THE LUCIANIC TEXT OF 1 KINGS VIII 53\textsuperscript{b}.

One of the stock instances of the value of the Septuagint for restoring the original text of the Hebrew Bible is the addition which we find in the Greek attached to the end of 1 Kings viii 53, i.e. to the end of Solomon's dedicatory prayer. It consists of a fuller, though somewhat corrupt, form of the same speech that occurs in the Hebrew at 1 Kings vii 12, 13, i.e. prefixed to the beginning of Solomon's prayer. According to the Greek the passage is a quotation from the famous 'Book of Jashar', though the reference is a little obscured by a corruption in the Hebrew text that underlies the Greek. Naturally a piece of critical information so interesting as this has received plenty of attention from scholars: Cheyne (art. 'Jas\textsuperscript{h}er', Encycl. Bibl. 2334 b) quotes, besides Klostermann's note on the passage, Robertson Smith \textit{OTJC}. \textsuperscript{9} 434 sq. and Wellhausen \textit{CH.} \textsuperscript{8} 269, in addition to his own \textit{Bampton Lectures} 193, 212, and Driver's \textit{Introduction} 182. The passage appears to me to merit a rather more detailed discussion than it has hitherto received, especially as the generally accepted reconstruction of the Hebrew text involves a serious error, which leads to a misconception of the genesis of the 'Lucianic' text of the Septuagint, and of the value of that text for critical purposes. The following Note therefore will deal at some length with the passage, and also attempt to point out in what way our estimate of the Lucianic text is modified by the readings adopted.

I

The chief authorities for reconstructing 1 Kings (3 Regn.) viii 53\textsuperscript{b} are the Greek texts of B A and 'Lucian', together with the Masoretic text of 1 Kings viii 12, 13.

\[\text{τότε ἐλάλησεν Ἑλληνικὸς ὕπερ τοῦ οἴκου ὃς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαι αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὖσαν Κύριος ἐπὶ πᾶς τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν γινόμενοι ἐπὶ καινότητος οὐκ ἴδον αὐτὴ γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς σφήνας;}\]

\textbf{Variants of BA Lucian:}

\begin{itemize}
\item Σαλομών Luc. ἐγνώρισεν B A, ἔστησεν Luc. κατε 
\item κατε 
\item κατε Κατε ὁ Κατε τὸ κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κατε Κα
istic of the various texts. The insertion of καί before εἰρήν shews that 'Lucian' connects Κύριος with the preceding words. ἐκνοφογ for ἐννοφωθ must ultimately be a mere mistake, though probably the scribe of B was not the culprit, as the Ethiopic is said to support ἐκ νότον. For the Books of Kings οὖν ἵδον, not οὐχί, is the regular formula, and ἐν βιβλίῳ is confirmed by the Vienna Latin Palimpsest in 3 Regn. xi 41, xvi 5, 14, though it represents Ἰσραήλ

The process of retranslating the Greek into the Hebrew that it represents, and of thereby restoring the original Hebrew of the passage, is beset with one or two serious difficulties. If we are to arrive at a fairly sure result, it can only be attained by the slow process of consulting the Concordance.

τότε ἐλάλησεν = ἔριπι
: see Josh. x 12, I Kings xi 7. The MT of ver. 12 (Ῥωμ 11) betrays the hand of the later adapter by the use of the perfect after ἔριπι.

ὁσσον εὐφέρεσεν = ἔφεσά; see 3 Regn. viii 54, 4 Regn. x 25.

ἐγνώρισεν—ἰστήρα. Wellhausen, followed by Robertson Smith, Cheyne and Driver, all regard the original Hebrew corresponding to this to have been לֹא 'he set', so that the first line of the extract from the Book of Jashar runs 'Jahwe set the sun in the heavens'. כָּל, so the theory goes, is preserved in the Lucianic text (ἰστήρα). But it was corrupted into כָּל 'he understood', and translated εγνώρισεν in the Greek text represented by B and A. ‘These two readings εγνώρισεν and iστήρα have no resemblance in Greek. But the corresponding Hebrew words are כָּל and כָּל respectively, which are so like that they could easily be mistaken. There can be no doubt that the latter is right; and the error in the common text shews that the addition really was found by the translators in Hebrew, not inserted out of their own head’ (Robertson Smith Old Test. in the Jewish Ch., 2nd ed., p. 433, following Wellhausen).

