



**BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
FOR SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES**

Volume 23    Fall, 1990

Minutes of the IOSCS Meeting, Leuven	1
Treasurer's Report	5
News and Notes	6
Record of Work Published or in Progress	10
The Story of David and Goliath (1Sam 17-18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition <i>Julio Trebolle</i>	16
Evaluating Minority Variants Within Families of Greek Manuscripts <i>Bernard Taylor</i>	31

## BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by  
**THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR  
SEPTUAGINT AND COGNATE STUDIES**

### OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### *President*

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

#### *Immediate Past President*

Albert Pietersma  
Dept. Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

#### *Vice President*

Robert Hanhart  
Septuaginta-Unternehmen  
Theaterstrasse 7  
3400 Göttingen

#### *Secretary/Treasurer*

Leonard Greenspoon  
Religion Dept.  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina  
29634-1508

#### *Associate Editor*

Walter R. Bodine  
5621 Tremont  
Dallas, Texas 75204

#### *Editor*

Melvin K. H. Peters  
Dept of Religion  
Duke University  
Durham, North Carolina 27706  
USA

#### *Honorary Presidents*

Harry M. Orlinsky  
Hebrew Union College  
Jewish Inst. Religion  
One W. Fourth Street  
New York, NY 10012

John Wm Wevers  
Dept. Near Eastern Studies  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

#### *Members at Large*

Anneli Aejmelaeus  
Oraskatu 3 c 26  
SF-05880 Hyvinkää  
Finland

Emanuel Tov  
Dept. of Bible  
Hebrew University  
Jerusalem Israel

Robert A. Kraft  
Dept. Religious Studies  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
19104

#### *Publications Editor*

Claude Cox  
Grove Park Home  
P.O. Box 460  
Barrie, Ontario L4M 4T7  
Canada

## MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING

26 August, 1989--Leuven, Belgium

### *Programme*

Friday, 25 August

9.00 - 10.30

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Clemson University, "Its All Greek to Me: The Use of the Septuagint in Modern Translations of the Hebrew Bible"

Anneli Aejmelaeus, University of Helsinki, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translators"

Arie van der Kooij, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, "On the End of the Book of 1 Esdras"

11.00 - 12.40

John W. Wevers, University of Toronto, "The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partum Reflections"

Peter W. Flint, University of Notre Dame, "The Text of Psalms at Qumran and in the Septuagint"

Seppo Sipilä, University of Helsinki, "The Septuagint Version of the Book of Joshua"

14.30 - 16.00

Olivier Munnich, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, "Daniel-Theodotian et ses sur-révisions O et L"

Raija Sollamo, University of Helsinki, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun"

Johan Lust, Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, "Messianism in the Septuagint, Jeremiah"

16.30 - 18.00

R. Ferdinand Poswick et Jean Bajard, Centre "Informatique et Bible", Maredsous, "Aspects statistiques des rapports lexicaux entre la LXX et le Texte Massorétique"

Emanuel Tov, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, "Progress Report on the

## CATSS Project—Applied Research and Concordances"

Galen Marquis, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, "The CATSS Base for the Macintosh—Computerized Research on the LXX and MT for Everyone"

20.00 – 21.30

Takamitsu Muraoka, University of Melbourne, "Issues in the Septuagint Lexicography"

Anssi Voitila, University of Helsinki, "La Traduction de l'imparfait (yiqtol) hébreu dans l'histoire de Joseph grecque"

Michael Thomas Davis, Princeton Theological Seminary, "Ἰσοὺ ἐγώ = ʾיְיָ? : An Analysis of the Grounds for the Retroversion of an Apparent 'Hebraism'"

Saturday, 26 August

9.00 – 10.30

Marguerite Harl, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, "Le renouvellement du grec des Septante d'après le témoignage des révisions, des citations et des notes lexicales des Pères"

Geoffrey Jenkins, University of Melbourne, "Colophons to the Syrohexapla and the Textgeschichte of the Hexaplaric Text"

Maria Victoria Spottorno, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "The Lucianic and Byzantine Texts in the New Testament"

11.00 – 12.30

Julio Treballe-Barrera, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, "The Sigla Ⲅ in BHS: The Books of Kings"

Natalio Fernandez-Marcos, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "The Antiochian Text in I-II Chronicles"

Philippe Lefebvre, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, "Le mariage de Salomon"

14.30 – 16.00

Claude Cox, Wilfred Laurier University, Ontario, "Job's Final Soliloquy According to the Old Greek Text (Job 29-31)"

Johann Cook, University of Stellenbosch, "Hellenistic Influence in the LXX Book of Proverbs"

José Ramon Busto-Saiz, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, "Wisdom 2:9: Text Criticism and Meaning"

16.30 - 18.15

Raymond A. Martin, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, "The Syntax Criticism of Baruch"

S. Peter Cowe, Columbia University, New York, "The Armenian Version of the Epistle of Jeremiah: Vorlage and Translation Technique"

Joan Annandale-Potgieter, University of South Africa, Pretoria, "The Priestly Orders in I Maccabees and in the Writings of Josephus"

*Business Meeting*

The meeting was called to order by the President, Eugene Ulrich at 6 p.m.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved as amended.
2. Ulrich mentioned the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, to be held at the University of Manchester from July 30 to August 2, 1990. This conference is being organized by George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Several IOSCS members are on the program. He announced the establishment of a new group, The International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS). This organization was established earlier in August at a meeting in Gronigen. Ulrich also reported that Marguerite Harl and her associates, principally Cecile Dogniez, are preparing a bibliographical survey of materials related to the Septuagint that will serve to update the Brock-Fritsch-Jellicoe bibliography of 1973. He reminded members that the IOSCS will meet next year in New Orleans. In 1992 the IOSOT will probably meet in Paris, and the IOSCS, as it is custom, will hold its meetings that year on the Friday and Saturday prior to the opening of the IOSOT sessions.
3. On behalf of *BIOSCS* editor Melvin Peters, Ulrich reported that volume 21 is out. Peters hopes to publish volume 22 before the end of this calendar year. That will get us back on schedule.
4. Greenspoon presented the treasurer's report.
5. In his report as an editor of the SCS monograph series, Cox presented a progress report on a number of SCS volumes: (1) John Kampen's study of 1 and 2 Maccabees is the most recent publication in the series; (2) Ted Bergren's monograph on the Fifth Ezra is in press; (3) Ben Wright's work on the Greek text of Sirach will be sent to press very

## BULLETIN IOSCS

soon; (4) Rob Hiebert's analysis of the so-called Syro-Hexaplaric Psalter is almost ready to go to press; (5) John Harick's commentary on Koheleth has been accepted; (6) the proceedings of a symposium on the Septuagint, held in Australia and organized by T. Muraoka, should be ready to go to press later this year; (7) George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars plan to publish the proceedings of next year's symposium in Manchester as an SCS volume; (8) John Wevers will publish his textual commentary on Greek Exodus in our Series; (9) the proceedings of this year's IOSCS meeting will be edited by Cox who hopes to have this volume ready for next year's IOSCS meeting in New Orleans. In connection with this volume, Cox reminded all contributors to adhere closely to the guidelines previously sent to them. In particular, they should make every effort to have their papers produced on a laser printer using a Courier font. No handwritten material should be submitted. Cox asked all contributors to give him a final copy of their article in Leuven or to mail it to him by October 1 of this year. Each contributor will receive one copy of the volume.

6. A request was made that we check into having abstracts of IOSCS papers included in the printed program for future IOSOT meetings.
7. Thanks were offered to John Lust and all others responsible for the very fine Leuven meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30.

Respectfully submitted  
Leonard Greenspoon  
Secretary-Treasurer

## IOSCS TREASURER'S REPORT

July 1, 1989 — June 30, 1990

Initial Balance (6/30/89)	.....	\$227.50
<b>Payments Received</b>		<b>+ \$2473.52</b>
7/21/89		95.00
9/5		792.00
9/25		112.00
10/11		120.00
11/10		240.00
12/8		318.00
1/5/90	(int.)	2.35
1/12		77.00
3/6	(int.)	9.90
3/14		84.00
5/4	(int.)	9.04
5/17		111.00
5/29		205.00
6/6	(int.)	5.23
6/7		96.00
6/15		197.00
<b>Expenses</b>		<b>- \$2067.11</b>
7/10/89	(supplies)	45.15
8/4	(mailing)	184.83
8/8	(printing)	10.00
9/5	(mailing)	240.00
10/4	(annual mtg. display)	55.00
2/12/90	(mailing)	42.00
2/29	(supplies)	50.00
4/2	(supplies)	66.15
5/17	(mailing)	126.15
6/4	(mailing)	333.08
6/8	(printing)	894.00
6/8	(mailing)	20.00
Balance as of 6/30/90	.....	\$633.91

NEWS AND NOTES

*A New Verzeichnis*

Rahlfs' *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* has served Septuagint scholars well for the last 75 years, but, though it remains an indispensable tool, it is antiquated. Manuscript descriptions were largely based on old library and museum catalogues; many of these have now been read and collated at the Septuaginta Unternehmen, and newer catalogues now often exist for libraries and museums, all of which render the *Verzeichnis* badly out of date.

The Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen has through the LXX Unternehmen commissioned a thoroughgoing revision of the *Verzeichnis* by Detlef Fraenkel. In order that this catalogue may be as complete and up to date as possible, anyone aware of manuscript materials, especially of papyri fragments, is urgently requested to communicate such information to Detlef Fraenkel, Septuaginta Unternehmen, Theaterstr. 7, D3400 Göttingen, Germany.

*Hanhart Retirement*

Professor Robert Hanhart retired from his Göttingen Professorship and as the Director of the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen in the summer of 1990. Anneli Aejmelaeus will replace him in both capacities. BIOSCS wishes both of these distinguished members of the IOSCS much success in their new roles.

*Hanhart Festschrift*

Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast and John Wevers edited a Festschrift in honor of Robert Hanhart on the occasion of his 65th birthday. That work, *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* published as MSU XX by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in 1990, contains the contributions of so many IOSCS members that most of its "Inhalt" is reproduced here rather than in the record of work.

JAMES BARR  
"Guessing" in the Septuagint

ILMARI SOISALON-SOININEN  
Zurück zur Hebraismenfrage

RADA SOLLAMO  
The Koine Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items

EMANUEL TOV  
Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX—Their Nature and Distribution

ANNELI AEJMELEAUS  
*OTI recitativum* in Septuagintal Greek

†JOSEPH ZIEGLER  
Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes

JOHN WM WEVERS  
PreOrigen Recensional Activity in the Greek Exodus

DETLEF FRAENKEL  
Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35-40

OLIVIER MUNNICH  
Origène, éditeur de la *Septante de Daniel*

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS  
Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint

UDO QUAST  
Der rezenzionelle Charakter einiger Wortvarianten im Buche Numeri

DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, O.P.  
Les relations de la Complutensis avec le papyrus 967 pour Éz 40<sub>42</sub> à 46<sub>24</sub>

ALBERT PIETERSMA  
Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter

EUGENE ULRICH  
A Greek Paraphrase of Exodus on Papyrus from Qumran Cave 4

LOTHAR PERLITT  
Dtn 1,12 LXX

PIERRE-MAURICE BOGAERT, O.S.B.  
La libération de Jérémie et le meurtre de Godolias: le texte court (LXX) et la rédaction longue (TM)

BERNDT SCHALLER  
Das 4. Makkabäerbuch als Textzeuge der Septuaginta

RUDOLF SMEND  
Der Geistige Vater des Septuaginta-Unternehmens

*Manchester LXX Symposium*

As announced in the previous *Bulletin*, the University of Manchester's Department of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis sponsored a Symposium on July 30-Aug 2, 1990 entitled: The Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings. All the papers were of interest of Septuagintalists and, until the proceedings appear in print, the titles of the presentations are offered for your information.

- Sebastian Brock (Oxford) "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation"
- Leonard Greenspoon (Clemson) "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle Are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?"
- Frank Polak (Tel Aviv) "MT, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Old Greek of the Books of Samuel: Classification, Statistical Analysis and Philological Judgment"
- Robert Gordon (Cambridge) "The Problem of Haplography in 1 and 2 Samuel"
- Eugene Ulrich (Notre Dame) "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran"
- Johann Cook (Stellenbosch) "The Relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls from Caves 1, 4 and 11 and the LXX in the Light of the Computerized Database"
- Arie van der Kooij (Leiden) "The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Isaiah Texts: Some General Comments"
- Lawrence Schiffman (New York) "The LXX and the Temple Scroll: Shared 'halakhic variants'"
- Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem) "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Study of the LXX and *vice versa*"
- Anthony Hanson (Thirsk) "The Treatment in the LXX of the Theme of Seeing God"
- Nina Collins (Leeds) "The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek"
- Zipora Talshir (Jerusalem) "Is 3K 12 a-z pre-Deuteronomistic?"
- Robert Hanhart (Göttingen) "Die Übersetzung der Septuaginta im Licht ihr vorgegebener und auf ihr gründender Tradition"
- Anneli Aejmelaeus (Helsinki) "Septuagintal Translation Techniques"
- Lester Grabbe (Hull) "The Translation Process in the Greek Minor Versions"
- Ilya Schiffman (Leningrad) [title unavailable as of this printing]

*South African Septuagint Mini-Congress*

On Monday, September 17, 1990 a mini-congress of Septuagint Studies took place at Stellenbosch, South Africa prior to the meeting of the Old Testament Society of South Africa (OTSSA). Organized by Johann Cook and the members of the "Textual Criticism" interest group at Stellenbosch, this congress featured the presentations of several LXX scholars. Until the proceedings appear in print, the papers are listed for your information.

- J. W. Wevers (Toronto) "The Building of the Tabernacle According to the Exodus Septuagint"
- E. Tov (Jerusalem) "The Importance of the Septuagint for Biblical Exegesis"
- A. Pietersma (Toronto) "Johana and his Brother and the Origin of the Jannes and Jambres Legend."
- J. Cook, "Was the Same Translator Responsible for the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job?"
- S. J. P. K. Riekert, "The Atticistic Greek of 2 Maccabees 5"
- B. A. Niewoudt, "Translation Technical Aspects in the Book of Deuteronomy (Septuagint)"
- D. L. Büchner, "Micah 7:6 in the Ancient Old Testament Versions"
- P. E. Steyn, "On the Relationship between the Peshitta and the Septuagint in the Book of Proverbs"

*A Note from the Editor*

The publication of *BIOSCS* is possible because of the voluntary collaboration of the President, the Associate Editor, the Secretary-Treasurer, individual contributors and each member of the IOSCS, with the Editor serving primarily as a co-ordinator of these varied interests. Despite early efforts to elicit from the membership regular reports of scholarly activity for inclusion in the Record of Work, the Editor has received only modest, sporadic and predictable submissions. His attempts to solicit articles have also been only moderately successful.

In these circumstances, he is caught each year on the horns of a dilemma: to print on schedule a small issue containing only the Minutes and gleanings from library holdings, or delay printing until various reports trickle in or until he or someone else can persuade others to report their work. In some circles, there is considerable sentiment (sometimes strongly expressed) to respect the tradition of punctuality and to publish "whatever is in hand" in the Fall, even if it means returning to a 10-page pamphlet. The current Editor is unpersuaded by such sentiments. Nor is he favorably disposed toward nudging colleagues constantly to honor promises made in good faith. Rather, he is more inclined to waiting until such time as a respectable issue can be produced, however long that may be. Many libraries now hold subscriptions to *BIOSCS*; they deserve more than our Minutes. In any event, future generations will judge *BIOSCS* for its content, not for its regularity.

The dilemma described above is not inevitable; it can be avoided with the help of IOSCS members. Each of you is invited again to send a report of your activity directly to the Editor who wishes also to renew his appeal for submissions to the Bulletin. He would welcome the luxury of a backlog of articles. Any typed format is acceptable.

