

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 11¹, i. e. just before the story of David and Bathsheba.

(3) It will be shewn that the translator of the second portion or 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:—

α = 1 Kingdoms.

$\beta\beta$ = 2 Kin. 1¹-11¹.

$\beta\gamma$ = 2 Kin. 11²-3 Kin. 2¹.

$\gamma\gamma$ = 3 Kin. 2²-21².

$\gamma\delta$ = 3 Kin. 22 and 4 Kin.

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 (α , $\beta\beta$, 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):—

α . The Reign^a 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 α 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 produced 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

^a This, rather than 'kingdom', was the meaning of βασιλεία 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 $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$.

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 unmistakable. 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 $\beta\gamma$. 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'. 'Ἐν τῷ ἑξαπλῷ καὶ τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἡ μὲν δευτέρα τῶν Βασιλειῶν πληροῦται ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Θραῦσιν τοῦ λαοῦ διηγήσει, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἄλλω τοῦ Ὁρνᾶ διαπράσει· ἡ δὲ τρίτη τῶν Βασιλειῶν ἀρχεται ἐκ τε τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀβισαγ τὴν Σουμανίτιν ἱστορίας, καὶ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἀδωνία καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ τυραννίδα. Διδώμενος δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Βασιλειῶν συνάπτει καὶ ταῦτα ἕως τῆς τοῦ Δαυὶδ τελευτῆς, ὁμοίως Θεοδωρήτῃ.

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 Kingdoms with καὶ Σολομῶν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, as 2 Kin. opens with καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν Σαούλ, 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^a: '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.^b

^a *Introd. to the Lit. of the O. T.* p. 179.

^b It may be added that Josephus brings the seventh book of his *Jewish Antiquities* down to the death of David.

One other interesting fact must be mentioned with regard to the Lucianic text. Lucian has removed from the text of 3 Kin. 1-2^u, presumably as monstrosities, practically all the characteristic marks of the translator of $\beta\gamma$, 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. 11¹. 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,^a had acted in a precisely similar way. After the genealogies which occupy the first nine chapters of 1 Chron., the narrative at 10¹ 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. 5¹ to 11¹ the two narratives run parallel with each other, except that the short

^a 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).

story of Mephibosheth is omitted. 1 Chron. 20¹ corresponds to the concluding verse of the translator $\beta\beta$: '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 20⁴) 'And it came to pass after this that there arose war at Gezer with the Philistines', a passage which corresponds to 2 Sam. 21¹⁴, 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 $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$. The instances selected are those that shew most clearly the beginning and ending of the portion $\beta\gamma$ (2 Kin. 11², 3 Kin. 2¹¹). They also serve to shew the striking agreement between $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$ and the almost complete absence of the phrases distinctive of this translator from the other sections α , $\beta\beta$, and $\gamma\gamma$. 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 $\beta\gamma$. 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 $\text{o}\iota\ \alpha\delta\upsilon\text{o}\iota$ for 'the great men' (Heb. הַגִּבּוֹרִים , גִּבּוֹרִים , &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. κερατίνη (sc. σάλπιγγος) as the rendering of *shophar* occurs also in Jd. (ten times, B and A text), 2 Es. 14¹⁸ (12), 20¹⁴, and in interpolations (? Hexaplaric) in Jos. 6⁹ ff and 2 Chron. 15¹⁴ (A). It occurs also in four of the later (Hexaplaric) versions. A passage in Ψ (97^a) explains the rendering, where the $\text{σάλπιγγος κερατίνη}$ (= רַעַשׁוֹשׁ) is distinguished from the σάλπιγγος ἐλατή (= הַרְצוֹצֵן). The *shophar* was synonymous with the *heren* and consisted in primitive times of a ram's horn: the *hasoserah* was the straight trumpet of beaten metal. Most of the LXX books use σάλπιγγος to render both Hebrew words: the

