

# The Temple Construction Report 1Kgs 6 – How Translators Deal with a Difficult Template

## 1. The Question under Dispute

There is a consensus in recent research on the Septuagint of Kingdoms that even the sections not affected by the *kaige*-revision are more oriented towards the source language than the target language. From this consensus, the nature of the translation of 1Kgs 6 must also be judged. This text has caused some difficulties for translators.<sup>1</sup> The same is true for Ezek 40 where the divergence of the transliterations of אֵילִם and אֵוֹלִם is many times greater.<sup>2</sup> James Montgomery and Henry Gehman compare ancient and modern translations and conclude: “moderns knew little more than the ancients.”<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere in secondary literature it is also explicitly stated that the translators only advised,<sup>4</sup> that they did not understand the text,<sup>5</sup> or that certain expressions were untranslatable.<sup>6</sup> There is no evidence that the construction of the first or the descriptions of the second temple in 1Macc 4:48<sup>7</sup>, Sir 50:2<sup>8</sup> or Josephus<sup>9</sup>, or indeed descriptions of the celestial

---

<sup>1</sup> Also in the Targum the difficult points in Hebrew vv. 4, 6, 9 are characterized by expanding precision (HARRINGTON and SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*, 222).

<sup>2</sup> In Ezek 40, we find the following variants: αἰλαμμῶθ renders אֵילִם (Ezek 40:24–26, 30bis, 31, 33bis, 34, 36), לֵיִם in Ezek 40:37–38; αἰλαμμῶν renders אֵילִם in Ezek 40:22bis, 24–26, 31, מֵלֵם in Ezek 40:21, 30bis, 33bis, 34, 36, לֵיִם in Ezek 40:37–38; αἰλεου renders לֵיִם in Ezek 40:21; αἰλεῦ renders לֵיִם in Ezek 40:9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37.

<sup>3</sup> MONTGOMERY and GEHMAN, *Kings*, 148; cf. NOTH, *Könige*, 99, on 1Kgdms 6:9.

<sup>4</sup> WÜRTHWEIN, *1. Könige 1–16*, 64.

<sup>5</sup> STADE and SCHWALLY, *The Books of Kings*, 85.

<sup>6</sup> FRITZ, *Das erste Buch der Könige*, 65 n. 30.

<sup>7</sup> 1Macc 4:48 mentions τὰ ἐντὸς τοῦ οἴκου καὶ τὰς αὐλάς but nothing else.

<sup>8</sup> According to Sir 50:2, Simon, the son of Onias, had built the temple twice as high; but this cannot be verified from Josephus.

<sup>9</sup> According to Josephus, the Solomonic temple was 120 cubits, the second temple only 60 cubits high (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:385, LCL:186) and also 60 cubits wide before its reconstruction by Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:13, 99, LCL:320, 362). There it is also reported that the temple was built from three layers of smoothed marble and one layer of wood from the land. There is nothing here about its inner division. Herod the Great had increased its length to 100 cubits, its height to 120 cubits (*Ant.* 15:391, LCL:188). Josephus twice mentions surrounding porticoes (*Ant.* 11:89, LCL:356; *Ant.* 12:141), once the upper rooms of the temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:149, LCL:384), and once the eastern

sanctuary in Qumran texts,<sup>10</sup> had any influence on the translators. But nor is the influence of Egyptian temple architecture<sup>11</sup> visible in 1Kgdms 6, while in Ezek 40 the term *παστοφόριον* suggests such an influence. Was the interest in the theology of the temple greater than the interest in its design?<sup>12</sup> Or – as is my thesis – was fidelity to the text more important to the translators than their own ideas about temple architecture?

It is necessary to realize the nature of the difficulties in the architectural terminology<sup>13</sup> which is encountered almost exclusively in reports of the temple construction or visions.<sup>14</sup> The terminology includes several controversial terms, e.g. *צִיעַ* (1Kgs 6:5),<sup>15</sup> *לִיֹּל* (1Kgs 6:8),<sup>16</sup> *גְּבִים* (1Kgs 6:9)<sup>17</sup>, and *שְׂדֵרֶת* (1Kgs 6:9)<sup>18</sup> which are reproduced differently in the Sept-

---

gate (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:154, LCL:386–388), but does not specify anything inside the temple itself.

<sup>10</sup> 11Q19 IV, 10 probably presupposes a height of 60 cubits. Perhaps in 11Q19 XX, 11f.; XXI, 3 an inner and an outer court are distinguished within the temple area. Further buildings within the temple area are described in 11Q19 XXX–XLV, but this does not help to explain 3 Kgs 6. 4Q405 XVI, 6f.; 11Q17 B, 3 mentions *דבירים* (plural), 4Q405 col XVII, 3–6 mentions the *דביר* of the king. The phrases “Debir of his Shrine” in 4Q403 I II, 16 and “a Most Holy in the King’s Debirim” in 4Q405 XVI, 7 also do not add clarity. 11Q20 XII; 1Q32; 2Q24; 11Q18 are too fragmentary to contribute to the interpretation of 3Kgdms 6. In 5Q15 nothing of the temple description is preserved.