## RECORD OF WORK

## PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

## BOOKS AND ARTICLES:

- Aranda Pérez, Gonzalo. *Evangelio de San Marcos en Copto Sahídico. Texto de MS69 y aparato crítico. Textos y Estudios «Cardinal Cisneros» 45.* Madrid: CSIC, 1988.
- Cadwallader, A. H. "The Correction of the Text of Hbs towards the LXX" *Nov. T.* (forthcoming).
- Cignelli, L. and G. C. Bottini. Il complemento d'agente nel greco biblico (LXX e NT) *Liber Annuus* 39 (1989) 37-48.
- Cook, Johann. (1) Reports that the following doctoral students are preparing dissertations under his supervision: B. N. Niewoudt *Aspects of the Verb in the Book of Deuteronomy (Septuagint)*; D. L. Büchner, *Messianism in Rabbinic Literature*; P. E. Steyn, *External Influences in the Peshitta (Proverbs)*. J. C. Erasmus. *The Text-Critical Value of 4Q Deuteronomy*. R. Lettelier, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom: A Study of Abraham and Lot in View of the Structure, Language and Symbolism of Genesis 18 and 19*. (2) "The Composition of the Peshitta (Pentateuch)" Pp. 147-168 in P. B. Dirksen en M. J. Mulder (reds.), *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History. Papers read at the Peshitta Symposium held at Leiden 30-31 August 1985*. Leiden: Brill, 1988. (3) "Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)?" *BIOSCS* 20 (1987) 30-43. (4) "New Horizons in the Textual Criticism"[sic] Pp. 51-62 in *Text and Context, Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F. C. Fensham*. Sheffield: 1988 (5) "Textkritische und grammatikalische Analysen in Urtext und Übersetzungen" *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, Vol 2 (1987) 254-55. (6) "The Plurality of Old Testament Texts and Exegetical Methodology" Mouton ao (reds.), [sic] *Paradigms and Progression in Theology* Pretoria: 1988, 362-77. (7) "The Computerized Data Base for the Dead Sea Scrolls" *Colloque <<Bible et Informatique: méthodes outils, résultats>>*, Jerusalem, 5-9 Junie 1988, 213-221. (8) "The Qumran (Biblical Scrolls) Data Base" *JNSL* 14 (1988) 27-40. (9) "Toepassingsmoontlikhede van die gerekenariseerde databasis vir die Bybelse Dooie See-rolle" *Journal for Semitics* 1/2 (1989) 50-65. (10) "Die Dooie See rolle na Veertig Jaar" *TGW* 29/4 (1989) 302-314. (11) "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls" *Revue de Qumran* 14/2 (1989) 291-303. (12) "On Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint." Pp. 75-85 in the *Proceedings of the 11th Annual conference of the South African Association of Jewish Studies, 4-7th September 1988*, Durban, 1990. (13) Reports that the following items (in the format that appears below) are **In the press**: A Systematic Approach to the Targumim?, Review-article of E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible*, De Gruyter, 1988, for *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Review of J.-P. Rothschild en G.D. Sixdenier, *Études samaritaines Pentateuque te [sic] Targum, exégèse et philologie, chroniques*, Peeters, 1988 for *JNSL*. The Computer at Qumran in *Logos*, periodical of the Academy, Namibia (Windhoek). Hannah and/or Elkana on their way home (1 Sam 2:11)? *Old Testament Essays (OTE)* 3/3 (1990). Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs, Kongresvolume van die *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, red. Claude Cox, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta), Scholars Press. A Computer-assisted Study of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls-with a special reference to orthography, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Recent Developments in Peshitta Studies, JNSL XV* (1989). Interpreting the Peshitta, *JNSL XV* (1989). On the relationship between the Septuagint and 11QPs<sup>a</sup> on account of the Computerized database, proceedings of the Congress on the relationship between the Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Manchester). *A Concordance for the Peshitta Version of the Old Testament (Genesis)* (editor). *The Computer At Qumran: A computerized data base for the Qumran biblical scrolls*. A publication of the proceedings of the first Septuagint-congress to take place in South-Africa at Stellenbosch (17th September 1990), *The Septuagint in the South*, is currently being prepared. Veelsydigheid en oorspronklikheid: Frank Charles Fensham die wetenskaplike, *Tydskrif vir Letterkunde*, Jan 1991. The Septuagint in South Africa *Bulletin of the SAHSRC*, January, 1991.
- Deist, Ferdinand E. *Witnesses to the Old Testament. Introducing Old Testament Textual Criticism*. The Literature of the Old Testament 5. Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1988.
- Diamond, A. R. Pete. "Jeremiah's Confessions in the LXX and MT: A Witness to Developing Canonical Function?" *VT LX*, 1 (1990) 33-50.
- Dorival, Gilles. et. al. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Vol. 2, L'Exode* (tr. Alain Le Boulluec and Peirre Sandevor) Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1989.
- Fischer, B. (1) *Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 15. *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10 Jahrhundert*. Freiburg: Herder. II. Varianten zu Markus (1989). (2) III. Varianten zu Lukas (1990).
- Frede, Hermann J. (ed.) (1) *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel* 25. Pars II. *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum., Titum Philemonem, Hebraeos*. Freiburg: Herder. 3. Lieferung: Hbr Vorberkung und 1,2 (1987). (2) 4. Lieferung: Hbr 1,2-2,16 (1987). (3) 6. Lieferung: Hbr 5,8-7,10 (1989) (4) 7. Lieferung: Hbr 7,10-9,12 (1990). (5) 8. Lieferung: Hbr 9,12-10,28 (1990).
- Gryson, Roger (ed.). *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel* 12. *Esaias*. Freiburg: Herder. Fascicule 1: Introduction; Is I, 1-22 (1987). (2) Fascicule 4: Is7, 14—10,19 (1989).

- Hiebert, Robert J. V. *The "Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*. SBLSCS 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Kaestli, Jean-Daniel and O. Wemeling (edd). *Le Canon de l'Ancien Testament. Sa Formation et son Histoire*. Le Monde de la bible. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1984.
- Knoppers, Gerald Neil. (1) "What Share Have We in David?: The Division of the Kingdom in Kings and Chronicles" Dissertation under revision for publication in *Harvard Semitic Monographs* (2) "Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?" in *JBL* (forthcoming). (3) "A Reunited Kingdom in Chronicles?" *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 9 (1989) 74-88. (4) Review of: JAMES BARR, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. in *JETS* (forthcoming).
- Kooij, A. van der. (1) "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation" in: J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah / Le Livre d'Isaïe* (BETL 81) Leuven: 1989, 127-33. (2) "De tent van David: Amos 9: 11-12 in the Griekse bijbel" in: B. Becking, J. van Dorp, A. van der Kooij (red.) *Door het oog van de profeten. Exegetische studies aangeboden aan prof. dr. C. van Leeuwen* (Utrechtse Theologische Reeks 8), Utrecht 1989, 49-56. (3) "Abraham, vader van/voor een menigte volkeren. Gen. 17: 4-5 in het Hebreeuws, alsmede in de Griekse, Aramase en Syrische vertaling" (Inaugural lecture, University at Leiden, 23 February 1990), Leiden 1990. (4) "Zur Frage des Anfangs des I. Esrabuches" (forthcoming in *ZAW*).
- Löfstedt, Bengt. *Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 14. Sedulius Scottus. Kommentar Zum Evangelium nach Matthäus 1,1-11,1*. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.
- Martínez Borobio, Emiliano ed. *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en Tradición Babilónica*. Vol. I: Josué-Jueces Textos y Estudios «Cardinal Cisneros» 46. Madrid: CSIC, 1989.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "In Defense of the Unity of the Septuagint Minor Prophets," *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 15 (1989) 25-36.
- Rehkopf, Friedrich. *Septuaginta-Vokabular*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1989.
- Stipp, Hermann-Josef. (1) "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen." *BZ* n.s. 34/1 (1990) 16-37. (2) "Textkritik — Literarkritik — Textentwicklung. Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik." *ETL* 66/1 (1990) 143-59.
- Stuchenbruck, Loren T. "Revision of Aramaic-Greek and Greek-Aramaic Glossaries in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* by J. T. Milik," *JJS* XLV,1 (1990) 13-48.

- Thiele, Walter (ed.). (1) *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bible. 11/2. Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. 3. Lieferung: Sir Prolog und 1,1-3,31. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.
- Tov, E. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scrolls from Nahal Hever (8 Hev XIIgr)* Discoveries in the Judean Desert VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum. Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los libros de Samuel y Reyes*. Textos y Estudios «Cardinal Cisneros» Madrid: CSIC, 1989.
- Ulrich, Eugene C. (1) "A Greek Paraphrase of Exodus on Papyrus from Qumran Cave 4." Pp. 287-298 in Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast und John Wm Wevers, eds., *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990. (2) Orthography and Text in 4QDan<sup>a</sup> and 4QDan<sup>b</sup> and in the Received Masoretic Text." Pp. 29-42 in H. W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas Tobin, eds., *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Landham, MD: University Press of America, 1990. (3) "Jewish, Christian and Empirical Perspectives on the Text of Our Scriptures." Pp. 69-85 in Roger Brooks and John J. Collins, eds., *Hebrew Bible or Old Testament? : Studying the Bible in Judaism and Christianity*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 5. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1990. (4) "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: An Overview and a Progress Report on Their Publication." Pp. 207-228 in F. García Martínez, ed., *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community: Proceedings of the Groningen Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls (20-23 August 1989)*. Vol. 1 *Biblical Texts*. Paris: Gabalda, 1989. [= *Revue de Qumran* 14/2 No. 54 (December 1989) 207-228]. (5) "Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel." Pp. 81-96 in Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, eds., *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1989. (6) "The Paleo-Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4." In *Proceedings of the Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes [in press]. (7) The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value." In George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, eds., *The Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings*. SBLSCS Atlanta: Scholars Press [in press].
- Vermeylen, J. ed. *Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures, unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*. BETL 81. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Wevers, John W. (1) *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SBLSCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990. (2) Ed. with D. Frankel and U. Quast *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990 [see News and Notes]. (3) "Pre-Origen Recensional Activity in the Greek Exodus." Pp. 121-39 in



(2) *supra*. (3) "Critical Editions of Canonical Texts: The Göttingen Septuagint" *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series V* Vol. II (1987) 131-138.

