



BULLETIN NO. 11, FALL, 1978  
of the  
International Organization for Septuagint  
and Cognate Studies

CONTENTS

Minutes of IOSCS Meeting	1
Financial Report	4
News and Notes	5
Record of Work Published, in Hand, or Projected	6
Mitteilung	11
R. Hanhart	
New Developments in the Study of the <i>Ecrits Intertestamentaires</i> With a Request	14
James H. Charlesworth	
Albert-Marie Denis	
Describing Meaning in the LXX Lexicon	19
Moises Silva	
Theodoret's Biblical Text in the Octateuch	27
N. Fernández-Marcos	
The So-Called "L" Text of Psalms 72-82	44
L. J. Perkins	
Septuagint Abstracts	64

BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*President*

J. W. Wevers  
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ont., M5S 1A1  
Canada

*Immediate Past President*

H. M. Orlinsky  
Hebrew Union College  
40 West 68th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10023

*Secretary*

A. Pietersma  
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ont., M5S 1A1  
Canada

*Treasurer*

E. Ulrich  
Dept. of Theology  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

*Editor*

G. Howard  
Dept. of Philosophy and Religion  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602

MINUTES OF IOSCS MEETING

August 19-20, 1977

Theologicum of the University

Room T01

IOSOT/International Organization for  
Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Göttingen, BRD

---

PROGRAMME

- Friday 10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
- Greetings by Professor Walther Zimmerli,  
President of IOSOT
- Introduction by Professor J. W. Wevers,  
President of IOSCS
- Professor Zimmerli presiding
- "The Text of the Ethiopic Enoch in the Light of Recent Study"  
M. A. Knibb, London
- "Some Examples of Fulfilment Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah"  
A. van der Kooij, Utrecht
- "Einige Beiträge der Vetus Latina für die Wiederherstellung des  
griechischen Textes Tobit"  
J. R. Busto Saiz, Madrid
- Friday 3:00-6:00 p.m.
- Professor Wevers presiding
- "Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta-Forschung"  
R. Hanhart, Göttingen

"Eisakouō and epakouō and Text Criticism in the Greek Psalter"

C. Cox, Toronto

"Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos"

J. de Waard, Aix-en-Provence

Friday 8:00-11:00 p.m.

Professor Hanhart presiding

"La témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante"

P. M. Bogaert, Denee

"The Renderings of *lilne* in the Septuagint"

R. Sollamo, Helsinki

"Est-ce que la sagesse aime l'humanité?"

A. Pelletier, Paris

Saturday 10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Professor Pietersma presiding

"The Textual Affinities of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy"

M. K. H. Peters, Cleveland

"Die Übersetzungsweise des Deuteronomiumübersetzers im Lichte von Papyrus 848"

U. Quast, Göttingen

"Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural im griechischen Pentateuch"

I. Soisalon-Soininen, Helsinki

"Constancy and Variety in Vocabulary Use in the Septuagint"

J. Barr, Oxford

Saturday 3:00-6:00 p.m.

Professor Wevers presiding

"Recensional Evidence for the Corruption of I Kings 22:46"

S. J. De Vries, Delaware, Ohio

"The Possibilities and Impossibilities of Reconstructing the Vorlage of the LXX"

E. Tov, Jerusalem

"Das Problem des griechischen Textes der Complutenser Polyglotte zu dem Zwölfprophetenbuch"

N. Fernández Marcos, Madrid

BUSINESS MEETING

Called to order by the President.

1. Summary of the minutes of the St. Louis (Missouri) meeting of IOSCS, October 29, 1976, was approved as presented by the Secretary (A. Pietersma).

2. Treasurer's Report (presented by the President):  
Balance on hand, August 8, 1977 \$1,549.93

ACCEPTANCE MOVED

CARRIED

3. President's Report

a. Lexicon Project: a Research Grant application for a Research Tools Project to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), after initial rejection, has been re-submitted.

b. A list of corrections to J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens*, compiled by Professor Hanhart, will be published in the IOSCS Bulletin. The list is not intended as a general corrective, but is solely concerned with Rahlfs-numbers of manuscripts included in the *Catalogue*.

c. The President stressed the importance of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen as a central bureau for information on the Septuagint.

4. *Rahlfs' Verzeichnis*

It was moved and carried that the Septuaginta-Kommission be informed of the meeting's interest in having the *Verzeichnis* reprinted. [Professor Hanhart has since learned that the *Verzeichnis* is in fact available as a Kraus reprint obtainable from Kraus-Thomson Organization Ltd., Route 100, Millwood, N. Y. 10546, U.S.A., or Kraus-Thomson, FL-9491, Nendeln, Liechtenstein. Price \$12.00 - A.P.]

5. Unanimous thanks were expressed a) to Professor Hanhart, in his capacity of Leiter des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, for the readiness and expertise with which he continues to make information accessible to interested scholars; b) to Professor Wevers for organizing the excellent programme of the third meeting of IOSCS in conjunction with the *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Albert Pietersma  
Secretary

FINANCIAL REPORT

August 8, 1977

BALANCE ON HAND, October 29, 1976	\$1235.23
(Treasurer's Report, <i>Bulletin</i> #10)	
INCOME	
Subscriptions	316.00
Interest on Savings	<u>54.07</u>
	370.07

EXPENDITURES

Duplication & Postage:

University of Toronto	9.00
University of Georgia	34.35
University of Notre Dame	<u>12.02</u>
	55.37

Income	370.07
Expenditures	<u>55.37</u>

NET INCOME 314.70

Balance, October 29, 1976 1235.23

Income, to August 8, 1977 314.70

BALANCE ON HAND, August 8, 1977 1549.93 \$1549.93

Eugene Ulrich, Treasurer

Auditors:

James D. Whitehead  
Department of Theology  
University of Notre Dame

Louanne Bachner  
Department of Theology  
University of Notre Dame

NEWS AND NOTES

The *Bulletin* draws special attention to the publication of *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. III, 2 Deuteronomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) edited by John W. Wevers. This is the second volume on the Pentateuch published in the Göttingen Septuagint. The recently increased pace in publication of the series is welcome news to biblical scholars.

Announcement of new journal: MAARAV: *A Journal for the Study of the Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures*. The periodical will appear twice each academic year beginning October 1978. Annual subscription is \$10 (\$12 outside US). Write: MAARAV, Suite 510, Dept 3, 2444 Wilshire Blvd., Santa Monica, CA 90403 USA.

The editor is happy to report that the *Bulletin* is now being abstracted in the "Zeitschriftenschau" section of ZAW.

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED, IN HAND, OR PROJECTED

(The list includes items brought to the attention of the Editor since *Bulletin* No. 10 went to press.)

Arieti, J. A. *Review of Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2*, by D. W. Gooding. *JBL* 96 (1977) 586-587.

Bruce, F. F. "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," in *Instruction and Interpretation. Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis* [Papers read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Louvain, 1976]. Leiden: Brill, 1977, 22-40.

Busto-Saiz, J. R. Informs that his doctoral thesis "Léxico y técnicas de traducción de símaco en el libro de los Salmos" is finished and will be published in a few months. [See earlier report in *BIOSCS* 9 (1976) 8.]

Carmignac, J. "Fragments de la Quinta d'Origene en traduction Latine." Delivered at the Aramaic Targums and the Septuagint section of the Seventh World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, August 8, 1977.

Cox, C. (1) *Eisakouō and epakouō and Text Criticism in the Greek Psalter.* Delivered at the IOSCS session of the IOSOT meeting in Göttingen, August 19, 1977. (2) "The Armenian Bible," written for *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, H. Weber, ed. Gulf Breeze, Florida: Academic International Press. (3) Reports that he is a recipient of a 1977-78 Canada-USSR Exchange Fellowship which is enabling him to spend 10 months in Yerevan doing research in the Mateuadaran (manuscript library) in connection with his doctoral thesis at Toronto: "The Textual Character of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy."

Delling, G. "Das ἄγαθόν der Hebräer bei den griechischen christlichen Schriftstellern," *Das Korpus der Griechischen-Christlichen Schriftsteller* [= TU 120], (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977), 151-172.

Gooding, D. W. (1) "An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *JSS* 21 (1976) 15-25. (2) "A Recent Popularisation of Professor F. M. Cross' Theories on the Text of the Old Testament," *Tyndale Bulletin* (1977) 113-132.

Hanhart, R. & Wevers, J. W. *Das Göttinger Septuaginta Unternehmen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Heater, A. H., Jr. *A Septuagint Translation in the Book of Job*. Diss. Catholic, 1976.

Howard, O. S. Reports completion of his dissertation under Professor Ben Zion Wacholder at Hebrew Union College (Cincinnati) entitled: "The Greek Text of Job in Light of the Ancient Qumran Targum."

- Marcos, N. F. (1) "Los estudios de 'Septuaginta'. Visión retrospectiva y problemática más reciente," *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 11 (1976) 413-468. (2) "Tipología de variantes en la transmisión de un texto patrístico," *Emerita* 45 (1977) 19-32. (On Theodoret's "Quaestiones in Octateuchum"). (3) "El texto bíblico de Dídimo en el comentario a Zacarías del Papiro de Tura," *Seferad* 36 (1976) [In Press]. (4) "Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta," *Seferad* 37 (1977) 239-259. (5) "The Sigla 'Lambda Omicron' in I-II Kings LXX." Delivered at the Aramaic Targums and the Septuagint section of the Seventh World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, August 8, 1977.
- McGlasson, P. "The Local Text Theory of Old Testament Textual Criticism." Honors Thesis, University of Georgia, 1978. [Directed by G. Howard].
- Orlinsky, H. M. (1) Delivered the Albright Memorial Lectures at Johns Hopkins University, November 16, 1977. Morning: "The Septuagint and the Textual Criticism of the Book of Isaiah"; Afternoon: "Male-Oriented Language in the New Bible Translations." (2) "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," written for vol. II of the *Cambridge History of Judaism*. (3) "The Use of the Septuagint in Some Modern Translations and Editions of the Hebrew Bible." Delivered at the SBL meeting, San Francisco, December 29, 1977.
- Pietersma, A. (1) "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter," *VT* 28 (1978) 66-72. (2) Review of *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke* by Adrian Schenker. *JBL* 96 (1977) 433-436. (3) *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter*. *Analecta Biblica* 77. (To appear in 1978). (4) *The Apocalypse of Elijah* (Chester Beatty inv. 1493) [see *BIOSCS* 10 (1977) 5]. (5) With R. T. Lutz, "Jannes and Jambres," *The Pseudepigrapha*, J. H. Charlesworth, ed. (6) The Psalter Project [See *BIOSCS* 10 (1977) 8].

- Rofé, A. "The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint," *Shnaton* (1977) 217-227. [English summary, pp. XVIII-XIX].
- Schmidt, D. "The LXX *Gattung* 'Prophetic Correlative'," *JBL* 96 (1977) 517-522.
- Sgherri, G. "Sulla valutazione originiana dei LXX," *Biblica* 57 (1977) 1-28.
- Silva, M. (1) Review of *The Text of the Septuagint* by W. P. M. Walters in *The Westminster Theological Journal* 36 (1974) 233-239. (2) "New Lexical Semitisms?" *ZNW* (In Press). (3) Reports that he is involved in research into the stylistics of Paul, with special concern over LXX influence on his vocabulary.
- Soison-Soininen, I. "Der Gebrauch des Verbes 'EXEIN in der Septuagint,'" *VT* 28 (1978) 92-99.
- Stone, M. E. (1) *Armenian and Biblical Studies*. Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1976. (2) "New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Revue Biblique* 84 (1977) 94-107.
- Thomas, K. J. "Torah Citations in the Synoptics," *NTS* 24 (1977) 85-96.
- Tov, E. (1) "Recent Developments in OT Textual Criticism," *Shnaton* 2 (1977) 279-286. (2) "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the Vorlage of the LXX," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 29-36. (3) "The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX," *JSOT* (1978). (4) "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," *RB* (1978). (5) "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah," *ZAW* 90 (1978). (6) Review of *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, The Additions*,

by C. A. Moore (Anchor Bible; New York, 1977) in *IEJ*. (7) Review of *The Jewish People in The First Century*, Volume Two (Assen-Amsterdam, 1976) by S. Safrai & M. Stern, eds., in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. (8) Review of *Religion d'Israël et proche orient ancien* by M. Delcor (Leiden, 1976) in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. (9) "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words," *Biblica* 58 (1977) 189-212. (10) "The Textual History of the Song of Deborah in the A Text of the LXX," *VT* 28 (1978) 224-232.

Ulrich, E. (1) *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Scholars Press. [Due to appear in late 1978]. Cf. summary in *BIOCS* 8 (1975) 24-39. (2) Collaborating with F. M. Cross on the *DJD* edition of the Samuel manuscripts from Qumran. (3) The edition of 4QSam<sup>c</sup> is completed. It will appear in the Samuel volume of *DJD*, ed. by F. M. Cross, and will receive preliminary publication with fuller textual analysis in a journal. (4) Reports that the University of Notre Dame library has on microfilm typed index cards with many, but not all to date, of the Old Latin readings from the *Vetus Latina* Institut in Beuron, W. Germany. Write Ulrich for details.