<sup>11</sup> Ptolemaic and Seleucid rulers had temples built purely in the style of the old regional advanced civilizations in addition to architecturally innovative complexes; cf. LAUTER, *Architektur*, 5. Especially in Hellenistic times a quite elaborate design of the propylon becomes common; only now the propylon become a common architectural element (LAUTER, *Architektur*, 201). But it is not certain that the books of the kingdoms were translated in Egypt. On the method of localization cf. TOV, “Reflections,” 7–15.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. RÖSEL, “Tempel und Tempellosigkeit,” 457, on the differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text with regard to the tabernacle.

<sup>13</sup> In general, cf. DEVRIES, *1 Kings*, 94–95.

<sup>14</sup> 1Kgs 6:1–22; Ezek 40f; 2Chr 3.

<sup>15</sup> NOTH, *Könige*, 98, derives the word from *צע*. He thinks of a building layer, which, resting on the uneven, unhewn natural stones, should result in a flat surface for the support of the roof construction. THENIUS, *Könige*, 65, and OUELETTE, “The *yāsīā‘* and *slā‘ōt*,” 187–191, interpret the term as ‘annex.’

<sup>16</sup> The word can be understood as a trapdoor according to the Syrian translation (*קטרקטא* = *καταρράκτης*; STADE, “Der Text des Berichtes über Salomos Bauten I Kö. 5–7,” 135) or as a spiral staircase according to the Septuagint (cf. Callixinos of Rhodes, frgm. 1, Müller 57). MULDER, *Kings 1–11*, 247, however, supposes another solution: *ב* is not preposition but part of the word. The root *בלל* means “mingle,” *בלול* does not mean “winding stair” but “spiral shaped stair.”

<sup>17</sup> The term *גְּבִים* is controversial with regard to the word form as well as the meaning. THENIUS, *Könige*, 65, reads *גְּבִים* and interprets it as wood, the underside of which was cut out to form a flat arch; these are then laid across the roof. *שדרת* means the horizontal rows. According to ŠANDA, *Das erste Buch der Könige*, 128, however, the roof of the temple was a flat roof, similar to the flat roofs in Egypt. COGAN, *1 Kings*, 240, suggests a conjecture from *גב*: “hollow, depression.” GÖRG, “Zwei bautechnische Begriffe,” 12–15,

uagint. The divergences in reproduction are not simply due to ignorance of a foreign-language lexeme. At least for experimental purposes one must include the tensions between the texts concerning the construction of the temple in their different versions. In the following, neither questions about the archaeological verifiability of 1Kgs 6<sup>19</sup> nor the biblical dating of the construction of the temple<sup>20</sup> or its dimensions,<sup>21</sup> nor the various textual conversions<sup>22</sup> and special items of the MT<sup>23</sup> will be examined, but rather the transliterations  $\alpha\iota\lambda\alpha\mu$  and  $\delta\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota\rho/\delta\alpha\beta\iota\rho$  and some terms especially from 3Kgdms 6:1–15.

---

suggest the meaning ‘annex’ due to Egyptian parallels, In general, cf. the critical remarks of DEVRIES, *1 Kings* 95.

<sup>18</sup> GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 162 n. e, considers שדרת to be a doubtful phonetic variant of סדרת, though שדרת is attested with this meaning in 2Kgs 11:8, 15.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. KAMLAH, “Der salomonische Tempel,” 46–47.

<sup>20</sup> No consensus has been reached on the priority of dating the temple building to the 480<sup>th</sup> year (MT, LXX<sup>ant</sup>) or the 440<sup>th</sup> year (LXX<sup>ra</sup>) after the exodus. WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 265, pleads for dating according to MT whereas NOTH, *Könige*, 110, and COGAN, *1 Kings*, 236, both prefer the dating of the Septuagint.

<sup>21</sup> GOODING, “Temple specifications,” 168–172, explains the changed length measures as a misunderstanding of v. 17. He is followed by NOTH, *Könige*, 97; MULDER, *1 Kings*, 232; DEVRIES, *1 Kings*, 87. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, Tome I*, 340, on the other hand, attributes the reduced measurements to an attempt to conceal the comparison made in Hag 2:3 to the detriment of the new temple. The problem was already controversial in pre-Enlightenment exegesis in the opposite direction. Unaware of the Masoretic Text, Ps.-Anastasius Sinaita deduces from the competing data in v. 2 and v. 17 (a separate mention of Debir) that the temple must have been 60 cubits long; he qualifies this as his own opinion, against the specification of the Holy Scriptures (Θαυμαζέτω δὲ μηδεὶς, εἰ, τῆς Γραφῆς μ’ πηχῶν εἰρηκυίας τὸ μῆκος, ἐξήκοντα εἶπον ἐγώ: No one should be surprised that while the Scripture states the length as 40 cubits, I say that it is 60 cubits; Ps.-Anastasius Sinaita, *Qu.* 44, PG 89:596a; this material is not included in CC.SG 59). Ps.-Anastasius also refers to the contradiction to 2Chr 3:4 and to the corresponding statements by Josephus.