	^a (1 K.)	^{ββ} (2 K. 1 ^L 11 ^L)	^{βγ} (2 K. 11 ² - 3 K. 2 ¹¹)	^{γγ} (3 K. 2 ²³ -21 ²³)	^{γδ} (3 K. 22, 4 K.)
<i>Adjectives.</i>					
(1) ἀδρός = ἦτις, ἔτι	—	—	{ 2 K. 15 ¹⁰ B 3 K. 1 ⁹ B	—	4 K. 10 ^{4, 11}
(2) κερατίνη = ἔτι	—	—	{ 2 K. 15 ¹⁰ , 18 ¹⁰ , 20 ^{1, 22} 3 K. 1 ^{24, 25, 41}	—	4 K. 9 ¹²
= σάλπιγξ	13 ²	2 ²⁶ 6 ²⁴	—	—	—
(3) μουσικός = ἦτις also rendered by γεδοῦρ ἕξοδία σύστημα	— 30 ^{4, 18} 34, 33	— 3 ²² 4 ²	2 K. 22 ²⁰ — —	— — 11 ¹⁴	4 K. 5 ^{2, 6} , 13 ^{22, 21} , 24 ² quater — —
<i>Prepositions and particles.</i>					
(4) ἀπάνωθεν cf. ἐπάνωθεν	—	—	{ 2 K. 11 ^{20, 22} 3 K. 1 ²² 2 K. 11 ²¹ , 13 ² 34 ² , 24 ²² 3 K. 2 ⁴	7 ^{2, 15, 16, 22} 8 ⁷	4 K. 2 ³ B ^{2, 5} A 10 times (including vll. in 2 ^{4, 5})
(5) καί γε = οὐ	— ⁰	2 ⁷ BA ^b	{ 29 exx. in B 24 " A from 2 K. 11 ¹¹ to 21 ²⁰ , and 3 K. 1 ^{6, 22} , 2 ²	— ⁰	{ 17 exx. in B 15 " A 3 K. 22 ²² , and 4 K. 2 ⁸ onwards
(6) καί μάλα = ἔτι	—	—	{ 2 K. 14 ² 3 K. 1 ²²	—	4 K. 4 ¹⁴
(7) ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι cf. ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα	—	—	2 K. 12 ^{4, 10} —	—	4 K. 18 ¹² B, 21 ¹⁰ 4 K. 10 ²⁰ , 21 ^{11, 12}
(8) ἥνιστα	— ⁴	—	2 K. 12 ²¹ , 13 ²⁰ , 16 ¹⁸ , 17 ²⁷ , 20 ¹³	—	4 K. 4 ¹⁸ , 17 ²¹
<i>Syntax.</i>					
(9) ἐγὼ εἶμι as subject of finite vb. (e.g. ἐγὼ εἶμι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω)	—	— ⁰	{ 2 K. 11 ⁴ , 12 ⁷ , 15 ²² , 18 ¹³ , 20 ¹⁷ , 24 ^{12, 11} 3 K. 2 ²	— (contrast e.g. ἐγὼ αἰτοῦμαι &c. 21 ¹⁴ , 14, 20)	4 K. 4 ¹⁸ , 10 ² , 21 ²⁰
(10) Historic present	145 exx.	28 exx. (2 ⁴ -9 ⁶)	Once ^f (11 ⁷ παραγίνεσθαι)	47 exx. (3 ¹⁶ -21 ²³)	Twice ^g (7 ² -10 ² ἔστιν)

^a Occurs in three Hexaplaric interpolations in A: 1 Kin. 18⁸, 19^{20, 22}.

^b Also in the preceding verse in A, where the text of B has been cut away, and in an interpolation of A in 3¹⁰.

^c In a Hexaplaric interpolation of A after 7¹⁷ (20).

^d A has it in 1²⁴ (B omits clause).

^e But cf. 2 Kin. 7²⁰ οὐ εἶ, κίριέ μου Κύριε, ἐλάλησας.

^f The clause is omitted in Codd. 71, 245. The passage 14^{27b}, not in M.T., is shown by the two presents to be a gloss.

