

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in Johann Cook / Hermann-Josef Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

B or not B? The place of Codex Vaticanus in textual history and in Septuagint research in: Johann Cook / Hermann-Josef Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, pp. 69–96

Leiden: Brill 2012 (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 157)

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004241732\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004241732_006)

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill: <https://brill.com/page/RightsPermissions/rights-and-permissions#selfarchiving>

Your IxTheo team

---

Liebe\*r Leser\*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor\*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in Johann Cook / Hermann-Josef Stipp (Hg.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint* erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor\*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

B or not B? The place of Codex Vaticanus in textual history and in Septuagint research in Johann Cook / Hermann-Josef Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, pp. 69–96

Leiden: Brill 2012 (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 157)

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004241732\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004241732_006)

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/page/RightsPermissions/rights-and-permissions#selfarchiving>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

## **B or not B?**

### **The Place of Codex Vaticanus in the Textual History and in Septuagint research.**

*Siegfried Kreuzer*

key words: Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Septuagint, kaige-recension, Lucianic text, Antiochian text, Naḥal Hever,  
bible texts: 2Sam 15:2-10; 19:38(39); 1Kgs / 3 Reigns 18:19,25; 2 Kgs / 4Reigns 4:2,5; 6:8-9; Rom 11,4

One of the most basic facts in Septuagint studies is the text used for analysis or comparison. This statement will hardly be challenged. Yet it is a fact that needs to be reflected upon. For most studies on the Septuagint, but also in studies on the biblical quotations in the New Testament or even in comparisons with the daughter translations, many times simply the Göttingen Edition or Rahlfs' so-called Handausgabe are taken as the starting point for research and comparison.<sup>1</sup>

Now, there is some reason for this approach: Rahlfs with his critical edition wanted to reconstruct the Old Greek and the Göttingen edition has the same goal. Yet, it is and remains a goal only, and how this goal is pursued and probably achieved depends on the methods and presuppositions of the editor; and that is exactly where Codex Vaticanus comes into play. The critical editions use different manuscripts for their reconstructions, yet Codex Vaticanus takes pride of place and dominates the editions. Rahlfs, in his Handausgabe, stated that he mostly relies on the Majuscules B, S, and A; among them – with a few exceptions like in the book of Judges – he basically followed Manuscript B, the Codex Vaticanus. The same holds true for most of the volumes in the Göttingen edition.

#### **1.1. The importance of B for the editions**

Since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Codex Vaticanus is the most important, i.e., the most highly esteemed manuscript for Septuagint editions and research. With the exception of the Aldina from 1518 and the Complutensian Polyglott from 1514–1717, and starting with the Sixtina (1587), almost all editions of the Septuagint were more or less based on Codex Vaticanus.

The first printed Version of the Septuagint appeared in Venice in 1518 from the printer Aldine and is therefore called the Aldina. It used manuscripts which were available in the city at that time. At about the same time the famous Complutensian Polyglott was prepared at the Alcala University in Complutum, near Madrid. For this edition, manuscripts from Rome and other cities were collected or borrowed.<sup>2</sup> After about two generations the later Pope Sixtus V initiated and published a new edition; manuscripts were sought and Codex Vaticanus became the basis of the new edition, not only because it was available in Rome, but also because of its excellent state of preservation and legibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graece. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1931ff.); Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the basic study by Franz Delitzsch, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Polyglottenbibel des Cardinals Ximenes* (Leipzig: Edelman, 1871); and, more recently: Séamus O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources: The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible* (OBO 215; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

Basically all Septuagint editions from the 17<sup>th</sup> through to the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries,<sup>3</sup> and even into the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, have been based on the Codex Vaticanus. More or less the only exception was Johannes Ernestus Grabe's edition from 1709–1720 which was based on Codex Alexandrinus. Practically all other editions are diplomatic editions of Codex Vaticanus with an ever expanding critical apparatus, i.e., with the readings of other manuscripts as they became available. This holds true also for the editions of Holmes-Parsons,<sup>4</sup> of Swete,<sup>5</sup> and of Brooke-McLean<sup>6</sup>. Even the critical edition by Rahlfs and, to a large extent, also the Göttingen edition rely heavily on Codex "B".

## 1.2. Reasons for the importance of Codex Vaticanus

There are good reasons for the importance of **Codex Vaticanus**. First, it was and still is the oldest MS of almost all of the Old and the New Testament. There is consensus that it was written in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, but it is debated if it was produced in Caesarea in Palestine or, more probably, in Egypt. The reason for Caesarea is its relation to Codex Sinaiticus; the reason for Egypt is the agreement of the order of the books with the canon list of Athanasius and because of some relation to the Egyptian text, especially in the Psalms. Yet, both arguments suppose that these traditions (the specific order of the canon list, and the Greek *Vorlage* of the Egyptian text) had been available in Egypt only. So, what so far seems to be certain is that Codex B originated in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. It was written by at least two scribes, and – as we will see – the Codex or its *Vorlage* was put together from scrolls of different textual traditions.

As the ink over the centuries had become faint, it was re-inked in the Middle Ages, sometime after the 10<sup>th</sup> century. This is evident because the so-called enclitic *nu* has been re-inked according to the late Byzantine school rule. The Codex probably came into the Vatican Library via southern Italy. Unfortunately, the beginning of the Codex, i.e., most of the book of Genesis, is missing.

There are only a few other large codices from late antiquity. There is **Codex Sinaiticus**. The complicated history of its discovery starting with Tischendorf's journey of 1844 to the St. Catherine Monastery in Sinai does not to be reiterated here.<sup>7</sup> There are indications that it originated in Caesarea, and one of its three or four scribes was possibly identical with a scribe of Vaticanus. The codex has been dated between 340 and 360 C.E. It was probably bound only in the 6<sup>th</sup> century and soon afterwards brought to St. Catherine. Most important is the fact that the codex underwent several corrections. Corrector A (C<sup>a</sup>) seems to have worked in the 6<sup>th</sup> century; he added readings from other traditions. Unfortunately large parts of the Codex are missing: besides some newly published chapters of Joshua and Judges the older historical books are missing and also large parts of the Pentateuch. With exceptions in a few books, the text, at least in the Old Testament, is very close to that of Codex Vaticanus. The remarks of Corrector A present older textual tradition, some of the corrections seem to presuppose a Hexaplaric text, others are close to the Lucianic/Antioch-

---

<sup>3</sup> Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), 182, counts at least 21 editions of that kind, deriving directly or indirectly from MS B. Swete himself based his edition on a new collation with MS B.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Holmes and James Parsons, eds., *Vetus Testamentum Graecum Cum Variis Lectionibus*, (Oxford: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1798–1820).

<sup>5</sup> Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (3 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1887–1894).

<sup>6</sup> Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the text of Codex Vaticanus supplemented from other uncial manuscripts with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the LXX* (Cambridge: University Press, 1906–40).

<sup>7</sup> It will be of interest that the famous debate about the legitimacy of its being taken away from the St. Catherine Monastery is now solved as the documents about the donation of the Codex to the Tsar by the monastery have been found in Moscow, cf. Christfried Böttrich, "Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte des 'Codex Sinaiticus'" *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 605–613.

ene text. The fact that these corrections have been added only shows that this tradition was important for the corrector, but not how old the sources for these corrections are. The Codex with all of its parts is now accessible in an excellent edition on the internet.<sup>8</sup>

The next codex is **Codex Alexandrinus**, generally dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> century. There is practically no information about the origin of the Codex. Around 1300 it came to Alexandria and in 1627 it was presented to King Charles I of England. Its text is considered less consistent than Vaticanus, but this is also a question of the standard for comparison, as Codex Vaticanus is also mixed, at least between *kaige* and non-*kaige* sections. In Leviticus, Isaiah, and Jeremiah Alexandrinus seems to be close to Vaticanus; in other parts it shows Hexaplaric influence; but it is also close to the Antiochene text; and it has many idiosyncratic readings. As mentioned above it was used for the edition by Grabe 1709–1720. Grabe also wrote an essay about the Alexandrinus having the oldest text in the book of Judges, which was evidently the reason for its specific presentation of the book of Judges in the editions of Brooke-McLean and Rahlfs. Different from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, the beginning of the Codex, i.e., the whole book of Genesis, is also preserved in Codex Alexandrinus.

