

Natalio Fernández Marcos

Instituto de Filología. CSIC-Madrid.

“Aber zu ernten ohne gesäet zu haben, gilt mir nicht für theologisch. Das eigentliche Studium kann ich nur auf die Mittel richten, nicht auf die letzten Ziele; diese sind Früchte, die von selbst abfallen, wenn sie reif sind - wo aber nichts gewachsen ist, da hilft kein Shütteln”, Julius Wellhausen¹

The editors of the books of Samuel and Kings (= 1-4 Kings LXX) will have a real interest in knowing the earliest and most authentic text that can be found using, according to A. E. Housman ‘the application of thought to textual criticism’². That said, and given that we do not have a critical edition of the Greek text in the *maior* series of Göttingen, we have no other option but to continue our tasks of textual criticism with the Hebrew and Greek documents and the other ancient versions which we have at our disposal. Indeed, the editor of the Greek Pentateuch, John W. Wevers, was right when he said that before using the Septuagint for textual comparison with the Hebrew we should ask ourselves if we are really using the ancient LXX (the Old Greek), or, at the least, the eclectic text closest to the original, which can be reconstructed by philological means, and not that of a later stage of language or a concrete recension limited to a specific geographical or chronological framework different from that of the original.

This complex, yet fascinating journey through the history of the biblical text, leads us to the Antiochene in the Books of Kings edited, according to the criteria of the classical philology, by the team in Madrid³.

Already in 1871, in an appendix to his famous textual commentary on the Books of Samuel, Julius Wellhausen had expressed his surprise that the text of the Lucianic manuscripts 19, 82, 93, and 108 not only often confirmed his critical decisions but also

¹ In response to those who accuse him of being “ein untheologischer Kleinigkeitskrämer”, cf. J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1871, p. XIV.

² A. E. Housman, *The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism*, “Proceedings of the Classical Association” 18 (1922) 67-84.

³ N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, with the collaboration of M^a Victoria Spottorno and S. Peter Cowe, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega. I, 1-2 Samuel*, TECC 50, CSIC, Madrid 1989; *II, 1-2 Reyes*, TECC 53, CSIC, Madrid 1992; *III, 1-2 Crónicas*, TECC 60, CSIC, Madrid 1996.

backed up his own conjectures. Wellhausen insisted on the need for a more in depth study of these manuscripts and in which it would be desirable to edit a continuous text even if it were for one single biblical book⁴. P de Lagarde attempted to fulfil Wellhausen's wish by publishing the text of these manuscripts from Genesis to Esther. However, it was a continuous text with no critical *apparatus* and did not take into account the fact that these manuscripts are only Lucianic from Ruth 4,11⁵. Lagarde's failure and more especially Rahlfs' derogatory judgement on the Lucianic recension⁶, lead to the discrediting of this recension and the fact that it has hardly been used in either textual criticism or biblical commentaries. The effects of this negative opinion can be seen in the manual edition of the Septuagint edited by Rahlfs himself and which, for many years, was the standard reference text for the Greek. This edition takes no account of the readings of the Lucianic group of manuscripts. Indeed, Rahlfs begins the Books of Kings with the following note in reference to the text of these manuscripts (L): "huius editionis innumeras lectiones singulares (cf. Rahlfs Sept.-Stud. 3 [1911] praetereo"⁷.

However, the history of the biblical text was turned upside down with the discoveries of Qumran. As new documents were published, and with the appearance of D. Barthélemy's monograph, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10, Brill, Leiden 1963), the Lucianic text of Kings returned to the forefront of the scientific debate during the second half of the 20th century. I am fairly sure that it will continue to add to the already abundant literature once the texts of Samuel have been published in the series *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert*⁸. The base text or Vorlage of the Septuagint, supported in some books by the Hebrew fragments of Qumran, started to be seen in a different light, as a Hebrew text which, at times, was different from the transmitted

⁴ "Zum Zwecke einer solchen [Untersuchung] wäre es wünschenswerth - da man nach Holmes doch nur eine sehr ungenügende Vorstellung gewinnt-, dass man ihern vollen Text herausgäbe, wenn auch vielleicht nur für Ein biblisches Buch", cf. J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 223. In 1907, Thackeray was already putting forward some of the reforms of the Greek text of the Books of Kings I-IV that we have adopted in our edition of the Antiochene text: "it will probably not fall within the scope of the larger Cambridge Septuagint to depart from the arrangement of books in the Codex Vaticanus, but I venture to think that the Septuagint of the future the second of the four Kingdoms books will end with the death of David", cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings*, "JTS" 8 (1907) 162-278, p. 266.

⁵ P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonice Pars Prior Graece*, in Aedibus Dieterichianis Arnoldi Hoyer, Gottingae 1883.

⁶ "Denn der Hauptcharacterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips", cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuagint-Studien 3*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1911, p. 293.

⁷ A. Rahlfs, *Septuagint*, Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart 1935, p. 502.

