MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING
26 August, 1989--Leuven, Belgium

Programme

Friday, 25 August

9.00 – 10.30

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Clemson University, "It's 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 surrévisions O et L"

Raija Sohlam, 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", Marseille, "Aspects statistiques des rapports lexicaux entre la LXX et le Texte Masoretique"

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, "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 Trebolle-Barrera, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, "The Sigla & 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, Wilfrid 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 Manandale-Poitier, University of South Africa, Pretoria, "The Priestly Orders in 1 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 its custom, will hold its meetings that year on the Friday and Saturday prior to the opening of the IOSOT sessions.

3. On behalf of IOSCS 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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Balance (6/30/89)</th>
<th>$227.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payments Received</td>
<td>+ $2473.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/89</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>792.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>318.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/90 (int.)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6 (int.)</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4 (int.)</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29</td>
<td>205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6 (int.)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>197.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>- $2067.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/10/89 (supplies)</td>
<td>45.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4 (mailing)</td>
<td>184.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8 (printing)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5 (mailing)</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4 (annual mtg. display)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/90 (mailing)</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/29 (supplies)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2 (supplies)</td>
<td>66.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17 (mailing)</td>
<td>126.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4 (mailing)</td>
<td>333.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8 (printing)</td>
<td>894.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8 (mailing)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance as of 6/30/90.............................................. $633.91
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 Septuagina 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
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 and the Old Greek of the Books of Samuel: Classification, Statistical Analysis and Philosophical 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-2 pre-Deuteronomistic?"
Robert Hanhart (Göttingen) "Die Übersetzung der Septuaginta im Licht ihr vorgegebener und auf ihr gründender Tradition"
Anneli Ajmeläus (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) "Johanan 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. Rickert, "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 retuning to a 10-page pamphlet. The current Editor is unsuured 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.
BOOKS AND ARTICLES:


Cadwallader, A. H. "The Correction of the Text of Hêb towards the LXX" Nov. 7. (forthcoming).


REVIEWs:


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

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. The MT of Samuel, however, can in places be considered as an expanded and later text, whereas the LXX of this book is 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 MT. This question has recently been the subject of a recent joint research venture, produced by Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust, and Tov.

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 (LXXL) 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):
 Whereas the MT reads "and Michal, daughter of Saul, loved him (David)," LXX$^B$ 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 Μειῳκόλ ἡ Σοιάτης ηγείμεν ηυθόν = MT), repeats the content of v 20a: ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ. 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 ἦλθαν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν = LXX), repeats the expression found in the MT and the LXX at v 16a (καὶ ἦλθεν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν τῷ Δαβίδ). 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 ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(17-19 > OG, David and Merab)

20a ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(20-21a, 22-27a, David and Michal)

28 ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(LXX$^L$)

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 (καὶ ἦλθεν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν) allows the insertion of a second discourse of redactional character (v 21b):

21a ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(LXX$^L$)

21b ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(MT)

The double reading attested by LXX$^L$ and — separately — by MT and LXX$^B$ 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$^L$ offers a double reading:

LXX$^L$

καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν  
(LXX$^L$)

καὶ ἦλθαν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν  
(MT)

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 ἦλθεν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν). 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 ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(17-19 > OG, David and Merab)

20a ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(20-21a, 22-27a, David and Michal)

28 ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(LXX$^L$)

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 (καὶ ἦλθεν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν) allows the insertion of a second discourse of redactional character (v 21b):

21a ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(LXX$^L$)

21b ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(MT)

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 (καὶ ἦλθεν ἔσεθον διὰ Σοιάν) allows the insertion of a second discourse of redactional character (v 21b):

21a ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(LXX$^L$)

21b ἐνέργησεν δὲ Μεκελβα τῷ Δαβίδ τῷ Δαβίδ  
(MT)
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, "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 בֶּן רֹדֶה; אֲלֵי שָׁאוֹל רֶ), in v 3b (MT יָדָא אֶתָהוּ יְרָתָנָה; בַּמֵּשֶׁת) is a case of resumptive repetition, which proves that v 1 continues in v 4. 6

vv. 1*, 4  
vv. 1*, 2

1a David came (LXX)  
Jonathan saw him (LXX)

1b and became as fond of David as if his life depended on him.

2 He loved him as he loved himself

3a (And Jonathan entered into a bond with David.)
3b because he loved him as he loved himself.
4 Jonathan divested himself of the mantle ....