Wevers, J. W. (1) See Hanhart above. (2) *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum III, 2 Deuteronomium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977. (3) *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy (MSU XIII)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Mitteilung

R. Hanhart

Der Leiter des Septuaginta-Unternehmens  
der Akademie der Wissenschaften  
Göttingen

In dem von Joseph van Haelst herausgegebenen Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens, Paris 1976, ist durch ein Mißverständnis eine Reihe von Handschriften abweichend von der in Göttingen geführten Liste der Septuaginta-Handschriften zitiert worden. Da die von der Septuaginta-Kommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen autorisierte Liste im Septuaginta-Unternehmen geführt wird, wird im Einvernehmen mit J. van Haelst gebeten, von der folgenden Richtigstellung Kenntnis zu nehmen.

Abweichende Angaben über Rahlfs-Nummern in: Joseph van Haelst, Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens, Paris 1976 (= Haelst), korrigiert nach der im Septuaginta-Unternehmen geführten Liste; vgl: Kurt Aland, Repetitorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri I, Berlin 1976 (= Aland) und : Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum (= Septuaginta). Die entsprechende Richtigstellung muß auch in der Kondordanz Haelst, S. 377f. vorgenommen werden.

1) Haelst Nr 27. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, P Erlangen 2: Gen 41, 48-57. Statt: Rahlfs 996 muß es heißen: Rahlfs 815 (= Aland AT 13; vgl. Septuaginta I, Genesis, ed Wevers, 1974, S.22).

- 2) *Haelst Nr 84.* Turin, Museo Egizio e di Antichità Greco-Romane, T gr 1, P Taur 27: Ps 1, 1. Statt: Rahlfs 2116 muß es heißen: Rahlfs 2144 (= Aland Var 3).
- 3) *Haelst Nr 170.* Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, P Antinoopolis 51: Ps 71, 12.16-17. Statt: Rahlfs 2121 muß es heißen : Rahlfs 2126 (= Aland AT 75). Rahlfs 2121 ist: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, P Vindob G 29418: Ps 21,19 (= Aland Var 7; *Haelst Nr 124*).
- 4) *Haelst Nr 176.* Manchester, John Rylands Library, P Copt 29: Ps 78, 2.3.1. Rahlfs 1230 muß gestrichen werden. Rahlfs 1230 ist: Athos Vatopedi, 660: Ps.
- 5) *Haelst Nr 209.* Manchester, John Rylands Library, P Copt 31: Ps 98, 1. Rahlfs 1232 muß gestrichen werden. Rahlfs 1232 ist: Durham, Duke Univers. Library, Gr 17: Ps.
- 6) *Haelst Nr 215.* Manchester, John Rylands Library, P Copt 30: Ps 103, 24.1. Rahlfs 1231 muß gestrichen werden. Rahlfs 1231 ist: Athen, Nationalbibliothek, 2988: Ps.
- 7) *Haelst Nr 221.* Genua, Universität, Istituto di Filologia Classica, PUG Inv Nr 1160 r: Ps 114, 5-8. Statt: Rahlfs 2117 muss es heißen: Rahlfs 2134 (= Aland AT 85).
- 8) *Haelst Nr 1082.* (vgl. auch S.119, Zeile 9). Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gr bibl c 2 (P): Dan 6, 20-21. Statt: Rahlfs 985 muß es heißen: Rahlfs 853 (= Aland Var 25). Rahlfs 985 ist: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, P Antinoopolis 52: Is 1,18-29 (= Aland AT 128; *Haelst Nr 292*).
- 9) *Haelst Nr 1139.* Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, P Iand inv 225: Traktat über Exod 17,3 Num 20,5. Rahlfs 995 muß gestrichen werden. Rahlfs 995 ist: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, P Berlin Inv Nr 17213: Gen 19, 11-13.17-19 (= Aland AT 10; *Haelst Nr 15*; vgl. Septuaginta I, Genesis, ed Wevers, 1974, S. 28).

*Korrekturen bzw. Differenzierungen  
früher publizierter Numerierungen*

- 1) *Haelst Nr 56.* Kairo, P Fouad Inv. 266. Statt: Rahlfs 942 muß es heißen: Fouad (I) : Gen 7,17-20; 38,10-12: Rahlfs 942 (= Aland, AT 3(01)); vgl. Septuaginta I, Genesis, ed Wevers, 1974, S.25). Fouad (III): Deut 11,1-16; 31,26-33,27 (fragm.): Rahlfs 847 (= Aland AT 26a(01), S.395 und 16 Anm. 1; vgl. Septuaginta III, 2, Deuteronomium, ed Wevers, 1977, S.14). Fouad (II) : Deut 17,14-33,29 (fragm.): Rahlfs 848 (= Aland AT 27(01); vgl. Septuaginta ib).
- 2) *Haelst Nr 241.* Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, P Vindob K 8706 (fol 1b=Exod 15,1-8: früher P Vindob Lit theol 4): Oden (fragm.). Statt: Rahlfs 2036, 2119 muß es heißen: Rahlfs 2036 (= Aland AT 16(0201)).

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE STUDY OF THE

ECRITS INTERTESTAMENTAIRES

James H. Charlesworth, Director  
International Center for the Study of Christian Origins  
Duke University

With a Request from Albert-Marie Denis, Louvain

In "Translating the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Report of International Projects" (BIOSCS 10 [1977] 11-21), I tried to report the most important developments in the study of the Jewish and Jewish-Christian apocryphal writings. As attention was drawn to the significant work in progress to translate these documents into English, Danish, German, Japanese, and Spanish, it became obvious that there was a need to update, improve, and expand or perhaps even replace J. Bonsirven's *La Bible Apocryphe*, which appeared in 1953 and was reprinted with an "Avertissement" in 1975. Professor M. Philonenko has now informed me that he and A. Dupont-Sommer have been preparing and directing what appears to be the first full edition of the Pseudepigrapha into French.

According to Philonenko, the third volume of a "Bible de la Pléiade" will be entitled *Ecrits intertestamentaires* and will contain a translation of the major documents from Qumran, including the recently published Temple Scroll, and the following pseudepigrapha:

<i>I Hénoch</i>	A. Caquot
<i>Jubilés</i>	M. Testuz
<i>Testaments des Douze Patriarches</i>	M. Philonenko
<i>Psaumes de Salomon</i>	P. Prigent
<i>Testament de Moïse</i>	E.-M. Laperrousaz
<i>Martyre d'Isaïe</i>	A. Caquot
<i>Livre des Antiquités Bibliques</i>	J. Hadot

<i>Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch</i>	J. Hadot
<i>IV Esdras</i>	P. Geoltrain
<i>Oracles sibyllins</i>	V. Nikiprowetky
<i>II Hénoch</i>	A. Vaillant
<i>Joseph et Aséneth</i>	M. Philonenko
<i>Testament de Job</i>	M. Philonenko
<i>Testament d'Abraham</i>	F. Schmidt
<i>Apocalypse d'Abraham</i>	B. Sayar et M. Philonenko
<i>Paralipomènes de Jérémie</i>	J. Riaud
<i>Histoire de la Captivité à Babylone</i>	J.-M. Rosenstiehl
<i>Vie d'Adam et Eve</i>	D. Bertrand
<i>Apocalypse grecque de Baruch</i>	J.-Cl. Picard
<i>Apocalypse copte d'Elie</i>	J.-M. Rosenstiehl
<i>IV<sup>e</sup> livre des Machabees</i>	A. Dupont-Sommer

The editors hope to submit the work to the publisher before the end of 1979.

*Concordances*

Father Albert-Marie Denis, also in response to the previously mentioned publication in the BIOSCS, has reported on the progress made toward the Concordance des pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament which has been in preparation for almost fifteen years and is nearly completed. In a letter of 21 March 1978, he asked me to share the following information and request for advice to the members of the IOSCS.

Request from Albert-Marie Denis

La concordance complète des pseudépigraphes grecs d'A.T. (cf. la liste dans Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'A.T.) est en voie d'achèvement par ordinateur, grâce à un subside du F.N.R.S.

(Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique) de Belgique, de FB 280.000 (env. \$9000). La dactylographie des textes, jointe à la lemmatisation et à une analyse succincte se poursuit actuellement. Le ms., selon notre programmation, doit être terminé en décembre 1979. C'est donc maintenant qu'il faut prévoir la présentation définitive et les détails de l'édition. Les avis des membres de l'I.O.S.C.S. nous seraient fort utiles pour résoudre un certain nombre de questions concrètes.

1. Les sigles retenus pour désigner les différentes oeuvres sont les suivants: Adam, Hen., Abr., (TRub TSim TLev TJud TIss TZab TDan TNep TGad TAsé TJos TBen), Asen, Sal., Jer., Bar., Prop, Esdr, Sedr, Job, Aris, Sib. F(=fragmenta): FJos, FMos, FEld, FJan, FJub, FEli, FIsa, FMan, FBar, FEz, FSop, FEsd, FAch, FPho. I(=interpolations): IEsc, ISop, IEur, IOrp, ISop, IDip, IMen, IDip, IEur. H(=historiens): HDem, HEup, HArt, HArI, HCle, Han(nonyme), HHec, HCal(listhène). A(=auteurs): APhi, ATHe, AEze, AAri. f(=fragmenta anonyma) ou: frag (page et ligne du volume).

Si certains jugent ces signes trop sibyllins, nous serions heureux d'avoir leurs suggestions. Il est à noter que dans la prochaine édition, en préparation, de l'Introduction, les oeuvres complètes hors du grec (Jubilés, Baruch syriaque, IV Esdras) seront traitées à leur place parmi les oeuvres complètes, et donc que leurs fragments grecs seront peut-être à placer dans l'ordre chronologique de celles-ci.

2. Les différentes formes d'un même lemme peuvent être groupées (cf. Mandelkern) ou non (cf. Moulton-Geden). Le second système évite l'éparpillement du premier, mais la forme brute (theoû) est souvent cherchée pour elle-même (ainsi: theoi).

3. Les différentes formes groupées (Mandelkern) sont rangées par l'ordinateur selon l'ordre alphabétique brut (theoi, theon, theos, theoû). Une manipulation supplémentaire peut rétablir l'ordre des cas ou de la conjugaison, mais elle sera parfois arbitraire (cas homographes: neutre pluriel nominatif et accusatif).

4. Les termes à radicaux multiples sont rangés séparément dans la plupart des dictionnaires et concordances, par ex. *légô/eîxon*, *oraô/eîdon*, *kakos/kheirôn*. Malgré ces autorités et l'exactitude scientifique de ces séparations, étant donné le caractère pratique d'une concordance, il nous paraît préférable de ne pas les imiter, comme nous l'avons fait dans la Concordance de Baruch grec. L'aoriste de *oraô* est, en fait, *eîdon*. Et faudrait-il ranger sous des lemmes différents: je *sîus*, je *fus*, j'*étais*?

5. Les adjectifs substantivés (*ta agatha*, *to kakon*) seront rangés avec l'adjectif, excepté quand le sens est nettement distinct (*oikouménê* ne peut se ranger sous *oikêô*); de même, par exemple, pour *enôpion*, qui ne peut se ranger sous *enôpios*. Les mots fusionnés seront rangés à leur lettre initiale: *kakeî*, *kagô*, sous K.

6. Les éditions utilisées sont souvent récentes et critiques, mais parfois anciennes et défectueuses (Test. Abr., Par.Jer., Asen., Vita Ad.Evae). Pouvons-nous insister auprès des éditeurs qui préparent ces éditions, pour qu'ils fassent l'impossible afin de fournir, au moins, un texte en ms. pour la Concordance, avant la publication définitive. Ainsi M. de Jonge nous a envoyé une photocopie du ms. des XII Patriarches quand il l'a envoyé à l'impression. Cette question est sans doute la plus importante, et elle est urgente si nous voulons suivre notre programmation: dactylographie terminée en décembre 1978.

Nous recevrons avec plaisir toute remarque, critique ou suggestion, même partielle et rapide. Elles peuvent toujours éclairer quelque aspect laissé dans l'ombre. En outre, elles seront la preuve que chacun apporte sa contribution à l'oeuvre commune.

Please send your advice directly to Denis, Ravenstraat 112,  
B 3000 Louvain, Belgium.

DESCRIBING MEANING IN THE LXX LEXICON

Moises Silva  
Westmont College  
Santa Barbara, CA

The very valuable comments by Emmanuel Tov in issue No. 9 of this *Bulletin* ("Some Thoughts on a Lexicon of the LXX") brought to mind a statement attributed to J. J. Scaliger: "The worst criminals should neither be executed nor sentenced to forced labour, but should rather be condemned to compile dictionaries, because all [conceivable] tortures are included in this work."<sup>1</sup> The severe problems raised by translation literature, compounded by the uniquely complex textual tradition of the LXX, render the proposed lexicon a Sisyphean project par excellence.

Unfortunately, we seldom stop to think that even lexicographers dealing with relatively easy material are baffled by numerous problems that plague their discipline. In the past, dictionary makers have not always faced these theoretical difficulties. (As someone has suggested, they assumed they were doing a good job, seeing that their dictionaries kept selling so well.) But in the last decade or so a number of full-scale works have appeared. From France we may note, besides the journal *Cahiers de lexicologie* (1959ff.), Jean Dubois and Claude Dubois, *Introduction à la lexicographie: le dictionnaire* (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1971); Josette Rey-Debove, *Étude linguistique et sémiotique dans dictionnaire français contemporains* (Approaches to Semiotics 13; The Hague: Mouton, 1971). From Eastern Europe, Ladislav Zgusta, *Manual of Lexicography* (Janua linguarum, series maior 39; Mouton, 1971); Witold Doroszewski, *Elements of Lexicology and Semiotics* (Mouton, 1973). From Israel, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Introduction to the Lexicography of*

*Modern Hebrew* (in Hebrew with English summary; Jerusalem; Schocken, 1971).