The bearings of this theory upon the assumed genesis of the Lucianic text will be discussed later. At this point it is sufficient to point out that it is wholly at variance with the usage of the Greek Bible. ἰστήρα might indeed stand for כָּל, as in Isaiah xi 20, though it is dangerous to predicate anything for certain with regard to so colourless a word. But εγνώρισεν can have nothing to do with כָּל; a glance at the Concordance is enough to shew that it must correspond to כָּל, as in 3 Regn. i 27 and about forty or fifty other passages. Between the two readings on internal grounds I venture to think it is not difficult to choose. ἐγνώρισεν makes no obvious sense, it is quite a peculiar word to use in this context, such a word as would naturally come to a translator mechanically translating a corrupt text he did not understand; ἰστήρα, on the other hand, is quite colourless, and might just as well
be an attempt to make some sort of meaning out of ἑγνομορεν, as a real rendering of some Hebrew word. ἑστησεν might be an explanation of ἑγνομορεν, while ἑγνομορεν can hardly have arisen out of ἑστησεν. In any case ἢνα is not a really appropriate word for an ancient Hebrew poet to use of the sun, which visibly 'runs its course' from east to west.

Klostermann accepts ἑγνομορεν and supposes it to correspond to יָדִים, which he points יִדְתִים, i.e. 'The sun is (or rather, will be) made known in heaven'. But the imperfect tense, which is essential to this pointing, is not suggested by the Greek, and would be exceedingly harsh. The general sense also is prosaic.

I venture to suggest that the יָדִים attested by LXX is a corruption of יָדִים 'to shine', a word especially used in connexion with a Theophany, e.g. Deut. xxxiii 2, Job xxxvii 15. I should like further to suppose that what underlies ἑγνομορεν is not ἡλίου (perf.) but ἡλίου (imperat.), and that Solomon says, 'Sun, shine forth in the heaven! Jahwe hath said He will dwell in the darkness—I have built Thee, O Jahwe, a House.' At least, we know that it would not be the only address to the Sun in the Book of Jashar (see Josh. x 12).

ὁικοδομησαν οἶκον μου = το ημιν, a mistake for the MT שָׁנַה בָּנָי, as Wellhausen and others have seen. But if שָׁנַה was written defectively (שָׁנַה), and this led to the error found in the Greek, it makes it easier to believe that יָדִים was also written defectively.

ἐκπρετή B, εὐπρεπή A Lucian, may perhaps imply γνύσι, as in Job xviii 15: comp. 2 Regn. xv 25. But more probably οἶκον ἐκπρετή (or εὐπρ.) is a guess at the meaning of בְּרוֹנ. Modern scholars guess from this context and from Isaiah lxiii 15 that בְּרוֹנ means some kind of heavenly castle or abode. It occurs in Hab. iii 11 in connexion with the sun, so that its use seems appropriate here. Even if the Greek represented מָנ, מָנ could only be regarded as a gloss for the more poetical term בְּרוֹנ.

toῦ κατοκεῖν . . . τῆς φωτοῦ; For these words the Masoretic Hebrew, both in 1 Kings viii 13 and in 2 Chr. vi 1, has only מַעָלָהה יָלְנוֹת שָׁלֹכְכֶנ, Chronicles prefixing 'and'. It is obvious that we have here something more than mere palaeographical confusion, to be healed on the usual plan of attempting to reconstruct the Hebrew underlying the LXX by altering the MT as little as possible. The LXX here may represent a corrupt Hebrew text, but it is obviously a literal translation of something, for it does not make sense and attests at least one Hebrew corruption which we can correct (τῆς φωτοῦ = ρημῖν, a mistake for שָׁלֹכְכֶנ 'Jashar').