Regarding the older historical books I would like to mention two more codices: Codex M which is **Codex Coislitanus** from the 7<sup>th</sup> century, now in Paris. It comprises the Octateuch and the historical books. It has many marginal readings with Hexaplaric material. In the historical books its text is a mixture between the *kaige* text and the Antiochene text. Its close counterpart is Codex N, also called Codex V like **Codex Venetus**. The reason for the different designations is that N and V are two parts of one codex. One part is in Rome, while the other part is in Venice. Because of its close relation to M the Roman part has been named N in Brooke-MacLean. It became identified as the first part of a codex whose second part had become **Codex Venetus**. Rahlfs therefore uses one and the same siglum for both parts. Codex V dates from the 8<sup>th</sup> century, and in both parts it comprised the entire Old Testament.<sup>9</sup> Both Codices represent a text which is partly close to the Antiochene or Old Greek texts and partly to *kaige* texts like in Codex Vaticanus.

Looking at these codices with their later origin and their idiosyncracies, it is understandable, that codex Vaticanus became and is still considered as the most important single witness to the Septuagint. Yet, there are other and earlier documents as well.

### 1.3 Other early manuscripts and witnesses of the Septuagint.

The picture widens, if we take into account other manuscripts and the witnesses of Greek writing authors and the daughter translations. Besides some manuscripts from pre-Christian times like Papyrus Fouad 266, several fragments from Qumran, and especially the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hiver, there are today papyri from the 1<sup>st</sup> down to the 4<sup>th</sup> century C.E. from different parts of the Old Testament. For most books of the Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus today is just one of many witnesses which are relatively contemporary, but some witnesses are several centuries older. I cannot go into the details, but only refer to the impressive and interesting list “Das handschriftliche Material für die einzelnen Bücher des Alten Testaments” in the Verzeichnis der Griechischen Handschriften edited by Detlef Fraenkel.<sup>10</sup>

Interestingly, amidst this wealth of manuscripts, there is an exception for the older historical books, i.e., 1–4 Reigns, 1–2 Chronicles, and 1–2 Esdras. There, with the exception of 2 Chron, Codex Vaticanus is still the oldest witness of the Greek text in form of a codex.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.codexsinaiticus.org>.

<sup>9</sup> Probably it originally was also a codex of the whole bible with the NT portion now lost, cf. Alfred Rahlfs and Detlev Fraenkel, *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (vol. 1.1 of *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*; idem; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

<sup>10</sup> Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 472–497.

Yet, also in these parts of the Septuagint there are other important witnesses to the Greek text as well. First, there is the Jewish writer Josephus, who in his *Jewish Antiquities* referred to the historical books and quoted them; and even in his allusions it is sometimes possible to identify a specific form of the text he refers to. An explicit comparison has been made by Adam Mez, already in 1895.<sup>11</sup> Later, Henry St. J. Thackeray did the same in connection with his studies on Josephus.<sup>12</sup> The relevant passages can now be found in the critical apparatus of the Madrid edition of the Antiochene text.

But there are also Christian writers who quoted the Septuagint, and at least some of them quoted not only Genesis, Psalms, and the Prophets, but also the historical books. Unfortunately, the older fathers like Justin, Irenaeus or Clement of Alexandria do not offer much material from these books. But in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, there were Theodoret of Cyrrus with his commentaries, and Chrysostome with his sermons, and other, although less prolific, authors like Asterius Sophista. With some caution their works can be seen as witnesses of the texts they used. Especially Theodoret in his commentaries is an excellent witness to the biblical text he used, which is the so called Antiochene or Lucianic text.<sup>13</sup>

Considering this environment, one must say that the large old codices have their special importance, but they are not the only textual witnesses. Beyond that, looking at the whole field, one must admit that Vaticanus (and Sinaiticus, where extant) represent a minority position within the field and that also Codex Vaticanus is of a mixed character as can be seen esp. in the change between *kaige* and non-*kaige* sections.

For getting the whole picture, a look at the daughter translations, especially the Old Latin, is necessary. The Old Latin version originated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, probably at more than one place, probably by more than one attempt, and probably with even some Jewish origins. But this does not make a difference for our theme. With its origin in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century the Old Latin is older than Origen's Hexapla and long before Lucian. It therefore witnesses to a pre-Hexaplaric and a pre-Lucianic text. As the Old Latin was produced for and among Latin speaking people in the western part of the Roman Empire, it must have been based on a Greek *Vorlage* used in those western areas.<sup>14</sup>

Something similar can be said about the earlier Egyptian translation, the so called Sahidic version from Upper Egypt. Different from the younger Bohairic translation of Lower Egypt, the Sahidic version was produced in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century for people who no longer spoke Greek or who never had

---

<sup>11</sup> Adam Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus, untersucht für die Bücher V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895). Mez's results have been pushed aside by Rahlfs, 1911, but they were confirmed by Henry St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1929), and Eugene Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1978).

<sup>12</sup> Thackeray, Josephus.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the editions: Natalio Fernández Marcos and Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoretii Cyrensis quaestiones in octateuchum* (TECC 17, Madrid: Poliglota Matritense, 1979); Natalio Fernández Marcos and Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *Theodoretii Cyrensis quaestiones in quaestiones in reges et paralipomena* (Madrid: Poliglota Matritense, 1984); Theodoret of Cyrus, *The Questions on the Octateuch, Vol. 1. On Genesis and Exodus; Vol. 2. On Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth* (ed. John F. Petruccione. Translated by Robert C. Hill. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007).

<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately the state and tradition of the Old Latin text is complicated. There are only a few codices and fragments from palimpsests, and, for some books, marginal notes in Bible manuscripts. In spite of these problems and its fragmentary character, the Old Latin is an important witness to an old stage of the Septuagint. For the Old Latin texts from Samuel, Kings and Chronicles cf. the apparatus in Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramon Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno* (TECC 53/56/60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC, 1989/1992/1996).

before. Through its *Vorlage*, this Egyptian translation attests a Greek text from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, which probably was older than the Hexapla and also certainly before the floruit of Lucian.<sup>15</sup>

Taking these things together there is an obvious conclusion: If there is an agreement between the Antiochene text and the Old Latin and the Sahidic translation, then we have a textual tradition which was widespread from Syria to Egypt and to the West and which most probably is very old, if not identical with the original Septuagint or the so called Old Greek. From this wider picture we return to B, the Codex Vaticanus.

## 2. Codex Vaticanus and the other forms of the text.

### 2.1 Some peculiarities of Codex Vaticanus.

For the following we will concentrate on the historical books. There is a special problem in the book of Judges. Besides the textual tradition in Vaticanus there is definitely a different textual form in Codex Alexandrinus. Brooke-McLean highlighted this text by using a different font.<sup>16</sup> Rahlfs went two steps further in his edition: 1) He presented both traditions side by side, and 2) he used the text of Alexandrinus as the basis for a critical reconstruction. In doing so, Rahlfs presented what – at least in his opinion – was the Old Greek, which he called text A, and presented below that the text of Codex B, as the evidently secondary text.<sup>17</sup>

Yet in spite of the evident secondary status of B in Judges, in the subsequent books Rahlfs basically followed the Codex Vaticanus. The basis for this procedure was his investigation of the Lucianic text in Kings, published in 1911.<sup>18</sup> To put it briefly: In the 1860s some MSS had been identified as presenting the Lucianic or Antiochene text. Julius Wellhausen in his book on the text of Samuel<sup>19</sup> found that many times those manuscripts presented the oldest readings or even confirmed his conjectures. Accordingly, Paul de Lagarde started his search for the Old Greek text by editing the Lucianic textual tradition. This line of research was supported by Adam Mez who – as mentioned above – had compared the Antiquities of Josephus and had found that Josephus' biblical quotations basically agree with the Lucianic text. This meant that the Lucianic text is not the result of a late reworking by Lucian around 300, but basically existed in the 1<sup>st</sup> century already. Besides that, there was the Old Latin text from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, which, also agreed with the Lucianic text, most of the time against Vaticanus.

