THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF THE FOUR BOOKS OF KINGS.

The study of the Septuagint from a linguistic point of view has a fascination of its own, and now and again rewards the investigator with some surprising results. It has been my task for some years to try to disentangle the various strata in the Greek Bible and to discover the joints in single books or in groups of books where the work of one translator is taken up by another. Having begun with little prospect of success in such an undertaking, considering the corrupt state in which the text has come down to us, I have become more and more convinced that, if the investigation is conducted on broad lines, we do possess the materials for the work of disintegration and for assigning to the original translators the portions for which they are severally responsible. In one of the lines of demarcation to which I propose to call attention in this article, the linguistic evidence is corroborated by very ancient MS evidence. This very welcome confirmation gives me greater confidence in believing that in other cases, where MS evidence is lacking, the results arrived at are not purely chimerical.

The subjects with which I propose to deal are as follows:—

(1) I shall endeavour to shew that the earliest line of division between the books of Samuel and the books of Kings was not where the M.T. places it at the end of the second book of Samuel, but at the end of verse 11 of the second chapter of 1 Kings (or 3 Kingdoms, to use the title by which the book is known in the Greek Bible). In other words the break comes at the death of David and the accession of Solomon.

(2) I shall attempt to prove that this second Book of Kingdoms, which has now been slightly extended by the addition of sixty-four verses commonly attached to the third Book, must be divided into two parts, the break occurring after 11', i.e. just before the story of David and Bathsheba.

(3) It will be shewn that the translator of the second portion of 2 Kingdoms is identical with the translator of 4 Kingdoms.

(4) A few observations will be offered on some peculiarities in the language of this last-named translator.

(5) The characteristics of the other portions will be briefly discussed.

(6) Some tentative suggestions will be made as to place and date of the translator referred to in (3).

* The greater part of this paper was read before the Cambridge Theological Society on Nov. 28, 1906. Since reading it I have modified the concluding paragraphs as to place and dates.
THE FIVE DIVISIONS AND THE FOUR TRANSLATORS.

For convenience I shall refer to the five divisions into which the
Books of Kingdoms fall as follows:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= 1 \text{ Kingdoms.} \\
\beta \beta &= 2 \text{ Kin. } 1^1-11^1. \\
\beta \gamma &= 2 \text{ Kin. } 11^2-3 \text{ Kin. } 2^2. \\
\gamma \gamma &= 3 \text{ Kin. } 21^2-21^4. \\
\gamma \delta &= 3 \text{ Kin. } 22 \text{ and } 4 \text{ Kin.}
\end{align*}
\]

The portions \(\beta \gamma\) and \(\gamma \delta\) will be referred to collectively as \(\beta \delta\).

Attention will mainly be concentrated on the translator of the two
portions \(\beta \gamma\) and \(\gamma \delta\), the other three portions (\(\alpha, \beta \beta, \text{ and } \gamma \gamma\)) being treated
more cursorily.

The contents of these five portions are as follows (the two, which
I shall endeavour to shew are the latest, being relegated to the end):—

\(\alpha\). The Reign * of Saul, with the events that led up to it.

\(\beta \beta\). The Reign of David in his prime; his early victories.

\(\gamma \gamma\). The Reign of Solomon and the early history of the divided
Monarchy.

Two later additions by a single hand, which might be entitled ‘The
Decline and Fall of the Monarchy’, viz.:—

\(\beta \gamma\). The story of David’s sin and the subsequent disasters of his
Reign.

\(\gamma \delta\). The later Monarchy and the Captivity.

The work of this last translator, who is responsible for about two-fifths
of the Greek narrative of the Reigns or Kingdoms, bears unmistakable
marks of a late date. He set himself to fill up the gaps which his
predecessors had left by rendering into Greek the story of David’s
transgression and its outcome, which appears to have been previously
passed over as unedifying, together with the story of growing degeneracy
under the later Monarchy culminating in the captivity. It is not difficult
to see the reason for the unwillingness of the earlier translators to bring
such a story of disasters before the notice of heathen readers.

The three remaining portions, so far as my investigations have gone,
appear to be homogeneous wholes, that is to say, they are the work of
three distinct translators. Possibly an exception should be made in the
case of \(\gamma \gamma\), where two hands may have been at work. The portion \(\alpha\) is
undoubtedly the work of a single hand: \(\beta \beta\) has considerable affinity
with it, but there is enough, I think, to shew that a fresh hand has pro-
duced it. As to \(\gamma \gamma\), it is impossible to speak very definitely. The text
has been so much interpolated that it is difficult to tell what the original
version was like. It was probably considerably shorter than our First

* This, rather than ‘kingdom’, was the meaning of \(\text{ βασιλείας} \) in Hellenistic times.
Book of Kings, while, on the other hand, the translator was not unwilling to paraphrase and to amplify the narrative (especially when dealing with the story of Solomon in all his glory) by information derived from other sources. Such liberties seem to indicate that the translation was made at a time when the Book had not yet been universally recognized as canonical: the freedom of treatment offers a marked contrast to the literalism of the portions βγ and γδ.

One word of precaution seems necessary. It must of course be understood that in no existing MS or version of the Books of Kingdoms have we the earliest form of the Greek text intact. In our oldest uncials, B as well as A, the original version has suffered considerably owing to the intrusion of phrases, or even sections of some length, from the three later versions which stood beside it in the Hexapla, and upon which Origen drew to supplement the LXX text of his day and to bring it into conformity with the ‘Hebraica veritas’. These Hexaplaric accretions, however, usually betray themselves. Doublets, of which there are so many in these books, are patent instances of interpolation, and it is sometimes possible to determine which of the two words or phrases is the intruder. Again, the peculiar style of Aquila, whose version is constantly utilized by the ‘A text’ (in 3 Kin. especially) to supplement the shorter ‘B text’, is quite unmistakeable. It is thus possible, especially with the help of the Old Latin version, where available, to trace in general outlines the original version lying behind the interpolated text of the uncials; and if it is found, as is the case in the books under consideration, that certain large portions of the translation are characterized by peculiarities of rendering or grammatical usage which are absent from other portions, it is, I submit, a legitimate inference that different translators have been at work.

