



BULLETIN NO. 8, FALL, 1975
of the
International Organization for Septuagint
and Cognate Studies

CONTENTS

Minutes of IOSCS Meeting	1
Financial Report	2
News and Notes	3
Record of Work Published, in Hand or Projected	5
Septuagint Abstracts	11
The Göttingen Septuagint J. W. Wevers	19
4QSam ^a and Septuagintal Research Eugene C. Ulrich	24

BULLETIN IOSCS

Published Annually Each Fall by

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

J. W. Wevers
University College
University of Toronto
Toronto 181, Ont., Canada

Immediate Past President

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

Secretary

A. Pietersma
Victoria College
University of Toronto
Toronto 181, Ont., Canada

Treasurer

Eugene Ulrich
Theology Department
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Editor

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

Members at Large

F. M. Cross, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass.)
M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (Jerusalem)
R. Hanhart (Göttingen)
R. A. Kraft (Philadelphia)

ARCHIVISTS

C. T. Fritsch
80 Mercer St.
Princeton, N. J. 08540
A. Pietersma

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

R. W. Klein (St. Louis)
H. M. Orlinsky, Chairman
E. Tov (Jerusalem)

HONORARY PRESIDENT

H. S. Gehman (Princeton)

BOARD OF ADVISORS

D. Barthélemy (Fribourg)
M. Black (St. Andrews)
S. P. Brock (Oxford)
S. Daniel (Jerusalem)
C. T. Fritsch (Princeton)
D. W. Gooding (Belfast)
J. Reumann (Philadelphia)
I. L. Seeligmann (Jerusalem)
I. Soisalon-Soininen (Helsinki)
J. Ziegler (Würzburg)

MINUTES OF IOSCS MEETING

Friday, October 25, 1974

The Washington Hilton, Washington D.C.

Room 325 (L Chevy Chase)

SBL/International Organization for

Septuagint and Cognate Studies

2:00-5:15 p.m.

Programme

Professor J. W. Wevers, President of IOSCS, presiding:

"The *hapax legomena* of the Book of Wisdom,"

James M. Reese, St. John's University

"Levi and Jochebed in the Septuagint,"

Saul Levin, State University of New York at Binghamton

"The Lucianic Text of Amos,"

George E. Howard, University of Georgia

"The Greek Psalter: A Question of Methodology and Syntax,"

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto

Business Meeting

Called to order by the President, Professor J. W. Wevers.

1. Minutes of the Chicago meeting of IOSCS, on November 10, 1973,

were approved as recorded in *Bulletin 7*, pages 3-4.

2. Report of the President

a. Dr. Emanuel Tov has accepted the appointment of Editor in

Chief for the Septuagint Lexicon (on the condition that

adequate funding can be arranged).

b. An Advisory Board for the Lexicon Project has been constituted:

F. M. Cross, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, R. Hanhart, J. W. Wevers (Chairman).

3. Recommendations of the Executive Committee

a. That the present members of the Executive Committee continue in office for a new term of two years with Professor Howard being responsible solely for the editing of the *Bulletin*.

SO MOVED CARRIED

b. That Professor Eugene Ulrich be appointed Treasurer of the IOSCS for a term of two years

SO MOVED CARRIED

4. Report of the Treasurer: Balance as of October 24, 1974, \$720.12

Acceptance MOVED CARRIED

5. Item of Information: IOSCS is scheduled to meet (in conjunction with the 9th IOSOT Congress) in Göttingen in 1977. A Special meeting is planned in the city of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Albert Pietersma

Secretary

FINANCIAL REPORT

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

October 31, 1974

Balance on Hand November 8, 1973 566.90

Income

Subscriptions 215.92

Edinburgh Conference 81.00

Interest on Savings 18.64

315.56

TOTAL 882.46

Disbursements

Postage 41.13

Bulletin Publication 76.16
(for 1973 #6)

Edinburgh Conference 41.00

Bank Service Charge 4.05

162.34

Balance on Hand October 31, 1974 720.12

George Howard, Treasurer

AUDITOR: Bob Sellers, Research Associate
Institute of Government
University of Georgia

AUDITOR: Walter H. O'Briant, Associate
Professor of Philosophy
University of Georgia

NEWS AND NOTES

The *Bulletin* wishes to draw special attention to the 1974 publication of the Göttingen edition of *Genesis* by J. W. Wevers. A report by Wevers on the Göttingen Septuagint project appears later in this issue of the *Bulletin*. Also we are pleased to announce the 1974 publication of *Masoretic Studies 1, 1972 and 1973 Proceedings IOMS*, edited by H. M. Orlinsky.

Professor M. J. Mulder, Amperestraat 48, Badhoevedort, The Netherlands; has kindly accepted the task of receiving payment for the *Bulletin* (\$2 per year) from all members living in the Netherlands. Newsletters of related interest to IOSCS members may be obtained

from the following addresses: (1) W. E. Aufrecht, Editor, Newsletter for Targum Studies, Department of Near Eastern Studies, Victoria College, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1K7, Canada. (2) Newsletter of the Pseudepigrapha Group, % James H. Charlesworth, P. O. Box 4735, Duke Station, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706. (3) Newsletter of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 126 Inman St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139. (4) Newsletter of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, Calif. 92664. (5) Newsletter of the Philo Institute, Inc., McCormick Theological Seminary, 800 West Belden Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60614.

From a "Report on the Ethiopia Manuscript Microfilm Library" by W. Harrelson (circulated by the Pseudepigrapha Group): "Over 3,000 manuscripts have been filmed. In recent months, several ancient and rare manuscripts have turned up from northern Shoa province and from Wollo province. The most valuable material is only now coming to light, it appears." A catalogue of the materials thus far acquired is being prepared by Dr. Macomber of the Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota.

From the Minutes of the IOSCS Executive Committee meeting October 25, 1974: Professor Michael Stone indicates "that the Synod of Bishops of the Armenian Church has decided, in some sort of collaboration with the Armenian Academy of Sciences, to proceed to the preparation of collations for an Old Armenian Version....The importance for Septuagint Studies lies in the fact that the results of the undertaking, though leaving a lot to be desired due to the methodology employed, will be far superior to the Zohrab edition of the Old Armenian Version."

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED, IN HAND, OR PROJECTED

(The list includes items brought to the attention of the Editor since *Bulletin* No. 7 went to press.)

Allen, L. C. *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1974. Two Parts (VTS XXV, XXVII).

ARIETI, J. A., "The Vocabulary of Septuagint Amos," *JBL*, 93 (1974), 338-347.

ARONSON, P. M. has written a M.A. Ordination thesis for H. M. Orlinsky and Arthur Soffer entitled "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of the Minor Prophets," 57 typed pages, 1969.