An older work worthy of special mention is Julio Casares, *Introducción a la lexicografía moderna* (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1950). Note further the surveys on "Semantics" (S. Ullmann) and "Lexicology and Lexicography" (B. Quemada) in vol. 9 of *Current Trends in Linguistics* (Mouton, 1972).

Of particular importance is a very recent collection of articles by Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and some of his collaborators, entitled *Introducción a la lexicografía griega* (C.S.I.C., *Manuales y Anejos de "Emérita"* XXXIII; Madrid: Instituto Antonio Nebrija, 1977). Probably the only work of its kind, it serves as a prolegomenon to the forthcoming *Diccionario Griego-Español*, which promises to mark a notable advance, not only in the history of Greek dictionaries, but in the field of bilingual lexicography generally.

The most fundamental questions being asked, of course, have to do with the nature of meaning and its description. How do we distinguish between polysemy and homonymy and how is the distinction to be indicated? What criteria are to be used in organizing the various acceptations of a (polysemous) word? Most important, how does the concept of lexical structure affect dictionary making? Since Professor Tov chose to ignore these broader questions, and since the last question in particular has weighty implications for the lexicon project, a brief discussion may prove helpful to readers of the *Bulletin*.

Although wide disagreement still exists regarding the extent and character of structural relations in the vocabulary, the fact of some such lexical network in each language is not disputed. Thus, John Lyons in a standard work can insist on the primacy of sense relations over against the notion of reference, which he considers secondary. Now the usual description of meaning in dictionaries is more compatible with a reference view of meaning than with the recent emphasis on

sense (Coseriu: lexematic) relations. Accordingly, Francisco Rodríguez Adrados contends that dictionaries should abandon their "essentialist" definitions and instead rely on the semantic oppositions which words contract with each other (though always noting the possibility of neutralization). He adds that, if such a structural approach is necessary in a monolingual dictionary, the situation becomes critical in bilingual dictionaries, where translation equivalents must be given: how can these equivalents be reported accurately in view of the lack of semantic isomorphism between the two languages?<sup>2</sup>

A simple example may help to clarify this last point. Under *sōma*, Liddell and Scott give *person, human being* as possible translation equivalents. Some modern theologians, persuaded that Paul used the term in reference to the whole person, and not to the physical body, have used L-S as evidence for such a usage in non-Biblical Greek. As my colleague Robert H. Gundry has shown, however, the very examples given in L-S indicate that it is the physical existence that is in view (see *Sōma in Biblical Theology*, S.N.T.S. 29; Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976, ch. 2). Of course, L-S were not necessarily in error in giving such translation equivalents (and they certainly could not foresee that later theologians would use their work irresponsibly), but their failure to indicate the lack of isomorphism between English and Greek can easily mislead the user of the lexicon.

A second example of quite a different sort helps to show the value of structural considerations for solving these problems. If we look up the verb *to eat* in an English-Spanish dictionary, the equivalent given will be *comer*. However, in syntagmatic combination with *sopa* ("soup") Spanish, in some of its varieties at least, prefers the verb *tomar*, which is normally the equivalent of *to drink*. We may say

that the paradigmatic opposition between *comer* and *tomar* is different from that between *to eat* and *to drink*, and that the difference comes out in specific syntagmatic (or syntactical) combinations. (The word *paradigmatic* is here used in reference to words which, because of their semantic associations, may occupy the same slot in a sentence.) It would appear then, as a result of these structural considerations, that the English terms should be defined with reference to the manner in which the food is taken to the mouth, whereas the Spanish terms with reference to the constitution of the food (that is, whether or not mastication is necessary).

Now the emphasis on studying words as part of specific semantic fields, rather than atomistically, leads to the view that a dictionary ought to be arranged, not alphabetically, but according to paradigmatic groups. Such a view, incidentally, is not by any means original with structural linguists. None other than Otto Jespersen, considered by many the last of the older philologists, admitted that the alphabetic arrangement of dictionaries is "completely unscientific." Even earlier, in 1921, the young Spaniard Julio Casares, upon being received into the Real Academia Española, pled with the members of the Academy to produce an ideological dictionary of Spanish on the grounds that an alphabetic repertoire is merely the necessary complement to a truly "rational" classification. I finally mention that dean of Romance linguistics, W. von Wartburg, who passionately preached that "a scientific descriptive dictionary must abandon the meaningless and unscientific principle of alphabetical order," which must be "replaced by a system dictated by the state of the language itself at a given moment in time."<sup>3</sup>

Should the LXX lexicon therefore be arranged in a manner similar to *Roget's Thesaurus*? Hardly. The theoretical and practical difficulties

would be insuperable. They are so obvious, in fact, that unfortunately many are led to take the opposite extreme and drop structural considerations altogether. The truth is that the LXX scholar, probably more than scholars in other disciplines, stands to gain a great deal from a study of lexical relations. For example, I was delighted to read Professor Tov's emphasis on the need for a correct analysis of "the translators' lexical choices" (p. 15). Few concepts in the contemporary study of style have proven more productive than that of *choice*. From the perspective of communication theory, we know that predictable items are void of information, and that meaning cannot be conveyed apart from the possibility of choice.<sup>4</sup> But if the LXX lexicographer--more important, if the user of a LXX lexicon--is to be aware of the lexical choices available to the translators, a clear grasp of semantic fields is unavoidable. Furthermore, our need to determine Hebrew-Greek equivalents and to clarify their significance intensifies the problem; indeed, I doubt whether we will ever come to a satisfactory treatment of lexical equivalence unless we are able to set complete paradigmatic groups in the source language over against their corresponding groups in the target language.

I wish to suggest that it is possible, and even preferable, for the LXX lexicon to remain traditional in its general orientation and format without ignoring the generally received insights of the last two decades. Specific proposals would include the following:

1. Scholars doing the initial research must not be assigned parts of the alphabet, but rather specific books or groups of books. Such an approach is crucial (even apart from the concerns of this article) insofar as a certain degree of expertise is required for specific translation styles in the LXX. Further, the character of

the LXX lexicon, should be uncompromisingly synchronic, not diachronic or historical, for which we have L-S.

2. More specifically, the researchers should be instructed to avoid an atomistic approach, where one word is studied at a time. Rather, initial consideration should be given to other words (and lexical units) contracting oppositions with it. Probably, a tentative semantic grouping should also be attempted at this stage.

3. The writing of the articles should be characterized by special concern for the "collocations" or syntagmatic relations of the words. From the semantic point of view, this is doubtless the greatest strength of Bauer's *Lexicon* (even L-S are not bad in this respect). More can be done, however, for the sake of consistency and cogency in the presentation of the material.

4. Some system of cross-references to semantically associated words must be included in each article. Even more valuable, if a practical method can be devised, is the indication of which other words are found in the specific syntagmatic combinations listed.

5. An appendix should be included at the end of the lexicon, listing words and phrases (but probably excluding function words, such as prepositions) according to their semantic groups. (Note that Professor Goshen-Gottstein in his *Dictionary of Modern Hebrew* plans to list related words in the articles and to produce a companion Thesaurus volume.) Considerably more helpful would be such an appendix with the parallel groups in Hebrew (and Aramaic?).

6. Spin-off articles and monographs on the more important lexical fields should be encouraged. Comparative studies of semantic fields in the various LXX books might prove revolutionary for identifying translation styles.

In conclusion I may add that, in my opinion, a lexicon that will truly meet the needs of Biblical scholars for the next generation cannot be produced in less than 15 years. If so, does that mean that our students will have to do without a LXX dictionary for two more decades? This seems ironic, especially since the initial idea was to produce a small tool for students. Why not produce an intermediate type of lexicon within the next four or five years? If nothing else, it could serve as a pilot edition. Using it for an extended period, scholars would be in a much better position to articulate their views regarding what should and should not be included in the larger project.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>According to Zgusta (bibliographic information above in the text), this article is based on a paper read at the IOSCS meeting in Chicago, 1973, entitled "Semantic Structure and Septuagint Lexicon."

<sup>2</sup>Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 443 (he has, however, modified his terminology in a more recent two-volume work, *Semantics*, 1977, ch. 7). Rodríguez Adrados, *Estudios de lingüística general* (Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1969), pp. 22, 49. In my judgement, the most promising and suggestive research is that of Eugenio Coseriu, whose ideas are ably summarized by Horst Geckeler, *Strukturelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie* (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1971). Coseriu and Geckeler have further articulated their view of "lexematics" in vol. 12 of *Current Trends in Linguistics*. For a parallel approach in America, see Eugene Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures* (Approaches to Semiotics 57; Mouton, 1975).

<sup>3</sup>Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965 [orig. 1924]), p. 34. Casares, *Nuevo concepto del Diccionario de la lengua y otros problemas de lexicografía y gramática* (Obras completas 4; Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1941), pp. 47ff., 118. Von Wartburg, *Problems and Methods in Linguistics* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969), p. 174. Cf. also K. Baldinger, "Alphabetisches oder begrifflich gegliedertes Wörterbuch?" In *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 76:521-536 (1960).

<sup>4</sup>Note John Lyons, *Introduction*. pp. 89, 413; G. W. Turner, *Stylistics* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1973), pp. 21ff.

*Theodoret's Biblical Text in the Octateuch*

N. Fernández-Marcos  
Instituto "Arias Montano" del CSIC-Madrid

Several years ago Prof. A. Sáenz-Badillos and I began work on a critical edition of Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (Thdt). This work is now in Press. The importance that Thdt's text has for the history of the LXX and in particular for the study of the Antiochian recension is significant. Following Prof. George Howard's kind suggestion, a brief summary of our conclusions stemming from this edition is stated here.<sup>1</sup>

The Antiochian or Lucianic recension has been identified in the historical books, in the Prophets and in the Writings (published so far are Sira and Sap. Salomonis). As for the Octateuch, even after a century of investigation, initiated by Lagarde, the discussion continues. For example, Prof. Wevers has recently maintained that in relation to Genesis there is no evidence for the existence of a Lucianic text at all.<sup>2</sup> Consequently we do not know if this recension included the whole Bible or only part of it. Again, the discussion in recent years of a plurality of ancient Hebrew and Greek texts has brought to the foreground a debate on the protolucianic recension.<sup>3</sup> Although the discussion centers mainly in the books of Reigns, the question is not alien to the Octateuch.<sup>4</sup>

One of the principal obstacles to identifying the Antiochian recension in the Octateuch has been the lack of a scientific edition of Thdt. Our work attempts to rectify past research based upon deficient editions of this Father. With the present critical edition, in which special attention has been given to biblical

quotations, we are in a position to determine the form of the biblical text used in Antioch in the IV-V centuries. A book by book analysis of Thdt's biblical quotations follows.

*Genesis:* Nearly always Thdt follows the reading of Wevers' text and is often supported by numerous mss and versions.<sup>5</sup> His agreements with readings supported by individual groups of mss are very few. Even his agreements with groups *b*, *n* and *d*, using Wevers' classification,<sup>6</sup> that is, those which are closest to Thdt's text, are so scanty and sporadic that they do not allow a recensional relationship.

*Exodus:* Thdt has two readings in common with ms *n*<sup>7</sup>: 4,22 πρωτότοκος) πρωτογονος *n* Phil Thdt and 9, 7 (ιδών) ειδε *n* Thdt; two in common with mss (*b*)*w*: 5,1 (εορτάσωσιν) λατρευσωσιν *w* Thdt and 9,28 εδξασθε) προσευξασθε *bw* Thdt; and one in common with ms *p*: 3,19 (έν) ει *p* Thdt. We may include readings which Thdt has in common with *n* accompanied by some other witnesses, since *n* (and sometimes *g*) is the constant factor in all these occurrences. Examples are:

- 1,22 τοσοῦτφ) τοσοουτον *cno* Thdt
- 3,14 om και ειπεν 2° *egj Sa Eus* Thdt
- 9,7 (εβαρύνθη) *pr και Mdnt* Thdt
- 9,12 (εσκληήρυνε δέ) και εσκληηρυνε *bnwy* Thdt
- 9,34 προσέθετο) *pr και npt* Thdt
- 13,18 (έκ γής) εε *An* Thdt
- 19,6 om και *egjn Sa-ed Aeth* Thdt
- 19,8 (ειπεν) ειπε *akn Sa-cod* Thdt

- 20,11 κύριος)+ ο θεος σου Thdt: +ο θεος *dnpt Arm*  
om (ιδά-εβδόμην) *cn* Thdt
- 25,9 om μοι *fn Phil-arm* Thdt  
om πάντων *egj Phil-arm* Thdt:om τών *n*

Neither the number nor the quality of these variants is significant. None suggests a recensional text.

*Leviticus:* The proportion of Thdt's readings that agree with individual groups of manuscripts is minimal. The following shows how these agreements are distributed.

