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MINUTES OF IOSCS MEETING
August 19-20, 1977
Theologicum of the University
Room 701

IOSOT/International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Göttingen, BRD

PROGRAMME

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

Friday 3:00-6:00 p.m.
Professor Wevers presiding
"Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta-Forschung"
R. Hanhart, Göttingen
"Lisakhw and epakw and Text Criticism in the Greek Psalter"
C. Cox, Toronto
"Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos"
J. de Waard, Aix-en-Provence

Friday  8:00-11:00 p.m.
Professor Hanhart presiding
"La témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante"
P. M. Bogaert, Denee
"The Renderings of Ilion in the Septuagint"
R. Sollamo, Helsinki
"Est-ce que la sagesse aime l'humanité?"
A. Pelletier, Paris

Saturday  10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Professor Pietersma presiding
"The Textual Affinities of the Bohairic of Deuteronomy"
M. K. H. Peters, Cleveland
"Die Übersetzungsweise des Deuteronomiumübersetzers im Lichte von Papyrus 848"
U. Quast, Göttingen
"Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural im griechischen Pentateuch"
I. Soisalon-Soininen, Helsinki
"Constancy and Variety in Vocabulary Use in the Septuagint"
J. Barr, Oxford

Saturday  3:00-6:00 p.m.
Professor Wevers presiding
"Recessional Evidence for the Corruption of I Kings 22:46"
S. J. De Vries, Delaware, Ohio

"The Possibilities and Impossibilities of Reconstructing the Vorlage of the LXX"
E. Tov, Jerusalem
"Das Problem des griechischen Textes der Complutenser Polyglotte zu dem Zwölffprophetenbuch"
N. Fernández Marcos, Madrid

BUSINESS MEETING

Called to order by the President.
1. Summary of the minutes of the St. Louis (Missouri) meeting of IOSCS, October 29, 1976, was approved as presented by the Secretary (A. Pietersma).
2. Treasurer's Report (presented by the President):
   Balance on hand, August 8, 1977 $1,549.93
   ACCEPTANCE MOVED  CARRIED
3. President's Report
   a. Lexicon Project: a Research Grant application for a Research Tools Project to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), after initial rejection, has been re-submitted.
   b. A list of corrections to J. van Haelst, Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens, compiled by Professor Hanhart, will be published in the IOSCS Bulletin. The list is not intended as a general corrective, but is solely concerned with Rahlf's-numbers of manuscripts included in the Catalogue.
   c. The President stressed the importance of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen as a central bureau for information on the Septuagint.

"The Possibilities and Impossibilities of Reconstructing the Vorlage of the LXX"
E. Tov, Jerusalem
"Das Problem des griechischen Textes der Complutenser Polyglotte zu dem Zwölffprophetenbuch"
N. Fernández Marcos, Madrid

BUSINESS MEETING

Called to order by the President.
1. Summary of the minutes of the St. Louis (Missouri) meeting of IOSCS, October 29, 1976, was approved as presented by the Secretary (A. Pietersma).
2. Treasurer's Report (presented by the President):
   Balance on hand, August 8, 1977 $1,549.93
   ACCEPTANCE MOVED  CARRIED
3. President's Report
   a. Lexicon Project: a Research Grant application for a Research Tools Project to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), after initial rejection, has been re-submitted.
   b. A list of corrections to J. van Haelst, Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens, compiled by Professor Hanhart, will be published in the IOSCS Bulletin. The list is not intended as a general corrective, but is solely concerned with Rahlf's-numbers of manuscripts included in the Catalogue.
   c. The President stressed the importance of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen as a central bureau for information on the Septuagint.
4. Rahlfs' Verzeichnis

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

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

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

Albert Pietersma
Secretary

FINANCIAL REPORT
August 8, 1977

BALANCE ON HAND, October 29, 1976 $1235.23

(Treasurer's Report, Bulletin #10)

INCOME

Subscriptions 316.00
Interest on Savings 54.07
370.07

EXPENDITURES

Duplication & Postage:
University of Toronto 9.00
University of Georgia 34.35
University of Notre Dame 12.02

Income 370.07
Expenditures 55.37

NET INCOME 314.70

Balance, October 29, 1976 1235.23
Income, to August 8, 1977 314.70

BALANCE ON HAND, August 8, 1977 1549.93 $1549.93

Eugene Ulrich, Treasurer

Auditors:

James D. Whitehead
Department of Theology
University of Notre Dame

Louanne Bachner
Department of Theology
University of Notre Dame

NEWS AND NOTES

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

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

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED, IN HAND, OR PROJECTED
(The list includes items brought to the attention of the Editor since Bulletin No. 10 went to press.)


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


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


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


Ulrich, E. (1) *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Scholars Press. [Due to appear in late 1978]. Cf. summary in *BIOSeS* 6 (1975) 24-39. (2) Collaborating with F. M. Cross on the *OJS* edition of the Samuel manuscripts from Qumran. (3) The edition of 4QSam<sup>6</sup> is completed. It will appear in the Samuel volume of *OJS*, ed. by F. M. Cross, and will receive preliminary publication with fuller textual analysis in a journal. (4) Reports that the University of Notre Dame library has on microfilm typed index cards with many, but not all to date, of the Old Latin readings from the Vetus Latina Institut in Beuron, W. Germany. Write Ulrich for details.


NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE STUDY OF THE
ECRITS INTERTESTAMENTAIRES

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

With a Request from Albert-Marie Denis, Louvain

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

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

I Nénoch
Jubilés
Testaments des Douze Patriarches
Psautiers de Salomon
Testament de Moïse
Martyre d'Isaïe
Livres des Antiquités Bibliques

A. Caquot
M. Testuz
M. Philonenko
P. Prigent
E. M. Laperrouzaz
A. Caquot
J. Hadot

Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch
IV Esther
Oracles sibyllins
I Nénoch
Joseph et Aséneth
Testament de Job
Testament d'Abraham
Apocalypse d'Abraham
Paralipomènes de Jérémie
Histoire de la Captivité à Babylone
Vie d'Adam et Ève
Apocalypse grecque de Baruch
Apocalypse copie d'Èlie
10e Livre des Maccabees

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

Concordances

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

Request from Albert-Marie Denis

La concordance complète des pseudépigraphes grecs d'A.T. (cf.
la liste dans Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'A.T.) est en
voie d'achèvement par ordinateur, grâce à un subside du F.N.R.S.
(Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique) de Belgique, de FB 280.000 (env. $9000). La dactylographie des textes, jointe à la lemmatisation et à une analyse succincte, se poursuit actuellement. Le ms., selon notre programmation, doit être terminé en décembre 1979. C'est donc maintenant qu'il faut prévoir la présentation définitive et les détails de l'édition. Les avis des membres de l'I.O.S.C.S. nous seraient fort utiles pour résoudre un certain nombre de questions concrètes.


