

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\_jts-os\_01.php

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

### THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

# THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF THE PROPHETICAL BOOKS.

IN preceding numbers of the JOURNAL<sup>1</sup> I have given reasons for believing that the task of translating the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel into Greek was in each case divided between two translators. The striking fact that the break in each book comes at nearly the halfway point suggested that this division of labour was the result of the collaboration of two *contemporary* translators. It must, however, be admitted that another explanation is not impossible, namely that the earliest Greek version of both books was an incomplete one, which was afterwards supplemented by another worker. The question as to which of these views is correct could only be decided by the discovery of some sure linguistical criteria for distinguishing a Greek translation made in the second century B.C. from a translation belonging to one of the succeeding centuries.

May we equate any of the four hands which we have traced in these two books? The second hand in Jeremiah (Jer.  $\beta$ ) and the second hand in Ezekiel (Ez.  $\beta$ ) each present certain distinctive features of their own, and can certainly not be equated, nor (apart from the reappearance of Jer.  $\beta$  in the book of Baruch) is there any trace of either of these two hands elsewhere in the prophetical books of the Greek Bible. But the earlier portion of the Greek Jeremiah (Jer. a) and the remaining portion of Ezekiel (Ez. a and  $\gamma$ ) together with the version of the Minor Prophets show a considerable affinity in their vocabulary, which renders it not improbable that they were all produced at about the same time, if not actually by one and the same hand.

In dealing with large groups of books such as this, it is difficult to *prove* identity of translators. All that can be attempted here is to show that these books or portions of books have very many details in common, and that as translations they are sharply distinguished from the Greek Isaiah.

33. omne benedictione celeste Gell; omnem? benedictionem S. 34. de multitudinem Gell. 33. Anastasia cum ('et' added by another hand) Ang. 36. prestes R. 37. Before Lord's Prayer, rubric: Orat, R. 38. Before 'Libera nos,' rubric: Sequitur oratio, Ang; Item sequitur oratio, S, Gell.

The following, though not unica, must also be mentioned here: 39. 'nt' omitted before 'placatus accipias,' R, 2296. 40. dispone (for 'dispons') R and Sacr. Godelgaud (see Ménard, Notae, p. 15, Migne P. L. lxxviii 276). 41. Simile modo Bo, Gell. 42. novi acterni testamenti, R, S, Gell (and Bergamo MS of Ambros.). 43. effunditur Bo, Gell. 44. pracclarae majestatis Bo, Gell, 45. benedices et praestas, Bo, Gell. 46. opem misericordiae, Bo, Gell. <sup>1</sup> J. T. S. vol. iv, pp. 245 fl., 398 fl.



With regard to the Minor Prophets, the discovery of the two hands in Jeremiah and the two in Ezekiel had led me to expect to find a similar division of labour in this group also. In this, however, I have been disappointed. The Greek versions of the Minor Prophets are linked together by the recurrence in the opening and closing books and throughout the collection of certain rare words and usages. I have failed to detect any clear indication of the work of more than one hand. The following are some instances of words and uses which occur in more than one of the Minor Prophets but not elsewhere in the LXX. 'Amooralágeur (Am.<sup>1</sup> Jl.<sup>1</sup>):  $dpern = \exists n \pmod{2} (\text{Hb.}^1 \text{ Zech.}^1)$ :  $duenter = \forall n \pmod{2} (\text{Am.}^1 \text{ Hb.}^1 \text{ Hg.}^1)$ :  $\pi p d \pi u \sqrt{2} (\text{Am.}^1 \text{ Zeph.}^1)$ :  $\sigma k o \pi d \sqrt{2} (\text{Am.}^1 \text{ Mal.}^1)$ —kordulaupdes (Zeph.<sup>1</sup>):  $\pi p d \pi u \sqrt{2} (\text{Am.}^1 \text{ Zeph.}^1)$ :  $\pi d w \sqrt{2} (\text{Am.}^1 \text{ Zech.}^1)$ .