- a)Agreements with *n*  
23,14 om έως 1°-ταύτην *n* Thdt
- b)Agreements with *gn* and a few other witness  
1,2 (δώρα 1°) δωρον *gna<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>* Thdt  
16,16 τὸ ἅγιον) περι των αγιων *M(mg)gnv(mg)z(mg) Sa La* Thdt  
16,22 (μαρος) τραγος *egjns(txt)v(txt)zb<sub>2</sub>* Thdt  
16,29 ταπεινώσατε *BAdfpt Aeth Chr1/2) κακωσετε M(mg)gns(mg)z(mg)* Thdt  
16,31 ταπεινώσατε)κακωσετε *gns(mg)z(mg)* Thdt  
17,7 οἷς) ων *gnx* Thdt  
23,14 (λίρα νέα) *tr nx Cyr-cod 1/3* Thdt
- c)Agreements with *gn+dpt*  
1,2 και 3°) η *bdnpt Arm* Thdt  
14,34 (μὲν 2°)υμων *M(mg)bdgpt Arm(vid)* Thdt  
23,15 (πιθέματος)αφορισματος *M(mg)dgnps(mg)tv(mg)z(mg)* Thdt  
26,35 (σαββατιεῖ) *pr και dgnpt Arm Aeth* Thdt
- d)Agreements with *gn+dpt+bw*  
17,11 (ψυχής) +αυτου *bdgnptwy Arm* Thdt

quotations, we are in a position to determine the form of the biblical text used in Antioch in the IV-V centuries. A book by book analysis of Thdt's biblical quotations follows.

*Genesis:* Nearly always Thdt follows the reading of Wevers' text and is often supported by numerous mss and versions.<sup>5</sup> His agreements with readings supported by individual groups of mss are very few. Even his agreements with groups *b*, *n* and *d*, using Wevers' classification,<sup>6</sup> that is, those which are closest to Thdt's text, are so scanty and sporadic that they do not allow a recensional relationship.

*Exodus:* Thdt has two readings in common with ms *n*<sup>7</sup>: 4,22 πρωτότοκος) πρωτογονος *n* Phil Thdt and 9, 7 (ιδών) ειδε *n* Thdt; two in common with mss (*b*)*w*: 5,1 (εορτάσωσιν) λατρευσωσιν *w* Thdt and 9,28 εβξασθε) προσευξασθε *bw* Thdt; and one in common with ms *p*: 3,19 (άν) ει *p* Thdt. We may include readings which Thdt has in common with *n* accompanied by some other witnesses, since *n* (and sometimes *g*) is the constant factor in all these occurrences. Examples are:

- 1,22 τοσοῦτφ) τοσουτον *eno* Thdt
- 3,14 om και ειπεν 2° *egj* Sa Eus Thdt
- 9,7 εβαρύνθη) *pr* και *Mdnt* Thdt
- 9,12 εσκληρυνε δε) και εσκληρυνε *bnwy* Thdt
- 9,34 προσέθετο) *pr* και *npt* Thdt
- 13,18 εκ γης) εΞ *An* Thdt
- 19,6 om και *egjn* Sa-ed Aeth Thdt
- 19,8 ειπεν) ειπε *akn* Sa-cod Thdt

- 20,11 κύριος)+ ο θεος σου Thdt: το θεος *dnpt* Arm
- om δια-εβδόμην *cn* Thdt
- 25,9 om μοι *fn* Phil-arm Thdt
- om πάντων *egj* Phil-arm Thdt: om τών *n*

Neither the number nor the quality of these variants is significant. None suggests a recensional text.

*Leviticus:* The proportion of Thdt's readings that agree with individual groups of manuscripts is minimal. The following shows how these agreements are distributed.

- a) Agreements with *n*
  - 23,14 om έως 1°-ταύτην *n* Thdt
- b) Agreements with *gn* and a few other witness
  - 1,2 εῶρα 1°) δωρον *gna<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>* Thdt
  - 16,16 τὸ ἄγιον) περι των αγιων *M(mg)gnv(mg)z(mg)* Sa La Thdt
  - 16,22 χίμαρος) τραγος *egjns(txt)v(txt)zb<sub>2</sub>* Thdt
  - 16,29 ταπεινώσατε *BAdfpt* Aeth Chr1/2) καωσατε *M(mg)gns(mg)z(mg)* Thdt
  - 16,31 ταπεινώσατε) καωσατε *gns(mg)z(mg)* Thdt
  - 17,7 οἷς) ων *gnx* Thdt
  - 23,14 χίδρα νέα) *tr nx* Cyr-cod 1/3 Thdt
- c) Agreements with *gn+dpt*
  - 1,2 και 3°) η *bdnpt* Arm Thdt
  - 14,34 ὑμῶν 2°) ὡμων *M(mg)bdgpt* Arm(vid) Thdt
  - 23,15 ἐπιθέματος) αφορισματος *M(mg)dgnps(mg)tv(mg)z(mg)* Thdt
  - 26,35 σαββατιεῖ) *pr* και *dgnpt* Arm Aeth Thdt
- d) Agreements with *gn+dpt+bw*
  - 17,11 ψυχῆς) +αυτου *bdgnptwy* Arm Thdt

From these lists it is obvious that Thdt does not agree consistently with any group of mss. Its only reading that approaches *n* is an omission probably caused by homoioarcton. Groups *dpt* and *bw* have no readings in common with Thdt. On the other hand, from paragraphs b) and c) we can see something already noted in Exodus, namely, that Thdt's agreements with *gn+dpt* or *gn* + any other witness (above all the margins of *M*, *s*, *v* and *z*) are relatively frequent. In all these concurrences *gn* is the constant, the other witnesses the variant. Thus we must conclude that it is with *gn* that Thdt agrees most often and that his agreements with *dpt* and *bw* occur only when these mss appear with *gn* (see, for instance, 16:29 where Thdt agrees with *gn* against *dpt*).

*Numbers:* Although agreements with the majority-text prevail, Thdt's agreements with *gn* and *dpt* are notable.

a) Agreements with *gn*

5,16 om αὐτήν 1° *gn* Arm Thdt

12,6 λαλήσω αὐτῷ )tr *gn* Thdt

16,22 θεός, θεός)ο θεος *n* Thdt

Agreements with *gn* and any other witness

3,8 κατά) και *cgnt* Arm Cyr-cod Thdt

5,6 ἐάν *BAMfir*)om *Nbgnw* Thdt

ποιήσῃ)ποιήσει *bgnpsw* Thdt

5,8 om ὁ *Aaghns* Thdt

5,18 τοῦ ἐπικαταρωμένου τούτου *Bgna<sub>2</sub>* Arm Bo(vid) Cyr-ed Thdt)...

5,19 ἀθήα) αθως *F<sup>b</sup>* *gn* Thdt

10,10 νομηναίαις) νεομηναίαις *Nbcgknw* Thdt

11,8 om αὐτό 1° *gny* Arm La Thdt

12,14 ἀφορισθήτω)αφορισθησεται *Agn* Cyr-ed 1/2 Thdt

23,3 εὐθείαν) *pr* επ *F<sup>b</sup>**gn* Thdt;*pr* εις *dkpt*

23,20 ἀποστρέψω) ἀποστραφῶ *bgnw* *Aeth*(vid) Thdt

31,16 om ἡ *acgn* Thdt

Disagreement with *gn*

6,2 ἐάν *BAg<sub>n</sub>*) αν *FGMN* *rell* Thdt

b)Agreements with *dpt*

5,21 om καί 1°-γυναικί *dpt* *Chr* Thdt

11,11 ἐπιθεῖναι) + μοι *dpt* *Arm* Thdt

23,19 εἴπας) εἰπων *dpt* Thdt

Agreements with *dpt* and any other witness

5,8 πρὸς αὐτόν) *pr* το *dps*(*mg*)*tz*(*mg*) Thdt

5,20 μεμίανσαι) *pr* συ *dgkptx* *La* Thdt

11,8 ἤληθον) ἤλεθον *k*(*mg*)*dpqtu* Thdt

11,17 λαοῦ)+ τούτου *dgkpt* *Arm* *Bo* *Sa* *Aeth* Thdt

14,21 ζῶν) ζῆ *Ndmpt* *Bo*(vid) *La* Cyr-ed 1/6 Thdt

Disagreements with *dpt*

11,16 πρὸς *Bdprta<sub>2</sub>* *Cyr*) εις ...Thdt

16,40 μηθεῖς *Bdprta<sub>2</sub>*) μηδεις *AFMN* *rell* Thdt

23,3 εὐθείαν) *pr* επ *F<sup>b</sup>**gn* Thdt;*pr* εις *dkpt*

c)Agreements with *gn+dpt*

5,15 ἀναμιμνήσκουσα) *pr* θυσια *dgnt* *Arm* Thdt

5,16 αὐτήν 2° ) την γυναικα *dgnt* *Arm* Thdt

6,2 κυρίῳ) *pr* τῷ *dfgnpt* *Cyr-cod* Thdt

6,12 ἄλογοι) αλογιστοι *dgnt* Thdt

15,31 ἡ ἁμαρτία) ἁμαρτια γαρ *dgnt* *Arm* Thdt

15,39 πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν) πασας τας εντολας *dgnt* Thdt

καὶ ποιήσετε) ποιησαι *dgnt* *Arm* Thdt

23,8 ἦ) και *bdgnptw* *Bo* *Aeth* Thdt

31,16 ἀποστήσαι) ἀποστηναι *degntb<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

The group nearest to Thdt's text is *gn*. It is with this group that Thdt agrees most often and with which he disagrees the least. Sometimes he agrees with *dpt* but not as often as with *gn*; he clearly disagrees with *dpt* on three occasions. As seen from paragraph c) Thdt agrees with *gn+dpt* in a number of important variants. It should be noted that the agreements between Thdt and *gn*, *dpt*, or both groups together are often accompanied by the Armenian version (3,8; 5,15.16 (twice). 18;11,8.17;15,31.39), the substratum of which, as recent investigations in 1 Samuel have shown,<sup>8</sup> includes protolucianic material.

*Deuteronomy*:<sup>9</sup> *θgn* is certainly the nearest group to Thdt, followed by groups *dpt* and *bw*. Most of the variants common between them either consist of omissions or lack sufficient clarity to point toward a recension.<sup>10</sup> However, there are a few traces of revision in those passages in which *θgn* is joined by *dpt* (apparently influenced by the Hexapla). The following are examples.

- 7,9 ἔλεος B\*) ελεον bgnw...Thdt
- 13,2 λέγων) και ειπη θdpt...Thdt:sim.gn
- 23,14 ὀφθῆσεται) ευρεθησεται θbgnw Thd
- 27,1 λέγων) λεγοντες θdegjnptv(mg) Thdt  
φυλάσσεσθε) + ποιειν θdnopt Thdt
- 33,19 ἐπικαλέσσεθε) -λεσονται θdglnpt Thdt  
θύσετε) θυσουσιν θdglnpt Thdt

It is difficult to separate Thdt's agreements with *θgn* (with whom he agrees the most) from his agreements with *dpt*, because

most of the readings that show clear traces of revision are shared by both groups.

*Joshua*: a) Agreements with *gn*

- 2,10 om τῷ gn Thdt
- 10,13 τοῦτο) αυτο gn Thdt  
γεγραμμένον)γεγραπται gn Thdt  
τοῦ εὐθοῦς) το ευρεθεν gn Thdt
- 23,13 om καὶ εἰς ἤλους gn Thdt  
εἰς βολίδας) σκωλα gn Thdt

- Agreements with *gn* and a few other witnesses

- 1,3 ἐφ' ὃν) ου gn Aeth Syh Thdt
- 1,17 σου 1°)pr και bgn Arm Sa Aeth(vid) La Or-lat Thdt
- 10,13 βιβλίου) βιβλιον cgnv(mg) Thdt
- 14.7 τοῦ θεοῦ) κυριου gw Thdt
- 19,8.9 om κατά 2°- (9) συμεών 1° cgn Aeth Thdt
- 19,9 om οἱ An Thdt
- 23,14 τὰ ἀνήκοντα) α ειρηκεν ημιν δεδωκε Thdt:α ειρηκεν gnw
- 23,15 κύριος ὑμῶν) tr gn La Thdt

b) Agreements with *dpt*

- 11,20 ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν) του αφανισθηναι αυτους dptw Thdt:om gn

c) Agreements with *gn+dpt(w)*

- 1,3 om ὁ F\* bdgmnpt Thdt
- 2,9 ὑμῶν κύριος)κυριος ο θεος υμων a<sub>2</sub> Thdt:κς ο θς υμιν bdgpt
- 2,10 ἐποίησεν)εποιησατε bedknptx Arm Syh Thdt
- 5,12 ταύτη)αυτη Fdgmnpqtw Aeth Thdt  
ἐκ)απο dgnpt Thdt  
ἐκαρπίσαντο)εκαρπωσαντο θcdghnpt Thdt
- 6,26 om αὐτοῦ 2° dgnpt La Thdt

- 11,20 διὰ) παρα dgnptw Arm Syh Thdt  
 ὅπως) pr και dgnptw Arm Sa Aeth Thdt
- 23,14 τῆ καρδία) pr εν gmnptw Thdt  
 τῆ ψυχῆ) pr εν gmnptw Thdt  
 λόγων) + των καλων gnptw Thdt  
 πρόσ) + ημας ginoptwxy La Syh( προς ημας sub \*X) Thdt
- 24,19 ομοδοτος gnptw Sa Aeth La Thdt Spec

The relationship of these groups with Thdt's text is now clear. The nearest group to Thdt's text is *gn* as can be seen by the number and quality of common readings and by the list of variants in which *gn* or either of them is the constant and the other witnesses are the variant (cf. a)), and above all by the long list of Thdt's agreements with *gn+dpt* to which frequently *ms w* is added (cf. c)). On the other hand, it agrees with *dpt* in only one apparently recensioned reading in a stylistic way, because it avoids the repetition of ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν within the same verse (cf. 11,20). It is clear that Thdt agrees with *gn* and *dpt* when they go together, and usually with *gn* against *dpt* when their readings differ. Once it agrees with *dpt* against *gn* in a recensioned reading (11,20) where the omission of *gn* appears as the older since it is farthest from the Hebrew (יָזַב אֶת־בְּשָׁרָה).