## REVIEWS:

- ALEXANDER, MONIQUE. *Le Commencement du Livre Genèse I-IV. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception.* (Christianisme Antique Bibliothèque de recherche dirigée par P. Nauten) Paris: Beauchesne, 1988. Reviewed by: Alision Salvesen in *JJS* 40 (1989) 246-7; F. Manns in *Liber Annuus* 39 (1989) 339-40.
- BAR-KOCHVA, B. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleukids.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. Reviewed by: O. Kaiser in *ZAW* 102 (1990) 141.
- BARTHÉLEMY DOMINIQUE, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, 2: Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations.* OBO 50/2 (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986). Reviewed by: Joseph Schreiner in *Biblische Zeitschrift* 34 (1990) 113-16.
- BLINKINSOPP, JOSEPH. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary.* OT Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988 and London: SCM Press 1989. Reviewed by: Tamara C. Eskenazi in *JBL* 109 (1990) 525-7; H.C. Schmitt in *ZAW* 102 (1990) 143; S. McEvenue in *Biblica* 71 (1990) 100-102.
- CALLAWAY, PHILLIP R. *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation.* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 3.) Sheffield: Academic Press, 1988. Reviewed by: Geza Vermes in *JJS* 40 (1989) 116-17; J. A. Emerton in *VT* 40 (1990) 125.
- CROWN, A. D. Ed., *The Samaritans.* Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989. Reviewed by: H. C. Schmidt in *ZAW* 102 (1990) 160.
- DIEZ-MERINO, LUIS. *Targum de Qohelet: Edición Príncipe de Ms. Villa-Amil n° 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Bibliotheca Hispana Biblica 13) Madrid: CSIC, 1987. Reviewed by: Zev Garber in *CBQ* 52 (1990) 109-10.
- DIRKSEN, P. B. *An Annotated Bibliography of the Peshitta of the Old Testament.* Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 5. Leiden: E.J. Brill. (date not cited). Reviewed by: J. A. Emerton in *VT* 40 (1990) 126.
- FERNANDEZ MARCOS, NATALIO and BUSTO SAIZ, JOSÉ RAMON eds. *El Texto Antioqueno De La Biblia Griega Vol. I: 1-2 Samuel* Madrid: CSIC, 1989. Reviewed by: J. Lust in *ETL* 66 (1990) 180-2.
- GIGNOUX, PHILIPPE. *Incantations magiques syriaques* (Collection de la Revue des Études Juives) Louvain: E. Peeters, 1987. Reviewed by: Sebastian Brock in *JJS* 40 (1989) 121-124.
- HARL, M. ed. *La Bible d'Alexandrie I: La Genèse.* Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986. Reviewed by: J. A. Emerton in *VT* 40 (1990) 128.
- HEATER, HOMER, JR. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job.* (CBQ Monograph Series 11) Washington DC, 1982. Reviewed by: Ernst Kutsch. in *Biblische Zeitschrift* 34 (1990) 127-8.
- JEANSONNE, SHARON PACE. *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12.* CBQMS 19 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988). Reviewed by: Wolfgang Schenk in *Biblische Zeitschrift* 34 (1990) 128-129; G. Bissoli in *Liber Annuus* 38 (1988) 483-85.
- KNIBB, M. A. *The Qumran Community.* Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Reviewed by: J. A. Emerton in *VT* 40 (1990) 246.
- NELSON, MILWARD. DOUGLAS. *The Syriac Version of the Wisdom of Ben Sira Compared to the Greek and Hebrew Materials.* (SBLDS 107) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988. Reviewed by A. de Halleux in *ETL* 66 (1990) 194; A. Di Lella in *CBQ* 52 (1990) 329-31.
- PRIJS, LEO. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta: Die Grammatikalische Terminologie des Abraham Ibn Esra.* (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 1987). Reviewed by: Richard White in *JJS* 40 (1989) 124.
- TREBOLLE BARRERA, JULIO. *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum. Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los libros de Samuel y Reyes.* Textos y Estudios «Cardinal Cisneros» Madrid: CSIC, 1989. Reviewed by: J. Lust in *ETL* 66 (1990) 180-2.
- WRIGHT, BENJAMIN G. *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text.* SBLSCS 26 Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989. Reviewed by: J. Lust in *ETL* 66 (1990) 190-92.

THE STORY OF DAVID AND GOLIATH (1 SAM 17-18):  
TEXTUAL VARIANTS AND LITERARY COMPOSITION<sup>1</sup>

JULIO TREBOLLE

Universidad Complutense, Madrid

The lack of some sections of the Masoretic Text (MT) in the Old Greek (OG) version of 1 Sam 17-18 creates a dilemma as yet unsolved: did the Greek translator (or his Hebrew *Vorlage*) abbreviate a longer text, or did the MT add to a shorter Hebrew text like that reflected by the LXX? The criteria for solving this question are usually those of *Tendenzkritik*: a tendency to harmonize tensions among the various episodes could have led the Greek translator — or more probably a Hebrew editor — to omit certain disturbing or inconvenient passages.<sup>2</sup> The MT of Samuel, however, can in places be considered as an expanded and later text, whereas the LXX of this book is not known (outside these two chapters under discussion) to delete; therefore, the Greek translator must have been familiar with a shorter Hebrew text than that preserved in the

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the SBL Annual Meeting 1987 (Boston 5-8 December) in the Old Testament Textual Criticism Section.

<sup>2</sup>This is the view of Budde and, more recently, of Barthélemy and Pisano. Cf. K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel. Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Giessen 1890) 212; D. Barthélemy, "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS — Vienna, ed. E. Tov (Jerusalem 1980) 1-44; S. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*, OBO 57 (Freiburg/Göttingen 1984) 78-86.

MT.<sup>3</sup> This question has recently been the subject of a recent joint research venture, produced by Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust, and Tov.<sup>4</sup>

This paper attempts a different approach to the question concerning the priority of the longer or shorter form of the text. The method to be followed consists of a two-fold analysis of the text-critical questions and of the compositional techniques employed by the editor(s) of these chapters. The textual variants to be considered are double readings and resumptive repetitions. These are not merely the work of copyists and glossators, but are traces of transpositions and insertions made by the editor(s) or composer(s) of these chapters.

I. 1 Sam 18:16-28

We commence by proposing a case of double reading attested by the Lucianic text (LXX<sup>L</sup>) and connected with two resumptive repetitions. At the end of the episode where David wins the hand of Michal by killing 200 Philistines (1 Sam 18:20-28), the Antiochian text presents a conflate reading, which is characteristically Lucianic: "and Michal, daughter of Saul, and all Israel loved him" (18:28b):

LXX <sup>L</sup>	LXX <sup>B</sup>	MT
καὶ Μελλοὺ	καὶ	ומיכל
ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ		בת שאול
καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραηλ	πᾶς Ἰσραηλ	
ἠγάπα αὐτόν	ἠγάπα αὐτόν	אהבתהו

<sup>3</sup>Other authors adhering to this view include J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen 1871); R. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg i. Breisgau 1899) 30-62; H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament 8/1; Gütersloh 1973) 313; and P. K. McCarter, *1 Samuel* (Anchor Bible 8; New York 1980) 306-307.

<sup>4</sup>D. Barthélemy, D. W. Gooding, J. Lust, and E. Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Research Venture* (OBO 73; Fribourg [Suisse]/Göttingen 1986).

Whereas the MT reads "and Michal, daughter of Saul, loved him (David)," LXX<sup>B</sup> has "and all Israel loved him." The Antiochean text presents a conflate reading, characteristically Lucianic. Each of these two readings is related to its own context. The first, "Michal, daughter of [Saul], loved him" (καὶ Μελχοὺ ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ ἠγάπα αὐτόν = MT), repeats the content of v 20a: דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד // καὶ ἠγάπησεν Μελχοὺ ἡ θυγάτηρ Σαουλ τὸν Δαυειδ. This sentence introduces the episode of vv 20, 21a, 22-27 concerning David's marriage to Michal. Likewise the second reading, "and all Israel loved him" (καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ ἠγάπα αὐτόν), repeats the expression found in the MT and the LXX at v 16a (דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד // καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδας ἠγάπα τὸν Δαυειδ). This second repetition defines a broader inclusion, which encompasses also the episode in vv 17-19 (concerning Saul's daughter Merab, previously promised to David), which is wanting in the OG:

- 16a דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד  
(17-19 >OG, David and Merab)
- 20a דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד  
(20-21a, 22-27, 28a, David and Michal)
- 28 דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד (MT)  
דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד (LXX<sup>L</sup>)

These two episodes (vv 17-19 and 20-28\*) are connected by v 21b, which is missing in the OG: "Thus for the second time Saul said to David: 'You will become my son-in-law today!'" After Saul's discourse in 21a, a resumptive repetition (דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד) allows the insertion of a second discourse of redactional character (v 21b):

- 21a דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד ויאמר שאול אחננה לו ותהי לו למוקש ותהי בו יד פלשתים
- 21b >OG דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד ויאמר שאול אל דוד בשנים תחתך בי היום

The double reading attested by LXX<sup>L</sup> and – separately – by MT and LXX<sup>B</sup> in 18:28b has the editorial function of linking two literary units, the first of which is wanting in the shorter OG text.

## II. 1 Sam 18:1-4

18:1-4 belongs to a section lacking in the OG. At the beginning of v 1 LXX<sup>L</sup> offers a double reading:

LXX <sup>L</sup>	MT
καὶ ἐγένετο	ויהי
ὡς εἰσῆλθεν Δαυιδ (=בבא דוד)	
πρὸς Σαουλ καὶ (=אל שאול ר')	
συνετέλεσεν λαλῶν αὐτῷ	ככלתו לדבר אל שאול
εἶδεν αὐτὸν Ἰωνθαν (=וירא אתו יהונתן)	
καὶ συνεδέθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ	ונפש יהונתן

Instead of the Masoretic reading "After David finished talking to Saul," the Lucianic version has a longer text: "When David came to Saul and finished talking to him, Jonathan saw him..." (καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς εἰσῆλθεν Δαυιδ πρὸς Σαουλ καὶ συνετέλεσεν λαλῶν αὐτῷ εἶδεν αὐτὸν Ἰωνθαν // ויהי בבא דוד אל שאול וככלתו לדבר לו וירא אתו יהונתן — cf. 17:55 דוד ויהודה אהב את דוד) (וכראות שאול את דוד).<sup>5</sup> The conflate reading of LXX<sup>L</sup>, "When David came to Saul" // "When David finished talking to him (=MT)," could be the result of a resumptive repetition, (אל/ל שאול... אל/ל שאול). This conflate reading should not be explained as a phenomenon of textual transmission, but as a vestige of editorial activity. Neither a Greek recensor nor a Hebrew copyist would have introduced such a reading in such a context, thereby challenging an

<sup>5</sup>The two words underlying the Lucianic reading, בבא דוד, are similar to כשוב דוד in v 6 of the MT. In both cases the expression "When David came..." connects the episodes of 18:1ff. and 18:6ff. with 17:54.

already extant Masoretic reading. Each of these two readings is part of the thread connecting two different sections of the text.