A noteworthy connecting link between the versions of Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets is found in their rendering of the Divine name 'Lord of hosts' (THEN 22 MITH), a phrase in the rendering of which a well-marked distinction in the books of the LXX may be observed. It is rendered (1) Kúpuos  $\sigma \alpha\beta\alpha\omega\theta$  in 1 Kings (five times), and Isaiah (about fifty-seven times)<sup>1</sup>, (2) Kúpuos  $\tau\omega\nu$  duráµew in the Psalms (passim) and in some few passages elsewhere, (3) Kúpuos Ilaurospárwp in Jeremiah (in both parts, about fifteen times in all: in numerous instances the phrase 'Lord of hosts' occurs in the Hebrew where it is omitted in the Greek), the Minor Prophets (Hos. Am. Mic. Na. Hab. Zeph. Hag. Zech. Mal.), in some few passages in 2 and 3 Kings and 1 Chron., and in the Greek books. The Hebrew phrase, it should be noted, is absent from Ezekiel. In this case, it will be seen, Jeremiah a and  $\beta$  are not distinguished from each other.

I have already in Table I in my first paper<sup>a</sup> noted several instances where the first portion of Jeremiah agrees in its renderings with Ezekiel (the agreement is usually confined to Ezekiel a and  $\gamma$ ) and the Minor Prophets. Thus, in the second of the instances there quoted, we find that the two words radorw and adawayds occur frequently in Jeremiah a, Ezekiel (a and  $\gamma$ ) and the Minor Prophets as the renderings of two not uncommon Hebrew words, but are unrepresented in Isaiah. This mutual agreement of Jer. a, Ezek. a and  $\gamma$ , Min. Prophets, and the exclusion of Isaiah from this group may be attested by numerous examples. As I have said, I think that it points to the translation of the group being a single undertaking, that is to say, the translations were made at one time, and, if not by a single translator, at any rate by a small group of collaborateurs. It is probable, as will be shown later,

<sup>1</sup> Also in Jos. vi 17 B (Heb. simply mm), Zech. xiii 2 (om. σaβ. AQ), Jer. xxvi 10 AQ (om. σaβ. BN).

<sup>9</sup> Vol. iv, pp. 247 ff.

that the version of Isaiah had been already made, and that the rest i the prophetical group or the bulk of it was then translated *en bloc*. It s quite possible that a closer examination than I have yet made will rever divergences of rendering within the group, but the general agreement is, I think, unmistakable.

The following table contains a selection of some of the most striking examples where Jer. a, Ezek. a and  $\gamma$ , and Min. Prophets or two of these three books (the Minor Prophets in the Greek must, as was said, be treated as a single book) stand alone <sup>1</sup>, or nearly alone in their rendering of a Hebrew word or phrase, or in their employment of the same Greek word <sup>3</sup>.

#### Table IV.

(a) Jer. a Ezek. a and y and Minor Prophets.

1. 555 draσώζειν (ol draσωζόμενοι). Jer.<sup>4</sup> chaps. xxvi, xrvī. xxviii [li 14] (Lam.<sup>1</sup>): Ezek.<sup>8</sup> (a<sup>t</sup> β<sup>i</sup>): Min.<sup>τ</sup> (Am. Jl Ob. Zech.).

The Greek word occurs elsewhere in Hist. books', Maccab.<sup>3</sup> The Heb. is rendered elsewhere by σώζευ, duσώζευ and (Psalms) ρύεσθαι.

2. Heb. <sup>\*</sup>διεκβολή. Jer.<sup>1</sup> (xii 12): Ez. γ<sup>3</sup>: Min.<sup>3</sup> (Ob. Zech). various The verb occurs in Joshua.

3. 729 elodéxeoda. Jer. a<sup>1</sup>: Ez. a<sup>6</sup>: Min.<sup>6</sup> (Hos. Mi. Hb. Zeph. Zech.). Only else in Greek books.

- 4. USU. TPD éxôixeûr. Jer.  $a^{16}$  (to xxviii 52): Ez.  $a^{10}$  (to xxv 12): or DDP Min.<sup>91</sup> The verb is not common in other translated books. Is. has it once only  $(=2^{10})$ .
- 5. misc.: in ενθύμημα. Jer.  $a^{2}$ : Ez. a passim  $\gamma^{2}$ : Mal<sup>1</sup> Else only Ezek. I Ch.<sup>1</sup>,  $\Psi^{1}$ , Sir. είστα
- 6. μτ' έπιγινώσκειν. See Table III 2.

<sup>1</sup> These instances are indicated by an asterisk.