In the MT, on the other hand, the certainly genuine

1 It is of course possible that the MT is wrong in Josh. x 13 and 2 Sam. i 18, and that the true name of the 'Book of Jashar' was the 'Book of Song': see Hastings DB. sub voc.
reference to the ‘Book of Jashar’ has been cut out, a fact that betrays
the work of a conscious editor. Moreover, suggests a patch
from Exod. xvi 21: the editor’s methods are Paitanic. 1

When we come to try and reconstruct the Hebrew underlying the
LXX we are met with insuperable difficulties. No doubt the phrase at
the end corresponds to ‘Is it not written in the Book of Jashar?’ exactly as in Josh. x 13. But τὸν κατουκεῖν is
without a suffix, and certainly without μή prefixed. And εἰς καυνότητος is a real crux: I do not see how it can be equated with
午后μαι. Wellhausen and his followers regard εἰς καυνότητος as a rendering of τοῦ τούτον ‘youth’, but εἰς must stand for ἐν, and then we have only μή left. And even if we emend καυνότητος into νεότητος, and suppose
this corresponds to ἡλικία (as in Job xx 11 Theod.), we have yet to
account for εἰς.

In the LXX καυνός occurs many times and almost always as a rendering of שָׁעַר. The only other place where καυνότης itself occurs in the
Greek Old Testament is Ezek. xlvii 2, in which τὸ καυνότητος corre-
sponds to שָׁעַר. Is it not therefore likely that τὸν κατουκεῖν εἰς καυ-
νότητος represents לַשְׁבֵּהֻ פֶּרֶשְׁיָם? This, as it stands, is ungrammatical,
and I do not see how to emend it. It suggests a mention of the
Sabbath as well as of the New Moons; though this is, on closer investi-
gation, improbable, seeing that in all extant Hebrew literature up to the
time of the Exile (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Kings) the New Moon comes
before the Sabbath when they are mentioned together. It is only in
Chronicles and Nehemiah, and partly in Ezekiel, that the Sabbath is
mentioned first. However that may be, it is difficult to avoid regarding
καυνότητος as evidence that New Moons, i.e. the days of the monthly
Feast, were originally mentioned in this passage, although I do not think
we can exactly reconstruct the wording.

The general sense is, that Solomon claims for the new Temple not
that it will be the continuous home of Jahwe, but that it will be His
abode when He comes to meet His worshippers at the stated Feasts.
In early times the New Moon was the regular occasion for sacrifice, for
the meeting between Jahwe and His people as represented by king and
court. This is clear from 1 Sam. xx. Jahwe and His people met
month by month, and they might hope to find Him in His Temple.
Hosea indeed draws a picture of Israel coming with flocks and herds
and not finding Jahwe after all. The New Moon would see their cattle
slaughtered, but they would get no benefit (Hosea v 6, 7). In the
passage before us, if the general sense be what I suppose, Solomon
expresses his confidence that Jahwe will deign to visit the House he has

1 See Taylor–Schechter The Wisdom of Ben Sirah p. 21 f.
built for Him whenever the monthly Feast was held—or perhaps also, if נְדוֹן does after all refer to the Sabbath, at the weekly sacrifice, which may very well have been from the first a feature of the more elaborate ritual of the royal Temple at Jerusalem (see 2 Kings xi 5, 7).

In any case the extract from the 'Book of Jashar' refers to the coming down of Jahwe Himself in cloud to take possession of the new Sanctuary, as related in 1 Kings viii 10, 11. The thunder-cloud descends, darkening the sun and driving away the ministering priests. But the King perceives it is Jahwe entering His Temple: Sinai is in the Sanctuary (Ps. lxviii 18). And so he cries out, as the Cloud gathers itself into the Holy of Holies

'Sun, shine forth in heaven!
Jahwe hath said He will dwell in darkness';

then addressing Jahwe he continues

'I have indeed built Thee a celestial Palace,
For Thy dwelling at the New Moon Feasts'—
or, according to a possible reconstruction,

'For Sabbaths and for New Moon Feasts'.