BARR, J. (1) "'επιζω and 'επειζω in the Septuagint: a note principally on Gen. xlix. 6, *JSS*, 19 (1974), 198-215. (2) Review of: R. A. Kraft (ed.). *Septuagintal Lexicography and 1972 Proceedings* (SCS 1 & 2), 1972, in *JSS*, 19 (1974), 300. (3) Review of: Peter Walters (formerly Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge: University Press, 1973, in *VT*, 25 (1975), 247-254.

BARTHELEMY, D. Review of: Kevin G. O'Connell, *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 3). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972, in *Biblica*, 55 (1974), 91-93.

BODINE, W. Reports that he is revising his 1973 Harvard Ph.D. dissertation for publication. It concerns the Greek recensions of the Book of Judges.

BROCK, S. Review of: Peter Walters (formerly Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge: University Press, 1973, in *JTS*, 25 (1974), 148-152.

CHESMAN, A. has written a M.A. Ordination thesis for H. M. Orlinsky and Arthur Soffer entitled: "Studies in the Septuagint Text of the Book of Joshua," 121 typed pages, 1967.

DELLING, D. (1) "Die biblische Prophetie bei Josephus," in *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*. Edited by O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel. Festschrift für Otto Michels 70 Geburtstag. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974. (2) Scheduled to appear in *HUCA*, 45 (1974): "Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums."

FELDMAN, L. H. "Epilegomenon to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB)," *JJS*, 25 (1974), 305-312.

FERREE, P. Reports that he is "secretary for twenty-one colleagues in the Islamic world, charged with an inquest into the Vocabulary, as rendered in Arabic, of the Greek Bible, known to them through Vulgate only. He mentions a work entitled: "Arabic

retroversion for Hatch-Redpath vs Latinization via Jerome-Aquinas."

FRITSCH, C. T. (1) "Homophony in the Septuagint," to be published in the proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies which met in Jerusalem, Summer, 1973. (2) "Studies in the Theology of the Greek Psalter," published in a volume dedicated to President Shazar of Israel, under the auspices of the Jewish Bible Society.

GILBERT, M. (1) "La prière d'Azarias (*On* 3, 26-45 Théodotion)," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 96 (1974), 561-582. (2) "L'éloge de la Sagesse (*Siracide* 24)," *Revue Théologique de Louvain*, 5 (1974) 326-348.

GOODING, D. W. "On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums," *JTS*, 25 (1974) 1-11.

GORDON, R. P. "The Second Septuagint Account of Jeroboam: History or Midrash?" *VT*, Jubilee Number (1975), 368ff.

GRAY, J. "The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum (11QtargJob)," *ZAW*, 86 (1974), 331-350.

GRELOT, P. "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *Revue Biblique*, 81 (1974), 5-23.

- JANZEN, J. G. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, 6. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973.
- JELlicoe, S. *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*. Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav, 1974.
- KLEIN, R. W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament. From the Septuagint to Qumran*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- MARTIN, M. Reports preparation on an OT lexicon based on the LXX, Peshitto, Targums, and Vulgate.
- MARTIN, R. A. "Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL*, 94 (1975), 65-72.
- MURAOKA, T. (1) Review of: Peter Walters (formerly Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by D.W. Gooding. Cambridge: University Press, 1973, in *JSS*, 19 (1974), 305-309. (2) Reports work on First Esdras, translation with Introduction and Notes for the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Japanese (Tokyo 1975). (3) Carrying on revision of Hatch and Redpath.
- NICKELSBURG, G. W. E. (1) "Enoch 97-104: A Study of the Greek and Ethiopic Texts," in *Armenian and Biblical Studies*, ed. Michael

- E. Stone (Jerusalem, 1975). (2) Reediting of materials on Testament of Abraham which originally appeared in *Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2*, for a second edition of that volume.
- NORTH, R. Review of: Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1974, in *CBQ*, 37 (1975) 239-240
- O'CONNELL, K. G. Review of: Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974, in *CBQ*, 37 (1975), 266-267.
- PASINYA, M. "La notion de Nomos dans le Pentateuque grec," *Analecta Biblica*, 52 (1973).
- PIETERSMA, A. (1) Reports that he is engaged in active research on the Septuagint Psalter. (2) "F. G. Kenyon's Text of Papyrus 963 (Numbers and Deuteronomy)," *VT*, 24 (1974), 113-118. (3) Forthcoming: Review of S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, in *Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses*; "The 'Lost' Folio of the Chester Beatty Ecclesiasticus," *VT*; "The Greek Psalter: A Question of Methodology and Syntax," *VT*.
- STONE, M. E. Reports: (1) *Armenian and Biblical Studies* containing many matters of text critical interest is now mostly typeset.

(2) Vol. I of *Apocrypha V. T. in Lingua Armeniaca Conservata* is ready for the printers. Vol. II is finished and also ready for the printers. Both contain chiefly unpublished documents. Vol. III contains *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, Vol. IV *Fourth Ezra*. Both are in active preparation. (3) "Stichometry Armenian Canon Lists II: The Stichometry of Arania of Shirak," *HTR* (Forthcoming), containing a stichometric list translated from Greek in the seventh century. In some points it is preferable to Nicephorus. (4) "An Armenian Psalter in North Western University Library," *Le Muséon*, 87 (1974), 195-205.

TOV, E. In Print or ready to be printed: (1) *The Book of Baruch (Greek and Hebrew), Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series*. (2) "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel," in: M. E. Stone, ed., *Armenian and Biblical Studies*. (3) Review of: E. Camilo dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* in *JBL*. (4) Review of: S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch and S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint in VT*. (5) "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint."

TREU, K. "Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich," *Kairos*, 15 (1973), 123-144.

VAN DER HORST, P. W. (1) Translating Pseudo-Phocylides for the Doubleday edition of the O.T. Pseudepigrapha (project edited by Charlesworth). (2) Preparing a commentary with introduction

and bibliography on Pseudo-Phocylides as a thesis written under W. C. van Unnik.

VÖÖBUS, A. *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla: The Discovery of a Unique Manuscript. A Facsimile Edition with an Introduction*. CSCO; Louvain: Scriptorum Syri, 1975.

WEVERS, J. W. (1) *Genesis. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis Editum, Vol. 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974. (2) *Text History of the Greek Genesis. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974, Vol. 11.

WRIGHT, R. B. "A New Fragment of the Greek Text of Sirach," *JBL*, 94 (1975), 111-112.

SEPTUAGINT ABSTRACTS

From the IOSCS/IOSOT Meeting, August 17, 1974, Edinburgh, Scotland:
George Howard

"Septuagint Variants Reflecting a Hebrew Vorlage." The paper illustrates a number of variant readings within the LXX mss which reflect an alternate Hebrew Vorlage to that of the accepted LXX text. Often where the majority of witnesses accurately translate the text of MT a variant (sometimes late) will reflect an extra-masoretic Vorlage. The implications of this are examined regarding the origin of LXX and the nature of its transmission.

