

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in Martti Nissinen (ed.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

'Lukian redivivus' or Barthélemy and beyond?

in: Martti Nissinen (ed.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, pp. 243–261

Leiden, Brill 2012 (Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 148)

Access to the published version may require subscription.

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

Your IxTheo team

---

Liebe\*r Leser\*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor\*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in Martti Nissinen (Hg.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor\*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

'Lukian redivivus' or Barthélemy and beyond?

in: Martti Nissinen (Hg.), *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, S. 243–261

Leiden, Brill 2012 (Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 148)

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

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

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

Ihr IxTheo-Team

# ‘Lukian redivivus’ or Barthélemy and beyond?

*Siegfried Kreuzer*

## Abstract

D. Barthélemy’s *Les Devanciers d’Aquila* (1963) has become one of the most important books in Septuagint research, esp. the discovery of the kaige-recension has been widely accepted. On the other hand S. Brock’s “Lucian redivivus” (1965/68) has become most influential in defending the traditional view of the Lucianic redaction against Barthélemy’s revaluation of the Lucianic/Antiochene text as the best representative of the Old Greek, esp. in 1-4 Kgdms. The present paper is the first detailed examination of Brock’s paper. It turns out that Brock’s reasons and examples are doubtful and misleading or mere possibilities but no real proofs against Barthélemy’s insight. It becomes clear that the identification of the kaige-recension and Barthélemy’s new evaluation of the Antiochene text are two sides of one coin. In the part on the “beyond” some conclusions are drawn and some observations on the text of Codex Vaticanus in the non-kaige-sections are presented.

## 1. Introduction

The famous German philosopher and poet Gotthold Ephraim Lessing once wrote a little three-liner about Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, a famous and much appraised poet who lived in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and who was a little bit older than Lessing. It goes:

„Wer wird nicht einen Klopstock loben?  
Doch wird ihn jeder lesen? Nein!  
– Wir wollen weniger erhoben und fleißiger gelesen sein.“  
(„Who would not praise a Klopstock?  
But would everyone read him? No!  
– We would like to be less elated but more read.”)

This saying could also be applied to one of the most famous Septuagint scholars at least of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Dominique Barthélemy, and his book “*Les Devanciers d’Aquila*” from 1963.<sup>1</sup> This book can be found in almost every bibliography wherever it is appropriate. Certainly, the basic idea, i.e. the discovery of a heavily Hebraising Palestinian recension, now called the kaige-recension, is recognized in Septuagint studies. Yet, looking more closely and in detail, Barthélemy’s book not always has the impact it could have and deserves, and sometimes hardly more is known than its basic idea.

Certainly one reason is, that the book is in French and at least partly in a rather elaborated style.<sup>2</sup> The other reason is a counter article written by Sebastian P. Brock with the title “Lucian redivivus”. Brock by that time was completing his dissertation on 1 Sam which then was accepted in 1966. Brock’s paper was presented to the “Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church”, Oxford, 1965, and appeared in print in 1968.<sup>3</sup> To understand both, Barthélemy and Brock, we have to take a brief glance at the earlier research on the books of Samuel and Kings or 1-4 Kgdms respectively.

## 2. Research on the Lucianic text up to Barthélemy and Brock.

---

This paper stands in the context of research sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

<sup>1</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d’Aquila* (VTS 10, Leiden 1963).

<sup>2</sup> In the inofficial part of the centennial celebration of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen 2007 I have suggested to make a German or English translation of Barthélemy’s work. I am glad that this idea has been taken up and will be realised by P. Hugo and T. Law.

<sup>3</sup> S.P. Brock, Lucian redivivus. Some Reflections on Barthélemy’s *Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, in: F.L. [!] Cross, *Studia Evangelica, Vol. V, Papers presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965* (TUGAL 103, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1968, 176-181).

The most influential position on this subject was that of Alfred Rahlfs with his study on the text of the books of kings.<sup>4</sup> Rahlfs not yet discussed the distinction between different sections of 1-4 Reigns put forward by Thackeray in 1907 and then in 1921,<sup>5</sup> which we today call the distinction between the kaige and non-kaige-sections. As expressed in the title “Lucians Recension der Königsbücher” the basic question was the evaluation of the Lucianic text in 1 and 2 Kings. As is well known, the Lucianic text has its name because Hieronymus mentioned the relation of the biblical text used in Antioch with the martyr Lucian who died in 312. The text was known through the quotations by the Antiochene fathers, but it was identified in the manuscripts by Antonio Maria Ceriani in 1863 (and probably independently by Paul Anton de Lagarde in 1867).<sup>6</sup> Different from his teacher Lagarde and different from Adam Mez, who in 1890 had presented the agreements between Josephus and the Antiochene text,<sup>7</sup> Rahlfs clearly concentrated on Lucian’s redactional activity. His basic idea was that the text of Codex Vaticanus was practically identical with the original Septuagint and that almost all the differences in the Lucianic texts were the result of Lucian’s activity. For this, he reduced all the contrary indications: The agreements with Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities were reduced to a few name forms and the agreements with Vetus Latina and Latin Fathers were declared as later influence or as agreements that came about by chance. Agreements with quotations in the NT were explained as secondary influence of the NT text into the OT manuscripts. To be correct, it has to be noted, that Rahlfs allowed for some old substratum in the Lucianic text, but mainly the text was the result of a late Lucianic redaction. According to Rahlfs, the main traits of this redaction were additions, i.e. additions of the article and of explaining words, semantic changes to other expressions, and a change to atticising forms. – But there was also a problem: Lucian’s activity was irregular. He not only added the article or explaining words, sometime he also deleted them. As Rahlfs was convinced, that the Lucianic text was late, this observation was not seen as a problem of the analysis, but it was declared as a further trait of Lucians work: Lucians recensional activity was irregular and even contradictory. In the words of Rahlfs: “der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips” (“the main characteristic of this recension is the lack of a clear rule”),<sup>8</sup> or as Ziegler in his description of the Lucianic activity in the prophetic books expressed it: “Konsequenz ist nicht seine Sache” (“being consequent is not his thing”).<sup>9</sup> These traits of the Lucianic redactional activity became generally accepted. Also in Brocks analysis of 1 Sam there are these traits: Addition of article, additions of explaining words, and irregularities in all of them. Only that Brock in his book speaks about recurrent and non-recurrent variants or – as he calls them – approximations and that he leaves out the non-recurrent variants from further consideration.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Barthélemy, kaige and the consequences for the Lucianic text.