THE DIVIDING LINE AT DAVID’S DEATH.

Before proceeding to state the linguistic evidence, I propose to consider the two points in the narrative which mark the beginning and ending of the portion here designated βγ. What evidence have we to shew that the story was ever broken at these points? and what reasons are there why it should be so broken?

As a matter of fact the group of MSS (19, 82, 93, 108, 245) from which de Lagarde reconstructed the ‘Lucianic text’ brings the second Book of Kingdoms down to the death of David, i. e. includes in that book the first chapter and the first eleven verses of the second chapter of what is commonly called 3 Kingdoms. A Scholiast’s note in Cod. 243, transcribed in Field’s Hexapla, adds two more authorities for this arrangement, viz. Diodorus and Theodoret, the Scholiast warning the reader as to the other division, which is to be found (he says) in the
Hexapla and in 'the more accurate copies'. 'Εν τῷ ἦξαπλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἡ μὲν δευτέρα τῶν Βασιλείων πληροῖται ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν θραύσιν του λαοῦ διηγήσει, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἀλοῦ τοῦ Ὀρνᾶ διαπράσαν ἢ δὲ τρίτη τῶν Βασιλείων ἄρχεται ἐκ τῇ τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀβισσάγ τὴν Σουμανίων ἱστορίας, καὶ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἀδωνία καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ τυραννίδα. Διάδωρος δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Βασιλείων συνάπτει καὶ τάκτα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θαυδίδ τελευτής, ὀμοίως Ἑρωδιάτῳ.

It is this latter division which the internal evidence comes in to support, shewing that 'the more accurate copies' of the scholiast in reality contain a later arrangement of books. It is not easy to conjecture the reason for the division of books in the M. T.; why, that is to say, the closing scenes of David’s reign should be placed at the opening rather than at the close of a book. The Lucianic text which opens 3 Kings with καὶ Σολομών ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ βρόντου Θαυδί τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, as 2 Kin. opens with καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανὼν Σαοῦλ, is far the more natural arrangement, assigning as it does one book apiece to the reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon (with his immediate successors). Moreover, Hebrew scholars are agreed that the first two chapters of 3 Kin. are closely connected with chaps. 9–20 of the preceding book and probably come from the same hand. It will be sufficient to quote Driver’s words*: ‘1 Ki. 1–11. Solomon.—Here c. 1–2 are the continuation of 2 Sa. 9–20 . . . forming at once the close of the history of David and the introduction to that of Solomon.’ He adds that, with the exception of a few verses, the narrative in chaps. 1 and 2 is ‘entirely in the style of 2 Sa. 9–20, and appears to be the work of the same author’.

Not only does the Lucianic arrangement give us a more natural division of subject-matter, but it also exhibits the first two Books of Kingdoms in the form of two volumes of exactly equal bulk (for this purpose ββ and βγ are treated as a single volume: the separation of ββ was due to subjective considerations on the part of the translator and does not seem to go back to the original Hebrew). With the Lucianic arrangement, α occupies in Cod. Vaticanus 44 pages, 1 column, 1½ lines, ββ and βγ together occupy 44 pages, 1 column, 3 lines. It is certainly a remarkable fact that there is a difference of only 1½ lines, or barely half a dozen words, between the two books. The difference in bulk in the M.T., if the Lucianic arrangement is adopted, is greater, amounting to some four pages in an ordinary printed Hebrew Bible: this is chiefly due to the interpolation in the M.T. of sections concerning the early history of David which are absent from Cod. B..

* * *
One other interesting fact must be mentioned with regard to the Lucianic text. Lucian has removed from the text of 3 Kin. 1—2, presumably as monstrosities, practically all the characteristic marks of the translator of βγ, which in the text of the two oldest uncials serve to link that chapter and a half to the preceding narrative in 2 Kin. If Lucian has preserved the oldest tradition as to the division of books, it is the text of B and A that enables us to check him and to pronounce that that division is correct. Needless to say, this fact enhances very greatly the value of the uncials, particularly of the text as furnished by a consensus of Codd. B and A.

It will probably not fall within the scope of the larger Cambridge Septuagint to depart from the arrangement of books in the Codex Vaticanus, but I venture to think that in the Septuagint of the future the second of the four Kingdom Books should and will end with the death of David.

THE BIPARTITION OF DAVID'S REIGN.

I turn to the other main line of demarcation, that which must be placed after 2 Kin. 11. As has been said, the reason is not far to seek which induced the translator of the earlier portion of 2 Kin. to lay down his pen on reaching the following passage: 'And it came to pass at eventide, that David arose from off his bed, and walked upon the roof of the king's house: and from the roof he saw a woman bathing; and the woman was very beautiful to look upon,' with the subsequent narrative. And as he read on to the story of Amnon and Tamar, of the rebellion of Absalom and Sheba and the various calamities that crowded round his hero at the close of his life, it is not surprising that he decided to limit his work to the earlier and happier years of David's reign.

Although we have, to my knowledge, no MS evidence to indicate a break at this point (nor was any indication likely to survive when the translation of the book was subsequently completed), yet we have an exact parallel in the O.T. for the reserve, call it scrupulousness or patriotism if you will, of this translator. He had a precedent to support him. The Chronicler, writing perhaps a century and a half before our translator, had acted in a precisely similar way. After the genealogies which occupy the first nine chapters of 1 Chron., the narrative at 10 begins with the death of Saul on Gilboa, repeating the story that had been told in the last chapter of 1 Kin. (31); the first four chapters of 2 Kin. find no equivalent in Chron., but from 1 Kin. 5 to 11 the two narratives run parallel with each other, except that the short

* About 300 B.C. is the date of Chronicles adopted by Driver with most critics. The two narratives are conveniently placed side by side in The Parallel History of the Jewish Monarchy (Camb. Univ. Press, 1897).
NOTES AND STUDIES

story of Mephibosheth is omitted. 1 Chron. 20:1 corresponds to the concluding verse of the translator ββ: 'And it came to pass at the time of the return of the year, at the time when kings go out to battle, that Joab led forth the power of the army, and wasted the country of the children of Ammon, and came and besieged Rabbah. But David tarried at Jerusalem.' Then the narrative is condensed. The story of Bathsheba and the birth of Solomon is omitted, together with the whole history of the rebellions of Absalom and Sheba. After stating the bare fact that ‘Joab smote Rabbah and took it’, and narrating how David took the king's crown and punished the Ammonites, the Chronicler proceeds (in 20:6) 'And it came to pass after this that there arose war at Gezer with the Philistines', a passage which corresponds to 2 Sam. 11:16, in other words he passes over nearly eleven chapters of the earlier narrative.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO LATEST PORTIONS.