III. 1 Sam 18:5-16

In 18:5a LXX offers two variants:  
(1) The sentence of MT 5aa appears in LXX after 5ab:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לָכֶל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחְנוּ שָׁאוֹל יְשֵׁכַל</td>
<td>לָכֶל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחְנוּ שָׁאוֹל יְשֵׁכַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ κατέστησαν αὐτῶν Σαουλ</td>
<td>καὶ κατέστησαν αὐτῶν Σαουλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴπτος ἀνὴρ τοῦ πολέμου</td>
<td>εἴπτος ἀνὴρ τοῦ πολέμου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=5a) συνέβη εν πάσιν οικ ἀπόστελεν αὐτῶν Σαουλ</td>
<td>(=5a) συνέβη εν πάσιν οἰκ ἀπόστελεν αὐτῶν Σαουλ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 This analysis confirms with slight modifications the main conclusion arrived at by J. Lust: "1 Sam 17:1-11; 32-54; 18:16 (G), 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 as a case of parablepsis remains highly hypothetical.
The transposition reflected by LXX is also found in the parallel text of v 13. 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 in v 5a reads as follows: "And David went out and marched home successfully in whatever mission..." The LXX adds the verb ἐλέησεν, which is grammatically incorrect, LXX reads ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν as in v 14. Instead of MT ἴτω, as is also the case in v 13. Instead of MT ἴτω, as is also the case in v 13. Instead of MT ἴτω, as is also the case in v 13. Instead of MT ἴτω, as is also the case in v 13. Instead of MT ἴτω, as is also the case in v 13.

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 (нологικός ἐλέησεν) in whatever mission Saul sent him" — a 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 5a "Saul feared David" (ὐπάρχει, ἐλέησεν, ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν), which is grammatically incorrect, LXX reads ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν as in v 14.8

At the end of v 18:16, LXX reads πρὸς παραστάσιν τοῦ λαοῦ (= Λαοῦ), instead of MT Ἰσραὴλ. The LXX reading is a better-adjusted repetition of the phrase in v 13:

v. 13b Ἰσραὴλ ἔφυγεν καὶ τῆς τοῦ λαοῦ (LXX; MT Ἰσραὴλ)

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" (_ITEMS_1, which is grammatically incorrect, LXX reads ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν), which is grammatically incorrect, LXX reads ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν as in v 14.8

v 14b "and Yahweh was with him" (ὁ Ἰσραήλ ὢν, ὠς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν), which is grammatically incorrect, LXX reads ὡς καὶ τις ἐλέησεν as in v 14.8

v 15 = v 28: "and Saul saw..." (]._ Items_2.

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" (v 6aa). This conflate reading is related to another double reading present in v 6aa. Each component of the doublet has been preserved individually in a textual witness (whether MT or LXX):
According to the MT, the women came out "to meet Saul" (דְּנָמַנְנָה), whereas the OG says they came out "to meet David" (אֵלֶּכֶת). The Greek reading is based upon the shorter form of the text (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 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. 11

IV. 1 Sam 17:13-15

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

17:13a הָלְכוּ בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לְחַלֵּמָה לָם הָלְכוּ בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לְחַלֵּמָה
17:13b לְשׁוֹלַשׁ בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לָם הָלְכוּ בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לְחַלֵּמָה
17:14a לִפְרֵד בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לָם הָלְכוּ בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש בָּנֵי יְשֵׁש לְחַלֵּמָה

13 "The names in 17,13 may have been inverted in order to strengthen the link with the context," Lust 124.
14 Cf. Stoebe 322; McCarter 303; Tov 43; Barthélemy 48; Lust 90.
Hereziah, besieged by Sennacherib, sends him the message: "Withdraw from me" (עָלָם). In both instances the context is one of military conflict, as is also the case in our passage.\(^{15}\)

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 לְלַעֵב (v 13a) is better explained in terms of the resumptive repetition that encompasses vv 13b-14a.\(^{16}\)

Other textual variants related to resumptive repetitions are the following:

(1) In v 16:1 LXX reads καὶ ἀπενέχθη Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουήλ: "(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 יִשְׁתַּחַר "introductory" phrases 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).\(^{17}\)

V. The Longer and Shorter Forms of the Text

The question of the origin and character of the pre-Hexaplaric and pre-Lucianic (proto-Theodotionic?) text in the passages missing in the B text of the Old Greek requires further investigation.\(^{18}\) 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.\(^{19}\) The conflated 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 18:20-19) 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 17:1-30 [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...
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.20 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).21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition I</th>
<th>Edition II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT – LXX</td>
<td>MT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Units</td>
<td>Literary Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David and Goliath I</td>
<td>David and Goliath II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1-9 (10) 11</td>
<td>17:12-30 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-33 (34-36 τῶν)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 "Version 2 could not have existed separately" (Tov, 19).