Barthélemy’s discovery of the kaige-recension changed this picture. The basic discovery was that at least in the kaige-sections, the text of Codex Vaticanus was not the Old Greek, but a

<sup>4</sup> A. Rahlfs, “Lucians Recension der Königsbücher”, *Septuaginta-Studien III* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1911 [reprint 1965]), 3 [363] 295 [655].

<sup>5</sup> St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek translators of the four books of Kings”, *JTS* 8 (1907): 262-266; id., *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, A Study in Origins* (London: British Academy 1921; reprint München: Kraus 1980).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the discussion in Rahlfs, “Lucians Recension”, 80 [440], fn. 1. For this and the further history of research see Jong-Hoon Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen, der Samuel- und Königebücher. Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1-19,9* (BZAW 394, Berlin: de Gruyter 2009), 4-22.

<sup>7</sup> A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus – untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895).

<sup>8</sup> Rahlfs, *Lucians Recension*, 1911, 293.

<sup>9</sup> J. Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta* (MSU VI, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1958), 163.

<sup>10</sup> S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*, (Dissertation Oxford 1966), (Torino: Zamorani 1996), esp. 255.

recensional text, and – on the other hand – that the Lucianic text was not affected by this recension. So, comparison of the texts may not necessarily start with the text of Vaticanus, but it must be done openly. In doing so, Barthélemy came to the result, that most of the differences can be explained as result of the kaige-recension. Typically, the kaige-recensor would replace words that express the function, like *σάλπιγξ*, for giving signs, by a literal rendering, like in this case by *κερατίνη*, which is a one to one rendering of the Hebrew *שופר*, but without the functional connotation it has in Hebrew. Kaige would also tend to make the Greek transparent for more or less formal specifics of the Hebrew, like by rendering the short form of the Hebrew personal pronoun *אני* with *ἐγώ* and the long form *אניכי* with *ἐγώ εἰμι*, independent from Greek grammar. And kaige would try to render the same Hebrew word by the same Greek word, i.e. Hebrew *איש*, man, is rendered by *άνήρ*, man, even where it means *ἕκαστος*, everyone.

With the discovery of the kaige-recension the situation of the Lucianic text becomes different as well. If e.g. *κερατίνη* is a word of the kaige recension, *σάλπιγξ* is not necessarily a change made by Lucian, but may be as well the original Greek. The same is the case for *άνήρ* versus *ἕκαστος* and many other differences. Barthélemy's discovery also affects the question of atticising language in the Antiochene text. Certainly, compared with kaige, the Antiochene text has atticising tendencies. But atticising language is possible not only for Lucian around 300 C.E., it is even more possible in Alexandria in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E., where the classic Greek writers and philosophers were the yardstick for literary Greek (by the way: there was always a difference between everyday Hellenistic Greek and the literary ideal of atticising language).

Taking all this together Barthélemy came to the conclusion that the Antiochene text is basically identical with the original Septuagint, although certainly with some changes and corruptions which happened over the centuries. In Barthélemy's famous words: The Lucianic or Antiochene text, is "essentiellement la Septante ancienne plus ou moins abâtardie ou corrompue" ["essentially the ancient Septuagint, more or less disturbed or corrupted"].<sup>11</sup>

This insight now also allows accepting the witness of Josephus and of the Old Latin. They don't need to be belittled or pushed aside to fit in the concept, as Rahlfs had done. Rather they are the evidence that this text existed long before Lucian and also before the Hexapla.

This was the new situation as Sebastian P. Brock was working on 1 Sam and as he delivered his paper on "Lucian redivivus". This was indeed a fitting title, because of the insights of Barthélemy a Lucianic recension around 300 needed not any longer to be assumed and it even would be hard to show traces of such Lucianic activities. This brought serious problems to Brock's almost finished work on 1 Sam and he therefore – understandably – tried to refute Barthélemy and to revive Lucian, i.e. the Lucianic recensional activity.

#### 4. Brock and his 'Lucian redivivus' from 1965.<sup>12</sup>

First, Brock sketches briefly Barthélemy's book, basically by referring to the kaige recension discovered in the Nahal Hiver scroll of the Minor Prophets in Greek, but also mentioning, "that his pre-Aquila *correctio* of the LXX was by no means confined to the Minor Prophets, but that it can especially be isolated in the textual tradition of the Historical Books." (p. 177) "Barthélemy treats in considerable detail the section of Kingdoms which Thackeray designated *βγ* (= 2Kgdms 11:2 - 3 Kgdms 2:11). In this section in particular, the text of certain minuscules differs notoriously from that of Vaticanus and the rest of the textual tradition. ... Barthélemy, however, shows that in fact this so-called 'Lucianic' text, which he prefers to call 'Antiochene'

---

<sup>11</sup> Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 127.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. fn. 3. For the sake of a fair presentation and a clear discussion some larger quotations will be given.