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

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

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

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

5. Les adjectifs substantivés (τὰ ἁγαθα, τὸ ἤκον) seront rangés avec l'adjectif, excepté quand le sens est nettement distinct (οἴκουμεν ne peut se ranger sous ὀίκειον), de même, par exemple, pour νῶπλον, qui ne peut se ranger sous νωπλοῖον. Les mots fusionnés seront rangés à leur lettre initiale: ἱκεῖο, ἴκο, sous K.

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

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

---

DESCRIBING MEANING IN THE LXX LEXICON

Moises Silva
Westmont College
Santa Barbara, CA

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

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

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

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

Although wide disagreement still exists regarding the extent and character of structural relations in the vocabulary, the fact of some such lexical network in each language is not disputed. Thus, John Lyons in a standard work can insist on the primacy of sense relations over against the notion of reference, which he considers secondary. Now the usual description of meaning in dictionaries is more compatible with a reference view of meaning than with the recent emphasis on sense (Coseriu: lexematic) relations. Accordingly, Francisco Rodríguez Adrados contends that dictionaries should abandon their "essentialist" definitions and instead rely on the semantic oppositions which words contract with each other (though always noting the possibility of neutralization). He adds that, if such a structural approach is necessary in a monolingual dictionary, the situation becomes critical in bilingual dictionaries, where translation equivalents must be given: how can these equivalents be reported accurately in view of the lack of semantic isomorphism between the two languages?

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

A second example of quite a different sort helps to show the value of structural considerations for solving these problems. If we look up the verb *to eat* in an English-Spanish dictionary, the equivalent given will be *comer*. However, in syntagmatic combination with *sopa* ("soup") Spanish, in some of its varieties at least, prefers the verb *tomar*, which is normally the equivalent of *to drink*. We may say
that the paradigmatic opposition between comox and tomaz is different from that between to eat and to drink, and that the difference comes out in specific syntagmatic (or syntactical) combinations. (The word paradigmatic is here used in reference to words which, because of their semantic associations, may occupy the same slot in a sentence.) It would appear then, as a result of these structural considerations, that the English terms should be defined with reference to the manner in which the food is taken to the mouth, whereas the Spanish terms with reference to the constitution of the food (that is, whether or not mastication is necessary).

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

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

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

1. Scholars doing the initial research must not be assigned parts of the alphabet, but rather specific books or groups of books. Such an approach is crucial (even apart from the concerns of this article) insofar as a certain degree of expertise is required for specific translation styles in the LXX. Further, the character of
the LXX lexicon should be uncompromisingly synchronic, not dia-
chronic or historical, for which we have L-S.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTES

1 According to Zgusta (bibliographic information above in the text),
this article is based on a paper read at the IOSCS meeting in Chicago,

2 Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics (Cambridge University
Press, 1968), p. 443 (he has, however, modified his terminology in a
more recent two-volume work, Semantics, 1977, ch. 7). Rodríguez
Adrados, Estudios de lingüística general (Barcelona: Editorial Planeta,
1969), pp. 22, 49. In my judgement, the most promising and suggestive
research is that of Eugenio Coseriu, whose ideas are ably summarized
by Horst Geckeler, Struktuelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie (München:
Wilhelm Fink, 1971). Coseriu and Geckeler have further articulated
their view of "lexematics" in vol. 12 of Current Trends in Linguistics.
For a parallel approach in America, see Eugene Nida, Componential
Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures (Approaches to
Semiotics 57; Mouton, 1975).
Several years ago Prof. A. Sáenz-Badillos and I began work on a critical edition of Theodoret's *Questiones in Octateuchum* (Thdt). This work is now in press. The importance that Thdt's text has for the history of the LXX and in particular for the study of the Antiochian recension is significant. Following Prof. George Howard's kind suggestion, a brief summary of our conclusions stemming from this edition is stated here.¹

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

One of the principal obstacles to identifying the Antiochian recension in the Octateuch has been the lack of a scientific edition of Thdt. Our work attempts to rectify past research based upon deficient editions of this Father. With the present critical edition, in which special attention has been given to biblical
quotations, we are in a position to determine the form of the biblical text used in Antioch in the IV-V centuries. A book by book analysis of Thdt's biblical quotations follows.

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

**Exodus:** Thdt has two readings in common with ms n 7: 4,22 ποιωτόκος) πρωτογονός η Φιλ Θθτ and 9,7 έξων επέ η Θθτ; two in common with mss (b)n: 5,1 δοτάκευσαν λατρευσαν η Θθτ and 9,28 τοφασος) προσεύχασθε η Θθτ; and one in common with ms p: 3,19 έξων επέ η Θθτ. We may include readings which Thdt has in common with n accompanied by some other witnesses, since n (and sometimes g) is the constant factor in all these occurrences.