<sup>22</sup> On the dissent with regard to the transition from Chapter 5 to Chapter 6, see the positions of Adrian Schenker on the one hand and Percy S. F. van Keulen, among others, on the other (SCHENKER, *Septante, et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14*, 135–136; VAN KEULEN, *Two Versions*, 124–126). On the dissent with regard to 1Kgdms 6,37f. cf. STADE, “Text,” 135. On the ordering of the report of the construction of the royal palace cf. on the one hand POLAK, “The Septuagint Account of Salomon’s Reign,” 153, who follows WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 264, in regarding the Masoretic Text as primary, and on the other hand TREBOLLE BARRERA, “Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles,” 497, who argues for the priority of the Septuagint text.

<sup>23</sup> The addition 1Kgs 6:11–13 calls for obedience to the commandments; the addition in vv. 20–22 speaks of works in gold to increase the glory of the temple (WÜRTHWEIN, *1 Könige*, 61). The temple should not be inferior to the tabernacle (KITTEL, *Könige*, 51). The Masoretic Text is generally regarded as secondary here. On the literary criticism of 1Kgdms 6:17–20, see below.

## 2. The Transliterations αιλάμ and δαβειρ/δαβιρ

In the older Greek versions of the temple construction report known to us, **היכל** is rendered by *ναός* whereas **אולם** is transliterated as αιλάμ and **דביר** as δαβειρ/δαβιρ. Some renderings of **אולם**, *προναίον*,<sup>24</sup> *πρόπυλον*<sup>25</sup> and *προπύλαιον*<sup>26</sup> and distinct renderings of **דביר**, *ἄδυτον*<sup>27</sup> and *χρημαστήριον*,<sup>28</sup> are not traceable in the early Greek versions. The transliterations mentioned also occur in the much clearer construction report 2Chr 3. **אולם** also reoccurs in the above variations in Ezek 40–48; but both transliterations are missing, as are the Hebrew referents, in Exod 25–40.

The holiness of the temple was not the rationale for these transliterations. 1. Transliterations in 3Kgdms also concern things outside the temple, namely the αιλάμ of the Royal Palace in 3Kgdms 7:43–45, *θεε* in 3Kgdms 14:28, the plant *ράθυμ* in 3Kgdms 19:4 and the Idumean Ader, which is called *σατάν* (2Kgdms 11:4). 2. **היכל** is also not transliterated, but mostly reproduced with *ναός*, which is not reserved for sacred buildings but can designate an Israelite or even non-Israelite royal palace<sup>29</sup> or temple<sup>30</sup> outside the books of Kings. Nor can one assume that details concerning the interior (e.g. *χερουβιμ* and *μεχωνωθ*) existed only in the temple of Jerusalem.<sup>31</sup> There are several ways to interpret the transliteration of **אולם** and **דביר** as opposed to the translation of **היכל**:

1. One could assume that **אולם** and **דביר** have been adopted as loan words,<sup>32</sup> but I am sceptic about this: due to the translations *προναίον*, *πρόπυλον* etc., these potential loan words have not been established in Greek-speaking Judaism.<sup>33</sup>

2. Concerning **אולם** and **דביר** we can ask about the reason for the transliteration. So far, however, this has not led to any consensus. Therefore, I suggest a new approach to the problem:

<sup>24</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 18:65, LCL 433:50. Vitruvius 4:4.1, LCL:226 also knows *pronaon* as Greek foreign word for “porch.”

<sup>25</sup> 3Kgdms 6:3; 7:6 (bis), 7 Symmachus.

<sup>26</sup> Theodoret, *Qu. 3Reg.* 23, PG 80:685a.

<sup>27</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 8:72, LCL:610.

<sup>28</sup> 3Kgdms 6:5, 16, 19, 20 Symmachus; cf. LAW, “The Translation of Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms),” 282.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Ps 44(45):16<sup>LXX</sup> and 2Chr 36:7. In both cases *ναός* stands for **היכל**.

<sup>30</sup> Joel 3 (4):5<sup>LXX</sup>; Bel and the Dragon.

<sup>31</sup> SIEGERT, *Zwischen hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 216.

<sup>32</sup> TVEDTNES, “Etymologies,” 217, suggests that **דביר** is either a Semitic loanword in Egypt or, conversely, an Egyptian technical term translated into Canaanite. GÖRG, “Weiteres zur Gestalt des Tempelbaus,” 22f., refers for **אולם** to the Egyptian counterpart *wrm.t* (pergola, roof).

<sup>33</sup> **אולם** is still used in Hebrew and Aramaic traditions as the name of the porch of the temple, cf. 11Q19 IV, 8:1; mMid 3:6.

3. One may ask what אולם has in common with דביר in a way that does not apply to היכל.

In my opinion, the transliteration procedure in both cases is due to the translators' uncertainty as to the exact execution of the project. This is not to say that the translators did not in principle know whether אולם meant the front or the back area. It is much more about the structural assignment of the two parts mentioned, which are fixed in their function, to ναός.