N. Fernández Marcos

"The Barberini Text of Habakkuk III Reconsidered." The author analyzes the background of other parallel texts and the phenomenon of the Targums in regard to the problems raised by the presence of the Barberini Text in Hab. III. After a study of the witnesses of the Barberini Text he compares it with the LXX-text, the Targum of Jonatan to Hab. III, the Greek fragments of Qumran, the hexaplaric witnesses (especially Symmachus), the Lucianic recension, the Coptic versions and the Vulgate. He concludes:

The serious questions raised by the presence of the B-text in the LXX-history are far from being solved: did the translation of B extend only to this song or to the whole book of Habakkuk, to the Minor Prophets or only to the *haftarot* read in the synagogue's liturgy? Why is it preserved only in Hab. III, in some mss close to the LXX-text? At what time was it placed in these mss together with the Septuagintal text? One thing seems clear: in the preservation and transmission of this text external factors like its frequent use in the liturgy and its early circulation independent of the book of Habakkuk have been influential. This is shown by the fact that in the Peser Habakkuk from Qumran, chapter III does not appear at all.

About the translator, who must remain anonymous, the analysis shows, from the vocabulary and the technique of translation employed, that he belongs to the school of Symmachus. Perhaps he is connected with 'o 'εβραϊος, but we hardly dare to suggest this when we take into consideration the few remains of this translation we have for comparison. Field has also mentioned another translation which has no affinities with LXX, 'Ιωνιος. But we cannot decide anything

certain about its relationship with B because of its limited number of quotations preserved. Therefore we prefer to consider the B translator as belonging to the Symmachus school. But we ought to think, as in the case of Aquila or Theodotion of the 'devanciers', of a non-unified Symmachus in accordance with Jerome's reference to a twofold edition. The witness of the mss and ancient writers who, from time to time, attribute to Symmachus two or three different readings for the same biblical passage, points in the same direction.

With respect to the provenience of B, Asia Minor must be preferred rather than Egypt as suggested by Good. The ancient witnesses to the version of Symmachus and the contacts with the Lucianic recension, already noticed, point to this locality. The date of the translation is more difficult to determine. Nevertheless, even though the text looks very ancient, it is posterior to the Septuagint and is not the original text as Thackeray thought. We place it somewhere between the end of the Second Century B.C. and the end of the First Century A.D.

Concerning the problem of a twofold text in some late books of the Septuagint, in relation to Hab. III, we must conclude, from our interpretation of the B text, that it does not affect the Lagardian hypothesis on the LXX-origins. Accordingly we place it in the textual tradition of the younger versions of the Bible, particularly in the school of Symmachus.

T. Muraoka

"Syntax of the Pronouns in the Greek Genesis." An attempt was made to show how the translator of Genesis tried to resolve the conflict of the two forces, occasionally of discordant nature, namely

that of the source language (Hebrew) and that of the target language (Koine Greek). Seven items were chosen for close examination:

1. nominal clause and copula, 2. personal pronouns in nominative in verbal clause, 3. tonic forms 'εμοῦ, 'εμοῖ, 'εμέ, 4. position of possessive μου, σου etc. in relation to their substantival head,
5. omission of possessive pronouns, 6. possessive adjectives,
7. verb and its pronominal complements.

Angel Sáenz-Badillos, Judit Targarona

"Some Contributions to the Text-History of the Greek Judges."

The group glnw (KZ), recognized in Judges years ago, previously was labeled the "true Lucianic group" or was not studied at all. Here are the main conclusions of our analysis: 1. It is a text-group with a very definite personality clearly different from irua₂ (Befmsz) (close to the κα'γε recension), A, Gabcx Syr (the Origenian recension), MNhyb₂, and dptv. 2. Theodoret employed in Judges a text which is very similar to that of glnw; we can call it Antiochian or Syrian. 3. As a study of the passages under asterisk or obelus shows, it is very likely a prehexaplaric text, with some later additions. 4. Often in the least recensend readings it conserves much from the Old Septuagint. 5. It is not identical to the Old Septuagint, however, since it has small natural corruptions, and contains a free reelaboration or revision of the text of the Primitive Septuagint, exclusively in accordance with inner-Greek principles. It is a very expansionistic text, with pluses which may be of Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) origin. Its stylistic changes are also very important, in morphology, syntax and vocabulary,

with a moderate atticistic tendency. 6. We cannot speak of a true recension. We see no proof of the existence of a "proto-Lucianic recension" of the Septuagint of Judges. The cases of free translation or reelaboration are very clear. 7. The group seems to have no connection with the martyr Lucian, but is much older; only group dptv shows similar characteristics to those detected as Lucianic in the full sense (posthexaplaric) in other books. In the so-called "Lucianic materials" of Judges, we may speak of three different layers: a) Old Septuagint, b) early free stylistic Jewish revision, c) posthexaplaric recension (dptv).

Raija Sollamo

"Some Improper Prepositions, Such as *enopion*, *enantion*, *enanti*, etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek." The scholar who seeks to know what kinds of translations the books of the Septuagint are has two different tasks. He has to compare the Hebrew Old Testament with the Septuagint and find out the translation technique used by each of the translators. But he must also consider what was the standard of the Greek language used by them. He has therefore to examine contemporary Koine Greek in all known documents and literary genres. My article concentrated on this comparative task.

In the first plan I outlined some principles of the comparative work. I stated that contemporary Jewish Greek is too narrow a basis for reliable comparison. It is necessary to go through the extant contemporary papyrus material, all inscriptions, historical, philosophical, and scientific works, poems, and so on; or at least to take a selection of these. The main stress of this kind of

comparison should lie upon the time when the Pentateuch was translated.

A merely statistic study, which registers how many times a certain word or construction appears in the Septuagint and in the Koine elsewhere, is not enough. The context with all its components must be observed carefully, in order to find out the exact meaning of the word or expression and to define its syntactic relations.

According to these principles I dealt with some so-called "improper" prepositions ('ἐνώπιον, 'ἐναντίον, "ἐναντι [ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι], ἔμπροσθεν).

Finally I refer to *Vetus Testamentum* in which my paper will be published in a year or so.

From the SBL Pacific Coast Section April, 1973, Oakland, Ca.;
April, 1975, San Jose, Ca.:

Daryl Schmidt

"Linguistic Clues to the Structure of Septuagintal Poetry." The "structure" of a biblical passage is usually discussed in terms of its content. However, linguistically, the structuralist looks behind the content to the interrelationships of the parts of a given system (word, phrase, sentence). The implications for critical methodology have been developed in various directions, but never with the emphasis on linguistics, per se. Such an emphasis would be most applicable to poetry, because of its succinctness.