Examples are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,22</td>
<td>τοσσοτρι</td>
<td>τοσσουτον επο Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,14</td>
<td>ομ και ειπεν 2ο</td>
<td>egj Sa Eus Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>έδωσωθαν</td>
<td>pr και Mnt Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,12</td>
<td>έσκολπνεν δε</td>
<td>και εσκολπνεν bmwy Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,34</td>
<td>ποιωτοκο</td>
<td>pr και prt Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,18</td>
<td>εκ γης</td>
<td>εξ An Θθτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>ομ και egj Sa-ed Aeth Θθτ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>ειπε αλν Sa-cod Θθτ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **a)** Agreements with n
- 23,14 om εως 1ο-τατην η Θθτ
- **b)** Agreements with gh and a few other witnesses
- 1,2 έδωσα 1ο) δουκον gna,b2 Θθτ
- 16,16 το αγιον περι τον αγιον M(mg)gna(mg)z(mg) Sa La Θθτ
- 16,22 λ(ο)ς M(mg)ταγος egjns(txt)τυ(τυ)π2 Θθτ
- 16,29 ταπεινώσατε 1/2 Aeth Chrl/2) κακωσετε M(mg)gna(mg) z(mg) Thθτ
- 16,31 ταπεινώσατε κακωσετε gns(mg)z(mg) Θθτ
- 17,7 of(z) ον gnx Θθτ
- 23,14 λ(ο)ξα νεα) tr nx Cyg-cod 1/3 Θθτ
- **c)** Agreements with gndpt
- 1,2 και 3ο) η bndpt Arm Θθτ
- 14,34 δ(ο)την 2ο)λοιον M(mg)bndpt Arm(vid) Θθτ
- 23,15 έπιθεματος αμορισματος M(mg)dgnp(mg)τυ(τυ)z(mg) Θθτ
- 26,35 σο Byzati(e) pr και dgnpt Arm Aeth Θθτ
- **d)** Agreements with gndpt+bw
- 17,11 ψυχης) ταυτον bndnptwy Θθτ
quotations, we are in a position to determine the form of the biblical text used in Antioch in the IV-V centuries. A book by book analysis of Thdt's biblical quotations follows.

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

**Exodus:** Thdt has two readings in common with ms n: 4,22 (ποσοκόμος) ποσοκόμος in Phil Thdt and 9,7 (έδω) είδε in Thdt; two in common with mss (b): 5,1 (λατρεύω) λατρεύω in Thdt and 9,28 (εξευθείας) εξευθείας by Thdt; and one in common with ms ρ: 3,19 (έδω) είτε ρ θατ. We may include readings which Thdt has in common with himself accompanied by some other witnesses, since n (and sometimes ρ) is the constant factor in all these occurrences. Examples are:

1. 22 (τοσοστω) τοσοστουν ενο θατ
2. 3,14 om και ειπεν 2° egj Sa Eus Thdt
3. 7 (δωδεκάνης) προ και Μαθ Thdt
4. 9,12 (εσκαλίσων δέ) και εσκάλισον bmsy Thdt
5. 9,34 (προοέθετο) προ και προ θατ Thdt
6. 13,18 (εις γυς) είς An Thdt
7. 19,6 om και εγίνθ Σα-αδ Αθεν Thdt
8. 19,8 (ειπεν) είπε ακα Σα-κοδ Thdt

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

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

a) Agreements with n
1. 23,14 om έως 1ο-τατον n θατ
b) Agreements with μ and a few other witness
1. 2 (διναρι) διναρι gns1,2 Thdt
16. 16 (το δυνατον) περι των αγιων Μ(μγ)gns1,2 Thdt
16. 22 (χλαμας) τραγος egjns (txt)υ (txt) ιά Thdt
16. 29 (ταξινόσατε) BAdftp Aeth Chr1/2 θασοτεί M(μγ) gns1,2 θατ
16. 31 (ταξινόσατε) θασοτεί gns1,2 θατ
17. 7 (οκεν) αν γνω θατ
23. 14 (ξιδαν νέα) τι μν Σερ-κο Σκορ 1/3 Thdt
c) Agreements with μ+dpτ
1. 2 (και 3ο) m bdpτ Arm Thdt
14. 34 (διναμικη) μαν Μ(μγ) bdpτ Arm (vid) Thdt
23. 15 (επιδειματος) αυτος θατ M(μγ) gns1,2,υ (μγ) θατ
26. 35 (πασαθεια) προ και bdpτ Arm Aeth Thdt
d) Agreements with μ+dpτ+Θω
17. 11 (ουνη) +αυτου bdpτωυ Arm Thdt
From these lists it is obvious that Thdt does not agree consistently with any group of mss. Its only reading that approaches α is an omission probably caused by homoioarcton. Groups dpt and bw have no readings in common with Thdt. On the other hand, from paragraphs b) and c) we can see something already noted in Exodus, namely, that Thdt's agreements with gnt+dpt or gnt + any other witness (above all the margins of H, α, ν and z) are relatively frequent. In all these concurrences gnt is the constant, the other witnesses the variant.

Thus we must conclude that it is with gnt that Thdt agrees most often and that his agreements with dpt and bw occur only when these mss appear with gnt (see, for instance, 16:29 where Thdt agrees with gnt against dpt).

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

a) Agreements with gnt
5,16 om αόην 1ο gnt Arm Thdt
12,6 λαλήσω αὐτῷ tr gnt Thdt
16,22 Θεός, Θεός Θεός n Thdt
Agreements with gnt and any other witness
3,8 κατά) καὶ gngnt Arm Cyr-cod Thdt
5,6 ἐκαθόμισεν) om Nbgw Thdt
5,8 om Aaghns Thdt
5,18 τοῦ ἐπικαταστάτου τούτου Nbgnt2 Arm Bo(vid) Cyr-ed Thdt...
5,19 αὕτης) αὕτης F gnt Thdt
10,10 νομισμάτων) νομισμάτων) Nbgkw Thdt
11,8 om αὐτῷ 1ο gnt Arm La Thdt

b) Agreement with gnt
6,2 έὰν Bagn) αὐ FGMN rell Thdt

23,20 ἀποστράφου) αποστράφου bgnt Aeth(vid) Thdt
31,16 om ἕν gnt Thdt

Disagreement with gnt

b) Agreements with dpt
5,21 om καὶ 1τοῦ γυναικί dpt Chr Thdt
11,11 ἐπιστάναι) + μοι dpt Arm Thdt
23,19 εἶπαι( ἐπισαι dpt Thdt

Agreements with dpt and any other witness
5,8 ποδες αὐτῶν) pr to dpse(mg)τζ(mg) Thdt
5,20 μειλανσαι) pr cu dgkptx La Thdt
11,8 Μάθησιν) πλεον k(mg)dpctu Thdt
11,17 λαοὶ+) τουτου dgkpt Arm Bo Sa Aeth Thdt
14,21 ξένω) En Nmpnt Bo(vid) La Cyr-ed 1/6 Thdt
Disagreements with dpt

11,16 ποδες Bdprta2 Cyr) εἰς ...Thdt
16,40 μηθεις Bdprrta2) μηθεις APMN rell Thdt
23,3 εἴθεις) pr en Fgnt Thdt; pr εἰς dgkpt