I now proceed to give a list of ten instances including the chief characteristics of the translator of the portions βγ and γδ. The instances selected are those that shew most clearly the beginning and ending of the portion βγ (2 Kin. 11:1, 3 Kin. 21:17). They also serve to shew the striking agreement between βγ and γδ and the almost complete absence of the phrases distinctive of this translator from the other sections α, ββ, and γγ. The instances of similarity of style in the latter half of 2 Kin. and in 4 Kin. might easily be multiplied: the instances proving that this style extends to the first sixty-four verses of 3 Kin. are of course fewer. I think, however, that these ten examples are sufficient by themselves to fix the bounds of the portion βγ. Three of them, at any rate (Nos. 5, 9, and 10) concern the use or disuse of phrases and modes of speech which offer ample opportunities for testing the practice of the Kingdom Books as a whole. (See table on p. 268.)

Several of the words in this list will repay study.

(1) The use of 01 δῆρον for 'the great men' (Heb. ל כ ב נ, כ ב נ, &c.) is limited elsewhere in LXX to two passages in Job (not in the θ portions), one in Isa., and one in Jer. α. It is not attested in the other versions known to Origen and is foreign to classical Greek.

(2) The use of the adj. καταινή (sc. οὐλπιτυγγ) as the rendering of shophar occurs also in Jd. (ten times, B and A text), 2 Es. 14:18 (19), 20 (24), and in interpolations (? Hexaplaric) in Jos. 6:1 ff and 2 Chron. 15:14 (A). It occurs also in four of the later (Hexaplaric) versions. A passage in ψ 97) explains the rendering, where the οὐλπιτυγγ καταινη (= ἐφώς) is distinguished from the οὐλπιτυγγ θλασαγ ( = ἐφώς). The shophar was synonymous with the κερεν and consisted in primitive times of a ram's horn: the ἱασαραθ was the straight trumpet of beaten metal. Most of the LXX books use οὐλπιτυγγ to render both Hebrew words: the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a (1 K.)</th>
<th>BB (2 K. 11-11)</th>
<th>βγ (2 K. 11-11</th>
<th>γγ (3 K. 12-12)</th>
<th>γ (3 K. 22, 4 K.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Adjectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδειος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 14, 3 K. 15}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνεργία</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 15, 3 K. 16, 20, 24}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύναφες</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μορφοῖ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 K. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 3, 6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also rendered by</td>
<td>30, 118, 119, 123</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀφοί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions and particles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ἀνάμεσα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 11, 34}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 2} B 8 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 11, 34, 43}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάμενε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 11, 14, 15, 44}</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>{10 times}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) καὶ γε</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 BA</td>
<td>{29 exx. in B}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{17 exx. in B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from 2 K. 11 to 2 K. 14, and 3 K. 1, 4, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 K. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 K. 22, and 4 K. 2 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) καὶ μάλα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) ἀπὸ ὑπὸ διὰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 14}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 K. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπὸ ὑπὸ διὰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) ὅτε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 K. 12, 13, 16, 17, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 K. 4, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐφώ ἐφω</td>
<td>subject of finite vb.</td>
<td></td>
<td>{2 K. 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24}</td>
<td></td>
<td>{4 K. 4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contrast e.g. ὧν καὶ ὧν καὶ &amp;c. 21, 24, 26, 31, 35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Historic present</td>
<td>145 exx.</td>
<td>28 exx.</td>
<td>Once 47 exx.</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>74 exx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-9)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(3-14, 15)</td>
<td>(3-14, 15)</td>
<td>(7-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Occurs in three Hexaplaric interpolations in A: 1 Kin. 18, 19, 24.
+ Also in the preceding verse in A, where the text of B has been cut away, and in an interpolation of A in 318.
- In a Hexaplaric interpolation of A after 47 (M).
* A has it in 318 (B omits clause).
- But cf. 2 Kin. 7th ob e, πότε μοῦ Æρε, ἢλλάτυς.
* The clause is omitted in Codd. 71, 245. The passage 147b, not in M. T., is shown by the two presents to be a gloss.
- These exx. disappear in the Lucianic text, which reads ὧν. Ὅτων in 211 is due to the Heb. participle: the Lucianic text, with some VSS., reads ὧν οὖν. The passage 147b, where B has βασιλεῖ, is not in M. T., and the hist. pres. indicates that it was not part of the original version.
translator now under consideration, in common with two late books of the Greek Bible and the later versions, indicates the distinction in the original by using the adj. meaning ‘horn’ of the shophar, and restricting the use of σάλβατρις to the ἁσασεραχ."

(3) Μονόξωνος is an interesting and puzzling word. The Hebrew מַעְתִּיר, which it renders, is from a root signifying ‘to cut’ or ‘penetrate’; the noun is used of ‘a band’ or ‘troop’, (1) usually a marauding band, (2) in later Hebrew ‘a division’ or ‘troop’ in a regular army, (3) once (2 Sam. 3:27) ‘a raid’ or ‘foray’. The Oxford Hebrew Lexicon offers two alternative methods of connecting the meaning of the noun with the root-meaning: either the troop got its name ‘as making inroads’, or as ‘a division, detachment (as severed)’, a meaning, however, which is restricted to later Hebrew.