Due to the ambiguity of the phrase עַל-פְּנֵי in 1Kgs 6:3,<sup>34</sup> אולם can be understood as an independent porch separated from the היכל by a free space at least in the middle, or as a porch whose wall towards the היכל is shared with the היכל itself. In the former case, the etymology would have led to the translation πρόπυλον; in the latter case, to the translation πρόναος.<sup>35</sup> In my opinion, the juxtaposition of the two translations in later renditions indicates uncertainty concerning the spatial conception. The description of the Royal Palace in 3Kgdms 7:43–45 is, as in the Masoretic Text, just as unclear. In v. 45 the house for the Pharaoh's daughter is compared to an αἶλαμ; in 3Kgdms 7:43f. it seems to be rather a hall within a larger complex.

But דביר was also left untranslated. The phrase ἄγιον τῶν ἀγίων, which is explicitly given in A, probably contributed to the confusion, as a comparison of the various temple construction reports suggests: according to Ezek 41:3<sup>MT</sup> the קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוּשִׁים, the Holiest of Holies, is located in an inner room (פְּנִימָה). According to Ezek 41:3<sup>LXX</sup>, it is located in an inner courtyard; 1Kgs 6:16b<sup>MT</sup> reads לְקֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוּשִׁים מִבַּיִת לְדַבִּיר; 3Kgdms 6:17<sup>Ant</sup> reads καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκ τοῦ δαβειρ τὸν τοῖχον εἰς τὸ ἄγιον τῶν ἀγίων, 3Kgdms 6:17<sup>Ra</sup> reads ἐκ τοῦ δαβειρ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον τῶν ἀγίων.<sup>36</sup> The presentation is no more transparent in what follows. In the addition<sup>37</sup> 3Kgdms 6:18<sup>Ant</sup>=6:19<sup>Ra</sup>, ναός is more closely defined by κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβειρ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ οἴκου ἔσωθεν; similarly, the expanded addition in the Masoretic Text offers דָּבַר בְּתוֹךְ-הַבַּיִת מִפְּנֵימָה (וְ) לְפָנָי; cf. v. 17). 1Kgs 8:6<sup>MT</sup> reads דָּבַר הַבַּיִת (LXX: δαβειρ τοῦ οἴκου) whereas 2Chr 3:8 reads בֵּית-קֹדֶשׁ הַקְּדוּשִׁים.

<sup>34</sup> This phrase can mean “at the front of a building” or “vis-à-vis” (Gen 18:16; 19:28).

<sup>35</sup> In fact, as the relevant encyclopedias show, the terms are not completely restricted to the meaning given above; one can assume, however, that the translators have oriented themselves on etymology.

<sup>36</sup> Mostly the absence of בית in LXX is understood as unintentional erasure, while the reference to the wall was supplemented to have a suitable object to ויבן. The ἐκ before τοῦ δαβειρ is changed by Theodotion and Aquila to ἔσωθεν, by Symmachus to ἐσώτερον (FIELD, *Hexapla*, 604). This also indicates the difficulty of understanding.

<sup>37</sup> V. 18 was probably not left out in the Septuagint (THENIUS, *Könige*, 69), but must be judged as a secondary addition. Many scholars regard v. 19 as an earlier addition to the text vv. 17, 20 (KITTEL, *Könige*, 50; MONTGOMERY and GEHMAN, *Kings*, 150; COGAN, *1 Kings*, 242; NOTH, *Könige*, 100; WÜRTHWEIN, *Könige*, 60 Anm. 10).

So the semantic relationship between דביר and בית was unclear to the translators, as it remains in recent research. And for other reasons the original meaning of דביר is quite controversial.

The theory presented here is also not called into question by those texts in which דביר or אולם are reproduced by *ναός*, because these variations in translation originate from philological or theological correction. If in Ps 28:2 דביר is rendered as *ναός*, this is probably due to the fact that the raising of hands in prayer to the Holiest of Holies was perceived as an unjustified intervention in the sphere of holiness. But so too the replacement of אולם by *ναός*, which can be found five times, is probably intentional. According to 1Chr 28:11 David will probably have given his son a draft not only for אולם. The altar of burnt offering stands in front of the main building, not especially in front of אולם (2Chr 8:12; 15:8). In 2Chr 29:7 the complete end of the cult for the God of Israel is said to have been stated, and the statement “They went into אולם and consecrated the house” in 2Chr 29:17 seemed nonsensical: both phrases should refer to the same object.

To conclude this paragraph: the translators did not know how they should imagine the structural assignment of אולם and דביר to היכל. Nor did they use the general term *αὐλή*, which had rendered חצר since Exod 27:9 and is also used in 3Kgdms 6–7. They opted for transliteration because they were afraid of making false statements. From ancient philology on Homer the principle is known that a text must also be factually perfect, i.e. according to the understanding of reality at that time, it must also correspond to reality in detail. This ideal of correspondence between text and reality could obviously not be achieved by the translators, but in their eyes this by no means justifies false statements. Ancient philologists on Homer declared some verses to be false due to contradictions to other statements in Homer. This was not an option for Jewish or Christian interpreters of the Bible. Yet the temple construction report cannot do without these two controversial terms. Therefore, transliteration was apparently perceived as an adequate means of solving the problem.

