

Theology on the Web.org.uk

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:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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]

A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS SETTLING THE DATES OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE VARIOUS BOOKS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

IN a paper published in the *American Journal of Theology*, I attempted to deduce a theory as to the use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch from the variations between the Massoretic text and the Septuagint renderings.

In the present paper I have carried my researches still further into the rest of the translated books of the Septuagint with some reference also to the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.

In what follows it is taken for granted that the normal use is :—*Θεός* is equivalent to Elohim, *Κύριος* to Yahweh ; and a certain number of points have to be presupposed and remembered :—

- (1) Joshua evidently goes with the Pentateuch.
- (2) The B or Vatican text of Judges is late, probably fourth century A. D.
- (3) The Greek of Judges and Ruth runs with the Greek of 1, 2, 3, 4 Kingdoms.
- (4) The Greek of 1 Kingdoms is different and apparently earlier.
- (5) The Greek of 1 Esdras is earlier than that of 2 Esdras.
- (6) The Greek of Isaiah is older than the Greek of the rest of the prophets.

[For the statements 3-6 I am indebted to Mr Thackeray.]

(7) Mr Thackeray's articles in the *J. T. S.* on the division of the translation of some of the prophetic books between various translators must also be taken into account.

We have also to take account of the fact that to the Jew the Torah was certainly placed on a much higher plane than the other books of the Old Testament. More especial value was attached to it, more care was taken of the text, and it was more constantly referred to. This is reflected, I think, in the Greek translation, and in the state of the Hebrew text. But we still find points to remind us, in Hebrew and Greek alike, of the dread, almost or quite superstitious, inspired by the name Yahweh. Why, on the other hand, Pharaoh-necoh should have changed Eliakim's name to Jehoiakim is not obvious : some say it was to gratify the young king, others at the suggestion of the priests. We have also that extraordinary variation in the termination of certain names between יה— and יהו—. The latter of these forms occurs in odd verses of a narrative in which the former is the prevalent form (e.g. 2 Ch. xiii,

Abiah), and both forms occur even in the same verse, not only for two different persons (e.g. 2 Ch. xxi 2, Azariah), but also for the same individual (e.g. 1 (3) K. xiv 4, Ahijah). Such a verse as 2 Ch. xxiii 1 with the termination יהו—three (if not four) times—shews that the form was a persistent one. If so, the books of Chronicles and Kings, at any rate, give indications of what I have contended for in the case of the Pentateuch—a conflation of two texts of the Hebrew anterior to the present authorized consonantal text. The Greek terminations—[ε]α[ς] and [ε]ου—shew that the variation existed in the Hebrew when the translation was made; and sometimes the alternative form to that of the present M.T. is suggested by the Greek, e.g. in Obadiah: but no English reader of the Bible either in the Authorized Version or in the Revised Version, would have any idea that this variation occurs in some of the most familiar proper names.

If, as I have ventured to suggest elsewhere, the name יה was prior to the tetragrammaton, and the latter only an evolution from it, then it is quite within reason to suppose that names which began or ended with יה, as placing the individuals bearing them under the special protection of Yahweh the God of Israel, were in later times, when the superstitious dread of pronouncing the tetragrammaton became practically a law of disuse of the Name, docked of either the ו or the ה of יהו and in this way we can account for the forms in יה— or —יו such as Azariah for Azariahu, or Joiakim for Jehoiakim. No name with the termination יהו is attributed to any one whose birth can be assigned to exilic or post-exilic times, and the (chronologically) earliest occurrence of this form is in the case of a grandson of Eliezer the son of Moses. The forms of name commencing with יהו are of greater persistency, and extend from Joshua, the successor of Moses, down to post-exilic times. It will be remembered with regard to the particular name יהושע that its invention is ascribed to Moses, and that in post-exilic times it was contracted into ישוע.

It may be that the termination יהו was dropped when the Captivity came, as a national and political protest against using a form of name which belonged to the conquering people who had deported them. I cannot find that the form יהו was ever used in Babylonia as a prefix, though it occurs as a suffix. There would, therefore, not be the same objection to its persistence in Hebrew.

We may now proceed to our more immediate subject.