C) Agreements with gnt+dpt
5,15 ἀναμιμνησκούσα) pr θυσία dgnpt Arm Thdt
5,16 αόηθυ 2ο) την γυναικα dgnpt Arm Thdt
6,2 κυρί(ο) pr τω dgnpt Cyr-cod Thdt
6,12 ἄλογοι) αλογιστοι dgnpt Thdt
15,31 ἡ Διαμορφωσις αμαρτία γαρ dgnpt Arm Thdt
15,39 πασον των εντολιν) πασας τας εντολας dgnpt Thdt
καὶ ποιῆσετε) ποιησαι dgnpt Arm Thdt
23,8 δι και Bdgntw Bo Aeth Thdt
31,16 ἀποστήσαι) αποστησαι dgnptb2 Thdt
The group nearest to Thdt's text is gn. It is with this group that Thdt agrees most often and with which he disagrees the least. Sometimes he agrees with dpt but not as often as with gn; he clearly disagrees with dpt on three occasions. As seen from paragraph c) Thdt agrees with gn+dp in a number of important variants. It should be noted that the agreements between Thdt and gn, dpt, or both groups together are often accompanied by the Armenian version (3,8; 5,15.16 (twice). 18;11,8.17;15,31.39), the substratum of which, as recent investigations in 1 Samuel have shown, includes protolucianic material.

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

7,9 ἐλευθερίας θν*) ἐλευ...Thdt
13,2 λόγων καὶ εὐθ...dpt...Thdt:εἰς:gn
23,14 διὸ ἔστω ὑπὲρ...Thdt:εὐθ:gn
27,1 λόγων λέγοντες ἐδείγμην (mg) θντ
φυλάσσοντες + ποιεῖν ὀνομάτ: Thdt
33,19 ἐπικαλέσσεται -λέγονται ἐδείγμην Thdt
θόρος) δυσοῦν ἐδείγμην Thdt

It is difficult to separate Thdt's agreements with gn (with whom he agrees the most) from his agreements with dpt, because most of the readings that show clear traces of revision are shared by both groups.

Joshua: a) Agreements with gn
2,10 om με γν Thdt
10,13 τὸ γενὸς αὐτὸ γν Thdt
γεγραμμένοιν γεγραμμένοι αὐτὸ γν Thdt
τὸ θεὸος) το εἱρήν θεο γν Thdt
23,13 om καὶ εἰς ἄλλη γν Thdt
eἰς δολίσας) ὑπὲρ γν Thdt

- Agreements with gn and a few other witnesses
1,3 θε': δν) ou γν Aeth Syh Thdt
1,17 οὐ εἰς: (vid) bgn Arm Sa Aeth(vid) La Or-lat Thdt
10,13 βιβλίου) βιβλίου εἰς γν (mg) Thdt
14,7 τοῦ δεοῦ κυρίου γν Thdt
19,8,9 om κατὰ 2ο (9) συμεών 1ο γν Aeth Thdt
19,9 om ςΑ: An Thdt
23,14 η ἀνήκουσα αἱ εἰρήνεις μὴν δέσσαι Thdt:αἱ εἰρήνεις γνω
23,15 χρόνος οὖν ἑαυτῷ τρ γν La Thdt

b) Agreements with dpt
11,20 ἄλλοι以人为 δολεροεὐθαναίῳ τοῦ αὐτοσείνῳ αὐτους dptw Thdt:om gn

- Agreements with gn+dp(w)
1,3 om θεοίγαν Thdt
2,9 οὖν χρόνος) κυρίος ο θεος νομαν Thdt:κς ο θες μιήν bαγκτ
2,10 ἐποίησαν εποίησατε θεοθητητικός Αρμ Συή θν Thdt
5,12 τοῦτου) αὐτοῦ Πδγκτπτω Aeth θν Thdt
εὐταγνοκταν Thdt

- Agreements with gn+dp(w)
6,26 om αὐτοῦ 2ο dpt Thdt

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

Judges: Just a glance at the list of variants reveals a change in the textual spectrum. The number of Thdt's agreements with the reading of the majority has decreased. It also has fewer unique readings. On the other hand, the proportion of agreements with glsw and with dpt has considerably increased. Thdt's text is now more clearly. In Judges dpt never agrees with Thdt alone but always in conjunction with glsw. It is not unusual for the hexaplaric recension to agree with Thdt when it is joined by dpt and glsw to form the majority reading. On the other hand glsw are often prehexaplaric and preserve elements of the old-LXX but with some traces of inner-Greek stylistic revision. At the moment the specific text that circulated in Antioch and which was known by Thdt can be determined with its clearly defined characteristics. Some of its most significant readings are as follows:

1,35 κατοικεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ γλως Θαθὴν
2,1 ἀνεβαί νασαν (εὐνασαν παλιν) γλως δρτ Θαθὴν
2,3 εἰσα ἐποὺ γλως δρτ Θαθὴν
2,19 πάλιν διέφθαρεν διεφθάρεν γλως Θαθὴν
3,19 γαλαγαλίς γαλαγάλις f γλως δρτ Θαθὴν
3,22 κατὰ τῆς ὁλογραφία τῆς παραξενίας γνω δρτ Θαθὴν
5,7 δυνατόν 1οι κρατουντες γλως δρτ Θαθὴν
5,10 ἄνω διαλες μεσομεριας υποκειμενα A γλως δρτ Θαθὴν
17,5 ἐποιήσαντες πάντα μισα Θαθὴν + μισά Z glsw δρτ Θαθὴν
17,6 ἀνήα ἄνθρωπος γλως δρτ Θαθὴν tὸ ἐσθένο τῆς γλως Θαθὴν
20,28 Ἀδαμ ἀπὸ τοῦ τερεμοῦ γλως τοῦ τοῦ πρόβ Θαθὴν

The list reflects some revisions which appear to be the result of recensional activity. Usually they occur when glsw and dpt go together, but also, to a smaller degree, when only glsw agree with...
Thdt. We meet Atticistic corrections (2,3.19), doublets (17,6a), explanatory additions (17,5; 20,28), a declension of a transliteration (3,19), interchange of synonyms (3,22; 5,7.10; 17,6b), etc.

