obvious context. There is, indeed, no gap for these verses to occupy; the Dutch scholar Oort and Dr. T. K. Abbott placed them *after* xl 20 (Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 299), but the present tendency is to place them *before* that verse. But neither position can they take without discomfort; the words לֹא יִמוּט ('not be moved') have an awkward sound at the end of successive verses, and Dr. Cheyne accordingly omits them from xli 7 in his *Critical Text*. Moreover, on the theory that the passage xli 6, 7 originally stood after xl 19 or 20 no good reason can be given for its removal to its present place. Presumably it was a pure accident with nothing to explain it.

One more difficulty—a serious one—remains. *Ex hypothesi* xli 5 is an insertion the purpose of which is to connect the misplaced verses (6, 7) with their new context. But I hope to show later on that on the one hand ver. 5 stands in a definite relation to ver. 2, and on the other that it is followed very appropriately by verses 6, 7. If ver. 5 be an

insertion, it is, I believe, the work of an interpolator who was capable of actually improving a passage of the second Isaiah.

The theory of transposition rests in the main on two consecutive assumptions; it falls to the ground if either assumption is disproved. It is assumed

(i) That verses 6, 7 are a 'peep into the image-smithy' (*Blick in die Götzenschmiede*), and

(ii) that as such they do not agree with verses 1-4.

(i). The clearest and earliest statement of the first assumption so far as I know is found in Rashi's commentary on the passage. He says that *חרש* ('carpenter' E.V.) means the *founder* of molten images (*נוסך הפסל*); that *צורף* ('goldsmith' E.V.) is the one *who plates the image with gold* (*המרוקעו בזהב*); and that *דבק* ('soldering' E.V.) is in Romance (*שולר'וריא* (*בלע'ז*) *solder* (*וריא*)). Kimkhi also introduces the image, only a carved wooden one. Ibn Ezra (*in loco*), ed. Friedländer, also sees a reference to idolatry. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion keeping close to the Hebrew do not mention idols, but they agree with Rashi as to the interpretation of *דבק* (*τη κολληη Α'Θ'*; *εις κολλησιων Σ'*). Ewald in modern times in commenting on this passage says that the isles 'stellen in der Angst ihre neugebildeten und verzierten Götter auf, die lächerlichen!' He then adds with enigmatic brevity, 'v. 5-7 nach 40. 19 f'; by which he means no doubt that xli 5-7 is to be interpreted with the help of xl 19 f. Dillmann and Kittel (1890 and 1898) take the same view of the meaning of ver. 7, without, however, agreeing with the theory of transposition.

But if we accept the view of the meaning of the passage taken by Rashi, Ewald, Dillmann, and Kittel, it is somewhat hard to resist the transposition theory of Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti. One is forced to go at least as far as Dr. Skinner, and to confess that 'the transition from the assembling of the nations to the inside of an idol factory is extremely abrupt.'

But must we accept Ewald's principle: 'v. 5-7 nach 40. 19 f'? The words *חרש* and *צורף* can be used in the quite general senses respectively of 'smith' and 'metal-founder.' In xl 19 we know that the two words are applied respectively to one who makes and to one who overlays *images*, because the context expressly tells us so. But the case is otherwise with xli 7, where we have no mention of idols in the context. We are left free indeed to take the two words in a general sense. Similarly we are free to give a general sense to the words 'not be moved' (*לא ימוט*) in xli 7, for though they are applied to an image in xl 20, an image is not the only thing fashioned by a smith which is in danger at times of slipping from its place.

The scene is a smithy, but *not* an idol-smithy. But the objector will answer, Something is being made in the smithy, and if it is not an idol, what else is it? Let us look at ver. 7 again: 7 a shows us a smith and a metal-founder at work; 7 b shows us the nature of their work, I would even say the object on which they are working. Now in 7 b the stress falls without doubt on the word לֵבְרָבָק ('saying of the soldering, It is good' R.V.). If then the English Version and the many authorities which agree with it be right, all the stress falls on the action of soldering and nailing an unknown object, and the temptation to remove these verses to a context in which some important object is mentioned becomes very strong.

Before, however, we consent to the transposition we must at least examine carefully the meaning of the word on which the stress falls in 7 b. Must לֵבְרָבָק mean 'soldering'? The word is treated practically as a $\text{\AA}\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ by the lexicographers, for they do not attempt to illustrate its meaning from the $\text{\textcircled{L}}\text{בְּרָבָק}$ of 1 Kings xxii 34, which in form at any rate is the plural of בְּרָבָק . We may presume that there are three reasons for accepting the translation 'soldering':

(a) The root בְּרָבָק means 'to cleave to.'