In contrast to the diachronic pursuits of Dahood, structural analysis focuses on synchronic linguistical features. It is the pattern of these features which will give us a linguistic structure

of one category of poetry. The model chosen in Ps 88 (LXX), for both its significance and the mistreatment it has received by biblical scholars.

The dominant linguistic features of this psalm are clues to its tri-partite structure of I praise (2-19), II recitation (20-46), III petition (47-52):

I (2-5, 6-16, 17-19)	II (20-30, 31-38, 39-46)	III (47-49, 50, 51-52)
voc., fut., because...	Then, aor.	voc., fut., impv.
voc., fut., because...	Ἰδὲ, subjv.	voc., present
voc., fut., because...	But, aor.	voc., impv.

(It can be noted that 'diapsalma' is always located at the end of one of our sub-sections.) The parallelism usually observed in poetic lines is seen here to be characteristic of both the sections (case and tense) and the total structure of the poem.

This basic structure can be verified in the early "odes" in the LXX: Exod 15, Deut 32, Judg 5, 2 Sam 22, 1 Chr 16, and in the book of Odes. A three-part pattern can also be found in IQS, the Akkadian "Hymn to Ishtar," and especially in Greek prayers from Homer on.

"Servant-Sensitivity in the LXX of Jeremiah. A Significant Translation Pattern." J. G. Janzen's work on the text of Jeremiah isolated each variant reading from the LXX and offers plausible explanations of MT errors and expansionism. However, a more comprehensive view of the LXX and MT texts can reveal a pattern in the differences. The pattern focuses on the 'bd stems in MT and how they are handled in LXX. The three occurrences of 'Nebuchadnezzar, my servant' are the most notorious examples (LXX never has 'my servant'). Moreover, there are eight instances where a clause

or verse is missing in LXX containing the verb 'bd when the object is the enemy or the King of Babylon (17:4, 25:14, 25[34]:7[6], 13, 14, 17, 28[35]:14); two cases have a shift in meaning (25:11, 40[47]:9) and seven times 'bd is rendered by *ergazesthai*, when the object is the King of Babylon or stranger (27:6, 9, 11, 12[34:5, 7, 9, 10], 28[35]:14, 30[37]:8, 40[47]:9). Elsewhere, *douleuein* is the usual translation (including 2 Kg 25:24).

What level of textual history would have produced such a pattern: MT vorlage, LXX vorlage, or translation? Qumran fragments represent both MT and LXX vorlage, so no simple answer is available there. In addition, there may be other patterns ('faithless one' is applied to Israel four times in MT and 'false sister' four times to Judah, whereas LXX completely reverses the pattern).

What social context provides the best explanation for the pattern of disagreement? The hypothesis offered here is that *the LXX translator(s) of Jeremiah reinterpreted the servant terminology in the light of his own contemporary theological perspective, in the spirit of Maccabean repulsiveness against servitude to a foreign power.*

Further use of the LXX to reconstruct isolated textual variants must be cautioned against until more attention is paid to a methodology which recognizes the LXX as a translation text with its own *Sitz im Leben.*

THE GÖTTINGEN SEPTUAGINT

J. W. Wevers, University of Toronto

The editor of the Bulletin has asked me to give a brief statement on the origins of and present status of the Göttingen Septuagint project.

Paul de Lagarde (born Paul Bötticher in 1827) was named Heinrich Ewald's successor as Professor of Oriental Languages in Göttingen in 1869 where he remained until his death in 1891. His monumental works not only as "father of modern Septuagint Studies" but as general orientalist as well have been appreciatively though critically reviewed by his student and disciple Alfred Rahlfs in Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk im Rahmen einer Geschichte seines Lebens dargestellt, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens IV, 1, Berlin 1928.

Lagarde's plan for reconstructing the original text of the Septuagint was based on his acceptance of Jerome's statement in the Prologus in Paralipomena and quoted in Contra Rufinum II.27: *Nunc vero cum pro varietate regionum diversa ferantur exemplaria... Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilius vulgaverunt: totusque orbis hac inter es trifaria varietate compugnant.*

Lagarde accordingly believed that the original Septuagint could only be critically restored after the three ecclesiastical recensions had been isolated (and published). He then with typical impulsiveness and industry proceeded to the collation of two Vatican mss. known

to be Lucianic in the books of the Kingdoms and published his *Librorum VT Canonicorum Pars Prior Graece* in 1883, i.e. Genesis through Esther, which Rahlfs quite rightly called "der grösste Fehlschlag Lagardes." Fortunately Lagarde did not proceed beyond this.

After Lagarde's death the work was continued by his follower Alfred Rahlfs. In 1908 the Septuagint Institute (Septuaginta-Unternehmen) was established under Rahlfs' direction by the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen for the express purpose of collecting materials (i.e. photographs and microfilm of Septuagint mss. and of other related matters), making propaedeutic studies (such as the *MSU* series), and eventually publishing critical texts with full apparatus designating textual recensions and families in the same way as had been the practice for the NT text.

The Institute at Göttingen, now under the able guidance of Robert Hanhart, is undoubtedly the most complete repository for Septuagint materials in existence. It still operates on the upper floor of Lagardes' home on the Friedländerweg with a number of student assistants who under Herr U. Quast systematically collate all known Septuagint mss. up to the time of Gutenberg for a given book or books. After a ms. has been collated by a collator, the collation is systematically "revidiert" by two collators. Any difficulties of collations are noted and discussed in a series of notes to the collation. Eventually when all mss. for a given book are finished the collation books are handed over to the editor who then adds his own collations of papyri, the versions, and patristic citations. Separate studies are made by the Göttingen Institute

together with the editor of the materials for the second apparatus, that is of the non-Septuagint materials in the mss., catenas and the patristic writers. The editor then makes his studies of the text and its history. He alone is then responsible for the establishment of the critical text and the apparatuses as they appear in the published volume. By "critical text" is meant the earliest form of the text which on the basis of the collations and of our knowledge of the Greek used in the Alexandria of the third to first centuries B.C.E.