Contrary to this, Rahlfs basically defended the opposite view in his investigation. For him, without a doubt, Codex Vaticanus represented the oldest text and everything had to be compared with it. And the Lucianic text was not only a text type connected with the authority of that martyr (as the

---

<sup>15</sup> For the Sahidic Version, cf. Sebastian P. Brock, *Bibelübersetzungen I.5 Bibelübersetzungen ins Koptische 2. Altes Testament*, TRE 6: 199–200. Especially for the older Coptic Versions there is still much to be done. In a large project, Karlheinz Schüssler has started to collect and to catalogue the manuscripts: Karlheinz Schüssler, ed., *Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament: Biblia Coptica: Die koptischen Bibeltex-te* (Forschungsinstitut für Ägyptenkunde und Koptologie der Universität Salzburg; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995ff).

For the books of Samuel there is the important edition: James Drescher, ed., *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II)* (CSCO 313–314; Scriptorum Coptici 35–36; Louvain: Peeters, 1970).

<sup>16</sup> One reason for this decision most probably was the old treatise by Johannes Ernestus Grabe on the priority of Codex Alexandrinus in the book of Judges: Johannes Ernestus Grabe, *Epistola Ad Clarissimum Virum, Dn. Joannem Millium ... Quâ ostenditur, Libri Judicum Genuinam LXX. Interpretum Versionem eam esse, quam Codex Alexandrinus exhibet* (Oxford: Verlag, 1705).

<sup>17</sup> It should be noted that text "A" is not identical with Codex A, while text "B" is basically identical with Codex B (in the footnotes to B, Rahlfs only mentions corrections from within the Codex).

<sup>18</sup> Alfred Rahlfs, *Lucians Text der Königebücher*, Septuaginta-Studien II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1911 = reprint 1965.

<sup>19</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1871.



famous remark of Hieronymus can be understood),<sup>20</sup> rather Codex Vaticanus was equated with the Old Greek and all the differences against Vaticanus were interpreted as the result of the comprehensive redactional activity of Lucian.

For this goal, Rahlfs minimized all contrary evidence: The agreements with Josephus were explained away, he accepted only some name forms as original. Also the evidence of the Old Latin was explained away as being secondarily influenced by the Lucianic tradition. In the same way those quotations in the New Testament which agreed with the Lucianic text were explained as a secondary influence from the New Testament into the Lucianic manuscripts.

By this procedure – which he also had applied in his investigation on the Psalms in 1907<sup>21</sup> – Rahlfs came to his picture about the Lucianic/Antiochene text, which became most influential for the following decades and in Septuagint research in general. It became one of the basic principles for Rahlfs' own edition and also for most editors in the Göttingen edition like Ziegler and others.

In a description of the editorial work for the Septuagint volumes still in 2000 Udo Quast explained: At the beginning of the editorial work one knows little about the manuscripts and the recensional activities. “Lediglich von dem Vorkommen der zwei großen christlichen Rezensionen des Origenes und Lukian kann von vornherein – oder wenigstens in den meisten Büchern – ausgegangen werden. Für sie stehen die Rezensionsmerkmale außerdem weitestgehend fest.”<sup>22</sup> (“Only the occurrence of the two extensive Christian recensions, those of Origen and of Lukian, can be assumed, at least for most of the books. Beyond that, the characteristics of these recensions are well known and practically certain.”)

## 2.2 The problem of the Lucianic text.

What are these well known characteristics of the Lucianic redaction? Rahlfs mentioned three main traits: The first is the addition of articles; the second is the addition of explaining words like the name of a person speaking or acting. Yet, those traits are irregular. Lucian not only added words and articles, sometimes he also deleted them.<sup>23</sup> For Rahlfs this was not a question to his analysis, rather he made this irregularity into a further characteristic of Lucians work and he stated: “Der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips”<sup>24</sup> (“The main characteristic of this recension is that it has no clear principle”). Yet, one may say that the intention of Lucian was to improve the Greekness of the text.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> “Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provinciae palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt, totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate conpugnat.” Jerome, *Preface to Chronicles*. Cf. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> Alfred Rahlfs, *Der Text des Septuagintapsalters*, Septuaginta-Studien II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1907 = reprint 1965.

<sup>22</sup> Udo Quast, “Einführung in die Editionsarbeit” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 387–399: 394–395.

<sup>23</sup> See in the synopsis below: Articles added in V. 2, 6, 10; deleted in V. 10. Explaining words are added in: V. 2; deleted in V. 10.

<sup>24</sup> Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 293.

<sup>25</sup> Rahlfs also mentions the Atticizing tendency of Lucian. For Rahlfs this trait was less important than it was referred to in later scholarship: He mentions Atticizing improvements (“attisierende Verbesserungen”), but there are not many and they also are done irregularly. The word Attic (“attisch”) is mentioned rather late in the study under the heading other changes (“sonstige Änderungen”) (p. 176), where he first notices, that the Aorist εἶπα had been used in Attic already and that it became common in the Hellenistic time and that is found in both, MS A as well as in MS B (p. 176–177); therefore it is not a sure sign. Indeclinable δὺο is used by the “Attiker”, and is found 4 times in L, while δὺοσι, which was especially favored in Hellenistic times, is kept by Lucian in 2 Kings 5:23 (“indeklinables δὺο [kommt] schon bei den Attikern vor” (I 2,32; 22,31; II 21,5; 23,12), whereas δὺοσι represents a “jüngere Bildung, die in hellenistischer Zeit besonders beliebt ist”, in II 5,23 von Lukian beibehalten wurde”; p. 259). For the change from ἱερεῖς to ἱεραεῖς Rahlfs mentions 5 occurrences, but also 7 occurrences, where Lucian did not make a change (p. 263). Altogether, Rahlfs mentions seven forms or grammatical phenomena (p. 176, 204, 259, 260, 262, 263, 279) with 1 to

This basic idea was taken over by, e.g., Ziegler. In his edition of Jeremiah he mentioned the same characteristics as Rahlfs, and he also wrote about Lucian's irregularity. "Konsequenz war nicht seine Stärke" ("Consistency was not his strength").<sup>26</sup>

Things changed with the discoveries from Qumran, especially the biblical texts from Qumran and other places in the Judean Desert. Especially the first scroll of the book of Samuel (4QSam<sup>a</sup>) presented a text that was very close to the Lucianic text or rather its Hebrew *Vorlage*. This means that a large part of the idiosyncracies of the Lucianic text are not Lucianic, but rather are old, if not original. This new evidence from Qumran could not be pushed aside like Rahlfs had done with the evidence from Josephus, from the New Testament or from the Old Latin. The text from Qumran could not have been later influenced by the Lucianic tradition. Qumran scholars like Frank Moore Cross, Eugene Ulrich, or Emanuel Tov therefore accepted the importance and the great age of the Lucianic, or more accurate because it is more neutral, of the Antiochene text. Yet, as they also embraced the old view about the Lucianic text and therefore developed some compromise models.<sup>27</sup>

### 2.3 Naḥal Ḥever, *kaige*, and Lucian Redivivus

Another text also has become very important: The Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever. As is well known, this text has become the basis for the identification of the *kaige* recension.<sup>28</sup> This *kaige* recension, with its close and formalistic adaptation of the Old Greek to the Hebrew text, is not restricted to the Minor Prophets, but can be identified in other books as well.<sup>29</sup> What is most important for the current discussion: The *kaige* recension can also be found in Samuel and Kings. Barthélemy took up an old observation by Thackeray, who had discerned four different sections in Reigns, which he named by the Greek letters of the respective book. The sections βγ (2 Reigns 10–3 Reigns 2) and the section γδ (3 Reigns 22–4 Reigns 25) are the *kaige* sections. These sections show the same traits as the Naḥal Ḥever scroll. The other sections of Samuel and Kings do not share these characteristics. Therefore they may be called the non-*kaige* sections. The Greek text of these passages is of a different characteristic and closer to the Old Greek.

It needs to be mentioned that this division refers to Codex Vaticanus alone. While the *kaige* recension is a wide spread phenomenon and can be found in most books beyond the Pentateuch, the division within 1–4 Reigns is a unique feature of Codex Vaticanus. It must have arisen from the combination of different scrolls with different text types.

