Tuukka Kauhanen

The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

V&R

De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI)

Edited by
Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kristin De Troyer,
Wolfgang Kraus, Emanuel Tov

In Co-operation with
Kai Brodersen (Erfurt, Germany), Cécile Dogniez (Paris, France),
Peter Gentry (Louisville, USA), Anna Kharanauli (Tbilisi, Georgia),
Armin Lange (Wien, Austria), Alison Salvesen (Oxford, UK),
David Andrew Teeter (Cambridge, USA), Julio Trebolle (Madrid,
Spain), Florian Wilk (Göttingen, Germany)

Volume 3

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Tuukka Kauhanen

The Proto-Lucianic Problem
in 1 Samuel

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Printed and bound in Germany by ⊕ Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Printed on non-aging paper.

Preface

This monograph is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, submitted to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Helsinki in March 2011. Of those several scholars who have helped me to get through this work I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor Anneli Aejmelaeus, who has meticulously read all parts of this study and offered innumerable comments that have contributed to the work immensely. Thanks are also due to Professors Raija Sollamo and Martti Nissinen as well as to the members of the Helsinki Septuagint group: Marketta Liljeström, Elina Perttilä, Christian Seppänen, Raimund Wirth, Jessi Orpana, and Miika Tucker.

Special thanks go to Prof. Jan Joosten and Prof. Eugene Ulrich who were the official reviewers of the doctoral thesis. Their comments and suggestions advanced the work significantly. I have also had valuable feedback from the following scholars: Prof. Anna Kharanauli, Prof. Andres Piquer, Prof. Pablo Torijano, Prof. Julio Trebolle, Dr. Reinhart Ceulemans, Dr. T. M. Law, and Dr. Georg Walser.

Finally, I wish to thank the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint Project, funded by the Academy of Finland, for the chance to prepare my thesis as a project researcher during the years 2005–2006 and 2009–2010. I also wish to thank the Finnish Cultural Foundation for three generous grants that have made it possible to continue the work during the years 2007–2009 and 2010–2011.

Dr. Robert Whiting has meticulously revised the English of this volume. He has also provided several helpful comments on the content. For any remaining mistakes I am solely responsible.

Helsinki, Juli 2012 Tuukka Kauhanen

Table of Contents

Grouping of the Septuagint Manuscripts for 1 Samuel

The edition of 1 Samuel for the Göttingen series[1] is being edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus for whose Project for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint I have worked. I have had the opportunity to consult the collation books of 1 Samuel prepared by the Göttingen *Septuaginta-Unternehmen*, as well as other preliminary material of the edition, including the preliminary grouping of the MSS. It is my aim to keep the sigla used in this study compatible with the forthcoming edition as far as possible.

Uncials: A B M V

Fragments: 842 (contains 23:28–24:2; 24:6–8, 12–13, 18–20) 845 (13:16–18, 20–21; 13:23–14:1, 3–4; 18:8–25) 846 (24:11–17; 24:20–25:20; 31:12–fin) 867 (4:6, 9, 13, 15–16)

O: 247-376
L: 19-82-93-108-127
  19´: 19-108
CI: 98-(243)-379-731
  98´: 98-379
CII: 46-52-236-242-313-328-530
  46´: 46-52
  242´: 242-328
    C': *CI + CII*
a: 119-527-799
b: 121-509
d: 44-68-74-106-107-120-122-125-134-(370)-610
  68´: 68-122
f: 56-246
s: 64-92-130-314-381-488-489-(762)
  64´: 64-381
  488´: 488-489

Manuscripts without grouping: 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 (342) 460 554 707

---

1 Introduction

1.1 The Proto-Lucianic Question

The textual history of the Greek Old Testament or the Septuagint (LXX) is fascinatingly complex. In addition to the normal corruption that takes place in the transmission of all ancient texts, the text of the LXX has undergone several revisions or *recensions*. In the First book of Samuel[2] there are three major textual traditions. The *B-text* has traditionally been identified with "the Old Greek" (OG).[3] It is represented by codex Vaticanus (B), minuscules 121 and 509, and the Ethiopic daughter version (Aeth). The *Hexaplaric text* derives from Origen's text-critical work, the Hexapla. Origen compared the LXX text at his disposal with the Hebrew text. Whenever the Hebrew text included a reading that was not present in the LXX, he added the reading, taking it from the later Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion), and marked it with an asterisk. The readings that were present in the LXX but not in the Hebrew text he marked with an obelos. As scribes copied the LXX text of the Hexapla, they often failed to include Origen's text-critical marks and/or misunderstood them. Eventually this resulted in a distinct text form. This text form, however, is not found in a pure form in any MS of 1 Samuel since none of the witnesses provides a direct copy from the LXX column of the Hexapla. A considerable number of its readings, however, are preserved in codex Alexandrinus (A) and MSS 247 and 376. The third major textual tradition is commonly called the *Lucianic* (or *Antiochian*) *text* because it is supposed to originate with a revision of the text by the martyr Lucian of Antioch (d. 311/312 CE). In the Historical Books this textual tradition is found in the MS group *L*[4] and the biblical quotations of the Antiochene church fathers.