Ruth: a) Agreements with glowe₂
1,16 ἀποντήσας ἡμᾶς γένοιτο glowe₂ Thdt
2,21 ἐν ποδὶς με glowe₂ Thdt
4,10 ὑπὸ gklewe₂ Thdt
4,12 ἐστὶν ἰδέα bglob₂ east Thdt: ὅτι n
b) Agreements with dptv
none

c) Agreements with glowe₂+dptv
1,12 εἴναι εἶπον gn-qtvwe₂ Thdt
eστὶν pr. ὅτι glowe₂ dptv Thdt
gνηθηθαίᾳ γνωσθαί Nα? glowe₂ ptv Thdt
1,16 ἀποστρατίαν pr του glowe₂ ptv Thdt
σῷ προτὸν πονεῦσαι glowc ptv Aeth Thdt
tολοθρηθαμέν] + καὶ glowe₂ ptv Syh(sub—) Thdt
ὁ 1ος pr. φτε glowe₂ ptv Thdt
2,12 ἀποτομῶν τοι γλowe₂ ptv Arm Sa Aeth La Thdt
2,21 δὲ ὅποις τούτους glowe₂ ptv Thdt
3,10 τῷ (εἰς) τοῦ εἰκὼν glowe₂ ptv Thdt
τῷ 2ος τοῦ glowe₂ ptv Thdt
τῷ 3ος τοῦ gowe₂ ptv Thdt
eἰσαι ἢ ἸΔαβδείας; προί a glowe₂ ptv Thdt
eἰσαι ἢ ἸΔαβδείας; προί a lowe₂ ptv Thdt
4,12 ἐκ 1ος pr καὶ bglnwe₂ ptv Thdt
4,14 ἀγνοεῖτα ὁθυκρωκα, b₂ Syh)αγνοεῖται bgl-ptwe₂ Thdt
cαὶ καὶ 2ο bgk-onwe₂ Arm Sa Thdt

Considering the brevity of Ruth, Thdt's text is characterized by a large number of variant readings. It agrees often with glowe₂+diptv, sometimes against the hexaplaric recension (cf. c). However, since it never agrees with [d]p[tv alone, it is nearer to group glowe₂ (≠ from 4,11 on).

As for the type of text reflected in these variants, it includes most of the characteristics of the Antiochian recension as we know it in the Prophets: Atticisms (1,12(twice), 16;3,10 (three times); additions which elucidate the meaning of the Greek (1,16;2,12); interchange of synonyms (2,21;4,14). Some of these characteristics appear in the agreements of Thdt with glowe₂ (the optatives of 1,16 and 4,12), but most of them appear when Thdt agrees with glowe₂ and (d) p[tv together. In addition we should not forget that two members of the group, mss oe₂, in the historical books are witnesses of the lucianic text.

CONCLUSIONS: We have seen how in Genesis Thdt agrees with the majority-text, although in a few cases he agrees preferentially with groups b, n and d of Wenck's edition. In Exodus mss {g} of Brooke-McLean are the nearest to Thdt's text in peculiar readings, but neither the number nor the quality of the variants are significative. In Leviticus Thdt agrees still with the reading of the majority as in the preceding books. But if we attend to the combinations of mss (gn plus other witness; gn and dpt), we observe that gn is the constant and the other witnesses are the variable. Consequently, gn is the nearest group to Thdt's text. In Numbers gn continues to be the nearest group to Thdt, although it is also in agreement with dpt in some peculiar readings. As for the type of variants, in its agreements with dpt or with gn+dpt, there appear slight traces of
revision (additions of pronoun or article, improvements of style, interchanges of synonyms...). In Deuteronomy, gn is the nearest group to Thdt, followed by dpt and bw. Although most of the agreements consist of omissions, there appear some traces of revision, above all in those passages where gn are supported by dpt (which are more recensioned, as it seems). In Joshua the identity of groups is more outlined because of an increase in specific variants. Groups gn and dpt are nearest to Thdt. He agrees more with gn, however, as can be seen from the number and quality of peculiar readings he has in common with them and from the number of his agreements with gn+dpt. Some marks of intentional revision can be seen above all in his agreements with gn or with gn+dpt. Judges: group glnw is nearest to Thdt in its specific readings, not only when it stands alone but also when it is accompanied by dptv. This last group never agrees with Thdt in its peculiar readings except in the company of glnw. As we have seen glnw has prehexaplaric elements with traces of internal stylistic changes. When it alone agrees with Thdt, and in a special way when it is accompanied by dptv, it has traces of revision which may reflect the Antiochian text known by Thdt, namely, Atticisms, interchange of synonyms, doublets, and explanatory additions. In Ruth Thdt agrees most often with glnowe and (d)ptv when they go together, sometimes against the hexaplaric recension. Taking into account that Thdt never agrees only with (d)ptv, but at times does with glnowe, we conclude that the latter is the nearest to Thdt. Here the variants show practically all the characteristics of the Antiochian recension as we know it from the historical and prophetic books.

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

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

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

As for the textual character reflected in their agreements with Thdt we can see it best in the last books of the Octateuch. In Ruth Thdt's text has the main traits of the Antiochian recension. In Judges we find indefinite traces of intentional stylistic revision. In a decreasing manner, traces of stylistic revision can be observed back to Numbers. In Numbers and Deuteronomy these traces appear clearer in the material coming from dpt than from gn. Nevertheless there are also traces of stylistic revision even in the stratum of the tradition represented by gn when it agrees with Thdt.
The interpretation of this phenomenon is not easy. Future critical editions of these books may elucidate more fully the textual panorama of the LXX. In the meantime, due to the lack of a better hypothesis, using as an analogy the historical books, it seems best to explain the textual data we have explored in terms of the Lucianic and protolucianic text, or if one prefer, in terms of an Antiochian text which includes an old prehexaplaric though somewhat revised substratum and a more recent layer of revised material. Group dp reflects the revised ulterior stage. Group gmw, whose prehexaplaric elements are clear in Judges, contains elements of the old-LXX but also reflects traces of an inner-Greek revision. Future investigations are needed before this view of gmw can be expanded to include the rest of the books of the Octateuch.