II

With whatever hesitation we may conjecturally restore the original Hebrew text of Solomon's invocation, I venture to think I have shewn that there is no real evidence for the theory that the 'Lucianic' text of it attests a different Hebrew from that implied by Cod. B. On general grounds this conclusion has an important bearing on the character of the Lucianic recension, and indeed of the whole series of variants in the MSS of the Old Testament in Greek. At first sight the mass of variation, both of single MSS and of larger groups, presents a bewildering maze. But when we come to consider what these Greek variations represent in Hebrew, it is surely evident that there can only be two rival readings at the most, and one of these rival readings must be identical with the Masoretic text. There is no room for what Westcott and Hort called 'ternary variations'.

This conclusion does not seem to be always admitted, but I do not see how we can evade it. How, in fact, could more than one genuine alternative to the Masoretic Hebrew have been transmitted? Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the other fragmentary translations used by Origen, all attest the consonantal text approved by Akiba and the Rabbis; the genuine 'LXX', on the other hand, is a translation of such Hebrew texts as were available in Ptolemaic Egypt. It is, of course,
conceivable that these texts differed among themselves, were separately translated or used for revision, and that fragments both of revised and of unrevised Greek texts uncontaminated by Hexaplar assimilation to the Masoretic standard have survived to the present day in our MSS. But this chain of possibilities is highly improbable, and nothing but a number of clear instances could justify us in believing in its realization.

Now of all the instances cited, Wellhausen's theory of ἐγνώρισεν—ἐστησεν in 3 Regn. viii 53b seemed the most convincing. Here we had, according to the theory, a real ternary variation. There was (1) the true text Ἰορ, attested by Lucian; (2) the palaeographical corruption Ἰω, attested by B; and (3) simple omission of the whole phrase, attested by MT. On this theory the value of 'Lucian' was, genealogically, very great; it had preserved ἐστησεν from Ptolemaic times. B also had preserved ἐγνώρισεν unchanged from Ptolemaic times: both readings were (on this hypothesis) literal translations of pre-Masoretic Hebrew variants.

But, as we have seen, the theory breaks down and ἐστησεν turns out to be nothing more than an attempt to make sense of ἐγνώρισεν, without reference to the Hebrew. We are left simply with two readings, viz. the Masoretic omission of a corrupt phrase and the Greek retention of it. In this particular instance it appears that B is stolidly faithful to the original LXX, while Lucian gives a plausible correction of it, 'sensible and feeble'.

Not that the Lucianic text is not often exceedingly useful in helping us to restore the original text of the LXX, especially in places where the genuine Old Latin version is no longer extant. But wherever 'Lucian' has a better text than B or A, it does not mean that both B and 'Lucian' preserve Ptolemaic variants, it means that B has a stupid blunder or that it has been corrupted from the Hexapla. Not unfrequently, of course, all our Greek MSS, including B and A and 'Lucian', have been corrupted from the Hexapla, and the true LXX is either lost altogether or survives only in Latin. But I do not think we ought ever, without the strongest internal evidence, to assume the existence of two rival Hebrew variants to the Masoretic Hebrew. If such variants can really be produced, it is time to revise prevailing theories about the history of the text of the Canonical Books in post-Maccabean times. Naturally I am speaking of real variations, not the kind of 'various readings' which are attested in the collations of Kennicott and de Rossi.

A couple of instances will make what I mean clearer.

2 Regn. xxiv 5-7.

1 See Hort's Introduction § 187.
These verses describe Joab's journey round the frontiers of David's realm. As so often in the case of geographical passages, the text has been variously corrupted. But the Lucianic text in ver. 6 has *eis γῆν Χαττιτῶν Καδέσσα*, i.e. 'to the land of the Hittites, to Kadesh', where the MT has 'to the land of Tahtim-hodshi'. The excellence of the Lucianic text is all the more striking, as both B and A give no help. B has *eis τὴν (sic) βασιλείαν ἥ ἐστιν αδάσατ*, and A has *eis γῆν βασιλείαν αδάσατ*. Thus the reading of B is not only nonsense; at first sight it looks like nonsense which is different from the nonsense of the Masoretic Hebrew.

