A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF EZEKIEL[1].

IN the last number of the JOURNAL I drew attention to the difference in style and vocabulary between the first and the second half of the Greek Jeremiah. I attempted to show that the most probable explanation of this difference was the employment of two translators, the former of whom undertook the rendering of i–xxviii, while the latter translated xxix–li; the final chapter, it was suggested, might possibly be the work of yet a third hand. I found that there was a certain mixture of the two vocabularies in the middle of the book, immediately before and immediately after the point where the work of the first translator ended, and that this mixture was also apparent to some extent in the later chapters of the second portion. It was further shown that the hand of the second translator of Jeremiah reappeared in the book of Baruch[1]. With greater hesitation I hazarded the conjecture that this division of the Greek book into two parts might be traceable to an older division of the Hebrew Jeremiah into two books, and might afford an explanation of the different position assigned to certain chapters in the Greek and in the Massoretic texts. I pointed out that some critics, who had failed to notice the change in the style and vocabulary of the Greek version, had nevertheless, on other, though perhaps insufficient, grounds, been led to the conjecture that there were in pre-Christian times two distinct Hebrew collections of the prophecies of Jeremiah. Lastly, it

[1] I had intended to follow up my previous paper with some remarks on the affinity existing between the Greek versions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets, and the contrast which they present to the Greek Isaiah. But the discovery of the two hands in Ezekiel seemed to deserve separate treatment. A few notes on the Greek versions of the Prophets considered collectively are reserved for a later number of the JOURNAL.

[2] Dr. Nestle has drawn my attention to the explanation which he has given of the statement in the Syro-hexaplar text that certain words in Baruch are 'not in the Hebrew,' namely that the Hebrew of Deuteronomy, not of Baruch, is intended (see his article SEPTUAGINT in Hastings, B.D. iv 450 note 2). I am not yet convinced that there was never a Hebrew original of the first half of Baruch: if, however, that view is correct, the second of the Jeremiah translators seems to have been the *author* of Baruch (part I).

was shown that the Codex Alexandrinus contained a slight indication that the close of the twenty-eighth chapter was at one time regarded as the conclusion of a book.

It was not until the proofs of my previous paper had been printed and revised that I discovered that the Greek version of Ezekiel presented certain features closely analogous to those which I had detected in the Greek Jeremiah. Although I was able to refer to this discovery in the final revise of my paper, and to some extent to modify what I had written, I must confess that some parts of that paper might have been otherwise worded, had the evidence as to Ezekiel been before me when it was first undertaken.

As I have already briefly stated in my former paper, the Greek of Ezekiel, as tested by style and vocabulary, falls into three parts: (1) i–xxvii, which I shall call Ezek. α, (2) xxviii–xxxix, here referred to as Ezek. β, (3) xl–xlviii, here termed Ezek. γ. Instead of the two main divisions which we found in Jeremiah, we here find a threefold division. But, as I hope to show, there are here, as in Jeremiah (excluding the appendix), two translators and two only. While the second portion of Ezekiel presents certain features peculiar to itself, in the third portion we find a recurrence of the α phrases, which are absent from the β portion. In other words, the hand which translated Ezek. γ is, in my opinion, identical with the hand which translated Ezek. α. The book appears, like Jeremiah, to have been divided, for purposes of translation, into two nearly equal parts, but, instead of the second hand continuing to the end, as was the case in Jeremiah, the first translator resumed the task when the difficult concluding section, containing the account of the vision of the Temple, was reached. Even here there is not wanting a slight parallel in Jeremiah, in that a certain mixture of the two vocabularies may be traced in chapters xxxix to li of that book.

Table III, which follows, shows the most noteworthy differences between Ezek. α and Ezek. β. The size of the page would hardly admit of the addition of another column devoted to the renderings in Ezek. γ. But such a column is the less needed, as most of the Hebrew words and phrases included in this table are, owing to the totally distinct subject-matter of Ezek. γ, entirely absent from that portion. It should be stated that none of the β renderings shown in this table occur in γ; where the Hebrew word occurs at all in the γ portion, it is the Greek version of α, not of β, that is employed. At the end of the table I have added lists of (1) other peculiarities of Ezek. β, (2) renderings common to Ezek. α and Ezek. γ, but absent from Ezek. β, (3) the few instances of note-worthy coincidence in the renderings of Ezek. α (mostly in xxvi–xxvii) and Ezek. β. An asterisk indicates that the word or phrase to which it is affixed is not found in the LXX except in the passages cited. The

break, it will be seen, comes in the middle of the denunciation of, and lamentation over Tyre (xxvi–xxviii), where the prophet turns from the city itself to denounce its 'prince.' Indeed it was the difference between the appellation of the city in the earlier part of this section, where it is rendered Σόρ, and that in the later part, where it becomes Τύρος, that first drew my attention to the change in the Greek style. The use of certain distinctive prepositions and conjunctions by β on the one hand and α and γ on the other should be specially noted, as it is in these minor parts of speech that the difference between writers or translators is wont to reveal itself.

