

THE LUCIANIC TEXT OF 1 KINGS VIII 53^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 viii 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 Jasher', 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. 'JASHER', *Encycl. Bibl.* 2334 b) quotes, besides Klostermann's note on the passage, Robertson Smith *OTJC.*³ 434 sq. and Wellhausen *CH.*³ 269, in addition to his own *Bampton Lectures* 193, 212, and Driver's *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^b are the Greek texts of B A and 'Lucian', together with the Masoretic text of 1 Kings viii 12, 13.

τότε ἐλάλησεν Σαλωμών ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν Ἥλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν γνόφῳ οἰκοδόμησον οἶκόν μου οἶκον εὐπρεπῆ σεαυτῷ τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὐτῆ γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ψδῆς;

Variants of B A Luc(ian):

Σολομών Luc. ἐγνώρισεν] B A, ἔστησεν Luc. εἶπεν] pr. καὶ Luc. ἐν γνόφῳ]
A Luc., ἐκνοφου B ἐκπρεπῆ σαντῷ B καινότητος A οὐκ ἰδοὺ] οὐχὶ A ἐν
βίβλῳ A, ἐπὶ βιβλίου Luc.

The Hebrew of 1 Kings viii 12, 13 is
 אז אמר שלמה יהוה אמר לשכן בערפל: בנה בניתי בית זבל לך מבחן לשבחך
 : עולמים

Only one of the Greek variations is important, viz. ἔστησεν for ἐγνώρισεν. All the others are mere slips, or stylistic changes character-

istic of the various texts. The insertion of *καὶ* before *εἶπεν* shews that 'Lucian' connects *Κύριος* with the preceding words. *εκκνοφογ* for *εἰρηνοφω* must ultimately be a mere mistake, though probably the scribe of B was not the culprit, as the Ethiopic is said to support *ἐκ νότου*. For the Books of Kings *οὐκ ἰδοῦ*, 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 *על ספר*.

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 = *יא ירבר*: see Josh. x 12, 1 Kings xi 7. The MT of *ver. 12* (*יא אמר*) betrays the hand of the later adapter by the use of the *perfect* after *יא*.

ὡς συνετέλεσεν = *כבליחו*; see 3 Regn. viii 54, 4 Regn. x 25.

ἐγνώρισεν—*ἔστησεν*. Wellhausen, followed by Robertson Smith, Cheyne and Driver, all regard the original Hebrew corresponding to this to have been *הִבִּין* 'he set', so that the first line of the extract from the Book of Jashar runs 'Jahwe set the sun in the heavens'. *הִבִּין*, so the theory goes, is preserved in the Lucianic text (*ἔστησεν*). But it was corrupted into *הבין* 'he understood', and translated *ἐγνώρισεν* in the Greek text represented by B and A. 'These two readings *ἐγνώρισεν* and *ἔστησεν* have no resemblance in Greek. But the corresponding Hebrew words are *הבין* and *הִבִּין* 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. *ἔστησεν* might indeed stand for *הִבִּין*, as in Isaiah xl 20, though it is dangerous to predicate anything for certain with regard to so colourless a word. But *ἐγνώρισεν* can have nothing to do with *הִבִּין*; a glance at the Concordance is enough to shew that it must correspond to *הודיע*, 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; *ἔστησεν*, on the other hand, is quite colourless, and might just as well

be an attempt to make some sort of meaning out of ἐγνώρισεν, as a real rendering of some Hebrew word. ἔσθησεν might be an explanation of ἐγνώρισεν, while ἐγνώρισεν can hardly have arisen out of ἔσθησεν. In any case הכין 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 ἐγνώρισεν and supposes it to correspond to וידע, which he points ויִדַע, 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 הוריע attested by LXX is a corruption of הופיע '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 ἐγνώρισεν is not הודיע (perf.) but הודיע (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).

οἰκοδόμησον οἶκόν μου = בנה ביתי, a mistake for the MT בנה בניתי, as Wellhausen and others have seen. But if בניתי was written defectively (בנתי), and this led to the error found in the Greek, it makes it easier to believe that הופיע—הוריע was also written defectively.

