Methodological Remarks
on the Textual History of Reigns:
A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer

T. M. LAW AND TUUKKA KAUHANEN*

Since its initial publication in 1963, Dominique Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* has shaped the field as extensively as any other single work.[1] *Les Devanciers* has inspired numerous doctoral dissertations, monographs, and articles. Indeed, the secondary literature of our field has become appropriately saturated with references to Barthélemy. In some ways, all Septuagintalists are inheritors of Barthélemy's legacy, and the present authors count it a privilege to continue the line of research he began with his unusual percipience.

Even as Barthélemy's theory of the καίγε recension has been widely accepted, his view that in the καίγε sections of Reigns (2 Rgns 11:2–3 Rgns 2:11 and 3 Rgns 22–4 Rgns) the Old Greek (OG) translation is actually preserved in the few manuscripts of the Lucianic group (*L*) has been criticized.[2] In Barthélemy's view, the secondary features of *L* were due to assimilation to the Hexaplaric text, not to revision.[3] Indeed, Barthélemy preferred to speak of an 'Antiochene text' rather than a 'Lucianic recension' because, in his view, the text does not exhibit the characteristics of a recension and the tradition that attributes the work to the historical Lucian is not completely reliable.[4] Barthélemy was correct to question the assumption that Lucian was solely responsible for the Antiochene text, but subsequent studies have demonstrated that final recensional touches were carried out in the fourth

---

1 D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). For an evaluation of the impact of Barthélemy's work see R. A. Kraft, "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 1–28.

2 *L* = 19 82 93 108 127 (boc$_2$e$_2$ in Brooke-McLean[-Thackeray]).

3 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 126–27.

4 D. Barthélemy, "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2–1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des Devanciers d'Aquila / A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2–1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticisms of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the SBL Pseudepigrapha Seminar, 1972 proceedings*. (ed. R. A. Kraft; trans. K. McCarthy; SCS 2; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 16–89.

century on a text that had already been developing for several centuries.[5] Barthélemy's claim that the Antiochene text did not exhibit the features of a recension drew criticism as soon as scholars were able to digest the ground-breaking nature of the publication, and then to move to an assessment of its specific claims. Among others, Sebastian Brock raised profound concerns in his article "Lucian *redivivus*" only five years after Barthélemy's monograph.[6] Brock noted the Atticistic tendencies in *L* in contrast to the κοινή of the OG, for which "there could be no clearer sign of recensional activity at work." Moreover, Brock argued that the recensional character of *L* is evident when comparing *L* in a καίγε section to *L* in non-καίγε sections. If *L* is the OG in the καίγε sections, one should logically assume that the same readings found in the non-καίγε sections would also be the OG. But that is not the case. Instead, in the α-, ββ-, and γγ-non-καίγε sections of Reigns, one repeatedly finds in *L* the same sorts of secondary characteristics as in the βγ- or γδ-καίγε sections. Importantly, Brock did not completely reject Barthélemy's proposal, but noted with more nuance that the text of *L* in both καίγε and non-καίγε sections alike is "only partly" recensional. The problem was not in Barthélemy's identification of OG readings in *L*, but in the categorical claim that *L* is the OG.

There have been other criticisms directed toward Barthélemy's acceptance of *L* as the OG, and for the past several decades no scholar has challenged the nuances brought to the discussion by Brock and others. That was, however, until very recently when Siegfried Kreuzer undertook the challenge once again.[7] The present authors will argue that Kreuzer's latest two publications on the textual history of Reigns contain significant methodological flaws. Thus, the following is our attempt to interact with these two articles and to

---

5 See E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 19 (1972) 101–13, as well as the works in n. 7.

6 S. P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *SE*, 5 (1968) 176–81. See also B. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992–93); N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism," in *De Septua-ginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pieters-ma and C. Cox; Mississauga, 1984) 161–74; and, idem, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Sep-tuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. C. E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1987) 287–304.

7 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 *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 239–53; idem, "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns," *BIOSCS* 42 (2009) 34–51.

offer our concerns on the methodology employed in the study of the textual history of Reigns.