The scholarly consensus is that there are at least two strata in the Lucianic text: the recensional elements, which date back to at about 300 CE, and the substratum under these recensional elements, the *proto-Lucianic text*. The recensional elements are distinguishable to some degree since the comparison between MS group *L* and the other textual traditions reveals some tendencies that are easy to attribute to the reviser. However, some distinctive readings in *L* must have been present already in the substratum since they also seem to be supported by witnesses that antedate the supposed time of the recension by

---

[2] In the LXX, 1–2 Sam and 1–2 Kgs form one block, Βασιλειῶν Α´–Δ´; for this reason, many studies refer to 1 Sam of the LXX as 1 Reigns or 1 Kingdoms.

[3] The term means the oldest Greek form of any book of the Old Testament.

[4] 19–82–93–108–127 = *L*; the group is often referred to by the Brooke-McLean sigla of the MSS: boc₂e₂.

several hundred years, namely the Old Latin version (OL) and the biblical text used by Josephus, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian. It has also been posited that some *L*-readings might go back to Hebrew readings that are not found in the Masoretic text (MT) but appear in the Qumran biblical texts. This phenomenon – distinctive readings of a textual tradition that has undergone a recension appearing in witnesses that are too early to have been touched by the same recension – constitutes the proto-Lucianic problem.

The present study deals with the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Samuel. The task is to analyze the textual material that antedates 300 CE and contains agreements with *L* against B and/or the rest of the witnesses.

1.2 History of Research on the Lucianic Text

1.2.1 The Point of Departure

The scholarly discussion on the proto-Lucianic problem cannot be viewed in isolation, but must be seen in the broader context of Septuagint studies. The related topics are the discussion on the nature of the Lucianic text and the other textual traditions as well as the overall textual history of the LXX in general and the methodology of textual criticism of the LXX and the Hebrew Bible.

In the recent presentations of the history of research, some conclusions are seen as having gained scholarly consensus.[5] These may be taken as starting points of the present study.

1. The existing witnesses of the LXX text of 1 Samuel go back to a single original translation that was made in the first or second century BCE. This makes it meaningful to speak of the "original text" (the OG) of the translation.
2. The OG translation was made on the basis of a Hebrew text[6] that contained many readings that diverge from the MT and was in some readings closer to the original Hebrew text than the MT.
3. The MSS 19, 82, 93, 108, and 127 (*L*) form a homogenous group or family that in the Historical Books attests a distinctive textual tradition. It is characterized by readings more in accordance with good Greek style and the requirements of context and parallel passages, as well as a considerable number of Hexaplaric corrections according to the Hebrew text.
4. The text of *L* consists of at least two strata, of which the latest results from recensional activity that aimed at improving the style, language, and reada-

---

[5] E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 136–7, 148. A. Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel", in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 123–7; B. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (HSM 50–51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 11.

[6] Referred to as the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

bility of the text. The same or some later layer contains multiple Hexaplaric readings.

The following subsections introduce and comment upon the discussion that has led to the above conclusions. Many excellent state-of-the-question articles have been written in the past,[7] and this allows the following survey to concentrate on the matters that are most important regarding the proto-Lucianic problem.

1.2.2 The Overall Nature of the *L*-group

The existence of a unique textual tradition in MS group *L* was noticed already by the 19th-century scholars O. Thenius,[8] A. M. Ceriani,[9] J. Wellhausen,[10] and F. Field.[11] On the basis of testimonies by ancient writers,[12] Paul de Lagarde assumed that there were three recensions of the original LXX text (*trifaria varietas*): Hesychian, Hexaplaric, and Lucianic. The OG could be reconstructed by first reconstructing and then comparing these three recensional texts. As a preliminary work he attempted to reconstruct the earliest form of the Lucianic text in his *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum*.[13]

That some distinctive readings of the *L*-group existed before the fourth century and are thus *pre-Lucianic* (antedating the historical Lucian) was already suggested by Wellhausen.[14] A. Mez[15] attempted to distinguish these pre-Lucianic readings in the biblical references of Josephus and C. Vercellone[16] in the Old Latin version (see chapters 2 and 8).