Masoretic text and was, indeed, more ancient⁹. At another level, the monograph of Barthélemy, taking as its point of departure the Greek fragments of the Twelve Prophet of Nahal Hever, put forward a coherent theory of revision of the Old Greek, bringing it closer to the proto-Masoretic Hebrew text of the 1st century CE, the *kaige* revision¹⁰. In two sections of the Books of Kings (**bg** and **gd**), this revision had dealt with the greater part of the Greek manuscript tradition, including the Vatican codex. The only elements untouched by this Hebraising revision were the Lucianic manuscripts which are the subject of our edition. This new textual panorama brought about a whole series of publications related to the Lucianic text of Kings in its most primitive form, the so-called proto-Lucianic, and its relation to the *kaige* revision and the Old Greek. The consequence of these studies for the reconstruction of the genuine biblical text in the books of Samuel-Kings is obvious.

With the experience and perspective of several decades of editing and studying the Antiochene text of the historical books behind me, I would now like to put forward a personal view of the state of the question, including those main areas of consensus and those others which continue to tax our minds and naturally divide researchers.

The Antiochene text is first and foremost Septuagint, that is to say that the great number of coincidences with the Majority Greek text is such, that it is in the same current of tradition as the Old Greek. It shares with the rest of Septuagint the additions of 3 Kings 2,35 a-o and 46 a-l on the wisdom and prosperity of Solomon as well as 3 Kings 12,24 a-z; all of these passages are without their equivalent in the Masoretic Hebrew. It shares with the rest of LXX the distinctive organisation of the material in 3 Kings as well as the permutation of chapters 20 and 21. In other words, it is not a new translation of the Hebrew, or ‘an Old Greek’ as if there had been more than one translation. Nevertheless, it separated from the majority current of LXX at an early

⁸ *Qumran Cave 4. XII. 1-2 Samuel* by F. M. Cross, D. W. Parry, R. J. Saley and E. Ulrich, DJD XVII, Clarendon Press, Oxford 2005.

⁹ The intuitions of a number of critics of the 19th century on the quality of the Antiochene text were confirmed by certain manuscripts of Qumran. The Septuagint was the translation of a different Hebrew Vorlage. The textual pluralism did not originate in the translation (Kahle), but was already to be found in the source Hebrew text: “In brief, Kahle postulated a plurality of translations into Greek. Nowadays scholars are more and more convinced that there was a plurality of text traditions in Hebrew at the time of the translation into Greek. In other words, the emphasis has shifted from the plurality of translations to the plurality of texts in the Hebrew *Vorlage*”, cf. N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators. Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*, VTS 54, Brill, Leiden/New York/Köln 1994, p. 14.

¹⁰ In accordance with the dating of these fragments by P. J. Parsons in the *editio princeps*, the date of this revision should be brought forward to the end of the 1st century BCE, cf. *The Greek Minor Prophets*

stage, probably in the 1st century CE., and its transmission was relatively independent from the rest of the Greek tradition¹¹. On the one hand, this explains the considerable number of original readings it conserves and which were lost in the rest of the manuscript tradition; on the other, it explains the original nature of its text in comparison to the rest of that tradition. The proper names merit our special attention; their forms differ considerably from those transmitted by the LXX rell., including the Hexaplaric recension, and reproduce more faithfully the forms of the Masoretic text.

Although it is not a new translation, it does present intriguing links to the Hebrew text. This can be seen, not only in the last level of the recension which incorporates Hexaplaric material taken either from the three most recent translators or the fifth column of the Hexapla, but also in the traces of a pre-Hexaplaric approach to the Hebrew which could situate it in parallel with the Hebraisms detected in the *Vetus Latina*. However, I am inclined to think that it is not necessary to have a first hand knowledge of Hebrew to explain these links. It would suffice that those responsible for the corrections had access to Greek manuscripts which had undergone Hebraising revisions and to the new Jewish translations of the 2nd century CE¹². We should not forget that we have in our possession only a minimal part of the manuscript material which was in circulation in those centuries immediately previous to the Hexaplaric recension.

Both early authors and modern commentators emphasize the capacity of the Lucianic recension to put the materials in their right place and to reorganise the narrative¹³. A particular characteristic, which is of special note in the Antiochene text, is the prolongation of the second book of Kings to 3 Kings 2,11, the death of David, and the beginning of 3 Kings in 3 Kings 2,12 with the reign of Solomon. It is a more logical and understandable division, given that the first book of Kings also ends with the death of Saul. I would like to call your attention to this important intervention, since it would have been difficult to conceive if it had not been born out by the same sequence of material in the Hebrew scroll used as the basis of the translation. We have no documentary proof of the existence of ancient Hebrew scrolls or codices with the same

Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I), by E. Tov with the collaboration of R. A. Kraft and a contribution by P. J. Parsons, DJD VIII, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1990, p. 26.

¹¹ S. P. Brock, *A Doublet and its Ramifications*, "Biblica" 56 (1975) 550-553, p. 553.