^g These exx. disappear in the Lucianic text, which reads ἦν. Ποιοῦσιν in 21¹⁰ is due to the Heb. participle: the Lucianic text, with some VSS., reads ἐποίουν. The passage 1¹⁶⁻⁴, where B has βασιλεύει, 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 *σάλπιγξ* to the *hasoserah*.^a

(3) *Μονόζωνος* is an interesting and puzzling word. The Hebrew *מַחֲצֵה*, 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. 3²⁷) '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. 12²¹. Elsewhere we have *πειρατήριον* (Gen. 49¹⁹, Job 19¹², Ψ 17⁸⁰), *πειρατής* (Job 25⁸, Hos. 6⁹), *ληστήριον* (2 Chron. 22¹), *ληστής* (Hos. 7¹, Jer. 18²²), *δύναμις* (1 Chron. 12¹⁸, 2 Chron. 25^{9, 10, 18}), *ισχυρός* (1 Chron. 7¹), *ἐμφραγμός* (apparently meaning 'blockade', if the text is right, Mic. 5¹ (4¹⁴)). In 2 Chron. 26¹¹ 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 *εὐζωνος*, a word specially used of light-armed troops.

Aquila's rendering brings us back to the similar *μονόζωνος* now under consideration. In 4 Kin. the word is used in the plural (once only in the singular, 13²¹ ἴδον τὸν μ.) of predatory bands from Syria, Moab, Ammon, and Chaldaea: possibly, as in the case of *κερατίνη*, a substantive (e.g. *στρατιῶται* or *λόχοι*) should be supplied. In 2 Kin. 22⁹⁰ ἐν σοὶ δραμοῦμαι *μονόζωνος* (מִן־יָדַי רָצַח, R. V. 'run upon a troop') it is used adjectivally and appears to be equivalent to *εὐζωνος*, 'under Thy protection no heavy armour need impede my steps': the parallel passage in Ψ 17 (18)⁸⁰ runs ἐν σοὶ ῥυσθήσομαι ἀπὸ πειρατηρίων.^c Apart from these passages in 2 and 4 Kin. the word is confined^d in 'Biblical Greek' to two instances in Theodo-

^a *Σάλπιγξ* in 4 Kin. 11^{14b}, 12¹²: *hasoserah* does not occur in the βγ portion.

^b Incorrect, the final γ being read as ς.

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

^d The version of *Quinta* in Ψ 67⁷ should be read as *μονόζωνος*. In 2 Kin. 3²² Aquila is cited in favour of both *εὐζώνου* and *μονοζώνου*; the former is, no doubt, what he wrote.

tion's version of Job, viz. 19^b (of the troops of God that beset him = τὰ κειρατήρια αὐτοῦ of LXX) and 29^b, where the patriarch describes his former prosperity when he 'dwelt as a king in the army', κατεσκήνουν ὡσεὶ βασιλεὺς ἐν μονοζώνοις. 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, οἰόζωνος, 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 (λησταί) in the plural, 'but' he adds,

εἰ δ' ἄνδρ' ἐν' οἰόζωνον αὐδήσει, σαφῶς
τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἤδη τοῦργον εἰς ἐμὲ ῥέπον.

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^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 οἰόζωνος and λησταί, in the light of the later use of μονόζωνος, 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^b a sort of catechism on difficulties in the Old and New Testaments. The last of the questions and answers runs: (ἐρώτησις) τίνας λέγονται μονόζωνοι; (ἀπόκρισις) οἱ φονεῖς καὶ λησταὶ καὶ πᾶς κακοῦργος καὶ πόρνος μονόζωνος 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 ταῦτὸν τοῖς ἄλλοις ζωστήρα φοροῦντες (this looks less like guessing, but the date is late), (2) ἀσύντακτοι (undisciplined) καὶ ὡσανεὶ λησταί, (3) οἱ ἔφοδοι βάρβαροι ἢ ἀπελάται μάχιοι (cattle-stealers). Hesychius gives οἱ τῶν πολεμίων κατάσκοποι ἢ

^a The late Sir Richard Jebb.

^b Roman edition (1732-1746), tom. III (græce et latine) 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.