### 3. Other Terms of Architecture

There are epigraphic and literary parallels for some of the architectural terms used here, but not for others. Parallels from 2Chr 3 and Ezek 40-48 are used on a case-by-case basis.

In 3Kgdms 6:9<sup>Ant=4<sup>Ra</sup></sup>, *θυρίδες* functions as the equivalent of חלונים; this is probably due to everyday language and is therefore not in need of

clarification.<sup>38</sup> In the continuation, the Antiochene text offers *δεδικτυωμένας κρύπτας*, while Codex Vaticanus offers *παρακυπτομένας κρύπτας*. Understanding the Hebrew text as well as the Greek versions is difficult;<sup>39</sup> the later revisions of the Septuagint diverge.<sup>40</sup> The first word of the Antiochene text (*δεδικτυωμένας*) is also documented as an architectonic expression,<sup>41</sup> but not the first word of the text in Codex Vaticanus (*παρακυπτομένας*<sup>42</sup>); the dependency on a Hebrew letter sequence *הקש* is evident.

The term *πλευρά* is encountered in 3Kgdms 6:10, 13<sup>Ant</sup>=5, 8<sup>Ra</sup> as a translation of *צל*, vocalized *צֶלַע* (side extension, board).<sup>43</sup> For this term, however, other translations are offered in the report discussed here and in its context, *ξύλον* (3Kgdms 6:16<sup>Ant</sup>=15<sup>Ra</sup>) and *πτυχή*, rendering both *צֶלַע* and *עֲלֵק*.<sup>44</sup> The term *πλευρά* is used of living beings, sometimes also of the inanimate world, and can denote the flank of a military formation,<sup>45</sup> but also the flanks of a triangle.<sup>46</sup> It does not appear in literature as an architectural term. This fact, however, does not necessarily mean much; not all such expressions, which are also used by non-literates, must have immortalized themselves in literature. The term *צֶלַע* includes a broad semantic spectrum. Is there an interpretive reproduction here, so that the translator tries to orientate himself on the structural or spatial scenario

<sup>38</sup> This is true also for the concordant rendering of *קיר*, *τοιχος* (similarly in 2Chr 3:7; in Ezek 40; 41, however, *קיר* is rendered sometimes by *περίβολος* (Ezek 40:5; 42:20), sometimes by *προτείχισμα* (Ezek 40:5; 42:20; 48:15). The reproduction of *הקרקר* by *ἔδαφος* (Nbs 5:17) also corresponds to the use of everyday language. Outside the history books, however, *ἔδαφος* renders various Hebrew terms. In everyday language it is also understandable, but not concordant, that the term *πυλών* functions in 3Kgdms 6:8, 33 for *הַמַּשְׁעָה*, in 2Chr 3:7 for *הַשַּׁעַר*, in Ezek 40:9 for *הַשַּׁעַר* as an equivalent. For the use of *θύρα* or *θύρωμα* to reproduce *הַמַּשְׁעָה* or *הַמַּשְׁעָה* in the three temple building reports, no vocabulary-statistical laws can be established.

<sup>39</sup> The expressions are also considered obscure in recent research, cf. COGAN, *1 Kings*, 238. This part of 3Kgdms 6:4 has no parallel in the temple construction report of the Chronicler or in Josephus, which also suggests difficulties in understanding and attempts to avoid a false statement.

<sup>40</sup> Theodotion *θυρίδας διακυπτομένας κρύπτας*, Aquila *θυρίδας ἀποβλέπουσας βεβυσμμένας*, Symmachus *θυρίδας καὶ ἐκθέτας ἐπισκέποντας*.

<sup>41</sup> Polybius 15:30.8, LCL 159:542; IG XI/2, 165,13 (Delos, 3. Cent. BCE).

<sup>42</sup> In the Septuagint, the word renders *הקש* *hi*. in Gen 26:8, *הקש* *ni*. in Judg 5:28; 1Chr 5:29.

<sup>43</sup> Due to *πλευρά* in 3Kgdms 6:11<sup>Ant</sup>/6<sup>Ra</sup>, some others read *צל* instead of MT *עיע* (GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 161; NOTH, *Könige*, 98; COGAN, *1 Kings*, 239).

<sup>44</sup> The word has been rendered *ιστίον* since Exod 27:9 but does not otherwise occur in 3 Kgs 6-7. Is there a misreading from *צל* to *עלק*? BÖSENECKER, "Text und Redaktion," 141, suspects that the old writing variant *עלק* has already been changed to *צל* in the template.

<sup>45</sup> Xenophon, *An.* 3:4.22, 28, LCL 90:234, 236.

<sup>46</sup> Plato, *Tim.* 53d, LCL:126.

presented? This would not be in contradiction to the thesis on transliterations developed above. Alternatives in the translator's imagination are unlikely to have been close at hand, unlike in the case of transliterated terms. For 3Kgdms 6:33<sup>Ant</sup>=34<sup>Ra</sup> this explanation may be sufficient. In 3Kgdms 6:16<sup>Ant</sup>=15<sup>Ra</sup>, עֲצָ is rendered by ξύλον. This term, normally rendering עֵץ, only here is the rendering of עֲצָ. Did the translator read a form from עֵץ in his template?