¹² M. Kraus, *Hebraisms in the Old Latin Version of the Bible*, "Vetus Testamentum" 53 (2003) 487-513.

distribution of material. There are, however, other indications which support this hypothesis. The *kaige* revision, in section **bg**, ends exactly where 2 Kings ends in the Antiochene text, in 3 Kings 2,11¹⁴.

There is, then, no need to enter into sophisticated speculations as to the motives for this revision and why it only covers two concrete sections of the Books of Kings. I share Barthélemy's view that the *kaige* revision originally encompassed the whole of the Books of Kings, and that the fact that only two sections remain is due to an accident of transmission, the alternate copying of different types of scrolls by the scribe of the archetype of the Vatican codex. This resulted in a mixed text, alternating sections from the Old Greek type with sections from the *kaige* type¹⁵. Both the *kaige* revision and the Antiochene text belong to a period in which the biblical text was transmitted in scrolls and not in codices. The Antiochene text goes back to another archetype whose original scrolls from which the scribe copied, did not include texts corrected according to the *kaige* revision. The value of the Antiochene text in the Books of Kings, therefore, lies in the fact that it transmits a homogeneous text which has not undergone the Hebraising revision of *kaige*, and which, therefore, contains the most ancient segments of text that we have at our disposal, even if the text has been slightly revised. Let us not pretend that we are in possession of the Old Greek; this was lost for all the books. However, we do have the oldest text that we can reach through textual criticism and the documentation at our disposal. What I am saying, is that I am not of the opinion that in the non-*kaige* sections the substratum of the Antiochene text always represents the Old Greek¹⁶. It is probable that all the Greek texts of the Books of Kings which have come

¹³ For example, the Pseudo-Chrysostom, cf. J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta. XIV Isaïas*, 3. Auflage, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1983, p. 73; J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings*, ICC, T.& T. Clark, Edinburgh 1951, p. 434.

¹⁴ In accordance with this data, 3 Kings would end in the Vorlage of the Septuagint in chapter 21, the victory of Ahab (= chapt. 20 of the MT, given that the LXX transposes chapters 20 and 21) and 4 Kings would begin in chapt. 22 of 3 Kings. Thackeray is also inclined to place the end of the third book of Kings at the end of chapter 21 of the Septuagint, cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Septuagint and Jewish Worship", p.19.

¹⁵ D. Barthélemy. *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, OBO 21, Éditions universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Fribourg/Göttingen 1978, p. 275: "je ne crois pas qu'il y ait eu une première recension palestinienne partielle portant seulement sur les sections **bg** et **gd**. Je pense qu'elle a porté d'emblée sur les quatre livres des Règnes. J'admets aujourd'hui que c'est à cause d'une simple alternance dans les types des rouleaux copiés par le scribe que l'archétype du Vaticanus s'est trouvé porteur d'un texte mixte où s'entremêlaient des sections du type 'Septante' et sections du type '*kaige*'".

¹⁶ Contrary to the view of Tov who states, "In conclusion, it is suggested here that the substratum of boc_2e_2 contains either the OG translation or any single OG translation", cf. E. Tov., *Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Toward a New Solution of the Problem*, "RB" 79 (1972) 101-113, now in E. Tov, *The Greek and*

into our possession, are already revised. The Old Greek which was the archetype for both the Antiochene text and the *kaige* revision can only be reconstructed from those revised texts once the recensional characteristics of the two types of text have been identified¹⁷.

These are not the only indications that the Antiochene text has its roots in the Hebrew and that it dates back to a stage of the transmission when the umbilical cord of the Septuagint had still not been cut from the sacred language. A good number of the doublets in this recension go back to readings or alternative translations of the same Hebrew term. There is also a group of early corrections which Rahlfs qualifies as learned interventions (“Gelehrtenkorrekturen”) and whose theological or Midrashic characteristics reveal a Jewish milieu of transmission or at least influenced by Jewish exegesis¹⁸. Given the lack of external factors which could explain the isolation and peculiar transmission of the Antiochene text, and the need to reconcile the two most representative characteristics of the recension, the stylistic corrections and the approaches to the Hebrew, the following hypothesis was posited. I suggested, a few years ago, that the first revision of the text was carried out by the Jews of Antioch in the 1st century CE. Antioch was a city with a large Jewish community which probably resided there since its founding in 300 BCE and was second only in importance to Alexandria¹⁹. It is true that many sources, Flavius Josephus, the Acts of the Apostles, the Letter to the Galatians, the Didache and the Gospel According to Matthew, all give a

Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint, VTS 72, Brill, Leiden/Boston/Köln 1999, 477-488, p. 484.

¹⁷ “Sie [die ursprünglich Septuaginta-Übersetzung] hat die Vorlage sowohl für die lukianische wie für die Kaige-Rezension gebildet und kann aufgrund der beiden wiederhergestellt werden, wenn die Rezensionszüge der beiden Rezensionen erkannt werden. Praktisch würde ich hier den Hinweis geben neben Rahlfs die spanische Edition des antiochenischen (d.h. lukianischen) Textes zu stellen. Wenn eine Textstelle zugleich in den beiden verschiedenen Rezensionen geändert worden ist, dann bleibt nur die Rekonstruktion des ursprünglichen Textes übrig”, cf. A. Aejmelaeus, *Die Übersetzung einer Übersetzung. Vom Hebräischen über das Griechische in eine moderne Sprache*, in S. Kreuzer - J. P. Lesch (eds), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel. Band 2*, BWANT 161, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 2004, 133-150, pp. 136-137.