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

We find no signs of a protolucianic recension in the Octateuch in the sense defined by Cross, that is, a recension which brings the Greek into harmony with the Hebrew text circulating in Palestine in the 1st century BC. On the other hand, there is nothing to forbid us from naming "protolucianic" the first stylistic revision of the Antiochian text in gmw. This is in line with the position suggested by Brock, and recently confirmed by Ulrich. In fact the stylistic revision under consideration here agrees in nature with that which Brock discussed in regard to the Lucianic text in the books of Reigns. This revision is scarcely perceptible at the beginning of the Octateuch, and becomes more defined from Numbers on, especially in Joshua-Judges-Ruth. Nevertheless we would not call it a recension except from Judges on. With this text, which was scarcely revised stylistically until Joshua, more intensively in Judges-Ruth and which can be called "protolucianic" agrees Thdt in a singular manner.

Notes


3) "All in all, the so-called proto-Lucianic text is to my mind the most difficult problem in modern Septuagint work," says J. W. Wevers. "Proto-Septuagint Studies," in The Seed of Wisdom (Fs. T. J. Meek; Toronto: 1964), 69.

4) "(The Proto-Lucianic) is found as the substratum of the Lucianic Recension (hence 'Proto-Lucian') of Samuel-Kings in the cursives boc22, in Joshua-Judges in the groups K gm dp, and more faintly in the Pentateuch in the families gm dp and (in Deuteronomy) 6," F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." IEJ 16/2(1966) 84, n. 16.

6) J. W. Wevers, Text History of the Greek Genesis, 9 ff, 33 ff and 101 ff.

7) We follow the symbols of the Brooke-McLean edition, except for the abbreviations of the secondary versions where we follow the Göttingen edition.


9) After the present study was finished, I received J. W. Wevers, Septuaginta...III,2 Deuteronomium, Göttingen 1977. Nevertheless I have left Brooke-McLean's symbols and collations in order to preserve uniformity in the quotations from the Octateuch. But here especially our results must be corrected in the light of the new evidence of Wever's Edition and Text History of Deuteronomy.

10) For a more expanded analysis of Thdt's variants in Deuteronomy, cf. N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, Theodoreti Cyrenensis ..., XLVIII ff.

11) More details on these variants are found in N. Fernández Marcos y A. Sáenz-Badillos, op. cit., LV ff.

12) A description of the main characteristics of this group is in A. Sáenz-Badillos, Tradición griega y texto hebreo del canto de Débora (Jue 5). Sef 33/2(1973) 253 ff.


14) F. M. Cross, op cit. 84-85.

15) S. P. Brock, "Lucian redivivus. Some reflections on Barthélemy's Les Devanciers d'Aquilia." Studia Evangelica V (Berlin 1968) 180: "Thus what evidence there is, and it is admittedly not full enough to be at all satisfactory, does point to the Antiochene text as having received its final formulation at a time close to Lucian. For this reason I see no objection to keeping the traditional designation of this text as Lucianic, remembering, of course, that very many of its peculiarities are Pre-Lucianic. The task for the future remains to separate the Lucianic from the pre-Lucianic in this text ... For if Pal. has undergone a hebraising revision, Ant. has also suffered from recensional activity, but of a quite different kind, the aim being to provide a more readable Greek text" (p. 181).

16) Eugene C. Ulrich, "4QSam" and Septuagintal Research," BICS 8(1975) 26-27: 30: "This forces us to go beyond Brock's tentative suggestion ... and to admit proto-Lucianic revisional activity at least, and possible recensional activity."
Jerome’s statement concerning the texts of the Greek Psalter current during his day has formed the basis for investigating the history of the textual tradition of the Greek Psalter. In his "Letter to Sunnia and Fretola" (c. 403 AD) Jerome wrote:

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

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

This paper seeks to take four criteria which Rahlfs defined as characteristics or tendencies of the Lucianic text of Reigns and see if they are also characteristic of the l text in the Psalter. A review of the identification of the vulgar text as Lucianic is in order because of the new papyri which have been found since Rahlfs did his work (eg. 2110, 2149) and the recent evidence put forward by Wevers against a Lucianic revision of Genesis. This investigation is confined to these specific Psalms because it is merely a preliminary attempt to reassess this complicated area.

The four criteria which will be assessed are doublets, atticisms, revisions toward the Hebrew text, and replacement of words by synonyms.

Rahlfs only mentions two doublets in the Psalter:

"Auch hat Lucian offenkundige Dubletten geschaffen: 26:6 αὐνέσεως καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ, 97:9 στὶ ἔρχεται στῇ ἡμέρᾳ."  

At 26:6 the textual evidence reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αλλαλαγμοῦ</th>
<th>Β' Β' Β' Β'</th>
<th>2120 2130/2110 = Μ</th>
<th>αὐνέσεως μὸν ἡμέραν Β'</th>
<th>αὐνέσεως καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ Α'; Α'</th>
<th>αὐνέσεως ...1219</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

A similar situation exists at 97:8:

| γαλλίζονται | Β'' Μα' '' | in (Vulg. a) conspectu domini Ga = M; | +ἀπὸ προσωπου κυριου στι ερχεται Aug 1'' | Α'' (55'pro uno) et alii Latini. |

The "doublet" is created when δυ έρχεται is taken in conjunction with δυ έρχεται of verse 9. The variant in Ga may reflect the work of Origen. The addition of δυ έρχεται in Γ Α'', however, probably shows the influence of the parallel in 95:13.

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

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

Metzger states:

"In other cases it appears that Lucian, acting under the influence of the Atticizing tendency of grammarians of the time, replaced Hellenistic forms of the Septuagint (such as ἐλάβον, ἐῖναον, το ἔλεος, ἔγενθο) with those of Attic usage (ἐλάθων, ἐῖναον, ὁ ἔλεος, ἔγένθο)."

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

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

A common Atticism was the return to the use of the second aorist forms which had been assimilated to first aorist forms in Hellenistic Greek. In the Psalter the L group consistently employs ἐῖναον for the 3 pers. pl., which would correspond to classical usage. Other witnesses generally have ἐῖναον. The only exception might be 93:7 where only Ἐαυ read ἐῖναον (which may be assimilation to the usual pattern of the L group). On the other hand L consistently employs ἐῖνα for the 1 pers. sg., in agreement with the majority of manuscripts, reading ἐῖνα only when other witnesses have it (eg. 40:8, 35:3). In all other cases of ἐῖνευ (except 34:25 where the L group divides over which optative form to read) the L group uses the Hellenistic form. The use of Attic forms of ἐῖευ is very strictly controlled in the L group.

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

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

ἐπιπτειω B T He* S C R* A' ] ἐπεκοινων S* R* L' 2110.