(1) The reading known to LXX<sup>L</sup>, "When David came to Saul, Jonathan saw him...", introduces vv 1-4 and attaches these verses to the end of the story of David and Goliath (17:54). Both passages are linked by the motif of the armor: David keeps Goliath's armor in his tent, Jonathan sees him coming before the king, and — taking off his own armor — gives it to David.

(2) The MT reading (18:1aa), "When [David] had finished speaking to Saul...", connects v 2 with the episode of 17:55-58. After slaying the Philistine, David is presented to Saul and identifies himself as the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite (17:58); then Saul does not allow him to return to his father's home (18:2).

The repetition of 1b, "Jonathan loved [David] like himself" (MT ויאהב אתו יהונתן כנפשו, ויאהבתו אתו כנפשו), in v 3b (MT באהבתו אתו כנפשו) is a case of resumptive repetition, which proves that v 1 continues in v 4.<sup>6</sup>

	vv. 1*, 4	vv. 1*, 2
1a	ויהי	ויהי
		(MT) ככלתו לדבר
	(LXX <sup>L</sup> ) בנא דוד	אל שאול
	אל שאול ו-	
	(LXX <sup>L</sup> ) וירא אתו יהונתן	
1b	<u>ויאהבו יהונתן כנפשו</u>	
2		ויקחהו שאול ביום ההוא
		ולא נתנו לשוב בית אביו
3a	(ויכרת יהונתן ודוד ברית)	
3b	<u>באהבתו אתו כנפשו</u>	
4	ויתפשט יהונתן את המעיל ...	

<sup>6</sup>This analysis confirms with slight modifications the main conclusion arrived at by J. Lust: "1 Sam 17:1-11; 32-54; 18:1b (3), 4 are a well balanced composition, interrupted by 17:12-31, 55-58; 18:2 and by some shorter passages" (J. Lust [et al.], *The Story of David and Goliath*, 12). However, Lust's proposal of explaining the absence of vv 18:1, 3-4 in LXX<sup>B</sup> as a case of parablepsis remains highly hypothetical.

1a	When	When
	David came (LXX <sup>L</sup> )	[David] had finished speaking (MT)
	to Saul	to Saul
	Jonathan saw him (LXX <sup>L</sup> )	
	and became as fond of David	
	as if his life depended on him.	
1b	<u>He loved him as he loved himself</u>	
2		Saul lay claim to [David] that day
		and did not allow him to return to his
		father's home.
3a	(And Jonathan entered into a bond	
	with David,)	
3a	<u>because he loved him as he loved himself.</u>	
4	Jonathan divested himself of the mantle ....	

### III. 1 Sam 18:5-16

In 18:5a LXX<sup>L</sup> offers two variants:

(1) The sentence of MT 5aa appears in LXX<sup>L</sup> after 5aβ:

	LXX <sup>L</sup>	MT
aα)		ויצא דוד
		בכל אשר ישלחנו שאול ישכיל
aβ)	καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν Σαουλ	וישמהו שאול
	ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦ πολέμου	
(=aα)	συνιῶν ἐν πάσιν οἷς ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν Σαουλ	

The transposition reflected by LXX<sup>L</sup> is also found in the parallel text of v 13.<sup>7</sup> This is the obvious sequence of events: Saul did not allow David to return to Bethlehem, but put him in command of the troops; David then carried out successfully every mission on which Saul sent him. According to the MT of v 5, however, David is sent on mission even before having been put in charge of the troops.

(2) The text attested by LXX<sup>L</sup> in v 5aa reads as follows: "And David went out and marched home successfully in whatever mission..." (*καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐλσεπορεύετο σπουδῶν ἐν πάσων...*). It adds the verb וַיֵּצֵא to MT וַיֵּצֵא, as is also the case in v 13. Instead of MT יִשְׁכַּל, which is grammatically incorrect, LXX<sup>L</sup> reads מִשְׁכַּל as in v 14.<sup>8</sup>

Verse 5 is to be read according to the text and order reflected by the Lucianic version: "Saul put him in command of the fighting men and David went out and marched successfully (מִשְׁכַּל) in whatever mission Saul sent him" —

וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ שְׂאוּל עַל אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וַיֵּצֵא דָוִד וַיִּבֵּא מִשְׁכַּל בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחנֹו שְׂאוּל.<sup>9</sup>

Verses 5 and 13-14 have many words in common. They form a resumptive repetition, which includes the two episodes referring to Saul's jealousy (18:6-9 and 10-11):

18:13aβ-14a	18:5 (LXX <sup>L</sup> )
וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ לוֹ	וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ שְׂאוּל
שֶׁר אֵלָף	עַל אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה
וַיֵּצֵא וַיִּבֵּא	וַיֵּצֵא דָוִד וַיִּבֵּא
לפני העם	
וַיְהִי דָוִד לְכָל דְּרוֹכֵי מִשְׁכַּל	מִשְׁכַּל בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחנֹו שְׂאוּל

<sup>7</sup>McCarter (301, 303) follows LXX<sup>L</sup> here.

<sup>8</sup>Wellhausen, Budde, Smith and others tried to overcome the problem of MT יִשְׁכַּל by prefixing it with *waw*; Caspari proposed omitting it altogether. The vocalization of the imperfect [וַיֵּצֵא] is not to be changed to the frequentative [וַיֵּצֵא], *pace* Budde, Caspari, and de Groot; cf. Stoebe, 343.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. the discussion by Lust, 126.

At the end of v 18:16, LXX reads *πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ* (= לפני העם), instead of MT לפנייהם. The LXX reading is a better-adjusted repetition of the phrase in v 13:

v. 13b וַיֵּצֵא וַיִּבֵּא לְפָנֵי הָעָם

(vv. 14-16a)

v. 16b וַיֵּצֵא וַיִּבֵּא לְפָנֵי הָעָם (LXX; MT לפנייהם)

The resumptive repetition noted above, "all Israel (and Judah) loved David" (18:16a and 28b), encloses the two literary units concerning Merab and Michal (18:17-19, 20-27). Other repetitions reveal the intensive editorial activity that affected the context before and after those units. Several expressions from vv 12, 14, 15 are found in vv 28-29:

v 12 "Saul feared David" (וַיִּירָא שְׂאוּל מִלְּפָנֵי דָוִד) = v 29 "Therefore Saul feared David all the more" (וַיִּאֲסֹף שְׂאוּל לְרֵא מִפְּנֵי דָוִד).

v 14b "and Yahweh was with him" (וַיְהִי הוָיָה עִמּוֹ) = v 28 "and Yahweh was with David" (וַיְהִי עִם דָוִד).

v 15 = v 28: "and Saul saw..." (וַיִּירָא שְׂאוּל).

The editor of the longer text repeated these expressions in order to obtain an easier and smoother transition among the different episodes of the composition. The edition of the longer text seems to presuppose here the shorter form of the text.

We now return to v 18:6aa, which is lacking in the OG. The MT offers a new instance of double reading: "At their approach (i.e., of Saul and David), on David's return after slaying the Philistine" (בְּשׁוּב דָוִד // יְהִי בְּבֹאֵם).<sup>10</sup> This conflate reading is related to another double reading present in v 6aβ. Each component of the doublet has been preserved individually in a textual witness (whether MT or LXX):

<sup>10</sup>McCarter, 310.

LXX  
καὶ ἐξῆλθον  
  
αἱ χορεύουσαι  
εἰς συνάντησιν Δαυειδ  
ἐκ πασῶν πόλεων Ἰσραηλ

MT  
והצאנה  
הנשים

מכל ערי ישראל  
לשור והמחלות  
לקראת שאול המלך

According to the MT, the women came out "to meet Saul" (לקראת שאול), whereas the OG says they came out "to meet David" (εἰς συνάντησιν Δαυειδ). The Greek reading is based upon the shorter form of the text (v 18:6a follows here after 17:54), while the reading of the MT, "to meet Saul," belongs to the longer text. Here the episode of vv 17:55-58 + 18:2, 5 precedes that of 18:6-9. The conflate reading of the longer text ("at their approach" // "on David's return") reflects a double tradition. According to the older tradition, the Israelite women came out to meet David on his return after slaying the Philistine. Following the more developed tradition, however, they came out to meet "King Saul" and David after the missions on which Saul had sent him.<sup>11</sup>

#### IV. 1 Sam 17:13-15

A new case of resumptive repetition is found in 17:13-14:

17:13a וילכו שלשת בני ישי הגדלים הלכו אחרי שאול למלחמה  
13b וישם שלשת בניו אשר הלכו במלחמה  
אליאב הבכור ומשנהו אבינדב והשלשי שמה  
14a ורוד הוא הקטן

<sup>11</sup>The first tradition is the older one from the point of view of the editorial history of the text, and probably also from the viewpoint of the historical course of events. For a contrary position, cf. Barthélemy (et al.), *The Story of David and Goliath*, 50: "18:5 n'a été rédigé que pour fournir une introduction à 18,7."