---

[7] B.M. Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible", in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 7–14; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 157–71; idem, *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1974), XXXIV–XXXVII; G. Howard, "The Septuagint: A Review of Recent Studies", *ResQ* 13 (1970), 158–63; E. Tov, "The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions", in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings for IOSCS and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula, 1972), 8–9 (with a bibliography, pp. 13–15); E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 15–37; Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 32–8; J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 7–32.

[8] O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuelis* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1842).

[9] A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher: Septuaginta-Studien 3* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [1st ed. 1911]), 49 n. 1, 80 n. 1, refers to Ceriani's *Monumenta sacra et profana* (1863) and *Le edizioni e i manoscritti delle versioni siriache del V.T.* (1869/1870).

[10] J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1871).

[11] F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta* (vol. 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1867), lxxxvii.

[12] See Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension", 3–7.

[13] P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum: pars prior* (Gottingae: Arnoldi Hoyer, 1883). On the limitations of Lagarde's work, see Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 24–30.

[14] Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 221–4.

[15] A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus: Untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895).

[16] C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis, vol. 2* (Rome, 1864).

After Lagarde, the next analysis of the Lucianic witnesses was the impressive work on the Books of Kings by Alfred Rahlfs. Rahlfs demonstrated that there are not any simple criteria to make a distinction between the recensional *L*-readings and the readings already present in the base text of the recension. The overall nature of the recension is equally difficult to describe. Rahlfs preferred to use the term 'tendency' to describe the recensional features. These tendencies include: making the language sound like better Greek, harmonizing some details in the text according to the context, and sporadic corrections towards some Hebrew tradition – mainly to the so-called proto-Masoretic text.[17] According to Rahlfs, the base text was an old, pre-Hexaplaric text close to the type attested in B and the Ethiopian daughter version.[18] Rahlfs was the first to show that the old picture of a threefold textual history of the LXX is not all that clear. However, more recently several scholars have suggested that Rahlfs' "lagardian point of view"[19] made him undervalue the importance of the pre-Lucianic readings.[20] Rahlfs utilized the biblical quotations of early church fathers as important pre-Lucianic witnesses, an approach followed later by Bonifatius Fischer and Sebastian Brock (see chapters 4–6).

The scholarly view of the textual history of the Historical Books was revolutionized by the discovery of the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll (8HevXIIgr)[21] and the subsequent identification of the καίγε recension by Dominique Barthélemy.[22] Having noted that the text of 8HevXIIgr contained a Hebraizing recension, Barthélemy found the same recensional features especially in the LXX of Lamentations and in the B-text of Judges and parts of the Books of Kingdoms (so-called καίγε sections: 2 Sam 11:2 – 1 Kgs 2:11, 1 Kgs 22 – 2 Kgs). Barthélemy's well-known thesis was that in the καίγε sections of Kingdoms the Old Greek translation is actually preserved in *L*. From this point of view, Barthélemy attempted to demonstrate that *L* gives the text closest to the OG in other sections of the Books of Kingdoms as well. He explained the secondary features of this text as assimilation to the Hexaplaric text.[23]

---

[17] Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 291–4.

[18] Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension*, 290–1.

[19] J.R. Busto Saiz, "The Antiochene Text in 2 Samuel 22", in L. Greenspoon/O. Munnich (ed.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 131.

[20] Ibid.; similarly E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem", *RB* 79 (1972), 101 following P.L. Hedley, "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint", *HTR* 26 (1933), 69.

[21] The latest edition is by E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

[22] D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

[23] Ibid., 33–41; 91–2; 126–7. For the impact of Barthélemy's work as well as a list of reviews see R.A. Kraft, "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's Devanciers, Forty Years Later", *BIOSCS* 37 (2004), 1. For responses to Barthélemy, see esp. S.P. Brock, "Lucian Redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's Les Devanciers d'Aquila", in *Studia Evangelica 5* (TU 103; 1968).

Major criticism of Barthélemy began in the following year with Frank Moore Cross's article in the *Harvard Theological Review*.[24] Cross's investigations on the Qumran biblical scrolls showed that the oldest Hebrew witnesses contain readings that seem to agree with the Greek *L*-readings. This led him to conclude that even the proto-Lucianic layer is a recensional text.[25] Emanuel Tov joined in the criticism. He pointed out especially that Barthélemy dismissed the evidence of the cases in which *L* gives a more literal equivalent of the Hebrew text than the καίγε recension. Moreover, strong internal evidence in *L* proves that this text is also of recensional origin, even in the καίγε sections (see also p. 22).[26]