μάχιμοι οὗς ἡμεῖς μονομάχους. Theophanes, the ninth-century Byzantine historian who continued the Chronicon of Syncellus, uses *μονόζωνοι* (sometimes with *στρατιῶται*) apparently for light-armed soldiers.* Lastly, the explanation given in a modern Greek Lexicon^b is ὁ φορῶν 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^o; 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 guerilla 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. Ἀπάνωθεν (unexampled outside LXX and Hexapla) is confined elsewhere in the LXX to Jd. 16²⁰ B, and to vll. in Am. 2⁹ (A), Job Θ 31³ (℣^o. *): Symmachus has it in Prov. 24¹⁹. Ἐπάνωθεν is more common: it may be noted that in the Hexateuch it is limited to the latter half of Exodus (25¹⁹, 26¹⁴, 38⁵). Compound prepositional forms are characteristic of the later books: such are ἐξόπισθεν, κατόπισθεν, πάρεξ, περικύκλῳ (distinctive of Ez. β), ὑποκάτωθεν. Under the same category come compound conjunctions such as ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι, ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα: apart from the examples quoted from βδ in the list, the former is confined in LXX to Dt. 28²⁹ and Ez. 36³⁴ (in a section recalling the style of Θ), the latter to Jd. 2²⁰ B A: ἀνθ' οὗ ὅσον in the A text of 3 Kin. 14^{1, 18} is from Aquila: elsewhere the translators use ἀνθ' ὧν alone.

Καί γε as the rendering of כִּי is one of numerous instances of a Greek word being selected from its resemblance to the Hebrew: it is common to α'σ'θ, but seems to have come into use before their time.

Καὶ μάλα, which is good classical Greek for 'indeed', 'certainly', in the LXX recurs only in Dan. O 10²¹ (= לְבַר) and twice in the ℣ text of Tobit. It is true that לְבַר which it renders is absent from Kingdoms α, ββ, and γγ: the word, which in older Hebrew is asseverative and in later Hebrew adversative, is elsewhere rendered by ναί (Gen.), ἀλλά (2 Chron., 1 and 2 Es.), ἀλλ' ἢ (2 Chron., Dan. Θ), and πλὴν (2 Chron.).

Ἦνικά, 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 κατὰ τῆς Βιθυνῶν Νικαίας παρατάττεται τῶν Σαρακηνῶν δύο Ἀμηνραίων στίφος, Ἀμηνραίων χιλιᾶσι μονόζωνων δεκάπεντε κ.τ.λ.

^b Λεξικὸν . . . ὑπὸ Σαρλάτου Δ. τοῦ Βυζαντίου (Ἀθήνησιν, 1839).

* Stephanus has the following: 'Bud. citat ex nescio quo Οἶδα καὶ ζώνην στραπωτισὴν καὶ ἀνδρικήν, καθ' ἣν ἀζαναὶ (! lege εὐζαναὶ) Συρίας καὶ μονόζωνοι καλοῦνται.' I have failed to find the passage in Budaeus.

(9) The strange use of *ἐγὼ εἰμι* followed by a finite verb, apart from the eleven instances in *βδ* (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, 6¹⁸ *ἐγὼ εἰμι καθήσομαι*, and once in Ruth (which forms an appendix to Jd.) 4⁴ B A *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀγχιστεύσω*: there is also a very doubtful example in Ez. 36²² 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)¹¹, where he appears to have read (with Θ) *ὅτι ἐγὼ οἶδα τὸν λογισμόν ὃν ἐγὼ εἰμι λογιζομαι*, 38 (31)²², 40 (33)⁹ *ἐγὼ εἰμι ποιήσω* twice (the text is uncertain in the first passage), and possibly 45 (38)²⁸, where he is cited both for *βάλλω ἐγὼ τὴν δεισίν μου* and for *ρίπτω ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸν ἐλεισμόν μου*, Field attributing the latter reading to Aquila's second edition. The solecism puzzled the scribes, who have twice altered *εἰμι* to *εἰ μή*, once to *μή*, while in the last passage quoted *εἰμι τόν* becomes *ἐμαυτόν*.

Theodotion, in addition to the first passage in Jeremiah already mentioned, had this construction in Job 33²¹ *κώφευσον καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι λαλήσω*, and probably in Is. 54¹¹ (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐμβαλών* being doubtless a correction made to improve the grammar).

With these examples must be placed the solitary instance of an analogous use of *σὺ εἶ*: 2 Kin. 7²² *σὺ εἶ, κύριέ μου Κύριε, ἐλάλησας*.

This otiose use of *εἰμί*, 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. *εἰμί*), that it is due to an ellipse of the relative *ὅς*, might derive some colour from the B text of 2 Kin. 12⁷, where *ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ χρίστας* balances *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐρουσάμην*; 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 ἔχρισσα*. Moreover, this explanation would not account for the phrase in passages where no emphasis is laid on the agent, or where, as in Jd. 11²⁷, *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. 3¹⁵.