The first critical text published by the Akademie was *Maccabaeorum liber I* by Werner Keppeler. (Rahlfs' own *Psalmi cum Odis* of 1931 is not really a fully critical text.) After his lamented death during the Second World War the work on the "apocryphal" and later books has been carried on by R. Hanhart, whose *Macc II* appeared in 1959, *Macc III* in 1960, and his *Esther* in 1966 and *Esdrae liber I* in 1974. He intends working on *Judith* and/or *Tobit* as his next contribution to the project. Just before the outbreak of the Second World War appeared the first volume by the outstanding Septuagint scholar of our day, Joseph Ziegler, viz. *Isaias* in 1939. Successively from his pen there appeared *Duodecim Prophetae* in 1943, *Ezechiel* in 1952, *Daniel*, *Susanna Bel et Draco* in 1954, *Ieremias*, *Baruch*, *Threni*, *Epistula Ieremiae* in 1957, *Sapientia Salomonis* in 1962 and *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* in 1965. Since then he has among other things been working on *Job* and *Proverbs*. According to recent reports from Göttingen *Job* is nearing completion and we may with some confidence expect to see the crown of Ziegler's labors on that difficult but magnificent book.

Of interest to Septuagint scholars will be the status of Maccabaeorum liber IV. The collation had been completed in the thirties, and the editorship assigned. An incomplete ms. with notes has long been at the Institute and awaiting reassignment. Fortunately Willem Baars of Leiden offered to complete this as a labor of love, and we can in due course expect a meticulous and excellent edition from him.

My own work on the Göttingen Septuagint began in the summer of 1966 when I visited Ziegler in Würzburg and Hanhart in Göttingen. My Genesis appeared in 1974 together with the Text History of the Greek Genesis, MSU XI, 1974. My Deuteronomium edition has now been completed and the ms. is in Göttingen. It should be going to Press this year. The volume "Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy" is currently being written and should be finished by the end of the summer. I shall then begin work on Numbers, which will hopefully be followed successively by Exodus and Leviticus.

The Institute at Göttingen has progressed far beyond the rather simplistic plans of Lagarde. The volumes thus far published demonstrate the complicated nature of the text groupings within the manuscript tradition. Furthermore it is now completely clear that textual loyalties change within individual mss; one cannot even refer to Codex Vaticanus as the oldest prerenational witness, of 19-108 as Lucianic, or of 82 as Hexaplaric. They are such in some books, but not necessarily in others. Thus B is hexaplaric in Isaiah, 19-108 become Lucianic in the Book of the Kingdoms, and 82 joins them in becoming Lucianic. The Hesychian recension still remains unidentified; the Lucianic cannot be identified in the

Pentateuch, and even the best known recension, that of Origen, is in certain books, e.g. Chronicles, difficult to isolate. On the other hand distinct textual families obtain in various books which seem to have no particular recensional base.

What is now abundantly clear is that we can never return to those days of Swete when the text of Codex B was reprinted, errors and all, and manuscripts were collated to it. No NT scholar would dream of accepting such a text, and there is no good reason for Septuagint scholars to do so either.

4QSam^a AND SEPTUAGINTAL RESEARCH

Eugene C. Ulrich
University of Notre Dame

For the past several years I have been studying the major Samuel scroll from Qumran, which is being edited by Professor Frank Cross for a forthcoming volume of the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series. Professor George Howard kindly suggested that I use this forum for sharing some of the clarifications and advances which 4QSam^a affords Septuagintal research.

I would like, then, to present a brief overview of "The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus,"¹ plus some of its salient findings. I wish also to solicit criticism of the presuppositions, methods, and content of the work, while offering to welcome questions from anyone concerning the topic.

The purpose of the dissertation is to chart the relationship of the 4QSam^a fragments to the Massoretic Text, to the various forms of the Greek Version, to the parallels from Chronicles, and to Josephus' recasting of the Samuel narrative in the *Jewish Antiquities*, V-VII. It is not an "edition" of the manuscript nor a comprehensive treatment of the proto-Lucianic or Josephan texts. What it seeks to do is to examine those segments of 1-2 Samuel for which 4QSam^a is both extant and at variance with either M or G. Approximately 250 such readings were isolated. These were first analyzed inductively according to commonly accepted OT text-critical principles. Then, instead of being listed simply seriatim, the readings were grouped qualitatively into categories suggested by the Barthélemy-Cross

theory of recensional development.² This theory was adopted as a working hypothesis for the dissertation because of its apparent success in unraveling other OT textual problems.³ It was not adopted, however, as if presumed to be a priori true or pronounced true by scholarly consensus. The dissertation is both a partial test of that hypothesis and an effort to build a broader base for further testing.

A survey of the history of scholarship (chapter I) dealing with the Lucianic text tradition and Josephus illuminates three points.

(1) Sebastian Brock's carefully worked dissertation⁴ establishes the Lucianic text form of 1 Samuel (preserved in the minuscules boc_2e_2) as a recensional text already in its present form in the early fourth century, and describes the characteristics of that Lucianic recension.

(2) Jerome's witness against the Lucianic and proto-Lucianic text forms is indeed valuable testimony both despite the fact and because of the fact that it is negative criticism:

In quo illud breuiter admoneo, ut sciatis aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae tractatores $\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\acute{\nu}\iota$ --id est communem--appellant atque uulgatam et a plerisque nunc $\Lambda\omicron\upsilon\kappa\iota\acute{\nu}\delta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ dicitur, aliam septuaginta interpretum, quae et in $\epsilon\grave{\xi}\sigma\tau\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ codicibus repperitur et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter uersa est et Hierosolymae atque in orientis ecclesiis decantatur....

$\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\acute{\nu}\iota$ autem ista, hoc est communis, editio ipsa est, quae et Septuaginta. sed hoc interest inter utramque, quod $\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\acute{\nu}\iota$ pro locis et temporibus et pro uoluntate scriptorum uetus corrupta editio est, ea autem, quae habetur in $\epsilon\grave{\xi}\sigma\tau\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ et quam nos uertimus, ipsa est, quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata septuaginta interpretum translatio reseruatur. quicquid ergo ab hac discrepat, nulli dubium est, quin ita et ab Hebraeorum auctoritate discordet.⁵

It is clear that Jerome, who by conscious choice followed the

principles and argumentation of Origen and Eusebius, considered (a) that the original Septuagint had taken two forms: the variedly corrupt *koine* Septuagint and the (restoredly) incorrupt hexaplaric Septuagint; (b) that the Massoretic Hebrew text that he knew in his day was the primary criterion for the correctness of the original Greek text; and (c) that the *editio* which in his day was termed "Lucianic" was already known to Origen as the *koine* Septuagint.

In response to Jerome: (a') The underlying unity of the Old Greek translation and the Lucianic recension has been reconfirmed by Brock. (b') The movement which climaxed in Origen has gigantically confused the transmission of the original Septuagint of Samuel by attempting to bring it into conformity with the inferior Massoretic text, when its original form was much closer to the superior (see below) Palestinian Hebrew tradition. (c') Therefore, the discredited *koine*, or proto-Lucianic, "Septuagint" is a valuable witness to the original text of Samuel rather than a *vetus corrupta editio*.