¹⁸ N. Fernández Marcos, *On the Present State of Septuagint Research in Spain*, in N. Fernández Marcos (ed), *La Septuagint en la investigación contemporánea*, TECC 34, CSIC, Madrid 1985, 271-285, pp. 281-282.

¹⁹ N. Fernández Marcos, *El Protoluciánico, ¿revisión griega de los judíos de Antioquia?*, “Biblica” 64 (1983) 423-427. Flavius Josephus says of the Jewish community in Antioch: “The Jewish race, densely interspersed among the native populations of every portion of the world, is particularly numerous in Syria, where intermingling is due to the proximity of the two countries. But it was at Antioch that they specially congregated, partly owing to the greatness of that city, but mainly because the successors of King Antiochus had enabled them to live in security... Moreover, they were constantly attracting to their religious ceremonies multitudes of Greeks, and these they had in some measure incorporated with themselves”, *The Jewish War* (translated by H. St. J. Thackeray in Loeb Classical Library) VII, 43-45.

special place to the conflicts between the Greeks organised in *collegia* and the Jews with their own rights which exempted them from practising the official cult. These conflicts were followed, some time later, by Christians coming from Judaism and Christians from the Gentiles. They tell us nothing of the texts, which are pushed into the background, while the theological debates and the importance of the conflicts between the communities occupy first place. It is, however, plausible that a city with a high level of Hellenisation and organised into multifarious associations, together with a Jewish population which could have reached 10%, with thirty synagogues organised as places for worship, meetings, social work and education, could well constitute the ideal milieu or *Sitz im Leben* for the transmission and revision of the biblical text, adapting it for public reading, serving to the needs of the community or more simply to the literary tastes of the times²⁰.

More than half a century ago, and before the time of D. Barthélemy, H. Dörrie had questioned, in no uncertain manner, the received ideas on the Lucianic recension and its link to the historical figure of Lucian, the founder of the school of Antioch. A number of his questions are still valid: how did this type of text come into being, does the recension make up a single whole, does it cover the whole of the Bible?²¹ We can, of course, add other questions as to the diverse components or levels of this type of text; the problems of the proto-Lucianic in the Books of Kings and its relation with the Old Greek and the Hebrew text of Qumran.

Meanwhile, the critical editions of the Septuagint have improved considerably and the same can be said for the studies on the texts of certain books as well as the critical editions of certain Fathers. The result has been that a number of points have been clarified and the excessive pessimism of Dörrie with respect to this recension, at least as far as the Books of Kings are concerned, would seem to be unfounded. It is true that it has not been possible to identify this recension in the Pentateuch, that in the Book of Psalms, it is possible that it has been diluted into the Byzantine text²², just as in the New Testament, and that the Alpha-text of Esther has no relation to the Lucianic

²⁰ M. Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch. A social-scientific approach to the separation between Judaism and Christianity*, Routledge, London/New York 2003, pp. 40-42 and 231-235, and M. Slee, *The Church in Antioch in the First Century CE. Communion and Conflict*, JSOTSS 244, Sheffield Academic Press, London 2003.

²¹ H. Dörrie, *Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta im Jahrhundert Konstantins*, "ZNW" 39 (1940) 57-110, pp. 89-103.

²² J. W. Wevers, *Apologia pro Vita Mea: Reflections on a Career in Septuagint Studies*, "BIOSCS" 32 (1999) 65-96, p. 71.

recension²³. But the critical editions of Prophets and Writings which appeared in the Göttingen series, confirmed the existence of this Antiochene textual type, albeit with lesser defined characteristics than in the historical books. It is probable that the revision was not the work of one person, not uniform, and although there are a set of common features, the level of intervention varies from book to book.

There has been a multiplicity of studies on the Antiochene text in the Books of Kings over the last few years. These have led us to the conclusion that, while in the rest of the books of LXX, the extension and the characteristics of the Lucianic recension have been qualified in different ways, even to the extent of questioning their existence in some of the books, in the Books of Kings, however, the Antiochene text emerges with even stronger features²⁴. But it would be ingenuous of us to believe that all the doubts have been dissipated. On the contrary, the fragmentary nature of the data in our possession together with the absence of the indispensable links to allow us to reconstruct at least one approximate *stemma* of the history of the text, has meant that even those monographic, in-depth studies, end with a confession of ignorance: “This [that is, the Lucianic text] remains something of an enigma”²⁵.