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 pronoun * of the first person took the two forms *'ānōkī* and *'ānī*. Later writers shew a growing preference for *'ānī*, and the longer form practically disappeared: Aramaic had no equivalent for it. At the time when the later translators did their work *'ānōkī* was a strange word and would excite attention.

* 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 'ānōkī, not by 'ānī, except in the phrase 'I am the Lord', where 'ānī 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 ἐγώ εἰμι, the shorter by ἐγώ.^a 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 ἐγώ εἰμι = 'ānōkī became an invariable rule, even where 'ānōkī 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 ἐγώ εἰμι appears with another verb, 'ānōkī stands in the M. T., with the exception of the two last in 4 Kin. (10^b, 22^m) and Jer. 45 (38)^m, the passage where two readings are attributed to Aquila.^b As regards the two passages in 4 Kin. the translators probably found 'ānōkī in their text: but by Origen's time it had been replaced by 'ānī in 22^o, as the εἰμί was obelized in the Hexapla.

The rule governing the use of ἐγώ εἰμι 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 βδ by both the B and the A texts^c: its antiquity is moreover vouched for by the Old Latin, while the obelus of Origen proves that it was present in the κοινή ἐκδοσις 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 σὺ εἶ . . . ἐλάλησας. The phrase is unique: it occurs in a portion where the seemingly analogous ἐγώ εἰμι is absent: it cannot well be explained on the same principle. The εἶ has probably come into the text from the preceding verse, where it is in place (καὶ νῦν, κύριέ μου Κύριε, σὺ εἶ ὁ θεός), or else σὺ εἶ must be taken as a distinct clause and a stop placed before ἐλάλησας.

(10) As to the historic present I must be brief. The contrast which βδ 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.^d In the LXX the historic

^a Contrast Ex. 20^o ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος = יְיָ with ἐγὼ Κύριος B. 6^o, 6^o = יְיָ: but the rule does not seem to have been universally observed.

^b The reading of A in Ex. 36^m may be neglected, the insertion of εἰμι being due to the influence of the common refrain 'They shall know that I am the Lord'.

^c Whereas in Jd. it is, with one exception, confined to the B text, and in 5^o ἐγώ εἰμι is expressly marked with the asterisk.

^d 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'.

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^{1 ff}, 28^{4 ff}: so 3 Kin. 11¹⁸). In 3 Kin. the commonest instance is βασιλεύει, '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, ἐκομήθη . . . θάπτεται . . . ἐβασίλευσεν (or βασιλεύει) with the invariable phrase in γδ, ἐκομήθη . . . ἐτάφη . . . ἐβασίλευσεν.

Some other characteristic usages of βδ, which will repay study, are ἀνὴρ for ἕκαστος in the sense of 'each' (where the other translators of K. use ἕκαστος), ἀναγγέλλω (the others usually ἀπαγγέλλω)^a, ἐπαντή and συναντή (for the usual substantives in -ησις), two words for 'to save'—ἐξελέσθαι and ῥύεσθαι.

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: (τὸ) τῆς βασάνου = 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤀, 'guilt-offering', 6^{3, 4, 5, 11} (elsewhere περὶ ἀμαρτίας K. γδ 12¹⁸, Lev., Isa., τῆς πλημμελείας Lev., Num., ὑπὲρ (περὶ) ἀγνοίας Ez.):—δικάζειν = 𐤁𐤃𐤓 and δικαστής where other translators use κρίνειν and κριτής:—*κενοτάφια 19^{13, 16} = 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤀: in 15²³ θεραπείαν B is an example of imitation of the Hebrew word (elsewhere the Hebrew is transliterated θεραφεῖν, &c., Jd., 4 Kin., 2 Chron.):—λομός (adj.) 1¹⁶, 2¹², 10²⁷, 25^{17, 28}, 30²⁸ = 𐤋𐤓𐤁𐤀 (= παράνομος in Dt., Jd., Kin. βγ and γγ, and 2 Chron.):—μηδαμῶς = 𐤍𐤔𐤓𐤀 seven times in 1 Kin., once in Gen. (elsewhere μὴ γένοιτο 3 Kin. γγ, Gen., Jos.: ἔλεως 2 Kin. βγ 20²⁹, 23¹⁷, 1 Chron.):—παρήκαν γῆν 2⁶ apparently = 'gave ground', 'yielded':—πόλις ἑστερωμένη 6¹⁸ = 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤀 (rendered in βγ and γδ by π. ὀχυρά, as in most books, or by ὀχυρώμα):—σκήπτρον = 𐤓𐤔𐤏𐤀, with the meaning 'tribe' eight times; so three times in γγ (elsewhere φυλή in βγ, γγ, γδ, &c.):—σοφίζεσθαι