Sebastian Brock's dissertation in 1966 is the most thorough study of the recensions of 1 Samuel thus far.[27] Brock's conclusion is that the textual line that *L* is based on diverged from the rest of the tradition at a comparatively early date, perhaps first century CE. This means that all the distinctive *L*-readings are not necessarily due to the recensional activity of Lucian, but to an otherwise lost independent textual tradition antedating him. Brock has also noted the most striking recensional features in *L*: "correcting" the gender of some nouns, interchange of first and second aorist endings and of aorist middle and passive, adding the definite article, using a participle to avoid parataxis, and removal of the historic present.[28]

Although Brock's work remained unpublished until 1996, it has greatly influenced the subsequent study of the recensions in the Historical Books.[29] This can be seen especially in recent Spanish contributions to LXX studies, published in the series *Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros»*, which contains "monographs that are both preparatory and complementary to the edition of the biblical text as such."[30] An important contribution in that series is the edition of the Lucianic text. As a preliminary work, Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz edited Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena*.[31] The editors confirmed the great agreement between Theodoret's citations and

---

[24] F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert", *HTR* 57 (1964): 281–99.

[25] Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text", 292–7. Barthélemy responded in a prepublished paper for the 1972 symposium of the IOSCS: "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2 –1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticism of Les Devanciers d'Aquila", in R.A. Kraft (ed.), *1972 Proceedings: Septuagint and Pseudepigrapha Seminars* (SBLSCS 2; Missoula: SBL, 1972), 16–89.

[26] Tov, "Lucian", 102.

[27] Published thirty years later: S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996).

[28] Brock, Recensions, 297–8, 225–51.

[29] See N. Fernández Marcos, "Prólogo" to Brock, *Recensions*, 9*–11*.

[30] N. Fernández Marcos, "On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain", in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea: V Congreso de la IOSCS* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 34; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1985), 273.

[31] N. Fernández Marcos/J.R. Busto Saiz, *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: editio critica* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 32; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano", 1984) = Tht *1 Reg*.

the Lucianic (in their terms 'Antiochene') text of Samuel-Kings. The edition, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (= Ant), saw the light in 1989.[32]

In a paper at the sixth congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) Fernández Marcos put forward an appeal for greater concentration on the literary aspects of the Lucianic text. In his view, Rahlfs emphasized the double readings and Brock the syntactical and lexical variants, while he himself sees different kinds of narrative harmonizations as the major recensional feature. These include:

1. Completing the unsaid in the prediction-fulfilment scheme.
2. Adding small sentences to clarify the narrative or smooth some ruptures. These additions are not usually taken from parallel passages – if such exist – nor are they double translations.
3. Stylistic rewriting, including the elimination of Semitisms typical of translation Greek.
4. Corrections of theological or midrashic character.
5. Double readings, which may be further classified as those
   a. composed of translation plus transliteration of the same Hebrew word,
   b. based on different vocalization of the Hebrew, and
   c. alternative readings based on a different consonantal text.[33]

The overall nature of *L* in 1 Samuel has been investigated by Bernard A. Taylor in his dissertation in 1989, published a little later as a two-volume work *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*. Taylor's conclusion is that *L* is a witness to an archetype that was redacted, but the redaction "is not complete, and/or has been reharmonized towards the majority text."[34] Taylor maintains that his study supports the scholarly acceptance of B as *the* representative of OG and calls for reconsidering the positions of Barthélemy and Cross (see next section, p. 20) with regard to the relationship of the proto-Lucianic text and the OG.[35] This is, however, little more than a necessary consequence of his presupposition that for 1 Samuel "MS B is the best witness to, and lies close to, the Old Greek."[36] Contrary to Tov, Taylor rejects the possibility of seeing the Lucianic text as *an* Old Greek text (see p. 22). Taylor does not take a position regarding the value of proto-Lucianic readings in general.[37]

While 1 Samuel belongs to Barthélemy's non-καίγε section, recent studies show that it has not totally escaped early Hebraizing correction. This correction

---

[32] N. Fernández Marcos/J.R. Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vol.; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–1996).

[33] N. Fernández Marcos, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings", in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 292–8. See also idem, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 230–2.

[34] Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 96.

[35] Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 127.

[36] Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6. This is said to be proved by the lack of Hexaplaric material in B (ibid., 7).

[37] Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 53–4. The second part of Taylor's work consists of an edition of the majority text of the Lucianic MSS of 1 Samuel. See also idem, "The Lucianic Text of 1 Reigns: The Three Texts Compared and Contrasted", *BIOSCS* 29 (1996): 53–66.

worked with the same principles as the καίγε recension, but was much more sporadic. This type of correction is visible in the majority of the witnesses, including B, but not in *L*.[38] This observation further points to the conclusion that the textual tradition that *L* is based on deviated from the other traditions at an early date.