(b) Some very important ancient authorities support the rendering (A'ṯ[Σ'] Rashi).

(c) The context, understood in the narrower sense of the *parallelism*, is favourable to it.

On the other hand if we take בְּרָבָק as the singular of $\text{\textcircled{L}}\text{בְּרָבָק}$ (1 Kings xxii 34 = 2 Chron. xviii 33) we avoid making a needless $\text{\AA}\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$, and we obtain a sense which suits the context of Isa. xli 7 perfectly. We render 'armour-joint' or 'armour-plate.' (For the scale-armour or jointed armour of Old Testament times see Nowack, *Hebräische Archäologie*, vol. i, pp. 365, 6.)

The other reasons besides suitability to the context in favour of rendering בְּרָבָק 'armour-joint' or 'armour-plate' are:

(a) In Job xli 17 [9 Heb.] the root בְּרָבָק is used to describe how the armour-like scales of Leviathan fit closely together.

(b) The LXX gives $\text{\sigma}\mu\beta\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ ('joint'); Peshitta $\text{\textcircled{L}}\text{בְּרָבָק}$ (*debhḥa*, 'joint' as in 1 Kings xxii 34).

Thus interpreted ver. 7 means that the fear of the 'sword' and 'bow' of Cyrus (ver. 2) stirs up the Isles and the Ends of the Earth to defensive preparations; *they look to their armour!* The metal-founder brings the plate or armour-joint to the smith, who approves it and proceeds to fasten it on to the leathern shirt (which formed the framework of a coat of mail) with nails or rivets, *securely* that it should not be removed by the first hostile weapon which might assail it.

(ii) Looking now at the passage (xli 1-7) as a whole we find that

ver. 1 is an introduction announcing a challenge to judgement or rather to a trial by combat. Two great facts balancing one another on the stage of history become at once apparent, each expressed by a perfect tense in Hebrew, and each attended by results which are for the most part expressed in imperfects. On the eastern side Jehovah has stirred up (חֶעִיר) His champion to perform His will (ver. 2). On the western side fear has seized (רָא וַיִּירָא) even the dwellers on the distant Mediterranean coastlands (ver. 5). Without human aid the champion wins his triumphs, Jehovah alone upholding him (vers. 3, 4). With mutual encouragements and preparations for war his enemies hope to stand against him (vers. 6, 7). Surely there is literary unity in Isa. xli 1-7!

W. EMERY BARNES.

ON THE LXX OF ISAIAH v 14, 17, 18.

IN verse 14 b, the Hebrew text has: 'and her glory, and her abundance, and her uproar, and he that rejoiceth, shall descend into her' (or, 'he that rejoiceth in her shall descend').

The LXX, keeping as usual closely to the order of the Hebrew words, has καὶ καταβήσονται οἱ ἔνδοξοι καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ λοιμοὶ αὐτῆς. The first part of this presents no great discrepancy. Οἱ πλούσιοι (cf. xxxii 9 γυναῖκες πλούσιαι) points to שְׂאֵנָה for שְׂאֵנָה as the reading of the LXX; but with οἱ λοιμοί the difficulty becomes more acute, and the idea of paraphrase is absolutely excluded.

I suggest that for עלִי the LXX here read עַיִן, which is rendered by λοιμοί several times in Ezekiel; xxviii 7, xxx 11, &c. (The O. L. in Ezekiel has *pestes*: see Mr. F. C. Burkitt's *Tyconius*, pp. 44, 77, 79.) Compare the use of λοιμός in 1 Macc. xv 21; Acts xxiv 5.

In verse 17, 'the waste places of the fat ones (מִחִים) shall strangers eat,' appears in the LXX as τῶν ἀπειλημμένων ἄρνες φάγονται. Ἄρνες probably represents נִרְיִים for נִרְיִים (so Ewald, though Prof. Cheyne, in the fourth edition of *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, appears to lean towards כְּרִים). But the error in ἀπειλημμένων is of another kind, and has not, I think, been previously pointed out. What the Greek translator must have written is ἀπηλειμμένων (or ἀπηλιμμένων) from ἀπαλείφω, taking מִחִים from חָח, *wipe* or *blot out*: as in 2 Kings xxi 13, where the word is rendered three times by ἀπαλείφω. The corruption to ἀπειλημμένων would be very natural, and has apparently affected all known MSS; the only variants recorded being ἀπιλημμένων BQ* (ἀπειλ. Q^a) and ἐπειλημμένων in the cursives 239, 306 (Holmes and Parsons).

Incidentally, this confirms the present Hebrew text, in which the ח and the division of the words have been suspected: see Prof. Cheyne's