(1) The books of the Old Testament in which the occurrences of θεός for Yahweh are most noticeable are: Josh.¹ ten (eleven) times;

¹ v 6; vi 11 (BA, not F); ix 27; x 14; xiv 7 (B not A); xv 13; xvii 4, 14; xix 50; xxii 19 (B! A), 22!

1 K.¹ twelve times; 1 Ch.² ten times; 2 Ch.³ five times; 1 Esdras⁴ six times; Pss.⁵ eleven times; Prov.⁶ twenty-one times; Is.⁷ sixty-seven times; Jer.⁸ seven (eight) times. It may be noted with regard to these that, putting 1, 2 Ch. on one side, the rest of the historical books are those of which the translation on other grounds has been held to be earlier than that of the others; so also with regard to Isaiah, of which the Greek is earlier than that of the other prophets; the Greek of 1 Esdras is looked upon as earlier than that of 2 Esdras. Joshua naturally approaches the Pentateuch in its style. The following further points are to be noticed:—Proverbs, of which the Greek version is midrashic in character, naturally presents a large number of examples, though it is to be noticed that they stop at the break at the end of xxiv. Isaiah offers by far the largest number of instances, more than half as many as the whole of the Pentateuch. In the historic portion in the middle of the book, there are a considerable number of cases in which Θεός occurs, whereas Κύριος occurs in 4 Kings. Does this point, once again, to the two versions of the Hebrew text of the history, such as I have imagined in the case of the Pentateuch? or, is it an indication of this being a later version? I incline to think the former is the more reasonable idea. Lastly, Mr Thackeray's theory as to the translation of

¹ ii 1, 24; iii 7; iv 3; v 3; xiv 3 (B, A missing); xvi 7, 8 (B not A); xix 9 (B not A); xx 13 (B not A); xxii 10; xxvi 19.

² x 13 (B^N, not A); xiii 14; xv 3 (A not B^N), 15; xvi 6 (BA not N), 7 (N not BA), 26 (not Ps. xcv 5); xxv 6 (B not A); xxvi 27; xxix 21.

³ vii 12; xix 10 (A not B); xxiv 6, 24; xxxii 26 (B not A).

⁴ v 43 (Ezra, Nehemiah omits), 52 *ter*; ix 31 (B not A), 47 (B not A); 1 Esdras has, of course, been compared with the MT of Ezra and Nehemiah.

⁵ xxix 9; xxxiv 27 (N^{*}); xlv 9 (N^{ca} AT); lxviii 32; lxx 1 (B not N^R); lxxxiii 3 (N^{*}); lxxxviii 7 (N^{*}R); xc 2 (B^{*}N^{*}R); xcvi 4 (B^{*}R T); cxiv 1 (N^{*}, B wanting); cxli 2 (A R T). For this use by N^{*} comp. Jb. i 6; xlii 11; Sl. xl 26: it also occurs in Prov. Is.

⁶ i 7 (B^N, not AC nor Ps. cx 10); iii 5, 7, 19, 33; v 21; vi 16 (B not NA); xv 29; xvi 1 (9) (B^{NA}, not C), 1 (xv 33) (B^{NC}, not A), 5, 20 (B^N not AC); xvii 3 (A not B^N), 15; xviii 22 (B^{N*}, not N^{ca} A), 23 (xix 3); xix 11 (14) (B^N), 14 (17); xxi 1, 3; xxiv 21.

⁷ ii 2 (†a conflated text); iv 2; v 12 (N^{*}); vi 12; vii 17; viii 17, 18; ix 11 (10); x 20 26; xi 2, 3; xiv 2 (NAQΓ, om. B) 3 (N^{*}AQ^{*}Γ), 5 (NAQ^{*}Γ), 27; xxiii 16 (17); xxiv 21; xxv 10 (B^NQ); xxvi 4 (5) (†); xxvii 1 (not N^{*}), 12 (B); xxx 9 (not Q^{ms}), 18, 30 (NAQ, not Q^{ms}); xxxi 1 (not B); xxxiii 5 (not Q^{ms}), 6 (N^{*}); xxxvi 15 (†Q^{ms}, not 4 K. xviii 30), 18 (not 4 K.), 20 (not Q^{ms} 4 K., Γ omits); xxxvii 20 (not 4 K.), 22 (not 4 K.); xxxviii 7 (not 4 K.), 20 (B), 20 (not Γ), 22 (B); xxxix 6 (not N^{*} 4 K.); xl 27, 28, 31; xli 4, 14; xlii 10 (N^{*}), 12, 19, 24; xliii 11; xliv 5 *bis*, 6 (B^{ab} NAQ), 6, 23 *bis*; xlv 21 (not Q^{ms}), 23 (24) (B^{Nca} A Q), 25 (†, certainly not N^Q); xlix 13; li 13; liv 13; lv 6 (N^{ca} A Q^{*}); lviii 8, 9, 11, 13; lxi 9; lxv 23.