The word is rendered in a variety of ways in the LXX, its meaning being generally well understood (except that it is used of a single marauder as well as a troop), while one translator (Kin. ββ) correctly discriminates between two differing senses. Transliteration b only takes place in Kin. α, as quoted above, and in 1 Chron. 12:3. Elsewhere we have περατηρίων (Gen. 49:19, Job 19:8, Ψ 17:80), περατης (Job 25:6, Hos. 6:2), λυστηρων (2 Chron. 22:1), λυστης (Hos. 7:1, Jer. 18:22), δύναμις (1 Chron. 12:18, 2 Chron. 25:10, 11), λύσιν (1 Chron. 7:1), ἔμφραγμός (apparently meaning ‘blockade’, if the text is right, Mic. 5:4(44)). In 2 Chron. 26:11 the word is omitted in the Greek.

Turning to the later versions, the usual rendering of Symmachus (attested in five passages) is λόχος, which is well chosen as practically coextensive in meaning with the Hebrew word. Aquila’s rendering (attested eight times) is οἰκενως, a word specially used of light-armed troops.

Aquila’s rendering brings us back to the similar μονόξωνος now under consideration. In 4 Kin. the word is used in the plural (once only in the singular, 13“ δεν ντι μ.) of predatory bands from Syria, Moab, Ammon, and Chaldaeans: possibly, as in the case of κερατινη, a substantive (e.g. στρατώται or λόχοι) should be supplied. In 2 Kin. 22:20 ἐν σοι δραμόματι μονόξωνος (Ὑπ’ Ἐ. Υ. Ε., R. V. ‘run upon a troop’) it is used adjectivally and appears to be equivalent to οἰκενως, ‘under Thy protection no heavy armour need impede my steps’; the parallel passage in Ψ 17 (18)80 runs ἐν σοι φρενήθησαι απο το περατηριου. Apart from these passages in 2 and 4 Kin. the word is confined d in ‘Biblical Greek’ to two instances in Theodo-

---

a σάλβατρις in 4 Kin. 11:18-16, 12:15: ἁσασεραχ does not occur in the βγ portion.

b Incorrect, the final γ being read as γ.

c The verb used in Ψ is probably chosen on account of its similarity to the Heb. (πω’)—a common phenomenon in the LXX.

d The version of Quinta in Ψ 67 should be read as μονόξωνος. In 2 Kin. 3:28 Aquila is cited in favour of both οἰκενως and μονόξωνος; the former is, no doubt, what he wrote.
tion's version of Job, viz. 19\textsuperscript{b} (of the troops of God that beset him = τὰ παιρατήρια αὐτοῦ of LXX) and 29\textsuperscript{a}, where the patriarch describes his former prosperity when he 'dwelt as a king in the army', κατεσκήνων ὡσεὶ βασιλεὺς ἐν μονοξώνοις. This last passage is one of many interpolations from Θ which now form a part of our Septuagint text.

What is the origin of the word? Does it mean 'a man with only a belt', or (like similarly formed words) 'a man with only one belt' or 'a lonely man with a belt'? The last is the meaning given to what is practically the same word, οἰοξώνοι, in the only classical parallel of which I am aware. In Soph. O. T. 842 ff Oedipus, who has just heard from Jocasta the rumour that Laius was killed by robbers, and is anxiously awaiting confirmation from the sole survivor, finds some consolation in the fact that the informant spoke of robbers (λησταὶ) in the plural, 'but' he adds,

εἰ δὲ ἄνδρα ἐν οἰοξώνοιν ἀδέσπει, σαφῶς
tovs' ἐστιν ἠδη τοὐργον εἰς ἐμὲ βέσων.

This is translated in the standard edition, 'But if he names one lonely wayfarer, then beyond doubt this guilt leans to me': and the eminent editor\textsuperscript{a} quotes parallels from the poets for instances where the second part of the compound is equivalent to a second epithet for the noun. It would be hazardous in the extreme to question this translation, but the juxtaposition of οἰοξώνοι and λησταὶ, in the light of the later use of μονοξώνοι, makes it hard to resist the suspicion that the former word or its prosaic equivalent already in the fifth century B.C. denoted in common parlance a highwayman or bandit.

Later writers, as quoted in the Lexicons, give various definitions, but the exact meaning of the word still remains uncertain, and some of the definitions may be mere guesses of commentators who knew how the word was used in the LXX. There is included in the works of Ephrem Syrus\textsuperscript{b} a sort of catechism on difficulties in the Old and New Testaments. The last of the questions and answers runs: (ἔφυσεν) τίσει λέγοντι μονοξώνοι; (ἀπόκρισις) οἱ φονεῖς καὶ λησταὶ καὶ πᾶς κακοῦργος καὶ πόρος μονοξώνοι λέγεται. This rather vague definition is repeated by others. Suidas quotes several definitions, the first two being taken from the commentary on Job written by Olympiodorus of Alexandria in the sixth century: (1) οἱ τίμοι τῶν στρατιωτῶν, οἱ μὴ ταύτων τῶν ἄλλως ζωτήρα φοροῦντες (this looks less like guessing, but the date is late), (2) ἀσώτατοι (undisciplined) καὶ ὡσανεὶ λησταὶ, (3) οἱ ἰθοδοι βάρβαροι ἢ ἀπελάται μάχιμοι (cattle-stealers). Hesychius gives οἱ τῶν πολεμίων κατάκόσποι ἢ

\textsuperscript{a} The late Sir Richard Jebb.

\textsuperscript{b} Roman edition (1732–1746), tom. III (graece et latina) p. 478 B. Of course Ephrem, who did not write in Greek, is not the author: but the inclusion of the catechism in his works suggests that it may be Syrian in origin.
Theophanes, the ninth-century Byzantine historian who continued the Chronicon of Syncellus, uses μονικόνων (sometimes with στρατιώται) apparently for light-armed soldiers. Lastly, the explanation given in a modern Greek Lexicon is ὁ φορὼν μόνον τὴν ζώνην (χωρὶς τοῦ σπαθί), i.e. without a broad-sword.

Whatever the original meaning, the points to note in connexion with the LXX are that the word is confined to one of the translators of Kin. and to Theodotion; that it is unknown (so far as I am aware) to the Egyptian papyri, whereas it seems to be more familiar in Syria; and that the latest translator of the Kingdom books, in selecting this word, perhaps had regard to the Heb. root meaning 'to cut' or 'sever', and intended by it a detachment of light-armed men who carried on guerrilla warfare on their own account under no regular leader.