It is of course quite possible that the reading of L is the original one. The translator apparently had a predilection for the second
aorist imperative form. The L group has no compunction at writing such forms as ἐλάδοσαν (78:1).

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

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

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

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

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

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

ἐγνωμα B' 55 R S L' 1219 2149.

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

ἐγνωσαν B' R 2110 ἐγνωσαν L' A'.

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

Another criteria for measuring Lucianic activity was the use of the masculine form of ἔλεος instead of the neuter, which is the more usual Hellenistic form. In the Psalter, however, out of more than one hundred occurrences, only once does the L group read the masculine form (100:1), agreeing with A against all the other witnesses. At 5:8 and 83:12 L' has the neuter form while B reads the masculine (Rahlfs accepts only the second B reading). Thus L cannot be designated as characteristically employing the masculine form of ἔλεος and thereby the Attic form of this word.
If Thackeray is correct in stating that the Attic form \( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \) was largely superseded by the form \( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \nu \), then we should expect that the \( \text{I} \) group would predominantly read \( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \), under Attic influence. But in the Psalter there are only seven occurrences where the \( \text{I} \) group has \( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \) (5:9, 8:3, 26:11, 43:23, 68:19, 121:8, 9), whereas the B text reads it in eleven of the twenty-six occurrences. In view of this the B text would be more atticistic than the \( \text{I} \) group. Rahlfs always follows the text supported by B except at 47:12 where it contravenes the principle set forth by Thackeray.

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

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

76:18 \( \delta \iota \mu \beta \rho \sigma \theta \uomicron \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \delta \iota \mu \beta \rho \sigma \theta \uomicron \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \text{Pau} \ 2110. \)
76:20 \( \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \uomicron \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \uomicron \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \text{S L}^{\text{b}} (20 \text{ mss}) 55 2110. \)

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

76:11 \( \delta \iota \mu \beta \rho \sigma \theta \uomicron \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \alpha \iota \) \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \) \( \text{B} \)

which reflects the influence of the Attic rule. The \( \text{I} \) group along with Bo R 1219' however reads \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \), perhaps reflecting a secondary accommodation to the singular \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \). In any event there is no revision toward the Attic standard.

At 72:2 although the Hebrew verb is pointed plural (\( \pi \tau \tau \pi \alpha \)) the consonants correspond to the singular form and the translator, having an unpointed text, rendered it by a singular verb: \( \varepsilon \xi \chi \delta \omicron \eta \) \( \tau \iota \delta \iota \iota \theta \eta \mu \alpha \omicron \nu \). There is no variant in the Greek tradition.

In only one context does the \( \text{I} \) group diverge from the main tradition. At 77:28 Rahlfs accepts \( \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) as the rendering of \( 77:28 \).

77:28 \( \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) \( 1046 55; \)
\( \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) \( \text{L}^{\text{a}} (69 \text{ mss}) \text{ThP}^{1219} \)
\( \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) \( \text{Lpau} (6 \text{ mss}) \text{ThP}^{1} \).

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

What is clear from these eleven Psalms is that the \( \text{I} \) group shows no pattern of change in the direction of the Attic rule. Only at 77:28 can it be suggested that the \( \text{I} \) group alters the
text for this reason, but even here it is uncertain whether the L group regards "κατὰ τὸν θυσία" as the subject.

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

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

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

Four in particular are important:

73:8 πᾶσας τὰς θυσίας L' Ga R' 55 2149 = MJ om. πᾶσας B' Sa 1219.
75:8 ἀπὸ τοῦ δυνάμενον G Sa 1219 2110 2149 = MJ om. τοῦ δυνάμενον B; τοῦ δυνάμενον R'.

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

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

73:18 τις θυσίας L' 55 2149 S Ga = MJ τῆς κτίσεως Sou B' Sa R' 1219 2110.
73:21 καταξιωσέως L 2149 = MJ pr. καταξιωσόν B LaThtP 2110.
73:23 ποιείς oé B' Sa R Aug 55 2110 2149] tr. προ δία πάντως R Sy He 1219; om. LaG Ga Hi LM.

75:7 οἱ ἐπιθετομένοις B' LaG L' Ga 2149 = MJ pr. πάντως Sa R' Aug I Pau.
may imply hexaplaric influence on the L group at this point. It should be noted however that the second stich of verse 7 which is also in a list of nations is not introduced with wāl, thereby agreeing with the Hebrew text. Furthermore, on stylistic grounds it is much easier to explain the addition of wāl than the omission. Finally it is questionable whether Lucian who is supposed to have created a stylistically smooth and grammatically unambiguous text, would have removed this wāl to achieve these purposes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The variation with respect to ἀυτὸς at 77:60 is very difficult to evaluate. The noun ὁμαλοικαί does not occur in the Psalter without a modifier, usually genitival (but at 131:5 it is modified by a dative construction) and rarely is the presence of this modifier contested (51:7, and the present text). Twice the translator has apparently added ἀυτὸς in order to clarify the context, even though there is no equivalent in the Hebrew text (18:5, 45:5), and on both occasions the L group witnesses to the presence of the personal pronoun. The new papyri 2110 and 2149 are divided in their support. Rahlfs is probably correct in accepting the presence of the pronoun as original. But if this is the case, then either
the L group goes against the general tendency of the Lucianic text to fuller expression or else it has been revised to agree with the Hebrew text or else the pronoun was omitted by error in the L group. Certainty seems elusive.

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

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

With respect to the change of word order to correspond with the Hebrew text in Psalms 72-82, only one context needs comment. At 73:1 Ga Hi l' (non Su) 1219 = M in reading ὁ θεός ἀνώτατον  but Rahlfs accepts ἀνώτατον ὁ θεός as supported by all other text groups (including the new papyrus 2149; 2110 is not extant here). The support of Ga and Hi for this transposition would indicate hexaplaric influence. But it is important to realize that the L group is quite inconsistent in altering the Greek word order to conform to the Hebrew. At 72:1 and 81:3 the L group supports a word order contrary to the Hebrew text (and examples could be multiplied throughout the Psalter eg. 31:6, 32:22, 50:13, 67:2). Consequently revision toward the Hebrew text in respect of word order cannot be isolated as a characteristic of this group over against other text groups.