<div align="center">

TABLE III.

PHRASES.

</div>

Hebrew	Ezekiel a (i–xxvii)	Ezekiel β (xxviii–xxxix)
1. '(Prophesy and) say' (אמרת)	(προφήτευσον καί) ἐρεῖς always to xxvii 3 [4 or 5 times in β]; εἰπόν in a renders the imperat. אמר	(προφήτευσον καί) εἰπόν 13 times from xxviii 12 to xxxix 1
2. '(They) shall know that I am the Lord' (כי אני יהוה)	ἐπιγνώσο(νται)) διότι, γνώσο(νται)) ὅτι) ἐγὼ Κύριος to xxvi 6 passim 'Ἐπιγινώσκειν is used along with γινώσκειν to render ידע in Jer. a, Ez. a and Min. Proph. Διότι is common in Jer. a, Ez. a and γ, Min. Proph. Εἰμι is regularly omitted in the above-named phrase in a	γνώσο(νται) ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος from xxviii 23 AQ to xxxix 28 passim 'Ἐπιγινώσκειν does not occur except twice as a v. l. in A Διότι occurs four times only after a verb, in each case with a var. lect. ὅτι: once (xxxiv 11) without v. l. at the opening of a sentence Εἰμι is regularly inserted (omitted in xxxvi 38 B, xxxvii 14)

<div align="center">

PLACE-NAMES.

</div>

3. צור, צר	Σόρ 10 times in xxvi–xxvii Only else in Jer. xxi 13 (Heb. צור)	Τύρος xxviii–xxix. So in Jer. β, Min. Proph., &c.

4. 'Tubal and Meshech' ἡ σύμπασα καὶ τὰ παρα- τείνοντα xxvii 13 Cf. Na. i 5 ἡ σύμπασα תֵּבֵל Μόσοχ καὶ Θοβἐλ xxxii 26, xxxviii 2 (Μέσοχ BQ), xxxix 1 (Μέσοχ B, Θοβέρ A)

PREPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS, &c.

5. סביבות and cognate words [κύκλῳ, κυκλόθεν occur in Ez. a β γ] περικύκλῳ 10 times from xxviii 23 to xxxix 17. Only else in Prophets in Is. iv 5
*ὑπερκύκλῳ xxxii 23 A

6. יען (יען אשר) [ἀνθ' ὧν a β γ] ἀντὶ τοῦ c. inf. 5 times from xxix 9 to xxxvi 6

7. לכן (על כן) [διὰ τοῦτο in a β γ] ἀντὶ τούτου xxviii 7, xxxiv 9. The use of ἀντί for 'because' ('because of') —apart from its use in the phrase ἀνθ' ὧν—is confined in the Prophets to Ez. β

In a and γ διά with accusative is only used in the phrase διὰ τοῦτο In β διά with accusative, apart from its use in διὰ τοῦτο, occurs 14 times (xxviii 17–xxxix 25) as the rendering of ב, מ, ל, על, &c. These examples include 3 instances of διὰ τὸ (μή) c. inf.

8. אם לא (in oaths and asseverations) ἐὰν μή xvii 16, 19, xx 33 A (ἢ μήν Q om. B) εἰ μήν 5 times from xxxiii 27 to xxxviii 19. (See Deissmann, Bible Studies 205 = Neue Bibelstudien 33.) The phrase does not occur again in the Prophetical books except as a v. l. in Is. xlv 23 and Ez. v 11 (see opp.)
εἰ μή v 11 AQ (εἰ μήν B)

9. ב 'when' usually ἐν τῷ c. inf. ἡνίκα ἄν xxxii 9, xxxiii 33, (xxxv 11 = כאשר). ἡνίκα does not occur elsewhere in Ez., and it is absent from Jer. and Min. Prophets

MISCELLANEOUS.

10. אנשים 'bands'	οἱ ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι xii 14	οἱ περί (τινα) xxxviii 6 bis, 9, xxxix 4
	παράταξις xvii 21	οἱ μετά (τινος) xxxviii 22
11. שמם, שממה and cognates	ἀφανίζειν iv 17, xx 26, xxv 3 [Also xxx 7 (B ἠρημωμ.), xxx 14 A (B ἀπολῶ), xxxvi 4 (τοῖς ἐξηρημ. καὶ ἠφανισμ.), and in ββ[1] xxxvi 34 bis, 35 bis, 36]	ἐρημοῦν xxix 12, xxx 7 bis, xxxii 15, xxxiii 28, 29, xxxv 3, 7 ἔρημος 10 times (xxix–xxxv) ἐρημία xxxv 9
	ἀφανισμός 9 or 10 times (iv–xxiii) [xxix 12 A]	ἀπώλεια xxix 9, 10, 12, xxxii 15
חרב, חרבה	ἐξερημοῦν vi 6, xii 20, xix 7 [xxxvi 4 B]	ἐρημοῦν [xxvi 2, 19 and] 7 times (xxix–xxxviii) ἐρημία xxxv 4
12. בז (בזה)	διαρπαγή xxiii 46, xxv 7	σκῦλον xxix 19, xxxviii 12 f.
	διαρπάζειν vii 21 (διαφθείρειν A)	
בזז		σκυλεύειν [xxvi 12] xxix 19, xxxviii 12 f., xxxix 10

Cf. the renderings of שלל by σκῦλον, προνομή, προνομεύειν.

