

Plato and Aristotle were produced during his sojourn in the north of England, for Neville's tastes seem to have run more in the direction of secular than of ecclesiastical learning. Conjectural as all this is, it seems to me worth suggesting.

There is one curious point about the Leiden MS. The title-page of which I have been speaking is the only one in the whole volume written in the peculiar 'Leicester' hand: yet Emmanuel claims to have written it all. Is his claim analogous to that of Constantine Simonides with regard to the *Codex Sinaiticus*? I was at first doubtful on the point, but an examination of the writing (of which I have a photograph) has led me to the conclusion that Emmanuel really did write the whole, but that he used a much finer pen and took more pains with his work than he did in other cases. The recumbent *epsilon*, so marked a feature of his writing, is present here: the other letters, notably the *episemon* and *xi*, are formed in his fashion throughout; and the rubricated initials are just such as appear in the Trinity Psalter. Yet the writing is so much finer, closer, and prettier than Emmanuel's ordinary hand, that a casual glance would never have suggested that it came from his pen.

I have not succeeded in identifying Emmanuel of Constantinople with any of the scribes of whom lists are accessible to me. Perhaps some reader of this JOURNAL will be more fortunate.

M. R. JAMES.

JACHIN AND BOAZ.

IN 1 Kings vii 21 (= 2 Chron. iii 17) we are told that two pillars of 'brass' (bronze or copper) were set up at the entrance of Solomon's Temple. They were cast by Hiram, the half-Tyrian copper-worker, whom Solomon fetched from Tyre to do foundry work for him. To these two pillars the names 'Jachin' and 'Boaz' were attached. Whether these names were given by Hiram, or by Solomon, or by popular usage, cannot be decided from the vague Hebrew expression *וַיִּקְרָא*, 'and he (some one) called'. On the other hand it is reasonable (though not necessary) to suppose that the two names, or two words closely resembling the names, were *inscribed on the pillars*.

In what precise form the two names appeared on the pillars (if they so appeared) I do not venture to enquire. If the inscriptions were due to Hiram, whose training was Tyrian, they may have been copied *literatim* from some Tyrian Temple in which they bore a meaning which is unknown to us at the present stage of Phoenician archaeo-

logical research. My chief object in the present paper is to ask in what form the two names appeared in the pre-Septuagintal text of Kings. If I venture to add a word about their significance it is with all reserve.

I can hardly hope to say much that is new. The textual facts are well given (on the whole) in Dr. Cheyne's Article on JACHIN AND BOAZ in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. A good selection of theories worthy of consideration also appears in that article. The two readings which seem to me to be probably right are found there. What I miss in Dr. Cheyne's work is a sufficient consideration of the evidence of the LXX. I am inclined to think (1) that the LXX points pretty clearly to the true reading; (2) that it gives a hint of the road by which scribes or editors arrived at our present text.

In Dr. Swete's LXX *Jachin* is Ἰαχοῦμ (cod. A, H. P. 158, 247, Ιαχουμ) in 3 Regn. vii 7 [21] and (by translation) Κατόρθωσις, 'Setting up', 'Establishing', in 2 Chron. iii 17: Boaz is Βάλαζ (cod. A, Βοος) in 3 Regn. vii 7 [21], and (by translation) Ἰσχίς, 'Strength', in 2 Chron. iii 17. Our present enquiry, however, is concerned only with the text of Kings; it seems to me quite probable that the LXX translators did not find the Hebrew text of Chronicles in agreement with that of Kings, as it is at the present day. I refer to Chronicles therefore only by way of illustration.

(A) JACHIN.

With regard to the first name we may say that while at first sight the question between the יָבִי (Hiphil), 'He shall establish', and the יָבִי or יָבִי (Kal?) which lies behind the text of the LXX, must on the external testimony be left undecided, internal evidence inclines the scale in favour of the LXX. The evidence may be presented thus:—

(a) For a Hiphil (*Jachin*) M. T.

Vulgate, *Jachin*.

Josephus, *Archaeol.* viii 3. 4 [§ 78], ed. Niese, Ἰαχεῖν¹.

Peshitta (*LU* = A) ܝܚܘܡܝܢ (exact transcription of the M. T.).

Targum (Antw. Polyg. = Lagarde) יָבִי (again an exact transcription).