^a Contrast the phrase ἀπηγγέλη λέγοντες in βγ (2 Kin. 15²¹, 19¹; 3 Kin. 1²¹) with ἀπηγγέλη λέγουσες in α (14²², 15¹², 19¹⁹, 23¹; cf. 24²); ββ (3²², 6¹²), and γγ (2^{28, 29, 30}).

= 𐤀𐤁 only in 1 Kin. 3⁹ (γγ renders by συνίειν). He transliterates where others translate in the case of κύριος (θεός) σαβαώθ with Isaiah (κ̄ς (θ̄ς) τῶν δυνάμεων in βγ, γδ, Psalms, &c. : κ̄ς παντοκράτωρ in ββ six times, Jer., Minor Proph., &c.): also in the case of εφουδ βάρ 2¹⁸ (= στολήν ξεῖλλον of 2 Kin. 6¹⁴, στ. βυσσίνη of 1 Chron. 15²⁷), and so εφουδ ten times in this book (εφωδ Jd.: in Pent., Sir., Ez. επωμύς). 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. 5^{1 ff}) and the opening of a sentence with a genitive absolute with asyndeton (e.g. 9^{5, 27}).

The translators of α and ββ coincide in some place-names. The form Ἰουδαία (as opposed to Ἰουδά) is confined in the B text of the Kingdom Books to these two portions^a: they have also in common the adjectival form Γαλααδίτης^b (elsewhere in Kin. Γαλαάδ). These two translators also stand alone in rendering 𐤇𐤍𐤁𐤇𐤃 by ὥστε λίαν (1 Kin. 11¹⁸; 2 Kin. 2¹⁷): the Greek versions elsewhere adopted are ἕως σφόδρα (3 Kin. 1⁴, 2 Chron., Ψ, Lam., Dan. Θ), σφόδρα (Gen., Isa., Dan. Ο 8⁸, Θ 11²⁵), and once (Dan. Ο 11²⁵) 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 -ει, ὄψει 3¹⁸ B, ἴσει 5² B*, παρέσει 5²³ B*, εἰσελεύσει 5⁶ B*, ἀναβήσει 5²⁸ B, καταβήσει 5²⁴ B* (the forms in -η begin at 11¹⁰ ἔρχη and continue throughout βγ, e.g. ἔση 13¹⁸, 14³, 15²⁸, 18³, 19¹⁸; 3 Kin. 2⁴); (ii) the termination -αν in the impf., διέβαιναν 2²⁹ B, ἔφεραν 3²³ B, ἦγαν 6⁸ B (contrast παρήγον 15¹⁸, ἀνέβαινον 15³⁰)^c; (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. ἐξήλθοσαν 2 Kin. 2¹³ A, ἐλάβοσαν 5²¹ B: the third ex. is ἡμάρτοσαν 3 Kin. 8⁵⁰ A (-τον B); to these should be added the rather different impf. termination ἐνοούσαν 2 Kin. 20¹⁶.

The mythological allusion in 2 Kin. 5^{18, 22} 'the valley of the Titans' = 𐤁𐤇𐤁𐤃 𐤀𐤁𐤅 (with which contrast ἐν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις τοῦ Ἰαφά, &c.,

^a 1 Kin. [17¹ A] 23³, 27^{6, 10}, 30¹⁴; 2 Kin. 2⁴: in Cod. A it twice replaces γῆ (τοῦ) Ἰουδα of B in 4 Kin. Ἰουμαία, however (2 Kin. 8¹⁴ bis), is also attested in 3 Kin. and once (14¹⁹) in 4 Kin.