But what about the Antiochene text in these books? After identifying the *kaige* sections, Barthélemy posed a logical question: If Codex Vaticanus is secondary in the *kaige* sections, where is the Old Greek to be found? Can it be identified in some other manuscripts or has it been lost? Barthélemy compared the *kaige* text (in his book still called the Palestinian text) with the Antiochene text and discovered that it must have been the base text for the *kaige* recension. The questions and the answers can well be seen in the headings of the relevant chapters in his book: At first, by

---

7 attestations (except εϋα, for which he does not mention any attestations), and in almost every case also exceptions). Rahlfs concludes: "But Lucian is not a rigorous Atticist because in that case he would have changed much more. And there are also cases where Lucian uses a non-Attic form instead of the Attic form, e.g., τριτον instead of τρις, also ... I 6,7 πελυξ instead of πελεκυς and II 18,27 τον ουρον instead of το ουρον" (p. 281; "Aber Lucian ist keineswegs strenger Attizist, er hätte sonst sehr viel mehr ändern müssen, als er getan hat. Auch kommen Fälle vor, wo gerade L eine nichtattische statt der attischen Form hat, wie τριτον statt τρις, ferner (in Abs. 1 nicht aufgeführt) I 6,7 πελυξ st. πελεκυς und II 18,27 τον ουρον statt το ουρον").

<sup>26</sup> Joseph Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta* (MSU 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), 163.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. Emanuel Tov, *Lucian and Proto-Lucian*, RB 79 (1972), 101-113, for whom the Lucianic text contains either the ancient Septuagint or an ancient Septuagint

<sup>28</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>29</sup> Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 89: "Études sur quelques membres déjà connus du groupe καίγε."



comparing the two texts, he concludes that there is a basic uniformity between the two text forms: “identité de base entre la forme antiochienne et la forme palestinienne du text grec”, (p. 92–102). This basic unity between the Palestinian text and the Antiochene text goes together with clear differences which can be explained in one way only: „la forme antiochienne ne peut être issue de la forme palestinienne par abâtardissement“ (p. 110–113), i.e., the Antiochene text cannot have originated from the *kaige* text. The dependence is the other way around: The Antiochene text is the older text, probably very close to the Old Greek or even identical to it (although not without corruptions in the course of its transmission).<sup>30</sup>

This means that the discovery of the *kaige* recension and the new evaluation of the Antiochene text are two sides of the same coin. This is not because of mere speculation or due to trepidation about the total absence of the Old Greek for these texts; it is simply because the Antiochene text indeed represents the text, which was used and revised by the *kaige* revisers.

At about the same time as Barthélemy published his discoveries (1963), a young man at Oxford had almost finished his dissertation. Sebastian P. Brock worked on his dissertation on 1 Samuel, which was accepted in 1966.<sup>31</sup> He did so in the rather traditional way and, just as many others had done, followed Rahlfs. He did not use the few papers on the Qumran scrolls F.M. Cross had published by that point,<sup>32</sup> but he took great care with the Hexaplaric material and to analysing the Lucianic recension. Evidently, he was not happy with Barthélemy’s book where the Lucianic recension had dissolved and the Antiochene text had become the Old Greek, although with corruptions over the time.

In 1965 Brock had the opportunity to deliver a paper about Barthélemy’s book. Basically he defended the old ideas about Lucian. He gave it the fitting title “Lucian redivivus”. In this paper of only 6 pages he picked out a few variant readings. His main argument was that the Lucianic text has the same traits in the *kaige* and in the non-*kaige* section. He combined this correct statement with the assumption that Codex Vaticanus in the non-*kaige* sections represents the Old Greek and, therefore, the Lucianic text is secondary. And he concluded: Therefore, the Lucianic or Antiochene text must also be secondary in the *kaige* sections.

At first this sounds convincing, but a closer look shows that Brock jumps from a difference within Codex Vaticanus – i.e., the difference signalled by the terms *kaige* and non-*kaige* - to dating the Antiochene text. This simply is false reasoning. The difference within the text of Codex Vaticanus leads to a different relation to the Old Greek. But that’s a problem within Vaticanus and does not say anything about the Lucianic text. The variant characters and ages within the text of Vaticanus do not affect the character of the Antiochene text. What changes is not the Antiochene text, but its relation to the different parts of Vaticanus because of their different characteristics.

Interestingly, Brock’s small paper was never checked seriously, at least there is no publication.<sup>33</sup> Yet this paper became most influential. Its consequence was that Barthélemy’s discovery of the *kaige* recension was widely accepted while the other side of the coin, his new evaluation of the Antiochene text, has been pushed aside; the original combination of the two facts remains practically unknown. Representative for this situation is the statement in Fernandez Marcos’ “Introduction to the Septuagint” where he summarizes the importance of Qumran / Naḥal Hever and

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. the famous sentence: The Antiochene text is “la vieille septante, plus ou moins corrompue et abatardie”, Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 127.

<sup>31</sup> Printed much later: Sebastian P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel (1966)* (Torino: Zamorani, 1996).

<sup>32</sup> Frank Moore Cross, “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the LXX,” *BASOR* 132 (1953), 15–26; and idem., “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran,” *JBL* 74 (1955), 147–72. See also William Foxwell Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,” *BASOR* 140 (1955), 27–33.

<sup>33</sup> For a first analysis and discussion see now Siegfried Kreuzer, “Lucian Redivivus or Barthélemy and Beyond?” in *IOSCS Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (ed. Melvin K. Peters; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming).

Barthélemy's discovery only in regard of the kaige-recension: "With the obligatory refinements in matters of detail, Barthélemy's fundamental thesis, according to which these fragments belong to a consistent revision of the LXX to bring it close to a Hebrew text very similar to but not identical with the proto-Masoretic text, has been firmly accepted. Some of the particular features of this revision which Barthélemy noted, and others identified in later studies, can be debated. ... However, there is absolutely no doubt that these fragments belong to the LXX, which we knew through more reliable ancient witnesses, but it was revised to adapt it with greater literalism to the current Hebrew text.... The finds from Naḥal Ḥever, together with its general interpretation within the framework of the early history of the LXX provided by Barthélemy, became an obligatory reference point for all later studies."<sup>34</sup>

Lucian as a reviser was indeed revived by Brock and many Septuagint scholars still take it for granted that there was a general Lucianic recension<sup>35</sup> with its specific characteristics.<sup>36</sup> For many, codex Vaticanus is still the text most close or even more or less identical with the Old Greek, at least in the non-*kaige* sections. This problem is not only relevant in Samuel and Kings and in the other historical books like Judges, Chronicles and 2Esdras, but also in other books, i.e. in the prophetic and in some poetic books.

### 3. Evaluation and a new approach

#### 3.1 The relation of kaige and the Antiochene text.

The typical phenomena can be seen in practically any kaige text in the historical books. As an example I use a passage from where I started my discoveries, i.e. 2 Sam 15.

**3.1.1** The following synopsis<sup>37</sup> of 2 Sam 15:2b,5-6,10 shows all the typical characteristics as Rahlfs has put them forward, and it also shows that Rahlfs even in the kaige-section almost exclusively understood the text of codex Vaticanus as the oldest text (except V. 2b with the introduction of ὁ ἀνήρ).

The typical addition of the article can be seen in V. 2b line 7 (2x!), V. 5 line 2; V. 6 line 8; V. 10 line 3 (2x). The addition of an explaining word is found in V. 2b line 6 (in this case even a whole sentence *καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ ἀνήρ*) and V. 6 line 8 (*παντῶν*). There is also a change in words: *σάλπιγγος* instead of *κερατίνης*, V. 10 line 7, is not exactly the same thing, but it better represents the function.

Also the opposite is there: In V. 2b line 2 there is no *πρός*; in V. 10 line 7 both articles are deleted, and in line 9 the word *βασιλεὺς* is missing. Lucian indeed worked irregular and even contradictory: Why would he in V. 10 add two articles and a few words later he deletes the articles? Why would he in V. 2b add some words, and in V. 10 delete a word?

On the other hand, taking up Barthélemy's identification of the kaige-recension, the translation is indeed closer to the Hebrew, not only in regard of *πρός* in V. 2b line 2, the missing sentence in line 5, and the missing counterpart for *παντῶν* in V. 6 line 8, but also with the word *κερατίνη* for *רַפָּר* in V. 10 line 7.

---

<sup>34</sup> Natalio Fernandez Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, Leiden 2000 = Atlanta 2009, 72.