And yet I believe that the texts of A and B in this passage are nothing more than a bungling attempt to revise the ancient Greek rendering (preserved here fairly well in 'Lucian') by means of the Hexapla. The hand of the reviser in B is clear in the preceding verse, where he translates ἔδωκεν by φόραγε instead of χειμάρρων. χειμάρρων is in 'Lucian' here, and this is the rendering found elsewhere in the LXX of these books; φόραγε for ἔδωκεν belongs to Symmachus and Theodotion, as may be seen from 1 Regn. xvii 40. Similarly, in ver. 4 καὶ παρακέβαλον (B A) is suspicious, because it represents the MT reading ἔδωκεν; the genuine LXX is no doubt preserved by 'Lucian', which has καὶ ἔρριπτο, i.e. ἔδωκεν. Thus in the passage where 'Lucian' preserves the interesting and doubtless genuine reference to the land of the Hittites and to Kadesh on the Orontes, the text of the other LXX authorities, i.e. B and A, exhibits clear marks of corruption from the later Jewish translations. In the process scribes and editors ignorant of Hebrew corrupted the foreign names so much that they now produce the appearance of independence, but this independence of the MT is confined to the foreign names. There is no real ternary variant here; the fact is simply that in 2 Regn. xxiv 5–7 the text of A and B is not the text of the old Greek translation, commonly called the Septuagint, and the text of 'Lucian' does represent the text of the old Greek translation.

4 Regn. xv 10.

καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν Ιβλαμ 'Lucian', i.e. Shallum smote King Zachariah, son of Jeroboam II, in Ibleam. Here MT has ἔδωκεν 'and he smote him before [the] people'; B has καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν κατέναντι τοῦ λαοῦ, a manifest doublet.

In this case also the Lucianic text does us a signal service by preserving the true text, but again there is no ternary variant in Hebrew. B as usual stumbles over the name Ibleam (in 4 Regn. ix 27 it gives us ἐκβλαμ), and possibly nothing more is wrong with its text than the

1 Apart from such further blunders as B's τὴν for τὴν.
accidental dropping of ἐν after τῶν, and κέβ- written for ἱσβ-. More probably, however, in view of the doublet in A, the explanation of the mistake is to be found as usual in an attempt to correct a real or supposed error by means of the Hexapla, and that קֶבֶל (the Hebrew corruption of an original בֶּבֶל) was translated Κεβλαμμε by Theodotion and κατέναντι τοῦ λαοῦ by Aquila. B then gives us the LXX mended by Theodotion, A gives us the LXX mended by Theodotion plus Aquila, while 'Lucian' has escaped altogether in this particular instance.

But this is a very different thing from regarding B and Lucian as two texts that have come down from pre-Origenian times, each preserving Hebrew readings independent of the Masoretic, or rather we should say 'later Palestinian', Hebrew text. Our Greek authorities can only attest one variant to the later Palestinian Hebrew text, and they can only do this by preserving the text which lay before the Ptolemaic translators. The reason that this is not always self-evident to those who discuss readings 'attested by the Septuagint' is that very few scholars have realized till lately the terrible extent to which the text of B is disfigured by unskilful sporadic correction from the Hexapla.

F. C. Burkitt.

LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

Circumstances, which it is unnecessary to explain here, have induced me to think that it may be of use to offer to the readers of the Journal of Theological Studies a series of notes embodying passing notions or slight items of enquiry relating to liturgical questions; notes not regular, perhaps, but only intermittent; sometimes in the briefest form, but sometimes a dissertatiuncula. It is now more than forty years since the subject of Liturgy attracted my attention; much material, whatever its quality, has accumulated on my hands; the more so inasmuch as, perhaps in some measure by a natural disposition to what the Moralists call 'curiosity', I have been disposed rather to listen and learn than to write and teach. The material in question consists of hasty, if somewhat lengthy, pencillings in the margins or flyleaves of books made in the course of reading them; or a more formal examination, entered in note-books, of points as to which doubts suggested themselves to me that seemed not to have occurred to the authors. All these, with the mind that gave them birth and gives them a certain unity, may still be understood; but in a moment that cannot be distant