There are still some questions relating to the overall nature of *L* which have so far drawn little attention. These include the exact place of the Hexaplaric material in *L*: Does it belong to the first recensional layer that made the stylistic polishing or is it a later development of the text?[39] At least some of the Hexaplaric readings in *L* seem to be early since they are attested by Antiochian church fathers, e.g., the plus καὶ παρώργιζεν αὐτὴν ἡ ἀντίζηλος αὐτῆς καί γε παροργισμῷ διὰ τὸ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτήν in 1:6 is attested by John Chrysostom (d. 407 CE). However, improving the style and the language of the text and bringing it closer to the Hebrew text are at least partly opposite goals, since the Hebraizing readings often have Semitisms and other features of non-literary Greek.

The most recent advocate of Barthélemy's theory is Siegfried Kreuzer. In short, he maintains that *L* as a whole is very close to the OG and the differences between the witnesses result mostly from the activity of the καίγε recension.[40] Kreuzer's approach is at least partly founded on some results of previous studies that my study calls into question. Kreuzer pleads that "[w]e have to take seriously the insight that the Lucianic/Antiochene text has many agreements with Josephus and with the Old Latin translation and often is confirmed by the Qumran Samuel texts."[41] However, it will be seen in the course of the present study that, at least in 1 Samuel, the testimony of the witnesses mentioned is at best ambiguous (Qumran Samuel texts: see the next section and chapter 9; Josephus: chapter 2; the OL: chapter 8). Similar theories have been put forward by one of Kreuzer's doctoral students, Kim Jong-Hoon.[42]

---

[38] See the examples in A. Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the Textus Receptus", in A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008).

[39] I had the opportunity to discuss this matter with the late Udo Quast in Göttingen in the summer of 2005. He told me that his studies in the Octateuch had suggested that there was constant development in the Lucianic text. Quast termed this ongoing development "the Lucianic School."

[40] S. Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)", in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 251; idem, "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns", *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 43–4.

[41] Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek", 252. So also idem, "Translation", 39: "It is not only the agreements with Josephus and the OL version that show there is an old component in the Lucianic text, but the Qumran texts even more ... These witnesses support the Lucianic text in many cases, which makes it clear that it has an old component that is close to the OG."

[42] Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen*. I have assessed Kreuzer's theory at more length in a joint article with T.M. Law: T.M. Law/T. Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer", *BIOSCS* 43 (2010): 73–87.

1.2.3 The Theory of the Proto-Lucianic Recension

While Barthélemy suggested that *L* might not be a recensional text at all (see above), Cross suggested that there is a recension already in the substratum of *L*. The development of this theory and the critical reactions and alternative views to it deserve to be recounted at some length.

The most important – at least, from the point of view of a biblical scholar – archaeological discovery of the 20th century is the Qumran finds. Among them, fragments of three scrolls of the Books of Samuel were discovered in the late summer of 1952 from Qumran cave 4 (4QSam^{a-c}).[43] When Cross published the first fragments of 4QSam^a, he stressed the agreements between these fragments and the LXX. Cross concluded that 4QSam^a is a witness to the same textual tradition as the *Vorlage* of the LXX.[44] This analysis led Cross to adopt the "Local texts theory": The Masoretic text, the LXX, and the Qumran biblical texts reflect different local textual traditions.[45] The agreements between 4QSam^a and *L* are due to a "proto-Lucianic recension" made on the basis of the OG towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam^a in the second or first century BCE.[46]

In his dissertation in 1978, Eugene Ulrich attempted to demonstrate the connection between the textual traditions of 4QSam^a and *L* in 1 Samuel. The connection cannot be due to the recensional layer, since a Hebrew text similar to 4QSam^a would have been unavailable to Lucian. This means that the connection must be between 4QSam^a and the proto-Lucianic layer.[47] Because the proto-Lucianic layer is not a translation in its own right, its conformity with 4QSam^a must be due to a revision of it toward this type of Hebrew text ("the text tradition in contemporary Palestine"). Ulrich suggested that this revisional work should be termed "a series of proto-Lucianic revisions," rather than *the* proto-Lucianic recension.[48]

Another of Cross's students, James Donald Shenkel, refined the theory slightly. According to him, the proto-Lucianic recension is chronologically a second stage in the development of the Lucianic text. He stated that the three earliest text forms (the other two being the OG and the καίγε recension) "corre-

---

[43] For modern introductions to the Qumran biblical texts see, e.g., Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 101–17; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

[44] F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *BASOR* 132 (1953), 23.