⁸ i 2 (not Q); iii 21 (†); iv 4; ix 20 (not A); xiv 10; xxvi 23 (N); xxvii 15; xxviii 7 (N).

Jeremiah being divided between two translators is curiously confirmed by the fact that the instances of Θεός for Yahweh in that book stop at the point in the book where he, for other reasons, divided it between the two. It would seem too that Isaiah was certainly one book at the time the translation was made.

Of the other books of the Bible little need be said under this head. The following are the instances recorded:—Judges¹ one; 2 K.² one; 3 K.³ three; 4 K.⁴ one; 2 Esdr. (= Heb. Ezra) none; Neh. none (there are many cases in these books in which Yahweh is left out, and only the interpretative Θεός is given); Jb.⁵ three very doubtful cases, all in the prologue or epilogue; Eccl. of course none; Minor Prophets⁶ two; Jer. latter half none; Dan. LXX, Th. none.

I am inclined to think that, if the main basis of my theory is correct, we may here find a criterion for the dating of the Greek versions of the various books. That is to say, those in which Θεός stands frequently for Yahweh would come before, and those in which the present text of the Hebrew is almost invariably followed would come after the settlement of the authorized Hebrew consonantal text.

The Hexaplaric fragments do not help us much under this head. Aq. has one instance in Is. (viii 17) in agreement with the LXX. Sm. three instances, one in Jb. (xlii 9), where the LXX omits the Divine Name altogether; one in Ps. (lv 11), where Sm. stands alone; and one in Is. (lxi 10), where Sm. agrees with Th. against LXX and Aq. Theod., besides this last passage, has Θεός in one other passage (2 K. xxiv 1) which is rather inexplicable, and the passage as compared with 1 Ch. xxi 1 is difficult of explanation in that regard also. To an anonymous translator the same use of Θεός is assigned in Prov. i 7, but this is perhaps only a reference to a text followed by LXX (B^N). It will be seen that, with one exception, all these passages come from the books, of which I have suggested that the translations into Greek were the earlier.

(2) As supplemental to the above we may note the cases in which Θεός corresponds to יהוה. They are:—Minor Prophets⁷ ten times; Is.⁸ twice, but not certainly; Jer.⁹ four times (two doubtful); Ezek.¹⁰ thirty-

¹ vi 34 (only in A which in this book is older than B).

² xii 20 (the constant expression *ὄκος τοῦ θεοῦ*).

³ v 7 (21); xx (xxi) 3; xxii 19 (only B).

⁴ ii 2.

⁵ i 6 (N*), 8 (A); xlii 11 (N*).

⁶ Hos. iii 1, Ma. ii 17.

⁷ Am. iii 7, 8, 11; iv 5; vii 1 (only B certainly), 4 (only A certainly once and Q^{ms} once); viii 9 (A Q); ix 8; Ob. i 1; Zeph. i 7.

⁸ x 24 (N*); xxv 8 (only B^N certainly).

⁹ ii 19, 22 (A); xxvi 10; xxvii 25 (only B certainly).

¹⁰ iv 14 (BQ); xx 5 (A Q), 36 (A), 47 (A); xxi 7 (A), 28 (A); xxv 6 (A); xxviii 2 (A), 24 (A); xxix 3 (A), 8 (A), 16 (A); xxxii 31 (A); xxxvi 15 (A),

two times. It will be noticed from an examination of the citations from Ezekiel that there is a greater consensus of authority for this rendering in the third of the three sections of translation into which Mr Thackeray divides this book; and that in the other two the rendering seems to be due to the scribe of A or of some MS preceding A. The third section is, however, attributed by him to the same translator as the first.

It is difficult to see, with the traditional oral rendering of the expression יהוה ארני what other translation could have been given except a reduplication of *Kúrios*, which is indeed a constant variant of *Kúrios* (ὁ) *Θεός*. I am inclined to think that the three chief variant readings of the Greek point to the following stages in the Hebrew text of Ezekiel:— (1) יהוה alone represented by *Kúrios* standing alone. To this ארני was inserted in the margin just as we have in the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus ארן and עליון standing in the margin for אל. (2) ארני taken from the margin and incorporated in the text יהוה ארני: this would correspond to the Greek *Kúrios Kúrios*. (3) יהוה ארני read אלהים ארני with a corresponding Greek *Kúrios* (ὁ) *Θεός*.

The Hexaplaric fragments do not carry the matter much farther. The three translators all follow the use corresponding to (3) of the above in Ps. lxxviii 7, Is. lii 4. In Is. ii 4 Aq., Sm. by rendering ΠΙΠΙ ὁ Θεός seem to point to a reading יהוה אלהים instead of יהוה ארני. Sm. also follows (3) in Is. xxv 8, where Aq., Th. do not exist as does Theod. in Jer. xxxii 25. In Hb. iii 19 the unusual יהוה ארני is translated by the LXX and perhaps also by another translator *Kúrios* ὁ Θεός (μὸν).

(3) The third list of cases is where *Kúrios* ὁ Θεός stands for Yahweh. In Josh.¹ the expression occurs ten times; in 1 K.² three times; 2 Ch.³ twice; 1 Esdr.⁴ twice; Pss.⁵ twice, both cases doubtful; Is.⁶ twenty-three times; Jer.⁷ ten times. These figures are in very fair accord with those under the first heading: and correspond with the results of the investigation of the Pentateuch. In addition there is an abnormal number of instances (nine) in 3 K.⁸

32 (A), 33 (A); xliii 18 (BA), 19 (BA); xlv 6 (BA), 9, 12, 15, 27; xlv 9 (BA), 9, 15, 18; xlvi 1, 16 (BQ); xlvii 13, 23; xlviii 29.

¹ i 15; ii 10, 12; v 1; x 12 (A); xxii 23, 34 (A, unless ὁ̄ is a dittograph); xxiii 1 (A), 15 (B); xxiv 19 (A).

² i 3, 20 (probably a reminiscence of v. 3); xv 25.

³ xxx 8; xxxv 1.

⁴ ix 39 (A), 52 (A but δ κ. θ.).

⁵ xlv 12 (N^{R*}); lxxxiii 13 (N^{c-b} RT).

⁶ xxvi 12 (not Q); xxviii 13 (NA QΓ); xxxviii 22 (N^{a-b} A Q; not 4 K. xx 8); xli 17, 21; xlii 6, 8, 13, 21; xliii 1, 10, 14 (not Γ), 15; xlv 2; xlv 1 (not Q), 3 (not Q), 5 (not Q), 6 (not Q), 7 (not Q), 8 (N^{Γ*}), 11 (not Q); lx 20 (N^{*}); lxvi 23 (N^{*}). Note the special variants in N^{*} as noted before.

⁷ v 18; xi 21 (A); xv 2 (A); xxiii 30 (NA Q, B omits), 37, 38 (BNA); xxxvi 23 (A Q); xxxvii 5 (BNA); xxxiv 18 (N); xxxix 28 (BA Q).

⁸ v 5; viii 59, 60 (B); xi 10; xvii 1 (κ. δ θ. τῶν θυράμεων); xviii 18, 24; xxi 28 (κ. δ θ. Ἰσραήλ); xxii 19 (A τὸν κ. θ. Ἰσρα.).

The following are the remaining instances:—Judges¹ one; Ruth² one; 2 K.³ one; 4 K.⁴ one; 2 Esdr.⁵ one; Jb.⁶ one; Minor Prophets⁷ thirteen or fourteen (in several cases connected with the use of *παντοκράτωρ*); Ezek.⁸ three; Dan.⁹ LXX, Th. one.

The Hexaplaric fragments only furnish us with two instances:—Jer. v 22 and Dan. ix 14 (only as a v. l.).

The tendency of all these instances is to shew that the *ὁ Θεός* of the expression was an addition in imitation of the very frequent occurrence side by side with *יהוה* of the interpretative *יהוה*.

(4) The instances of *Κύριος ὁ Θεός* for *יהוה* after *יהוה* are limited to two books. One instance occurs in Am.¹⁰; twenty-seven in Ezek.¹¹; but all these latter only occur in one MS, and I need not repeat the explanation I have already given of the variations in usage which probably occurred both in Hebrew and Greek. It may just be noted that none of these instances occur in the third division of the Greek version according to Mr Thackeray.

(5) I come now to the cases in which *Κύριος* stands for *יהוה*, and it will be seen that these bulk much more largely than they did in the Pentateuch. Let me give the statistics first. *Κύριος* then stands for *יהוה* (in Josh. there are none); 1 K.¹² eleven (ten) times; 1 Ch.¹³ fifteen times; 2 Ch.¹⁴ thirty-one times; 1 Esdr.¹⁵ sixty times; Pss.¹⁶

¹ iii 28.

² iii 10 (B).

³ xv 31.

⁴ xix 20 (κ. δ. θ. τῶν δυνάμεων: cf. 3 K. xvii 1).

⁵ viii 28 (A).

⁶ xxxix 31.

⁷ Ho. vi 1; xiv 3; Am. iv 3 (A Q); v 8 (A Q + δ *παντοκράτωρ*); ix 6 (A Q + δ *παντ.*), 12 (A); Mi. iv 10; Jl. ii 12; Jn. ii 3 (not N*); Na. iii 5; Zach. x 3, 12; Ma. ii 16 (A); iii 6.

⁸ xx 38 (A), 47 (A); xxxv 15 (not Q).

⁹ Da LXX, Th. ix 14 (A Q only in Th.).

¹⁰ ix 5.

¹¹ xiv 6 (A); xx 30 (A); xxi 24 (A), 26 (A); xxii 3 (A), 19 (A); xxiii 22 (A), 28 (A), 32 (A), 34 (A); xxiv 21 (A); xxvi 21 (A); xxviii 6 (A), 25 (A); xxxii 8 (A), 32 (A); xxxiv 11 (A), 20 (A); xxxvi 3 (A), 37 (A); xxxvii 21 (A); xxxviii 10 (A), 14 (A), 17 (A), 18 (A); xxxix 8 (A), 25 (A).

¹² ii 25; iv 21 (A), 22 (B) (the passage is in confusion); v 2; vi 5; x 26; xi 6 (A omits); xiv 15; xxiii 14, 16; xxvi 8.

¹³ xv 2 (A); xvi 1 (A), 6 (N); xvii 3, 25 (A); xxiv 5; xxvi 20, 32 (B); xxviii 2, 12, 21 (B); xxix 1, 7, 13, 17.

¹⁴ iv 19; v 1; vi 40; xiii 12, 15, 16; xv 1; xix 3; xx 7 (B), 29; xxiv 5, 13, 20; xxv 8 *bis*, 20, 24; xxvi 5 *ter*, 7; xxviii 24; xxx 12; xxxi 13, 21; xxxii 29, 31; xxxiii 7 (A); xxxiv 9 (A), 32; xxxv 19.

¹⁵ i 25 *bis*, 26, 46, 49, 51, 52; ii 3, 5 *bis*, 6, 7; v 56 (B); vi 2 *bis*, 5, 12, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32 *bis*; vii 7, 15; viii 6, 9, 12, 13 *bis*, 15 (B), 45, 46 (A, B omits), 49 (B), 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 64, 69 (B), 71, 75 (B) 76 (B), 76, 78 (A), 79, 83, 89 (B), 90 *bis*; ix 13, 48 (B).

¹⁶ lii 5 (N*R), 7 (B N*R) [by assimilation with Ps. 14]; lv 2 (B), 5 (N*), 12 (N*); lxii 12 (N*R); lxx 16 (B N*R); lxxvii 31 (N*), 33 (N*); lxxxii 28 (B); lxxxvi 1; lxxxvii 59 (N*R). Only one of these is absolutely certain

twelve times (but most of them very uncertain); Prov.¹ once [there is one very doubtful case in A of Eccl.²]; Is.³ three (five) times; Jer. none. Josh. naturally accords with the Pentateuch where there are so few instances; in it there are none. In the other historical books, especially 1, 2 Chronicles and 1 Esdras the use of Κύριος for ד'יהוה may be taken to point to (1) a more Yahwistic edition of these books, which would fall in with my theory; or (2) Κύριος is midrashic and points to the God of Israel under this special designation. It is noticeable as rather confirmatory of the first view that in some passages (e.g. Ezra vi 22, as compared with the previous verse) the words 'the house of God, the God of Israel' would read much more naturally 'the house of Yahweh, the God of Israel'.

At any rate, we find the same use prevailing in Ecclesiasticus. Κύριος represents מלךיהוה in eighteen (seventeen) passages in that book⁴, but to this I shall recur later.

In the other books of the Bible the figures stand as follows:—Judges⁵ four times; 2 K.⁶ seven; 3 K.⁷ five; 2 Esdr.⁸ (including Neh.) two doubtful cases; Jb.⁹ nine; Minor Prophets¹⁰ once; Dan. LXX [it will be remembered that this is a midrashic version]¹¹ four times.

In the Hexapla, Aq. gives us two instances in the Pss.¹²; Th. one in 2 K.¹³ and one in the Pss.¹⁴ The fact of there being in two passages out of three, as in so many other cases, different occurrences from those in the LXX, rather strengthens my theory of two recensions, at least, of the Hebrew Bible.

(6) As in the Pentateuch, so in the whole of the rest of the LXX the use of Κύριος (ὁ) Θεός for ד'יהוה is very limited. The cases are:—Josh.¹⁵ two; Judges¹⁶ two; 1 K.¹⁷ one; 3 K.¹⁸ three; 2 Ch.¹⁹ six; 2 Esdr.²⁰ three; Pss.²¹ our (only one certain); Minor Prophets²² seven; Is.²³ four; Jer.²⁴

¹ iii 4.² vii 30.³ vii 13; xl 1 (N* as so often); lxi 10 (but not Aq. Sm. Th.); lxii 3 (N*), 5.⁴ iii 20; ix 16; x 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22, 24; xxxii 12; xxxiii 5; xxxvi 22; xl 26, 27; xlii 15; xlvi 14; li 1 (f).⁵ vi 20 (A); vii 14 (A); viii 3; ix (57).⁶ ii 27; vi 3, 7 (very doubtful), 12; vii 22; xv 24; xxiii 3 (A).⁷ lii 5, 11; iv 25; x 27; xii 22.⁸ ix 6 (A); xxiii 1 (N*).⁹ i 9 (B*); ii 9, 10; v 8 bis; xx 29; xxviii 23 (N*^a A C); xxxii 2; xxxiv 9.¹⁰ Ho. ix 8 (A Q).¹¹ i 2, 9, 17; ix 18.¹² lxxvi 2 (so LXX), lxxxii 1.¹³ xiv 16.¹⁴ lxxvi 2.¹⁵ xxii 16 (A); xxiv 27.¹⁶ iv 23 (A); x 10 (A).¹⁷ vi 3 (A, B θεοῦ κυρίου).¹⁸ viii 26; xviii 36; xxi 23 (A).¹⁹ ix 8; xv 18; xvii 4; xx 12, 33; xxxiv 3.²⁰ ix 9; xx 39 (A); xxiii 14 (but N* θῶ ἄν).²¹ xiii 5 (N*^a); xix 6 (NR); lv 13 (N*^a); lxxix 8.²² Ho. ii 23; Am. viii 14 (A); Mi. vi 8; Jl. ii 17 (A); Jn. iv 7 (A Q), 8 (A Q),²³ 9 (A Q).²⁴ xxv 9 (NR); li 20; lii 12 (NAQ); lvii 21 (NAQ).²⁵ xxviii 5 (A).

one; Ezek.¹ three; Dan. LXX² two (one); Th.³ three. In 1 Esdr.⁴ we have five. Only one doubtful instance occurs in the Hexapla from Aquila⁵.

To complete our survey we must add that in 1 Esdr.⁶ *Kύριος* stands by itself for יהוה + מלכיהם in six passages.

(7) I come now to two curious uses of *Kύριος*—curious because they seem to me to exhibit a distinct relationship between the Greek versions of Job and Ecclesiasticus, as we shall see as we go on.

It has often been noticed how in Job the names of God, El and Eloah, occur to the almost total exclusion of Yahweh, except in the account of Yahweh's discourse. The last-mentioned name does indeed occur once⁷ but that is all. But to take the name Eloah first. If we examine the passages in the Hebrew in which this name occurs and then look at the LXX we shall see that in ten cases⁸ there is no corresponding Divine Name in the Greek: in nine cases⁹ we have Θεός; whereas in twenty-two cases¹⁰ we have *Kύριος*. In Ecclus.¹¹ we have two corresponding instances of *Kύριος*.

(8) But this phenomenon is still more noticeable when we consider the use of *Kύριος* for מל. This occurs forty-one times in Job¹² (in every part of the book except the prologue and epilogue); and in Ecclus.¹³ thirty-two (thirty-four) times; whilst in the whole of the rest of the LXX outside the Pentateuch we only have the following occurrences:—Josh.¹⁴ once (so once in Pentateuch); Pss.¹⁵ seven times (only one quite certain); and Is.¹⁶ twice. In the Hexapla only one instance is quoted,

¹ viii 4; x 19 (A); xxxiv 31 (B^a A Q, B^{ab} κ. κ. δ θ.).

² ix 15 (doubtful); x 12. ix 17, 19 (A); x 12 (A Q).

³ v 67; vi 1; vii 9; viii 49 (A), 89 (A). Is. vii 13.

⁴ i 37, 45; v 68; viii 25, 70, 86 (B^a A); ix 50. xii 2.

⁵ ix 13; xii 4, 6; xxi 9; xxii 12, 26; xxiv 12; xxvii 10; xxxiii 12; xxxvi 2.

⁶ iii 23 (BNC); vi 8 (A); xxix 2, 4 (B^N*); xxxi 2; xxxv 10; xxxvii 15 (B^{NA}); xxxix 17, 32. πνεῦμα θεῶν is also found in xxvii 3.

⁷ iii 23 (A); iv 9, 17; v 17; vi 8 (BNC), 9; x 2; xi 5, 6, 7; xv 8; xvi 21, 22; xix 6, 21, 26; xxi 9; xxvii 8; xxix 4 (B^a A C); xxxi 6; xxxiii 26; xxxvii 15 (C). παντοκράτωρ occurs once (xxxvii 22).

⁸ xxxii 13; xlv 23.

⁹ v 8; viii 3, 5, 13 (B^N), 20; ix 2; xii 6; xiii 7; xv 4, 13, 25 (B^{NA}); xvi 12; xviii 21; xix 22; xxi 14, 22; xxii 2, 17; xxiii 16; xxv 4; xxvii 2 (B^{AC}), 9 (A C), 11, 13; xxxi 14, 23 (B^{AC}, B omits), 28; xxxii 13; xxxiii 14; xxxiv 5, 10, 12, 23, 37; xxxv 2, 13; xxxvi 5; xxxvii 14; xxxviii 41; xl 4, 14.

¹⁰ iii 18; v 4 (cod. A, but C^m, cf. supra and xliii 5); vi 16; vii 4 (both A and C), 29, 31; xi 22; xiv 11; xv 9, 11; xvi 17, 26; xxxv 14; xxxii 21 (A), 22 (מלך in marg.); xxxviii 1, 4, 9, 14; xxxix 16, 33; xli 4; xlii 15, 17; xliii 9; xlvi 5 (B, BAC omit), 5 (f), 11, 16; xlvii 5, 22; xlviii 3 (B^N1), 20; xlix 3.

¹¹ iii 10 (A).

¹² xv 1 (B^N* A R U); lxxiii 8 (B); lxxxiv 9; cv 21 (B^a); cxxxv 26 (B^a A); cxxxviii 23 (A R T). xl 18; xlii 5.

and that is from the Symmachus version of Job¹. Can it be that Job and Ecclus. were both translated by the same person, who being a devout Jew preferred to make it clear that the El or Eloah of these books was identical with Yahweh? Scarcely, I think; for the whole style of the two translations is very dissimilar. It rather seems to point to some special school or place of translation where, in a conservative spirit, the names אל and מלא received their special Jewish appropriation, and the word Κύριος was used to denote that by those names the name יהוה was really designated.

Lastly, if we examine the Aramaic passages of the Old Testament we shall find Κύριος representing מלא in 2 Esdr.² once; in Dan. LXX³ six times; whilst Κύριος (δ) Θεός stands for the same word in 2 Esdr.⁴ twice (but only in A); and in Dan. LXX⁵ once.

I proceed to sum up what I think may be the results arrived at with an approach to certainty as to the Greek translations of the Canonical Books outside the Pentateuch.

1. Joshua goes with the Pentateuch.

2. The larger number of the rest of the books can be divided into two groups, in one of which the variation in the translation of the Divine Names is much more noticeable and frequent than the other.

In the first is included 1 K., 1, 2 Ch., 1 Esdr., Pss., Prov., Is., and more doubtfully Jer., or at any rate Jer. down to chapter xxviii.

In the other group there fall Judges, 2, 3, 4 K., 2 Esdr. (including Neh.), the Minor Prophets (?), Jer. (perhaps the latter half), Dan. LXX, and Ezek.

The dividing line between these two groups, if what I have advanced has any approach to truth about it, would be the settlement of the authorized consonantal Hebrew Text whenever that occurred. Before that the usage of the Divine Names varied in the different MSS, after that the usage was stereotyped in one particular way.

3. Ruth would go naturally in the Greek with Judges: Esther, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, for this purpose, have practically nothing to be taken account of.

4. There remains only the Greek Book of Job. This in its constant use of Κύριος for אל and מלא stands practically alone among the books of the LXX. But it has a marked parallel in the Greek of Ecclesiasticus as compared with the Hebrew. It is curious to note that in both these books there has been claimed to exist a considerable number of

¹ viii 3.

² vii 15 (B).

³ ii 18, 19, 20 ($\text{του κ. του μεγάλου}$), 23, 37; iii 95 (Syr. κ. δ θ.). It is interesting to note that Mr. Thackeray suspects a break in the LXX of Dan. at the end of chap. 3.

⁴ v 1 (A); vii 12 (A).

⁵ iii 29.

Arabisms. It may be that something of this kind led the translators to use the term *Kúpios*. At any rate the phenomena indicate that they must come from the same school of Jewish thought or translators. This source may be Palestinian, so far as this usage is concerned: in the case of the Greek Job the translator was probably a Hellenizer. This is shewn by his usage of Homeric and classical Greek words. The translator of Ecclesiasticus it should be remembered represents himself as the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach, and as only a temporary sojourner in Egypt (see Prologue).

In conclusion, I would say that, though I have done my best to make my statistics accurate, and I have no doubt that they are so in the main, my figures may require some slight modifications. So far as I am aware, no such an exhaustive analysis of the use of these Divine Names has ever before been attempted.

H. A. REDPATH.

THE CATACOMB OF COMMODILLA.

Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Serie V: Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità, 1905.

To the student of Christian archaeology by far the most interesting of the discoveries recorded in this volume are those made in the excavations which in the course of the past two years have brought to light the central crypt or basilica of the *Coemeterium Commodillae*. The only text in which this catacomb is named is the following passage of the *Index Coemeteriorum*:—‘Coemeterium Commodillae ad S. Felicem et Adauctum via Ostiensi.’ The indications furnished by these words and the mention of St Felix and St Adauctus immediately before St Paul in the Itineraries enabled Boldetti, in 1720, to locate the cemetery in the Via delle Sette Chiese, not far from S. Paolo fuori le Mura. Boldetti actually penetrated into the central crypt, and there saw a fresco in which St Felix and St Adauctus were represented, thus placing the identification of the catacomb beyond doubt. Unfortunately, the roof of the crypt collapsed eight days after Boldetti’s discovery, and the excavations were then dropped. Prof. Orazio Marucchi, the indefatigable secretary of the *Commissione di Archeologia Sacra*, succeeded in procuring the resumption of the enterprise in 1904, and the result has been to bring to light the whole of the crypt entered by Boldetti and a portion of the catacomb of which it was the centre.

The interest of the discovery rests in the light which it throws upon the latest phase in the history of the catacombs, and in the difficulties