

Antiochian Readings of 1–4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers.

MARTIN MEISER

I. Introduction

After a long period of research influenced by Rahlfs' view on the so-called Lucianic or Antiochene text, the question of the character of this text-form is re-opened, but so far there is no consensus: Some hold the view inclining to Rahlfs' thesis that, in sum, this text is a recensional text despite the existence of single readings which are witnessed before the lifetime of Lucian the martyr¹; other scholars consider this text as the main source for the Old Greek despite readings which are to be seen as recensional.² Just describing the character of the Antiochene text does not lead to a consensus, because there are two possibilities that cannot be decided by themselves: Either the first translator made a translation closest to the Hebrew Vorlage, and this text has been improved later towards better Greek, along to the line of διόρθωσις in the Christian church³, or the first translator made a translation in more-or-less good Greek, and this text has been corrected towards the Hebrew Vorlage. There is also no consensus with regard to possible implications due to the

¹ Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthelemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968), 176–81; Bernard Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992–93); Timothy M. Law and Tuukka Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer," *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), 73–87; Jonathan Robker, "The Greek Framework of Kings: Indicators of Recension," in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010* (ed. Melvin K.H. Peters, SBL.SCS, 59; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 207–18.

² Siegfried Kreuzer, "'Lukian redivivus' or Barthélemy and Beyond?," in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010* (ed. Melvin K.H. Peters; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 243–61. See already Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10, Leiden: Brill, 1963), 127: The Antiochian text "c'est la vieille Septante, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue."

³ Barbara Aland, "Neutestamentliche Textforschung und Textgeschichte. Erwägungen zu einem notwendigen Thema," *NTS* 36 (1990), 337–58.

fact that some characteristics of the Antiochene text occur not only in the kaige-sections, but in the non-kaige-sections as well: According to some scholars this emphasizes the recensional character of this text-type;⁴ for other scholars this continuity confirms that it is the same old text throughout.⁵

An important factor for the evaluation of the Antiochene text was its close relationship to the biblical text that was used by Josephus. Already Adam Mez discovered and described this close relationship and it was later confirmed by Thackeray and more recently by Natalio Fernández Marcos and Maria Victoria Spottorno.⁶ This close relation would prove the existence of this text already in the 1st cent. C.E., i.e. long before Lucian's lifetime. However, Rahlfs on the other side tried to minimize this point and explained the agreements as later cross-influence between the manuscripts. He did the same with the agreements between the Antiochene text and the Old Latin. This evaluation of the Antiochene/Lucianic text became most influential for Rahlfs' own edition and for many other scholars. However, it was weakened by the discovery of the Qumran texts that also frequently agree with the Lucianic text. For these texts it was not only hard to assume that the Greek text would have influenced the Hebrew texts, but there could be no cross-influence at all as the Qumran texts were hidden in their caves for two thousand years. Consequently, one either has to accept that the Lucianic text is old altogether or one has to consider it a mixed text with early parts and late parts. In the first sense Emanuel Tov already in 1972 stated that the Lucianic text is "the Old Greek or one Old Greek". That the Antiochene text is more or less the Old Greek although with corruptions and probably also some corrections was the result of Barthélemy's investigations⁷ and later on and by a

⁴ Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian redivivus", 181; Timothy M. Law and Tuukka Kauhanen, "Remarks", 74.

⁵ Kreuzer, "Barthélemy and Beyond", 252f, 258f.

⁶ Adam Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895); Maria Victoria Spottorno, "Some Remarks on Josephus' Biblical Text for 1-2 Kgs," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986* (ed. C. E. Cox, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 277–85; eadem, "Josephus' Text for 1-2 Kings 3-4 Kingdoms," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Paris 1992* (ed. L. Greenspoon, O. Munnich; SCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 145–52; Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Vetus Latina of 1-2 Kings and the Hebrew," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Paris 1992* (ed. L. Greenspoon, O. Munnich; SCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 153–63.

⁷ Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers*, esp. 127 (see the quotation in fn. 2). In a later statement ("A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2-1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of

different approach also that of Siegfried Kreuzer. The second position is maintained e.g. by Philippe Hugo who speaks about the Antiochene mixture or by Tuukka Kauhanen, who describes “The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel” by comparing the suggested agreements between the manuscript group *L* and Qumran, Josephus, the early church fathers, and who concludes: Many suggested agreements are only coincidental; of the indisputable agreements nineteen are agreements in the original reading, twenty in a secondary reading. According to Kauhanen, the Lucianic text is a recensional text but presents “under the recensional layer(s) ... very old, even original readings that have not been preserved in B”.⁸

In this situation it may be of interest to look for quotations of the Septuagint in early Christian writings before the time of Lucian and to evaluate their text form, i.e. to check if they represent Antiochene readings or others.

Before doing so we may consider what we can look for and the possible relevance of the findings. It is clear that at the time of the early apologists and church fathers, i.e. in the 2nd and 3rd cent. C.E., there existed both, the Old Greek and the hebraizing revisions (like the kaige-recension). Therefore it would not be a surprise to find either text-form. This also means that a quotation of one text-form only confirms this text-form, but it does not prove that the other text-form did not exist at that time as well. However, a quotation in the Antiochene form of the text would prove that this reading existed already before Lucian and that it cannot be considered as being created by the Lucianic redaction (in its traditional sense).

The following investigation will concentrate on the four books of Reigns⁹ because this is the main area of discussion since Thackeray identified the

Certain Criticisms of Les Devanciers D'Aquila.” [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2, 1972], 16-89), Barthélemy accepted, that also the Antiochene text may have undergone not only unintentional corruptions but also some intentional revision. However, he did not give a date for this possible revision and also the mere amount of it would be far from the traditionally assumed “Lucianic redaction”.

⁸ Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (De Septuaginta Investigationes, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 191.

⁹ For the Greek and Hebrew texts the following editions are used: Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean and Henry St. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek, II/1 Samuel* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1927); *II/2 1 and 2 Kings* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1930); Alfred Rahlfs (/ Robert Hanhart), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 (/ 2006)); Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramon Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega, I, 1-2 Samuel; II, 1-2 Reyes* (TECC 50, 53, Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC 1989, 1992); *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed.

different translation styles, later on identified as the kaige- and the non-kaige sections, since Rahlfs wrote on the Lucianic text in the book of Kings and since Barthélemy applied his findings from the Naḥal Ḥever Dodekapropheton scroll to the kaige section of 2Samuel. Admittedly, I-IV Reigns are not the most important books for Early Christianity. The so-called Apostolic Fathers do not quote them; within Early Christian apologetic literature it is only Justin Martyr who sometimes uses these books, but only rarely in a way suitable for text-critical investigation. From the third century, there is an increasing number of quotations, but some of them again are unsatisfying for text-critical research. However, there are relevant passages and there are even some really interesting phenomena, e.g. where there are both, apparently Antiochene and seemingly non-Antiochene, readings of a biblical text within the corpus of one distinct Christian author.

This paper presents the readings that are relevant for textual criticism from the works of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen in a comprehensive way. Novatian, Hippolytus of Rome and Methodius of Olympus offer but one or two names.

II. Septuagint quotations from 1-4 Reigns in Early Church Fathers

Justin Martyr (ca. 100 – 165)

Within the works of Justin Martyr, some occurrences of the so-called Antiochene text (= Ant) are known;¹⁰ the books of Kings, however, were not really important for Justin; allusions to 2 Reigns 6,7f. and 4 Reigns 6:1-7 have minimal use for textual history.¹¹ Referring to 2 Reigns 7:13f.,¹² Justin quotes in V. 14 only Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι in analogy to Codex Vaticanus (=MT) and not καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι in analogy to the Antiochene text; but probably the omission of καὶ can be explained very simply because it is the beginning of the verse quoted. The quotation of 3 Reigns 19:14.18 in Dial. 39:1 offers a spe-

Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1967-1977, 5th ed. 1997 (= 2007); Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (VT.S 134, Leiden: Brill, 2010).

¹⁰ Martin Meiser, "Die Septuaginta-Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei Justin," in *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity/Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum* (ed. Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer; SBL.SCS 60, Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 323–48.

¹¹ Justin, Dial. 133.2 (PTS 47:299; there are nowhere witnesses for δαμάλεις instead of βόας and for νεοτόκους instead of πρωτοτόκους); Dial. 86.6 (PTS 47:220).

¹² Justin, Dial. 118.2 (PTS 47:273).

cial problem: The order “killing prophets – destroying the altars” has no parallel in any witness of Biblical textual transmission;¹³ the readings *ὑπελείφθην* and *ἔκαμψαν* (instead of *ᾠκλασαν*) are parallel to Rom 11:3–4 and the Antiochene manuscripts.¹⁴ About 25 years ago already, Maria Victoria Spottorno characterized them as Protolucianic, i.e. old readings.¹⁵ Interestingly, the reading *τῆ Βααλ* is a stable reading within Justin’s works (he always refers to 3Reigns, not to Rom 11:4).¹⁶ This reading which is found in the Antiochene manuscripts of 3 Reigns is clearly Old Greek. In codex Vaticanus and most other manuscripts the article is changed to the appropriate masculine article (as in the B-text of Judges).¹⁷ The name of David’s successor, *Σολομών*¹⁸ (as opposed to *Σαλομών* in Codex Vaticanus), is in analogy to the Antiochene text as well. To sum up: Justin Martyr clearly testifies to Antiochene readings.

Irenaeus of Lyon (ca. 135 – ca. 200)

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 15:22¹⁹, the phrase “non vult ...” presupposes Ant *οὐ θέλει*, and not *Εἰ θελήτῳ* (Codex Vaticanus); but there is a difference between the Latin (“non”) and the Armenian (“numquid”) translation.²⁰ In the continuation, the *γάρ*, which, amidst the text, has no equivalent in MT, is missing as in Codex Vaticanus, whereas the word order *auditus bonus super sacrificium* is congruent to Ant *ἀκοῇ ἀγαθῇ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν* and not to B *ἀκοῇ ὑπὲρ θυσίαν ἀγαθῇ* (identical with the word order of MT and probably adapted to it).

¹³ This word order reoccurs in Origen, comm. Rom. 8:1 (FC 2/4:192).

¹⁴ MS 19; 93; 127 read *ὑπελήφθην*; 82 reads *ὑπολέλιμμα*, in analogy to Codex Vaticanus *ὑπολέλειμμα*.

¹⁵ Maria Victoria Spottorno, “The Lucianic Text of Kgs in the NT,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 279–84), 280–81.

¹⁶ Justin, Dial. 39.1; 46.6 (PTS 47:134, 146).

¹⁷ The female article most probably indicates that instead of Baal one should read *αἰσχύνῃ*, shame (cf. already August Dillmann, „Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel“, *Monatsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*, 1881, 601–620; see also the explanation in *Septuaginta-Deutsch* [ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011], 248, fn. to Judg 2:13). The reading in 3Reigns 19:18 is not found in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, but in Brooke/McLean/Thackeray, *Samuel*.

¹⁸ Justin, Dial. 34.1, 2, 7; 85.1 (PTS 47:125, 127, 216).

¹⁹ Irenaeus, Haer. 4:17.1 (SC 100:574–77).

²⁰ Most of Irenaeus’ Greek works are extant in Latin translation only, some parts also in Armenian translation.

In Haer. 4.26.4, Irenaeus quotes 1 Reigns 12:3–5.²¹ The Antiochene Text offers the personal pronoun ὑμῶν at several places, Irenaeus has this, according to the Latin translation [“vestrum”] but not in Greek only in the beginning, without agreement to B and MT respectively, where the phrase מִי מִמֶּנִּי is not attested at all. This textform that is close to the Antiochene text can later on also be found in John Chrysostom and Theodoret. On the other hand, neither the Antiochene plus καὶ ἀπέκρυψα τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου ἐν αὐτῷ nor the concluding ἡμῶν of V. 4 nor the clarifying λαός in V. 5 has any equivalent in Irenaeus’ text.

In the reference to the Story of David, Nathan and Bathseba²² – within Thackeray’s section ββ – one seemingly non-Antiochene reading in 2 Reigns 11:27b (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Κυρίου instead of ἐνώπιον Κυρίου)²³ and one clearly Antiochene reading in 2 Reigns 12:6 (τετραπλασίονα) are to be noted, the latter one also witnessed by Josephus.²⁴ This reading is analogous to the MT (whereas Codex Vaticanus offers the older ἐπταπλασίονα). This fourfold retribution most probably is an accommodation to Exod. 21:37 by some (early?) Hebrew revisor. Interestingly only Codex Vaticanus preserves the sevenfold retribution which most probably is the original text. Irenaeus presupposes a reading that is also present in Ant.

Irenaeus’ rendering of 3 Reigns 18²⁵ offers some interesting aspects: He quotes 3 Reigns 18:21 without the concluding ὑμῶν in the first half and without δεῦτε καὶ in the midst of the second half. So he uses a text close to but not identical to the known Antiochene witnesses. But how to evaluate the seemingly Antiochene variants? The wording ὑμῶν may be an adaptation to common Biblical style made by Irenaeus himself. A plus like δεῦτε can be part of original translation as the usage of δεῦτε in analogous contexts shows (cf. Ps 45 [46]:8; 65 [66]:5; Mi 4:2, in any case for ἤλῃ). Back to 3 Reigns 18:21b: Is δεῦτε καὶ the rendering of an original Hebrew reading הִלֵּךְ לְבָנֶיךָ, that intensified Elijah’s demand, whereas MT has לְבָנֶיךָ only, which then is followed by B?

²¹ Irenaeus Haer. 4:26.4 (SC 100:724–26).

²² Irenaeus, Haer. 4:27:1 (SC 100:732). – It is not sure that Irenaeus used the non-Antiochene text. Perhaps he applied to Biblical language in a free way.

²³ It looks like Irenaeus in this case presupposes a kaige reading, or maybe he used “biblical” language in a free way.

²⁴ Irenaeus, Haer. 4:27.1 (SC 100:732–33); Josephus, Ant 7:150.

²⁵ Irenaeus, Haer. 3:6.3 (SC 211:72–75).

3 Reigns 18:24 is cited with the Antiochene plus *σήμερον*. This *σήμερον* is probably influenced by 18:36: *ἐπάκουσόν μου σήμερον ἐν πυρί*. This thesis of contextual influence of a reading implies its secondary character; but probably this context-influenced reading already was in the Hebrew *Vorlage* or it was the work of the translator, well versed in Jewish exegesis, and not the work of a Christian revisor; Christian authors would rather make a comment but not change the biblical texts.

3 Reigns 18:36 is quoted without the Antiochene *μόνος*. Nevertheless, even if we could not find any witness to this *μόνος* in Early Jewish or Christian rendering of 3 Reigns 18:36, this *μόνος* could be an old insertion made by the translator of the Old Greek due to his own theological insights.

Rendering the story of Elijah at Mt. Horeb²⁶, Irenaeus quotes 3 Reigns 19:11 (*Κύριος παρελεύσεται*) in the word order of the Antiochene text, while B with *παρελεύσεται Κύριος* has the word order of MT. Even if one does not follow the explanation that the B text is adapted to the Hebrew, we can conclude that we do not have to wait for Irenaeus (who quotes a text available to him) or for Lucian at the end of the 3rd century for this wording.

In the quotation of 3 Reigns 19:12 in Haer. 4:20.10 (SC 100:656), Irenaeus does not presuppose the final *κάκει Κύριος*, but we cannot draw any conclusion because just at this point there ends the quotation of 3 Reigns 19.

Tertullian (after 150 – after 220)

The first remarkable quotation to be discussed immediately reveals both the uncertainty and the fruitfulness of some of our research. Rendering 1 Reigns 2:8²⁷, Tertullian formulates *sedere eum faciat*; this is near to the Antiochene *τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτόν* and different from the single word *καθίσαι* in Codex Vaticanus. This additional *eum* could be a stylistic improvement by Tertullian independently of an Antiochene *Vorlage*, yet the Antiochene reading itself can be the Old Greek.²⁸ The sing. *λαοῦ* at the end of the verse is not restricted to Antiochene text-forms, but has a wider attestation, e.g. it is also attested in the Old Latin. Interestingly, B, A and others read the plural *λαῶν*, while MT has no equivalent. Evidently, the OG interpreted the preposition *עַל* of the (proto-)MT as “people”. Probably the singular is original, because the plural would require *עַלְמֵי* and probable came about as

²⁶ Irenaeus Haer. 4:20.10 (SC 100:656-7).

²⁷ Tertullian, Marc. 4:14.6 (CC.SL 1:575).

²⁸ Cf. Kauhanen, *Problem*, 93.

amplification within the Greek tradition. In either case, “people” is the Old Greek reading and it is interesting that Tertullian agrees with the singular version of this reading as it is testified in the Antiochene text. Tertullian shows that this Antiochene reading is old.

In 1 Reigns 15:28–9, Tertullian, *Macr.* 2:24.7 (CC.SL 1:503) reads *Discidit dominus regnum Israhelis de manu tua [...] et scindetur Israel in duas partes et non conuertetur neque paenitentiam aget, quia non sicut homo est ad paenitendum*. In the first part, the words *regnum Israhelis de manu tua* are in correspondance to Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus (and to MT) whereas Codex Vaticanus shares the reading witnessed also by Antiochene manuscripts (τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ ἐκ χειρός σου), i.e. “your kingdom away from Israel out of your hand”. This reading most probably is the original Old Greek, because there is hardly a reason, why “kingdom of Israel” should be changed to “your kingdom away from Israel out of your hand”, while on the other hand, “kingdom of Israel” can be explained as adaptation to MT. In the second half, *scindetur* is close to the Antiochene *σχισθήσεται*, not to *διαιρεθήσεται*; the presupposed *יצח* is rendered sometimes by *διαιρέω* but not by *σχίζω*. According to Kauhanen, *σχίζω* is an interpretive recensional Lucianic reading which underlines that it is not just a small part of Israel is split off; Tertullian invented the reading *scindetur* independently.²⁹ This “independent invention” in an exegetical context that closely follows the biblical text is not convincing; rather, it is an invention in order to avoid the consequence that Tertullian confirms the antiquity of the Antiochene reading (which in this case interestingly also agrees with B). The other way around is more probable: The interpretive reading witnessed also by Tertullian is old and has later on been corrected by someone who adapted the phrase to the usual translation of *יצח* by *διαιρέω*. The following *converti* demonstrates Tertullian’s dependency on the Septuagint which presupposes *ישׁי* instead of *ישׁר* (MT), and seems to be closer to the Antiochene *ἐπιστρέψει* than to *ἀποστρέψει*.³⁰ The reading *ἐπιστρέψει* is supported not only by the Lucianic manuscripts, but by several other manuscripts, although minuscules only. The additional words “the Holy One of Israel” in the Antiochene text are unknown to Tertullian or unimportant for him. The last word *αὐτός* of B and others has no parallel in

²⁹ Kauhanen, *Problem*, 104–05.

³⁰ Perhaps Josephus knows different readings and therefore offers the neutral *στρέφειν τὴν γνώμην* (Ant 7:153).

MT and it is not present in the Antiochene text (in this case confirmed by Theodoret). Tertullian has no counterpart to it and evidently did not read it in his *Vorlage*.

1 Reigns 16:14^{Ant}, witnessed by Tertullian,³¹ could be a double rendering, first by a form of עצר, rendered sometimes by συνέχω in the Septuagint, secondly by a form of בעט; unfortunately there is no Qumran fragment of this passage. It is not sure whether the Antiochene text is secondary as the fuller text³² or if the reading of B et al. is an adaptation to the shorter MT. One may also consider the longer text as a double reading in the sense of a combination of two different renderings. The important point is that Tertullian evidently knew this longer reading, wherever it originated.

Rendering 1 Reigns 21:7, Tertullian with “*De exemplo David introgressi sabbatis templum et operati cibum audenter fractis panibus propositionis*” (= ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως) follows the text given also by Codex Vaticanus³³, yet 1 Reigns 21:7^{Ant} beginning with καὶ ἔδωκεν ... ἄρτον προσώπου may also be considered an old reading: The translator intended to avoid the original contradiction between ἄρτος τῆς προθήσεως and ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου in the same verse. Such an exegetical deliberation is the work of the translator of Old Greek but not the work of a Christian revisor.

In 2 Reigns 12:13, the reading *circumduxit*³⁴ is nearer to παρεβίβασεν of Codex Vaticanus than to the Antiochene ἀφείλεν.

The beginning of Elijah’s story in 3 Reigns 17:1 offers Ζῆ Κύριος in the Antiochene text, אלהי ישראל in MT, and Ζῆ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ in Codex Vaticanus. Tertullian quotes the short form as found in the Antiochene text (*Viuit Dominus*),³⁵ but this can also be a shortening due to memory. Nevertheless, the short reading may be the original translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and MT and Codex Vaticanus represent secondary longer texts.³⁶

Tertullian’s rendering of 4 Reigns 4:29 is without text-critical value; the relative pronouns are caused by necessities of the Latin language.³⁷

³¹ Tertullian, Fug. 2:7 (CC.SL 2,1138).

³² Kauhanen, *Problem*, 101.

³³ Tertullian, Marc. 4:12.5 (CC.SL 1:570).

³⁴ Tertullian, Marc. 4:10.3 (CC.SL 1:562).

³⁵ Tertullian, Ieiun. 6.6 (CC.SL 2:1262).

³⁶ Josephus, 8:319 offers but a paraphrasis.

³⁷ Tertullian, Marc. 4:24.3 (CC.SL 1:607): *quemcumque conueneris in uia qui te benedixerit.*

Cyprian of Cartage (ca. 200 – 258)

Within Cyprian's works, we find texts only from Thackeray's sections α and $\beta\beta$, the stories of Hannah and of Eli's rejection, and Nathan's prophecy. The reading *et exaudivit eam Dominus* in 1 Reigns 1:13³⁸ may be due to an Antiochene plus, a preliminary hint at the following, made by the translator. More complicated is Cyprian's rendering of 1 Reigns 2:3³⁹: At the beginning, a clearly non-Antiochene reading is presupposed ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\chi\eta\eta\upsilon$ is missing), the following *et* could be due to an Antiochene Vorlage, but could also be an obvious stylistic improvement; the ending formula *deus scientiarum* is close to Codex Alexandrinus and to MT.

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 2:25⁴⁰ the wording *si autem* (instead of *et si*) corresponds to the Antiochene text; an independent stylistic improvement is not impossible but not very probable; the reading *homo*, in "*Si delinquendo peccet vir adversus virum, orabunt pro eo Dominum. Si autem in Deum peccet homo, quis orabit pro eo?*" in my opinion, is to be seen as influenced by an Antiochene Vorlage, in this case consistent with MT.

In 1 Reigns 2:30 fine, we find different readings in the Septuagint, $\omicron\iota \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma \mu\epsilon \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omega\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ (Antiochene text) vs. $\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\omega\eta\omega\mu \mu\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\mu\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (Codex Alexandrinus), but also in Cyprian's works, *qui spernit me spernetur*⁴¹ vs. *qui me spernent spernentur*.⁴² The juxtaposition of singular and plural allows to suppose that Cyprian quotes from memory; therefore the use of the verb *spernere* may also be a hint at memorization and is perhaps no indication of an Antiochene text. The Antiochene reading is an adaptation both to plural and to structure implying a word-play also at the end of the verse, and this adaptation is made, in my opinion, by the translator, not by a Christian revisor.

In the quotation of 1 Reigns 2:36⁴³ Cyprian follows the Antiochene text. Rendering 2 Reigns 7:4.14⁴⁴ Cyprian quotes V. 4 according to the shorter form (*ad Nathan dicens*) witnessed also in Codex Vaticanus⁴⁵, V. 14 with the introducing *et* according to the Antiochene text. Concluding the paragraph on

³⁸ Cyprian, Or. 5 (CC.SL 3 A:92).

³⁹ Cyprian, Quir. 3:4 (CC.SL 3:92).

⁴⁰ Cyprian, Quir. 3:28 (CC.SL 3:123); id., Fort 4 (CC.SL 3:191).

⁴¹ Cyprian, Zel. 15 (CC.SL 3 A:83).

⁴² Cyprian, Or. 11 (CC.SL 3 A:96).

⁴³ Cyprian, Quir. 1:17 (CC.SL 3:18).

⁴⁴ Cyprian, Quir. 1:15; 2:11 (CC.SL 3:16.43).

⁴⁵ Codex Vaticanus: $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \text{Ναθαν λέγων}$; Antiochene text: $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \text{Ναθαν τὸν προφῆτην λέγων}$.

Cyprian, we can say: The amount of material is meager, but reveals again that both Antiochene and non-Antiochene readings of one and the same Biblical passage existed and were available to Cyprian.

Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150 – 215)

Only very few quotations of Clement of Alexandria are really valuable for our inquiry.⁴⁶ Rendering 3 Reigns 19:4 he offers *ράμνον* instead of *ράθυμ* (B) or *ράθαμείν* (Ant)⁴⁷; rendering 3 Reigns 19:6 he uses *κρίθινος* vs. *ὄλυρίτης*.⁴⁸ The quotation of 1 Reigns 16:7 in the *Paedagogicus* is remarkable: Instead of *εἰς πρόσωπον*, he offers *εἰς ὀφθαλμούς* in analogy to part of Hebrew tradition and greater proximity to MT עֵינַיִל. This is evidently a Hebraizing adaptation (close to what the kaige-recension would show). The following *καί* in Clement's quote is more in accordance with the Massoretic *ו- copulativum* than the Septuagint reading *ὁ δέ*; *Κύριος* is a reading closer to MT יהוה than *θεός*. We could neglect these facts if the proximity to MT were not supported by the reading *εἰς ὀφθαλμούς*. Another remarkable quotation is the rendering of 2 Reigns 6:19 in the *Paedagogicus* (*διεμέρισεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἕως γυναικὸς ἐκάστῳ κολλυρίδα ...*): the *verbum compositum* and the missing additional *καί* (corresponding to MT) before *ἕως* underline that Clement used a non-Antiochene text.⁴⁹ In the survey on Israel's history in *Strom.* 1:109.1–121.4, the readings *Σολομών* and *Ἡλίας* are analogous to the Antiochene text,⁵⁰ the readings *Ἀβιούμ*, *Ὀχοζίας*, *Ιωσίας* and *Ιωαχάς* are analogous to Codex Vaticanus. The kings mentioned in 4 Reigns 23:34 and 4 Reigns 24:18 both are called *Ἰωακεῖμ*, and the latter is explicitly called cousin-by-name of the former⁵¹; that presupposes the reading of Codex Vaticanus, not the Antiochene text, despite the ending *-κεῖμ* (Clement) instead of *-κιμ* (Septuagint).

⁴⁶ In 1 Reigns 12:18 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6:29.1, GCS 52:444) and 3 Reigns 8:27 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Frsm.* 4 [GCS 17:218]) we do not find differing readings in the textual transmission. The hint on 1 Reigns 28:18 in *Paed.* 1:53.5 (GCS 12:93) is wrong.

⁴⁷ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3:38.1 (GCS 12:258).

⁴⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3:38.2 (GCS 12:258).

⁴⁹ Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2:18.2 (GCS 12:167).

⁵⁰ This form of the name is offered also by Methodius of Olympos, *symp.* 10:3 (GCS 27:124).

⁵¹ Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 1:121.2 (GCS 52:76). The same is true in Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 3:25.2 (PTS 44:129); Hippolytus of Rome, in *Dan* 1:2 (GCS 1:5).

These observations show that Clement – in contrast to the authors discussed so far – used an isomorphically revised kaige-type text, at least in 1-4 Reigns.

Origen (ca. 185 – 254)

Very often, Origen follows the text witnessed also in Codex Vaticanus; this is true for 1 Reigns 5:6,9;⁵² 6:9;⁵³ 16:14,⁵⁴ 23;⁵⁵ 21:7;⁵⁶ 28:18;⁵⁷ 3 Reigns 5:11⁵⁸; 17:1⁵⁹; 22:22;⁶⁰ 4 Reigns 1:3⁶¹; 5:10, 14.⁶² Sometimes, he presupposes Antiochene readings as in 1 Reigns 2:30;⁶³ 15:11⁶⁴; 21:6⁶⁵; 28:12.⁶⁶ Rendering 1 Reigns 2:1 Origen offers at the beginning *Et oravit Anna et dixit*, analogous to Antiochene text, but in the following (*ἐπλατύνθη στόμα μου ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου*) Origen varies the order of the last two elements⁶⁷ – we do not know anything about his *Vorlage* in this case. The personal pronoun *μου* after *ἐχθρούς* could be a hint at an Antiochene text but could also be evaluated as

⁵² Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145), does not render the long Antiochene plus.

⁵³ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:146): *magna haec mala*, according to B (*κακίαν ταύτην τὴν μεγάλην*) instead of *κακίαν τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην* (Antiochene text).

⁵⁴ Origen, Princ. 4:2.1 (SC 268:296); id., Hom. in Num 15.1 (GCS 30:130); id. Comm. Rom 7:1 (FC 2/4:34): only one verb (*ἐπιγιγε*) is used.

⁵⁵ Origen, Hom. in Num 15.1 (GCS 30:130). The Antiochene additional words (*πνεῦμα*) *παρὰ θεοῦ* are missing.

⁵⁶ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 4, Frgm. 10 (SC 328:166): *ἄρτον τῆς προθήσεως*.

⁵⁷ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 5.5 (SC 328:184): *οὐκ ἐποίησας θυμόν* (instead of *οὐκ ἐπλησας θυμόν*).

⁵⁸ Origen, Cels. 3:45 (SC 136:108): *Γαιθαν* instead of *Αιθαν*.

⁵⁹ Origen, Hom. in Gen. 16.3 (SC 7bis:380): *Ζῆ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ* instead of *Ζῆ Κύριος*.

⁶⁰ Origen, Princ. 3:2.1 (SC 268:154): *Ἀπατήσεις καὶ γε δυνήσει, ἐξελθε καὶ ποιήσον οὕτως* instead of *Δυνήσῃ ἐξελθε καὶ ποιήσον οὕτως*.

⁶¹ Origen, Cels 1:36 (SC 132:176): *Εἰ παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι προφήτην ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε ἐπιζητῆσαι ἐν τῷ Βάαλ μυϊαν θεὸν Ἀκχαρῶν* instead of *Εἰ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι προφήτην ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε ἐπερωτῆσαι διὰ τοῦ Βάαλ μυϊαν προσόχθισμα θεὸν Ἀκχαρῶν*.

⁶² Origen, Hom. in Luc. 33.5 (SC 87:398): *et restituetur tibi caro tua* in according to Vaticanus *καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου σοι* (instead of the Antiochene *καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου ἐπὶ σοι*); *et facta est caro eius quasi caro pueri*, in analogy to Vaticanus *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ ὡς σὰρξ παιδάριου μικροῦ*, without the Antiochene adding *ἐπ' αὐτὸν* before *ὡς*.

⁶³ Origen, Comm. Rom. 2:6 (FC 2/1:202).

⁶⁴ Origen, Princ. 4:2.1 (SC 268:296): *Μεταμεμῆλμαι* instead of *Παρακέκλημαι*.

⁶⁵ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 4, Frgm. 10 (SC 328:166). But this can be an obvious improvement.

⁶⁶ Origen, Hom. in 1 Reigns 5.4, (SC 328:180): *ἡ γυνή*², against all stylistic rules.

⁶⁷ Origen, Hom. in 1 Sam 1.9 (SC 328:126): *ἐπλατύνθη ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου στόμα μου*; Origen, Hom. in 1 Sam 1.10 (SC 328:136): *ἐπλατύνθη στόμα μου ἐπ' ἐχθρούς μου*.

obvious accommodation. Quoting 1 Reigns 2:3 (*Nolite multiplicare loqui excelsa*),⁶⁸ Origen, in my opinion, presupposes the Antiochene εἰς ὑπεροχὴν; he explicitly asks why *multiplicare* is used. Referring to 1 Reigns 5; 6 Origen offers a mixed text: *Inventus Dagon est cecidisse pronus in terram ante arcam testamenti Domini* is, with regard to the words *in terram*, analogous to the Antiochene text; *Et gravata est manus Domini super Azotios, et dissipavit eos et percussit eos in natibus* is analogous to Codex Vaticanus.⁶⁹ The wording *in terram* could be an accommodation to general style but I have no theory who may be responsible for this addition. The longer Antiochene text in the following passage is probably an accommodation to other passages within 1 Reigns 5. Citing 1 Reigns 6:3, in Origen's text the "Antiochene" stylistic improvement δῶρα is missing;⁷⁰ citing 1 Reigns 6:7, Origen reads an additional *quibus iugum non est impositum* which is witnessed also in the Antiochene text (ἐφ' ἃς οὐκ ἐπετέθη ζυγός), whereas the "Antiochene" superfluous μίαν is missing and βοάς is repeated (instead of αὐτάς), in analogy to Codex Vaticanus. In my opinion, δῶρα is secondary; the superfluous μίαν is a rendering of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, and βοάς is the older reading in comparison with the more elegant αὐτάς.

Rendering 1 Reigns 28,⁷¹ Origen offers neither the identifying Σαουλ in V. 11b nor the introducing εἶπον (V. 13), both in accordance with Vaticanus. All these readings can may be stylistic improvements made also by Origen himself, but in V. 12, in analogy to the Antiochene text he introduces the superfluous repetition ἡ γυνή. In Vv. 18-19, Origen uses a text once⁷², in V. 18, analogous to Codex Vaticanus (ἐποίησας according to MT instead of ἔπλησας) and once, in V. 19, in combining the two text-forms πεσοῦνται (Codex Vaticanus) and μετ' ἔμοῦ (Antiochene text).⁷³ The mentioning of Jonathan in the Antiochene text could be an old reading whereas the general "sons" in 1 Reigns 28:19 B (= MT) is an adaptation to 1 Sam 31:2/1 Reigns 31:2 where three sons of Saul are mentioned. But some elements of quotation are maybe due to Origen's memory; 1 Reigns 28:19a is quoted καὶ δώσει κύριος καίγε

⁶⁸ Origen, Hom. in 1Sam 1.13 (SC 328:142). Id., hom. in 1Sam 1:9 (SC 328:126): *mala*.

⁶⁹ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145).

⁷⁰ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:146).

⁷¹ Origen, hom. in 1Sam 5.4f. (SC 328:180–86).

⁷² Not all the parallels to either Antiochene *Vorlage* (repeating the name of the woman in 1 Reigns 28:12) or Codex Vaticanus (omissing the name Saul in 1 Reigns 28:11; omission of εἶπον in V. 19a) are necessarily due to using a distinct form of the Biblical text but also can be considered as stylistic improvement.

⁷³ Josephus, Ant 6:336, offers a similar combination.

τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν χειρὶ ἀλλοφύλων and in repetition καίγε τὴν παραβολὴν Ἰσραὴλ παραδώσει κύριος αὐτὴν ἐν χειρὶ ἀλλοφύλων⁷⁴ – none of these readings is identical with the also repeated phrases of 1 Reigns 28:19.

Similarly, rendering 1 Reigns 6:2 Origen offers only two elements (*sacerdotes et divinos suos*) instead of three.⁷⁵ Rendering 1 Reigns 30:17, Origen offers ἕως according to Codex Vaticanus instead of the Antiochene καὶ ἕως (= MT) but this may also be a stylistic improvement made independently of any *Vorlage*.⁷⁶

Citing 3 Reigns 19:18, Origen twice uses the 1st singular καταλείψω in analogy to the Antiochene text which is in my opinion a theological statement of the first translator favoring the sovereignty of Israel's God even in relation to the activity of his prophet.⁷⁷

3 Reigns 22:20 is quoted differently: Once Origen cites this text in analogy to Codex Vaticanus⁷⁸; once he offers a textform nearer to the Antiochene text.⁷⁹ the difference once more lies in word sequence: "He shall go up to Ramoth Galaad and fall there" (Ant) or "He shall go up and fall in Remmath Galaad" (B, A et al.), which also is the word order in MT. As there is no real reason to change the word order of the B text, Ant is the older text and the text in B et al. is an adaptation to the word sequence of MT. In any case, Origen confirms the Antiochene reading in his time.

Within the quotation of 4 Reigns 5:10, 14 we observe⁸⁰ an analogy to the Antiochene text: By his reference to the preposition ἐπί in V. 10 Origen shows that he knows about the Antiochene text: καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ καθαρισθήσῃ. In Codex Vaticanus ἐπί is deleted because there is no counterpart in the Hebrew text which has הַיְהוָה בְּשֵׁנִי only. The same is the case in V.14: There also is ἐπί in Ant while in B et al. it is missing and the text agrees exactly with the Hebrew text. These observations, as also the observations on 3 Reigns 22:20, exactly fit the characteristics of the kaige-recension (which runs from 3 Reigns 22 to the end of 4 Reigns).

⁷⁴ Origen, Hom. in 1Sam 5.5 (SC 328:186).

⁷⁵ Origen, Hom. in Num 16.7 (GCS 30:145).

⁷⁶ Origen, Hom. in Num 19.1 (GCS 30:181).

⁷⁷ Origen, Princ. 4:2.6 (SC 268:326; including τῆ Βααλ); id., comm. Rom 8:7 (FC 4/2:242; only preserved in Latin).

⁷⁸ Origen, Princ. 3:2.1 (SC 268:154): καὶ ἀναβήσεται καὶ πεσεῖται ἐν Ρεμμαθ Γαλαὰδ instead of καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς Ῥαμῶθ Γαλαὰδ καὶ πεσεῖται ἐκεῖ.

⁷⁹ Origen, Comm. in Rom 7:1 (FC 2/4:34), citing v. 21: (*Ero, inquit, spiritus mendax in ore omnium prophetarum et dicam, ut) ascendat in Galaad et ibi cadet.*

⁸⁰ Origen, Hom. in Luc. 33 (GCS 49:187).

III. Conclusions

This survey of quotations from 1-4 Reigns in the fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries leads to the following observations and conclusions.

1. All the Fathers quote Antiochene and non-Antiochene text forms, sometimes almost side-by-side. It is only Clement of Alexandria who rarely uses Antiochene text-forms. As the quotations come from different parts of 1-4 Reigns they may be considered as representative at least for their context if not for the whole books. This means that in the 2nd and 3rd centuries there existed two main text forms: The text forms later on represented in Codex Vaticanus and (to some extent) in Codex Alexandrinus and other manuscripts, and the so-called Antiochene or Lucianic text, represented in the so-called Lucianic manuscripts and to a large extent also in exegetical writings such as those of Theodoret or Eusebius. It is interesting that the number of Antiochene readings in the quotations by most authors is larger than the other readings.⁸¹

2. As already stated in the methodological remarks in the introduction the existence of either text form does not mean that the other text form did not exist. Evidently both text forms existed and were available in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. However, the quotations of the Antiochene texts show that at least these readings existed long before Lucian and cannot be the work of a “Lucianic” redaction around 300.

3. The old way of discarding proto-Lucianic readings in Josephus or in the New Testament or in the Old Latin translation by explaining them as later cross-influence between the manuscripts has been considerably weakened by the discovery of Qumran texts that agree with the Lucianic text, because there cannot have been any interference from the fragments in their caves. Also the Antiochene readings in this essay speak against such an explanation: Both the quotations and also the way of transmission of the writings of the Fathers are too widespread to explain the Antiochene readings as later cross-influence. Who would have had the interest, the knowledge, and the possibility to do this (not to speak about the Latin texts)? In my view, it seems important to distinguish between scribal activities in the last centuries B.C.E. and exegetical activities in later times.

⁸¹ Interestingly Thackeray's segmentation seems to have no relevance for the distribution of Antiochene and non-Antiochene readings within Early Christian literature.

4. It is hard to image that only where there is a quotation by one of the Fathers (or by Josephus or in the Old Latin) the Antiochene text should be old, i.e. pre-Lucianic, and that in all the other cases, the Antiochene text should be the result of the (assumed) Lucianic redaction. Such an assumption would imply that the character of the Antiochene text would have changed just where we have a quotation (or a fragment from Qumran or the Old Latin).

5. As the discussion about the oldest text and the revised text moves back towards the 1st centuries B.C.E. and C.E. one has to admit that the quotations in the fathers are not decisive for these questions. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries, both text forms have been around. However, one should be careful not to transfer the old assumptions about what Lucian (or whoever it was) would have done around 300 C.E. to a time and a situation three centuries earlier. Rather, the reasoning must be done in view of the texts themselves. For these deliberations it is interesting that in most cases it is hard to find relevant reasons for a change of what is effectively represented by the B-text towards the Antiochene text, but that in most cases the B-text can be explained as an isomorphic adaptation to the Hebrew text, be it by words or by word order. This has been demonstrated in some cases and could be demonstrated for most of the other cases. Of course, we have to exclude occasional analogies caused by common biblical style or by quotation of memory or by an obvious necessity for stylistic improvement.

However, the goal of the present essay was to collect and to present the evidence for quotations from 1-4 Reigns by the Fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries.

MARTIN MEISER

Universität des Saarlandes

Saarbrücken, Deutschland

martin.meiser@mx.uni-saarland.de