(M. T., Vulgate, Peshitta, and Targum have the same reading in 2 Chron. iii 17²).

(b) For a Kal or a verbal substantive having the form of a Kal imperfect (or voluntative).

LXX (cod. B; Lucian) Ἰαχοῦμ.

(cod. A) Ἰαχούν.

¹ Cf. Lagarde, *Onom.* p. 168 Ιαχιν, ἡτοιμασμένος, ἔτοιμος.

² The Targumic gloss however suits יָבִי somewhat better than יָבִי. The passage is, יָבִי עַל שֹׁם דְּמִקְרָא מִלְכּוּתָא דְּבֵינָא דְּרוּר.

De Nom. Hebraicis (Lagarde *Onomastica* p. 42) has :

Jachon, *Praeparatio*,

which is probably a reproduction of a Greek gloss

Ἰαχὸν¹, Καρόθωσις.

(I have not been able to find any Old Latin evidence in Sabatier, or Vercellone, or in the *Speculum*, or in Cyprian.)

The Ethiopic (in the main, I suppose, a daughter-version of the LXX) has a transcription answering to Ἰακουμ (with κ), a reading found in H. P. 44, 55, 56, 64, 71, 92, 106, 120, 123, 134, 144, 242, 243, 244, 246, Ald. Cat. Nic., and plainly a corruption of Ἰαχουμ. I think on the foregoing testimony that we may say with confidence that the original reading of the LXX was Ἰαχουμ or Ἰαχουν.

The decision between this and the Massoretic reading is to be given on internal grounds. יַחֲוֹן is a form known to Mass. Hebrew, יַחֲוֹן or יַחֲוֹן (uncompounded) is not. The Massoretes gave a meaning to an obscure Hebrew name by making one of the regular Massoretic changes. Thus Ἰαχουμ (Ἰαχουν) is to be preferred as the reading which gave birth to its rival.

(B) BOAZ.

The evidence for the reading *Boaz*, a name identical with that of Ruth's second husband, is as follows :—

M. T. בּוֹז, written *plene* in four of Kennicott's MSS.

LXX (cod. A, Boos : H. P. 123, Boaz ; H. P. 247, Boaz ; Arm., Booz¹ or Booz²).

[*De Nom. Hebraicis*. Booz, *In fortitudine.*]

Peshitta, בּוֹז or בּוֹז.

Targum, בּוֹז Lagarde ; בּוֹז Antw. Polyg.

Vulgate, *Boos*.

(Targum on 2 Chron. iii 17 : 'He called the name of that on the left 'Boaz' after the name of Boaz, the head of that family of Judah whence came forth all the kings of the House of Judah.')

At the head of the variants to the received reading *Boaz* should be placed a significant variant which affects the vowels only :

LXX (Lucian = H. P. 19, 93, Baaz ; H. P. 108, Baaz).

Josephus (*ut supra*, ed. Niese), Ἀβαζ, Βαζ, Βαίς ; Josephus 1st, *Baes*.

The remaining variants of the Septuagint are those which introduce a λ as middle consonant of the name. They may be said to follow two forms : (1) a form of which it may simply be said that λ is introduced ;

¹ Lag. *Onom.* p. 167, Ιαουβ, (*sic*) which is the reading of H. P. 119 in 3 Regn.

² So Mr. N. M^cLean informs me.

(2) an elaborated form which suggests in addition a disturbance of the vowels of the word.

First Form.

LXX (cod. B=Ethiopic), Βάλαζ.

Second Form.

LXX (cod. Basiliano-Vaticanus, IX Century), Βαολαοζ.

- „ (H. P. 52, [74 ?]¹, 92, 121, 134, 144, 236, 242, 243, 244. Cat. Nic.), Βαολαοζ.
 „ (H. P. 71, 245), Βοολαοζ.
 „ (H. P. 44), Βολαοζ.
 „ (H. P. 55), Βοολαζ.
 „ (H. P. 64), Βολοζ.