(henceforth ‘Ant.’) often *alone* retains the original LXX translation of this book” (p. 177). Brock continues with some remarks on the Palestinian [= kaige-]revision, which brought the text “into closer agreement with the Hebrew” and comes to Barthélemy’s conclusion: “Consequently he proposes that the question-begging title ‘Lucianic Recension’ be dropped altogether: the so-called ‘Lucianic’ manuscripts simply preserve an old popular text which escaped the Hebraising ‘Palestinian Recension’.” (p. 177)

Brock at first goes on to underline this, but then he declares his reservation: “It should be said at once that his main point, that the Antiochene text has escaped this hebraising revision which influenced the rest of the tradition, seems entirely convincing, and it would be hard to over-emphasize the importance of this discovery. What I wish to stress here, however, is that Ant. still remains a recensional text, even though it has escaped the Palestinian revision which Barthélemy so brilliantly isolated.” (p. 177)

The Ant still remaining a recensional text for Brock simply means the old ideas about the Lucianic redaction of this text. This view is defended with several points which we have to discuss now.

**4.1** Brock begins with “a minor but quite definitely recensional feature in Ant., namely the preference for Attic, as against Hellenistic, grammatical forms. On of the most obvious examples for this is the regular replacement in Ant. of Hellenistic εὔταετc. by εὔτων etc. Now this feature is found in, and often confined to, so-called Lucianic manuscripts of a very wide range of books. There could be no clearer sign of recensional activity at work. It is found, for example, just as much in Kms α (= 1 Kgdms), where, according to Barthélemy, the Palestinian recension is not traceable, as in Kms αβ.” (p.177)<sup>13</sup>

The matter of atticising language in Ant. (esp. as compared with the text of Codex Vaticanus), is a well known and largely accepted fact. It was already used by Rahlfs, 1911, and it is widely accepted. – But what does it really mean or proof? It is a correct description, but it does not decide the chronological relation to the kaige-text. Ant is different from kaige, yes. But the atticising aspects in Ant may be introduced by Lucian, or they may have been part of the Old Greek. Attic was the ideal for literary language (against the ‘everyday’-Koine), at least as much in Ptolemaic Alexandria as in late Roman Antioch. The atticising tendencies show that Ant. is different from kaige, but they do not prove that Lucian (or whoever it was) introduced them.

**4.2** Brock goes on by expanding on the fact that features of Ant in the kaige-sections can also be observed in the non-kaige-sections: “This very fact that the Palestinian recension did not affect Kms α is important in evaluating the character of Ant. in Kms βγ, for the five manuscripts which provide the Antiochene text in fly also provide a text at variance with the rest of the tradition in Kms α, and at variance often in the same sort of way as in fly. This of course raises a problem, for the variant text of Ant. in Kms α cannot be attributed to the non-influence (to use an ugly term) of the hebraising Palestinian recension, since there is no trace of this in this book. The obvious inference is that the distinctive text of Ant. in both Kms α and Kms βγ is partly (and only partly) the product of recensional activity.” (p.178)

Before coming to an example, Brock states: “It has often been noted that one of the striking features of the so-called ‘Lucianic’ text in all books where it is easily identifiable, is a desire to improve on the Greek style of the original translation. This desire is manifested not only in grammatical changes of the kind already mentioned, but also in more drastic syntactical and lexical ones”. Then he discusses the two different translations of ביהוה נשבעתי in 2Kgdms 19,7(8) with ἐν κυρίῳ (ὠμοσα) in Pal. [= kaige] and κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου in Ant and goes on by concluding: “At first sight it looks as if Pal. is bringing Ant. closer to the Hebrew, yet in fact

---

<sup>13</sup> In the footnote Brock, *Lucian redivivus*, refers to two more examples: “Other recurrent features of this type, even more closely confined to ‘Lucianic’ MSS, are, e. g., the alteration of the gender of *eleos* from *Koine* neuter to the more literary masculine; likewise that of ἄλωϋ from masculine (apparently only LXX) to the normal feminine.”

Ant. must be secondary since the same change is also found twice in 1 Kms<sup>14</sup>: it is evidently a recensional characteristic of the Antiochene text.” (p. 178)

Now, at first sight this conclusion (“Ant. must be secondary since the same change is also found twice in 1Kms”) is surprising and not very clear. It works only with the assumption that Ant. is late (and if B is always the oldest text). Indeed, if a feature in Ant. is late within the  $\beta\gamma$ -section, it will be late in the  $\alpha$ -section as well. But the same is true the other way around also: If Ant is old and close to the OG in the  $\beta\gamma$ -section, it will be the same in the  $\alpha$ -section. – Again, the syntactical and lexical similarities or identities show that the texts belong together, but they do not prove the age of the text. Brock’s conclusion about the age is methodologically wrong and simply wishful thinking without considering the other possibility. Yet, even if Brock’s reason does not prove his conclusion, there are indeed two readings and one of them must be secondary.<sup>15</sup> The alternative simply is that also in the non-kaige-section, where B is much closer to the Old Greek, the text of B is secondary, probably because also in the non-kaige section there may have occurred a Hebraising revision (although so to say much milder) or some cross-influence from a kaige-text. This question will be taken up later on. Here, in regard to Brock, it is enough to note that his reason does not decide the case, but allows both conclusions.<sup>16</sup>

**4.3** Brock now turns to matters of lexical variation: “Despite the very large number of instances of lexical variation between Ant. and the main tradition throughout Kms and elsewhere, it is surprisingly hard to find any consistency or motivation for change, whether it be on the part of Ant, or not. On the negative side, it can be said that, except in one or two cases, the dictates of the Atticist lexicographers do not seem to have played any great part in the choice of words used.” (p. 178) This statement is interesting insofar as it relativises the question of Atticist vocabulary.