ἐκπρηγή B, εὐπρηγή A Lucian, may perhaps imply נוה, as in Job xviii 15: comp. 2 Regn. xv 25. But more probably οἶκον ἐκπρηγή (or εὐπρη.) is a guess at the meaning of בית זבל. Modern scholars guess from this context and from Isaiah lxiii 15 that זבל 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 נוה, נה could only be regarded as a gloss for the more poetical term זבל.

τοῦ κατοικεῖν . . . τῆσ φδῆσ; For these words the Masoretic Hebrew, both in 1 Kings viii 13 and in 2 Chr. vi 1, has only לשבתך עולמים and 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 φδῆσ = הַשִּׁיר, a mistake for הַיָּשָׁר 'Jashar').¹ 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, מִכּוֹן לְשִׁבְתָךְ suggests a patch from Exod. xv 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 הֲלֹא הִיא כְּתוּבָה עַל סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר 'Is it not written in the Book of Jashar?' exactly as in Josh. x 13. But τοῦ κατοικεῖν is כְּתוּבָה without a suffix, and certainly without מִכּוֹן prefixed. And ἐπὶ καινότητος is a real *crux*: I do not see how it can be equated with עוֹלָמִים. Wellhausen and his followers regard ἐπὶ καινότητος as a rendering of עוֹלָמִים 'youth', but ἐπὶ must stand for עַל, and then we have only מִים left. And even if we emend καινότητος into νεότητος, and suppose this corresponds to עוֹלָמִים (as in Job xx 11 *Theod.*), we have yet to account for ἐπὶ.

In the LXX καινός occurs many times and almost always as a rendering of חֲדָשׁ. The only other place where καινότητος itself occurs in the Greek Old Testament is Ezek. xlvii 12, in which τῆς καινότητος corresponds to לְחֻדְשָׁיו. Is it not therefore likely that τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος represents לְשִׁבְתָךְ עַל חֲדָשִׁים? 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 investigation, 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 καινότητος 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 Sira* p. 21 f.

built for Him whenever the monthly Feast was held—perhaps also, if *לשבת* 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. lxxviii 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 Aqiba 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 ἐγγώρπισεν—ἔστησεν in 3 Regn. viii 53^b seemed the most convincing. Here we had, according to the theory, a real ternary variation. There was (1) the true text הכין, attested by Lucian; (2) the palaeographical corruption הין, 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 ἔστησεν from Ptolemaic times. B also had preserved ἐγγώρπισεν 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 ἔστησεν turns out to be nothing more than an attempt to make sense of ἐγγώρπισεν, 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'.¹

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 *εἰς γῆν Χερτιεμ Καδησ*, i. e. *אל ארץ החתים קדשה* 'to the land of the Hittites, to Kadesh', where the MT has *אל ארץ החתים חרשי* '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 *εἰς τὴν* (sic) *θαβασων ἢ ἔστιν αδασαι*, and A has *εἰς γῆν εθαων αδασαι*. 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 *נחל* by *φάραγξ* instead of *χειμάρροσ*. *χειμάρροσ* is in 'Lucian' here, and this is the rendering found elsewhere in the LXX of these books; *φάραγξ* for *נחל* belongs to Symmachus and Theodotion, as may be seen from 1 Regn. xvii 40. Similarly, in ver. 4 *καὶ παρέβαλον* (BA) is suspicious, because it represents the MT reading *ויהו*; the genuine LXX is no doubt preserved by 'Lucian', which has *καὶ ἤρξαντο*, i. e. *ויהו*. 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.¹ 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 Ἰεβλααμ 'Lucian', i. e. Shallum smote King Zachariah, son of Jeroboam II, in Ibleam. Here MT has *ויהו קבל-יכו* 'and he smote him before [the] people'; B has *καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν Κεβλααμ*, A adds *καὶ Κεβλααμ* to the preceding clause, and goes on *καὶ ἐπάταξαν 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 *εβλααμ*), and possibly nothing more is wrong with its text than the

¹ Apart from such further blunders as B's *την* for *γην*.

accidental dropping of $\epsilon\eta$ after $\alpha\gamma\tau\omicron\eta$, and $\kappa\epsilon\beta$ - written for $\iota\epsilon\beta$ -. 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 $\kappa\beta\lambda\epsilon\omicron\mu$ (the Hebrew corruption of an original $\kappa\beta\lambda\epsilon\omicron\mu$) was translated $\kappa\epsilon\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu$ by Theodotion and $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\eta\tau\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon$ 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