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

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

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

72:21 ἐκείνης Ῥ' Ga l'' 1219' νυσσαὶ B''-2039 Sa La'Aug.
73:16 οἰκονυμ. ἡ ἡλιον Sa Ga l''1219'2110 2149 =Μ ἡ ἡλιον ὁ Γαλαταί B'' R''
73:17 ὕπαλλαξιν Sa l''1219 pi-trained Ga επικοινων B'' R''
73:10 τῆς γῆς Bo Sa R' Ga l' 55 2110 = M l τῆς γῆς B' La'' Aug Sy 2149.
76:5 οἱ δεσπότες Sa R' Ga l''1219' 2110 = Μ οἱ εξοροὶ B'; παντες οἱ εξοροὶ B'' La'' Aug et Cyp Alex
77:10 ἢσθενον B' R He 1219 2016 l' (vel e) θεολογικόν L' 55 2054 2110 2149.
79:10 καὶ ἐπιλάξας ἤ γῆ B''R''Sa He* (vid) 55 2110 καὶ ἐπιλάξας τὴν γῆν Ga Aug l'' 1219 2004
73:1 La'' Aug 2149; ἐπιλάξας (=M) terminus terrae Ta'G.
Rahlfs accepted the L group reading in 72:21, 73:16, 17, 75:10 and 76:5, all of which give a reading more representative of the Hebrew text. In two cases Rahlfs rejected the reading supported by the L group (77:10, 79:10).

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

At 79:10 the variant concerns whether the noun ἡ is subject of a passive verb form ἐπλάσεν or the object of an active verb ἐπιλάσσεσθαι. The Hebrew tradition is divided as to a nihal form (which would have ἦτα of verse 9 as the subject. The new evidence of 2110 and 2149 is divided. It is of course possible that the L group reflects hexaplaric activity for its reading is supported by Ga. But then we should also posit the same explanation for 2004 and 2149.

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

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

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

"Einsetzung synonymer Ausdrücke ist sehr häufig..."14

Metzger states that

"He (Lucian) substituted synonyms for many words employed by the Septuagint. In some cases it is difficult to discover the reason for the alteration, as θαλάσσα for θαλάσσα, ἐπιλέξα for ἐπιλέξα, διέμοχα for παρέμοχα, δουλεία for παῖδες, ἐκκλησία for ἐκκλησία, etc."15

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

There is only one consistent variant of this type which occurs in Psalms 72-82 and also throughout the Psalter and that is the replacement of συγκλάνυ by συμολάνυ. The problem occurs at 74:11 where the evidence is
In the other two contexts where αὐτάν occurs in the Psalter the ι group consistently replaces it with συνέλασις:

45:10 συνέλασις B' 2110 2149] συνέλασις R ι' 1219'.

106:16 συνέλασις S RΓ θαλασσίου ι' Θθθ ι' 55.

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

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

If the conclusion of this paper is valid, then Lucian either felt that the Psalter did not need revising or thought that there would be too much opposition to the idea of revising this part of the Old Testament or never intended to revise the Old Testament in Greek but only certain portions of it. In the light of this perhaps it would be advisable to use a different term to designate the ι text in order to remove the danger of association and a priori assumptions. "Byzantine text" might be more apt and would certainly be more neutral and historically accurate. Jerome's description of the textual situation of the Psalter as it existed in his time must not be taken at face value, but must be examined closely. Lucian's name could have been transferred to material which never felt the scrutiny of his revision. If the ι text is not Lucanian then it may need to be treated more generously as an independent textual witness.
FOOTNOTES

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


16. Lucian may not have had time to complete his work.
Tobit ist uns bekannt durch zwei beziehungsweise drei Rezensionen: der Kodex Sinaiticus bietet uns die eine; eine zweite, kürzere Rezension stellen uns der Vaticanus, Alexandrinus und die meisten Kursiven vor. Drei Kursiven zeigen schließlich eine dritte Textart vor (Tob. 6,7 - 13,8), die eine Kompromisslösung zwischen den zwei anderen zu sein scheint.

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

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

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


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

N. Fernández-Marcos

Das Problem des griechischen Textes im Complutens 'Vedekapropheton'


in folgenden Punkten zusammengefasst werden:


In Beziehung zu den complutensischen Sonderlesarten zeigen die Analysen deutlich, dass die Varianten gegenüber dem hebräischen Text jene, die sich ihm annähern, überwiegen. Deshalb war die Angleichung an den hebräischen Text kein entscheidendes Kriterium für die Entstehung dieser Lesarten. Endlich scheint uns erlaubt zu behaupten, dass ausser dem historischen Wert des Complutense-Deodaphoton als Document und Exponent der Situation der biblischen Philologie in XVI Jahrhundert, ihr Text nicht ohne Interesse für die moderne Textkritik ist, dank der bewiesenen Qualität und Altertümlichkeit einer grosser Zahl ihrer Lesarten.

N. Fernández-Marcos

The Sigla "Lambda Omicron" (λ) in I-II Kings-LXX
(Abstract of the paper read at the VIIth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 7-14, 1977).

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

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

Owing to all these traces and to the strong predominance of λ-readings in accord with the Hebrew, none of them disagreeing with it,
we are inclined to postulate for the sigla 7 the interpretation of ὁ λοιπὸν ἄγνωστον or ἄλλος ἄγνωστος in I-II Kings. Now, if we consider the high number of hexaplaric readings transmitted as anonymous in the margin of the manuscripts, or included collectively under a common sigla, for lack of more information about ἄλλος, we prefer the interpretation of ὁ λοιπὸν for the following reasons: a) It was an easy solution for the scribe, to include under this sigla one or more readings of the 'three', when the marginal space of the manuscript was scant, or when the attributions were not clear; b) the fact that in different passages 7 is put together with some of the abbreviations of the 'three' is not opposite to this interpretation. We are in front of other witnesses that, even having been explained as ὁ λ', were put together with the abbreviations of Aquila and Symmachus; c) furthermore, even in these cases 7 is not a superfluous sigla, as Mercati suggested (Lob 24 (1943) 16-17). It has the advantage that it can include any of the other versions, only partially known, as the quinta, sexta, ko hebraices, ko syros, ko samareiticon, or others that are anonymous that have left traces in the corrections of ms. Fb, or in the numerous hexaplaric readings that are transmitted for the Octateuch in the margins of the mss. M, i, v, z, etc.
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