14b ושלשה הגדלים הלכו אחרי שאול  
15 ורוד הלך ושב מעל שאול לדעות את צאן אביו בית לחם

17:13a "The three oldest sons of Jesse had followed Saul to war.

13b [The three sons who had gone off to war were named, the first-born Eliab, the second son Abinadab, and the third Shammah.

14a David was the youngest.]

14b While the three oldest had followed Saul.

15 David would go out and return from Saul's side to shepherd his father's flock in Bethlehem."

In v 17:13a of the MT, the word הלכו repeats the preceding וילכו and is itself repeated in 13b and 14 (הלכו), although the second instance of הלכו is generally omitted.<sup>12</sup> Besides the repetition of הלכו, the whole clause of v 13a, "[the three] oldest sons had gone after Saul" (הלכו אחרי שאול) (הגדלים), is repeated soon afterwards in v 14b. By the technique of resumptive repetition the glossator incorporated the following text: "The names of the three sons who went to the war were: the first-born Eliab, the second Abinadab and the third Shammah. David was the youngest" (vv 13b-14a). This is designed to connect the passage of 17:12-30 (31), which is lacking in the OG, with the stories of the preceding chapter 16.<sup>13</sup> Although some authors assign this function to vv 14b, 15,<sup>14</sup> in our opinion the sentence of v 15, "David went back and forth from Saul's side to shepherd his father's flock in Bethlehem," refers to David's going back and forth from the encampment of Saul, and not from the royal court (16:14-23). This is confirmed by the two other passages where the same expression מעל הלך is also found: 2 Sam 10:14, "So Joab returned to Jerusalem from the Ammonite campaign" (וישב יואב מעל בני עמון), and 2 Kgs 18:14, according to which

<sup>12</sup>S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1890) 141; Stoebe 322; McCarter 302.

<sup>13</sup>"The names in 17,13 may have been inserted in order to strengthen the link with the context," Lust 124.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Stoebe 322; McCarter 303; Tov 43; Barthélemy 48; Lust 90.

Hezekiah, besieged by Sennacherib, sends him the message: "Withdraw from me" (שׁוּב מֵעַלַי). In both instances the context is one of military conflict, as is also the case in our passage.<sup>15</sup>

In conclusion, v 15 follows after v 13a: "His three oldest sons had followed Saul to war. (15) David went back and forth from Saul's side to shepherd his father's flock in Bethlehem." The awkwardness of the verb הִלְכוּ (v 13a) is better explained in terms of the resumptive repetition that encompasses vv 13b-14a.<sup>16</sup>

Other textual variants related to resumptive repetitions are the following:

(1) In v 16:1 LXX<sup>L</sup> reads καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουηλ: "(1a) And Yahweh said to Samuel, "How long will you go on mourning over Saul when I have rejected him as king of Israel?" (1b) And Yahweh said to Samuel (MT om.), "Fill your horn with oil and go...." V. 16:1a was added in order to link the stories of chapters 15 and 16.

(2) In vv 17:34 and 37a the words וַיֹּאמֶר introduce two speeches by David, the second of which (37a) is omitted by the OG. However, the repetition preserved in the MT is preferable, since it enables the reader to recognize two independent speeches that are juxtaposed here (17:34-36 and 37).<sup>17</sup>

### V. The Longer and Shorter Forms of the Text

The question of the origin and character of the pre-Hexaplaric and pre-Lucianic (proto-Theodotianic?) text in the passages missing in the B text of the

<sup>15</sup>The reading מֵעַל of some mss could be preferable to MT מֵעַלַי.

<sup>16</sup>Tov (43) thinks, however, that "we may be confronted here with a textual rather than an editorial problem."

<sup>17</sup>17:8-9 and 10 also juxtapose two speeches of David, both introduced by וַיֹּאמֶר. Therefore, the expression common to vv 26 and 36 — חָרַף מְעַרְבֵּן אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים — should probably not be considered, as Barthélemy maintains, "un indice littéraire confirmant que 17,32-54 a été rédigé comme la suite de 17,12-31" (D. Barthélemy [et al.], *The Story of David and Goliath*, 50).

Old Greek) requires further investigation.<sup>18</sup> In each case, the Hebrew *Vorlage* was not necessarily identical with the MT.

The longer text of the Masoretic tradition, which is also attested by the Hexaplaric and Lucianic texts ("Edition II"), is a highly elaborated text.<sup>19</sup> The conflate readings related to resumptive repetitions — characteristic of a *longer* text — are not necessarily *later* phenomena occurred during the process of textual transmission. They are, rather, precious traces of the work accomplished by the editor(s) who linked the various compositional units by employing such editorial techniques.

The OG attests a stage in the composition history ("Edition I"), in which the units 17:1-11, 32-54\*, 18:6\*-9 and 18:12a, 13-16, 20-28\*, 29a formed a loose composition. As a characteristic of this account, a jealous Saul makes David commander of the troops in order to send him into hazardous combat against the Philistines.

The longer form of the text — attested by the Masoretic tradition (Edition II) — adds a series of literary units that are related to each other (cf. vv 17:25 and 18:17-19) and to the episodes collected earlier in Edition I. The passage 18:10-11 (Saul's jealousy) refers to 16:14-23 (Saul's evil spirit and David as a harpist). Verses 18:1, 4 allude to the episodes concerning Jonathan and David (1 Sam 14, 20, 23; 2 Sam 9). The "romantic" story of 17:12-30 [31] is opposed to the "heroic" version of 17:1-11, 32-54\*. The scene in 18:10-11 concerning Saul's jealousy parallels that of 18:6-9, just as the episode

<sup>18</sup> As J. Lust comments: "The Lucianic codices certainly do not preserve any trace of the Old Greek.... Nevertheless, it appears possible to discern some important characteristics of the prehexaplaric Greek text" (Lust, 6f.). With reference to 17:4, he affirms: "We may suggest that the Lucianic codices have preserved here (17:4) a trace of the early Greek text" (Lust 16 n.21). If it is true that "the (Lucianic) 'pluses' are probably due to hexaplaric influence" (Lust, 16 n.14), Tov's assertion should be noted: "The origin of the Hexaplaric pluses in 1 Sam 17-18 is probably *kaige*-Theodotion" (Tov, 19).

<sup>19</sup> "The redactor for the massoretic text type did a very skillful job" (Lust, 125). This point is particularly stressed by Gooding: "Our idea was that if Version 1's original thought-flow had been infiltrated by later, ill-adapted, elements from another version, those elements would show up as disturbances within an otherwise smooth-flowing narrative sequence. We have discovered no such disturbances. On the contrary, we have found that the combined version as it stands is a highly-wrought, sophisticated, narrative-sequence, that everywhere makes excellent sense. The only unsatisfactory features we have found have been features peculiar to Version 1" (Gooding, 74-75).

concerning Merab (18:17-19) parallels that about Michal (18:20-28). Finally, according to 18:5 Saul puts David in command of the fighting men out of admiration for David's victory over Goliath and the Philistines. This is in marked contrast with vv 18:13-15, where Saul acts out of jealousy, and tries to get rid of David by sending him on a risky mission. Edition II makes one episode follow the other (Saul rewards David but later dismisses him); accordingly two episodes that were previously unrelated are now presented as successive steps in David's career.

The episodes collected in Edition I appear never to have comprised a continuous and complete narrative strand. Likewise, it is not certain that, by collecting all the material added in Edition II (17:12-31, 41, 48b, 50), we are in fact able to reconstruct a second version of the story of David and Goliath.<sup>20</sup> Verses 41 and 48a, omitted by the OG, are best understood as sutures of the composition rather than as fragments of this hypothetical parallel version of the story. They are likely to have been introduced by the editor of the longer text (Edition II).<sup>21</sup>

<u>Edition I</u>	<u>Edition II</u>	
MT - LXX	MT+	MT+
Literary Units	Literary Units	Editorial Sutures
David and Goliath I		
17:1-9 (10) 11		
	David and Goliath II	
	17:12-30 (31)	
	32-33 (34-36 עךך)	

<sup>20</sup> "Version 2 could not have existed separately" (Tov, 19).

<sup>21</sup> Compare the division of the text suggested here with those based on a simple comparison of the pluses and minuses in the MT and LXX texts. McCarter recognizes a first account in 17:1-11, 32-40, 42-48a, 49, 51-54 (MT-OG); and a second account in 17:12-31, 41, 48b, 50, 55-58; 18:1-5, 10-11, 17-19, 29b-30, together with the brief sections 18:6-8a, 9, 12a, 13-16 ("Saul's jealousy of David") and 18:20-21a, 22-27 ("David's marriage to Michal"). 18:28-29a belong to the following section concerning Jonathan's intercession on behalf of David (McCarter, 284-320).