[45] According to Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), 256, n. 9, the theory originates with H.M. Wiener and W.F. Albright. Tov refers to H.M. Wiener, "The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner", *BSac* 71 (1914): 218–268 and W.F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible", *BASOR* 140 (1955), 27–33 (repr. in F.M. Cross/S. Talmon [ed.], *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975], 140–6). More recently, the theory of local texts has found an advocate in Shemaryahu Talmon: see Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook", in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 321–400.

[46] Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text", 295–6.

[47] Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 15.

[48] Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 258–9.

spond to the principal local types of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew text."[49] The earliest stratum of the Lucianic text is, according to Shenkel, an ancient text dating to the first centuries BCE, while the second stratum consists of additions by means of which the earlier stratum was brought into partial conformity with the Hexaplaric text.[50]

Fernández Marcos is one of the present advocates of the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension. An interesting thought in Fernández Marcos' work is that all doublets are not necessarily recensional elements, nor secondary readings at all. Many of them could go back to an alternative Hebrew reading.[51] Richard J. Saley, one of Cross's co-editors in the DJD series, seems to have become doubtful about the close relationship of 4QSam[a] and *L* – this is suggested by his recent articles in *BIOSCS*.[52] For example, regarding the doublets in *L*, Saley concludes: "[T]here is not a close correlation between the Greek Lucianic doublets and 4QSam[a]... . Whatever the source(s) for the Greek Lucianic doublets in the Books of Samuel, the evidence at hand does not support an origin in a text akin to that of 4QSam[a]."[53]

The theory of the proto-Lucianic recension has been under constant criticism. In his dissertation, Brock expressed reservations about it and offered conclusions of his own. A couple of quotations from his summary conclusions are in order:

While it is indeed possible that Cross' 'Proto-Lucianic' recension, based on the 'Palestinian' Hebrew text, did exist for 1 Kms, the evidence adduced so far is not decisive, and is capable of other explanations.[54]

---

[49] J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), 5.

[50] Shenkel, Chronology, 8. This stratification is used also by N. Fernández Marcos, "A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text", in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 309. In addition to Shenkel, Tov (*Text-Critical Use*, 256 n. 10) lists the following scholars as developers of Cross' theories: R.W. Klein, "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966); idem, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); J.D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968); K.G. O'Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek* (HSM 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972); J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); and Ulrich, *Qumran Text*. At this point could also be mentioned the rather vague idea put forth by George Howard ("The Septuagint", 163) that the proto-Lucianic stratum was a "revision of καίγε in favour of a Hebrew Vorlage like the texts presented by the Qumran Scrolls", rather than vice versa as Cross and Barthélemy had suggested.

[51] Fernández Marcos, "On the Present State", 283. See also idem, *Septuagint*, 235–6.

[52] R.J. Saley, "Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam[a]", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 63–73; idem, "Proto-Lucian and 4QSam[a]", *BIOSCS* 41 (2008): 34–45. See my references to some of Saley's analyses of the readings in section 9.2.2.

[53] Saley, "Greek Lucianic Doublets", 73.

[54] Brock, *Recensions*, 303.

The text of *L* in fact contains at least three different strata of approximations: first, non-hexaplaric. [*sic*] which are probably, but not certainly, early; second, hexaplaric in the narrow sense of readings deriving from the fifth column; and third, readings excerpted from the other columns of the hexapla. The attribution of individual approximation, when not attested by *O/D* [*D* ≈ *d* 554], to any one of these strata is often difficult.[55]

The textual tradition behind *L* had split off from that behind LXX *rell* at an early date, and so underwent several centuries of more or less independent development before it reached its present form, c.300 AD. Thus its text contains many early variants lost to the rest of the LXX tradition, and – most important – a number of original readings, again otherwise lost.[56]

Tov denies the existence of a proto-Lucianic recension. In his article in Revue Biblique in 1972, Tov suggested "a new solution of the problem": The substratum of Lucianic recension contains "either *the* Old Greek translation or any Old Greek translation."[57] Tov offers his "working hypothesis" as a compromise between the views of Barthélemy and Cross (see above). According to Tov, the sources reflecting Lucianic and even proto-Lucianic readings are so numerous that all of them could not have been retouched by Lucianic revisers. Even some post-Lucianic sources may be independent of the recension and reflect the ancient substratum, or, indeed, the OG.[58]

Tov admits that it is not easy to define criteria for distinguishing the three layers of *L*: the OG, Hexaplaric approximations (which Tov attributes to Lucian), and Lucian's own corrections. This difficulty is because all the phenomena of adding and changing for syntactical or contextual reasons are seen in the first stratum of the recension as well.[59] Tov suggests that the investigation should start with pinpointing those readings in which proto-Lucianic elements reflect early variants. Consequently, certain "typologically similar readings" without additional evidence might be pre-Lucianic as well. Another line of investigation should attempt to pinpoint the Hexaplaric readings in *L*. The changes that Lucian himself introduced (the third layer) have been studied quite extensively already.[60]