13. זרה pi. ni.	διασπείρειν (v–xxii) 5 times. This verb in β usu. = פוץ διασκορπίζειν (v vi). In α β γ = פוץ	λικμᾶν xxix 12, xxx 23, 26, xxxvi 19 [xxvi 4 = al.]
14. קבץ	εἰσδέχεσθαι xi 17, xx 34, 41, xxii 19, 20 bis ἐπισυνάγειν xvi 37[a] B (συνάγειν AQ)	συνάγειν [xvi 37 A, 37[b]] xxviii 25, xxix 13, xxxiv 13, xxxvii 21, xxxviii 8, xxxix 17, 27 ββ[2] ἀθροίζειν xxxvi 24
15. טוב	καλός xvii 8, xx 25 (προστάγματα οὐ κ.), xxiv 4 [xxxiv 18]	ἀγαθός xxxiv 14 bis, xxxvi 31 (τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ὑμῶν τὰ μὴ ἀγ.)
16. דלית	κλῆμα xvii 6, 7, 23, xix 11 (and elsewhere for other Heb. words)	κλάδος xxxi 7, 9, 12 (and elsewhere for other Heb. words)

[1] I use ββ to denote the section xxxvi 24–38, on which see below.

[2] See below.

17. חזק, חזקה	κραταιός iii 9, 14, xx 33 f. δυνατός iii 8	ἰσχυρός [xxvi 17 AQ a Hexaplaric addition] xxx 22, xxxiv 4, 16.
18. שׁוט 'to contemn' (Aram.) מאוּט 'contempt'	περιέχειν xvi 57 ἐπιχαίρειν xxv 6 (?), 15 (?) (ἐπιχ. ἐκ ψυχῆς)	ἀτιμάζειν xxviii 24, 26, xxxvi 5 (ἀτιμάσαντες ψυχάς)
19. חרב	ξίφος xvi 40, xxiii 47 [ῥομφαία a³⁵ β¹⁰ circa]	μάχαιρα 33 times from xxviii 7 to xxxix 23. [Also v 2, 12, xxvi 6, 8, 9, 11]
20. חלל	[τραυματίας a and β]	τετραυματισμένος xxviii 23, xxx 4, xxxii 28, 30 A, xxxv 8
21. גאון	ὑπερηφανία vii 20, xvi 49, 56	ὕβρις xxx 6, 18, xxxii 12, xxxiii 28

Other instances of *words and usages in Ezekiel peculiar to the β portion*, or practically peculiar to it (all instances occurring in the other portions are noted) are as follows.

Γίγας⁶ = נבור (אל נבור) in xxxii and xxxix (other LXX renderings are ἰσχυρός, e. g. in Jer. a and β, μαχητής in Jer. a and Min. Proph., δυνατός, &c.): δοῦλος⁶ = עבד (παῖς in Ez. xlvi 17): ἐξελέσθαι⁵ = נצל, מלט (a has σώζειν⁶: ἐξελέσθαι in vii 19 A is a Hexaplaric addition): ἔσχατος⁶ (cf. the use of πέρας in a): καταβιβάζειν⁴ (and in xxvi 20): καταδουλοῦν²: κατεργάζεσθαι²: κατοικίζειν⁷ (and in xxvi 20): λοιπός² (κατάλοιπος a and β): use of the comparative πλείων (= רב) in xxix 15 (Heb. רדוה), xxxiii 24, xxxviii 8: ῥῆμα⁵ = דבר: σκέπη⁵ = צל, צלל (σκιά aβ): ταράσσειν⁶ (in xxvi 18 A it occurs in a Hexaplaric addition): ὑπό c. gen.⁵: φάραγξ⁸ (also in vi 3). Another feature of the β portion, also found in the last two chapters of the a portion, is the *practice of placing a dependent genitive pronoun or noun* (σου, αὐτοῦ, &c.) *before its governing noun*. I do not find any instances of this transposition before xxvi 11. From that point onwards we have σου πάσας τὰς πλατείας· (xxvi 11), σου τὰ τείχη (12), σου τὸ κάλλος (xxvii 11), σου ἡ καρδία (xxviii 2), εἰς γῆς βάθος (xxxi 14, xxxii 24), ἐν μέσῳ μαχαίρας τραυματιῶν (xxxii 20 : Heb. 'them that are slain by the sword': contrast 21), οἱ δεδωκότες αὐτῶν φόβον (xxxii 24 : contrast 26 τὸν φόβ. αὐτῶν), μου τὸ στόμα (xxxiii 22), σου τὰ ῥήματα (32), μου τὰ πρόβατα (xxxiv 6), ὑμῶν τὰ μνήματα (xxxvii 12), καὶ αὐτοί μου ἔσονται λαός (27, יהיו לי לעם). Under the same category may be placed certain slight deviations from the Hebrew order such as xxvii 2 (υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ σύ), xxxiii 21 (ἦλθεν ὁ ἀνασωθεὶς πρὸς μέ), xxxiv 24 (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἄρχων), xxxv 8 (ἐνπλήσω τῶν τραυματιῶν βουνούς), xxxvi 2 (ἡμῖν ἐγενήθη : ? to avoid hiatus): but similar