<sup>35</sup> The question is not about Lucian as a person of the Syrian church, living around 300 C.E. (although his role sometimes has been questioned), neither that there are remarks in ancient manuscripts which relate specific texts to (some) Lucian, but about the assumed extensive recensional activity of Lucian (or a person of that time).

<sup>36</sup> Representative again Fernandez Marcos, *Introduction*, 229: „However, no-one has doubted the peculiar nature of the Lucianic or Antiochene text in the historical books (Samuel-Kings-Chronicles).”

<sup>37</sup> In the following tables I use the vocalised MT as a matter of convenience and also to indicate that the “text” never consisted of consonants only, but always was a “vocalised” text with a reading tradition.

Yet, the representation of the Hebrew in the kaige text is also questionable. It follows the rules for the article only partially like in V. 2b line 8, where the determination of עבדך is expressed by ὁ δοῦλός σου, or in V. 10 line 7 where the determination is mirrored in τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης. But there are also other cases: The determination of שבטי ישראל has no article as counterpart, neither the אנשי ישראל in V. 6 line 8 nor the שבטי ישראל in V. 10 line 3.

This seeming inconsistency can be explained by the underlying hermeneutics: For the kaige-revisors not only the grammar and meaning was important but also and even more the surface of the text. The result was an isomorphic translation or better: adaptation of the text which mirrored its Vorlage. This explains the seeming irregularity: שבטי ישראל (V. 2b line 7 and V. 10 line 3) and אנשי ישראל (V. 6 line 8) are a determined genitival construction, but there is no visible article. Also איש in V. 5 line 2 has no article, therefore there is no article with ἄνδρα either. On the other hand, where there is an article or a similar visible element<sup>38</sup> in Hebrew, there is also an article in the kaige text.

2 Sam / 2Reigns 15:2b,5-6,10

MT		KR (Rahlfs / B)	Ant (Madrid Edition)
<p>וַיִּקְרָא  אֶבְשָׁלֹם אֵלָיו  וַיֹּאמֶר  "אִי-מִתְנַה עֵירִי אֲתָה  וַיֹּאמֶר  מֵאֲתַד שְׁבַט־יִשְׂרָאֵל  עַבְדְּךָ:</p>	2bb	<p>καὶ ἐβόησεν  πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀβεσσαλωμ  καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ  ἐκ ποίας πόλεως σὺ εἶ  καὶ εἶπεν [ὁ ἀνὴρ &gt; B]  ἐκ μιᾶς φυλῶν Ἰσραηλ  ὁ δοῦλός σου</p>	<p>καὶ ἐκάλει  αὐτὸν Ἀβεσσαλωμ  καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ  ἐκ ποίας πόλεως εἶ σὺ  καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ ἀνὴρ  καὶ ἔλεγεν  ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ  ὁ δοῦλός σου</p>
<p>וַהֲיֶה  בְּקֶרֶב-אִישׁ  לְהַשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לוֹ  וְשָׁלַח אֶת-יָדוֹ  וַהֲחִזִּיק לוֹ  וַנִּשְׁק לוֹ:</p>	5	<p>καὶ ἐγένετο  ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν ἄνδρα  τοῦ προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ  καὶ ἐξέτεινεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ  ἐπελαμβάνετο αὐτοῦ  καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν</p>	<p>καὶ ἐγένετο  ἐπὶ τῷ προσάγειν τὸν ἄνδρα  τοῦ προσκυνεῖν αὐτῷ  καὶ ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ  καὶ ἐπελαμβάνετο αὐτοῦ  καὶ κατεφίλει αὐτόν</p>
<p>וַלַּעַשׁ אֶבְשָׁלֹם  כַּדְבָּר הַזֶּה  לְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל  אֲשֶׁר-יָבֵאוּ לְמִשְׁפַּט אֶל-  (הַמֶּלֶךְ)  וַיִּגְנֹב אֶבְשָׁלֹם  אֶת-לֵב  אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל:</p>	6	<p>καὶ ἐποίησεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ  κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο  παντὶ Ἰσραηλ  τοῖς παραγινόμενοις εἰς κρίσιν  πρὸς τὸν ὄν βασιλέα  καὶ ιδιοποιεῖτο Ἀβεσσαλωμ  τὴν καρδίαν  ἀνδρῶν Ἰσραηλ</p>	<p>καὶ ἐποίησε Ἀβεσσαλωμ  κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο  παντὶ Ἰσραηλ  τοῖς παραγινόμενοις εἰς κρίσιν  πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα  καὶ ιδιοποιεῖτο Ἀβεσσαλωμ  τὰς καρδίας  παντῶν τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ</p>

<sup>38</sup> This refers especially to the nota accusativi תא. As תא is used before a determined object, it has basically the same function as the article.

וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶבְשָׁלוֹם מַרְגָּלִים;	10	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατασκόπους ἐν πάσαις φυλαῖς Ἰσραηλ λέγων ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι ὑμᾶς τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης καὶ ἐρεῖτε βεβασίλευκεν βασιλεὺς Ἀβεσσαλωμ ἐν Χεβρων	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ κατασκόπους εἰς πάσας τὰς φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ λέγων ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι ὑμᾶς φωνὴν σάλπιγγος καὶ ἐρεῖτε βεβασίλευκεν Ἀβεσσαλωμ ἐν Χεβρων
--------------------------------------	----	---	---

This surprising observation fits to the fact, that in early Judaism not only the meaning but also the surface of the text had become important. This can be seen in the strange phenomenon of the *kaige*-recension that the short form of the Hebrew personal pronoun **אני** is rendered with *ἐγώ* and the long form **אנכי** with *ἐγώ εἰμί*, even if a finite Verb follows and this combination in Greek is not only strange but simply wrong. This difference simply indicates the form of the Hebrew pronoun although there is no difference in meaning. The basic idea is that every detail and every element in the holy text has some importance, even more if it seems superfluous, just because it is there.<sup>39</sup>

From this we can go on to the Antiochene text. If we leave the old assumptions about Lucianic redaction and try to see things the other way around, we come to a surprising solution. 1) Considering the Antiochene text as a whole and not only looking at the supposed redactional differences, this text is a faithful rendering of the Hebrew parent text and at the same time a text with a rather good Greek. 2) The seemingly irregular and even contradictory changes by the supposed Lucianic redaction turn into a consistent explanation as a redaction aiming at isomorphic equivalence. The changes of the article can be explained consistently: As demonstrated above, the articles in the Antiochene text are in accordance with the grammar of the Hebrew text, while the *kaige* recension has added or deleted the articles according to its isomorphic principle. The same is the case with the so called explaining words. Evidently, the translator of the Antiochene text added explaining words or – in view of the Qumran texts more probable – there was a Hebrew Vorlage which was slightly different from the Masoretic text. The *kaige*-recension again adopted the Greek to its Hebrew reference text, in this case a text more or less identical with MT. According to the principles of the *kaige*-recension explained above, this again led to additions and to omissions (see the sentence with *ἀνὴρ* in V. 2b line 6 and *παντῶν* in V. 6 line 8), according to the same clear principle as for the article. This close adaptation also leads to changes in number (e.g. V. 6 line 7: singular *τὴν καρδίαν* according to **את-לב**) and addition or adaptation of prepositions (V. 2b line 2: *πρὸς* according to **אלי**; V. 10 line 3: *ἐν* according to **ב** instead of *εἰς*).

Also the semantic change from *σάλπιγξ* to *κερατίνη* can be explained by this close formal adaption. While the Antiochene text / the Old Greek aimed at functional equivalence (trompet) the *kaige*-recension wants the material equivalence (horn). This and other things like the substitution of the historical past have been discussed by Thackeray and Barthélemy and go beyond the redactional principal presented here.

<sup>39</sup> On Early Jewish hermeneutics see e.g. Christoph Dohmen and Günter Stemberger, *Hermeneutik der Jüdischen Bibel und des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1996; Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish hermeneutic in Palestine*, Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975;

The close adherence to the Hebrew reference text allows also a conclusion in regard of the Vorlage. In v. 2 line 3 the Hebrew text evidently had ל (cf. αὐτῷ), and in V. 10 line 9 there must have been a second מלך, read as מְלֶךְ. The reference text of the kaige-recension therefore was close to but not fully identical with MT. The Hebrew reference text of the Antiochene text / Old Greek was only slightly different. The plus in V. 2b lines 5-6 presupposes the typical Hebrew combination ויאמר – ויען which therefore most probably was in the Hebrew Vorlage.

The emphasis (the heart of) *all* (men of Israel) may be an emphasis by the translator, but may as well go back to the Hebrew text.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, V. 10 line 9 βασιλεὺς is missing. This also may be a change by the translator or – in view of the general closeness to the Hebrew text – represent a minus in the Vorlage.

**3.1.2** Basically the same situation is given in the kaige text of 2Kgs [4 Reigns]. Unfortunately, the Qumran evidence for this book is very meagre. But this does not matter because the argumentation developed above relies on the inner relation of the texts. On the other hand, there is some interesting evidence from the Old Latin, as the following brief synopsis shows.

### 2 Kgs / 4Reigns 6:8-9

MT		kaige / B (Rahlfs)	Ant (Madrid Edition)
וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אֹרְמֵי הַגִּיָּה גַלְתָּם בְּיַשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּנְעֲזוּ אֶל־עֲבָדָיו לְאֹמֶר אֶל־מְקוֹם פְּלִגִּי אֶל־מַגְי תַּחְנִיתִי:	8	καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας ἦν πολεμῶν ἐν Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ λέγων εἰς τὸν τόπον τόνδε τινα εὐμονίᾳ παρεμβάλω	καὶ βασιλεὺς Συρίας ἦν πολεμῶν τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ συνέβουλεύσατο τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ λέγων Εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν φελμουνεὶ ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον, καὶ ἐποίησαν.
		Et consilium habuit cum pueris suis: dicens: In locum Phelminiim insidia faciamus L <sub>115</sub> in locum Phelmunim obsessionem faciamus L <sub>91-95</sub>	
וַיִּשְׁלַח אִישׁ הָאֵלֶּהֱיִים אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאֹמֶר הַשֹּׁמֵר מֵעַבְרָה הַמְּקוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי־יִשָּׁם אֲרָם נֹחֲתִים:	9	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἐλισαίε πρὸς [τὸν >B] βασιλέα Ἰσραηλ λέγων φύλαξαι μὴ παρελθεῖν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ ὅτι ἐκεῖ Συρία κέκρυπται	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰσραηλ λέγων Πρόσεχε τοῦ μὴ διελθεῖν τὸν τόπον τούτον, ὅτι ἐκεῖ Σύροι ἐνεδρεύουσιν.
		Et mandavit homo dei L <sub>115</sub>	

We find similar phenomena as above. In V. 8 line 2 the article gets replaced by the preposition ἐν (Israel) according to the כ. In V. 8 line 3 πρὸς is introduced according to the לָשׁ in the Hebrew text. In V. 8 line 6 the intentionally correct but free rendering ποιήσωμεν ἔνεδρον, let us make an ambush, is replaced by the exact rendering παρεμβάλω, for תַּחְנִיתִי.

<sup>40</sup> The closeness to the Hebrew reference text can be seen by the fact that in V. 2 the assumed additional ויען היאשי is confirmed by ויענה האיש in both, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 4QSam<sup>c</sup> ( DJD XVII, 260). The difference between ויען and ויענה is regularly found in the Qumran texts. Both forms express past tense. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> although in the reconstructed text has כול as equivalent for παντῶν in V. 6 line 8. Unfortunately 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is not extant beyond the beginning of V. 7.

In V. 9 line 3 the article is deleted because in מלך ישראל there is no visible article. V. 9 line 5 seems to presuppose במקום instead of המקום, while the accusative and the article in the Antiochian text presuppose the article of the MT. In V. 9 line 6 Σύροι is replaced by Συρία as the exact rendering of ארם.

In this passage, the Old Latin is very interesting. The Latin expression *com pueris suis* may represent either version. But “in locum Phelminiim/Phelmunim” and “insidia/obsessionem faciamus” clearly represent the Antiochene text. It is interesting, that the expression *peloni almoni* is not translated but transcribed in both versions and represented with one expression only, yet both, Phelminiim and insidia/obsessionem clearly represent the Antiochian text. In V. 9 line 2 there is the change between the name Ελισαιε and the title ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ, both expressions can be found in the context. Interestingly, again the Antiochian text agrees with MT and it is confirmed by the *homo dei* in the Old Latin.

There are two conclusions: 1) The Old Latin confirms that the Antiochene text is pre-Hexaplaric and pre-Lucianic. The comparison again shows that the kaige-text is deduced from the Antiochene/Old Greek text.

2) Differently from the situation in 2 Sam in 2 Kings the Antiochene text seems closer to the MT, while the kaige-text had a slightly different reference text. Yet, the only difference which presupposes a difference in the Hebrew text is the change between the name Elisaias and the title man of God in V. 9 line 2. In regard of the Hebrew text form this is a minor difference because of the repetition and the interchange of both elements in the context. But in regard of the age of the text, the agreement with the Old Latin is a proof for the high age of the Antiochene text.

In sum it can be said, that among other aspects, the two texts show that in the kaige sections, both, of 2 Sam and 2 Kings, the kaige text is a revision and not the original text of the Septuagint. This proves that the text of Codex Vaticanus in these sections is secondary.

### **3.2 The relation of Codex Vaticanus and the Antiochene text in the non-kaige sections.**

The situation in the non-kaige-sections is more difficult. In these sections of the historical books, esp. 1-4 Reigns, the text of Codex Vaticanus is much closer to the Old Greek. Most authors hold it to be the witness closest to the Old Greek, many practically equal it with the Old Greek.

On the other hand, the Antiochene text also has proven to be very close the Old Greek. The change between the kaige-sections and the non-kaige-sections is a feature of Codex Vaticanus only. The Antiochene text shows no such difference. Therefore it can be assumed that also in the non-kaige-sections not only the character but also the age and the relation to the Old Greek is about the same. So, there are two textual traditions which are seemingly very close to the Old Greek. If both, B and Ant are close to the Old Greek, B and Ant must also be closer together. Yet, there are many differences also in the non-kaige-sections. What is the relation between these two text forms and to the Old Greek? – We take a look at some examples:

#### **3.2.1 ἡ Βααλ – the seemingly female Baal.**

Starting with Judg 2:13, until 4 Reigns 21:3, and 2 Chr 17:2 there is an interesting feature: The name of the Canaanite god Baal is combined with a female article: ἡ Βααλ, τῆ Βααλ or also ταῖς Βααλμ. The meaning of this strange feature most probably is a kind of Ketib-Qere in the Greek: The female article indicates that the name of this God should not be pronounced but that it should



be read as ἡ αἰσχὺνη etc.<sup>41</sup> This is confirmed by the well known change of the name of Ishbaal/Mephibaal to Ishboschet/Mephiboshet and by the reading αἰσχὺνη in 3 Reigns 18:19,25. This reading practice can also be found in other books, esp. in the book of Jeremia. Yet, this reading practice was given up later on. The kaige-recension in the historical books has returned to the male article with Baal as can be seen in Judg 2:13; 3:7; 10:6,10.