21 Compare the division of the text suggested here with those based on a simple comparison of the phrases and minuses in the MT and LXX texts. McCarter recognizes a first account in 17:1-11, 32-40, 42-47, 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 belongs to the following section concerning Jonathan's intercession on behalf of David (McCarter, 284-320).

THE STORY OF DAVID AND GOLIATH

| 37-40 (42-47 τῶν) | 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
18:6a-8a, 9
Saul's jealousy II
18:10-11
12a
13-14, 15, 16
David and Merab
18:17-19

David and Michal
18:20-21a
22-27
28a, b (LXX) / b (MT)
(29a)
v. 21b
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.22 The question about the longer

22 "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,23 as well as the editorial techniques employed by Editor II to insert his new material into the previous work of Editor I.

---

1 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.


3 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 Gössenig text as the base text.

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

**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,7 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

---

5These are MSS b o c 2 e 7, with 'b' representing both MS b' and MS b where they share the same reading, for a total of five manuscripts.


7Various 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.

---

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

9'Majority of the family' in contradistinction to a majority of the manuscripts in the database.

10Theoretically, with five (ie. an odd number of) manuscripts in the family, no reading can be supported by less than half the manuscripts in the database, and the latter to readings supported by more than half of them.
family majority readings and the family minority variants along with their Lucianic and non-Lucianic support. 11

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. 12 This new manuscript was in turn copied. Shortly after its creation, 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 beyond the original text, although three new and independent characteristics were introduced. 14

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 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, 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. 17

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.

---


12 These manuscripts have been tagged as 'Lucianic' because in the main they agree with distinctive scribal 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.

13 Sebastian Brock, as a result of his analysis in 1 Reigns, dates the Lucianic text as witnessed to by MSS b c2 e2 g 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 Lucian, 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 I Samuel" [D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1966], p. 190).

14 In all but two of the twelve occurrences of ἔστηκεν MS ε2 has ἐστηκεν. The majority (Lucianic) text correctly places the augment between the prefix and the verb in ἐστηκεν. MS b' goes one step further and adds a double augment as in ἐπεστηκεν. Finally, MS ε2 prefers the form ἐπέστηκεν over the Lucianic majority ἐστηκεν.

15 Some are chance occurrences created when Lucianic orthographic variants happen to coincide with the more popular tradition, such as a ἐπεστηκεν unconsciously altered to the orthographic variant ἐπέστηκεν which happens to be shared by the wider tradition, one of numerous such changes.

16 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.

17 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 ἀνθρώπος ἄβατος, "an upright man;" whereas MSS b' (along with A y m N gh) read the lesser variant ἄνθρωπος ἀβαίμα, 'a man early,' "Ophriel" 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 ἀπεβαίμα 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, gave prominence to MS b' as the quintessential Lucianic manuscript, 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 as Ionic or Doric or other dialectal forms but which are simply copyist errors. Failure to recognize them as such results in misleading, even if attractive, conclusions.

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.'

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.

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.

---

18Paul A. de Lagarde, ed., Liberorum Vetere Testamenti canonicorum pars prior (Göttingen, 1883).

19This is true for 1 Reigns, and may be true for other Books. Driver is certainly not correct for 1 Reigns when he says: "MS 95 [eg] 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), p. xlviii. In fact, it is the least used of the five manuscripts.


21For the reading ζωήσων ('sandal') of the majority in 1 Reigns 12:3, MS c has ζωόδωσα ('tunic') in the text, and ζωόδωσα ('supporting wall'), the Doric form of ζωόςων, in the margin. It is clear from the context that this is an inner-Greek variant.

22At 1 Reigns 5:10 an impressive group of manuscripts (b y Ac z e gv Eus) omits the same passage--καὶ ηγεῖται ὧς ἐρρέετο καὶ φάσατο τοῦ διὸ ἀρχήσατο. However, it turns out that they all do it for the same reason--haplography--having jumped from καὶ to καὶ.

23At 1 Reigns 11:10 ἄρω is read by MSS be2 Beq Acx qta efmrw MGhbrhbp, and λυπεῖν is read by MSS be3 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 be2.
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.
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