*Judges*: Just a glance at the list of variants reveals a change in the textual spectrum. The number of Thdt's agreements with the reading of the majority has decreased. It also has fewer unique readings. On the other hand, the proportion of agreements with *glnw* and with *dpt* has considerably increased.<sup>11</sup> Group *glnw* stands nearest to the text of Thdt.<sup>12</sup> Although it does not always agree

with it, it has more specific readings in common with Thdt, sometimes exclusively, sometimes in association with *dpt*. What was seen in outline form in Numbers and Deuteronomy is seen now more clearly. In Judges *dpt* never agrees with Thdt alone but always in conjunction with *glnw*. It is not unusual for the hexaplaric recension to agree with Thdt when it is joined by *dpt* and *glnw* to form the majority reading. On the other hand *glnw* are often prehexaplaric and preserve elements of the old-LXX but with some traces of inner-Greek stylistic revision.<sup>13</sup> At the moment the specific text that circulated in Antioch and which was known by Thdt can be determined with its clearly defined characteristics. Some of its most significant readings are as follows:

- 1,35 κατοικεῖν) pr του glnw Thdt
- 2,1 ἀνεβ(βασαν) ανηγαγεν glnw dpt Thdt
- 2,3 εἶπα) ειπον glnw dptv Thdt
- 2,19 πάλιν διεφθειραν) διεφθειρον παλιν glnw Thdt
- 3,19 γαλαλ) γαλαλοις f glnw dptv Thdt
- 3,22 κατὰ τῆς φλογός) την παραξιφιδα gnw dptv Thdt
- 5,7 δυνατοί) οι κρατουντες glnw dptv Thdt
- 5,10 θνου θηλειας μεσημβρίας) υποζυγιων A glnw dpt Thdt
- 17,5 ἐποίησεν) + αυτω μιχα Thdt :+ μιχα Z glnow dptv
- 17,6 ἀνήρ) ανηρ εκαστος Zglnow dptv Thdt  
 τὸ εὐθέξ) το αρεστον Zlow Thdt
- 20,28 Ἄαρὼν)+ του ιερεως gl(om του)now ptnb Thdt

The list reflects some revisions which appear to be the result of recensional activity. Usually they occur when *glnw* and *dpt* go together, but also, to a smaller degree, when only *glnw* agree with

Thdt. We meet Atticistic corrections (2,3.19), doublets (17,6a), explanatory additions (17,5; 20,28), a declension of a transliteration (3,19), interchange of synonyms (3,22; 5,7.10; 17,6b), etc.

Ruth: a) Agreements with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>*

1,16 ἀπαντήσαι ἐμοί)μοι γενοίτο *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

2,21 om πρόσ με *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

4,10 om λαοῦ *gklnoe<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

4,12 δώσει)δωη *bglōb<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* Thdt: δωει n

b) Agreements with *dptv*

none

c) Agreements with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>+dptv*

1,12 εἴπα)ειπον *gn-qtvwa<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

ἐστίν)pr ουκ *gnowe<sub>2</sub> dptv* Thdt

γενηθήναι)γενεσθαι N<sup>a?</sup> *gnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

1,16 ἀποστρέψαι) pr του *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

σὺ post πορευθῆς *glnow ptv* Aeth Thdt

ἀυλισθήσομαι) + εκει *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Syh(sub—) Thdt

ὁ 1°) pr οτι *gnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

2,12 ἀποτίσαι)+σοι *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Arm Sa Aeth La Thdt

2,21 ὄς ὑπάρχει)τον υπαρχοντα *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

3,10 τὸ ἔλεος) τον ελεον *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

τὸ 2°)τον *glnowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

τὸ 3°)τον *gowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

εἴτοι 1°BAbdejsx) ητοι a *glnoe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

εἴτοι 2° BAbdejsx) ητοι a *lowe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

4,12 ἐκ 1°)pr και *bglnoe<sub>2</sub> ptv* Thdt

4,14 ἀγχιστέα *ahikqruxa<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>* Syh)αγχιστευοντα *bgl-ptvwe<sub>2</sub>* Thdt

om και 2° *bgk-onwe<sub>2</sub>* Arm Sa Thdt

Considering the brevity of Ruth, Thdt's text is characterized by a large number of variant readings. It agrees often with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>+{d}ptv*, sometimes against the hexaplaric recension (cf. c)). However, since it never agrees with *{d}ptv* alone, it is nearer to group *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* (+b from 4,11 on).

As for the type of text reflected in these variants, it includes most of the characteristics of the Antiochian recension as we know it in the Prophets: Atticisms (1,12(twice), 16;3,10 (three times); additions which elucidate the meaning of the Greek (1,16;2,12); interchange of synonyms (2,21;4,14). Some of these characteristics appear in the agreements of Thdt with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* (the optatives of 1,16 and 4,12), but most of them appear when Thdt agrees with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* and *{d} ptv* together. In addition we should not forget that two members of the group, mss *oe<sub>2</sub>*, in the historical books are witnesses of the lucianic text.

CONCLUSIONS: We have seen how in *Genesis* Thdt agrees with the majority-text, although in a few cases he agrees preferentially with groups *b*, *n* and *d* of Wever's edition. In *Exodus* mss *{g}n* of Brooke-McLean are the nearest to Thdt's text in peculiar readings, but neither the number nor the quality of the variants are significant. In *Leviticus* Thdt agrees still with the reading of the majority as in the preceding books. But if we attend to the combinations of mss (*gn* plus other witness; *gn* and *dpt*), we observe that *gn* is the constant and the other witnesses are the variable. Consequently, *gn* is the nearest group to Thdt's text. In *Numbers* *gn* continues to be the nearest group to Thdt, although it is also in agreement with *dpt* in some peculiar readings. As for the type of variants, in its agreements with *dpt* or with *gn+dpt*, there appear slight traces of

revision (additions of pronoun or article, improvements of style, interchanges of synonyms...). In *Deuteronomy*, *egn* is the nearest group to Thdt, followed by *dpt* and *bw*. Although most of the agreements consist of omissions, there appear some traces of revision, above all in those passages where *egn* are supported by *dpt* (which are more recensioned, as it seems). In *Joshua* the indentivity of groups is more outlined because of an increase in specific variants. Groups *gn* and *dpt* are nearest to Thdt. He agrees more with *gn*, however, as can be seen from the number and quality of peculiar readings he has in common with them and from the number of his agreements with *gn+dpt*. Some marks of intentional revision can be seen above all in his agreements with *gn* or with *gn+dpt*. *Judges*: group *glnw* is nearest to Thdt in its specific readings, not only when it stands alone but also when it is accompanied by *dptv*. This last group never agrees with Thdt in its peculiar readings except in the company of *glnw*. As we have seen *glnw* has prehexaplaric elements with traces of internal stylistic changes. When it alone agrees with Thdt, and in a special way when it is accompanied by *dptv*, it has traces of revision which may reflect the Antiochian text known by Thdt, namely, Atticisms, interchange of synonyms, doublets, and explanatory additions. In *Ruth* Thdt agrees most often with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>* and *(d)ptv* when they go together, sometimes against the hexaplaric recension. Taking into account that Thdt never agrees only with *(d)ptv*, but at times does with *glnowe<sub>2</sub>*, we conclude that the latter is the nearest to Thdt. Here the variants show practically all the characteristics of the Antiochian recension as we know it from the historical and prophetic books.

Therefore Thdt's text in relation to the LXX for the Octateuch can be described by the following scheme:

Genesis: b, n, d(groups of mss. in Wever's edition)  
 Exodus: (g)n (mss. of Brooke-McLean)  
 Leviticus: gn  
 Numbers: gn  
 Deuteronomy: egn  
 Joshua: gn  
 Judges: glnw  
 Ruth: glnowe<sub>2</sub>(+b from Ruth 4,11 on)

From this we can see the group that agrees most often with Thdt in peculiar readings without concealing the high proportion of readings in which Thdt agrees with the majority-text, especially at the beginning of the Pentateuch. We must add that in the Octateuch *dpt(v)* is the nearest group to Thdt after *gn*, above all when its readings agree with *gn*. On the one hand it can be seen how the number of mss which agree with Thdt is expanded at the end of the Octateuch; on the other, how the entity of these mss is progressively defined.

As for the textual character reflected in their agreements with Thdt we can see it best in the last books of the Octateuch. In *Ruth* Thdt's text has the main traits of the Antiochian recension. In *Judges* we find indefinite traces of intentional stylistic revision. In a decreasing manner, traces of stylistic revision can be observed back to *Numbers*. In *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy* these traces appear clearer in the material coming from *dpt* than from *gn*. Nevertheless there are also traces of stylistic revision even in the stratum of the tradition represented by *gn* when it agrees with Thdt.

The interpretation of this phenomenon is not easy. Future critical editions of these books may elucidate more fully the textual panorama of the LXX. In the meantime, due to the lack of a better hypothesis, using as an analogy the historical books, it seems best to explain the textual data we have explored in terms of the Lucianic and protolucianic text, or if one prefer, in terms of an Antiochian text which includes an old prehexaplaric though somewhat revised substratum and a more recent layer of revised material. Group *dpt* reflects the revised ulterior stage. Group *glw*, whose prehexaplaric elements are clear in Judges, contains elements of the old-LXX but also reflects traces of an inner-Greek revision. Future investigations are needed before this view of *glw* can be expanded to include the rest of the books of the Octateuch.

Since the revisional tendencies of both these groups are similar, it is very difficult to separate the material from the earliest stratum of revision from that of the later.

We find no signs of a protolucianic recension in the Octateuch in the sense defined by Cross, that is, a recension which brings the Greek into harmony with the Hebrew text circulating in Palestine in the I century BC.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, there is nothing to forbid us from naming "protolucianic" the first stylistic revision of the Antiochian text in *gn(lw)*. This is in line with the position suggested by Brock,<sup>15</sup> and recently confirmed by Ulrich.<sup>16</sup> In fact the stylistic revision under consideration here agrees in nature with that which Brock discussed in regard to the Lucianic text in the books of Reigns. This revision is scarcely perceptible at the beginning of the Octateuch, and becomes more defined from Numbers on, especially in Joshua-Judges-Ruth. Nevertheless we would not

call it a recension except from Judges on. With this text, which was scarcely revised stylistically until Joshua, more intensively in Judges-Ruth and which can be called "protolucianic" agrees Thdt in a singular manner.

#### Notes

- 1) For a more detailed study of the history of the investigation of the Antiochian recension in the Octateuch, as well as more information on Thdt's text history consult the introduction to our edition: N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum. Editio critica*. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros," 17 Madrid, CSIC 1979.
- 2) J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Genesis* MSU XI, Göttingen, 1974, 173-75. See also N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Anotaciones críticas al texto griego del Génesis*. Madrid-Barcelona 1972, 73 and 125.
- 3) "All in all, the so-called proto-Lucianic text is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work," says J. W. Wevers. "Proto-Septuagint Studies," in *The Seed of Wisdom* (Fs. T. J. Meek; Toronto: 1964), 69.
- 4) "(The Proto-Lucianic) is found as the substratum of the Lucianic Recension (hence 'Proto-Lucian') of Smauel-Kings in the cursives  $boc_2e_2$ , in Joshua-Judges in the groups K gn dpt, and more faintly in the Pentateuch in the families gn dpt and (in Deuteronomy)  $\theta$ ," F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." *IEJ* 16/2(1966) 84, n. 16.

- 5) Cf. J. W. Wevers, *Septuaginta... I. Genesis*, Göttingen, 1974 and N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoretī Cyrensis... XLII* ff.
- 6) J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Genesis*, 9 ff, 33 ff and 101 ff.
- 7) We follow the symbols of the Brooke-McLean edition, except for the abbreviations of the secondary versions where we follow the Göttingen edition.
- 8) Cf. Bo Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge in I. Samuelbuch*, Lund 1968, 158; E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Towards a new solution of the Problem." RB 79/1(1972) 104, and for 3 Maccabees R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta... IX/3 Maccabaeorum liber III*, Göttingen, 1960, 23: "Die aus dem ursprünglichen Text bewahrten Lesarten ('Vorlucianismen') sind L mit der armenischen Übersetzung gemeinsam."
- 9) After the present study was finished, I received J. W. Wevers, *Septuaginta... III, 2 Deuteronomium*, Göttingen 1977. Nevertheless I have left Brooke-McLean's symbols and collations in order to preserve uniformity in the quotations from the Octateuch. But here especially our results must be corrected in the light of the new evidence of Wever's Edition and Text History of Deuteronomy.
- 10) For a more expanded analysis of Thdt's variants in Deuteronomy, cf. N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoretī Cyrensis ...*, XLVIII ff.
- 11) More details on these variants are found in N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, *op. cit.*, LV ff.