(4)–(8) Of the prepositions and particles in the above list not much need be said. ἄρανωθεν (unexampled outside LXX and Hexapla) is confined elsewhere in the LXX to Jd. 16:0 B, and to vll. in Am. 29 (A), Job 31 (N IIa): Symmachus has it in Prov. 24:18. ἐπάνωθεν is more common: it may be noted that in the Hexateuch it is limited to the latter half of Exodus (25:18, 26:4, 38:8). Compound prepositional forms are characteristic of the later books: such are ἑξοπισθεν, κατοπισθεν, πάρεξ, περικύκλω (distinctive of Ez. β.), ἔποκάτωθεν. Under the same category come compound conjunctions such as ἄνθ' ὅν ὅτι, ἄνθ' ὅν ὅσα; apart from the examples quoted from βδ in the list, the former is confined in LXX to Dt. 28:16 and Ez. 36:4 (in a section recalling the style of Θ), the latter to Jd. 20: B A: ἄνθ' ὅν ὅσον in the A text of 3 Kin. 14:18 is from Aquila: elsewhere the translators use ἄνθ' ὅν alone.

Καὶ γε as the rendering of οὐ is one of numerous instances of a Greek word being selected from its resemblance to the Hebrew: it is common to αὐθ', but has to come into use before their time.

Καὶ μιλά, which is good classical Greek for 'indeed', 'certainly', in the LXX recurs only in Dan. O 16v (= ßξν) and twice in the N text of Tobit. It is true that ßξν which it renders is absent from Kingdoms α, β, and γγ: the word, which in older Hebrew is asseverative and in later Hebrew adversative, is elsewhere rendered by να (Gen.), ἄλλα (2 Chron., 1 and 2 Es.), ἄλλας (2 Chron., Dan. θ), and πλήν (2 Chron.).

Ἡνίκα, which is limited in Kingdoms to βδ, is not uncommon elsewhere in LXX: it is a distinguishing mark of Ez. β.

* e.g. in Migne P. G. tom. 108, col. 817 fin. of Saracenic bands in Asia Minor: καὶ κατά τῆς Βασιλείας Νικάλας παρατάσσεται τῶν Σαρακηνῶν δύο Ἀμουραίων στίλες, Ἀμόρ ἄχλα Μοναδόνδος βεδάνετε χ. η. 

* Steph. dixit ex nescio quo Οθονα καὶ ἄνθερσταρατείνα καὶ ὁμονύμιοί (i.e. εὐθύνοι) Ἑβραῖοι καὶ μονοθείοι καλοῦνται.

I have failed to find the passage in Budaecus.
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The strange use of ἐγὼ ἐμι followed by a finite verb, apart from the eleven instances in βς (which are common to the B and A texts), occurs five times in the B text of Jd., once in the A text of that book, 6ο ἐγὼ ἐμι καθησομαι, and once in Ruth (which forms an appendix to Jd.) 4' B A ἐγὼ ἐμι ἀγγειονέω: there is also a very doubtful example in Ez. 36ο A.

Turning to the later versions, we find that Aquila has the same construction: but the only examples from his version collected by Field are confined to the latter part of Jeremiah. These are Jer. 36 (29)ο, where he appears to have read (with δ) ἐγὼ οἶδα τὸν λογομν ἐγὼ ἐμι λογιζομαι, 38 (31)ο, 40 (33)ο ἐγὼ ἐμι ποιήσω twice (the text is uncertain in the first passage), and possibly 45 (38)ο, where he is cited both for βάλλω ἐγὼ τὴν δέσιν μου and for βίπτω ἐγὼ ἐμι τὸν ἀλείσμον μου, Field attributing the latter reading to Aquila's second edition. The solecism puzzled the scribes, who have twice altered ἐμι to ἐι μη, once to μη, while in the last passage quoted ἐμι τὸν becomes ἐμαντόν.

Theodotion, in addition to the first passage in Jeremiah already mentioned, had this construction in Job 33ο καθοικον καὶ ἐγὼ ἐμι λαλησω, and probably in Is. 54ο (ἐγὼ ἐμι ἐμβαλων being doubtless a correction made to improve the grammar).

With these examples must be placed the solitary instance of an analogous use of οὐ εἰ: 2 Kin. 7ο οὐ εἰ, κύριε μου Κύριε, θαλησοσ.

This otiose use of εἰμι, not as an auxiliary with a participle (which is common enough in the Hellenistic language), but apparently in apposition with a finite verb, is probably unparalleled outside Biblical Greek. The suggestion quoted in Schleusner (s. v. εἰμι), that it is due to an ellipse of the relative δε, might derive some colour from the B text of 2 Kin. 1ο, where ἐγὼ ἐμι ὁ χριστος balances ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐφοσιμην; but the true text in the first clause is no doubt that witnessed to by the O.L. and a group of cursives, ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐχριστο. Moreover, this explanation would not account for the phrase in passages where no emphasis is laid on the agent, or where, as in Jd. 11ο, ἐγὼ εἰμι follows the other verb. Again, the fact that the phrase is used as often of men and women as of God puts out of the question any reference to the Divine Name of Ex. 3ο.

I have nowhere seen stated what I have no doubt is the true explanation. It is to be found in the usual ellipse in Hebrew of the verb 'to be' and in the varying forms of the Hebrew pronoun. The pronounο of the first person took the two forms 'ἐνοκι and 'ἐνι. Later writers shew a growing preference for 'ἐνι, and the longer form practically disappeared: Aramaic had no equivalent for it. At the time when the later translators did their work 'ἐνοκι was a strange word and would excite attention.