Brock goes on: “A few examples of general stylistic improvement in Ant, in  $\beta\gamma$  must suffice for the present. On several occasions Ant, introduces ὄλος as a variant to the interminable πᾶς. This alteration is found in other books of Kms<sup>17</sup>, and, importantly, in one or two passages of Hexaplaric origin<sup>18</sup>, which must mean that the change was made at a comparatively late date.” (p. 178) Brock then discusses two examples from Barthélemy, the different renderings of the question  $\eta\sigma\lambda\omicron\mu$ , in the sense of “is there well-being?” or more literal “is there peace?”, and the rendering of the oath formula found in 2 Kgdms 11:11. (p. 179) In both cases also Brock admits, that it is hard to decide. In the first of the two cases, there are just two possibilities, in the second case Brock’s reasoning is rather complicated. Brock is certainly right, that Ant is better Greek, but the conclusion, that Ant therefore is late, tends to circular reasoning. Why cannot the OG have given a fairly good translation – which would be preserved in Ant –, while the Palestinian revision formalistically adopted its text to the Hebrew. The explanation to these examples given by Barthélemy is much less complicated and far more convincing. Brock’s explanations are not impossible, but their mere possibility is far from disproving Brock’s view.

---

<sup>14</sup> In the footnote: “1 Kms 24,22; 28,10; once again in  $\beta\gamma$  at 3 Kms 1,17.”

<sup>15</sup> At least if there have not been two different translations. But because of the similarities of the two text types, this can be excluded and (to my knowledge) has never been contended for.

<sup>16</sup> It may be mentioned, that for 1 Kgdms 28:10 Brock does not give the full picture. There, the alternative is not B and Ant, but A and Ant. This means that A and Ant suppose a text like MT, while the reference text of B must have been without  $\text{בִּיהוּה}$ . This would be one of the cases where it could be assumed, that Ant (and also A) has been revised according to the MT or that probably this goes back to the Hexapla. In any case it must be assumed, that B had a Vorlage different from MT. – But this also can be seen the other way around: Ant (supported by the Coptic version!) with  $\text{κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ}$  is the oldest text; (the predecessor of) A has changed to  $\text{ἐν κυρίῳ}$ , and B (probably following its Hebrew reference text) has the verb only. However one decides, the case is difficult and certainly not a clear proof for Brock’s position.

<sup>17</sup> Fn: „e.g. 4 Kms 23,3; in  $\beta\gamma$  2 Kms 19,28; elsewhere e.g. 1 Chr 10,6.“

<sup>18</sup> Fn: „e.g. 3 Kms 15,29.“

Now, there is one argument which could become important. It is the reference to hexaplaric origin in the statement quoted above: “This alteration is found in other books of Kms, and, importantly, in one or two passages of Hexaplaric origin, which must mean that the change was made at a comparatively late date.” For this, Brock mentions 3Kgdms 15:29 without any further explanation. Again, the case is more complicated than it sounds: Firstly, B has only (ἐπάταξεν) τὸν οἶκον ἱεροβοαμ. Ant has ὅλον τὸν οἶκον. A and others, and evidently Origen *sub asterisco* read σύμπαντα. So, again there is a shorter reading in B, which is different from MT and there are two other different readings which represent MT, but differently. Again, it is hard to decide which of these two is older: σύμπαντα seems to be more in line with kaige’s rendering of כָּל with πᾶς, so it may represent some Hebraising influence. But σύμπαντα is not the same as πᾶς or πάντα (Brock does not mention the difference). Brock assumes that ὅλον is later, although there is no real reason except his general assumptions about Lucian and Lucianic recension. Beyond that, Brock’s statement is misleading. Even if Ant’s ὅλον were secondary against Origen’s σύμπαντα, Origen’s lifetime would not be the *terminus a quo*. Origen astericised σύμπαντα, this means he considered it as a plus compared with his Hebrew text (which in this case was not identical with MT!). – In other words: Origen did not create or insert this word, rather he found it in the textual tradition. We don’t know, how old it is, it may go back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E. or to the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E. or B.C.E., but it certainly is older than Origen. The very fact, that it is *sub asterisco* means that it is not from Origen, and therefore, Origen is not the *terminus a quo* for the Ant reading ὅλον, even if it were secondary against σύμπαντα. – Brock’s argument is simply wrong and is no real reason to date the Ant after Origen.

4.4 Brock goes on with one more example, namely the different renderings of הַטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ: “A different and more frequent type of case does not involve any Hebrew variant. As an example I take 2 Kms 19,38 (39). MT has הַטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ, for which Pal. has the literal τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, while Ant, gives τὸ ἀρεστόν ἐνώπιόν σου. At first sight once again this would seem to be an obvious case of the influence of the Hebraising recension on Pal., but on further investigation doubts arise. Usage elsewhere is unfortunately problematic and cannot decide the issue. But if one looks at the rendering of the same Hebrew phrase in 1 Kms, the tables are turned and suspicion shifts on to Ant. In this book הַטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ is normally rendered τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν, but Ant. regularly substitutes ἀρεστόν<sup>19</sup> for ἀγαθόν. In 1 Kms ἀγαθόν cannot be due to the Palestinian recension, since it is not to be found in this book; and even, supposing for a moment that it were, one would *then* have expected ἐνώπιόν to be altered to ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς<sup>20</sup>, as well as ἀρεστόν to ἀγαθόν. The conclusion must be that ἀγαθόν, at least, of Ant. is secondary in βγ. ἀρεστόν > ἀγαθόν is simply a recensional feature of Ant.” (p.179-180)

This statement again is complicated. If we put the words into a table, it becomes clearer: In the sense of Barthélemy,<sup>21</sup> the situation is as follows:

	1 Kgdms	2 Kgdms 19,38(39) and Pal. throughout
Hebrew	הַטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ	הַטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ
Ant	τὸ ἀρεστόν ἐνώπιόν σου	τὸ ἀρεστόν ἐνώπιόν σου
B (non-kaige)	τὸ ἀγαθόν ἐνώπιόν ...	
B (Pal. / kaige)		τὸ ἀγαθόν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου

<sup>19</sup> Fn: „1Kms 1,23; 3,18; 11,10; 14,36.40.”