^b 1 Kin. 31¹¹; 2 Kin. 2^{4, 8}. Cf. Ἰσραηλίτης = a Jezreelitess: 1 Kin. 27² B, 30⁸ B; 2 Kin. 3² B.

^c Similar forms of the aorist (εἶπαν, &c.) occur throughout 2 Kin., being very frequent in the βγ portion.

2 Kin. 21^{14,15,20})^a reminds the reader of the allusions to the Amazons in the Alexandrine version of Chronicles (2 Chron. 14¹⁵, (?) 22¹). The use of *ἐξοδία* (a word previously used in 3²⁰) in 11¹ suggests that that verse should be included in the ββ 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 2⁴⁶ a ff and 4¹⁹ ff), 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 *ἀνήρ* for *ἕκαστος* (22¹⁶) and of *καί γε* (23), and by the absence of the historic present: contrast also *εἰσέλθης ταμίον τοῦ ταμίον*²⁰ with 21²⁰ *εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ κοιτῶνος εἰς τὸ ταμίον* (same Hebrew). Further *οὐχ οὕτως* (Hebrew *לֹא כֵן*)¹⁷, &c., *διότι ἀλλ' ἦν¹⁸, μονώτατον²¹* are in the manner of βδ.

The three years' armistice between Syria and Israel (22¹) 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 βδ 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 βδ, 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 βδ (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 Sukiim and the Meunim with the Troglodytes^b and the Minaeans^c

^a In 21²⁰ *ἀπόγονοι τῶν γιγάντων* is an interpolation (not in M. T.). In verse 20, however, Lucian's text reads *καὶ οὗτος ἀπόγονος Τίτῶνος* (BA *καὶ γε αὐτὸς ἐπέχθη τῷ Παφά*).

^b 2 Chron. 12².

^c 1 Chron. 4¹¹; 2 Chron. 26⁷: cf. 20¹, 26⁶.

respectively, two tribes living by the Red Sea: he uses the titles of the Alexandrine court, διάδοχος^a (or διαδεχόμενος^b), οἱ πρῶτοι διάδοχοι^c τοῦ βασιλέως, ὁ πρῶτος φίλος^d: the word he uses for a chamber attached to the Temple is the name for a cell in the Serapeum (παστοφόριον)^e: the phrase τῆς ἐπιγονῆς (2 Chron. 31¹⁶, cf.¹⁸) is very frequent in the papyri, apparently referring to a second generation of Macedonian Greeks who had settled in Egypt.^f

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, ββ, 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^g by the fact that Josephus was acquainted with these portions of the Greek Kingdoms.^h In the N.T. the only clear use of βδ is in Ap. 20⁹ (= 4 Kin. 1¹⁰). Philo uses α and γγ, but does not quote from the βδ portion: his reference to 'the first Book of Kingdoms'ⁱ 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. 26¹¹, 28⁷.

^b 1 Chron. 26¹⁸; 2 Chron. 31¹².

^c 1 Chron. 18¹⁷.

^d 1 Chron. 27²³: 'Hushai the Archite, the king's friend' (ἠῦση γρ ἄρχιτ) has become Χουσι δ πρῶτος φίλος τοῦ βασ.; cf. ὁ ἀρχιτέταιρος Δαυεὶδ 2 Kin. 16¹⁶.

^e 1 Chron. 9²⁸, &c.; cf. Deissmann *Bible Studies* 149 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.

^g An exception might perhaps be admitted in the case of the Song and the Last Words of David (2 Kin. 22²-23⁷), where the similarity to the language of Θ is specially marked and where quotations from Θ are absent from Field's Hexapla.

^h A clear instance occurs in *Ant. Jud.* ix 122 (Niese) ἐπυθάνετο τις εἶη καὶ καταβῆσαν ἔκειν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλείψεν, following 4 Kin. 9³² Τίς εἶ σύ; κατέβηθι μετ' ἐμοῦ (M. T. וַיָּבֹאוּ).

Quod deus immut. 2 (6 Wendland) ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν βασιλειῶν.

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 $\beta\delta$ 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 α) and the Book of David (the Greek $\beta\beta$ with $\beta\gamma$) 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.