Naturally the first question to ask in considering these variants is, Can any explanation be given of the origin of the form which contains the elements B-λ-ζ and is supported by the united authority (very strong, it seems to me) of cod. B and the Ethiopic version? I think it can. Assume for a moment that the original reading here was, as some scholars suppose, BAAL (לעב). The reading is now at any rate BOAZ (עב). The intermediate step between these readings is afforded by the word לעב written with an מוּלְתָּ תַּוּ², *i. e.* with a suspended ך to warn the reader that the offensive word BAAL must be softened into BAAZ, *i. e.* into the reading found in the Lucianic LXX. The editors or translators, however, to whom the reading of cod. B is due, either hesitating to suppress any letter of Scripture, or misunderstanding the purpose of the suspended letter, 'simply added the ך and so gave us Βαλαζ.

The second question to be answered is, Can any explanation be given of the forms which shew a marked disturbance of vowel sounds, *i. e.* of the form Βαολαοζ and of its numerous variants which appear in the cursives? To this, I believe, an affirmative answer may be given; the theory of a suspended letter, if it be accepted, does explain these longer forms no less satisfactorily than the form Βαλαζ. We have only to suppose that in some Hebrew MSS the correction in the reading was written ךלעב instead of ךעב.

(The reason for introducing the ך in addition to the ך would be to shew more clearly that the ך was a *substitute* for the ך and not an addition to the three letters לעב; in other words to shew that the ך was to immediately follow ך.)

¹ No. 74 is quoted also for the reading Βιαζ.

² The four instances of a 'suspended letter' are Jud. xviii 30; Ps. lxxx 14; Job xxxviii 13, 15. (Cf. L. Blau *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg, 1891.)

But again (so I suppose) the fear of omitting something prevailed. Some early transcriber of the LXX text of Kings who was acquainted with the Hebrew text found there a combination of letters which he (disregarding the suspension of the last two) read as $\beta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma$. Such a form, if we may judge by analogy, would be represented in the LXX by $\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta$ ¹ or $\beta\alpha\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta$ or by one of the many intermediate forms cited above. But if we accept either of the above forms as original, the remaining forms given in the cursives may easily be explained as corruptions which arose in the course of the transcription of the Greek. (The present Heb. reading BOAZ (= LXX A) may be described as one remove further in the direction of euphemism than the Lucianic BAAZ.)

I conclude that the evidence of the LXX points to the reading $\beta\alpha$ (read *yāchūn* or *yāchōn*) for *Jachin*, and to $\beta\epsilon\gamma$ (read, however, as *Baaz*² by way of euphemism to avoid the name *Baal*) for *Boaz*. The two words thus restored *may* be Hebrew (though not Massoretic Hebrew), but they are more probably Phoenician. If they be Hebrew, it is conceivable that $\beta\alpha$ was understood by the writer of the account of the Temple-building in a sense kindred to the word $\beta\epsilon\gamma$ (1 Kings viii 13, 'a settled place' A.V.; 'a place' R.V.; $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\eta$ LXX B; $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\eta$ cod. A). Then reading the two names in the order given in the text of ver. 21 the writer may have understood them to mean 'The Lord dwelleth' or 'The Lord hath a dwelling'. But the words *may* be Phoenician, they *may* have to be read in the order *Baal Jachun*, and they *may* both be names or epithets of a Deity. Until we know more of Phoenician religion and Phoenician worship, it seems to me unsafe to go further.

W. EMERY BARNES.

PS. In *Critica Biblica* (Part IV, *in loco*) Prof. Cheyne proposes to read *Jerahmeel* for *Jachin*, and 'Jezebel, i. e. *Ishmael*' for *Boaz*.

ON ROMANS IX 5 AND MARK XIV 61.

THE punctuation of Rom. ix 5 has probably been more discussed than that of any other sentence in literature, and I should not venture to reopen the subject were it not that the interpretation which I wish to bring forward is based on a somewhat different view of the

¹ Cf. $\beta\omicron\omicron\mu\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ = $\beta\omicron\gamma\gamma$ (Ruth, *passim*, cod. A); $\beta\omicron\theta\omicron\mu\eta\lambda$ = $\beta\eta\gamma\gamma$ (Jud. iii 9, 11, codd. A B); $\beta\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$ = $\beta\omicron\beta$ (Exod. xvi 36, codd. A B); 'Αββακ = $\beta\gamma\gamma$ (Gen. xxiii 2, cod. A; hiat B).

² I fancy that the Lucianic LXX here as in some other places has preserved an ancient Hebrew tradition.