<sup>20</sup> Fn: „So regularly in Pal. in βγ.”

<sup>21</sup> Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, does not discuss this example.

This means: Ant is the oldest text (and more or less the Old Greek) and has the identical characteristic in the kaige- and the non-kaige-section. Pal. / kaige adapts exactly to the Hebrew wording. In the non-kaige section the text of B is older, it reads ἐνώπιόν as Ant, but it has ἀγαθόν instead of ἄρεστόν. This could be explained in the way that the text of B shows a first step of formalistic adaptation towards the Hebrew.<sup>22</sup>

Brock notices the difference between the kaige- and the non-kaige-section, and postulates that because according to Barthélemy Pal. / kaige would have changed to τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, and because in 1Kms there is also ἀγαθόν, ἀγαθόν can not be the Palestinian recension (because this recension is not in 1Kgdms), and if it were, also ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς should be expected. – As neither one is the case (but see ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς in 1Kgdms 1,23!) Brock postulates that Ant. must be late. Put in a table, Brock’s view is as follows:

	1 Kms	2 Kms (Pal.)
B	ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιόν	τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου
Ant	τὸ ἄρεστόν ἐνώπιόν σου	τὸ ἄρεστόν ἐνώπιόν σου

Now, this scheme is not impossible. It is just the old picture. But it does not solve the problem that the text within B is different. In fact, Brocks argumentation is a false syllogism, because he jumps from the semantic difference within B to dating Ant. The problem of the semantic difference within B falls under the table. - If Brock would explain the difference in B he would come to some kind of two levels in the text of B, and he would have to find some reason for it (be it a different translation technique or a revision). This would lead to a similar differentiation in B as shown above for Barthélemy’s view. The difference is just the place of Ant. and how it can be explained. - Again: Brock’s view is possible, but the mere possibility is no proof against the other solution.

**4.5** Finally, Brock once more tries to give a date for the Lucianic recension. A good reason would be if it could be shown that the Antiochene fathers before Lucian used a text different from the Lucianic text, while later on they used Lucian’s text: “if the pre-Lucian Antiochene fathers exhibit a text related to, but not identical with, our present Antiochene text, while post-Lucian writers provide this text exactly as we know it, then the traditional ascription may have some truth in it, for the Antiochene text will have received its final formulation during Lucian’s *floruit*.” (p. 181).

This indeed would be helpful (although the argument presupposes that there was only one text type around), but: “Unfortunately, however, the quotations from Kms are not extensive enough in pre-Lucian writers for a satisfactory analysis of their text, but to judge from what meagre indications there are, neither they, nor for that matter any other pre-Lucian witness, exhibit an Antiochene text in the form we know it to-day. The first writer who definitely does do so, is in fact a pupil of Lucian’s, Asterius Sophista, who died sometime after 341. This is quite clear from his Homilies on the Psalms, recently edited by M. Richard, for in these Asterius has several quotations, some fairly long, taken from Kms. Their text is virtually identical with the Antiochene text.” (p. 181). Brock goes on to say: “Thus what evidence there is, and it is admittedly not full enough to be at all satisfactory, does point to the Antiochene text as having received its final formulation at a time close to Lucian. For this reason I see no objection to keeping the traditional designation of this text as Lucianic, remembering, of course, that very many of its peculiarities are pre-Lucian.” (p.180)

That the Antiochene fathers of the fourth century confirm the Lucianic text is a well known and accepted fact. The problem is the time before Lucian. Brock is very vague on this and names no

<sup>22</sup> 1 Kgdms 1:23, the first of the cases mentioned by Brock [see Fn. 19], even has ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.



single author and gives not even one example of the “meagre indications”. So his conclusion (“thus what evidence there is”) is unfounded and creates a false impression.

On the other hand, Brock keeps silent about the evidence we really have: This is the evidence of the Old Latin translation which confirms the Antiochene text to a very high degree, and which goes back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E., and therefore not only antedates Lucian but also the Hexapla, and there are the quotations by Josephus.<sup>23</sup> Again, the contradicting evidence<sup>24</sup> falls under the table.

To sum up:

- Brock presents the basic ideas of Barthélemy’s “Les Devanciers” and he discusses some of his points, basically by giving a number of rather isolated examples. Most of the examples are from beyond the texts, Barthélemy had analysed. This also applies to the examples for semantic change in the kaige-revision (Brock does not take up the examples discussed by Barthélemy and practically ignores the subject). This certainly can be done, but it would have been more convincing to take up more of what is argued against and to show that there are better explanations.

- Most of Brock’s examples and reasons are rather strained, some are very complicated or with inconclusive arguments, some are simply wrong or misleading. And it is a serious problem that contradicting evidence is left aside.

- Several of Brock’s examples and decisions are possible or at least not impossible. Brock presents his cases as proofs against Barthélemy, but the mere possibility is not yet a proof.

- On the contrary, one may say, that Barthélemy’s view of the Antiochene text as being close to the Old Greek is not refuted; Brock’s examples rather confirm Barthélemy’s view; and they show that the discovery of the kaige-recension and the new evaluation of the Antiochene text belong close together.<sup>25</sup>

## 5) Barthélemy and beyond.

It is amazing that Brock’s rather short paper became so influential and that it never was seriously checked. This cannot only be explained by that paper itself, but rather because it confirmed the old assumptions about the Lucianic text as most scholars were used to, and at the same time it seemed to allow accepting the kaige-recension, which could hardly be ignored because of the findings from Qumran and the Judean desert.

**5.1** So, a first question may be, if the discovery of the kaige-recension and the new evaluation of the Antiochene text are really as independent as they are usually treated since Brock. Now, at least for the kaige-sections accepting the kaige-revision means that the kaige-text, i.e. the text of Codex Vaticanus, cannot be the Old Greek. If Ant. basically is Lucianic, there is a vacuum, because there is no other text type to really fill the gap and the hexaplaric or some reconstructed text becomes all the more important. So, is Barthélemy only redating the Ant in order to fill the

---

<sup>23</sup> Both, the evidence of Josephus and of the Old Latin and the ancient Latin fathers, are not without problems, but there has been enough critical discussion that established the importance of these textual traditions for the so-called proto-Lucianic material; cf. N. Fernandez Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 232-234 and the literature quoted there.

<sup>24</sup> I don’t want to argue about the evidence from Qumran. Unfortunately the publication of the Samuel manuscripts has been delayed over decades. But some of the evidence was known and explicitly related to the Septuagint long before Brock delivered his paper: F.M. Cross, A New Qumran biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew underlying the Septuagint[!] (BASOR 132, 1953), 15-26.

<sup>25</sup> Therefore it is important that Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, showed that the Antiochene text is not unrelated to the kaige-text, but that it represents its Vorlage („identité de base entre la forme antiochienne et la forme palestinienne du text grec“, p. 92-102), and that on the other hand, the Antiochene text cannot be deduced from the kaige-text („la forme antiochienne ne peut être issue de la forme palestinienne par abâtardissement“, p. 110-113).

vacuum? If one reads Barthélemy, it becomes clear that this is not the case. As I understand Barthélemy, this was not his starting point. Yet, as mentioned above, he asks about the base text for the kaige-recension and comes to the conclusion that it must be a text like Ant. (see above, fn. 25: “identité de base entre la forme antiochienne et la forme palestinienne du text grec“, p. 92-102), which therefore is older than kaige and close to the OG. On the other hand, he showed, that the Antiochene text cannot be deduced from the kaige-text (see above, fn. 25: „la forme antiochienne ne peut être issue de la forme palestinienne par abâtardissement“, p. 110-113). So, the discovery of the kaige-recension and the new evaluation of the Ant. are two sides of the same coin. This is not because of speculation or because of fear of a vacuum at the place of the Old Greek, it is simply because indeed the Ant. represents the text which was used and revised by the kaige revisors.

By a different approach – and before reading and understanding Barthélemy in this way – I have come to a similar conclusion. Traditionally it is said that Lucian in his revision improved the Greek style and that in order to do so he added articles and explaining words. But the problem is that Lucian was doing this very irregularly, not only adding, but also deleting the article or explaining words. Instead of questioning the analyses, already Rahlfs declared this irregularity as a further trait of Lucian’s work and he was followed by many authors, also in other books, like in Jeremiah.<sup>26</sup> Against this, I have found, that if one allows Ant to be the older text, the changes can be explained consistently. In order to make this observation of a consistent explanation, one can not just pick single cases, but one has to analyse coherent passages.<sup>27</sup> The observations confirm Barthélemy’s view that Ant. basically represents the Old Greek.

**5.2** At the end of his paper Brock made a statement about the Lucianic text being of mixed character, basically late, i.e. Lucianic, but with older components. “For this reason I see no objection to keeping the traditional designation of this text as Lucianic, remembering, of course, that very many of its peculiarities are pre-Lucian. The task for the future remains to separate the Lucianic from the pre-Lucianic in this text.” (p 180). That’s the traditional view since Rahlfs, (*Lucians Recension*, 1911) although these pre-Lucianic parts have been determined differently. Rahlfs pushed aside the evidence of Josephus and the Old Latin as much as he could, by explaining most agreements with Josephus as mere coincidence and the agreements with the Old Latin as secondary adaptations. Others, especially more recent authors who had the Qumran evidence in mind, tended to a larger share of pre-Lucianic text, although even e.g. E. Tov and E. Ulrich<sup>28</sup> tried to reconcile their observations with the traditional view of the Lucianic recension. So, most of the research on the Lucianic text has become a compromise between the insights of

---

<sup>26</sup> See above, part 2, (Rahlfs, *Lucians Recension* 1911, 293: „der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips“ [„the main trait of this recension is the absence of a clear rule“], or J. Ziegler, *Ieremias-Septuaginta* 1958, 163) “Konsequenz war nicht seine Stärke.” [“being consequent was not his strength”]).

<sup>27</sup> The first time I presented such observations (together with a chapter on early Jewish hermeneutics) was at the joint meeting of the “Bible d’Alexandrie” and “Septuaginta-deutsch” at Strassbourg in 2004; unfortunately, the publication of this congress took a long time. See now: S. Kreuzer, „Das frühjüdische Textverständnis und die Septuaginta-Versionen der Samuelbücher. Ein Beitrag zur textgeschichtlichen und übersetzungstechnischen Bewertung des Antiochenischen Textes und der Kaige-Rezension an Hand von 2 Sam 15,1-12“ (Strasbourg 2004), in *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d’Alexandrie*, (ed. W. Kraus / O. Munnich; OBO 238; Fribourg: Herder / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2010), 3-28. Further studies on the subject are: S. Kreuzer, “Towards the Old Greek. New Criteria for the Evaluation of the Recensions of the Septuagint (especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige-Recension)”, in *Congress Volume Lubljana 2007*, ed. M. Peters; SCS 55; Atlanta 2008), 239-253; S. Kreuzer, “Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns”, BIOSCS 43 (2009), 34-51; and S. Kreuzer, “Textformen und Bearbeitungen. Kriterien zur Frage der ältesten Textgestalt, insbesondere des Septuaginatextes, anhand von 2 Samuel 12“, in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel. The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. P. Hugo / A. Schenker; VTS 132; Leiden: Brill 2010), 91-115.