D d 2

slight deviations occur occasionally in Ez. α and γ.   In the case of the
dependent genitive pronoun it should be noted that the transposed
order is only found intermittently, the position of the pronoun after its
governing noun being quite common even in Ez. β.   Later scribes may
however have replaced the more usual order in some of these passages;
this is generally done in the MSS A and Q in the passages quoted above.

The following are some of the *words and usages common to the α and γ
portions, but absent from the β portion* [1].

*Τὸ αἴθριον (ix, x) [2] (xl, xlvii) [3], ἀπέναντι (i–xxvi, xl, xlii), ἀφηγούμενος
(xi–xxii, xlv ff.), *διπλασιάζειν (xxi 14, xliii 2), ἐγγίζειν (vii–xxiii, xl–xlv:
usu. = קרב), εἰσπορεύεσθαι (viii–xxvi, xlii–xlvi : = בוא), ἐκδύνειν, ἐξαίρειν,
ἐχόμενος -ον -α (i–xi, xlii–xlviii), ἡγούμενος (α⁶ γ⁶), κατά c. gen. (α² γ²), κατέναντι
(i, iii, xi, xl–xlvii), *κόλασις = מכשול (xiv, xviii, xliv), κόμη (α¹ γ¹ : not else
in Prophets), κορυφή = ראש (α² γ¹), τὰ νόμιμα (v–xx, xliii–xliv), ὃν τρόπον
(x–xxv, xl–xlviii), ὅρασις, ὅστις (α² γ⁴ : also once in β ἕως ὅτου = עד), ὄψις,
τὸ παράπαν c. neg. (α⁴ γ² : no Heb. equivalent), παραπικραίνειν, παρέξ, *the
historic present in the phrase πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου (ii–xi, xliii–xliv),
πρόθυρον = פתח (viii–xi, xliii–xlvii), πύλη = שער (viii–xxvi, xl–xlviii),
σκεῦος = כלי (ix–xxvii, xl : ὅπλον in xxxii 27), συντελεῖν usu. = כלה pi.
(iv–xxiii, xlii f. : συντέλεια usu. = כלה is confined to Ez. α, xi–xxii),
τάσσειν = שום or שים (iv–xxiv, xl–xliv), τοῖχος = קיר (iv–xxiii, xl–xliii),
τρισσός = שלש (xxiii, xlii : only twice elsewhere in LXX) and τρισσῶς
(xvi, xli : only 4 times else in LXX), ὑπέρ and ὑπεράνω, ὑποκάτωθεν (ὑποκάτω
in α β γ), ὑπόστασις.   ·

There are also numerous instances, which need not be enumerated, of
words found only in the α portion ; their absence from the γ portion is
due in most cases to the non-occurrence of the Hebrew phrase in the
concluding chapters, where the subject-matter is quite distinct from that
of the rest of the book.

So far I think I may claim to have established that the first twenty-
seven and the last nine chapters have been rendered into Greek by
a single hand, and that a second hand appears in the twelve chapters
xxviii–xxxix.   The list last given includes some quite rare words, the use
of the historic present in one and the same phrase in the middle of
past tenses [2], beside some not uncommon prepositions and other words
which are absent from the middle portion of the book.   The reappearance
of the first style at the close of the book makes untenable, I think, the
hypothesis that the translator laid down his pen for a time and then on
resuming his work adopted a completely different style.

[1] Several of the Hebrew phrases, it is true, are absent from the β portion.   But
this list is merely intended to prove the identity of translators α and γ.

[2] The only other instances of the historic present in this book which I have noted
are viii 16 (προσκυνοῦσιν) and ! xvii 8 (πιαίνεται).

There is only one noteworthy instance of an apparent difference between the portions which I have called *a* and *γ*. This difference is found in the rendering of the Divine name 'the Lord God' (אדני יהוה). This title is characteristic of Ezekiel, in which book it is found in the M. T. no less than 228 times. It appears, however, that in a very large number of these cases the Hebrew which the translators had before them contained only the single word יהוה [1]. The following table will show the LXX renderings according to the A and B texts in the three parts of the book.