Regarding the relationship between *L* and the other MSS in the non-καίγε sections, Tov suggests that we should continue to characterise the other MSS as the OG, but offers two alternatives when the *L*-reading deviates from the rest of the MSS: 1. In the non-καίγε sections the substratum of *L* "*always* represents the Old Greek, while the other MSS *as a rule* reflect the Old Greek, but *at*

---

[55] Brock, *Recensions*, 305. "Approximation" is Brock's term for a reading that has been changed to bring it to better conformity with the Hebrew text. Using the term allows one to avoid the ambiguous term 'correction'.

[56] Brock, *Recensions*, 306.

[57] Tov, "Lucian", 103.

[58] Tov, "Lucian", 103.

[59] Similarly B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus-Latina der vier Königsbücher", *Studia Anselmiana* 27/28 (1951), 175–6, who takes into account the possibility that the stylistic changes attributed to Lucian may have been present already in the earlier text stratum. This is shown by the fact that the Old Latin translation (see chapter 8) is now and then "more Lucianic than *L*."

[60] Tov, "Lucian", 107–108. The last point is especially true now after nearly four decades.

times their text has been retouched." 2. Both of the readings "represent two parallel Old Greek traditions."[61]

Tov has also written a lengthy comment on Ulrich's dissertation (see above). Tov admits that there are some important agreements between 4QSam[a] and *L*. He, however, suggests caution in evaluating the agreements, and that it is the agreement between 4QSam[a] and *L* that "must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian." Tov also claims that Ulrich focused on the *agreements* between 4QSam[a] and *L*, while the *disagreements* between the two have been disregarded. Tov's own investigations have shown that such disagreements must be taken into consideration because they make the agreements between 4QSam[a] and *L* seem even weaker.[62]

In her paper at the 8th congress of the IOSCS, Aejmelaeus rejected the hypothesis of a proto-Lucianic recension: it "is a hypothesis created to fit another hypothesis, the neat pattern of the theory of local texts, but without any practical significance." According to Aejmelaeus, the early Jewish Hebraizing corrections were more probably done towards a Hebrew text very similar to the MT. The same circles that eventually accepted the proto-Masoretic text as authoritative were the ones responsible for the early corrections. This sporadic correction in the main line of textual transmission and the possibility of inner-Greek corruptions are sufficient explanations for the phenomena on which the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension has been based.[63]

Cross's theory has also been rejected by Edward D. Herbert. Herbert examines briefly the suggested agreements between 4QSam[a] and *L* against both the MT and the B-text in secondary readings (relying on Kyle McCarter's assessments of the readings). There are actually only two of these (1 Sam 5:10, 6:2; see p. 173), and Herbert dismisses them as not convincing enough to establish a relationship between the witnesses.[64]

1.3 The Purpose and Methodology of the Present Study

1.3.1 Outline

The discussion concerning the nature of the pre-Lucianic readings has been concentrated on the theory of the proto-Lucianic recension. No attempts to analyze thoroughly the pre-Lucianic textual data have been made since Brock,[65]

---

[61] Tov, "Lucian", 109. Tov's views have remained essentially the same; see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 148.

[62] E. Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam[a]", JSOT 14 (1979), 43–4.

[63] Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel", 126.

[64] E.D. Herbert, "4QSam[a] and its Relationship to the LXX: an Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis", in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 46.

[65] An exception is V. Spottorno's ("The Lucianic Text of Kings in the New Testament", in C.E. Cox [ed.], *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* [SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991]: 279–84) attempt to show that some quotations from Samuel-Kings in

although already in 1972 Tov called for studies on "the nature and quantity of pre-Lucianic elements in boc$_2$e$_2$ [= L]."[66] This is the topic of the present study: to throw light on the proto-Lucianic problem by assessing the text-historical relationships between L and the (possibly) pre-Lucianic witnesses for the text of 1 Samuel.

The witnesses are dealt with roughly in the same order as they have been brought into the discussion in the history of research. The testimony of Josephus will be dealt with briefly in chapter 2. Chapters 3–7 deal with the quotations from 1 Samuel by Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. The quotations of these five early church fathers form the most substantial part of the allegedly proto-Lucianic textual material. Therefore their text-historical affinities are subjected to a more extensive analysis, taking into account the quotations in their broader textual and historical context. Most emphasis, however, will be given to the agreements between these witnesses and L. The OL version, especially the MS La[115], will be dealt with in chapter 8. Chapter 9 deals with the Qumran Samuel text. Each of the eight analysis chapters ends with a brief concluding section and in chapter 10 the overall conclusions regarding the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Samuel are given.