37-40 (42-47 עךך)		v. 41
48a		v. 48b
49		v. 50
51-54		
	David presented to Saul	
	17:55-58	
	18:1,4	
	2 (3a), 5	v.3b
Saul's jealousy I		
18:6aβ-8a, 9		v. 6aα
	Saul's jealousy II	
	18:10-11	
12a		v. 12b
13-14, 15, 16		
	David and Merab	
	18:17-19	
David and Michal		
18:20-21a		v. 21b
22-27		
28a,b (LXX) / b (MT)		
(29a)		v. 29b, 30

Neither the Greek translator nor his Hebrew *Vorlage* abbreviated a longer Hebrew text. The Greek translation reflects faithfully its Hebrew *Vorlage*, which was shorter than the MT and goes back to an older and less elaborated stage in the composition history than that represented in the Masoretic textual tradition.

The material added in Edition II, which was probably transmitted in a very loose composition before its insertion in Edition I, and may be as old as what was collected in the shorter form of the text.<sup>22</sup> The question about the longer

<sup>22</sup> "17,12ff. in the MT preserved the beginning of a story on David's accession to the court of Saul. It is probably older than its present context" (Lust, 125; cf. also 91). "On peut considérer aussi comme admis par tous qu'une bonne partie de la matière textuelle manquant



and shorter texts of 1 Sam 17–18 will be solved only as part of a wider investigation that includes similar cases such as the long miscellanies in LXX III Reg 2 and the LXX account of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12:24a-z). The composition history of the books of Samuel-Kings should be conceived in a way similar to that of the book of Jeremiah, in which the Masoretic textual tradition and that reflected by the OG correspond to two different editions of the book.

As previously indicated, longer readings are not necessarily later readings. Many doublets related to resumptive repetitions — even if they are only attested in such a recent text as the Lucianic — are not later phenomena originating along the process of textual transmission, but remnants of the original sutures that betray the various segments of the composition. In 1 Sam 17–18 these conflate readings and resumptive repetitions reveal the composite character of the biblical story,<sup>23</sup> as well as the editorial techniques employed by Editor II to insert his new material into the previous work of Editor I.

---

dans le \*G est au moins aussi ancienne que la matière textuelle commune au \*M et au \*G, et qu'elle est même plus ancienne qu'une partie de cette matière commune" (Barthélemy, 138).

<sup>23</sup> "In my view the solution to the problem lies in the question [of] whether or not the biblical story is *composite*. If the story is *not* composite, there is equal chance that the short form was created by truncation or that the long form was created by expansion. But if we recognize that the story in its present form in the Bible is composite, the situation changes. For in that case the assumption of an expansion becomes much more likely" (Tov, 134).

## EVALUATING MINORITY VARIANTS WITHIN FAMILIES OF GREEK MANUSCRIPTS<sup>1</sup>

Bernard A. Taylor, Loma Linda, California

### Introduction

In an attempt to utilize the evidence of families and sub-families of manuscripts in reconstructing the Hebrew Vorlage the text critic is often confronted by a minority or singular reading. While the reading may be attractive, especially as supporting some particular theory, is it reliable?

Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS) is in the process of creating a computer database of all known Greek variants. The Rahlfs text<sup>2</sup> is the base text,<sup>3</sup> and the readings of the various manuscripts are grouped around this text in a standardized format to indicate their relation to it: whether they share the base text reading, are an omission, substitution, or transposition of it, or are an addition to it.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This is a revision of a paper presented to the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible section at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Anaheim, CA, November 20, 1989.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. 9th ed (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), encoded for the computer by *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

<sup>3</sup>This was used for two reasons: because it is complete for the whole Septuagint, and because it was already encoded. It is planned that in time this will be replaced by the Göttingen text as the base text.

<sup>4</sup>For details see John R. Abercrombie, et. al., *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies*. Vol. 1, *Ruth* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), pp. 53-68; and, Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, "Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 14 (Fall, 1981), 22-40.

This paper arises from the analysis of the Lucianic manuscripts in 1 Reigns (1 Samuel)<sup>5</sup> in the context of the CATSS database which was created for the study from the second apparatus of Brooke-McLean's Cambridge Septuagint.<sup>6</sup>

#### What is a Variant?

One of the initial questions to surface in the analysis was: "What is a variant?" Within the context of the CATSS database the immediate answer is: "Any reading that differs with the base text." While this definition is usable when the focus is on the Old Greek text, it is inadequate and irrelevant in the analysis of a family of manuscripts such as the Lucianic manuscripts. In this case it is necessary to subdivide the readings on the basis of some internal (Lucianic) reference point. At first glance it would seem appropriate to select one of the five manuscripts and create a diplomatic edition in the same way that Brooke-McLean used MS B (Vaticanus) as the running text for the Larger Cambridge Septuagint. However, at the beginning of the study, when the selection of the manuscript needs to be made in order to group the other manuscripts around it, there are no known criteria to use as the basis for selection,<sup>7</sup> and history has shown that once a manuscript is selected for this purpose it is often (and, perhaps, even usually) quoted as the quintessential text without reference to the critical apparatus and the variants contained therein.

In order to study what it was that set the Lucianic family apart from the rest of the manuscripts it was necessary to isolate their distinctive readings. By

<sup>5</sup>These are MSS b o c2 e2, with 'b' representing both MS b' and MS b where they share the same reading, for a total of five manuscripts.

<sup>6</sup>A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, with H. St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint*, Vol. 2: The later Historical Books. i. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927).

<sup>7</sup>Various lists of Lucianic characteristics have been built up over the years, but the material has been overdrawn, especially from manuscripts outside of Samuel-Kings that have at best a dubious relation to the Lucianic text, as well as from the New Testament Lucianic text, an influence not always acknowledged. Thus it was decided to recognize only such characteristics as were evident in the Lucianic manuscripts of 1 Reigns. Consequently no manuscript could be selected in any meaningful way until the analysis was done, although a reference point was sought from the outset around which to organize the material for the analysis.

definition these are found among those readings that have the support of less than half of the manuscripts in the database.<sup>8</sup>

Having isolated the Lucianic readings in general, it is still necessary to divide them further so as to organize the plethora of data thus gleaned. Accordingly, the next division is between those readings of the family supported by a majority of the family,<sup>9</sup> and those supported by a minority of them. Patterns that occur regularly among the majority readings are the characteristics of the family that set it apart from the rest of the families in the database. The extent to which non-family manuscripts share these Lucianic readings indicates which manuscripts have been influenced by the Lucianic text, or are, with the Lucianic text, sub-families of another text-type.

Thus the above question can be answered in this way within the context of a family of manuscripts: a variant is any reading of the family that is supported by less than half<sup>10</sup> of the manuscripts in the family. Understood in this way, the text shared in common by the family--the body of majority readings--is the point of reference for establishing family minority readings as variants.

#### Family Minority Readings

It is important to keep in mind that the background for the family minority readings is the text of the family majority readings, not the text of the general database, the "Septuagint," or the Old Greek. To this end a majority text was created as a basis for the study of the Lucianic manuscripts. The running text consists of the (family) majority readings, and the apparatus contains both the

<sup>8</sup>That is to say, 'distinctive' is the antithesis of 'common,' the former referring to readings supported by less than half the manuscripts in the database, and the latter to readings supported by more than half of them.

<sup>9</sup>'Majority of the family' in contradistinction to a majority of the manuscripts in the database.

<sup>10</sup>Theoretically, with five (ie. an odd number of) manuscripts in the family, no reading can be supported by half of them. However, as noted, MS b represents the readings of MS b' and MS b which are two (close) witnesses to the same (sub-Lucianic) text, therefore when they agree they only deserve to be counted once. With four manuscripts under consideration it is common to have split readings divided between such as MSS bo and c2e2, etc., where the support is not "less than half," but at the same time lacks majority support. In practice these are counted as minority variants because they lack majority support, the chief criterion.

family majority readings and the family minority variants along with their Lucianic and non-Lucianic support.<sup>11</sup>

It is helpful to reflect on the sequence of events that transpired over the centuries in the copying process as witnessed to by the manuscripts under consideration. In the fourth century CE an existing Greek manuscript of at least the Books of Samuel-Kings was edited by Lucian, resulting in a new recension.<sup>12</sup> This new manuscript was in turn copied. Shortly after its creation,<sup>13</sup> copies spread out to different *scriptoria* where they were in turn copied until the tenth to fourteenth centuries, between which times the five extant manuscripts are dated.

During the copying process, the manuscripts were impacted in a variety of ways, almost all unintentional, which have left their marks: haplography, dittography, homoioteleuton, etc. Different levels of competency can be seen: some scribes were careless, some were not good spellers, some were more familiar with other manuscripts and harmonized, consciously or unconsciously, to the more popular or (at least to the scribe) better-known text.