While admitting these difficulties, the lack of uniformity in the Antiochene text of the different books and the lack of recensional principles followed in a consequent manner, it is possible, however, to observe in the Books of Kings, a series of textual characteristics which are sufficiently developed and coherent with those observed in the Lucianic recension in the books of the Prophets and Writings. These linguistic and literary traits which appear in the Antiochene text cannot be the mere product of historical evolution, they are not, as Barthélemy would have it, “la Septante ancienne, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue”²⁶. The different changes which were introduced can only be explained as being the result of an editorial intervention whose purpose was to eliminate some, but not all, of the most obvious Hellenistic Greek forms and substitute them for the Attic forms. Of special interest is the high number of lexical variants, as pointed out in the Greek-Hebrew Index to be published soon by our team; these merit careful study in the light of the Atticistic lexica, in order to ascertain the

²³ K. De Troyer, *Der lukianische Text. Mit einer Diskussion des A-Textes des Estherbuches*, in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta*, 229-246, pp. 237-238.

²⁴ N. Fernández Marcos, *The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism*, in A. Pietersma and C. Cox eds., *De Septuaginta. Studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*, Benben Publications, Mississauga, ON 1984, 161-174, p. 168.

²⁵ D. G. Deboys, *The Greek Text of 2 Kings*. Doctoral Diss., Oxford 1981, p. 183.

possible reasons, at least in some cases, for the change. For if this text were the result of accidents in its transmission and the adaptation to the stylistic tastes of the times, it would mean, given the high level of interventions in the sacred text, that the copyists were acting, to a large extent, as authors.

This text regularly corrects the masculine of **α{lw"** changing into the feminine; the common noun **ε[leo"**, neuter of the third declension in later Greek, is changed to the masculine of the second in oblique cases. The first aorists are generally corrected to those of second aorists, while the passive aorist of **givgnomai** is changed into middle aorist. There is a tendency to eliminate the Semitisms of translation: the **ειj**, with which the oaths in the translation of the Septuagint would start, is substituted for **oujk**; the Hebrew expression **ejrwta`n ειj" ειjrhvnhn** sometimes is substituted for the more classical **ajspavsasqai... ejn ειjrhvnh/**, and many Hebraisms are avoided. It is common to write the verb in the singular with a neuter plural subject and the article is frequently included although it is absent in the Hebrew. More use is made of participles to avoid the paratatic constructions common to the Hebrew language, and there is greater variety in the use of particles.

It is not only the stylistic manipulations which affect the form of the Antiochene text. As S. Brock²⁷ has pointed out, there is another series of changes which is best explained by more practical considerations with respect to those who are to receive the message, in other words, the text is adapted for reading in public. Among this group, are the insertion of proper names instead of the pronoun or because they are needed to clarify meaning when this is not clear from the context. Transliterations tend to be discarded and replaced by translations.

We have insisted on the fact that the Antiochene text is above all Septuagint, that it shares, together with the rest of the Greek tradition, the major part of the differences compared to the Masoretic text, in particular in 3 Kings 12-14. Even in those sections where the differences between the Greek and the Hebrew texts are not so obvious, the basic coincidences between the Antiochene and the rest of the Septuagint are confirmed²⁸. In general, there are a number of literary and editorial features which are

²⁶ D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, VTS 10, Brill, Leiden 1963, p. 127.

²⁷ S. P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*, Silvio Zamorani, Torino 1996, pp. 252-253.

²⁸ "As far as 1 Kms is concerned, the matter in common between L and LXX tells is so great that it would have required a philonic miracle (and then not a very competent one, in view of the actual divergencies)

worth our attention, apart from the division between 2 and 3 Kings in 3 Kings 2,12: the omission of a verse concerning the building of Jericho, 3 Kings 16,34, probably to avoid any suspicion that the forefathers of Israel had founded the city with the ritual sacrifice of children; the omission of the history of Jehoshaphat in 3 Kings 22,41-51 because it had already been told in 3 Kings 16,28 a-h; the insertion of a negative judgement on king Asa (**ejpoivhsen jAsa; to; ponerovn**) in 3 Kings 15,23 and its connection to the correction in 3 Kings 15,14, where the simple insertion of a **oujk** completely changes the judgement on the aforementioned king (“and his heart was *not* clean”). In 4 Kings the redistribution of the material is even more significant in the Antiochene text, especially in chapters 9 to 17. It should be noted that in these chapters, the *Papyrus Vindobonensis* of the *Vetus Latina* also contains a series of changes which are no doubt related to an earlier stage of the transmission in the Greek model. It suffices to mention the addition in 4 Kings 10,35-43 in the Antiochene text and the *Vetus Latina*, as well as the total reorganisation of chapter 13, changes which are given different interpretations by Rahlfs and Treballe²⁹.

The role of the editorial activity was, in part, to produce a more harmonious narration, rounding off the rough edges so that it flowed more smoothly. For this it used the following techniques: a) the completion of what was only implicit in one of the two moments of the narration according to the scheme of announcement and fulfilment, b) the insertion of short phrases to clarify any uncertain situations and soften the passage of any breaks in meaning, c) the reworking of the style of certain passages including multiple changes in the hyperbaton of the sentence, d) the addition of corrections of a Midrashic or simply learned kind, and e) the combination of alternative readings from different sources, incorporating them into the sentence with slight modifications to ensure they fit into the context.