Determining the OG

Kreuzer judges the negative reactions over the past (nearly) 50 years to the claim that *L* = OG unconvincing, and decides there was little wrong with Père Barthélemy's hypothesis. Rather than rejecting Barthélemy's views of *L*, Kreuzer discounts the criticisms and argues that we should in fact presuppose that in the καίγε sections of Reigns, the Antiochene text "basically represents the OG."[8] With "new criteria" we are invited to turn the tables, as it were, so that instead of attributing secondary changes to *L*, we would determine these readings are the OG and any differences between *L* and Codex Vaticanus (B) are due to the activity of the καίγε reviser on the OG text. In his article in the previous volume of *BIOSCS* Kreuzer wrote:

> The observations just presented allow *a new view* of the history of the Greek text in the historical books: the Antiochene text is very close to the OG, not only in some parts and not only where there is a quotation by Josephus or a fragment from Qumran, but in general.

> The seeming inconsistencies in the assumed Lucianic recension can be better explained the other way round, as the activity of the *kaige* revisor. This theory provides a consistent explanation of the differences (emphasis ours).[9]

Is this approach in fact new, or is the suggestion simply to return to Barthélemy's position? Perhaps the novelty is that by assuming *L* is the OG and then comparing *L* to καίγε, one may explain all divergences between the two texts as the result of καίγε's modification of the OG.

Two criticisms of Kreuzer's basic premise are relevant for the study of the textual history not only of the historical books but of the entire LXX. First, statements that the "Antiochene text is very close to the OG … in general," and the more unambigous assertion that, other than containing some unintentional corruptions, "the Antiochene text represents the OG,"[10] are proble-

---

8 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 51.

9 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 43–44. Kreuzer is not entirely accurate when he writes: "all the analyses so far start with the premise … that all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian …. This can be seen not only in the older work done by Rahlfs, but also in more recent research like that by Brock and by Taylor[.]" ("Translation and Recensions," 40). Only Taylor, whom he mostly criticizes, is close to the position Kreuzer describes (cf. Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, 6–7, 127). Rahlfs and Brock would hardly agree that "all the differences observed are changes made by Lucian."

10 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 44. Kreuzer does admit some recensional activity by Lucian, but he does not consider it to have been extensive: "So that I am not

matic, as is also the rather imprecise claim —made by others than Kreuzer—
that in the non-καίγε sections, B is the OG. Both claims, that B is the OG in
the non-καίγε sections and *L* is the OG in the καίγε sections, are misleading
in many cases and even erroneous in others. It is certainly true that *L pre-
serves* numerous OG readings, but one may affirm the latter assertion without
concluding that *L* "represents the OG." Likewise, while B often represents the
form of the text free from hexaplaric or other recensional activity in the non-
καίγε sections, it is not simply the OG or even the OG "in general." Contrary
to these vague claims, in many cases OG readings are found in *L* in the non-
καίγε sections, in B in the καίγε sections, and in other manuscripts throughout
1–4 Reigns. One important example of the former is at 3 Rgns 8:24, where
J. Trebolle Barrera has persuasively argued that the OG is to be found in *L*,
not B.[11]

3 Rgns 8:24

MT   אשר שמרת לעבדך דוד אבי את אשר־דברת לו ותדבר בפיך ובידך מלאת
       כיום הזה

B   ἃ ἐφύλαξας τῷ δούλῳ σου Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου· καὶ γὰρ ἐλάλησας ἐν
       τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν χερσίν σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.

L   ἃ ἐφύλαξας Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου, ἃ ἐλάλησας ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν
       ταῖς χερσί σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.

In v. 24, B may represent a text without את אשר דברת לו, because καὶ γὰρ
ἐλάλησας follows right after Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου, but Trebolle Barrera argued
this was not the most ancient reading. Instead, the oldest Greek reading was
to be found in *L*, and the translation there attests a Hebrew text in a form that
included את אשר דברת (= ἃ ἐλάλησας), lacking only the following ותדבר לו
found in MT. Trebolle Barrera's discussion on the development of the
Hebrew text is lengthy and worthy of consideration, but it is likely that *L* is
the OG in this non-καίγε section, and not B.[12]

---

misunderstood, I should note that I do not exclude some recensional activity by Lucian or
in his time, but it must be demonstrated and not merely postulated. The same must be said
about an assumed protolucianic recension." The numerous hexaplaric approximations in *L*
are sufficient to disallow the claim that the Lucianic text has evidence of 'some' recen-
sional activity.

11 J. C. Trebolle Barrera, *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum: variantes textuales y
composición en los libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Madrid: CSIC, 1989) 125–27. See also idem,
Salomón y Jeroboan: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2–12; 14 (Salaman-
ca: Universidad Pontificia, 1980) 110–18, where he mentions the value of M V rell for the
OG. Other than this brief mention, readers must consult Brooke-McLean(-Thackeray) until
the publication of the Göttingen editions is complete.

12 One may also mention the recensional καί γε that are found in an apparently non-
καίγε section at 2 Rgns 2:6, 7. B. Taylor, "To the Reader of the Old Greek Text of Reigns,"
in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; New

Kreuzer's intention up till now has been to prove the antiquity of *L* in the καίγε sections. Therefore, it is important to note where *L* exhibits the characteristics of recension in these places where *L* is assumed to have retained the oldest reading. One example of recensional features present in both B and *L* in a καίγε section is found in 2 Rgns 19:10:

2 Rgns 19:10
MT   המלך הצילנו מכף איבינו
OG[13]   ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυὶδ ἐξήρηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν
B   ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυεὶδ ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν
             ἡμῶν
L   ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυεὶδ ἐξήρηται ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν

Both B and *L* exhibit two stages of recension. The OG had ἀπὸ πάντων, perhaps reading a Hebrew *Vorlage* with מכל instead of MT's מכף.[14] The recensional change toward MT introduced ἐκ χειρός into the text and is attested by B *O L* 509 134. Several witnesses (247–376 509 134) and *L* then omit ἀπό so that the text reads more smoothly ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν instead of B's more awkward ἐκ χειρὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν.[15] The most important point is that the OG probably lies outside of both B and *L*.[16]

Another case is found in 2 Rgns 19:13 where *L* is, again, recensional, but B, which has allegedly in these καίγε sections lost the most ancient reading, attests the OG.

2 Rgns 19:13
MT   אתם עצמי ובשׂרי
OG   ὑμεῖς ὀστᾶ μου καὶ σάρκες μου
B   ὑμεῖς ὀστᾶ μου καὶ σάρκες μου
L   ὑμεῖς ὀστοῦν μου καὶ σάρξ μου

The problem in v. 13 is clarified by comparison with v. 14. In the latter, we note the same Hebrew phrase עצמי ובשרי, but find almost unanimous

---

York: Oxford) 247, suggests the reading is the OG, because "the manuscript evidence makes clear that these two readings are found in the earliest and best witnesses, rather than being later glosses." However, καί γε is most certainly later, as the OG knows nothing of this form, and it has simply influenced all later witnesses.

13 The reconstruction of the OG in this and the following case is that of Hugo's and Law's preliminary work on the Göttingen edition of 2 Reigns.

14 Whether or not this was in the *Vorlage* or was the result of a misreading is impossible to say at the moment.

15 Note that the hexaplaric group A-247-376 is here split, because A stays with B.

16 The analyses of these two problems were developed in a discussion between P. Hugo and T. M. Law, editors of 2 Reigns for the Göttingen LXX.

testimony in the Greek tradition for the reading ὀστοῦν μου καὶ σάρξ μου. Second, in v. 13, the OL, a valuable witness to the OG, has *ossa mea*, against *L*'s singular. Finally, MT's singular nouns in v. 13 demonstrate that B is not corrected to conform to the Hebrew. These considerations lead to the conclusion that *L*'s reading in v. 13 was produced in order to assimilate the OG's plural nouns to the singular nouns in v. 14. Here in this καίγε section is a reading where B is not recensional but is instead the OG, and *L* is not the OG but is recensional.

These examples could be multiplied far beyond what is necessary. One of the most basic yet ignored axioms in the study of the text history of the LXX is that readings must be assessed on a case by case basis. Often, the temptation to jump to universal explanations is strong, but it should be resisted. The transmission history, especially of Reigns, is extraordinarily complicated and cannot be explained by simplistic accounts. No single manuscript or manuscript group contains the OG "in general." That is a fact.

The second criticism is that Kreuzer's paradigm is dependent upon a presupposition that one should never make at the outset of text historical study. In order to explain the divergences with καίγε in the way Kreuzer does, one must begin by assuming *L* is the OG. But again one must never presuppose the originality of a given manuscript or manuscript group before one has analyzed all of the readings and has considered the possibility that each manuscript may at any given time represent the oldest Greek reading. Kreuzer's conclusions can only be reached if one has, from the outset, agreed that *L* is the OG. If such a presupposition is not accepted, one may find alternative explanations for each of the given examples (see below). Kreuzer's "most important point is that we must give up the old presuppositions."[17] It is, however, a seriously doubtful claim that the views on *L* espoused by Brock and Fernández Marcos (et al.) simply emerged from the authors' presuppositions. Not all of Brock's conclusions need to be accepted, but no one who has read his study on the recensions of 1 Samuel could possibly claim he was resorting to presuppositions instead of drawing conclusions on the basis of his extensive study of the manuscript tradition. The present authors would argue that not only the old but indeed all presuppositions should be abandoned. The oldest readings should be decided only after each reading has been analyzed.

One of the "old prejudices" questioned by Kreuzer in his paper in the 13th Congress of the IOSCS (Ljubljana, 2007) is that the considerably greater number of definite articles in *L* compared with the rest of the witnesses was

---

17 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 40.

simply because the Lucianic recensor had added articles,[18] and that often it is the καίγε recension that *omits* original articles preserved by *L*, which "means, at least in regard to the definite article, that the Old Greek interpreted its *Vorlage* according to Hebrew Grammar and translated it into correct Greek."[19] To demonstrate the phenomenon concerning the article a case study of a couple of verses from 2 Rgns 15 is presented in both of his papers. If the Lucianic recension theory were correct, it would mean that Lucian both added and deleted articles, but such activity Kreuzer sees as a problem that necessarily means (intolerable?) inconsistency by the recensor.[20] However, what a recensor concerned with good Greek style is prone to do is not simply *to add articles* but *to make the use of articles correspond to the needs of good Greek style*. With this in mind, the examples from 2 Rgns 15 can easily be explained the opposite way to the one that suggests that Ant[21] has preserved the original text.

> 2 Rgns 15:2b
> MT   מאחד שבטי ישראל
> B   ἐκ μιᾶς φυλῶν Ισραηλ
> Ant   ἐκ μιᾶς τῶν φυλῶν τοῦ Ισραηλ

According to Kreuzer, the translation with articles here "is not only good Greek, but corresponds to the Hebrew grammar, because שבטי ישראל is a definite genitival construction." The καίγε reviser should have deleted the articles due to the lack of a visible counterpart for them in the Hebrew.[22] It is, however, equally possible that the OG translator did not provide the articles for the very same reason; everything we know at this point about the translation technique of the translator(s) of 1–4 Reigns makes this even more likely. The Antiochene recensor, on the other hand, had good reasons to add the articles since the "tribes"[23] and Israel are known entities.

> 2 Rgns 15:10
> MT   את־קול השפר
> B   τὴν φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης
> Ant   φωνὴν σάλπιγγος

---

18 Kreuzer subtly uses the contrast of new and old to present his approach as "new," and ostensibly preferable to the "old" paradigm.

19 Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek," 251.

20 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 38–39.

21 By "Ant" Kreuzer means the Antiochene text according to N. Fernández Marcos and J. Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vols.; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–96).

22 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 43.

23 Translations of the LXX are from NETS.

In this example, Kreuzer maintains that the OG translator did not provide the articles, but they were added in the καίγε text to correspond to the Hebrew את and ‑ה.[24] As in the previous instance, the argument can be turned around without sacrificing the consistency: the translator provided the articles to correspond to the Hebrew articles, and the Lucianic recensor deleted them since "the sound of the horn" is not a certain sound of a particular (known) horn. Thus, Absalom's spies mean: "when you hear a horn making a sound."

From our perspective, articles should not be given a weight such as they have been given in the theory under consideration, which offers as the principal evidence for the priority of *L* certain patterns of articulation. Different types of textual components have different levels of importance, and to endow particles with a disproportionately greater significance compared with the other evidence will distort the picture. While every particle must indeed be taken into consideration in the study of the textual history, they should not alone be cited as evidence for the priority of this or that text, and especially not without statistical data to support the conclusions. The study of articulation in the OG is neither a new nor unfruitful area of research, as demonstrated by D. De Crom's recent analysis of articulation in the OG Canticles, which is but one example.[25] However, De Crom has analyzed every article in his corpus; thus, he has statistical data to support his argument on the translation technique demonstrated by these patterns. If articulation is to be used to determine the oldest text, one should present all of the data to show how the articles were employed by the translator; random selections of articles cannot be used to argue for any given theory of the text. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, articulation patterns alone cannot prove which text is the OG. They may be part of the evidence, but they cannot alone reveal the OG. To our knowledge, no exhaustive analysis of articulation in 1–4 Reigns that would be prerequisite to using it as a proof of originality has been conducted. Until then, one may ask why we should assume that the articulation in *L* is a feature of the OG, not of the later reviser.

---

24 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 43.

25 D. De Crom, "On Articulation in LXX Canticles," in *Florilegium Lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL, 24; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 151–69. See also the thesis of which his article is part: idem, *The LXX Text of Canticles: A Descriptive Study in Hebrew-Greek Translation.* Vol. 1: *Introduction, Function-Oriented Research, Product-Oriented Research (Notes on LXX Cant 1–2).* Vol. 2: *Product-Oriented Research (Notes on LXX Cant 3–8), Process-Oriented Research, Conclusions* (Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009) 480–95. The relevance of De Crom's work extends far beyond the study of Canticles to the study of translation technique. Importantly, he disputes the use of the terminology of 'faithfulness' to describe the Septuagint translators' approach to rendering the source text.

Other issues also surface in the discussion of 4 Rgns 6:8–19. These examples contain several indisputable cases of καίγε revision in B, but there are also good reasons to doubt the originality of *L*.

4 Rgns 6:17

MT　　יהוה פקח־נא את־עיניו ויראה ויפקח יהוה את־עיני הנער

B　　Κύριε, διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου καὶ ἰδέτω. καὶ διήνοιξεν Κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

Ant　Κύριε, διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδέτω. καὶ διήνοιξεν Κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

There are three different patterns for the reference to the "eyes of the lad." In the MT the pattern is "his eyes"–"the eyes of the lad;" in B "the eyes of the lad"–"his eyes;" and in Ant "his eyes"–"his eyes." Kreuzer states that "τοῦ παιδαρίου in the *kaige* must have had a reference text different from the MT, a text that did exactly what has been assumed for Lucian, that is it identifies the person referenced only by a pronoun[.]"[26] The suggestion is that the OG translator rendered את עיניו faithfully with τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, and the καίγε reviser corrected it against a now lost Hebrew reading. But there is nothing to suggest that the case could not be the other way round: the reading of the *Vorlage* was את עיני הנער — as in the MT in the second instance — and B contains the original translation which the Antiochene text changed for one or another reason. This is not to say that *L* could *not* represent the OG, nor that καίγε does not at times evince a Hebrew *Vorlage* at variance with MT, but that this is one of the many examples for which an alternative explanation is equally plausible, and therefore a too hasty acceptance of *L* as the OG would be imprudent.

4 Rgns 6:18

MT　　ויתפלל אלישע אל־יהוה ... ויכם

B　　καὶ προσηύξατο πρὸς Κύριον ... καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτούς

Ant　καὶ προσηύξατο πρὸς τὸν θεόν ... καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς Κύριος

Kreuzer again suggests that Ant contains the original text:

The κύριος. . . may go back to the Hebrew *Vorlage* or to the translator. It makes clear that it is κύριος who slays the Syrians with blindness. This theological emphasis would fit with the intention of the Septuagint translators who do that many times. But the same motivation may have found its way into the Hebrew text already. The πρὸς τὸν θεόν . . . may have had a Hebrew *Vorlage* different

---

26 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 45.

from MT, but one could also imagine that the translator just preferred some variation.[27]

Again, this analysis is open to counter-argument. The plus of Κύριος seems to be just the kind of explication of a subject which is one of the main tendencies of the Lucianic recension.[28] As with the variation between πρὸς Κύριον and πρὸς τὸν θεόν, the only thing to suggest the originality of the latter is that the former could be a correction toward the Hebrew אל יהוה. However, it is equally possible that πρὸς Κύριον is the original reading translating אל יהוה and it was the Lucianic recensor who "just preferred some variation."

To sum up this section, the text-critical cases offered to propose that we should accept the Antiochene text as the OG are open to strong counter-arguments. More counter-arguments could also have been put forth, but we believe that we have made clear that one solution (*L*=OG or B= OG) does not explain every problem the textual critic faces.

The Use of Other Witnesses

The assessment of the OG discussed in the preceding section has been judged by the present authors inadequate, but one may also question whether the other witnesses to the textual history have been treated properly in recent research. The hypothesis we have criticized is at least partly founded on some of the results of previous studies that have been questioned by one of the present authors. Kreuzer pleads: "We have to take seriously the insight that the Lucianic/Antiochene text has many agreements with Josephus and with the OL translation and often is confirmed by the Qumran Samuel texts."[29] However, Kauhanen's study on the proto-Lucianic readings in 1 Reigns[30] suggests that, at least in 1 Reigns, the testimony of the witnesses mentioned is at best ambiguous. Since no thorough examination of the question exists for 2–4 Reigns, how can one make claims without the data to support the conclusions? Although Kauhanen's is the only study to date that exhaustively analyzes the proto-Lucianic problem in 1 Reigns, one must take seriously the possibility that these conclusions could affect the interpretation of the data in

---

27 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions" 48.

28 E.g., Brock, *Recensions*, 252.

29 Kreuzer, "Towards the Old Greek," 252. So also idem, "Translation and Recensions" 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."

30 T. Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki, 2011).

2–4 Reigns. In any case, the study of the question in 1 Reigns still under-mines the blanket description of *L* as the OG. The treatment of the following witnesses is, in the minds of the present authors, problematic and therefore unconvincing.

Josephus

While A. Mez and H. St. J. Thackeray were very confident about Josephus' dependence on the Lucianic text, Rahlfs already was more cautious.[31] Brock concludes that the evidence is ambiguous and gives no ground for Mez's and Thackeray's "sweeping claims": "Josephus merely confirms the impression gained elsewhere that *L* here and there has preserved old material lost to the rest of the surviving tradition."[32] That Josephus and *L* should coincide now and then is by no means surprising. Josephus frequently utilizes his own chosen vocabulary, and of all the LXX witnesses lexical variants are found most frequently in *L*. Still, Josephus may depend on a Lucianic text, but as this is a question that has not been sufficiently studied in 2–4 Reigns, one cannot yet say much about it.

The Old Latin

Concerning the OL, Brock already wrote:

> [I]t is generally agreed that from their very inception the Old Latin translations were under continuous influence of, and contamination from, Greek texts, ….

---

31 A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel, 1895) 80; H. St. J. Thackeray, "Note on the evidence of Josephus," in Brooke-McLean 2.1.ix; idem, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929) 83, 85–86; A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher: Septuaginta-Studien 3* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [1st ed., 1911]) 92: "Josephus hat in den Samuelisbüchern nicht einen mit *L* fast identischen Septuaginta-Text benutzt, beweist aber in einer immerhin recht erheblichen Anzahl von Fällen, dass Sonderlesarten des *L*-Textes nicht erst von Lucian stammen, sondern mindestens schon im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr. vorhanden gewesen sind." Concerning the Books of Kings, however, Rahlfs concludes that there Josephus attests only a modest number of *L*-readings: "Während in den Samuelisbüchern eine immerhin ganz stattliche Anzahl von Sonder-lesarten des *L*-Textes, namentlich Eigennamen, bei Josephus nachzuwiesen war … ist ihre Zahl in den Königsbüchern sehr bescheiden. Josephus folgt hier in erster Linie dem hebräischen Urtext und zieht die LXX erst in zweiter Linie heran." (ibid., 111). The research history of Josephus' Bible text is a broad field, often not well known among Septuagint scholars. The present writers have only recently become aware of the problems involved through Louis H. Feldman's bibliography *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984) 165–70.

32 Brock, *Recensions*, 216.

This situation makes it virtually impossible to use Lat as a witness to "Ur-Lucian", since, while it cannot be denied that the Old Latin fragments contain a large number of 'Lucianic' readings, these may be due to the work of later correctors using 'Lucianic' manuscripts.… [T]hese Old Latin fragments contain a considerable amount of hexaplaric material, which must have entered Lat in this way, and so *a priori* there is no reason to suppose that this may not have been the case with the "Lucianic" readings too.[33]

More positive opinions have been expressed lately,[34] and though the present authors do indeed agree that the OL is a valuable witness to the OG, it must be questioned whether the marginal readings (La[91–96]) always attest genuine pre-Lucianic readings.

The Old Latin

Concerning the OL, Brock already wrote:

[I]t is generally agreed that from their very inception the Old Latin translations were under continuous influence of, and contamination from, Greek texts, ….

This situation makes it virtually impossible to use Lat as a witness to "Ur-Lucian", since, while it cannot be denied that the Old Latin fragments contain a large number of 'Lucianic' readings, these may be due to the work of later correctors using 'Lucianic' manuscripts.… [T]hese Old Latin fragments contain a considerable amount of hexaplaric material, which must have entered Lat in this way, and so *a priori* there is no reason to suppose that this may not have been the case with the "Lucianic" readings too.[35]

More positive opinions have been expressed lately,[36] and though the present authors do indeed agree that the OL is a valuable witness to the OG, it must be questioned whether the marginal readings (La[91–96]) always attest genuine pre-Lucianic readings.

Qumran

The strongest link between the Qumran biblical texts and the Lucianic text has been supposed by Cross in the edition 4QSam[a–c] in the DJD series.[37] However, the recent articles by Richard Saley[38] show that the link is much

---

33 Brock, *Recensions*, 217.

34 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 233. Ulrich, "Old Latin Translation," 261, accepts the marginal readings only as "plausible evidence."

35 Brock, *Recensions*, 217.

36 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 233. Ulrich, "Old Latin Translation," 261, accepts the marginal readings only as "plausible evidence."

37 F. M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4: 12, 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

38 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.

weaker than suggested by Cross: "[T]here is definitely a layer in 4QSam[a] showing distinctive agreement with Greek proto-Lucianic readings, but it is a relatively thin layer!"[39]

Symmachus

Kreuzer also challenges the suggestion that Lucian used Symmachus:[40]

> Also the fact that there are matches between the Antiochene text and Symmachus does not necessarily mean that Lucian quoted Symmachus from the Hexapla (or wherever). Symmachus certainly did not work in a vacuum, but knew and used the Septuagint (just as Aquila knew and used *kaige*). If Symmachus used the Septuagint, and if the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, i.e., the original Septuagint, it is no surprise that there are common words, including words that were preserved in the Antiochene text only, because they had been replaced in the *kaige*-tradition.

Doubtless, it is a proper claim that agreements between *L* and Symmachus do not *necessarily* mean Symmachus was a source for Lucian in the final stage of *L.* To our knowledge, no one has claimed that Symmachus did not know the OG (Kreuzer: 'the Septuagint'), nor that many Symmachus readings could not be OG readings.[41] Symmachus produced his text as a translation, but he was also another link in the chain of revision that had already been in process several centuries before his time. Symmachus not only used the OG, but also Aquila, and probably Theodotion and καίγε as well. Nonetheless, it is Kreuzer's final statement that makes his entire comment on Symmachus suspect: "If Symmachus used the Septuagint, and if the Antiochene text basically represents the OG, i.e., the original Septuagint…." The conclusion, that Lucian did not use Symmachus as a source in his revision, is based entirely on the premise that the Antiochene text is "basically" the OG. Doubtless, many readings that are agreements between Symmachus and Lucian are to be explained as the preservation of the OG by both Symmachus and *L.* A significant number of other readings, however, are clearly not OG, and yet are uniquely shared by both Symmachus and Lucian

---

39 Saley, "Proto-Lucian," 45.

40 See N. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, with the collaboration of B. Doyle; Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 151–61; and T. M. Law, "Symmachus in Antioch? The Relationship between the Antiochian Text and Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms)," *Text* 25 (2010) forthcoming.

41 A. G. Salvesen specifically acknowledges Symmachus probably knew the OG in the Pentateuch rather than working solely on the basis of his other reviser predecessors. See Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991) 263.

against all other witnesses. How would one explain these, not only in the books of Reigns, especially in the non-καίγε sections, but also those identified by Fernández Marcos in Ezekiel?[42]

Conclusion

To conclude, we would like to mention the following methodological principles that relate to the study of the textual history of the historical books, and particularly to 1–4 Reigns.

 1. The claim that in the καίγε sections *L* is the OG "in general" is unsubstantiated by the evidence, and therefore should be avoided. As Brock had already argued, one easily notices the recensional character of *L* in the non-καίγε sections, and it is therefore unlikely that the very same readings are the OG in the καίγε sections. Kreuzer only briefly mentions that his theory would "most probably" hold for the non-καίγε sections since the only difference would be in how *L* relates to B, but he has neither proven this, nor yet investigated the possibility.[43]

 2. Since both of the present authors have been involved in the preparation of the Göttingen editions of 1–4 Reigns, at least a preliminary comment can be registered that the OG is at times found neither in B nor *L*, no matter what section is under consideration. Thus, while we object to the assertion that *L* is the OG in the καίγε sections, we also question the claim that B is the OG in the non-καίγε sections. Although the revisional processes directed toward alignment with the emerging proto-MT have not significantly altered the shape of B in the non-καίγε sections, OG readings still must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. There are occasional readings where the OG is found outside of these two witnesses. There is no doubt that B offers numerous OG readings in non-καίγε sections and *L* in καίγε, but generalizations and vague claims are unhelpful in the study of the textual history. Instead, a more judicious description of B's value in the non-καίγε sections and *L*'s value in the καίγε sections of 1–4 Reigns is necessary, such as the one given by P. Hugo in his study of the textual history of 3 Rgns 17–18. In an assiduous *status quaestionis*, Hugo recognizes the importance of *L* (and the OL) for recovering the most ancient readings when B has been subjected to καίγε. Nonetheless, he carefully acknowledges that "LXX^B et LXX^L ne reflètent

---

42 Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel," 151–61. See also idem, "The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (ed. A. G. Salvesen; TSAJ, 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 408–20; and J. W. Wevers and D. Fraenkel, eds., *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel* (MSU 26; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003) 115–16.

43 Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions," 50.

pourtant pas directement la traduction initiale du livre."[44] *L* is doubtless a very good witness, but it is not plainly the OG, and when assessing *L* in these καίγε sections, "il faut une vigilance particulière et un examen attentif de ses leçons spécifiques, pour s'assurer qu'il ne s'agit pas de variantes secondaires."[45] On Codex Vaticanus, A. Aejmelaeus has shown that in the non-καίγε sections B attests the same type of sporadic early Hebraizing correction as in the καίγε sections.[46]

3. Surprisingly absent from much recent work that has made use of the LXX of the historical books is the tenet that a scholar should not only argue his or her position, but also demonstrates how the counterargument would not be more plausible.[47] If the argument can be turned in the opposite direction, it has not satisfied this most basic criterion. Some questions on the textual history lack sufficient proof for a single answer, requiring the scholar to point out two or more likely solutions. Some of the examples we have given above could also be turned around against us; thus, we have tried to offer our counter-arguments with language that admits it is not always possible to explain things in stark black and white terms. If a single conclusion is put forward, however, the other possible explanations must be shown to be inadequate.

T. M. Law
Oriental Institute
University of Oxford
Pusey Lane
Oxford OX1 2LE
timothy.law@orinst.ox.ac.uk

Tuukka Kauhanen
Faculty of Theology
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 4 (Vuorikatu 6 A 13)
FI-00014 University of Helsinki
tuukka.kauhanen@helsinki.fi

---

44 P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO, 217; Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006) 53.

45 Hugo, *Les deux visages*, 47.

46 See the examples in A. Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek—Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–66.

47 See the two recent articles by A. Schenker that discuss this shortcoming in recent work on the historical books: A. Schenker, "Jeroboam's Rise and Fall in the Hebrew and Greek Bible," *JSJ* 39 (2008) 367–73; and idem, "Man bittet um das Gegenargument! Von der Eigenart textkritischer Argumentation," *ZAW* 122 (2010) 53–63.