	Ez. *a*	Ez. *β*	Ez. *γ*
B *text.*			
	κ̄ς̄ *passim*	κ̄ς̄	κ̄ς̄
	κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ about 15 times or upwards (beginning at xii 10)	κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ 35 times or upwards	
	[(?) κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄ ὑμῶν xx 5, xxi 24, 26]	[ἀδωναὶ κ̄ς̄ in the Pentecostal lesson xxxvi 32, 33, 37]	κ̄ς̄ (ὁ) θ̄ς̄ about 16 times (the article inserted in xliii, xliv, omitted in xlv ff.)
A *text.*			
	ἀδωναὶ κ̄ς̄ 61 times (Hexaplaric). Also κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄ (doublet) (?) κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄ ιηλ	ἀδωναὶ κ̄ς̄ 22 times with the same variations as in *a*	ἀδωναὶ κ̄ς̄ only xlvi 16 κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄ (usually)

The B text is certainly the nearest to the original, and the result of the table is to show that *β* rendered the double name by κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄, *γ* by κ̄ς̄ (ὁ) θ̄ς̄, while *a*, in so far as his Hebrew contained the double name at all, agreed rather with *β* than with *γ* in his rendering of it. The difference in this respect between the earlier and the later portions of the book has, however, been noted already by Cornill, and he has argued that κ̄ς̄ (ὁ) θ̄ς̄ in the last part is the rendering not of יהוה אדני, but of יהוה אלהים, and that Ezekiel by the use of the latter phrase at the end of his book intended to bring his account of the new Jerusalem into connexion with the story of Paradise in the early chapters of Genesis, of which that combination of names is a distinctive feature (*op. cit.* p. 174). If Cornill is right, there is no difference of rendering between *a* and *γ*. In any case there are a few instances in Ezek. *a* (B text) and several in the A text of the rendering κ̄ς̄ ὁ θ̄ς̄, and the phrase is one in which other parts of the

[1] See on this phrase Cornill, *Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel* (1886), pp. 172 ff. In *a* and *γ* together he reckons that Codex B has κ̄ς̄ κ̄ς̄ 58 times only as compared with 201 instances of the double name in the M. T.

LXX show a strange diversity of rendering. Thus in Amos we find
$\overline{\kappa s}$, $\overline{\kappa s}$ $\overline{\kappa s}$, $\overline{\kappa s}$ δ $\overline{\theta s}$, $\overline{\kappa s}$ $\overline{\kappa s}$ δ $\overline{\theta s}$ intermixed in an inextricable fashion.   There
is certainly no reason here sufficient to overthrow the other numerous
reasons which have been put forward to prove that Ezek. a and Ezek. γ
are the work of one and the same hand.

In concluding these somewhat tedious but necessary lists, I must add
yet a further list of the few *instances where a peculiar word or phrase is
common to the a and the β portions*. (There are no noteworthy instances
of coincidence between the β and γ portions.)   The cases of coincidence
between the β portion and the chapters in the a portion earlier than the
twenty-sixth which seem to deserve notice only amount to four or five.
These are *ἁρμονία (xxiii 42, a sort of transliteration of המון, 'a multitude,'
and xxxvii 7, a paraphrastic rendering of עצם, 'a bone'): ἑκάτερος
? = ἕκαστος (i 11 f. and xxxvii 7: N.B. these two a words occur in
immediate proximity in β): *ἐκκενοῦν μάχαιραν, ἐκκ. ῥομφαίαν (v 2, 12, xii 14,
xxviii 7, xxx 11): *πέλτη (xxiii 24, xxvii 10, xxxviii 4 f., xxxix 9): στηρίζειν
τὸ πρόσωπον (a⁸ β⁸: but in xxxv 2 ἐπιστρέφειν τὸ πρόσ.).   These few instances
may be accounted for without difficulty.   More numerous are the
instances of coincidence between the last two chapters of the a portion
(xxvi, xxvii) and the β portion.   We have already noted an instance of
this in the position of the genitive pronoun, and others will be found
above in Table III.   Here may be added ἀνθ' οὗ xxvi 2 B, xxviii 2 B
(the usual phrase is ἀνθ' ὧν, which AQ read here also): ἐνισχύειν xxvii
9 + β⁸: κατακαλύπτειν xxvi 10, 19, xxxii 7, xxxviii 9: *στυγνάζειν = שמם
xxvii 35, xxviii 19 AQ (B στενάζειν), xxxii 10: συναγωγή = קהל (rendered
ὄχλος in xvi, xvii, xxiii) xxvi, xxvii, xxxii–xxxviii: *χρηστός (λίθος) = יקר
xxvii 22 B (ἐκλεκτός A), xxviii 13.   Were it not for the more striking
examples given in Table III, notably exx. 1 and 3 (the name of Tyre),
indicating that the division comes at the end of chapter xxvii, it might
be thought that we should rather place it at the end of chapter xxv.
The true explanation of this mixture of the two vocabularies in xxvi and
xxvii (to which a close parallel is to be traced in the central chapters
of Jeremiah) appears rather to be something like this.   The second
translator, before beginning his own work, read over the last portion of
the work of his predecessor, starting not unnaturally at the opening
of the denunciation upon Tyre, the translation of which had been left
for him to complete.   While reading over these pages, he introduced
some corrections of his own ; in particular, he was something of a stylist
with a nice ear for order of words, and objected to the too frequent
conclusion of a clause with a genitive pronoun.   In these cases he
improved the rhythm of the sentence by a slight transposition.