<sup>28</sup> E. Tov, “Lucian and Proto-Lucian”, RB 79 (1972), 101-113; E. C. Ulrich, “4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Septuagintal Research”, BIOSCS 8 (1975), 26-27.

Barthélemy and from the Qumran biblical texts (not to mention the witness from Josephus and the Old Latin) on the one hand and the traditional view that there was – or must have been – a Lucianic redaction on the other hand. This implies the assumption that the character of the Lucianic text changes along the fractures where we by chance have a Qumran fragment (or a quotation by Josephus or a fragment of the Old Latin) – an assumption which hardly can be justified. Although Brock tried to use the argument the other way around, he is at least right with his view, that the character of the Lucianic text in Sam-Kings is basically the same throughout.<sup>29</sup>

**5.3** All these facts and observation lead back – or maybe better: forward – to Barthélemy. Should we also go beyond Barthélemy? Now, Barthélemy gave us a groundbreaking work. Yet, he had to work with what he had and he concentrated on his new findings as they became possible because of the Nahal Hever scroll. Today we have much more of the Qumran biblical texts and we have an excellent critical edition of the Antiochene text with an apparatus including the testimonies of Josephus, the text of the Old Latin and quotations of the Antiochene fathers, and we have several decades of research on these questions.<sup>30</sup>

Barthélemy gave a new evaluation of the Antiochene text as basically representing the Old Greek though with changes and corruptions. This view excludes the traditional view of an ample Lucianic redaction. I think this is basically correct, although I would not exclude that there may have been some minor protolucianic (i.e. between the Old Greek and the Ant as we have it) or Lucianic redaction; but this must be shown and not only postulated.

Barthélemy concentrated on the kaige-section, because that was what related to the redaction he discovered in the Nahal Hever scroll. Today, Barthélemy's kaige-recension is widely accepted, and many also accept the other side of the coin, his new evaluation of the Ant.<sup>31</sup>

The question is about the non-kaige-sections. As the character of the text in Codex Vaticanus changes, its relation to Ant. also changes. In the kaige-section Ant. clearly is older and the text of B is the revised text. In the non-kaige-sections we have two so to say competing texts: The B-text, traditionally hold as very close to (or even more or less identical with) the Old Greek, and the Ant., also being very close to the Old Greek. This is, where further – and open minded – discussion has to go on and hopefully will bring us forward.

---

<sup>29</sup> It cannot be excluded that the character of the text may change within a Lucianic manuscript (just as the text of B changes between the kaige- and the non-kaige-section), but so far nobody made such an observation for the text within Sam-Kings (there is such a change in Ruth 4, 11, where the Mss 19 and 108 become Lucianic; cf. A. Rahlfs, *Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth* (MSU 3, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922), 77.)

<sup>30</sup> N. Fernandez Marcos/J. R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega, I, 1-2 Samuel; II, 1-2 Reyes; III, 1-2 Crónicas* (TECC 50, 53, 60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC 1989, 1992, 1996).

<sup>31</sup> At his point another problem may be mentioned, which is not taken up by Brock but which has some importance in the discussion; that is the relation of the Ant to the three younger translations, especially to Symmachus. There are cases where Ant and Symmachus exclusively agree, which shows that there must have been some contact. Normally these observations are seen as a proof, that 1) Lucian knew and used Symmachus and 2) that the Lucianic recension is post-Hexaplaric. This view is referred to e.g. in N. Fernandez Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context, 2000*, 230: „additions taken from ‘the three’, particularly from Symmachus” and 232: “From the earliest research it had already been noted that in the Lucianic recension there were two clearly differentiated components: 1. some late material, certainly post-Hexaplaric, included in the time of the historical Lucian; 2. an underlying layer of very ancient readings, earlier than the time of Lucian.” Yet these agreements can be explained in another way as well: Symmachus did his work not without knowing and using the Old Greek. Agreements between Ant and Symmachus may as well be explained by their common relation to the Old Greek. Especially in cases where a word has been changed by the kaige-recension or some other revision, specific words of the OG may have been preserved in Ant and in Symmachus only. – Now, this possibility is not a proof, but it certainly shows that the traditional assumption is not the only explanation of the phenomenon and not proof for a late Lucianic redaction. Yet it is less complicated, because one needs not to explain how Lucian came to use Symmachus or the Hexapla.

**5.4** Most probably the decisions will not always be the same. Even if the Ant. is “essentiellement la Septante ancienne” [“essentially the ancient Septuagint”], it is also “abâtardie ou corrompue” [“disturbed or corrupted”]. But also the text of B in the non-kaige-sections clearly is not always the oldest text, but it exhibits clear examples of disturbances and corruptions and it has interesting phenomena which point to hebraising influences or even revision.

**5.4.1** An interesting example is what we discussed above in regard to 2Kgdms 19: 38 (39) and other cases of the translation of הטוב בעיניך. If we allow Ant to be old, the explanation would be that ἀγαθόν (instead of ἀρεστόν) in 1Kgdms 1:23; 3:18; 11:10; 14:36,40 is a semantic adaptation to the Hebrew טוב. Interestingly, in 1Kgdms 1:23 there is not ἐνώπιόν but, so to say one step further, also the kaige rendering ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς. While the usual changes to ἀγαθόν look like a mild hebraising revision, the one case of ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς in 1:23 looks like a cross influence from a kaige-manuscript or because the scribe had this “biblical” expression in his mind.