However, in no instance does any copyist evidence any sensitivity to the characteristics of the Lucianic text to the extent of extending any characteristic

<sup>11</sup>For details see the writer's two papers read before the IOSCS group: "Analysis of Manuscript Families in the Septuagint: A Method Based upon the Study of the 'Lucian' Manuscripts in 1 Reigns," SBL Annual Meeting, Anaheim, CA, November, 1985; and, "The Majority Text of the Lucian Manuscripts for 1 Reigns: an Update on the Method and the Results," SBL Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, December, 1987.

<sup>12</sup>These manuscripts have been tagged as 'Lucianic' because in the main they agree with distinctive scriptural quotations by key Church Fathers such as Chrysostom and Theodoret from Antioch, where Lucian, described by Jerome as a recensionist, lived. It is not known whether the manuscript upon which Lucian based his recensional work contained the whole of the Septuagint, or, if it did, the extent of his editing. It is known that for the Pentateuch no manuscript is extant that consistently shares the Lucianic characteristics from Samuel-Kings, the standard point of reference.

<sup>13</sup>Sebastian Brock, as a result of his analysis in 1 Reigns, dates the Lucianic text as witnessed to by MSS b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> to the fourth century CE, which is shortly after the text was edited. He says: "The conclusion to be drawn from the investigation . . . is that the five MSS that constitute L[ucian], although none is earlier than the tenth century, accurately reflect the type of text that was current in and around Antioch as early as the first half of the fourth century, that is to say, shortly after Lucian's death" (S. P. Brock, "The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel" [D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1966], p. 196).

beyond the original text, although three new and independent characteristics were introduced.<sup>14</sup>

In addition to these family minority variants (that do not have majority external support), there are family minority readings that have majority support outside of the family. Most are harmonizations to the better known tradition<sup>15</sup> where more common readings have intruded into the Lucianic text. They are identified on the basis of their external (non-Lucianic) support.

Of the 1,632 Lucianic minority variants in 1 Reigns included in the study,<sup>16</sup> only 191, or 11.7%, are shared by two manuscripts. This overwhelming preponderance of single readings bears witness to the fact that minority variants arose in the copying process.<sup>17</sup>

Of all the Lucianic manuscripts, MSS b' and o have the highest incidence of minority variants, most of which are errors when referenced against the Lucianic majority text. From this it would be easy to conclude, as has been done, that these manuscripts are the most Lucianic of the family since they are the most distinctive. In fact this is not the case.

<sup>14</sup>In all but two of the twelve occurrences of *χριστός* MS e<sub>2</sub> has *χρηστός*. The majority (Lucianic) text correctly places the augment between the prefix and the verb in *προφητεύω*. MS b' goes one step further and adds a double augment as in: *ἐπροεφήτευσαν*. Finally, MS b' prefers the form *νότον* over the Lucianic majority *νότον*.

<sup>15</sup>Some are chance occurrences created when Lucianic orthographic variants happen to coincide with the more popular tradition, such as a *ύμῶν* unconsciously altered to the orthographic variant *ήμῶν* which happens to be shared by the wider tradition, one of numerous such interchanges.

<sup>16</sup>Rather than include all of the minority Lucianic variants in the analysis, the level of support by non-family members used as the criterion for inclusion/exclusion was dropped from fourteen (one less than half the manuscripts in the database) to ten, to concentrate on those variants that were more distinctive, and hence more characteristic.

<sup>17</sup>This is not to imply that there is no independent editing in individual manuscripts apart from the unintentional errors, for such is not the case. Confronted by a text that had been corrupted, a copyist would at times (consciously or unconsciously) edit it to make sense out of what was before him. In 1 Reigns 28:14 Saul asks the medium at Endor to describe the form of the figure that she sees. The OG records her as saying that she sees an *άνδρα ὄρθιον*, "an upright man;" whereas MSS *be<sub>2</sub>* (along with A y m Ngh) read the letter variant *άνδρα ὄρθριον*, "a man early." *Ὀρθριον* is also found in MS b', but the(/a) scribe, recognizing that the word was an adverb and not an adjective, moved it after the verb *ἀναβαίνοντα* where it logically belongs once admitted into the text.

This is of more than passing interest because Lagarde, when creating his text of the Lucianic manuscripts,<sup>18</sup> gave prominence to MS b' as the quintessential Lucianic manuscript,<sup>19</sup> preferring its readings over those of any other of the Lucianic manuscripts when there was no Lucianic majority reading available. His next most used manuscript for this purpose was MS o.

### Conclusions

1. Family minority variants are primarily studied in the light of the family majority text, not the "Septuagint" or other external reference point, least of all the Hebrew text.

2. It is necessary to establish whether the minority variants of the family under consideration display any sensitivity to the recensional characteristics of the majority text. In the case of the Lucianic manuscripts they do not. Given the nature of the copying process, were such characteristics to be found among minority readings it would call the corresponding majority readings into question as to whether they represent the family text.

3. Inner Greek errors of any kind among the minority variants must first be excluded. These include variants that in form are legitimate readings, but with reference to the majority text are recognized as orthographic variants. This especially includes all 'exotic' variants whose form happens to correspond with those listed in Liddell-Scott-Jones<sup>20</sup> as Ionic or Doric or other dialectal forms but which are simply copyist errors.<sup>21</sup> Failure to recognize them as such results in misleading, even if attractive, conclusions.

<sup>18</sup>Paul A. de Lagarde, ed., *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior* (Göttingen, 1883).

<sup>19</sup>This is true for 1 Reigns, and may be true for other Books. Driver is certainly not correct for 1 Reigns when he says: "MS 93 [e2] is in the main the basis of Lagarde's text" (S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913<sup>2</sup>), p. xlviii. In fact it is the least used of the five manuscripts.

<sup>20</sup>H. G. Liddell, and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New (9th) ed. revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925-40).

<sup>21</sup>For the reading ὑπόδημα ('sandal') of the majority in 1 Rgns 12:3, MS c has ὑπόδημα ('tunic') in the text, and ὑποδομά ('supporting wall'), the Doric form of ὑποδομή, in the margin. It is clear from the context that this is an inner-Greek variant.

4. Minority variants cannot be excluded *a priori* from consideration. In those places in the text where there is a split reading with no majority reading it is necessary to select from the minority readings that reading which accounts for, or best represents, their combined witness.

5. Especially with minority omissions and additions it is necessary to check first for the respective haplography or dittography before considering external support. Despite impeccable credentials of apparent external support such readings were often found to be 'errors in common.'<sup>22</sup>

6. Minority variants that are supported by manuscripts external to the family, and are not internal errors, are harmonizations, whether intentional or unintentional. The latter occur when a copyist's alteration unwittingly substitutes a word or form that is shared by the wider tradition. Where this leaves no family majority reading it is notoriously difficult to decide which was the original: the one with external support, or the one without it. Knowledge of the characteristics of the text of the family is the only guide.<sup>23</sup>

7. All minority variants, whether errors or not, are included in the critical apparatus of the majority text, but are irrelevant in the apparatus of a text such as the Göttingen Septuagint which is based on the evidence of more than one family.

8. It is theoretically possible that majority readings accidentally combine independent errors, but the overwhelming evidence is against it as a significant factor. It is all too easy for textual criticism to be limited--and held back--by theoretical possibility even though the probability--and evidence--is against it.

<sup>22</sup>At 1 Rgns 5:10 an impressive group of manuscripts (b y Ac z e gv Eus) omits the same passage--καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς εἰρήληθεν κίβωτος θεοῦ εἰς Ἀσκαλῶνα. However, it turns out that they all do it for the same reason--haplography--having jumped from καὶ το καὶ.

<sup>23</sup>At 1 Rgns 11:10 ἡμῶν is read by MSS oe<sub>2</sub> Ba<sub>2</sub> Acx qtz efmsw MNghinvb<sub>2</sub>, and ὑμῶν is read by MSS bc<sub>2</sub> dp a. Given the scattered support for the latter reading, it is more likely that it is a letter variant than that it was the original Lucianic reading, especially since there is no consistent pairing among the Lucianic manuscripts that would add weight to the combined witness of MSS bc<sub>2</sub>.

9. Minority variants cannot be quoted until these steps have been taken, regardless of how attractive they may appear in the light of some external criterion, or even criteria.

10. These results are based on the analysis of the Lucianic manuscripts in 1 Reigns. While it is anticipated that the results will be relevant for other Septuagint books this cannot be assumed; it waits to be investigated.

The Following Contributions are Invited:

1. Record of work published or in progress.  
(Please print or type in publishable format.)
2. Record of Septuagint and cognate theses  
and dissertations completed or in progress.
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, and regional academic  
meetings. Abstracts should be previously  
unpublished, not more than one page,  
double-spaced, including the time, place, and  
occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor  
by June 1 to be included in that year's *Bulletin*.

**BULLETIN SUBSCRIPTION / IOSCS MEMBERSHIP**

Send name, address, and US \$8 to:

Dr. Leonard Greenspoon, IOSCS Secretary-Treasurer

Dept. of Religion and Philosophy

Clemson University

Clemson, South Carolina 29634-1508 USA

In the Netherlands, send subscription price to:

Dr. Arie van der Kooij

Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden

The Netherlands