There is an interesting case in 3Reigns 19:18. This passage is quoted in the New Testament in Rom 11:4. Rahlfs in his analyses of the Lucianic text held the assumption that agreements between the Lucianic text and the New Testament are not witnesses to an old text but that the New Testament has influenced the Lucianic tradition. In this way he also explained the identical words in the quotation in Rom 11:4 and in the Lucianic text of 3 Reigns 19:18. Yet, Rom 11:4 has τῆ Βααλ. This word cannot be explained as having influenced the Lucianic text, because Rom 11:4 is the only occurrence of Baal in the New Testament and it would be impossible to assume that this quotation would have produced all the occurrences of ἡ Βααλ in the Septuagint. Rather, τῆ Βααλ in Rom 11:4 proves that not only this expression is old, but the whole quotation uses the old textual form. This form is the Antiochene text, which in this case again represents the Old Greek, while on the other hand the differences in the text of Vaticanus must go back to a revision, which not only changed the reading of the name of Baal but other words as well. Unfortunately Rahlfs discussed the other differences in this verse,<sup>42</sup> but he did not mention ἡ Βααλ and it is also missing at 3 Reigns 19:18 in the apparatus of the Handausgabe from 1935. Anyway, the expression τῆ Βααλ in the Antiochene text of 3 Reigns 19:18 shows that at this place, Ant hast represents the old text, i.e. Old Greek, while B has the revised text.<sup>43</sup>

τῆ Βααλ in 3 Reigns 19:18 and Rom 11,4

Rom 11,4	1 Kings / 3 Reigns 19, 18 Antioch. Text (Madrid)	1 Kings / 3 Reigns 19, 18 (Rahlfs)
<p><sup>4</sup> ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῆ Βάαλ.</p>	<p><sup>18</sup> καὶ καταλείψω ἐξ Ἰσραηλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν πάντα τὰ γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῆ Βααλ, καὶ πᾶν στόμα ὃ οὐ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ</p> <p>αὐτῷ] αὐτῆ 127</p>	<p><sup>18</sup> καὶ καταλείψεις ἐν Ἰσραηλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ὠκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βααλ καὶ πᾶν στόμα ὃ οὐ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ</p>

### 3.2.2 The rendering of הטוב בעיניך

Soon after Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* with its discovery of the kaige recension and its new evaluation of the Antiochene text, Sebastin P. Brock delivered a paper with the telling title "Lucian redivivus".<sup>44</sup> In this paper he accepted the kaige recension but defended the traditional view of an extensive Lucianic revision. One of his (rather few) examples was the rendering of the

<sup>41</sup> This explanation has been put forward by August Dillman, *Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel*. (Monatsberichte der Königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1881), 601-620, already and still is the most probable explanation.

<sup>42</sup> Rahlfs, *Lucians Text*, 251.

<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, there is also an opposite case: In 4 Reigns 21:3 codex Vaticanus has kept ἡ Βααλ, while the Antiochene text has the masculine form. This shows that codex Vaticanus sometimes may have kept an older expression, even within the kaige-section.

<sup>44</sup> Sebastian P. Brock, *Lucian redivivus. Some Reflections on Barthélemy's Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, in: F.L. [!] Cross, *Studia Evangelica, Vol. V, Papers presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965* (TUGAL 103, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1968, 176-181).

expression הטוב בעיניך in the kaige- and in the non-kaige-sections. Brock observed that in the Lucianic text the expression was translated with τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιόν σου while in Codex Vaticanus there are two renderings of it: in the kaige-section (“Palestinian text”) it is τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου and in the non-kaige-section there is ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν σου. Rightly Brock said that the character of the Lucianic text is the same in the kaige- and in the non-kaige-section. But in a strange turn of the argument he did not discuss the differences in the Vaticanus but postulated that Vaticanus is Old Greek in the non-kaige-section and that therefore and because of its identical character the Antiochene text must be secondary, i.e. the result of Lucians revision, in the kaige-section as well. Put in a table, his idea is the following.

	1 Kgdms	2 Kgdms (Pal.)
	הטוב בעיניך	הטוב בעיניך
B	τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν σου	τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου
Ant	τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιόν σου	τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιόν σου

Yet, the real Problem is the difference within Vaticanus. The difference shows that there must be two levels. Barthélemy’s identification of the kaige-recension showed that the text in the kaige-section belongs to the revision and that it is the younger text, while the Antiochene text is the older base text of that revision. If, as Brock had rightly maintained, the character and the age of the Lucianic text is the same in both sections, it is old in the non-kaige-section as well. Barthélemy’s insights and analyses lead to the following picture:

	1 Kgdms	2 Kgdms 19:38(39) and Pal. throughout
Hebrew	הטוב בעיניך	הטוב בעיניך
Ant	τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιόν σου	τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιόν σου
B (non-kaige)	τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν ...	
B (Pal. / kaige)		τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου

The only question is: Is the text of Vaticanus in the non-kaige-section even older (and closer to the Old Greek) as the Antiochene text, or is it younger, i.e. between Antiochene and kaige. As a look at the texts clearly shows, the expression τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν σου is half way between the Antiochene text and kaige. It has maintained ἐνώπιόν σου but it has changed τὸ ἀρεστὸν into τὸ ἀγαθὸν which is formally closer to the Hebrew. In other words: Brock’s example confirms Barthélemy’s view: The Antiochene text preserves the oldest text and is close to the Old Greek while the kaige-text is a later and formalistic revision towards the Hebrew reference text. And, interestingly: Also the non-kaige-sections in Codex Vaticanus show an – although milder - Hebraising revision.

### 3.2.3 Two examples of a whole verse

For further illustration we look at some verses in 2 Sam 4, comparing the text of Codex Vaticanus, the Antiochian text, the Masoretic Text and the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

2 Sam 4:2

MT	line	B	Ant <sup>ed</sup>

וּשְׁנֵי אַנְשִׁים שָׂרִי־	1	καὶ δύο ἄνδρες	καὶ δύο ἄνδρες
גְּדוּדִים	2	ἡγούμενοι συστρεμμάτων	ἡγούμενοι συστρεμμάτων
הָיוּ	3	τῷ Μεμφιβόσθε	τῷ Μεμφιβόσθε
בְּוֶשְׁאוֹל	4	υἱῷ Σαούλ·	υἱῷ Σαούλ·
שֵׁם הָאָהָד בְּעֵנָה	5	ὄνομα τῷ ἐνὶ Βαανά,	ὄνομα τῷ ἐνὶ Βαναία,
וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִי	6	καὶ ὄνομα τῷ δευτέρῳ	καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ ὄνομα
רָכָב	7	Ῥηγάβ,	Ῥηγάβ,
בְּנֵי רִמּוֹן	8	υἱοὶ Ῥεμμὼν	υἱοὶ Ῥεμμὼν
הַבְּאֲרָתִי	9	τοῦ Βηρωθαίου	τοῦ Βηρωθαίου
מִבְּנֵי בְנֵימָן	10	ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Βενιαμείν,	ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Βενιαμίν <sup>d</sup> ,
כִּי גַם-בְּאֲרוֹת	11	ὅτι Βηρώθ	ὅτι καὶ Βηρώθ
תַּחֲשֹׁב	12	ἐλογίζετο τοῖς υἱοῖς	ἐλογίζετο τοῖς υἱοῖς
עַל-בְּנֵימָן:	13	Βενιαμείν.	Βενιαμίν.

#### Qumran: 4QSam<sup>a</sup>

[וּשְׁנֵי אַנְשִׁים שָׂרִי גְדוּדִים] לַמְּפִיבֶשֶׁת בֶּן שְׂאוּל שֵׁם הָאָהָד  
 [בְּעֵנָה וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִי רָכָב] בְּנֵי רִמּוֹן הַבְּאֲרָתִי מִבְּנֵי בְנֵימָן [וְ] כִּי גַם  
 [בְּאֲרוֹת תַּחֲשֹׁב] עַל בְּנֵימָן [וְ] בְּרָחוּ הַבְּרִיתִים גַּת [וְ] יוֹ שֵׁם

As in all those chapters, this verse clearly shows the closeness of the text of B and of Ant. This demonstrates that there were not two different translations (or “Septuagints”), but one translation (i.e. the original Septuagint, the so called Old Greek), which has been revised. Besides the general agreements this is shown by the fact that there are even agreements against the MT like Μεμφιβόσθε in line 3 and τοῖς υἱοῖς in line 12. Interestingly, the first agreement, Μεμφιβόσθε has its counterpart in the Qumrantext, which shows that it belongs to the Vorlage not only to the translation. The second agreement, is harder to judge. Most probably it also goes back to the Hebrew, because it can be explained easier in the Hebrew as in the Greek as either an addition or an omission because of homoiokaton בנימין / בני. Beyond that עַל and the words before it in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> evidently are reconstructed according to MT.

Yet there are also small but significant differences: In line 5 the name Βαανά is closer to MT than the Ant with Βαναία, and in line 6 the word order in B agrees with MT. In both cases there is no real reason that Ant should have changed the text represented by B. In both cases the B text has no problem and Ant is not really better Greek. On the other hand, both differences can be explained as adaptation to the Hebrew text. Therefore it is highly probable that the text in B reflects an adaptation, which means that it has undergone an – although mild – revision towards a Hebrew reference text.