ο I take the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon as my authority.
The use of the one form or the other in the earlier Hebrew books is often indiscriminate: the longer form is, however, regularly employed with a predicate. ‘I am’ is expressed by ‘אָנָּהֻי, not by ‘אָנָי, except in the phrase ‘I am the Lord’, where ‘אָנָי is usual. This distinction between the two forms was observed by the translators, and the practice seems to have grown up of rendering the longer form by יְהַוֶּה אִמ, the shorter by יְהַוֶּה. When the demand arose for rigid exactness of translation, and every jot and tittle in the original required to be indicated in the version, the equation יְהַוֶּה אִמ = ‘אָנָהֻי became an invariable rule, even where ‘אָנָהֻי obviously did not mean ‘I am’. The Greek phrase was merely a mechanical device for indicating to the Hebrew-speaking reader the form which the pronoun took in the original. In all the passages quoted above, where יְהַוֶּה אִמ appears with another verb, ‘אָנָהֻי stands in the M. T., with the exception of the two last in 4 Kin. (10, 12) and Jer. 45 (38), the passage where two readings are attributed to Aquila. As regards the two passages in 4 Kin. the translators probably found ‘אָנָהֻי in their text: by Origen’s time it had been replaced by ‘אָנָי in 22, as the אִמ’ was obelized in the Hexapla.

The rule governing the use of יְהַוֶּה אִמ strongly reminds one of Aquila’s peculiarities, and it might be thought that he was its originator. Against this, however, is the fact of its attestation throughout β6 by both the B and the A texts: its antiquity is moreover vouched for by the Old Latin, while the obelus of Origen proves that it was present in the מְבָרָא הַדָּבָרִים of his time. It appears that Aquila was not the first to found a school of literal translation. Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona.

A word as to σύ εἰ... Ἰδαλίγης. The phrase is unique: it occurs in a portion where the seemingly analogous יְהַוֶּה אִמ is absent: it cannot well be explained on the same principle. The εἰ has probably come into the text from the preceding verse, where it is in place (καὶ νῦν, κύριε μου Κύριε, σὺ εἰ δ ὀθός), or else σύ εἰ must be taken as a distinct clause and a stop placed before Ιδαλίγης.

(10) As to the historic present I must be brief. The contrast which β6 presents in this respect to the other Kingdom Books recalls a similar contrast in the N. T., where Matthew and Luke between them have eliminated from the Gospel narrative nearly all the historic presents which are such a striking feature in Mark. In the LXX the historic

- Contrast Ex. 30 τῷ γάρ εἴμι Κύριος = רָאָה with יְהַוֶּה Кύριος ב. 6. א. י = רָאָה: but the rule does not seem to have been universally observed.
- The reading of A in Ex. 36 may be neglected, the insertion of אִמ being due to the influence of the common refrain ‘Thy shall know that I am the Lord’.
- Whereas in Jd. it is, with one exception, confined to the B text, and in 5 יְהַוֶּה אִמ is expressly marked with the asterisk.
- See the statistics in Horae Synopticae pp. 114 ff. Sir J. Hawkins is not quite accurate in his statement that ‘it appears from the LXX that the historic present was by no means common in Hellenistic Greek’.
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present is not frequent with verbs of saying: in the Pentateuch it is found chiefly with verbs of seeing, in the Kingdom Books mainly with verbs of motion (coming and sending). In 1 Kin. it is specially common in introductory clauses, where a fresh departure is made in the narrative: when the various actors have been brought on to the scene and their preliminary movements presented to the mind's eye by the historic present, the subsequent main actions are described by past tenses (e.g. 17:ff, 28:ff: so 3 Kin. 11:18). In 3 Kin. the commonest instance is βασιλέως, 'came to the throne'. All three translators, α, ββ, and γγ, use the picturesque tense of funerals, for what reason is not obvious: contrast the formula describing the decease of one monarch and the accession of the next as rendered in γγ, ἐκουμήνη ... βασιλεύει ... βασιλεύειν (or βασιλεύεις) with the invariable phrase in γδ, ἐκουμήνη ... ἐκκαίρισε ... ἐβασιλεύειν.

Some other characteristic usages of βάλειν, which will repay study, are ἀνήρ for ὕπνοι in the sense of 'each' (where the other translators of K. use ἅκαστος), ἀναγέλλω (the others usually ἀναγγέλλω), ἀναφέρεται and συναφεῖ (for the usual substantives in -γεῖς), two words for 'to save'—ἐξάλοσθαι and ἰόνεσθαι.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THREE EARLIER PORTIONS.

Characteristics of α. This translator has a certain independence or perhaps one should rather say a want of familiarity with renderings employed in the Pentateuch and elsewhere of some common Hebrew words. His version reads like a first attempt at rendering the phraseology of the Kingdom Books. He is on ground that has not been traversed before him. He is often in doubt as to the meaning, and occasionally omits difficult words. Examples of renderings peculiar to him are: (τά) τῶν βασιλέων = ὧν, 'guilt-offering', 6:6, 8, 11 (elsewhere περὶ ἀναφερέται K. γδ 12:8, Le., Isa., τῶν παλαιολέους Le., Num., ἀνήρ (περὶ) ἀναφέρειν Ez.): —δικαίω = έκκινήσεως and δικαστής where other translators use κρίνων and κρίνει: —καταφέρειν 19:16 = ἐπιτάσσειν: in 15:20 θεραπεύειν B is an example of imitation of the Hebrew word (elsewhere the Hebrew is transliterated θεραφείν, &c., Jd., 4 Kin., 2 Chron.): —λοιμός (adj.) 1:6, 2:13, 16:7, 25:11:8, 30: = γρήγορος (= παράνομος in Jd., Jd., Kin. βγ and γγ, and 2 Chron.): —μηδαμός = ἄδικος seven times in 1 Kin., once in Gen. (elsewhere ἀδικία 3 Kin. γγ, Gen., Jos.: ἄδικος 2 Kin. βγ 20:8, 23:7, 1 Chron.): —παρθένος γῆν 2:6 apparently = 'gave ground', 'yielded':—πόλει ἐπιτρέ­πουσαν 6:18 = ἀνακαίνεσθαι (rendered in βγ and γδ by π. ἄνευρε, as in most books, or by ἀνεύρετο): —στρατηγὸν = δικοῦ, with the meaning 'tribe' eight times; so three times in γγ (elsewhere φυλή in βγ, γγ, γδ, &c.): —σοφίζωνθαι

a Contrast the phrase ἀναγέλλω λήγοντες in βγ (2 Kin. 15:11, 19:1; 3 Kin. 1:14) with ἀναγγέλλω λήγοντες in a (14:2, 15:1, 19:15, 23:1; cf. 24:2); ββ (3:3, 6:15), and γγ (2:8, m. n).
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= "Γ only in 1 Kin. 30 (γγ renders by συνέλυ). He transliterates where others translate in the case of κύριος (θεός) σαβαὼθ with Isaiah (κυρίος θεο) τῶν δυνάμεων in βγ, γδ, Psalms, &c.: κυρίος παντοκράτωρ in ββ six times, Jer., Minor Proph., &c.: also in the case of ἐφοίτη βάρ 31 (= στολήν ξαλλον of 2 Kin. 64, στ. βασανίη of 1 Chron. 1510), and so ἐφοίτη ten times in this book (ἐφοίτη Jd.: in Pent., Sir., Ez. ἐπιμύσ). The divergence between α and ββ in these last two instances will be noted. Two other marks of his style are the use of the subject without a definite article when a genitive follows, due to imitation of the Hebrew (e.g. 51 ff) and the opening of a sentence with a genitive absolute with asyndeton (e.g. 937).

The translators of α and ββ coincide in some place-names. The form ὑιουδαία (as opposed to ἱουδά) is confined in the B text of the Kingdom Books to these two portions*: they have also in common the adjectival form Γαλαάδερισ (elsewhere in Kin. Γαλαάδ). These two translators also stand alone in rendering τιτιττιτττττ by δοτε λίαν (1 Kin. 1112; 2 Kin. 213): the Greek versions elsewhere adopted are θος σφόδρα (3 Kin. 13, 2 Chron., Ψ, Λαμ., Dan. Θ), σφόδρα (Gen., Isa., Dan. O 86, Θ 1110), and once (Dan. O 11111) σφόδρα λίαν.

Characteristics of ββ. A distinctive feature of the ββ portion consists in peculiarities in verbal terminations. Of course these may be due to later scribes and not to the translator. But it is remarkable that the following forms are restricted in 2 Kin. to the first few chapters: (i) the termination of the 2nd sg. of the fut. mid. in -η, δησε 313 B, ἵσαν B5, ταρέσε 52 B5, εἰρελέναι 54 B5, ἀναβήσε 55 B5, καταβήσε 56 B (the forms in -η begin at 1110 ἐρήμη and continue throughout ἵγα, e.g. ἵγα 1311, 1411, 1511, 1811, 1911; 3 Kin. 23); (ii) the termination -α in the impf., διεβάιναν 23 B, ἵφερα 23 B, ἱγαν 66 B (contrast παρήγαγον 1111, ἄνδεβανων 15110); (iii) the termination -οσαν, common in the other historical books (thirty exx. in the B text of Joshua), is conspicuous by its absence in 1-4 Kin.: of the three solitary exx. two occur in this ββ portion, viz. ἰγαλόσαν 2 Kin. 213 A, ἰλάσβοσαν 511 B: the third ex. is ἥμαρτοσαν 3 Kin. 810 A (τον B); to these should be added the rather different impf. termination ἵνοοῦσαν 2 Kin. 2016.

The mythological allusion in 2 Kin. 520, 22 · the valley of the Titans = Δανίζη, Ἵφη (with which contrast ἵνοι δύνατος τοῦ Παφά, &c.,

* 1 Kin. [17' A] 25, 276, 18, 3011; 2 Kin. 21: in Cod. A it twice replaces γγ (τοῦ) Ιουδα of B in 4 Kin. Ὑουδαία, however (2 Kin. 814 διόσ), is also attested in 3 Kin. and once (1411) in 4 Kin.

† 1 Kin. 311; 2 Kin. 214. Cf. ἱσραήλίτης = a Jezreelitess: 1 Kin. 271 B, 301 B; 2 Kin. 31 B.

* Similar forms of the αυρίστ (ήειν, &c.) occur throughout 2 Kin., being very frequent in the ββ portion.
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2 Kin. 21 14, 16, 20) reminds the reader of the allusions to the Amazons in the Alexandrine version of Chronicles (2 Chron. 14", (? 22'). The use of ἡγοῦσα (a word previously used in 3") in 11 suggests that that verse should be included in the βθ portion.

Of the style of γγ it is difficult to speak. The B and A texts diverge so widely, the order of events has so often been transposed in the two texts, while sometimes we get a duplicate record in the same text (e.g. the double narrative of Solomon's prosperity in the B text of 2 11 and 4 11), that it is extremely doubtful what the original version was like. Probably it consisted of extracts only, and it may be that two separate versions have been run together. That the last chapter of 3 Kin. should be ascribed to the translator of 4 Kin. is suggested by the use of ἄριστος for ἵππος (22") and of καὶ γας ("), and by the absence of the historic present: contrast also ἄσθιλθης ταμιών τοῦ ταμιῶν  with 2 11 ωῇλθὲν ἐς τὸν ὅλον τὸν κοινώσας ἐς τὸ ταμιῶν (same Hebrew). Further ὅχι ὀνόματι (Hebrew ש"), &c., δέκτα δὲλλ  "", μυστήριαν" are in the manner of βθ.

The three years' armistice between Syria and Israel (22') was the point selected for a break in the Greek narrative of the later Monarchy.

PLACE AND DATE OF TRANSLATION.

Before closing this paper, I will add some purely tentative remarks as to the place of writing and the date of the portions of the Greek Bible which we have been considering. As to the place of writing, I would suggest that there seems some ground for thinking that the translator of βθ was a Palestinian. In support of this I would call attention to two points. (1) The demand for a somewhat pedantically literal version, such as that contained in βθ, is more likely to have arisen in Palestine than at Alexandria. Such a version, the main purpose of which was to render every word of the original and to find an equivalent for each shade of difference in the Hebrew orthography, was a protest against the licence of the later Alexandrine translators, who did not scruple to abbreviate or add to the sacred page. The literalism has, of course, not advanced so far as in Aquila's version: we here see the tendency in an earlier stage of development. (2) There is a marked absence in the portion βθ (as also to a great extent in the other portions of the Kingdom Books) of the Alexandrine phraseology of the papyri. Here the translation of Chronicles offers a strong contrast. The Egyptian colouring is there unmistakeable. The translator of Chronicles identifies the Sukkîm and the Meunîm with the Troglodytes and the Minaeans  

In 21 ἄριστος τῶν ἄγωνων is an interpolation (not in M. T.). In verse 20, however, Lucian's text reads καὶ οὖσα ἄριστος Τιτανὸς (ΒΑ καὶ γας αὐτῶς τίτασαν τῷ Πάπδ).  

b 2 Chron. 13".  
c 1 Chron. 4"; 2 Chron. 26"; cf. 20", 26".
respectively, two tribes living by the Red Sea: he uses the titles of the Alexandrine court, διάδοχος (or διαδεχόμενος), οἱ πρῶτοι διάδοχοι τοῦ βασιλέως, ὁ πρῶτος φίλος: the word he uses for a chamber attached to the Temple is the name for a cell in the Serapeum (παστοφόρων): the phrase τῶς ἐν γυναικίς (2 Chron. 31:18) is very frequent in the papyri, apparently referring to a second generation of Macedonian Greeks who had settled in Egypt.

As to dates, I may on a future occasion discuss the bearing of some evidence from the papyri on the dates of these and other portions of the Greek Bible. Here I will merely state my opinion that, while α, β, and γγ go back as far as the second century B.C., the portion βδ is probably not earlier than 100 B.C. How much later than that date could βδ be placed? The similarity of some of the language to that of Theodotion has already been noted. The suggestion that might be made that Theodotion is himself the translator is rendered impossible by the fact that Josephus was acquainted with these portions of the Greek Kingdoms. In the N.T. the only clear use of βδ is in Ap. 20:4 (= 4 Kin. 1:10). Philo uses α and γγ, but does not quote from the βδ portion: his reference to 'the first Book of Kingdoms' need not imply the existence of more than three Books in his day. The conclusion arrived at is that the final portions of the Greek Books of Kingdoms were probably appended some time in the first century B.C., and that the translator's style has much in common with that afterwards adopted by Theodotion.

Criticism has come to a similar result in the case of the Greek Daniel, namely that there must have been in addition to the loose Alexandrine

---

\(^a\) 2 Chron. 26:11, 28:7.
\(^b\) 1 Chron. 26:18; 2 Chron. 31:18.
\(^c\) 1 Chron. 18:17.
\(^d\) 1 Chron. 27:22: 'Hushai the Archite, the king's friend' (יווחיאל ш הראש) has become Χουσελ ὁ πρῶτος φίλος τοῦ βασιλέως; cf. ὁ ἀρχιερατὴς Δανίελ 2 Kin. 16:14.
\(^e\) 1 Chron. 9:6, &c.; cf. Deissmann Bible Studies 145 f.
\(^f\) See Mahaffy Empire of the Ptolemies p. 211. Sir Henry Howorth has claimed in this Journal (April 1906, p. 343) and elsewhere to have definitely proved that the text of the Canonical Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah contained in the extant Greek Bibles is not a Septuagint text at all, but is a second-century production, probably Theodotion's. Whatever probability there may be in this contention as regards Esdras B, the Egyptian colouring of the 'Septuagint' Chronicles makes it impossible to hold that Theodotion is the translator. I have not seen any proofs adduced by Sir Henry Howorth from style.

An exception might perhaps be admitted in the case of the Song and the Last Words of David (2 Kin. 21:23-23'), where the similarity to the language of Θ is specially marked and where quotations from Θ are absent from Field's Hexapla.

\(^g\) A clear instance occurs in Ant. Jud. i 122 (Niese) ἐμπρόσθεν τή τιν ἔλη καὶ κατεβάσας ἑαυτοῦ προς ἀντίθεν θελείων, following 4 Kin. 9:3 τίς εἶ σοι; καταβαίνει μετ' ὧμου (M.T. ὡς τιν ἔτο). Quod dens immut. 2 (6 Wendland) ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ βασιλέως.
paraphrase of that book a translation resembling that of Theodotion, but made before his time and known to the writers of the N.T.

The following are some of the questions arising out of the foregoing discussion. When did the division of the Books dealing with the Monarchy originate? Did the translators find a two-fold or a four-fold division already in existence? What is the explanation of the ordinary four-fold division? What is the relation of β8 to the Greek version of Judges in the Codex Vaticanus?

H. St J. Thackeray.

'SPANISH SYMPTOMS.'

This title is borrowed; but its appropriation may find some excuse in that the details to be given will perhaps fit into the work of the writer from whom it is here adopted. In the Book of Cerne (Cambridge, 1902) it was said there appear to be 'real indications that the rising Church of the English was influenced in the very centre of its life by the then flourishing Visigothic Church of Spain' (p. 277); and it was suggested (p. 280) that this influence was felt through the medium of Ireland rather than of Gaul.

In the present paper I propose (I) to bring together the scattered notices on the subject in the 'Liturgical Note' of that volume, and add a few more details; (II) to consider at what period it is most likely Spanish documents can have made their way into England; (III) starting from the three prayers to the Blessed Virgin in the Book of Cerne (nos. 56, 57, 58) to illustrate the Marian cult evidenced in some of our earliest Western liturgy books. The subject of 'Spanish Symptoms' is if not new at least somewhat unfamiliar and at present obscure; it must therefore in any case be dealt with tentatively. What I should wish, however, now to do is to raise this question of the influence of the Visigothic Church on our insular Churches, of England and of Ireland, as a matter to be considered in and for itself; but I shall act as if little more than a finger-post, pointing to the lines of enquiry to be pursued and stopping short at the beginning of them.

It will be well, however, to make clear at once what is the ultimate object, what in a word is the 'use' of such enquiries. At the Congrès de l'Histoire des Religions', held at Paris in 1900, one or two voices

* I am aware that the Hebrew MSS have a two-fold division only; but the fact that the Book of Saul (the Greek σ) and the Book of David (the Greek ββ with ψ) form two volumes of exactly equal length in Codex B suggests that they may have been arranged as separate books before the translators did their work.