The term μέλαθρον is used in 3Kgdms 6:10<sup>Ant</sup>=5<sup>Ra</sup> probably for צֵיעַ (annex),<sup>47</sup> in 3Kgdms 7:41<sup>Ant+Ra</sup> for שִׁקְפִים (frame? beam?),<sup>48</sup> in 3Kgdms 7:9<sup>Ant+Ra</sup> for 3Kgs<sup>MT</sup> 7:20 כַּתֶּרֶת (“roof” of a pillar, capital). These are the only references of this term in the Septuagint. In classical Greek, this term includes a broad semantic spectrum and can mean the “cross girder,”<sup>49</sup> roof beam,<sup>50</sup> sometimes simply “roof,”<sup>51</sup> or even “house,”<sup>52</sup> not unlike *tectum*. By choosing such a semantically diversified equivalent one could again avoid a false statement.

The rendering διάστημα for מגרעות is the result of a misreading (מגרש is presupposed<sup>53</sup>; similarly, διάστημα renders מגרש in Ezek 48:15, 17<sup>54</sup>). With regard to 3Kgdms 7:46<sup>Ant+Ra</sup>, there is a disagreement in research as to whether διάστημα is to be regarded as a translation of מדה, which is possible from the semantics of מדה,<sup>55</sup> or whether a misreading from מגרה<sup>56</sup> or to מגרש is a better explanation.

In 3Kgdms 6:14<sup>Ant</sup>=9<sup>Ra</sup>, κοίλοσταθμέω renders ספן;<sup>57</sup> epigraphically, the Greek verb is attested with this meaning.<sup>58</sup> The terms גבים and שדרות are missing in LXX<sup>Ant+B</sup>; LXX<sup>A</sup> only offers a translation. The rendering

<sup>47</sup> MT Kt. יצוע; MT Qr. יציע. V. 15<sup>Ant</sup>=10<sup>Ra</sup> reads ἔνδεσμος, which is rare in archaeological literature (SIG<sup>2</sup> 587.308).

<sup>48</sup> In 3Kgdms 7:42, the verb μελαθροῦσθαι renders the hapax legomenon ηקש (3Kgs 7:5).

<sup>49</sup> Homer, *Od.* 8:279; 11:278 (von der Mühl 139; 203).

<sup>50</sup> Homer, *Od.* 19:544 (von der Mühl 369).

<sup>51</sup> Homer, *Il.* 2.414 (West, 62).

<sup>52</sup> Pindar, *Pythia* 5.40 (ed. Bowra); Aeschylus, *Ag.* 957, LCL 146:110.

<sup>53</sup> GOODING, “Temple specifications,” 153, sees in the difference of the arrangement of the side-chambers between MT (where they connect directly to the main room) and LXX (where they are separated from the main building by an interspace) the expression of a pious idea of a stronger separation between the actual temple and the side rooms. However, the interpretation I suggest fits in with the translator's translation technique.

<sup>54</sup> The word διάστημα is used in Ezek 40–48 for a much larger number of Hebrew terms. However, none of the Hebrew terms is the same as those used in 1Kgs 6.

<sup>55</sup> HRCS 1:311.

<sup>56</sup> BÖSENECKER, “Text,” 147.

<sup>57</sup> In 3Kgdms 6:14<sup>Ant</sup>=15<sup>Ra</sup>, κοίλοσταθμέω renders צפה II.; the semantic bandwidth of צפה allows this translation.

<sup>58</sup> P.Petr 3 p. 143; IG XI/2, 287 A 96 (Delos, 3. cent. BCE); ibd. B 146.

φατνώματα for גבים uses a term well known in architectonic literature.<sup>59</sup> The reproduction of שדרות with διάταξις remains obscure. In 2Kgs 11:8, 15, the Hebrew שדרות means a group of soldiers. In 4Kgdms 11:8, 15<sup>Ant+Ra</sup>, the term is transliterated (σαδηρωθ) whereas the translation of 2Chr 23:14 omits the term. διάταξις is otherwise used just like the verb διατάσσειν, and the noun τάξις not too often and quite unevenly. The verb τάσσειν often renders שים. But I think it's too daring to postulate a graphical bridge from שים to שדרות in order to explain 3Kgdms 6:14<sup>Ant=9Ra</sup>.

In my opinion, we cannot establish Aramaic influences either.<sup>60</sup> Concerning the terms שדרות and איל, a metaphorical architectural usage is not attested. This argument, however, is not totally compelling, due to a possible usage among non-literates unknown to us. The terms גב, לול, and שקוף = שקפא,<sup>61</sup> are well-known but do not include the same semantics as the terms used in the Septuagint of 1Kgdms 6; ספן ("roof") is missing.