#### 2Reigns 4:5

MT	line	B	Ant <sup>ed</sup>
וַיֵּלְכוּ בְּנֵי־רִמּוֹן	1	Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν υἱοὶ	Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ
הַבְּאֲרָתִי	2	Ῥεμμὼν τοῦ Βηρωθαίου	Ῥεμμὼν τοῦ Βηρωθαίου,
רָכָב וּבְעֵנָה	3	Ῥεκχά καὶ Βαάμ	Ῥηγάβ καὶ Βαναία
	4		ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ,
וַיָּבֹאוּ	5	καὶ εἰσηλθον	καὶ εἰσηλθον
בְּיֹום הַיּוֹם	6	ἐν τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας	ἐν τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας
אֶל־בַּיִת	7	εἰς οἶκον	εἰς τὸν οἶκον
אִישׁ בְּשֵׁת	8	Μεμφιβόσθε,	Μεμφιβόσθε,

וְהָיָה שְׁכָב	9	καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκάθευδεν	καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκάθευδε
אֶת מְשָׁכָב	10	ἐν τῇ κοίτῃ	
הַצָּהֳרָיִם:	11	τῆς μεσημβρίας.	τὸ μεσημβρινόν.

Qumran: Not extant.

In this verse again one can observe that both Greek text forms widely agree and therefore go back to one single translation, which has been revised; but there are not differences enough to understand the two versions as two independent translations.<sup>45</sup> There are fewer differences than in the kaige-sections, yet they are clear and significant: There is the difference in regard of the article in line 1 and in line 7, and in line 4 and line 11 there are differences in regard of addition and omission. According to the old theories about a Lucianic redaction, Lucian would have added the articles and he would have added the explaining words in line 4. On the other hand he would have deleted the words in line 11. A fact which was explained by Rahlfs and many others as a trait of Lucian, i.e. that he worked irregularly and even contradictory. But this is only an assumption and does not explain why he should have done this. Again – as in the kaige-section, one should test the other possibility: If one allows Ant to present the older text, one gets a coherent explanation: Each of the differences can be explained as adaptation to the Hebrew reference text, which in this case almost exactly was the proto-MT text. The identification of Benaia as “his brother” (line 4) is missing in the Hebrew text as well.

The place of Memphibostes rest (line 11) is an exact rendering of the MT. The Hebrew Vorlage of the Ant may have been shorter, but probably it is only a freer rendering of the same Hebrew words by naming the circumstance (“at noon”) of his sleeping, while B makes a word-by-word translation. In any case, B gives an isomorphic adaptation to its reference text. The deletion of the articles in line 1 and 7 exactly fits into this picture and again demonstrates the isomorphic character of the revision.<sup>46</sup>

The strange form of the names in line 3, both Πεκχα and Βααμ are a specific phenomenon of Codex Vaticanus which in this case is only followed by a few manuscripts (and for Βααμ also by the Ethiopic version which confirms a rather late date). The manuscripts show some variety and insecurity with these names.<sup>47</sup> Πεκχα could be explained by a Hebrew form רככ instead of רכב. Basically it looks like a scribal mistake, especially since in V. 2 line 6 there is the correct form in Codex Vaticanus. More amazing than the mistake is that it has not been corrected.

We could continue to analyse many more verses from the non-kaige-sections with similar results,<sup>48</sup> but for the sake of space this must suffice. The examples showed that with the text of Codex Vaticanus and the Antiochian text there are two text forms which inseparably belong together and are very close to the Old Greek. At the same time there are many differences, differences that are not scribal mistakes or other unintentional corruptions, but which must be explained as intentional reworking according to specific rules. The general rule of this reworking is a closer adaptation of the Greek text towards the Hebrew reference text, mainly in a formalistic, isomorphic way. This intention is the same as represented in the kaige revision, i.e. bringing the text closer to its Hebrew reference text and making it to reflect the holy Hebrew text not only in its content but also in its form.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Tov, Lucian and Proto-Lucian, 101-113: The Antiochian text contains “the LXX” or “a Septuagint”.

<sup>46</sup> Interestingly, both text forms read the name Memphiboste and not Isboste, which confirms that this is the Old Greek reading. The Hebrew equivalent is found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, cf. above, V. 2 which confirms that the Vorlage of the Old Greek was not proto-MT but a slightly different text form. Yet, one should notice that in 4:4 also MT reads Mephboschet/Memphiboste (see also V. 7) while Ant has Memphibaal, and that in 4:8 MT again reads Ishboshet. But these are questions of the plurality of the Hebrew text forms.

<sup>47</sup> See the apparatus in Brooke-McLean.

<sup>48</sup> This analysis is done in a research project at Wuppertal sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

In comparing the text forms and testing the possible directions of the change, it turns out that the text represented by Codex Vaticanus is the one which has been revised, while the Antiochien text is closest to the Old Greek.

As just stated, the formalistic Hebraizing revision is not as strong as in the kaige sections. One may ask if it represents an earlier stage in the development. Considering the general development of the Septuagint from a more free to a more literal translation, this seems logical. Yet one must consider that we deal about a revision, not about the original translation. The idea of more closeness to the Hebrew, in content but also in structure, may as well be the result of a cross influence from the kaige recension. Therefore, as long as we don't have indications for the chronology it seems better to avoid a name like pre-kaige and name the revision by its characteristic: The text of Codex Vaticanus at least in the non-kaige-sections of the historical books represents a semi-kaige text.

#### **4. Conclusion: B or not B?**

1) Codex Vaticanus (B) has become the most important single manuscript of the Septuagint because of historical reasons, as it was the basic manuscript for the diplomatic editions from around 1600 until the 20<sup>th</sup> century and as it still is the dominating manuscript in the critical editions. It probably still is the most important single manuscript, yet it has its worth no longer for itself, but only in the context of the other manuscripts and the other textual traditions (including the Hebrew texts, esp. from Qumran, on the one hand and the daughter translations, esp. the Old Latin but also the Sahidic and the Syriac translation, on the other hand). Also the quotations, both by Josephus and in the New Testament and by the early Christian writers have proven more important than it was accepted in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

2) Most important is the fact that B consists of different text types. There are least the kaige-sections and the non-kaige sections as they were identified by Thackeray and confirmed and interpreted by Barthélemy. This clearly shows that B is a mixed codex, i.e. a codex with different types of text. Since Barthélemy it is clear that the kaige-sections represent a revised text which is not the Old Greek. This result has been confirmed by the above mentioned aspects which demonstrate the early Jewish understanding of scripture and the related hermeneutics as background for the kaige recension. Yet, also the non-kaige sections of codex Vaticanus show evidence of a Hebraizing revision and therefore are not the Old Greek, although much closer to it. The – although milder – Hebraizing recension of the non-kaige-sections has a similar hermeneutic background as the kaige-sections, i.e. it intends a formalistic adaptation to the authoritative Hebrew reference text. Because it is a milder revision it can be called semi-kaige-recension. This means that in both, the kaige-sections and the non-kaige-sections at least of the historical books – but probably also other books, esp. in the prophetic books – Codex Vaticanus represents revised texts, although revised in different intensity.

3) The kaige sections in B demonstrate that there had been a Hebraizing revision not only in the Minor Prophets (cf. Naḥal Hever scroll), but also in large parts of the Septuagint – if not in all of it. Codex Vaticanus therefore is important not only where it is relatively close to the Old Greek, but also – and probably even more - where its text is secondary because this shows an important and highly influential phase of the transmission of the Septuagint.

4) B as a manuscript from the 4<sup>th</sup> century is older than the other extant codices and older than the manuscripts of the Antiochien texts, yet one has to keep in mind that it is not older than the text of the Antiochien fathers and it is younger than Josephus, the Old Latin and the Sahidic translation,

and (although they are in Hebrew) the Qumran texts. This is the field where the place of codex Vaticanus has to be defined today.

5) Be or not B? The answer is a clear “yes” and a clear “no”. “Yes”, in the way that Codex Vaticanus is still one of the most important manuscripts of the Septuagint. “No”, not in the old way as the most important witness of the original Septuagint, the so called Old Greek, but in the way that it clearly shows different stages of the transmission of the Septuagint and that it allows a glimpse at the factors which accompanied and the forces which shaped it.

-----