It must not be supposed that either of the translators is entirely
consistent in his renderings.   Exact consistency, such as was aimed at

by the revisers of our English Authorised Version of the N. T., must not be expected. I have already noted and suggested an explanation of some inconsistencies in the closing chapters of Ezek. *a*. A similar diversity of rendering may possibly be detected in its opening chapters, as also in the opening chapters of Jer. *a*. At any rate it is only in the opening of Ezek. *a* that we meet with ἐὰν ἄρα (= אם : ii 5, 7, iii 11 *bis*), ἀριστερός (i 10, iv 4, but also in xxxix 3 : εὐώνυμος in xvi 46, xxi 16), βαδίζειν (= הלך : i 9, iii 4, 11 : elsewhere πορεύεσθαι in *a* and *β*, including i and iii).

In Ez. *β* there is one section where the Greek markedly stands out from that of its immediate context. It is the passage containing God's promise to give His people a new heart in place of their stony heart (xxxvi 24–38). I shall refer to this section as *ββ*. The following are the distinctive features which I have noted in it.

xxxvi 24 ἀθροίσω = קבץ pi. The Greek word occurs here only in Ezek. For the renderings of the Hebrew word in *a* and *β* see Table III, 14. The Hebrew is rendered by ἀθροίζειν in Theodotion and Symmachus in Ezek. xx 34, and in other books of the LXX in α′ σ′ θ′.

Ib. γαιῶν = ארצות. Γαῖα here only in Ezekiel: the plur. of ארץ is elsewhere rendered by χῶραι. But α′σ′θ′ have ἐν ταῖς γαίαις in Ezek. xxix 12.

32 ἀδωναὶ Κύριος B^ab mg (κύριος Κύριος B*, κύριος ὁ θεός A), 33 and 37 ἀδωναὶ Κύριος B (κύριος ὁ θεός and κύριος Κύριος ὁ θεός A) = אדני יהוה. Throughout Ezek. *a* and *β* the constant rendering of the Hebrew phrase in Cod. B is, as we have seen, κύριος Κύριος. Here only does this MS introduce the Hexaplaric rendering. 'Αδωναὶ Κύριος is the rendering of α′σ′θ′ in Ezek. vii 5, xviii 23 : in ii 4 θ′ has ἀδωναὶ ΠΙΠΙ.

34 ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅτι = תחת אשר. The ordinary Greek phrase in Ezekiel for 'because' is the simple ἀνθ᾽ ὧν : the compound phrase only occurs again in the LXX in Deut. xxviii 62 and twice each in 2 and 4 Kingdoms, where it is perhaps a Hexaplaric intrusion. It is used by Theodotion, e. g. in Jer. xxxvi 19, 25.

34 παροδεύοντος B (διοδεύοντος A) = עבר. Παροδεύειν is not used again in the translated books of the LXX : but it renders עבר in σ′ e. g. in Ezek. xxxiii 28. Διοδεύειν (not attested in α′σ′θ′) is similarly used in the LXX in Ezek. v 14, xiv 15 and elsewhere : πάροδος (= παροδίτης) occurs in Ezek. xvi 15, 25.

35 κῆπος τρυφῆς = עדן גן. Κῆπος does not occur again in Ezek., which uses παράδεισος instead (xxviii 13, xxxi 8 *bis*, 9). Κῆπος is, however, the rendering of θ′ in Ezek. xxviii 13 and of α′θ′ in xxxi 8.

38 γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ (A ἐγώ εἰμι) Κύριος. The omission of εἰμι in cod. B is contrary to the regular practice of Ezek. *β* (Table III, 2). Contrast,

just before the section ββ, xxxvi 23, and, just after it, xxxvii 6, 13 (in 14 there should be no stop after the first Κύριος).