Is there a specific influence of Egyptian terminology, analogous to Ezek 40:15, 17? The term αἶθριον, used in LXX only by Ezekiel (in Ezek 40:14 as a reproduction of an incomprehensible Hebrew model, in Ezek 40:15 for פנין), is a term used in Egyptian house architecture and describes the square courtyard in the middle of the house complex from which the individual rooms of the house receive their light. In Ezek 40:17, παστοφόριον (for בלשלישם/παστόφορος) literally denotes the room of a παστόφορος part of the lower clergy in the cult of Egyptian gods, whose exact function in the Egyptian cult is unclear but whose position in the cult corresponds approximately to that of the Levites in the JHWH cult. παστοφόριον is documented only in Hellenistic texts. The evidence in the papyri indicates that these were side rooms within temple districts.<sup>62</sup>

In contrast to Ezek 40:14, 17 a specific influence of Egyptian terminology cannot be determined in 1Kgdms 6. The terms פנין and לשכה, which cause the translations mentioned above, are missing in 1Kgdms 6.<sup>63</sup>

#### 4. The Characteristic of the Translation of 1Kgs 6:1–22

The subject of the essay has not led to any special language among the translators. Both for the Antiochene text and for the mildly Hebraizing text

<sup>59</sup> IGRom IV 556; Polybius 10:27.10, LCL 159:166; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:68, LCL:606; Eupolemos, *Frgm.* 2 (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. ev.* 9:34.6, GCS 43/1:542).

<sup>60</sup> I consulted DALMAN, *Wörterbuch*; BAUMGARTNER, *Lexikon*; CHARLESWORTH, *Concordance*; BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*.

<sup>61</sup> DALMAN, *Wörterbuch*, 68, 215, 433.

<sup>62</sup> KONKEL, "Ezechiel," 2970.

<sup>63</sup> Ezek 40:14<sup>MT</sup> is regarded as obscure (KONKEL, "Ezechiel," 2969).

of Codex Vaticanus the following applies: the translators attributed dignity to the text and adhered to their Hebrew model precisely because they wanted to avoid false statements about the temple.<sup>64</sup> The exact structural assignment of אולם and היכל דביר was unclear to them, so they opted for a transliteration the first two terms.

Otherwise they mostly used architectural terms that are rarely attested in their immediate environment. Occasionally the concern to avoid misstatements is also a guiding factor; therefore they used words with a broad semantic spectrum such as μέλαθρον. Textual corruption is also to be expected. An interpretive rendering exists where alternatives for the translator's imagination are unlikely to have been close to hand. In the later version of Codex Vaticanus, the dependency on a Hebrew letter sequence is occasionally determinative (παρακυπτομένας presupposes שקף).

In my opinion, there are no traces of Aramaic influence; from a literary point of view there was no reason for Egyptianism. Thus the thesis that 3Kgdms section γγ is a translation oriented toward the source language, is confirmed by this section of the text.<sup>65</sup>

## Bibliography

### Sources and Translations

- HARRINGTON, DANIEL J. and SALDARINI, ANTHONY J., *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets. Introduction, Translation and Notes*, ArBib 10 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987).
- FIELD, FREDERICK, *Origenis Hexapla quae supersunt vol. I, Prolegomena; Genesis – Esther* (Oxford 1875 = Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964).
- Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, in: *Aeschylus, Oresteia: Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides*, ed. and trans. by Alan H. Sommerstein, LCL 146 (Cambridge [MA]/London: Harvard University Press, 2008), 1–205.
- Homer, *Ilias*, recensuit/testimonia congressit Martin L. West, Volumen Prius (Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner, 1988).
- , *Odyssea*, recognovit Peter von der Muehll, Editio stereotypa editionis tertiae (Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner, 1983).

---

<sup>64</sup> The faithfulness of the translators to their model is also confirmed by another detail: in 3Kgdms 6:15 the phrase “up to the beams, up to the walls” shows a double reproduction of two Hebrew terms differing only in ו as opposed to ך: nothing should be lost. Also the twofold non-Greek και έως in the same verse is a reproduction of the template ועד, in comparison to which the MT reads only עד.

<sup>65</sup> Thanks to J. Andrew Doole for improving my English.

- Pindar, *Carmina cum Fragmentis*, recognovit brevis adnotatione critica instruxit C. M. Bowra, Scriptorum Classicorum, Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).
- Platon, *Timaios*, in: Plato, with an English translation by The Rev. R. G. Bury (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1966), 16–253.
- Polybius, *The Histories*, with an English translation by W. R. Paton, in six Volumes, Vol. IV, Books IX–XV, LCL 159 (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1976).
- Vitruvius, *On architecture*, edited by the Harleian Manuscript 2767 and translated into English by Frank Granger, in two Volumes I (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1955).
- Xenophon, *Anabasis*, Books I–VII in: *Xenophon*, in seven Volumes, Vol. III, with an English Translation by Carleton L. Brownson, LCL 90 (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Josephus, *Antiquities*, Books V–VIII, with an English translation by Henry St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, in *Josephus* in nine Volumes, Vol. V, LCL (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1934=1966); Books IX–XI, with an English translation by Ralph Marcus, in *Josephus* in nine Volumes, Vol. VI, LCL (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1937=1966); Books XII–XIV, with an English translation by Ralph Marcus, in *Josephus* in nine Volumes, Vol. VII, LCL (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1943=1966); Books XV–XVII, with an English translation by Ralph Marcus, completed and ed. by Allen Wikgren, in *Josephus* in nine Volumes, Vol. VIII (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1963); Books XVIII–XX, with an English Translation by Louis H. Feldman, LCL 433 (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1965=1969).