\* It will be seen that Lamentations agrees with this group in some renderings. Both the recent Bible dictionaries (s.v. 'Lamentations') assert that this book cannot have been translated by the 'translator of Jeremiah.' The original authority for this statement is Nöldeke (*Die alttest. Literatur*, 1868, p. 144). The only reason which he gives is that 'die [Uebersetzung] der Klagelieder ist recht wörtlich, die des Jeremia frei und sehr nachlässig,' and this dictum is unsupported by any examples. I was at first inclined to think that Lamentations might belong to the group containing Jeremiah a. So far as vocabulary goes, they have a certain amount in common: witness the use of  $d\pi \delta \sigma m \sigma \mu a$ ,  $d\pi \mu \rho \partial \sigma \theta a$ ,  $d\rho a \sigma l(ev, e \rho \sigma \sigma f s, a a \sigma f s, and$  $the rendering of powe by <math>\beta d\rho m$  (Jeremiah a uses  $d\mu \rho o \delta \sigma m and <math>\theta e \mu e \lambda a \sigma$ ), now lead me to think that the Greek of Lamentations is the work of another and a later hand.

7. usu.	epastris. Jer. a <sup>6</sup> (Lam. <sup>1</sup> ) Ez. a <sup>6</sup> : Hos. <sup>6</sup> Also twice in
pi. אהב	Wisdom.
8. No Heb.	τό παράπαν. Jer. a <sup>1</sup> (vii 4 with oùr): Ez. a <sup>4</sup> $\gamma^3$ (with
	$\mu \eta$ ): Zeph. <sup>1</sup> (iii 6). Also in 3 K. xi 10.
9. usu. חתת	<b>TTOE</b> $i\nu$ . Jer. $a^{14}$ (to xxviii 56): Ez. $a^3$ ( $\beta^1$ cod. A):
	Min. <sup>6</sup> (Am. Ob. Hb.). Also in Is. <sup>1</sup> , and in a few other
	isolated passages. Cf. anrógros, Jer. xxvi 28, xxvii 2.
נאון .0	φρύαγμα. Jer. a <sup>1</sup> (xii 5 φρ. τοῦ 'Ιορδάνου: contrast ἐκ
	μέσου τοῦ 'Ιορδάνου xxix 20): Ez. a <sup>2</sup> : Min. <sup>2</sup> (Hos. iv 18,
	Zech. xi 3 to pp. toù 'Iopôdrou).
	Other renderings $\delta\beta\rho_{1}$ s Jer. xiii 9, xxxi 29, Ez. $\beta^4$ ,
	Min. <sup>10</sup> , &c. : inepnpavia? Jer. xxxi 29, Ez. a <sup>3</sup> , Min. <sup>1</sup> , &c.
	· · · · · · ·
	(b) Jer. a and Ezekiel.
11.	βελόστασις. J. xxviii 27: Ez. a <sup>4</sup> . Also in 1 Macc. <sup>2</sup>
רכב 12.	*iππάζεσθαι. J. xxvii 42 : Ez. a <sup>3</sup> . Heb. usu. rendered
	drußalveur, as in Min. Proph., and (with dopara) twice in
	Jer. a. Cf. innaoía below.
13.	*πελυξ. J. xxiii 29 (A πέλεκυς): Ez. ix 2. Elsewhere,
t	including J. XXII 7, méderus.
שלמים 14	φαρέτρα. J. xxviii 11: Ez. xxvii 11. See Streane,
	Double text, p. 296. The Greek renders other Heb.
	words elsewhere.
of armour.'	
	J. xxxi 18 : Ez. vii 17, xxi 7.)
	(c) Jer. a and Minor Prophets.
15.	draznpaireir. J. xxvii 27: Hos. xiii 15 [Sir."].
ערב 16.	ήδύνειν τινι (' to please '). J. vi 20 (al θυσίαι) = Hos. ix
-	4 (al $\theta v \sigma$ .). Elsewhere the verb occurs seven times with
	the accusative or in the passive.
מרכבה) 17.	*innasía. J. viii 16: Hab. iii 8. Cf. Innásesbas
1. (	above.
18.	το 'Ιταβύριον'. J. xxvi 18: Hos. v 1. So in Josephus
	τό 'Ιταβύριον δρος: elsewhere in LXX Θαβώρ.
19.	Κύριος Παιτοκράτωρ. See above.
בור 20.	$\mu \alpha \chi \eta \tau \eta s$ . Jer. a <sup>9</sup> : Min. <sup>9</sup> Else only Jd. A <sup>1</sup> , I Ch. <sup>1</sup>
	Other renderings are yiyas Ez. $\beta$ &c., duratos passim,
	οτιτέι Tenderings are γιγα Ε.Σ. β α.C., συναιος passim, Ισχυρός Jer. a and β & C., κραταιός, δυνάμενος, δπηρμένος.
27 1000	λήμμα. Jer. $a^7$ (Lam. <sup>1</sup> ): Min. <sup>7</sup> (Na. Hb. Hg. Zech.
21. NUD	Mal.). Also in 2 K. <sup>1</sup> , 4 K. <sup>3</sup> , Job <sup>1</sup> . Not in Isaiah, which
	has δρασιε (κατά), τὸ δραμα, τὸ ῥῆμα (τὸ κατά).