- 12) A description of the main characteristics of this group is in A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Tradición griega y texto hebreo del canto de Débora (Jue 5)*. Sef 33/2(1973) 253 ff.
- 13) Cf. J. Targarona Borrás, *Estudio del texto griego del libro de los Jueces. El grupo textual KZgln(o)w y su 'Vorlage' hebrea*. Memoria de Licenciatura (typed), Madrid 1976, specially 86 ff.
- 14) F. M. Cross, *op cit.* 84-85.
- 15) S. P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*. Some reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*." *Studia Evangelica V* (Berlin 1968) 180: "Thus what evidence there is, and it is admittedly not full enough to be at all satisfactory, does point to the Antiochene text as having received its final formulation at a time close to Lucian. For this reason I see no objection to keeping the traditional designation of this text as Lucianic, remembering, of course, that very many of its peculiarities are Pre-Lucianic. The task for the future remains to separate the Lucianic from the pre-Lucianic in this text . . . For if Pal. has undergone a hebraising revision, Ant. has *also* suffered from recensional activity, but of a quite different kind, the aim being to provide a more readable Greek text" (p. 181).
- 16) Eugene C. Ulrich, "4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Septuagintal Research," *BIOSCS* 8(1975) 26-27: 30: "This forces us to go beyond Brock's tentative suggestion . . . and to admit proto-Lucianic revisional activity at least, and possible recensional activity."

THE SO-CALLED "L" TEXT OF PSALMS 72-82<sup>1</sup>

L. J. Perkins  
Northwest Baptist Theological  
College and Seminary

Jerome's statement concerning the texts of the Greek Psalter current during his day has formed the basis for investigating the history of the textual tradition of the Greek Psalter. In his "Letter to Sunnia and Fretela" (c. 403 AD) Jerome wrote:

"You must know that there is one edition which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea and all the Greek commentators call κοινή, that is common and widespread, and is by most people called Lucianic; and there is another, that of the Septuagint, which is found in the manuscripts of the Hexapla,<sup>2</sup> and has been faithfully translated by us into Latin."

In his study of the textual history of the Greek text Rahlfs tried to prove that this vulgar text was indeed as Jerome intimated Lucian's revision because it was similar to the text which underlay the Syriac translation and was the text quoted by Theodoret. He had used similar arguments in his analysis of the text of Reigns.

This paper seeks to take four criteria which Rahlfs defined as characteristics or tendencies of the Lucianic text of Reigns and see if they are also characteristic of the L text in the Psalter. A review of the identification of the vulgar text as Lucianic is in order because of the new papyri which have been found since Rahlfs did his work (eg. 2110, 2149) and the recent evidence put forward by Wevers against a Lucianic revision of Genesis.<sup>3</sup> This investigation is confined to these specific Psalms because it is merely a preliminary attempt to reassess this complicated area. The four criteria which will be assessed are doublets, atticisms, revisions toward the Hebrew text, and replacement of words by synonyms.<sup>4</sup>

Rahlfs only mentions two doublets in the Psalter:

"Auch hat Lucian offenkundige Dubletten geschaffen: 26:6 αινέσεως και ἀλαλαγοῦ, 97:9 ὅτι ἐρχεται ὅτι ἦκει."<sup>5</sup>

At 26:6 the textual evidence reads:

ἀλαλαγοῦ B' R'' Ga A' 2021 2030/2110 = M]αινεσεως U'Tht';  
αινεσεως και αλαλαγοῦ L;  
αινεσε ...1219

Since the phrase θυσίαν ἀλαλαγοῦ is unique in the Psalter but θυσίαν αινέσεως occurs several times (49:14, 23, 106:22, 115:8) the question should perhaps be rephrased. Do we have a doublet or an example of ex par. influence? In the contexts where αινεσις occurs the L group does not add ἀλαλαγμός.

A similar situation exists at 97:8:

ἀγαλλιᾶσονται B'' SaR''+ in (Vulg. a) conspectu domini Ga = M;  
+ απο προσωπου κυριου οτι ερχεται Aug L''  
A''(55προ pro απο) et alii Latini.

The "doublet" is created when ὅτι ἐρχεται is taken in conjunction with ὅτι ἦκει of verse 9. The variant in Ga may reflect the work of Origen. The addition of ὅτι ἐρχεται in L'' A'', however, probably shows the influence of the parallel in 95:13.

A methodological question is raised when Rahlfs explains the same type of addition found in 80:9 (B'' 2149 2110 add και λαλησω σοι Ισραηλ) as due to ex par. influence. If this example can be explained in this way, why not the two additions found in the L group at 26:6 and 97:9? A further factor which would favour this process is the parallelism in Hebrew poetry which is carried over in the translation. That only two occurrences of a "Doublet" are cited for the entire Psalter should urge caution in calling this characteristic of the L group in the Psalter.

Atticisms were the second category of alteration which Rahlfs cited as a Lucian characteristic in Reigns.

"Diese Änderungen sind grossenteils durch die Zeitströmung des Attizismus hervorgerufen. Aber Lucian ist keineswegs „strenger Attizist, er hätte sonst sehr viel mehr ändern müssen, als er getan hat."<sup>6</sup>

Metzger states:

"In other cases it appears that Lucian, acting under the influence of the Atticizing tendency of grammarians of the time, replaced Hellenistic forms of the Septuagint (such as ἐλάβουσιν, εἶπαν, τὸ ἔλεος, ἐγενήθη) with those of Attic usage (ἔλαβον, εἶπον, ὁ ἔλεος, ἐγένετο)."<sup>7</sup>

How closely does the L text in the Psalter follow this atticizing tendency?

A number of caveats should be stated before discussing this issue. In the first place the vast bulk of the L group consists of medieval manuscripts whose scribes were probably trained in Classical Greek. Thus some of these alterations could be the corrections not of Lucian, but these later copyists. It is also assumed that since the Psalter was translated during the 3rd or 2nd century BC that Hellenistic forms would be employed. But this assumption perhaps should not be applied too stringently at this date. Finally, the L group should only be termed atticistic if the great majority of its manuscripts consistently agree in reading attic forms. The greater the number of manuscripts, however, the greater the probability that there will be some manuscripts which do contain these types of changes.

A common Atticism was the return to the use of the second aorist forms which had been assimilated to first aorist forms in Hellenistic Greek. In the Psalter the L group consistently employs

εἶπον for the 3 pers. pl., which would correspond to classical usage. Other witnesses generally have εἶπαν. The only exception might be 93:7 where only L<sup>pau</sup> read εἶπον (which may be assimilation to the usual pattern of the L group). On the other hand L consistently employs εἶπα for the 1 pers. sg., in agreement with the majority of manuscripts, reading εἶπον only when other witnesses have it (eg. 40:8, 35:3). In all other cases of εἶπεῖν (except 34:25 where the L group divides over which optative form to read) the L group uses the Hellenistic form. The use of Attic forms of εἶπεῖν is very strictly controlled in the L group.

The aorist forms of πίπτειν show a similar pattern. The L group usually reads ἔπεσον instead of ἔπεσαν (19:18, 26:2, 77:64), but B' 2110 agree with the L group in reading ἔπεσον at 35:13, and Rahlfs took this to be the original text. When the compound ἐπιπίπτειν occurs in the aorist, the L group also reads the -ov ending (68:9). On two occasions when the subject is a neuter plural and the other text groups tend to have the -av termination, the L group reads the 3 pers. sg. ending (15:6, 77:28). Thus L consistently uses the -ov termination for the 3 pers. pl. aorist form where applicable.

The L group follows the aorist termination of ἐρχεσθαι found in the other textual groups except in the imperative forms. L consistently reads ἐλθέτω (34:8,11, 54:15; 101:2) or ἐλθέτωσαν (118:77), agreeing with B 2110 except at 101:2 where the evidence is:

ἐλθέτω B T He\* S<sup>C</sup> R<sup>C</sup> A'] -θετω S\* R\* L' 2110.

It is of course quite possible that the reading of L is the original one. The translator apparently had a predilection for the second

aorist imperative form. The L group has no compunction at writing such forms as ἤλαθοσαν (78:1).

For the compound εἰσερχεσθαι again the L group follows the reading of the other text groups except in the imperative forms where it consistently reads the second aorist form (68:27, 78:11, 87:2, 99:2, 4). In two cases (68:27, 87:2) B' agrees with the L group, but in the other cases B reads the first aorist form (although 2110 agrees with the L group). Rahlfs uses the reading supported by B, intimating that the original translator was inconsistent in his usage. As in the case of the simplex form the L group does not hesitate to reproduce such Hellenistic forms as εἰσήλαθοσαν (68:1).

With respect to φαγεῖν the Septuagint text of the Psalter fluctuates between two second aorist forms. On each occasion the L group supports the usual Attic form (ἔφαγον 77:29, 105:28), at 21:30 all texts read ἔφαγον.

The second aorist of ἐκβάλλειν is always used by the original translator (43:3, 48:17, 79:9), and the majority of the L group support this form.

In conclusion the facts seem to indicate that if there was an atticizing tendency in the L group with respect to second aorists, it was confined to certain specific forms and was not thorough. It seems limited to third person plural forms and third person imperative forms. On other occasions, however, the L group shows no hesitation in transmitting purely Hellenistic forms.

Rahlfs suggested that the consistent replacement of the first aorist ἐγενήθη by the second aorist ἐγένετο was one of the chief indicators of Lucianic activity in Reigns. Does this shift occur in the L group of the Psalter?

Although the second aorist form (ἐγένετο) is less frequent in the Psalter, the L group supports the Rahlfs' selection with two exceptions. At 72:22 the evidence reads:

ἐγενόμεν B-2039 R 55] εγεννηθην S L' 1219 2149.

Rahlfs is probably correct in adopting the B text since this is the rarer form. But forms of ἐγένεσθαι occur in verses 14 (ἐγενόμεν) and 19 (ἐγένοντο) and this may have induced change in B. What is noteworthy is that the L group read the first aorist form, the opposite of the Lucianic tendency in Reigns. At 101:8 we find

ἐγενήθην B' R 2110 He] εγενομην L' A'.

If we are to accept the less frequent reading and if the second aorist form was preferred in Hellenistic Greek,<sup>8</sup> then the reading of the L group should be given serious consideration as the original.<sup>9</sup> B may have been influenced by the form which occurs in the preceding verse. However we interpret these two contexts, the L group in no way demonstrates the same characteristic as the Lucianic text of Reigns.

Another criteria for measuring Lucianic activity was the use of the masculine form of ἔλεος instead of the neuter, which is the more usual Hellenistic form. In the Psalter, however, out of more than one hundred occurrences, only once does the L group read the masculine form (100:1), agreeing with A against all the other witnesses. At 5:8 and 83:12 L' has the neuter form while B reads the masculine (Rahlfs accepts only the second B reading). Thus L cannot be designated as characteristically employing the masculine form of ἔλεος and thereby the Attic form of this word.

If Thackeray is correct<sup>10</sup> in stating that the Attic form  $\xi\nu\epsilon\alpha$  was largely superseded by the form  $\xi\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu$ , then we should expect that the L group would predominantly read  $\xi\nu\epsilon\alpha$ , under Attic influence. But in the Psalter there are only seven occurrences where the L group has  $\xi\nu\epsilon\alpha$  (5:9, 8:3, 26:11, 43:23, 68:19, 121:8, 9), whereas the B text reads it in eleven of the twenty-six occurrences. In view of this the B text would be more atticistic than the L group. Rahlfs always follows the text supported by B except at 47:12 where it contravenes the principle set forth by Thackeray.

A syntactical construction to which Attic Greek adhered very strictly was the use of the singular verb with a neuter plural subject. Mayser<sup>11</sup> states that Ptolemaic Papyri, the Septuagint, and the New Testament hold a middle position between Attic usage and later practice. Several variables affect the choice of the translator in the Psalter. In the first instance the number of the Hebrew verb is important; then the type of Greek neuter noun, whether it designates living beings or inanimate things. Within Psalms 72-82 fourteen verbs with neuter plural subjects occur (72:2, 74:11, 76:17(2x), 18, 20, 77:20, 28, 78:1(3x), 2, 10, 81:5).

On eleven occasions the Septuagint translates the plural Hebrew verb literally with respect to number (76:17(2x), 18, 20, 77:20, 78:1(3x), 2, 10, 81:5). A few manuscripts of the L group read a singular verb in two of these contexts:

76:18  $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ]  $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  L<sup>pau</sup> 2110.  
 76:20  $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ]  $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  S L<sup>b</sup> (20 mss) 55 2110.

On one occasion the translator rendered a plural Hebrew verb by a singular Greek verb:

74:11  $\delta\psi\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$   $\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\alpha\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ .

$\text{אֵלֶּיךָ אֶרְוֶה אֶרְוֶמְךָ}$

which reflects the influence of the Attic rule. The L group along with Bo R 1219' however reads  $\tau\omicron$   $\alpha\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ , perhaps reflecting a secondary accommodation to the singular  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ . In any event there is no revision toward the Attic standard.