Situating these types of interventions chronologically is no easy task and continues to provide fodder for scientific debate. Pisano maintains that one of these tendencies, that of completing what was left unsaid or half unsaid in the original, had already started with the very translation of the Old Greek of Samuel or even in its

to have brought about such a close identity of two different translations”, S. P. Brock, *The Recensions*, p. 31.

²⁹ N. Fernández Marcos, *Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings*, in C. Cox ed., *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, GE 1987, 287-304.

Hebrew Vorlage, if we compare it with the character of the Masoretic text³⁰. If this were the case, certain of these features would date back to the Old Greek or its base Hebrew text. But although clarification and the search for meaning is at the base of every process of translation, the level reached in the Antiochene text is far superior to anything that can be found in the tradition of the Septuagint, and this mere fact demands an explanation. The Antiochene text as we know it today, is to a large extent (though not wholly) the result of recensional and editorial activity. It was not comparable in size to the task undertaken by Origen in the school of Cesarea, but it was linked to the cultivated circles and the schools of scribes responsible for the transmission of the Antiochene text. Nevertheless, I am not sure that all the previously mentioned recensional characteristics come from the same source. I am rather inclined to admit that there are older recensional elements - which already include stylistic improvements and a few non-Hexaplaric approximations to the Hebrew - and, of course, a collection of ancient, in all probability original readings. This is the reason for the importance of this text for Hebrew textual criticism, since in the *kaige* sections may, in many cases, represent the oldest text we can approach with the methods that we use in textual criticism.

Another of the enigmas of the Antiochene text is its relation to the Hebrew text. I have always defended the point of view that its roots are in the Hebrew. There are several features which point in this direction. The elaboration of the Greek-Hebrew index brought to light the high degree of formal correspondence with the Masoretic text in the majority of the passages. A good number of variants with respect to the Majority text of the LXX can be explained as different readings of the same consonantal Hebrew text; others are due to an interchange of similar consonants in the square script, groups of letters which are confused or letters with similar sounds although the graphics are different. A large number of the doublets, so characteristic of the Antiochene text, can be traced back to alternative readings of the same Hebrew text. In short, a good number of the variants in the Antiochene text can only be explained at the level of the transmission of the Hebrew text, or in its first contact with the translation, and not in the process of an internal transmission to the Greek. It is precisely because the text is faithful to the Hebrew text in the majority of cases, that we can deduce that when the

³⁰ S. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*, OBO 57, Éditions universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Fribourg/Göttingen 1984, pp. 67-69 and 238-242.

text does not correspond to the Masoretic Hebrew –terms signaled with *aliter* in our Index- it is most likely that it follows a different Vorlage, which also has reorganised, in a different way, the material of 3 Kings and also 4 Kings. The confirmation of this fact came from the fragments of Samuel in Qumran, which show that many of its readings support the variants of the Antiochene text³¹.

Much has been written about the relation between the Antiochene text and the fragments of Qumran, and the official edition of these texts in the series *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert*, did little to change, in any substantial way, the textual image that had already been drawn up. The early analyses of these fragments carried out by Ulrich and Tov were based on a quantitative study of the coincidences and discrepancies of Qumran with the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. It is the method which is followed in the official edition and which also stresses a qualitative analysis of the readings in order to identify those which are superior or which are considered to be genuine. The connection between 4QSam^a and the Hebrew Vorlage of the Old Greek would seem to have been proved. Indeed, the number of coincidences between 4QSam^a and LXX rell. is three times greater in the non-*kaige* sections than in the *kaige* sections, while, on the contrary, the number of coincidences with the Antiochene text is seven times greater in the *kaige* sections³².

The typology of the text of 4QSam^b has been studied less, but in a recent article, Cross and Parry come to the conclusion that the fragment they had worked on is closer to the Vorlage of the Old Greek, as represented in the *codex Vaticanus*, the Antiochene, or indeed both together, than to the Masoretic text³³.

As for 4QSam^c, Ulrich comes to the conclusion that the Antiochene text, when distinct from that of LXX rell., never coincides with the Masoretic text against 4QSam^c, while, on the other hand, it coincides with this fragment of Qumran against the Masoretic text on nine occasions³⁴. The most striking case is 2 Samuel 14,30b (kai ;

³¹ N. Fernández Marcos, *Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek*, “Sefarad” 64 (2004) 341-362.

³² E. C. Ulrich, *The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^a*, “JSOT” 14 (1979) 37-53, pp. 43-44, and *Qumran Cave 4. XII, 1-2 Samuel*, p. 25: “Above all the study of the full manuscript has reinforced our early conclusion that 4QSam^a stands in the same general tradition as the Hebrew text upon which the Old Greek translation was based”.

³³ F. M. Cross and D. W. Parry, *A Preliminary Edition of a Fragment of 4QSam^b (4Q52)*, “BASOR” 306 (1997) 63-74. This affirmation is qualified in *Qumran Cave 4. XII, 1-2 Samuel*, p. 224. “Nevertheless, the most extraordinary characteristic of the text of 4QSam^b is the high proportion of original readings which it preserves, whether it be in agreement with the Old Greek, or in agreement with M, or against both in its several unique readings”.

³⁴ E. C. Ulrich, *4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hayyahad (1QS)*, “BASOR” 235 (1979) 1-25, and *Qumran Cave 4. XII*, p. 254: “The Old Greek translation

paragivnontai oi} dou`loi jIwa;b pro;" aujto;n dierrhcovte" ta; iJmavtia aujtw`n kai; levgousin jEnepuvrisan oi} dou`loi jAbessalw;m th;n merivda ejn puriv), which is backed up in the Antiochene text and in LXX rell., and confirmed in 4QSam^c, but is absent from the Masoretic text, due to a haplography by *homoioteleuton* of the last words in both sentences (*'et hahelqat ba'es* 1° and 2°). The important thing to take into consideration, is that these coincidences are not significant enough to be considered as different text types or different editions of the book of Samuel³⁵.

When compared with Samuel (1-2 Kings), the material preserved from Qumran for 3-4 Kings is very scant. One fragment, 5Q2 contains remains of 3 Kings 1,16-17.27-37. From the point of view of text types this is of little importance, given that LXX and the Masoretic text do not differ in these passages. However, the text dated around the year 100 BCE, is of interest since it situates the separation between the books 2 and 3 of Kings in the same position as the Masoretic text, and not in 3 Kings 2.12 as it was in the Antiochene text and Josephus. The fragments of 6Q4 contain some passages of 3 and 4 Kings. There are three clear approximations between the readings of Qumran (two have been restored with the exception of one or two words) and the Antiochene text (4 Kings 7.8; 7,15 and 8,2), but these in no way justify Shenkel's view, that these fragments, or a similar text, could constitute the Vorlage of the proto-Lucianic recension³⁶. The few fragments edited by Treballe should be included. In his opinion, these fragments are situated within the proto-Rabbinic text tradition, that is, that they agree with the Masoretic text of Kings and Chronicles against the Septuagint in all its most important variants³⁷.

Faced with these quantitative comparisons based on the agreements and disagreements in the different testimonies, recent studies have refined the analysis by having recourse to the traditional criteria of textual criticism; and this, because what really brings the text traditions together, are the conjunctive errors or shared secondary

not infrequently shines through only the Lucianic manuscripts. The G^L text, when distinct from G, never agrees with M against 4QSam^c but agrees with 4QSam^c against M nine times, in original readings, expansions and variants".

³⁵ *Qumran Cave 4. XII, 1-2 Samuel*, p. 253: "With respect to the textual affiliation, comparison of 4Qsam^c, M, and the Greek texts does not yield any indication in these chapters of variant editions of Samuel; patterns of affiliation are not strong and consistent enough to warrant speaking of text types".

³⁶ J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, HSM 1, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1968, p. 123.

readings. Herbert applied this criterion to the fragments of Qumran in order to establish their relationship to LXX and the Antiochene text, and came to the conclusion that the lack of shared conjunctive errors prevented a definition of the textual affiliation of these fragments³⁸. As for Pisano, he insists on the coincidences of 4Qsam^a with the most developed text of LXX, that these indicate that the readings were already present in the Hebrew when the books were translated, and that the Qumran contains another series of expansions which are not to be found either in the LXX nor in the Masoretic text. But the fundamental problem is not with whom the fragments of the Qumran coincide, but which is the original and most genuine reading. Pisano goes for the Masoretic text, which is the most consistent testimony of the most primitive text form and with less literary activity, compared to the pluses and minuses of the LXX or Qumran³⁹.

In contrast to this defence which Pisano makes of the Masoretic text in 1-2 Samuel, based on arguments of text criticism and even the detection of a false *homoioteleuton* as a technique to introduce the insertions in LXX, a recent monograph by Schenker inverts the terms for the Books of Kings and proposes that the Vorlage of the Septuagint is earlier and more genuine in these books, while the Masoretic text is the one which displays more literary activity⁴⁰. His study is based on the principles of text criticism, but the emphasis is placed on variants of ideological character. The changes are not the work of the literary zeal of creative copyists but due to the intervention of some official authority over the texts. This would be that of the priests of the Temple of Jerusalem around 140 BCE, given the anti-Samaritan character of the editing. Even the criterion of the *lectio difficilior* is frequently applied, not to the specific readings, but to the coherence or difficulty of the narrative, that is, to the wider areas of literary criticism.

³⁷ “Qumran Cave 4. IX, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Edited by E. Ulrich, F. M. Cross *et alii*, DJD XIV, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1995, pp. 171-183.

³⁸ “However, insufficient evidence was found to affirm any link between L and 4QSam^a, except for L’s dependence upon LXX, which was in turn dependent upon 4QSam^a”, cf. H. D. Herbert, *4QSam^a and its Relationship to the LXX: an Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis*, in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995*, B. A. Taylor ed, SCS 45, Atlanta, GA 1997, 37-55. p. 49.

³⁹ S. Pisano, *Additions*. p. 117-118 and 284. Even “The large 4Q plus at 1 Sam 10:27-11:1, shared in its entirety by no other known text, appears again to be a sign of later expansion”, p. 117. D. Barthélemy had already proposed a similar opinion, *La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel*, in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, edited by E. Tov, Academon, Jerusalem 1980, pp. 43-44.

⁴⁰ A. Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, OBO 199, Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Fribourg/Göttingen 2004, in particular pp. 181-184.

Here, we are obviously faced with the most arduous problem of text restoration, that of trying to guess who corrected whom, which text is the secondary one, the one which brings facilitation and harmonization in relation to the other⁴¹. The arguments are difficult to evaluate since we are comparing the Masoretic text with a Greek text which has not been critically restored and which, moreover, is characterised by such marked displacements that they take us back to a distinct Hebrew Vorlage, and, what is more, they are all exposed to possible interference from parallel passages of Chronicles in its Hebrew and Greek versions. Before entering into ideological explanations of the origin of the variants, I am in favour of exhausting all the possible textual explanations⁴². It is not necessary to go looking for historical or ideological reasons for what can be textual accidents in a complicated transmission. In the genealogy of the diverse text forms, it must be taken into account that a great many of the doublets in the Antiochian text and in the *Vetus Latina* come from different translations of a same Hebrew Vorlage and ultimately do not represent distinct textual forms in the Hebrew.

I feel, that following the drawing up of the Greek-Hebrew index of the Antiochene text, the textual position of these books has become far more complicated. Also that the model proposed by Schenker, according to which the LXX (at times the *Vetus Latina*), represents the earliest text, and the Masoretic text the most recent, corrected along the lines of the Deuteronomistic ideology, is not always applicable to those same books. A study of the tables of correspondence between the Antiochene text and the Masoretic text does not help us reach any definitive conclusion as to the reasons for the alterations in the order of the text, or for any other changes even on the ideological level. We would like to see a logic and a lineal process in the origins of these changes which, no doubt, date back to a Hebrew Vorlage different to the Masoretic text, and in which some of the sections are organised in a different way. But this is probably no easy process; we need those indispensable intermediary links, which we do not have, to pour light on to the *stemma*. For the time being, I can see no other way out than to respect the characteristics of each text since it is becoming more and more difficult to correct one from the other or to fix the priority of one against the other.

⁴¹ A different opinion to that expressed by Schenker can be seen in the recent monograph by P. S. F. Van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*, VTS 104, Brill, Leiden/Boston 2005, p. 305: "Therefore the results of our enquiry lead us to side with those who regard the LXX-version of the Solomon Narrative basically as the product of a Greek revision of the Hebrew text reflected by MT".

⁴² A. Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte*, pp. 66-67.

There are other possible models as L. Mazar has shown with Joshua. This specialist maintains that the Masoretic text and the Septuagint cannot be explained genetically as one coming from the other, but that both texts have a common source from which they separated and then developed along their individual lines⁴³.

It must also be added, that however literal the LXX may be as translation, it is also *interpretation*; that to whatever extent the documents of Qumran have confirmed the faithful nature of the Septuagint as a testimony of the Hebrew Vorlages, either partially or totally lost, we can never exclude the changes that came about in the translation. In other words, the Septuagint does not transmit the biblical text as just another copyist, but rather as an *interpretes*, and in this context there is a greater margin for the inclusion of ideological variants, even though they may have been introduced unconsciously. It is quite possible, in the original, to copy passages which have been corrupted or which are totally incomprehensible. But, in translation, it is not plausible to present an incomprehensible text. Maybe in many ways, but above all in the choice of words, has the translation taken up a position when confronted with the original text⁴⁴.

Please allow me to end with the words of another textual critic, the Italian scholar G. Garbini: "I apply to the biblical text, the criteria of classical philology for the reconstruction of the text, utilizing systematically the existing documents, that is the ancient versions. But the biblical text, compared with a Greek or Latin one, requires a larger use of *divination*, with all the risks that implies for establishing the original text, which was often deliberately 'corrupted' by Rabbinic revision for ideological reasons. But during the many years of philological work, I also discovered the importance of the Masoretic Text, which is twofold. At first sight, it offers a 'corrupted' and sometimes incomprehensible text; but at the same time, when we compare it with the Greek version (which we read in a form that is very 'contaminated' by the Hebrew text), the Masoretic text somehow *suggests* the original reading"⁴⁵.

⁴³ L. Mazar, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua*, "BIOSCS" 27 (1994) 29-38, p.38.

⁴⁴ A. Aejmelaeus, *Die Übersetzung einer Übersetzung*, p.139.

⁴⁵ G. Garbini, *Myth and History in the Bible*, Translated by Chiara Peri, JSOTS 262, Academic Press, Sheffield 2003, pp. VII-VIII. English translation of G. Garbini, *Mito e storia nella Bibbia*, Paideia Editrice, Brescia 2003.