has δρασιs (κατά), τὸ δραμα, τὸ ῥημα (τὸ κατά). <sup>1</sup> The mountain in Palestine is called 'Αταβύρισν in Polybius v 70 6. This form of the name indicates a connexion between the Hellenized form of Tabor and mount Atabyris or Atabyrium in Rhodes.

## 582 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

22. נרוד 'a troop'	= ληστής in J. xviii 22 and Hos. vii 1 only. The Heb. is rendered in a variety of ways elsewhere : γedding, ifodia, μονόζωνος, πειρατής (Hos. vi 9), πειρατήριον, σύστρεμμα,
23.	&c. With *πνευματοφορείσθαι, J. ii 24 cf. *πνευματοφόρις. Hos. ix 7, Zeph. iii 4.
24.	*σμίλαξ. J. xxvi 14 (DETE): Na. i 10 (DEND).
25. <b>תא</b> נה	*συκών. J. v 17: Am. iv 10. Elsewhere, including J. viii 13, Min. <sup>10</sup> , συκή.
26.	(d) Ezekiel a and γ and Minor Prophets. * dποκωφοῦν. Εz. iii 26, xxiv 27: Mic. vii 16. Eke- where κωφεύειν, κωφοῦν Ψ. <sup>9</sup> , κωφός Ψ. Is., αλαλος <del>Υ</del> . <sup>9</sup> , άφωνος Is. <sup>9</sup>
27.	eκοτρέφειν. Ez. a <sup>s</sup> : Min. <sup>s</sup> (Am. Zech.). Only else in Deut. <sup>1</sup>
28. <b>הבו</b> ח	άκφυσῶν. Ez. α <sup>3</sup> : Min. <sup>3</sup> (Hg. Mal.). Else only twice in Greek books.
29.	καθόλου. Ez. <sup>3</sup> (τό κ. μή): Am. <sup>4</sup> [Ex. <sup>1</sup> , Dan. <sup>1</sup> ].
30.	peremplier. Ez. a <sup>4</sup> : Min. <sup>9</sup> (Mic. Ob.). Else 9 <sup>1</sup> Gk books <sup>3</sup> .
31.	μνησικακείν. Ez. a <sup>1</sup> : Min. <sup>s</sup> (Jl. Zech.). Else Gen <sup>1</sup> Prov. <sup>1</sup>
32.	* mapoiseo fa. Ez. xx 38: Zech. ix 12. Cf. encourses
	Ez. vi 14 (Lam. <sup>1</sup> ¥ <sup>1</sup> ).
פרב 33. סרר	*парыстран. Ez. ii 6: Hos. iv 16.
34.	*тенна. Ez. 7 <sup>11</sup> (= ПСК): Hos. <sup>1</sup>
35.	συμφύρεσθαι. Εz. a <sup>1</sup> : Hos. <sup>1</sup> [Sir. <sup>1</sup> ].

This positive evidence may be supplemented by a certain amount of negative evidence, namely the absence from this group of books of such common words as  $\kappa a \theta \dot{a}$  (one doubtful instance in Ez. a and one in Jonah), oùr,  $\pi a u \dot{d} i \sigma$ ,  $\pi d \lambda u$  (one instance in Jer. a),  $\pi a \rho a \gamma \dot{u} \sigma \sigma \partial a$ ,  $\pi a \dot{u} \epsilon u$  (one instance at the end of Jer. a),  $\pi \sigma r \dot{c}$ ,  $\sigma u \sigma \tau \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon u$ .