At 72:2 although the Hebrew verb is pointed plural (  $\text{שָׁפַךְ}$  ) the consonants correspond to the singular form and the translator, having an unpointed text, rendered it by a singular verb:  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\chi\upsilon\theta\eta$   $\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ .

There is no variant in the Greek tradition.

In only one context does the L group diverge from the main tradition. At 77:28 Rahlfs accepts  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$  as the rendering of  $\text{לָפַי}$ .

77:28 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ ] $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$	1046 55;
$\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$	L <sup>a</sup> (69 mss) Tht <sup>P</sup> 1219
$\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$	L <sup>pau</sup> (6 mss) Tht <sup>P</sup> .

The singular form in the L group is explicable as conformity to the classical rule, if it regarded  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\grave{\alpha}$   $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}$  as the subject, but perhaps the L group considers the subject of the preceding verb (God) to be carried over into this verse as well (as the Hebrew text does which reads a singular hiphil).

What is clear from these eleven Psalms is that the L group shows no pattern of change in the direction of the Attic rule. Only at 77:28 can it be suggested that the L group alters the

text for this reason, but even here it is uncertain whether the L group regards πετεινὰ πτερωτά as the subject.

The third major characteristic of Lucian's recension according to Rahlfs' study in Reigns is revision towards the Hebrew text of his day. This revision is not consistent, nor does it follow precisely the corrections made by Origen, although there is some evidence that Lucian in Reigns knew Origen's work or worked directly from the Hebrew text or used one of the later translations<sup>12</sup>. In the Psalter tradition there is very little hexaplaric material available to use as a control to measure hexaplaric influence in the L text. But Rahlfs seems to have shown, with what evidence is present, that the L text possesses the asterisked portions and deletes the obelized material<sup>13</sup> as a general rule. But this is also true very often of S or A or 55. There is no doubt that the L group shows hexaplaric influence, but so do other texts. This cannot in itself determine Lucianic activity.

Apart from the hexaplaric materials, does the L group show closer agreement with the Hebrew text than the other textual groups? Does a consistent pattern of revision in this area show up in an investigation of the L group? In Psalms 72-82 this paper examines the following types of Hebraic revision: the addition of readings which bring the Greek text closer to the Hebrew parent text; the omission of words in the Greek text which the Hebrew text does not have; changes in Greek word order to correspond to the Hebrew text; rendering the Hebrew text more exactly.

There are several contexts within Ps. 72-82 in which the L group has a longer text than the other textual groups and agrees with the Hebrew text as we know it.

Four in particular are important:

73:8 πάσας τὰς ἑορτὰς L'' Ga R'' 55 2149 = M] om. πάσας B'' Sa 1219.

75:8 ἀπὸ τότε ἡ ὁργὴ σου S' Sa Ga L'' 1219' 2110 2149 = M] ἀπο τῆς ὁργῆς σου B; τότε ἀπο τῆς ὁργῆς R'.

77:32 ἐν τοῖς θαυμαστοῖς La<sup>G</sup> Aug Ga L'' 1219 2110 = M] om. ἐν B La<sup>R</sup>He\* 2149.

78:16 ἐπὶ ἔθνη B' 1219] ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη RL' 55 2110 2149 = M.

In three of these four examples Rahlfs accepted the longer reading supported by the L group (73:8, 75:8, 77:32). At 78:16 the new evidence of 2110 and 2149 for the longer text supported by the L group suggests that Rahlfs' textual decision needs to be re-evaluated. Therefore, when the L group has a longer text agreeing with the Hebrew text, this is not due to revision but reflects usually the original work of the translator in Psalms 72-82.

There are at least thirteen places in Psalms 72-82 where the L group preserves a text which is shorter than some other text groups and in agreement with the Hebrew text.

73:18 ταύτης L'' 55 2149 S Ga = M] τῆς κτίσεως σου B' Sa R'' 1219 2110.

73:21 κατασχυμμένος L 2149 = M] πρ. καὶ B La<sup>G</sup> Th<sup>P</sup> 2110.

73:23 πρὸς σέ B'' Sa R Aug 55 2110 2149] tr. pro δὲ παντός La<sup>R</sup> Sy He 1219; om. La<sup>G</sup> Ga Hi L<sup>M</sup>.

75:7 οἱ ἐπιβεβηκότες B'' La<sup>G</sup> L'' Ga 2149 = M] πρ. πάντες Sa R' Aug L<sup>pau</sup>.

- 76:2 φωνή 2° S Sa Ga L'' 1219' 2110 = M] pr. και η B' R''.
- 77:17 παρεπικραναν B' Ga L' 2110 2149 = M] pr. και LPau(6mss)  
R'' 1219' 2054.
- 77:57 και 4° B' La Ga 2149] om. R Vulg Aug L'' 55 2110 = M.
- 77:60 αὐτοῦ B'' Sa La Ga He\* 55 2149] om. R L'' - 1046 2110  
= M.
- 78:4 ὄνειδος S Ga Aug L'' 1219 2110 = M] pr. εις B R'' 2149
- 78:10 τὰ ἔθνη R'' L'' 1219' = M] εν τοις εθνεσιν B'' Sa Ga Aug  
2110 2149
- 78:13 τῆς νομῆς B' Sy(Marg. in Greek letters) 2110] om. τῆς  
R L' 1219'  
2149 = M
- 80:9 και διαμαρτύρομαί σοι Ισραηλ Ga L'' A 1219 (vid) =M] και  
λαλησω σοι Ισραηλ και διαμαρτυρομαι σοι B'' Sa He\* 55 (σε)  
2110 2149.
- 82:8 και ἀλλόφυλοι B' 2049 R'' A' 2110 2149] om. και Ga L'' 1219 = M.

In eight of these cases Rahlfs accepted the reading of the shorter text, which is supported by the L group, as original (73:18, 21, 75:7, 76:2, 77:17, 78:4, 10, 80:9). The remaining five instances deserve closer examination.

At 77:57 and 82:8 the L group supports the omission of και, which also happens to agree with the Hebrew text as we have it. At 77:57 the new papyri 2110 and 2149 are divided in their support and both the presence and absence of the conjunction are exegetically acceptable. The editor must decide on the basis of the general reliability of the manuscripts and text-groups involved.

In 82:8 και 3° is supported by a formidable array of witnesses. The fact that Ga supports the L group in the omission of this

may imply hexaplaric influence on the l group at this point. It should be noted however that the second stich of verse 7 which is also in a list of nations is not introduced with και, thereby agreeing with the Hebrew text. Furthermore, on stylistic grounds it is much easier to explain the addition of και than the omission. Finally it is questionable whether Lucian who is supposed to have created a stylistically smooth and grammatically unambiguous text, would have removed this και to achieve these purposes.

In any case the presence or absence of και in these two contexts is difficult to ascertain and should not be the basis of argument for revision toward the Hebrew text.

The context at 73:23 concerns the prepositional phrase πρὸς σέ. Rahlfs accepted the longer text and on the basis of the witnesses it is understandable. The support of Ga for the omission would suggest that the l group which also omits it has undergone hexaplaric influence.

The variation with respect to αὐτοῦ at 77:60 is very difficult to evaluate. The noun σκῆνωμα does not occur in the Psalter without a modifier, usually genitival (but at 131:5 it is modified by a dative construction) and rarely is the presence of this modifier contested (51:7, and the present text). Twice the translator has apparently added αὐτοῦ in order to clarify the context, even though there is no equivalent in the Hebrew text (18:5, 45:5), and on both occasions the l group witnesses to the presence of the personal pronoun. The new papyri 2110 and 2149 are divided in their support. Rahlfs is probably correct in accepting the presence of the pronoun as original. But if this is the case, then either

the L group goes against the general tendency of the Lucianic text to fuller expression or else it has been revised to agree with the Hebrew text or else the pronoun was omitted by error in the L group. Certainty seems elusive.

The last context in this category is 78:13 where B' 2110 read τῆς νομῆς but the majority of manuscripts omit τῆς R L' 1219' 2149 in formal agreement with the Hebrew text which does not have the definite article. In two other contexts in which this noun occurs in the same grammatical structure it is anarthrous (73:1, 94:7) with no variant. But at 99:3 B' diverges from the rest of the tradition in having the definite article before νομῆς. It would seem then that B shows a tendency to add the article in this situation. Whether or not this is the case, the L group cannot be said to show revision toward the Hebrew text on the basis of this context. Either the L group retains the original text or shows the results of inner-Greek corruption.

In eight contexts Rahlfs accepted the shorter text as original. In the remaining five cases which concern the omission of καί (77:57, 82:8), πρὸς σέ (73:23), αὐτοῦ (77:60) and τῆς (78:13) only one context (73:23) may show indication of Hebraic revision, but this may be due to hexaplaric activity and thus not necessarily directly attributed to Lucian. The other four instances concern words which are easily added or omitted in the Greek textual tradition in the course of scribal activity and there is no need to suggest revision according to the Hebrew text as the cause for variation.

With respect to the change of word order to correspond with the Hebrew text in Psalms 72-82, only one context needs comment. At

73:1 Ga Hi L'' (non Su) 1219 = M in reading ὁ θεὸς ἀπόσω but Rahlfs accepts ἀπόσω ὁ θεός as supported by all other text groups (including the new papyrus 2149; 2110 is not extant here). The support of Ga and Hi for this transposition would indicate hexaplaric influence. But it is important to realize that the L group is quite inconsistent in altering the Greek word order to conform to the Hebrew. At 72:1 and 81:3 the L group supports a word order contrary to the Hebrew text (and examples could be multiplied throughout the Psalter eg. 31:6, 32:22, 50:13, 67:2). Consequently revision toward the Hebrew text in respect of word order cannot be isolated as a characteristic of this group over against other text groups.

The last category in the area of revision toward the Hebrew text are those contexts in which the L group supports a Greek rendering which corresponds more exactly with the Hebrew text in ways not previously discussed. The contexts are:

- 72:21 ἐξεκαύθη R' Ga L'' 1219' ] ηυφρανθη B''-2039 Sa La<sup>G</sup> Aug.  
 73:16 φαῦσιν... ἥλιον Sa Ga L'' 1219' 2110 2149 = M ] ἥλιον...  
 σεληνην B'' R'' et Cyr Alex.  
 73:17 ἐπλασας Sa L'' 1219 *plasmati* Ga] ἐποίησας B'' R''  
 2063 2149; ...] ας 2110.  
 75:10 τῆς γῆς Bo Sa R' Ga L' 55 2110 = M ] τη καρδια  
 B' La<sup>R</sup> Aug Sy 2149.  
 76:5 οἱ ὀφθαλμοί Sa R' Ga L'' 1219' 2110 = M ] οἱ εχθροὶ B\*;  
 παντες οἱ εχθροὶ B C'' La<sup>G</sup> Aug et Cyr Alex  
 77:10 ἦθελον B' R He 1219 2016; η (vel ε) βουληθησαν  
 L' 55 2054 2110 2149.  
 79:10 καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ B'' R'' Sa He\* (vid) 55 2110] και  
 ἐπληρωσεν την γην Ga Aug L'' 1219 2004  
 2149; *replesti*  
 (=M) *terminos terrae*  
 La<sup>G</sup>.

Rahlfs accepted the L group reading in 72:21, 73:16, 17, 75:10 and 76:5, all of which give a reading more representative of the Hebrew text. In two cases Rahlfs rejected the reading supported by the L group (77:10, 79:10).

At 77:10 the variant concerns the semantically similar verbal forms ἤθελον and ἠβουλήθησαν. An investigation of the Psalter regarding the use of these respective verbs shows that θέλειν is the more common rendering of the translator for the root יָשַׁן (19 times) while βούλεσθαι renders it twice (39:9, 69:3). The only other two occurrences of (οὐ) βούλεσθαι are found in 35:4 (where it renders ἔπιεν) and 77:10 where οὐ βούλεσθαι, if original, renders יָשַׁן. (The Hebrew verb יָשַׁן also occurs at 77:3 but is translated by οὐκ ἀπατάω) With the new evidence of 2110 and 2149 plus the fact that βούλεσθαι is by far the less common form in the Psalter, it seems very possible that the L group has retained the original reading. In any case the variants are inner Greek and not due to revision on the basis of the Hebrew text.

At 79:10 the variant concerns whether the noun γῆ is subject of a passive verb form ἐπλήσθη or the object of an active verb ἐπλήρωσεν. The Hebrew tradition is divided as to a niph'al form ( קָלַחַל read by two manuscripts) and a piel form ( קָלַחַל ) which would have קָלַח of verse 9 as the subject. The new evidence of 2110 and 2149 is divided. It is of course possible that the L group reflects hexaplaric activity for its reading is supported by Ga. But then we should also posit the same explanation for 2004 and 2149.

In this final category then only one instance of revision toward the Hebrew text would suggest itself (79:10), and in all other contexts the L group supports the original text.

There is then little or no evidence which would suggest revision toward the Hebrew text independent of hexaplaric activity as a characteristic of the L group.

The last criterion commonly attributed to Lucian which this paper will investigate is, according to Rahlfs, that

"Einsetzung synonymmer Ausdrücke ist sehr häufig...."<sup>14</sup>

Metzger states that

"He (Lucian) substituted synonyms for many words employed by the Septuagint. In some cases it is difficult to discover the reason for the alteration, as φρόνησις for σοφία, ἐγένετο for ἦν, διέβη for παρήλαθον, δοῦλοι for παῖδες, ἐξείλατο for ἐρύσατο, etc."<sup>15</sup>

Is this characteristic present in Psalms 72-82 to a greater extent in the L group than in the other text groups? A substantially greater percentage must be present in the L group in order for this to be considered a proof of Lucianic revision, otherwise it could be attributed to the normal process which is found in all textual traditions. In addition there should be a certain degree of consistency in the replacement of the synonym. If the substitution only occurs once in a specific context then it would seem correct to seek an explanation from the context, or to suggest ex par. influence, or inner Greek corruption, rather than a deliberate replacement with a synonym on the part of a revisor.

There is only one consistent variant of this type which occurs in Psalms 72-82 and also throughout the Psalter and that is the replacement of συγκλᾶν by συνθλαῖν. The problem occurs at 74:11 where the evidence is

συγκλάσω B' 2110 2149] συνθλασω R L' 1219'.

In the other two contexts where συγκλάω occurs in the Psalter the L group consistently replaces it with συνθλαδν :

45:10 συγκλάσει B' 2013 R 1098 A] συνθλασει L' 55.

106:16 συνέκλασεν S R] -θλασεν L Tht<sup>P</sup> A'' : - τριψεν Tht<sup>P</sup>.

Since συνθλαδν occurs five other times in the Psalter it is quite probable that assimilation to the more common form has occurred, since there is only the difference of one letter between the two verbal forms. Thus there is replacement by a synonym but its significance is greatly reduced by the factors just mentioned.

In conclusion it must be reiterated that this paper is merely a preliminary attempt to call into question a theory which has governed the history of the Septuagint text of Psalms for so many years. Because the scope of the investigation is confined to Psalms 72-82 a distorted picture of the total Psalter may have resulted. However, on the basis of this initial survey there seems to be little affinity between the "Lucianic" characteristics or tendencies which appeared in Reigns and the characteristics and tendencies of the L group in the Psalter. The L text shows hexaplaric activity, and is a full text, but only differs quantitatively and not qualitatively from some text groups in these areas. Whether Lucian was responsible for this hexaplaric editing and filling out of the text must remain questionable.

If the conclusion of this paper is valid, then Lucian either felt that the Psalter did not need revising or thought that there would be too much opposition to the idea of revising this part of the Old Testament or never intended to revise the Old Testament

in Greek but only certain portions of it.<sup>16</sup> In the light of this perhaps it would be advisable to use a different term to designate the L text in order to remove the danger of association and a priori assumptions. "Byzantine text" might be more apt and would certainly be more neutral and historically accurate. Jerome's description of the textual situation of the Psalter as it existed in his time must not be taken at face value, but must be examined closely. Lucian's name could have been transferred to material which never felt the scrutiny of his revision. If the L text is not Lucianic then it may need to be treated more generously as an independent textual witness.

FOOTNOTES

1. This paper is the result of work done under the supervision of Prof. A. Pietersma at the University of Toronto in 1976 for a seminar in the Septuagint of the Psalter. I thank him for his guidance and help, but take full responsibility for any opinions expressed and errors. All references in this paper are the numeration of the Septuagint text. The symbols used are those found in Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis*.

2. B. Metzger. "Lucian and the Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," *New Testament Studies* 8 (1962) p. 192.

3. J. Wevers. *Text History of the Greek Genesis*. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), p. 158f.

4. A. Rahlfs. "Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher." *Septuaginta-Studien* 3 Heft. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965, sec. ed.).

5. Ibid., "Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters." *Septuaginta-Studien* 2 Heft. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965, sec. ed.).

6. Ibid., "Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher," p. 281.

7. Metzger, op. cit., p. 195.

8. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*. Rev. and transl. by R. Funk (Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1961), p. 42, sect. 98.

9. A. Pietersma. *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin*. Chester Beatty Monograph no. 11, p. 46-47 (to be published).

10. H. St. J. Thackeray. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* Vol. 1. (Cambridge at the University Press, 1909), p. 135.

11. E. Mayser. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* Vol. II. 3. (Berlin & Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1934), section 151.

12. A. Rahlfs, "Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher," op. cit., p. 172-174.

13. Ibid., "Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters," op. cit., p. 137-141.

14. Ibid., "Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher," op. cit., p. 283.

15. Metzger, op. cit., p. 195.

16. Lucian may not have had time to complete his work.

SEPTUAGINT ABSTRACTS

J. R. Busto-Saiz.

*Einige Beiträge der Vetus Latina für die Wiederherstellung des griechischen Textes Tobit.*

(Abstract of the paper read at the "Septuaginta-Kongress", Göttingen 19-20 August 1977).

Tobit ist uns bekannt durch zwei beziehungsweise drei Rezensionen: der Kodex Sinaiticus bietet uns die eine an; eine zweite, kürzere Rezension stellen uns der Vaticanus, Alexandrinus und die meisten Kursiven vor. Drei Kursiven zeigen schliesslich eine dritte Textart vor (Tob. 6,7 - 13,8), die eine Kompromisslösung zwischen den zwei anderen zu sein scheint.

Die alten Versionen teilen sich gemäss dieser griechischen Texte voneinander ab. Die in Qumran gefundene Handschriftenfragmente vertreten die längste Rezension, deren einziger griechischer Zeuge der Sinaiticus bleibt.

Wir sind zu dem Schluss gekommen, dass der Weg von dem langen zu dem kürzeren Text sich viel besser erklären lässt als der umgekehrte Prozess. Im Ganzen betrachtet, erweist sich die längere Rezension als die ursprünglichere.

Aber leider muss sich eine kritische Ausgabe dieser längeren Rezension mit zwei Mängeln auseinandersetzen: erstens: im Griechischen ist sie nur durch den Sinaiticus plus Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1594 (für Tob. 12, 14-19) vertreten; zweitens bietet uns der Kodex Sinaiticus im Tobit wichtige Lücken and häufige Verderbnisse.

Deswegen haben wir den Text der Vetus Latina mit dem der Sinaiticus und dem der kürzeren Rezension kollationiert. Dieser

Vergleich hat uns überzeugt dass der Text der längeren Rezension in der Vetus Latina viel besser erhalten ist als in dem Sinaiticus selbst. Manchmal hat sie gemeinsame Lesarten mit der kürzeren Rezension, die aus dem Sinaiticus durch leicht erkennbare paläografischen Irrtümern verschwunden sind. Die kürzere Rezension enthält noch diese Lesarten, aber meistens nicht so wörtlich wie die Vetus Latina. Merkwürdigerweise zeigt der kürzere Text in Bezug auf die Vetus Latina das gleiche Verhalten als er in anderen Stellen, in Bezug auf den Sinaiticus hat. Man könnte wohl sagen dass sich durch die Vetus Latina beide griechischen Texte näher gekommen sind.

Jede Lesart braucht eine eigene Analyse. Und oft können wir noch nicht genau entscheiden welcher der ältere Text ist. Auf jeden Fall hoffen wir gezeigt zu haben, dass der angehende Herausgeber des griechischen Textes Tobit die Lösung viele Probleme für die Wiederherstellung der ursprünglichen Septuaginta in der Vetus Latina finden kann.

N. Fernández-Marcos

*Das Problem des griechischen Textes im Complutenser 'Dodekapropheton'*

(Abstract of the paper read at the "Septuaginta-Kongress", Göttingen, 19-20 August 1977).

Im Jahre 1944 veröffentlichte Ziegler in *Bib.* einen sehr lehrreichen Aufsatz über den griechischen Text der Complutense. Seine Ergebnisse wurden in allgemeinen anerkannt, aber sein Urteil über die Complutensischen Sonderlesarten überzeugte nicht (cf. J. W. Wevers in *TR* 22 (1954)105). Wir haben das Problem wieder aufgegriffen. Unsere Hauptschlüsse in Beziehung auf Ziegler's Forschungen können

in folgenden Punkten zusammengefasst werden:

Die Zahl der Complutensischen Sonderlesarten hat sich noch mehr beschränkt. Manche von ihnen sind in den griechischen Fragmenten aus Naḥal Hever belegt, so wie früher manche angenommene Sonderlesarten von den koptischen Übersetzungen und von den *Pap. Washingtonianus* belegt wurden.

Obwohl wir die Handschriften, die als Vorlage dem Complutense-*Dodekapropheton* dienten, nicht kennen, ist es klar, dass Hss 40-42 dem Alcalá-Text am nächsten stehen. Von den übrigen Zeugen sind diejenigen, die am häufigsten die Complutense begleiten: 68, V und Cyr<sup>F</sup> durch das ganze Buch, und W, Ach, 764 und 239 besonders in dem ersten Teil, d. h. bis zum Micha. Aus den Übereinstimmungen mit der *Vetus Latina* sind wir zu dem Schluss gekommen, dass es nicht gestattet ist Ziegler zuzustimmen, dass die handschriftliche Vorlage der Complutense stark latinisiert wurde, ausser in dem Sinne, dass solche griechischen Zeugen die gleiche textuelle Strömung der *Vetus Latina* darstellen, aber nicht in dem Sinne, dass sie nach dem Lateinischen korrigiert wurden. Nachdem wir die Übereinstimmungen mit der Vulgata von denen mit der *Vetus Latina* gesondert haben, bleiben etwa zehn gemeinsame Lesarten der Complutense und Vulgata übrig, die dem Hebräischen entgegenstehen. In diesen Fällen müssen wir einen Kontakt mit dem lateinischen Text der Vulgata annehmen. Diese Schlüsse aber sind von dem Gedanken einer Anpassung des griechischen Textes an den der Vulgata weit entfernt.

In Beziehung zu den complutensischen Sonderlesarten zeigen die Analysen deutlich, dass die Varianten gegenüber dem hebräischen Text jene, die sich ihm annähern, überwiegen. Deshalb war die Angleichung an den hebräischen Text kein entscheidendes Kriterium für die Entstehung dieser Lesarten. Endlich es scheint uns erlaubt

zu behaupten, dass ausser dem historischen Wert des Complutense-*Dodekapropheton* als Document und Exponent der Situation der biblischen Philologie in XVI Jahrhundert, ihr Text nicht ohne Interesse für die moderne Textkritik ist, dank der bewiesenen Qualität und Altertümlichkeit einer grosser Zahl ihrer Lesarten.

N. Fernández-Marcos

*The Sigla "Lambda Omicron" (λ) in I-II Kings-LXX*

(Abstract of the paper read at the VII<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 7-14, 1977).

Of the 92 readings preceded in I-II Kings by the sigla λ, 50 consist of additions or formal corrections according to the Hebrew. Not one of the λ-readings is in disagreement with the Hebrew.

Fifteen variants agree closely with the Lucianic manuscripts and another six agree with some of the manuscripts belonging to this group. In these cases the abbreviation should be considered as indicating Λουκιανός. But none of these readings are in disagreement with the Hebrew text. Therefore, we have no firm criteria with which to distinguish the specific Lucianic readings. On the other hand we cannot forget that 10 λ-readings disagree expressly with the reading of the Lucianic group. In many λ-readings supported by the Lucianic manuscripts it is practically impossible to separate Λουκιανός-material from οὐ λουκιανός-material, as we know that this recension corresponds in part with the hexaplaric text at least in its last stages.

Owing to all these traces and to the strong predominance of λ-readings in accord with the Hebrew, none of them disagreeing with it,

we are inclined to postulate for the sigla  $\lambda$  the interpretation of  $\text{οι λοιποὶ ἑρμηνευταὶ}$  or  $\text{ἄλλος ἑρμηνευτῆς}$  in I-II Kings. Now, if we consider the high number of hexaplaric readings transmitted as anonymous in the margin of the manuscripts, or included collectively under a common sigla, for lack of more information about  $\text{ἄλλος}$ , we prefer the interpretation of  $\text{οι λοιποὶ}$  for the following reasons:

a) It was an easy solution for the scribe, to include under this sigla one or more readings of the 'three', when the marginal space of the manuscript was scant, or when the attributions were not clear; b) the fact that in different passages  $\lambda$  is put together with some of the abbreviations of the 'three' is not opposite to this interpretation. We are in front of other witnesses that, even having been explained as  $\text{οι λ'}$ , were put together with the abbreviations of Aquila and Symmachus; c) furthermore, even in these cases  $\lambda$  is not a superfluous sigla, as Mercati suggested (*Bib* 24 (1943) 16-17). It has the advantage that it can include any of the other versions, only partially known, as the *quinta*, *sexta*, *ho hebraios*, *ho syros*, *to samareiticon*, or others that are anonymous that have left traces in the corrections of ms.  $F^b$ , or in the numerous hexaplaric readings that are transmitted for the Octateuch in the margins of the mss. M, i, v, z, etc.

#### The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published, in hand, or projected. (Please print or type.)
2. Record of Septuagint theses and dissertations completed or in preparation.
3. Reports significant for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original groundbreaking research will be given primary consideration. Reports should be brief and informative and may be written in English, French, or German. Greek and Hebrew need not be transliterated.
4. Abstracts of Septuagint papers read before international, national, regional, and local academic meetings. Abstracts should be previously unpublished, not more than one page (11 by 8½), double-spaced, including the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by May 1 of each year to be included in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

**BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP**

Send name, address, and \$2 to Eugene Ulrich, Treasurer. In the Netherlands send subscription price to Professor M. J. Mulder, Amperestraat 48, Badhoevedort, The Netherlands.