In this section then, in the text of the Vatican MS, we appear to have a clear case of the influence of some other version, resembling that of Theodotion. It had occurred to me that the appearance of this fragment of another version in the middle of the LXX might be due to *lectionary usage*, and it is satisfactory to discover some confirmation for this conjecture. In a Lectionary in the British Museum of about the eleventh century (Add. 11841 = Gregory Lect. Apost. 79) I find on fol. 47ᵛᵒ the passage Ezek. xxxvi 24–28 given as the third of three lessons for evensong on the day of Pentecost. The two lessons which precede it are taken from Numb. xi 16–29 and Joel ii 23–32 [1]. The Ezekiel passage opens with the introductory formula Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, which takes the place of the first καί in verse 24. Otherwise the text agrees with that of Codex Vaticanus save for slight differences, viz. γενεῶν for γαιῶν in verse 24 (so H. and P. 26 and 36), καθαρὸν ὕδωρ for ὕδ. καθ. in 25, ἐν omitted in 26. Only the first five out of the fifteen verses make up the lesson : but doubtless the practice varied, and the following ten verses were sometimes read. Indeed it appears that the whole passage with eight more verses at the beginning (Ezek. xxxvi 16–38) was read at a very early time as a lesson in the Jewish synagogue [2]. The reading of a prophetical lesson or Haphtara is considered by critics to have been begun in the time of the Maccabees : at the end of every three verses a translation in the language of the country was given. Is it too bold to conjecture that a very early version of this section, resembling that of Theodotion [3], and used for lectionary purposes in the Jewish synagogue, was incorporated by the translators ? An alternative, but (to my mind) a less satisfactory suggestion, is that the version of Theodotion, or one resembling it, was used in the lessons of the *Christian* Church, and that in some unexplained way the lesson for Pentecost has in this passage supplanted the older version of the translators. The conjecture here made may possibly throw light on other cases of mixture of texts in the LXX.

[1] In our Prayer-book Ez. xxxvi 25-end is an alternative lesson for the evening of Whit-Sunday. The passages from Numbers and Joel are read on the Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun-week.

[2] See the art. ' Haftara ' in Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, ii p. 337. The lesson is given as the one read ' am Sabbat-Para ' (which seems to be the second sabbath before the Passover). The use of three lessons from the O. T., and none from the N. T., on the evening of Pentecost, as attested in the British Museum Lectionary, appears to have come down from a time when the Old Testament was the only source from which lessons were drawn.

[3] We know that for some books of the O. T. such a version existed in pre-Christian times.

We must return from this unique section to the consideration of the main divisions of the Greek book, which, as we have seen, falls into three parts. There is the break at the end of xxvii and the break at the end of xxxix. The second of these breaks coincides with a distinct change in subject-matter. There·is an interval of over twelve years between the date given in xl 1 and the last date previously mentioned (xxxiii 21). The description of the Temple must at all times have been regarded as a distinct section, and may have at one time formed a separate book[1].

The case as regards the other dividing-line is different. The two chapters which close Ezek. *a*, and the one which opens Ezek. *β*, all three being concerned with Tyre, would seem to be inseparable parts of a single whole. There is no break in the subject-matter[2]. We are not, however, without manuscript evidence for this point being regarded, for whatever reason, as one where a fresh departure is made. The Codex Marchalianus contains two early chapter-numberings in this book. According to one of these arrangements (found also in Cod. Vaticanus) the book is divided into fifty-six parts, according to the other into twenty-five τόμοι. The end of our chapter xxvii coincides with the close of a section in both these arrangements. According to one system Ezek. *a* contains thirty-three sections or chapters, according to the other thirteen. Moreover, in this MS the last words of chapter xxvii are followed by two slanting lines, apparently indicating a pause. It will be noted that, with the division into twenty-five τόμοι, a break at the end of the thirteenth represents the nearest possible division of the book into two parts containing an equal number of τόμοι.

It appears, then, that the break at the end of Ezekiel xxvii represents a division of the book into two nearly equal parts, made without strict regard to subject-matter. If we turn back again to Jeremiah, we are struck by the fact that there too the break comes nearly at the halfway point. If we take the pages of the Cambridge manual edition of the LXX and those of the R. V. (minion 8vo, 1885) as a test, we get the following result :

[1] Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, art. 'Ezekiel' (i 818) : 'This remarkable prophecy [xxxviii f.], representing the utmost limit of E[zekiel]'s prophetic vision, has the appearance of being intended as a conclusion to the book. This fact, taken in connexion with the long period of silence which follows, and a certain change of view manifested in xl ff., strongly suggests that the first edition of the prophecies really ended here, the remaining section having been added afterwards as an appendix.'

[2] One small section, however (xxix 17–21), dated 'in the seven and twentieth year,' and recognizing error in a previous prediction (xxvi 12), is clearly later than the rest. The dates given in Ezekiel are i 1 (the thirtieth year), i 2 (fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity), viii 1 (sixth year), xx 1 (seventh), xxiv 1 (ninth), xxvi 1 (eleventh), xxix 1 (tenth, LXX twelfth), xxix 17 (twenty-seventh), xxxi 1 (eleventh), xxxii 1 and 17 (twelfth), xxxiii 21 (twelfth 'of our captivity'), xl 1 (twenty-fifth 'of our captivity').

$$\begin{cases} \text{Jer. } a & = 66 \text{ pp. Camb. LXX} = 23\frac{1}{2} \text{ pp. R.V.} \\ \text{Jer. } \beta + \gamma = 60 \text{ ,,} \quad\quad \text{,,} \quad\quad = 21\frac{1}{2} \text{ ,, ,,} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{Ez. } a & = 58 \text{ ,,} \quad\quad \text{,,} \quad\quad = 21\frac{1}{2} \text{ ,, ,,} \\ \text{Ez. } \beta + \gamma = 53 \text{ ,,} \quad\quad \text{,,} \quad\quad = 19\frac{1}{4} \text{ ,, ,,} \end{cases}$$

The coincidence can hardly be accidental. It suggests that the translators of these two books were guided by the same principle in the apportionment of their work : and if that is the case, it is further suggested that the translations were parts of a common undertaking, and were made at the same time. In the case of Ezekiel, as we find that one and the same hand has translated the beginning and the end of the book, while a second hand intervenes in the middle, it becomes practically certain that these two Ezekiel translators were contemporaries. And the same is probably true of Jeremiah. The parallel between the two cases leads me now to abandon the suggestion, previously made, that there may have been an interval of time between the translations of Jer. a and Jer. β.

We arrive at the result, then, that with a view to expediting the translation of these two prophetical books, each book was divided into two parts, and two translators were set on to the work simultaneously. Whether the translators already found a break in the middle of their Hebrew texts, in other words, whether the Hebrew books were transcribed on two separate rolls[1], must remain doubtful. I have given some reasons for believing that such was the case in Jeremiah. The translator who undertook the earlier part of each book appears to have been the recognized leader and the more competent of the two. In Jeremiah we have seen that the second worker was lacking in skill and knowledge[2]. Towards the end of his work we may perhaps trace indications of a revision by the first hand. In Ezekiel, although the second hand is not so markedly inferior to the first, it is to be noticed that the first translator took to himself the hardest portions of the book, namely the chariot-vision in the first chapter, and the final section which I have called γ. These portions were, as Jerome tells us, considered so obscure that a Jew was not allowed to read them until he had reached his thirtieth year[3].

[1] Some interesting remarks as to the influence of the length of the roll on the division of Biblical books are to be found in Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur bibl. Litt.* (Strassburg, 1902).

[2] Witness his employment of Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew, where he was ignorant of the meaning of the latter. Αἶδε, οἶδε represent הדר (xxxi 33, xxxii 16) ; κειράδας = קיר חרש (xxxi 31, 36) ; τιμωρίαν = המדורים ('guideposts,' xxxviii 21) ; ἴως ᾄδου = הוי ארן (xli 5, rightly rendered οἴμοι κύριε in xxii 18).

[3] Ep. liii ad Paulinum, ' Tertius [the third of the greater prophets] principia et finem tantis habet obscuritatibus involuta ut apud Hebraeos istae partes cum exordio Geneseos ante annos triginta non legantur.' The same statement is repeated in the short preface to his Commentary on Ezekiel.

It appears, after all, so far at least as these two books are concerned, that there is some truth in the statement of Epiphanius[1] that *the translators worked in pairs*. The greater part of the story told by that Father[2] of the translation and the cells is wildly extravagant and improbable. But his statements with regard to the pairs of translators deserve quotation. They were, he says, shut up two and two in thirty-six cells (ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἓξ οἰκίσκοις, ζυγὴ ζυγὴ κατὰ οἰκίσκον) : the cells were double (διπλοῦς τε αὐτοὺς ποιήσας δύο δύο ἐνέκλεισεν): each pair had two servants to cook for them, and shorthand writers, and so on. Then comes the noteworthy statement that *to every pair was assigned one book* : ἑκάστῃ δὲ ζυγῇ βίβλος μία ἐπεδίδοτο, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἡ βίβλος τῆς τοῦ κόσμου Γενέσεως μιᾷ ζυγῇ, ἡ Ἔξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῇ ἄλλῃ ζυγῇ, τὸ Λευιτικὸν τῇ ἄλλῃ καὶ καθεξῆς ἄλλη βίβλος τῇ ἄλλῃ. He goes on to say that each Hebrew book was circulated in turn to every pair (κατὰ περίοδον ἑκάστῃ ζυγῇ ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐπιδιδόμεναι), so that thirty-six independent renderings of the whole Bible were produced, which were found to agree in the minutest details ! In spite of the fabulous accretions which are attached to it, it certainly looks as if in the statement that 'to each pair was assigned one book' we have a tradition, with an element of truth in it, which survived into the fourth century. How far the statement may be applicable to other books of the Greek Bible is a question which awaits further investigation.

H. St. J. Thackeray.

ON SOME EARLY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE
GREGORIANUM.

The notes on which the following paper is based were taken during the first half of the year 1895, a considerable portion of which was devoted to a minute examination of the mass-books of an earlier date than the tenth century in the Vatican Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and at Cambrai. The object was personal : viz., if possible to satisfy my mind in regard to a certain number of questions on the answers to which must depend the history of public worship and sacred rites in Western Europe from the sixth century to the tenth. As, for instance, these : (1) is it possible to recognize with certainty the *Gregorianum* in the actual state in which it was sent by Pope Hadrian to Charles, and to define with exactness its contents ? (2) If so, what

---

[1] Dr. Redpath recalled the story to my mind.
[2] In *De mens. et pond.* 3 ff. A fragment only of the story is quoted by Wendland in his edition of Aristeas, p. 139.