In some instances Jeremiah a diverges from the group, and Ezeke' and the Minor Prophets seem to be somewhat more closely related to each other than they are to Jeremiah. Thus, the following, which are used in common by Ez. a and  $\gamma$  and the Minor Prophets, are absent from Jer. a:  $i\chi \phi\mu\nu\nu\sigma (-\sigma -a)$ , sarérarr, by  $r\mu\phi\sigma\sigma\sigma$ ,  $i\pi\epsilon\rho\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma$ .

The instances given above in Table IV may not in themselves be sufficient to establish identity of translators. Some of them might be due to imitation. I think, however, that the general agreement in vocabulary existing in these prophetical books affords strong cumulative evidence that we have here another group<sup>1</sup> answering to that earlier group of the five books of the Greek Pentateuch for which the earliest tradition and all intrinsic evidence indicate a common origin.

As to the position of the Greek Isaiah, its rendering of 'Lord of hosts' is sufficient by itself to distinguish it from the group which we have been considering. The translator is, moreover, less competent on the whole than the translator or translators of the Ieremiah group<sup>3</sup>. though he tries to hide his ignorance by paraphrase or abbreviation. occasionally giving the general sense of a passage, while omitting to render the difficult words. Such deliberate deviation from the original is quite foreign to the translators of the other prophetical books, who honestly, although often with little success, try to find an equivalent for every word in the Hebrew. On the other hand, the Isaiah translator. while careless about producing a literal rendering, employs a Greek which much more nearly approaches the classical style than the Greek of the more painstaking translators of the other prophetical books. This may be illustrated by his use of connecting particles. Kai, dé, yéo are freely inserted, where there is no corresponding Hebrew word : we may note also the use of ral rir, diore rir (iii 8), rolrur (iii 10, V 13), rolrur διά τοῦτο (XXVII 4), rũr để (XXXVII 28), άλλά rũr (iii 13), τοιγαροῦr (V 26), οὐ yao ... allá (v 24). The greater ease of style, and the tendency to give a free rather than a verbatim rendering, are, I think, marks of a comparatively early date. Another characteristic of the Isaiah translation. which perhaps also points to an early date, is the agreement which it shows in some of its renderings with the book of Exodus. An ephah is rendered by *µirpa tola* only in Ex. xvi 36 and Is. v to; " (usually rendered mápousos or mpoornavros) is represented by the strange word yupas (yuppas) only in Ex. xii 19 (ii 22, Philo, De Confus. Ling. 17) and Is. xiv 1; the anthropomorphism by which Jehovah is called 'a man of war' is avoided by the same paraphrase ourpifor nolipous in Ex. xv 3, Is. xlii 12. Cf. also the use of the words then and corruptor, and the phrase els ror aliera xporror (Ex. xiv 13, Is. seven times). With Genesis the Isaiah translator uses Kórdu and ouraywyn uduros (Is. xix 6, xxxvii 25, Gen. i o) 3.

Further results may, I believe, be obtained in the grouping of the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ryle says, on the other hand, 'The only considerable portion of the translation done at the same time and by the same hands is the Pentateuch' (*Canon of the O. T.*, pp. 146 f.).

\* Swete, Introd. to O. T., p. 316.

\* A characteristic phrase of the Isaiah translator is  $\mu \kappa \rho \delta s$  and  $\mu \delta \gamma \sigma s$  (dard  $\mu \kappa \rho \rho \delta$  for  $\mu \epsilon \gamma \sigma \delta \lambda \sigma v$ ). He seems to have recourse to this when in doubt as to the meaning of the Hebrew. It occurs as the equivalent of five different Hebrew phrases (ix 14 (13), xxii 5, 24, xxxiii 4, 19), none of these being the common you which the Greek phrase ordinarily renders in other parts of the LXX.