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

**5.4.2** Most interesting is the case of ἡ / τὴ Βααλ in 3Kgt 19:18. (7000 in Israel did not bow to Baal). This verse is taken up in the New Testament in Rom 11:4 and it was discussed by Rahlfs in his “Lucians Recension” 1911, p. 251; i.e., Rahlfs discussed some of the differences between B and Ant. and the agreement of Ant with Rom 11 (see below). As in other cases, Rahlfs pushed aside the agreement between Ant. and the New Testament by explaining it as an influence from Romans (see below: “aus dem Zitat Röm 11,5”; “Nivellierung mit V. 10 und Röm 11,3”; “aus Röm 11,4”).

18<sup>24</sup> הַנְּעַי עֲפָרָה Ⓜ] + σημερον ℣: aus v. 28.  
 19<sup>10. 14</sup> וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה Ⓜ] και υπελειφθη ℣:  
 aus dem Zitat Röm. 11b, wo jedoch καγω υπελειφθη statt  
 και υπελειφθη εγω.  
 19<sup>14</sup> וְהָיָה וְהָיָה (oder -λον) Ⓜ] κατεσκαψαν ℣: Ni-  
 vellierung mit v. 10 und Röm. 11a. Auch das vorherge-  
 hende την διαθηκην σου ändert ℣ nach v. 10 in σε, ebenso  
 jedoch A und B (aber B hat την διαθηκην σου neben σε).  
 19<sup>18</sup> וְהָיָה וְהָיָה Ⓜ] εκαμψαν γονυ ℣ 121 244  
 247: aus Röm. 11a.

(Rahlfs, Lucians Recension, 251)

Amazingly, Rahlfs did not mention the most remarkable reading τη Βααλ. This is the only occurrence of Baal in the New Testament and strangely with the female article. This strange expression occurs many times in the Septuagint, starting from Judg 2:13 (A-text) and through Sam and Kings, and also in other books, esp. Jeremiah. Most probably the female article is a kind of Ketib-Qere in the Greek, indicating that one should avoid the name of Baal and read ἡ αἰσχύνη.<sup>32</sup> However the phenomenon may be explained, it is given up in the kaige-recension which reads Baal with the male article τῷ Βααλ (see e.g. Judg. 2:13; 10:6,10 etc.). Also in 3Kgt 19:18 τη Βααλ has been changed to Baal with male article, τῷ Βααλ. The situation is as follows.<sup>33</sup>

וְהָיָה וְהָיָה בְּיַשְׂרָאֵל שְׁבַע עָלְפִים כָּל-הַבְּרָפְּיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא-כָרְעוּ לְבַעַל וְכָל-הַפְּהָאֵי אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נָשְׁקוּ לוֹ:

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

Strangely, Rahlfs discussed the other variants, but he did not mention τη Βααλ.<sup>34</sup> Indeed it would be impossible to explain all the occurrences of ἡ Βααλ etc. as having originated from Rom 11:4 influencing 3Kgdms 19:18 and having spread out from there throughout the Septuagint. Because of the general situation of τη Βααλ > τῷ Βααλ, also in 3Kgdms 19:18 the reading in Ant. is clearly older than the reading in B. In B it is changed to the usual form with the masculine article. At first view, this change in B looks like an isolated adaptation to the reading practice

<sup>32</sup> Cf. S. Kreuzer, „Übersetzung – Revision – Überlieferung. Probleme und Aufgaben in den Geschichtsbüchern“, in X Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse (ed. : P. Hugo / A. Schenker; WUNT 252, Tübingen: Mohr 2010), 108-110.

<sup>33</sup> There are other interesting details which can only be mentioned briefly: The προσεκύνησεν at the end presupposes הוֹדוּתָהּ, to acclaim, to pay homage, instead of קָשַׁן, to kiss. As Ant and B agree, this will have been the OG / its Vorlage. The difference ἐν Ἰσραηλ / ἐξ Ἰσραηλ probably goes back to a scribal error כ / נ in the Hebrew. If the difference “I will leave” / “you will leave” goes back to the Greek or the Hebrew, is hardly to decide. But as B also keeps close to its Hebrew reference text it looks like that was different from MT (as it was with προσεκύνησεν).

<sup>34</sup> It is also not in the apparatus of A. Rahlfs(/R. Hanhart), Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935/2006). Brook-McLean clearly have it and show that not only the typical Antiochene manuscripts testify to it.

which would have returned to Baal instead of αἰσχύουνη. Yet, the article before Baal is not the only change in 3Kgdms 19:18. There are several other words which have been changed as well (see above, Rahlfs' discussion). So, the text of B also at this point is not just an isolated change of the reading of Baal, but again shows a real revision which changed several words.

## **6. Conclusion**

This first detailed evaluation of Brock's most influential paper has shown that its seemingly convincing arguments and examples are problematic and misleading or at best mere possibilities but no real proof against Barthélemy's insights, especially his new evaluation of the Lucianic/Antiochene text as "essentially the ancient Septuagint", although with corruptions. This changes the largely assumed view, that the Ant is a mixture of an old substratum and an extensive Lucianic revision, and leads to accepting the importance of the secondary witnesses like Josephus and the Old Latin and especially the Qumran biblical texts. With and beyond Barthélemy it is demonstrated that also in the non-kaige-sections the text of Codex Vaticanus has undergone an – although milder – Hebraising revision, corrections and cross-influences. So, for the search of the Old Greek in the non-kaige-sections, both textual traditions, Ant. and B, have to be considered as equal candidates which should be evaluated openly and without preliminary decision.

-----