The proto-Lucianic text is a fact; the question is its relationship to the Old Greek: is it identical with OG, another Old Greek,⁶ the OG "plus or moins abâtardie et corrompue,"⁷ or a revised form of the OG which "consists apparently of a light sprinkling of readings derived from the Palestinian textual family of the type found in the three Samuel manuscripts from Qumrân, to which the Old Greek was sporadically corrected"?⁸ I find a series of revisions in the early stratum of the L tradition (see under chapter III below). Thus, Brock's dissertation argues strongly against Barthélemy's dispensing with the recensional character of the late stratum of L, and the revisional material documented

by the present study argues against his dismissal of the early stratum of L as "la Septante ancienne, plus or moins abâtardie et corrompue."⁹

(3) The third point clarified in the history of the problem is that Rahlfs' criticism of Mez,¹⁰ though widely accepted, cannot be allowed to stand. Mez' study, pointing to an *urlucianische Vorlage* for Josephus' *Antiquities* V-VII, was short, limited, and ground-breaking. Rahlfs' analysis was comprehensive, detailed, and carefully researched, thus advancing as a Goliath against a mere David. But with regard to the theory behind this collection of readings, the decision must go once again to the little David. One example must suffice from each of Mez' series. For the first series, consider Mez' reading #120 (= 2 Sam 10:6 // 1 Chr 19:6 = *Ant.* VII.121):

VII.121		προς Συρον τον των Μεσοποταμιων βασιλεα χιλια ταλαντα
2 Sam 10:6	M	אִם אַתְּ שִׁכְרָה וְיִשְׁכְּרוּ
	G	εμισθωσαντο την Συριαν
	L	μισθουνται τον Συρον
1 Chr 19:6	M	אִם מִן אֲרָם לִשְׁכַר כֶּסֶף כִּכָּר הָאֵלֶּךְ
	GL	χιλια ταλαντα αργυριου τουμισθωσασθαι εαυτοις εκ Συριας Μεσοποταμιας

Mez includes only the proper names from Samuel, thus leaving out of consideration the important "1000 talents" and "Mesopotamia" in both J and Chr but "not in Sam." Still he includes this as proof that J = L on the modest basis of Συρον, which J has mistaken for the name of the Mesopotamian king.

Rahlfs counters that J is following Chr here, for only Chr names Mesopotamia and specifies the "1000 talents." Besides, Chr^G has Ευροç in 19:10,12. Accordingly, J is *not* reflecting L of Samuel; rather, he is dependent upon Chr!

Thus far one must agree with Rahlfs over Mez. But a fragment of 4QSam^a is extant for 2 Sam 10:6-9, most fortunately preserving three words (only at the end of its first line: אֵלֶּיךָ כָּסֶף !). This little lettered leather scrap disproves Rahlfs and limelights Mez as correct (but for insufficient proof), by showing that the "1000 talents" was in the text of Samuel, but only in the Palestinian tradition of Samuel, from which Chr derived the detail.

From Mez' second series Rahlfs accepts two of the ten proofs. In all but one of the rejected cases Rahlfs' reason for rejection is not that J ≠ L but that other mss besides L display the given reading, therefore J could have derived the reading from any of those disparate mss. Rahlfs' statement is true that each of those seven rejected readings *taken individually* does not prove that J used exclusively a proto-Lucianic Vorlage. But the seven are solid Lucianic readings, the only common denominator is L, and it approaches the absurd to say that each time J has a variant he is dependent upon a different ms. For example,

- in Mez #L J = B bovza₂c₂e₂ ≠ M ANrell OL
- in Mez #LXIV J = bgopuc₂e₂ P ≠ M BAMNrell
- in Mez #LXXIV J = boc₂e₂ OL C^{AN+} ≠ M BAMNrell C^M C^{BLS+}.

According to Mez, this coaxes the conclusion that J = L, for L is the solitary text tradition that could consistently ground J's readings. Interpreting Rahlfs, even though in ##LXXII and LXXIII

(which are exclusively Lucianic) J must have used L, J could have used B in #L, could have used P in #LXIV, and could have used C in #LXXIV.

While it is very likely that the biblical text of the historian Josephus became dotted with marginal readings embodying corrections, variants, parallel references, etc., it baffles the most elementary canons of elegance or concinnity to argue that a historian would predominantly select his data through a random sampling of texts differing in text affiliation (B), language (P), and biblical book (Chr), when it can be shown that all his data could derive from one single source. Should assent be still hesitant, let אֵלֶּיךָ כָּסֶף be remembered.

Chapter II lists the plus, minus, and variant readings in which 4QSam^a agrees with G against M. There are 124 such readings in sections α ββ (1 Sam and 2 Sam 1-9), 14 of which are quite striking examples. There are 19 readings in section βγ (2 Sam 10-24), but these are all from the Old Greek substratum of the *Kaige* Recension (KR), not from the properly *Kaige* recensional stratum. This yields a total of 143 readings in which 4Q = G ≠ M.

One example (2 Sam 7:23) which can be briefly listed displays G without variant following 4QSam^a exactly in a clear and certain error, while the Targum and the Peshitta follow M, Chr (1 Chr 17:21) passes over this mistaken word in its Palestinian Samuel Vorlage, and the Old Latin clearly echoes the G error:

4Q	יאהליס
M T P	ואלהין
G OL	ואי אהליס

Chapter III presents the 4QSam^a agreements with the Lucianic textual tradition against M and G. Eight readings were isolated in sections α ββ, 7 of which show clear agreement of 4Q and L where M has a different reading and where OG has yet another reading. Now the L text shows consistent dependence on the OG of Samuel, exhibiting at least two types of attempt to revise OG.¹¹ In these 7 instances, nevertheless, OG does not stand in need of revision, and yet L revises, with 4QSam^a as the unique basis for those revisions. This forces us to go beyond Brock's tentative suggestion that the 4Q-L agreements "might rather be explained as original readings preserved only in L, but corrected to the (proto-)masoretic norm in the rest of the LXX tradition (pre-hexaplaric),"¹² and to admit proto-Lucianic revisional activity at least, and possibly recensional activity.¹³

A further 27 agreements between 4QSam^a and L were found in section βγ, though at this point it is often methodologically difficult to distinguish as OG text from a proto-Lucianic text in βγ. The 35 4Q-L agreements raise the total to 178 readings in which 4Qsam^a agrees with the OG/pL, or pre-KR, form of the Greek Version.

Chapter IV presents and evaluates the evidence contrary to the pattern 4Q = G ≠ M. Out of 69 readings analyzed as possibly contrary, only 24 emerged as valid instances in which OG/pL is independent of the 4QSam text tradition.