books of the LXX by a careful study of their style and vocabulary. As an instance of this I should like, in concluding this note, w mention that, just as the Greek Isaiah stands apart from the other prophetical books, so I Kingdoms seems to stand apart from the other three Books of Kingdoms and the Book of Judges. Although owing to a large admixture of Hexaplaric readings<sup>1</sup>, it is difficult to arrive at the earliest text in these books, and there is no clear endence of so close a connexion as appears to exist between the later prophetical books, yet there are certain features common to, and practically confined to Id., 2, 3 and 4 Kingdoms, in which, as in other respects, they are distinguished from I Kingdoms. Thus, the peculiar use of in ein (='>) before a finite verb (in in around and the like is practically confined to Id. (B text five times, A text once), Ruth, 2 K. (seven times : also vii 29 ov el el alanoas), 3 K. (once), 4 K. (three times)<sup>2</sup>. Reparing for 'trumpet' ("Bild") is confined to Jd. (B and A texts ten times), 2 K. (four times), 3 K. (three times), 4 K. (once), 2 Ch. A text (once), and Nehemiah (twice); whereas ordarry is used in I K, and elsewhere. The same combination is seen in the use of the superlative portioners (לבד) with the sense of the positive ; it is confined to Id. (once), 2 K. (thrice), 3 K. (five times), 4 K. (twice), and 2 Chron. vi 30 A. 1 Kingdoms uses µoros, which is found along with partirates in 2, 3 and 4 K. Note also the use of the following in 1 K .: Bienes (= DUN 'guilt-offering'), the transliteration yeddovio (= 112: 2, 3, 4 K. render by poróforos, ifodia, ovorpeppa), ducafeir and ducaory's (Der: Id. Ruth, 2, 3, 4 K., &c., use spiner, spirns), the adjective Doupo's to render '(sons of) Belial' (maparopos in Dt., Id., 2, 3 K., &c.). Many of the renderings in Id., 2, 3, 4 K. mentioned above find attestation in some part of the Hexapla. I should be inclined to say that the original Greek of these books, when all due allowance has been made for the subsequent intrusion of Hexaplaric readings, was akin in many respects to that of the later Greek versions (Aquila, &c.), and that the versions of these historical books were made at a comparatively late date. I Kingdoms represents the first attempt to translate 'the earlier prophets' (DWD) ראשונים), as the Greek Isaiah exhibits the first attempted rendering of the later prophets' (נביאים אחרונים). It is curious to note that it is only in these two books that the Divine title יהוה צבאות is consistently represented by Κύριος σαβαώθ.

<sup>a</sup> Also Job xxxiii 31, Ez. xxxvi 36 A.

<sup>8</sup>  $\Sigma \delta \lambda \pi \eta \xi$  in 2 K. ii 28, vi 15; *separing* in 2 K. xv 10, xviii 16, xx 1, 22. There is other evidence for a distinction between the earlier and later portions of the book.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A striking instance is seen in 3 Kingdoms, in which book most of the large lacunae in the B text of the LXX are supplied in cod. A from Aquila (see viä 1, ix 15 ff. &c.).

It may be worth while briefly to state the conclusions reached :--

1. Isaiah was the first of the prophetical books to be rendered into Greek.

2. The first half of Jeremiah, the greater part of Ezekiel, and the whole of the Minor Prophets were afterwards translated *en bloc*, possibly by a single hand, possibly by a small group of *collaborateurs*.

3. The remaining portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel exhibit a style quite distinct from that which is found in the last-named group. These portions may have been made at the same time as the last group (this part of the work, with a view to expediting the translation of these two long books, being entrusted to persons not conversant with the methods of the translator or translators of the rest of the group), or they may be the work of a still later date, the earliest versions of these books having been only fragmentary.

4. In the case of Ezekiel, and possibly in other books, the rendering given of the lessons read on the great festivals, such as Pentecost, in the synagogues at Alexandria, formed the basis on which a complete translation was afterwards engrafted.

5. 1 Kingdoms was like the Greek Isaiah, a first attempt at rendering one of the main divisions of the Hebrew Bible, and exhibits a different style from that of the later versions of 2, 3 and 4 Kingdoms.

H. St. J. THACKERAY.

# ON SOME CHRISTIAN GRAVESTONES FROM OLD DONGOLA.

A FEW months ago Mr. Carl Armbruster, of King's College, Cambridge, and now of the Nubian Civil Service, sent to Cambridge three fragmentary gravestones with Greek inscriptions which had been long used as building material near Old Dongola. They are of interest as coming from so far up the Nile, for Old Dongola is about halfway between the great dam of Aşwân and Khartum itself. There is also a further feature of interest arising from the fact that one of the stones is dated 812 A. D., a curiously late date for a Greek inscription from the heart of Nubia. The other two stones, however, look earlier, and may be assigned to the seventh and eighth centuries. But in any case they seem to be later than the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt.