

Tuukka Kauhanen

## The Best Greek Witnesses for 2 Samuel

### Introduction

In 2015 I was assigned to edit the 2 Book of Samuel (2 Kingdoms) for the Göttingen Septuagint.<sup>1</sup> The aim of the edition is to present an eclectic text that presents the closest possible approximation to what the translator of this book wrote. The text is accompanied with a full critical apparatus that reports all the meaningful variation in the existing Greek manuscripts – ca. 60 in number – and noteworthy readings from secondary versions and other indirect witnesses, such as quotations from 2 Samuel by early Jewish and Christian authors. A second apparatus will report the existing Hexaplaric remains. The edition is scheduled to come out in 2022.

The edition is being produced with a digital tool that stores the textual data in a database from which the actual text and apparatuses are printed out. The database format allows for complex queries to be made in the apparatus. Such queries include patterns of agreement and disagreement between manuscripts in readings with or against the copy text. The data presented in this paper is taken from the database, with only occasional modifications. All text and apparatus presented here are provisional; the critical decisions and details in the apparatus may change for the actual forthcoming edition, but the information concerning the readings of the manuscripts is, to my very best knowledge, accurate.

In the Greek books of Samuel and Kings (1–4 Kingdoms in the Septuagint), the main text-historical question concerns the so-called *kaige* sections (2 Sam 10/11–1 Kgs 2:11; 1 Kgs 22–2 Kgs): which of the main textual traditions is a more faithful witness to the original translation, the B text or the *L* text? The B text is based on *codex Vaticanus* and a handful of manuscripts that regularly follow it. That is the main text in the Cambridge edition by Brooke and McLean, and, with some corrections, in the pocket edition by Rahlfs.<sup>2</sup> The *L* text, often called “Lucianic” or “Antiochian” is

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is related to my research project “The Septuagint of 2 Samuel”, carried out with a funding by the Academy of Finland (2017–2022) in the University of Helsinki.

<sup>2</sup> Alan E. Brooke/Norman McLean/Henry St.J. Thackeray (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940); Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum*

represented by a mostly unanimous group of five manuscripts. It can be found in the apparatus of Brooke-McLean in the manuscripts marked “*boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>*” and in an edition by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz.<sup>3</sup> My claim is that in search for the best Greek witnesses for 2 Samuel the question is not only one of choosing between B and *L*, neither favouring either one of them consistently. Especially in the *kaige* section, the choice is not between two major textual traditions but, rather, three or four. The oldest reading can occasionally be found in any of those traditions, at least in any of the three most important ones. In addition, knowledge on the textual history behind these traditions will shed light on the peculiarities of both the B and *L* texts. This, in turn, is bound to make one very suspicious towards attempts to establish the original translation relying mainly or only on one tradition, be it the B or the *L* text.

I will first give a rough overview of the three or four main textual traditions. After that I will illustrate the need to differentiate between various types of secondary readings in order to choose the best reading in each instance. In the last part I will sketch how the question “which are the best Greek witnesses for 2 Samuel?” could be answered.

## Overview of the Textual Traditions

In this section, the witnesses to the different textual traditions are presented according to the preliminary manuscript grouping of the Göttingen editions for 1–2 Samuel (1–2 Kingdoms), under preparation by Anneli Aejmelaeus (1 Sam) and myself (2 Sam). Subgroups are marked with the number of the leading manuscript with a prime (e.g., 68′). The main group is cited in parenthesis (e.g., *d*). The remaining members of the main groups can be found in the section “The Majority Text” below.

### *The B Text*

Primary witnesses:

B (codex Vaticanus, 4<sup>th</sup> cent.)

*b* = 121-509 (minuscules from 11<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> cent. respectively)

Secondary witnesses:

68′ (*d*) = 68-122 (15<sup>th</sup> cent.)

64′ (*s*) = 64-381 (10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> cent.)

55 (ungrouped minuscule, 10<sup>th</sup> cent.)

244, 245, 460, 707 (ungrouped, 10/11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent.)

---

*graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

<sup>3</sup> Natalio Fernández Marcos/José Ramón Busto Saiz (ed.), *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega* (3 vols.; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–1996).

In both of the two sections of 2 Samuel, non-*kaige* (2 Sam 1–9) and *kaige* (10–24) sections, the B text is mostly joined by the vast majority of the manuscripts. Apart from the occasional special readings, mostly due to corruption,<sup>4</sup> B is followed most often by 509 (52%)<sup>5</sup>, 55 (42%), and 460 (29%). The subgroup 64' (24–26%), especially, tends to follow B mainly in a specific type of secondary readings and mostly in the *kaige* section (2 Sam 10–24). These readings attest to the Hebraizing *kaige* revision carried out perhaps as early as the first century BCE. A highly significant phenomenon is that in the *kaige* section, there are numerous *kaige* readings shared by both the B text and the majority of the manuscripts but mostly escaped by the *L* text. However, both in the *kaige* and non-*kaige* sections there is a good number of clear *kaige* readings attested only by the B text as defined here and, most of the time, the Hexaplaric text.

### *The Hexaplaric Text*

Primary witnesses:

A (codex Alexandrinus, 5<sup>th</sup> cent.)

O = 247-376 (12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> cent.)

The distinct trait of the Hexaplaric text is that it attests the greatest number, roughly 300, Hebraizing readings. These are mainly additions, derived probably from the Fifth Column of Origen's Hexapla. Some dozens of such readings are joined by other witnesses, often of the Catena groups (*CI* and *CII*) or the minuscule groups *d* and *s* (for these groups, see section "The Majority Text" below). The *L* text, too, appears to attest some hundred of such readings. However, in 2 Samuel *L* attests considerably fewer Hexaplaric readings than in 1 Samuel where *L* is actually the fullest witness to the Hexaplaric text.<sup>6</sup> A noteworthy feature of this textual tradition is that it tends to join the B text in *kaige* or *kaige*-type readings and especially when they are attested by the secondary witnesses of the B text: 68', 64', and 55. This set of most *kaige*-like witnesses includes A B O b<sup>7</sup> 64' 55 318 460 and, less frequently, a 244. It does not form an actual manuscript group in the Lachmannian sense, namely, that it could be demonstrated that its members had a common archetype closer in the family-tree

---

<sup>4</sup> Excluding orthographic issues and proper nouns, B is completely alone in ca. 80 readings; almost all of those are simple mistakes, e.g., 8:12 τῆς] γης B.

<sup>5</sup> The percentage is the number of agreements between the manuscript and B against the copy text or with the copy text against the majority of the manuscripts. It is not the absolute sameness of the witnesses counted in words.

<sup>6</sup> Sebastian Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996), 150–151.

<sup>7</sup> Of the witnesses of the *b* group (121-509), 509 joins the most *kaige*-like witnesses against the Majority Text much more frequently than 121; I cannot give absolute figures but the proportion is roughly four to one.

than any two manuscripts or groups. The common trait of these witnesses is that they share a number of secondary readings of a very distinct type.

### *The L Text*

Primary witnesses:

*L* = 19-82-93-108-127 (10<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent.)

Secondary witnesses:

M<sup>ms</sup> (the margin of codex Coislianus, 7<sup>th</sup> cent.), esp. in ch. 19–21

V (codex Venetus, 8<sup>th</sup> cent.), esp. in ch. 2 and 15

554, often in a marginal reading (ungrouped minuscule, 14<sup>th</sup> cent.)

158, 245, 318, 460 (ungrouped, 10/11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent.)

The *L* group presents the most idiosyncratic text type: it is present in 17% of all the variation against the copy text in the 2 Samuel database; for comparison, the next most idiosyncratic group, *O* of the Hexaplaric text, is present in 9% and *B* in 3% of all the variation. The prevailing text-historical theories explain this by a revision that was undertaken around 300 CE and associated with the name of Lucian of Antioch. The revision aimed at improving the readability of the text as well as introduced a number of Hexaplaric readings.<sup>8</sup> Among the notable features of this textual tradition is that it attests only very few *kaige* readings. According to the standard theory, the base text of the revision, the *proto-Lucianic text*, was a good, old text-type that for a large part escaped the *kaige* revision.<sup>9</sup> This is why the *L* text may preserve original readings against all the other manuscripts when the latter attest a *kaige* reading or a corruption. This happens frequently in the *kaige* section but, occasionally, in the non-*kaige* section as well. However, the overwhelming majority of the special readings of the *L* text are secondary recensional readings. A rough estimation of the number of such readings in 2 Samuel is 3000. Only the margin of 554 follows these with some regularity; it attests ca. 500 *L*-readings. Codex Venetus (V) and the margin of M follow *L*-readings irregularly and only in some parts of 2 Samuel. The agreements between the other secondary witnesses and *L* against *B* and the majority range from 230 to 260 readings.

### *The Majority Text*

Primary witnesses:

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information and differing views on these questions, I refer the reader to two recent collections of studies: Siegfried Kreuzer/Marcus Sigismund (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Anneli Aejmelaeus/Tuukka Kauhanen (ed.), *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (DSI 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017).

<sup>9</sup> I have treated this phenomenon in: Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (DSI 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012).

M (codex Coislianus, 7<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 CI = 98-243-379-731 (with *catenae*, 10<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 74' (*d*) = 74-106-120-134-370 (11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 s<sup>-64'</sup> = 92-130-314-488-489-762 (10<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 29, 71 (ungrouped, 10/11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 Secondary witnesses:  
 V, esp. in other chapters than 2 and 15  
 CII = 46-52-236-242-313-328-530 (some with *catenae*, 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 a = 119-527-799 (11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 107' (*d*) = 44-107-125-610 (14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 f = 56-246 (11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 158, 318, 342, 372 (ungrouped, 10/11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent.)

The Majority Text forms a very loose textual tradition. The list of secondary witnesses especially contains witnesses that are quite far apart, some of them heavily idiosyncratic. What makes the Majority Text one *tradition* (as against a ‘text-type’ or ‘group’) is the fact that its witnesses do not share the distinct traits of the three other traditions. In the non-*kaige* section (2 Sam 1–9), most witnesses of the Majority Text do not follow either the occasional *kaige*-type readings of the B text, or the Hexaplaric or Lucianic readings. In the *kaige* section (2 Sam 10–24), by contrast, they share most but not all of the *kaige* readings of the B text.

## Differentiation between Reading Types

In the following examples, I will present some words of context according to my provisional critical text followed by the critical apparatus, often slightly reduced for clarity. When the provisional critical text differs from that of Rahlfs, the reading of the latter is marked with “Ra” in the apparatus. The Gothic  $\mathfrak{M}$  stands for the Masoretic text.

I will start with a clear *kaige* reading attested only by the *kaige* inner-group:

24:2 Δίελθε δὴ πάσας τὰς φυλάς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα  
 καὶ Ἰουδα] καὶ (+ τον L<sup>-82 127</sup>) ἰουδαν L 488 245<sup>(c)</sup> 460; > A B 247 509 64' 55 Ra =  $\mathfrak{M}$

While a typical *kaige* reading is a word variant, the *kaige* revisers added and omitted readings, too. Here the minus of “and Judah” is attested exclusively by the most *kaige*-like witnesses (A B O b 64' 55) and it corresponds to the Masoretic text. The longer reading is attested by the vast majority, including the *L* text. However, the *L* text gives the proper noun “Judah” in the accusative, making it an object for the verb ‘to go through’ rather than a genitive to “the tribes”: “Go through all Israel, and go through (the district of) Judah as well.” Three manuscripts of the *L* group even add the definite article. Both changes are well in line with the tenden-

cies of the Lucianic reviser. The Majority Text has preserved the original reading with “Judah” implicitly in the genitive.

Whenever the same pattern—the most *kaige*-like witnesses attesting a reading agreeing with the Masoretic text against the Majority Text—is found in the non-*kaige* section, we can safely assume that the question is of sporadic *kaige*-type correction. Credit of this finding goes to Anneli Aejmelaeus who noticed the phenomenon in her work with 1 Samuel that is non-*kaige* in its entirety.<sup>10</sup> In the non-*kaige* section of 2 Samuel (1:1–10:5), there are ca. 100 putative *kaige*-type readings, mostly in chapters 3 (24 instances in one chapter alone!) and 5–8, e.g.:

3:39 καὶ ὅτι σήμερον συγγενῆς καὶ καθεσταμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως  
 ὅτι] + εγω εμι A B O b(tr 509) 68’ 372 707 Ra = 𐤀𐤏 (אני)  
 βασιλέως] + πεπωκε(v) L 554

The Masoretic text reads: “Today I am powerless, even though anointed king” (NRSV). Either the Hebrew *Vorlage* was somewhat different from the MT or the translator misunderstood it. In the resulting translation, verse 39 continues the thought of v. 38: “a great leader has fallen... a kinsman and one appointed (i.e., Abner) by the king (i.e., David himself).” The Lucianic reviser added “has fallen” to complete the sentence, whereas the *kaige* revision added “I am” to correspond to the Hebrew אָנִי. However, the sporadic nature of the *kaige*-type revision is evident since the reviser did not correct the sentence throughout.

The following reading seems to be *kaige* by internal criteria but it is attested by the Majority Text (included in “rel” in the apparatus) as well as the B text:

24:3 καὶ ὁ κύριός μου ὁ βασιλεὺς ἵνα τί θέλει τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο;  
 θέλει scripsi] θελη L; γινεται 158; τουτο βουλευεται 245 707; βουλεται rel Ra (רפּן 𐤀)  
 τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο L] εν τω λογω τουτω rel Ra (היה בדבר 𐤀)

The two variation units here are best treated together. In my critical text, I have changed the verb θελω from a subjunctive to the indicative as in B and the majority, thus “θέλει scripsi”: the critical reading is not attested by any Greek manuscript. According to Raimund Wirth, the *kaige* revisers favoured βουλομαι in positive and ου θελω in negative clauses for the Hebrew רפּן.<sup>11</sup> Thus *kaige* changed the verb but retained the indicative, whereas the Lucianic reviser retained the verb θελω but changed the mood. The choice of verb may regulate the following construction: accusative in L, εν + dat. in B and the Majority, but there is not enough evidence in the Books of Samuel of how the translator usually construes the verb βουλομαι in similar expressions. As a rule of thumb, in the pattern λογος B rel] ρημα

<sup>10</sup> Anneli Aejmelaeus, “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel,” in Aejmelaeus & Kauhanen (ed.), *The Legacy of Barthélemy*, 169–184.

<sup>11</sup> Raimund Wirth, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher* (DSI 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 180–181.

L(+) the latter should be preferred in the *kaige* section unless there are good reasons for the Lucianic reviser to make the change, such as ρημα being used in the near context.

The previous example can be contrasted with another case of a word-variant where the attestation pattern is similar:

20:2 ככלם בברקו דבדוהי ושיאוי καὶ ἀνήρ Ἰούδα έκολλήθη τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτῶν  
καὶ ἀνήρ] οἱ δε ἀνδρες L 554<sup>mg</sup> |

έκολλήθη τῷ βασιλεῖ] προσεχωρησαν προς (περι 554) τον βασιλεα L 554<sup>mg</sup>

Against “and (every) man of Judah adhered to their king” (cf. NETS) of B and the Majority, the *L* text reads “but the men of Judah **sided with** their king”. In addition to the present case, the Hebrew קבט ‘to join, to follow’ is translated with κολλαω or προσκολλαω five times in Samuel-Kings; there are no lexical variants in those instances (2 Sam 23:10; 1 Kgs 11:2; 2 Kgs 3:3, 5:27, 18:6). Another rendering for קבט, συναπτω which has various meanings, including ‘to come near’, is found three times (1 Sam 14:22, 31:2 no significant variants; 2 Sam 1:6 συνῆψαν αὐτῷ] κατεβαλον αυτον 509). By contrast, in the whole Septuagint, προσχωρεω ‘to side with and support’ (GELS) is only found as a translation to the Hebrew לפנ which in those contexts means ‘to desert or surrender’ (1 Chr 12:20, 21; Jer 21:9; cf. 1 Macc 10:26); none of the cases are in Samuel-Kings. The translator of Samuel has the habit of varying the equivalent, as all good translators do. Here, however, even though the number of comparable instances is small, translation technique strongly points to the conclusion that the form in B and the Majority is original and it is the Lucianic reviser that changed the verb from κολλαω to προσχωρεω. Accordingly, the dative τῷ βασιλεῖ “to king” was changed to προς + accusative. The other differences in the near context point to the same conclusion: δε against και; “men” and the verb in plural and with the definite article (οἱ δε ἀνδρες προσεχωρησαν). This is precisely what the Lucianic reviser is prone to do. In this case the issue is not that there is a rare equivalent attested by the *L* text, or that the reading of the *L* text might be said to be slightly further away from the Hebrew text; the decisive factor is that προσχωρεω for קבט is not something that the translator of Samuel was likely to do.

That the best reading can be found now in one, now in another of the textual witnesses can be best demonstrated with an entire verse with multiple variation units. Again, the apparatus is slightly simplified for clarity:

24:16 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τοῦ διαφθεῖραι αὐτήν, καὶ μετεμελήθη Κύριος ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ καὶ εἶπεν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ διαφθεῖροντι ἐν τῷ λαῷ Ἰκανόν νῦν, ἄνες τὴν χεῖρά σου· καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἦν έστηκώς παρὰ τῷ ἄλφ Ὅρνά τοῦ Ἰεβουσαίου.

(1) τοῦ θεοῦ] > A L 52-530 74 64´ 707 = M

(2) εἰς] ἐπι L

(3) μετεμελήθη L] παρεκλήθη rel Ra (cf. ⲙⲛⲓ M)

(4) ἐπὶ] ἐν A 247

- (5) ἰκανόν] pr πολυ CII s<sup>-130 64'</sup>; πολυ A B M V 247 CI 509 f 64' 55 pauci Ra: cf 𐌆𐌗  
 (6) νῦν] > A 318 460; post σου tr L  
 (7) Κυρίου] του θεου L 64'  
 (8) ἐστηκόζ] > A B 247 509 55 Ra = 𐌆𐌗

In the eight readings presented here the following patterns can be found:

- (1) A probable Hexaplaric omission shared by the *L* text.  
 (2) A minor word-variant in *L* alone.  
 (3) A *kaige* word-variant attested by the B and Majority Texts; only *L* retains the original reading.  
 (4) A minor Hexaplaric word-variant.  
 (5) A *kaige* word-variant attested by the most *kaige*-like witnesses as well as a dozen other witnesses (not all of them cited above); *L* and a slight majority retain the original reading.  
 (6) An omission in A, a word-order variant in *L*.  
 (7) A word-variant concerning the divine name in *L* shared, possibly independently, by an unrelated witness.  
 (8) A *kaige* omission attested by the most *kaige*-like witnesses only; *L* and the vast majority retain the original reading.

In this verse, no manuscript attests the whole of the critical text, but the Majority Text is the closest one to it.<sup>12</sup> Both the B and *L* texts attest several secondary readings of different patterns within a verse of 47 words. Comparing only B and *L* here would lead to a very different analysis than taking all the evidence into account.

In 1 Samuel, some agreements between the *L* text and early patristic authors such as Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Tertullian attest proto-Lucianic readings, that is, ancient readings of the base text of the Lucianic recension. In those instances, the competing reading in the B text and often in the Majority result from error or early *kaige*-type correction.<sup>13</sup> If all the distinct readings of *L* were late, recensional readings, we could expect the pre-Lucianic witnesses never to follow *L*; but this is not the case. Conversely, if all or most distinctive readings of *L* were old, even original, we could expect the pre-Lucianic witnesses follow *L* throughout. This, too, is not the case. Thus the proto-Lucianic material confirms the dual nature of the *L* text as a revisional text based on a good, old text that, for the most part, escaped the *kaige* revision.

In 2 Samuel there is much less material by the pre-Lucianic witnesses than in 1 Samuel. However, there is a good amount of text in *Palimpsestus Vindobonensis* (La<sup>115</sup>), an Old Latin witness from the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>14</sup> Because of its age—at least a century after the supposed date of the Lucianic

<sup>12</sup> Apart from minor errors, manuscripts d<sup>-74 107'</sup> 130 244 762 attest the critical text in all details but μετεμελήθη L] παρεκληθη rel where only *L* retains the original reading. Manuscripts 376 372 700 are not extant for this verse.

<sup>13</sup> Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem*, 189–191.

<sup>14</sup> Bonifatius Fischer et al., “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings”, *BIOSCS* 16 (1983), 13–87.



recension—the manuscript itself does not qualify as a pre-Lucianic witness, but the translation is probably earlier than the actual manuscript. In my doctoral thesis I suggested that it presents a mixed text-type with distinct readings of both the B and L texts.<sup>15</sup> Behind this mixture one may still observe that it retains few – if any – *kaige* readings of the B text, fewer Lucianic recensional readings than the L text, and next to no Hexaplaric readings. This can be illustrated in a short segment in 2 Sam 11:8–9. The text is my provisional critical text. The noteworthy readings are underlined. The apparatus is slightly shortened for clarity, and La<sup>115</sup> is cited either inside or outside the lemma.

11:8b καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Οὐρίας ἐξ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ τῶν παρεστηκότων τοῦ βασιλέως. 11:9a καὶ κοιμᾶται Οὐρίας ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως μετὰ τῶν δούλων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ

*et exiit urias de domo regis et exier(unt) post eum protectores regis et dormivit urias in porta[m] domus regis cum omnibus servis regis domini sui* (La<sup>115</sup>)

- (1) 11:8 ἐξ οἴκου La<sup>115</sup> (תִּבְנִי) ] εκ προσωπου L 318 554<sup>mg</sup>
- (2) τῶν παρεστηκότων L 554<sup>mg</sup> La<sup>115</sup> (?) ] αρσις rel Ra: cf ℳ (תִּבְנִי)
- (3) τοῦ βασιλέως La<sup>115</sup>] τω βασιλει L 554<sup>mg</sup>
- (4) 11:9 κοιμᾶται L] εκοιμηθη rel Ra; *dormivit* La<sup>115</sup>
- (5) ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι L La<sup>115</sup> (?) ] παρα τη θυρα rel Ra: cf ℳ (תִּבְנִי)
- (6) τοῦ οἴκου La<sup>115</sup>] > A B M V O 530\*(c pr m) 799 b 106 f 64 *pauci* Ra (≠ תִּבְנִי ℳ)
- (7) μετὰ ] + παντων L La<sup>115</sup>
- (8) δούλων] παιδων L; δουλων του βασιλεως 121; *servis regis* La<sup>115</sup>

La<sup>115</sup> follows L against B in three original readings (numbers 2, 5, and 6), although it is not always entirely certain which reading it attests. Conversely, it agrees with B and the majority against L in at least two readings that seem to be clear Lucianic recensional readings (1 and 3). Once La<sup>115</sup> appears to attest a recensional reading (7), and in one instance it agrees with another Greek witness against the major textual traditions (the plus of “of king” in 8).

Two cases warrant for a longer comment:

(1) ἐξ οἴκου in B and the Majority is the original reading corresponding to תִּבְנִי. The reading in L is a logical improvement: Uriah did not go out from the palace but stayed overnight in the courtyard since “all” (thus L in reading 7) of the king’s servants did the same. Thus, Uriah only left the presence of the king, ἐξῆλθεν ... ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ βασιλέως (L), not the palace. La<sup>115</sup> follows the original reading of B and the Majority.

(2) In the L text the subject of the second ἐξῆλθεν is an undefined individual or individuals of the attendants of the king, sent to see if Uriah actually goes home or not (cf. v. 10). In the B text, by contrast, Uriah is followed by “a portion” (ἄρσις) of the king, apparently a portion from the king’s table. It corresponds well enough to the Hebrew word תִּבְנִי, a rare word for which there is not enough translation-technical data to determine

<sup>15</sup> Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem*, 164.

if ἄρσις is the normal usage of the translator. Tentatively, I suggest that ἄρσις is a *kaige* reading. If the *L* reading τῶν παρεστηκότων “of the attendants” is original, it corresponds to another Hebrew word; possibly משרתי from the verb שרת ‘to serve’.<sup>16</sup> *Protectores* in La<sup>115</sup> could work as a translation for the *L*-reading but certainly not for ἄρσις.

It should be emphasized that support by La<sup>115</sup> is not the decisive factor for selecting the provisional original reading in any of the instances above. Often it can be questioned which Greek reading La<sup>115</sup> actually follows, and a reason for a secondary change in the Greek witnesses should always be looked for. Here none of the three major Greek textual traditions retains the original translation as a whole. In this short passage, 31 words in my provisional critical text, a Greek back-translation of La<sup>115</sup> would be quite close to the original, but not identical to it in every detail. Of the Greek traditions, *L* is slightly closer to the original than the Majority and B texts, but the extent of the differences amounts to a couple of words only.<sup>17</sup>

### How to Find the Best Witnesses?

The original text of the Greek 2 Samuel has to be looked for now in the B text, now in the *L* text, and quite often in the Majority Text between them. Can any of the traditions or, indeed, a single witness or a manuscript group be called *the* best? In this section, I will present some statistics to sketch the relative quality of the most important witnesses. These statistics should be taken as tentative: they are not based on a full-scale analysis of all the readings; that will be done in the course of my edition work. The statistics are, however, based on the actual data on the agreements and disagreements between the witnesses. The data consists of all the meaningful variation between the known ca. 60 manuscripts of the Greek 2 Samuel. When it comes to at least the agreement patterns between the manuscripts, I hold that the data is reliable.

Since the Rahlfs edition is based mainly on B, it presents a text where most, almost all, *kaige* features are present. Counting words as against Rahlfs, the *kaige* features amount to some 3% in the non-*kaige* section (2 Sam 1–9). For the *kaige* section (10–24) I can only give a rough estima-

---

<sup>16</sup> Differently P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 9; New York: Doubleday, 1984) 280, who offers a much more complex retroversion and a reconstruction of the putative original Hebrew.

<sup>17</sup> Setting aside details relating to Greek-Latin renderings, La<sup>115</sup> attests to 30 of the 31 words and adds two words, i.e., it deviates from the original by three words. The comparable figures for the major Greek traditions are, in ascending order: the *L* text 3 words, the Majority Text 5, the B text 7, the Hexaplaric text 8.

tion of 5%–10%. One measure of the relative quality of a witness is the number of *kaige* readings it attests: the lower the number, the better its quality. I have located 103 probable *kaige*-type readings in the non-*kaige* section. The following presents the number of agreements with B in these *kaige*-type readings for most witnesses or groups. Some of them are clustered together and the range of agreements is given.

Witness or Group	# of <i>kaige</i> -type readings in 2 Sam 1–9	Witness or Group	# of <i>kaige</i> -type readings in 2 Sam 1–9
<b>B</b>	103	<b>68' 244 245 460</b>	38–46
<b>121</b>	80	<i>a</i> <sup>-527</sup> <b>64' 55</b>	26–31
<b>509</b>	73	V 527 <i>f</i> 71 158 318 342	11–18
A <b>707</b>	65–70	M <i>CI CII d</i> <sup>-68' s</sup> -64' 29 554	4–10
<i>O</i>	54–55	<i>L</i>	0

The most *kaige*-like witnesses are noted in bold. The significant issue is the considerable difference in the number of *kaige*-type readings attested between the witnesses. In addition to *L* and 554, many witnesses of the Majority Text (esp. M *CI CII d*<sup>-68' s</sup>-64' 29) attest a very small number of such readings.

Another measure for the relative quality of a witness is the number of Lucianic recensional readings: the lower the number, the better the quality. The following gives the numbers for the relative “Lucianity” for most witnesses, measured in the number of agreements in readings, attested at least by one witness of the *L* group and *not* attested by B. This includes probable Hexaplaric readings shared by *L*. The total number of readings is 4576. The numbers do not differ much at the low end and thus many of the witnesses can be clustered together. I have divided the witnesses into three categories: (1) most *kaige*-like, (2) least *kaige*-like, (3) no special trait. The bold type marks the most idiosyncratic witnesses.<sup>18</sup>

Witness or Group by category			% of agreement in readings of the type <i>L</i> ≠ B in 2 Samuel
(1)	(2)	(3)	
	<i>L</i>		68–72%
	554		13%
<i>O</i> <b>245 460</b>	<b>158</b>	318	5–6%
A 64' 244 <b>707</b>	M <b>71</b>	V <b>242</b> 799 <i>f</i> 44- <b>125</b> -610 ( <i>d</i> ) <b>488</b> ( <i>s</i> ) 342	3–4%
<i>b</i> 68' 55	<i>CI CII</i> 74'-107 ( <i>d</i> ) 130-489 ( <i>s</i> ) 29	<i>a</i> <sup>-799</sup>	1.5–3%
	92-314-762 ( <i>s</i> )		1.2–1.4%

<sup>18</sup> Idiosyncrasy of a single witness is here measured as the ratio of readings attested only by the witness itself to the total number of readings it attests. E.g., 509 attests a total of 1885 readings in meaningful variation; of these it is alone in 652 = 35% and in 141 = 7% it agrees with one other witness. Defined this way, 509 is the most idiosyncratic manuscript.

Among the least *kaige*-like witnesses, 554, 158, M, and 71 appear to attest at least some amount of Lucianic readings. Conversely, some of the least Lucianic witnesses belong to those that are most *kaige*-like, namely, *b*, 68', and 55. Among the most neutral witnesses, the Greater Catena group (*CII*) is somewhat more idiosyncratic than others.<sup>19</sup> Thus, measured in the lowest number of both *kaige* and Lucianic readings, and a low degree of idiosyncrasy, the best Greek witnesses for 2 Samuel are the Smaller Catena group *CI*; 74' of the *d* group; the ungrouped minuscule 29; and, with the exception of the subgroup 64', the *s* group, particularly 92-314-762.

## Conclusion

Most of the variation between the Greek witnesses of 2 Samuel is brought about by the Lucianic revision. A small portion of the Lucianic recensional readings, often including Hexaplaric readings, is shared by some or most members of the Majority Text. In those cases the B text retains the original text. When *kaige*-type readings are found in the non-*kaige* section (2 Sam 1–9), they are mainly attested by the B text and the Hexaplaric text. In addition, roughly a third of these kind of readings is shared by some number of the witnesses of the Majority Text; the best ones among them, namely, *CI*, 74', *s*<sup>-64'</sup>, and 29 retain only a handful of those secondary readings.

In the *kaige* section (2 Sam 10–24) the extent of the *kaige* readings is somewhat larger than in the former part of the book, and they are mainly, although not exclusively, attested by the vast majority of the witnesses. Some *kaige* readings appear to have entered even the *L* text, but the number is very small; my rough estimation is that such readings can be found once or twice per chapter in the *kaige* section. The importance of *L* lies specifically in this fact: when all the other witnesses attest a *kaige* reading, *L* retains the original reading in most of those instances. However, instances of that kind form a minority of all the noteworthy variation: in the *kaige* section, too, most of all the variation is still brought about by the Lucianic revision.

Especially in the *kaige* section, it can be expected that the Lucianic and *kaige* features overlap to some extent. Accordingly, for a few percent of the variation, the B text and the Majority Text attest a *kaige* reading while *L* attests a recensional reading. In those cases, the editor must suggest an emendation that explains both the B and *L* readings.

---

<sup>19</sup> In 38% of the readings in which any member of *CII* is included, only members of *CII* are present. By contrast, the comparable ratios to *CI*, 74', and *s* are 18%, 23%, and 25% respectively. These figures may be contrasted further with *L*: 57%.

## Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel.” Pages 169–184 in Aejmelaeus, Anneli/Kauhanen, Tuukka (ed.), *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila*. DSI 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli/Kauhanen, Tuukka (ed.), *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila*. DSI 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- Brock, Sebastian, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel*. Quaderni di Henoch 9. Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1996.
- Brooke, Alan E./ McLean, Norman/Thackeray Henry St.J. (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio/Busto Saiz, José Ramón (ed.), *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*. 3 vols. Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989–1996.
- Fischer, Bonifatius/Ulrich, Eugene/Sanderson, Judith, “Palimpsestus Vindobonensis: A Revised Edition of L 115 for Samuel-Kings.” Pages 13–87 in *BIOSCS* 16. 1983.
- Kauhanen, Tuukka, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*. DSI 3. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried/Sigismund, Marcus (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*. DSI 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- McCarter, P. Kyle, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 9. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.), *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Wirth, Raimund, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher*. DSI 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.