An example of OG independence from the 4Q tradition can be seen in 1 Sam 15:29 (= Ant. VI.153):

4Q	[מנה] ה' א' [ה]
M	הוא להנחם
NH+	ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΗΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΣ (om Nav; +αυτος z) απειλησει και ουκ εμμενει
BACX+	ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΗΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΣ
L Thdt	ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΗΣΑΙ
J	εμμενειν γαρ τον θεον..., ανθρωπινου παθους οντος ουχι θειος λοχυος

The Hebrew tradition is sound. OG had the expansion, as in NH+. Word order shows that, as often, ΕΣΤΙΝ = א'ה; αΥΤΟΣ obviously refers to ανθρωπος and is the subject of the two following verbs ("For not like man is He, to change His mind; he [= man] makes threats and does not abide [by them]"). The αΥΤΟΣ in BACX+ is thus the truncated remains of an erstwhile plus; one would not simply add αΥΤΟΣ alone here, and it is not coincidental that αΥΤΟΣ is the subject of the addition inserted precisely here! Josephus read the plus and incorporated it (εμμενειν and the whole positive clause about human inconstancy), thus confirming its age.

The plus was later excised in revision toward M -- but the cut was not clean, BACX+ carelessly retaining αΥΤΟΣ (erroneously for א'ה). The late Lucianic edition did the final, clean surgery, yielding a text carefully revised back to M. (Note the marginal censure in j^{mg} against the late Lucianic addition "ο αγιος του ιηλ" earlier in the verse: το ο αγιος του ιηλ παρ ουδενι κειται εν τω εξουλω.) This reading, strengthened by several similar examples, is important in that it shows us a rarely demonstrable phenomenon: an OG plus excised to conform to the shorter *hebraica veritas*.

Chapters II, III, and IV confirm the usefulness of the Barthélemy-Cross hypothesis of recensional development. Due to the random aspect of the surviving fragments, there can be no accuracy in statistics; but, though unfocused in details, the general picture provides a quite definite impression. Samuel fragments are extant for 29 chapters of $\alpha \beta\beta$ and for 14 chapters of $\beta\gamma$, or approximately twice as many chapters in $\alpha \beta\beta$ as in $\beta\gamma$. The ratio in chapter II of 124 readings in the 29 chapters of $\alpha \beta\beta$ to the 19 readings in the 14 chapters of $\beta\gamma$ is roughly 3 to 1. 4Q is three times closer to G in $\alpha \beta\beta$ than it is in $\beta\gamma$. Barthélemy's thesis, that the OG has undergone revision toward M in $\beta\gamma$, neatly explains this shift in results.

The ratio in chapter III of 27 4Q-L agreements in the 14 $\beta\gamma$ chapters to 8 4Q-L agreements in the 29 $\alpha \beta\beta$ chapters, is roughly 7 to 1. This, plus the conclusion of the previous chapter, lends strong support to the Barthélemy-Cross hypothesis that G in $\beta\gamma$ is the *Kaige* recension of the OG/pL text, and that the OG/pL text there is to be sought basically in mss boc_2e_2 . Furthermore, the two elements of this 7:1 ratio both argue against Barthélemy in favor of Cross concerning the Lucianic tradition. For almost all the $\alpha \beta\beta$ readings are pL revisions, and the fact that the rate of 4Q-L agreements rises 700% in $\beta\gamma$ also suggests that the L text there is a revisional text, not a degenerate and corrupt text.

The 24 readings in chapter IV for which the Vorlage of OG differs from 4QSam^a are sufficient to establish that the Hebrew text which was used in Egypt for the pristine Greek translation of Samuel was distinct from the Palestinian Hebrew text tradition.

But the ratio (7 1/2 to 1) of 182 cases of G agreement¹⁴ with the 4Q tradition to 24 cases of G disagreement with 4Q demonstrates a significantly closer affiliation between the Egyptian and Palestinian traditions than between the Massoretic tradition and either the Egyptian or the Palestinian tradition.

Chapter V then shifts its gaze to the passages in Chronicles which parallel the 4QSam^a fragments. 4QSam^a, as a text of Samuel, naturally agrees frequently with M of Samuel against Chr. An important relationship is highlighted, however, when the 4Q/M disagreements are viewed from the perspective of Chr and the Chronicler's source. Chr agrees with M of Samuel against 4QSam^a only twice. In contrast, Chr agrees with 4QSam^a against M in 42 readings, some of which are quite striking. The אלף ככר כסף reading presented above in Mez' defense is just one typical example of the Chr agreement with 4QSam^a against M of Samuel. Two observations point to the old Palestinian text of Samuel (not the text of Chr) as the root of this 21 to 1 ratio of 4Q-Chr agreement. First, the 4Q-Chr agreements are mostly original Samuel readings corrupt in M, or narrative expansions typical of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Palestinian textual tradition in general. Secondly, none of the 4Q agreements with Chr either betray characteristics commonly associated with the Chronicler's specific interests or display new types of 4Q variation from M due to the fact that Chr now provides a parallel. Thus, 4QSam^a is not a late conflation of an old Samuel text of the Massoretic tradition corrected and supplemented by Chr readings, but Chr is rather exactly what it has been believed to be all along, viz., a retelling of the history

of Israel based on the Samuel text of its day and locality, i.e., post-exilic Judah (Palestine). The contribution of 4QSam^a is that it provides us with an exemplar much closer than M to the Samuel textual basis used by the Chronicler.

Chapter VI analyzes the agreement and the disagreement of Josephus with 4QSam^a. Cross has published the "Jezreel" reading at 1 Sam 28:1 as "a rare instance when 4QSam and Josephus stand together against all other traditions,"¹⁵ and he has detected two further readings preserved only by 4Q and J, one of which is an original paragraph now lost from all other biblical manuscripts. Chapter VI extensively scrutinizes those three and demonstrates two additional readings preserved by 4QSam^a and Josephus alone. Equally significant is the fact that Josephus displays dependence on a Greek medium for three of those five readings. This means that just as some genuine Samuel readings have perished from the Massoretic tradition, so have some genuine Samuel readings perished from the Old Greek tradition, at times deliberately excised from G due to their non-correspondence to the altered Massoretic *veritas*. G explicitly joins the 4Q J alliance against M in 34 additional readings, of which 21 show specifically Greek influence on J, and 6 show precisely L influence on J. Eight further readings strengthen the case for 4Q L influence on J, where M and G diverge. And for its part, Chr joins the 4Q J alliance against M and G in 5 readings. Since 4Q or J dependence on Chr is untenable, the trustworthiness of Chr as a witness to the ancient Palestinian text of Samuel rises, since it may preserve genuine Samuel readings where 4QSam is lacking and M is corrupt.

The most frequent manner in which J departs from 4Q in favor of another biblical Vorlage is in his 11 agreements with G against 4Q and M. J does agree with M against 4Q in 5 readings, but in all five J agrees with L as well as with M and effectively depends on L. In fact, it can be said that, for all the portions of the Samuel text for which 4QSam^a is extant, J shows no dependence on M specifically or on a Vorlage in the Hebrew language. He uses a slightly revised form of the OG, but that revised form is the early stratum of the Lucianic tradition. J shows no connection with the specifically *Kaige* recensional stratum of the *Kaige* text or with the hexaplaric recension.

Complementary to chapters II-VI which study isolated readings and group them qualitatively into categories, chapters VII and VIII present a detailed analysis of the continuous text of 2 Sam 6, in order to provide a less dissected and more holistic feel for the texts of 4Q and J. The first part of chapter VII compares the Hebrew texts of 4Q, M, and Chr for those parts of 2 Sam 6 in which 4Q is both extant and at variance with either M or Chr. 4Q not only agrees with Chr slightly more often than it does with M, it shows a superior Hebrew text, followed closely by Chr and distantly by M. For only two words does G agree with M against 4Q; otherwise, G supports 4Q when it sides with M against Chr (to be expected for genuine Samuel readings) as well as when 4Q sides with Chr against M (highly significant, indicating genuine Egyptian-Palestinian Samuel readings).

The second part shows Josephus clearly distant from M but sharing an amazingly close affiliation with 4Q, scoring a 92% straight

agreement, 96% if allowance is made for the (demonstrated) fact that J's Vorlage was in a Greek form, and 100% if the minute difference is ignored in one proper name infected with rampant corruption in all traditions. Josephus' agreement with the OG/pl text is very close: eight readings betray a specifically Greek Vorlage, while none clearly suggests a Hebrew Vorlage.

Chapter VIII begins by demonstrating that it was fully possible for Josephus to have used a Greek bible and that it would have been the logical and practical course of operation. Then the entire Greek text of Ant. VII.78-89 (= 2 Sam 6) is analyzed word by word to determine the language of its Vorlage. 31.1% of the J material is too ambiguous to point toward either a Hebrew or a Greek Vorlage, but another 31.1% mildly indicates a Greek Vorlage, 28.3% strongly indicates a Greek Vorlage, and the final 9.4% unequivocally confirms a Vorlage specifically in the Greek language. No evidence at all was uncovered which could be interpreted as clearly or even probably pointing to a Vorlage in Hebrew.

The final section, examining the one single expression in J which might suggest a Hebrew Vorlage, shows that there is a double weakness in that suggestion, apart from its unique stance in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. Then the arguments of Mez, Rahlfs, Thackeray and Marcus for a Semitic Vorlage are reviewed for those readings where the 4QSam^a fragments are available. All except Rahlfs had agreed that the main source of J was a Greek bible though supplemented by a Hebrew or Aramaic bible; but, in the light shed by 4QSam^a, the reexamination leaves not a single persuasive indication, even from Rahlfs, of a Hebrew Vorlage, primary

or supplementary.

Josephus thus emerges as a highly important witness for the early form of the Greek text of Samuel, joining the group 4Q G L OL Chr which often, especially when the Massoretic text is troubled, provides or points toward the original text of Samuel.

In summary, then, 4QSam^a is of immense value to Septuagintal research. Its individual readings frequently provide the clue for understanding the history of the textual development of a passage. Since, however, those readings are not random but show a quite consistent textual tradition, 4QSam^a is a priceless touchstone for the general history of the Samuel (and Chronicles) text forms during the Second Temple period. The Hebrew textual tradition which it exhibits is very close to, though still distinct from, the Hebrew Vorlage of the original Greek translation of Samuel in Egypt. These two Hebrew traditions, on the other hand, are noticeably more distant from, and frequently superior to, the Massoretic Hebrew. The study of 4QSam^a and the Septuagint, therefore, both helps to sort out the ancient witnesses and to assess the comparative usefulness of the various scholarly contributions to the problems of the text of Samuel and the Septuagint. Due to its ancient documentation, 4QSam^a more solidly establishes the Septuagint, the Old Latin, Chronicles, and Josephus as important witnesses to the ancient text of Samuel. But more importantly, it acts as a control, evaluating and disciplining these witnesses for critical use in one of the books where the *textus receptus* stands most in need of this type of aid.

NOTES

¹This 1975 dissertation, alluded to in the 1972 *Proceedings* of IOSCS, ed. Robert A. Kraft (SBL, 1972), pp. 9n and 123, is now available through Interlibrary Loan from: Widener Library/Harvard University/Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138/ USA.

²Cf. D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* [SVT X] (Leiden, 1963); F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964), 281-299. See also Barthélemy's and Cross' restatements of their views in 1972 *Proceedings*.

It should be stated explicitly that the present discussion throughout concerns only 1-2 Samuel, and specifically those parts of Samuel for which the 4QSam^a fragments survive.

³Cf. the series of dissertations listed by Emanuel Tov, 1972 *Proceedings*, p. 9.

⁴"The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel," (D.Phil. Dissertation, Oxford University, 1966). See also his "Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," *Studia Evangelica* V [= TU 103] (1968), 176-181.

⁵Jerome's Letter to Sunnias and Fretela, *Epistula* CVI, 2.2, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* II [CSEL 55], ed. I. Hilberg (Vienna, 1912), pp. 248-249.

⁶Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian--Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 79 (1972), 101-113.

⁷Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, p. 127.

⁸Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," 1972 *Proceedings*, p. 116.

⁹Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, p. 127.

¹⁰Adam Mez, *Die Bible des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (Basel, 1895); A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* [Sept. Stud. III] (Göttingen, 1911), pp. 83-92.

¹¹Cf. Brock's dissertation and article, accepted by Barthélemy in "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11, 2 - 1 Rois 2, 11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila,'" 1972 *Proceedings*, p. 28.

¹²Brock, "The Recensions of the Septuagint..." p. 171.

¹³The evidence for revisional/recensional activity in the early stratum of L requires more space than is available here. I shall assemble it in a future article; provisionally, see the dissertation, chapter III and *passim*.

¹⁴In addition to the 143 readings from chapter II and the 35 readings from chapter III, four readings from chapter IV turn out to be 4Q-G agreements rather than disagreements, raising the total to 182.

¹⁵*HTR* 57 (1964), 292-293.

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 of unusual significance for Septuagint and cognate studies. Items of newly discovered manuscripts or of original ground-breaking 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 8 1/2), double-spaced, and provided with information of the time, place, and occasion of the presentation.

All materials should be in the hands of the editor by May 15 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 money to Professor M. J. Mulder, Amperestraat 48, Badhoevedort, The Netherlands.