Anastasius Sinaita, *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, PG 89:311a–824c.

–, *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, eds. Marcel Richard and Joseph A. Munitiz, CC.SG 59 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio evangelica*, ed. Karl Mras, GCS 43/1 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition ed. Édouard des Places (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982).

Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Libros Regum*, PG 80:527a–800d.

### Secondary Literature

- BARTHÉLEMY, DOMINIQUE, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, Bd. 1: Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther*, OBO 50/1 (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
- BAUMGARTNER, WALTER, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1953).
- BEYER, KLAUS, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, Vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); Vol. 2 (2004); Supplement Volume (1994).
- BÖSENECKER, JOBST, “Text und Redaktion. Untersuchungen zum griechischen und hebräischen Text von 1 Könige 1–11.” (Theol. Diss., University of Rostock, 2001).
- CHARLESWORTH, JAMES H., *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991).
- COGAN, MORDECHAI, *1 Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York et al.: Doubleday, 2001).

- DALMAN, GUSTAV, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (Frankfurt am Main: Kauffmann, 1901; Göttingen: Pfeiffer<sup>3</sup>1938).
- DEVRIES, SIMON, *1 Kings*, WBC AT 12 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2003).
- FRITZ, VOLKMAR, *Das erste Buch der Könige*, ZBK (Zürich: TVZ, 1996).
- GOODING, DAVID WILLOUGHBY, "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967): 143–172.
- GÖRG, MANFRED, "Weiteres zur Gestalt des Tempelbaus," *BN* 13 (1980): 22–25.
- , "Zwei bautechnische Begriffe in 1 Kön 6,9," *BN* 10 (1979): 12–15.
- GRAY, JOHN, *I & II Kings. A Commentary* (2<sup>nd</sup> revised ed. London: SCM Press, 1970).
- KAMLAH, JENS, "Der salomonische Tempel. Paradigma der Verknüpfung von biblischer Exegese und Archäologie für eine Rekonstruktion der Religionsgeschichte Israels," *VF* 53 (2008): 40–51.
- KITTEL, RUDOLF, *Die Bücher der Könige übersetzt und erklärt*, HKAT I/5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900).
- KONKEL, MICHAEL, "Ezechiel," in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, Vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2859–2992.
- LAUTER, HANS, *Die Architektur des Hellenismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986).
- LAW, TIMOTHY R., "The Translation of Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms)," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana, 2007*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters, SBLSCS 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 277–292.
- MONTGOMERY, JAMES and GEHMAN, HENRY SNYDER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1951=1986).
- MULDER, MARTIN J., *1 Kings; Vol 1/1, Kings 1–11*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 1998).
- NOTH, MARTIN, *Könige. I. Teilband*, BK AT IX/1 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968).
- OUELETTE, JEAN, "The yāsīa' and slā'ōt: Two Mysterious Structures in Solomon's Temple," *JNES* 31 (1972), 187–191.
- POLAK, FRANK H., "The Septuagint Account of Salomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBL.SCS 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 139–164.
- RÖSEL, MARTIN, "Tempel und Tempellosigkeit. Der Umgang mit dem Heiligtum in der Pentateuch-LXX," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 447–461.
- ŠANDA, ALBERT, *Die Bücher der Könige übersetzt und erklärt, I. Halbband: Das erste Buch der Könige* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1911).
- SCHENKER, ADRIAN, *Septante, et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14*, Cahiers de la Revue biblique 48 (Paris: Gabalda, 2000).
- SIEGERT, FOLKER, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*, MJSt 9 (Münster et al.: Lit-Verlag, 2001).
- STADE, BERNHARD and SCHWALLY, FRIEDRICH, *The Books of Kings. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text* (Leipzig: Hinrichs; Baltimore: John Hopkins; London: David Nutt 1904).
- , "Der Text des Berichtes über Salomos Bauten I Kö. 5–7," *ZAW* 3 [1883]: 129–177.
- THENIUS, OTTO, *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt*, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 9 (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, <sup>2</sup>1873).

- TOV, EMANUEL, "Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 3–22.
- TREBOLLE BARRERA, JULIO, "Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition," in *Reflection and Refraction. Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko and Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker, VTSup, 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 483–501.
- TVEDTNES, JOHN A., "Egyptian Etymologies for Biblical Cultic Paphernolia," in *Egyptological Studies*, ed. S. Israelit-Groll, ScrHier 28 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), 215–221.
- VAN KEULEN, PERCY S.F., *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11*, VTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- WELLHAUSEN, JULIUS, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Reimer, <sup>3</sup>1899),
- WÜRTHWEIN, ERNST, *Die Bücher der Könige, Bd. 1, 1. Könige 1–16*, ATD 11,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).