1.3.2 Principles for the Text-critical Analysis

The first one to establish stabile criteria in the form of text-critical *canons* was Paul de Lagarde. According to the first of his canons, the existing MSS of the LXX are eclectic and therefore the reconstructing of the original requires an eclectic method as well. Knowledge of the style of the translators is the most important tool in this process. The second and third canons instruct the analyst to prefer the reading that represents a freer rendering compared to a more slavish one, and the one that least corresponds to the MT.[67]

The two extreme opposite positions concerning the relationship of B and L are that the reading of B is *always* superior to that of the Lucianic witnesses (Taylor is not far from saying that), and vice versa (as Barthélemy in *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*). Both of these extremities should be avoided. Therefore, even if Taylor's presupposed preference for B[68] was still understandable in the late 1980's, by now the scholarly world should have awoken to see that there are obvious Hebraizing corrections in B.[69]

---

the NT could preserve proto-Lucianic readings. The question is beyond the scope of the present study since there are no explicit quotations from 1 Samuel in the NT.

[66] Tov, "State of the Question", 9.

[67] The reference is to Driver's English translation: S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), xliv.

[68] Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6; see p. 18 above.

[69] See the examples in Aejmelaeus, "Kingdom at Stake."

When analyzing the variation units,[70] Taylor expresses more than once his reservation towards Rahlfs' rejection of the "*lectio difficilior*" of B in favor of the Lucianic reading that is closer to the MT. He considers these occasions (see vv. 24:1, 31:12 in Taylor's chapter 3) as deviances from Lagarde's rule to favor the variant less in accordance with the Hebrew.[71] What vindicates a reading, however, is not the "difficulty" from the scholar's point of view, nor the discordance with the MT; it is its ability to explain the existence of the other readings.[72] Thus the most important question is "what happened to the text?" This is emphasized especially by Anneli Aejmelaeus:

> [T]he primary criterion for text-critical decisions is the probability of what happened, the probability of the development of the alternative readings from the supposed original. For instance, if *a* and *b* are alternative readings in a certain case, the emergence of *b* out of *a*, if *a* is the original, and the emergence of *a* out of *b*, if *b* is the original, are often two completely different stories, and the actual decision to be made concerns which one of these stories more probably represents what really happened.[73]

The internal criteria of the textual analysis of the LXX are not limited to the question of accordance or discordance with any Hebrew tradition. A reading becomes all the more trustworthy if it is in accordance with the contemporary κοινή Greek usage and, most importantly, the translation technique[74] of the original translator. Translation technique has been a somewhat neglected area in textual criticism because of the problems relating to its use. To make a study of the translation technique exact would presuppose the reconstruction of both the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the exact wording of the original translation. The reconstruction of the *Vorlage*, however, is not possible without the reconstruction of the original translation, which itself is not possible without acquaintance with the translation technique and the *Vorlage*. None of these three factors (the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the original translation, and the translation technique) stands without the others and so it is not possible to study one of them in isolation, nor

---

[70] *Variation unit* is a term that Eldon Jay Epp has suggested. It is defined as "*that segment of text, constituting a normal and proper grammatical combination, where our manuscripts present at least two 'variants'*." (Emphasis his.) Although Epp is discussing NT textual criticism, the definition can be applied to LXX textual criticism as well. E.J. Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'", in J.K. Elliot (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 172.

[71] Taylor, Lucianic Manuscripts, 62, 63.

[72] See, e.g., A. Aejmelaeus, "Licence to Kill? Deut 13:10 and the Prerequisites of Textual Criticism", in *On the Trail*, 181–204; see also K.H. Jobes/M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000), 130. In NT scholarship, the Alands (see K. Aland/B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 275–6) have stressed the importance of this criterion.

[73] "Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1" in P. Torijano Morales/A. Piquer Otero (ed.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (SJSJ 157; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 2.

[74] On the definition of the term and the principles of translation technical studies see Raija Sollamo, "Translation Technique as a Method", in H. Ausloos et al. (ed.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 35–41.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

De Septuaginta Investigationes | Vol. 3

The Lucianic text of the Historical Books is demonstrably a late, recensional text, but it has numerous curious agreements with the earliest witnesses against B and the majority of the manuscripts. Tuukka Kauhanen aims at throwing light on this »proto-Lucianic problem« in 1 Samuel (1 Kingdoms) by taking a comprehensive view of all the relevant witnesses. Kauhanen concludes that there are significantly less of actual proto-Lucianic readings than has often been supposed and refutes the old theory of the »proto-Lucianic recension«.

The Author

Dr. theol. Tuukka Kauhanen is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki.