

Anneli Aejmelaeus / Tuukka Kauhanen (eds.)

The Legacy of Barthélemy

50 Years after
Les Devanciers d'Aquila

V&R Academic

De Septuaginta Investigationes

Edited by

Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kristin De Troyer,
Wolfgang Kraus, and Emanuel Tov

In Co-operation with

Kai Brodersen (Erfurt, Germany), Cécile Dogniez (Paris, France),
Peter Gentry (Louisville, USA), Anna Kharanauli (Tbilisi, Georgia),
Armin Lange (Vienna, Austria), Alison Salvesen (Oxford, GB),
David Andrew Teeter (Cambridge, USA), Julio Trebolle (Madrid, Spain),
Florian Wilk (Göttingen, Germany)

Volume 9

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Anneli Aejmelaeus / Tuukka Kauhanen (eds.)

The Legacy of Barthélemy

50 Years after *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 22 tables and 12 graphics

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISSN 2197-0912
ISBN 978-3-647-54062-7

© 2017, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A. www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized
in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording,
or any information storage and retrieval system,
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting by NEUNPLUS1 - Verlag + Service GmbH, Berlin

Contents

Introduction.....	7
<i>Adrian Schenker O.P.</i>	
What Were the Aims of the Palestinian Recensions, and What Did They Achieve? With Some Biographical Notes on Dominique Barthélemy	14
<i>Philippe Hugo</i>	
The Books of Kingdoms Fifty Years after the <i>Devanciers d’Aquila</i> . Development of the <i>Kaige</i> Theory within Barthélemy’s Works, and Some Implications for Present Research.....	23
<i>Anneli Aejmelaeus</i>	
Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the <i>Kaige</i> Revisers	41
<i>Andrés Piquer Otero</i>	
The Minuses of the B 509 Manuscript Group in 3–4 Kingdoms.....	54
<i>Pablo Torijano</i>	
How Much Hexaplaric Material Entered into the Antiochene Textual Tradition?	69
<i>Julio Treballe</i>	
Readings of the Old Latin (Beuron 91–95) Reflecting “Additions” of the Antiochene Text in 3–4 Kingdoms	120
<i>Tuukka Kauhanen</i>	
Lucifer of Cagliari and the <i>Kaige</i> Revision.....	146
<i>Anneli Aejmelaeus</i>	
<i>Kaige</i> Readings in a Non- <i>Kaige</i> Section in 1 Samuel.....	169

<i>Raimund Wirth</i> Dealing with Tenses in the <i>Kaige</i> Section of Samuel.....	185
<i>Gerard J. Norton O.P.</i> The Legacy of <i>Les Devanciers d'Aquila</i> for the Study of the Greek Psalter	198
Bibliography	212
Index.....	225

Introduction

In August 1952, a fragmentary scroll containing a significant portion of the Greek text of the Minor Prophets was found at Naḥal Ḥever, a wadi in the Judean Desert, ca. 25 km southeast of Hebron. Shortly after the discovery, **Dominique Barthélemy** (1921–2002) published an article noting points of similarity between the readings of the newly found scroll and a Jewish Greek text cited by the early Christian author Justin Martyr (d. 165 CE). Ten years later Barthélemy published the work that would become the most seminal monograph written in the field of Septuagint studies during the 20th century, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, “the predecessors of Aquila”. In this monograph Barthélemy announced two major discoveries. First, the Greek text of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll was an edition, a *recension*, of the Septuagint translation of the Minor Prophets. The purpose of this recension was to bring the original text of the Septuagint into closer conformity with the Hebrew proto-Masoretic text. Second, this recension was present in (parts of) many other books of the Greek Bible, most notably in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel-Kings. The translational features of the recension were midway between the original Greek translation and the most developed later Jewish translation, namely, that of Aquila. A most striking feature of the newly discovered recension was the rendering of the Hebrew conjunction ׀ or ׀׀ “and also, moreover, but” with καὶ γε, which results in a strikingly un-Greek combination: in Classical Greek the combination καὶ ... γε normally includes at least one intervening word. This curious Greek expression provided the name for the recension which has ever since been known as the *kaige* recension or revision.

Problems that were discussed right after the publication of *Devanciers* still puzzle scholars working in this field. The nature of the Lucianic text is very much at the focus of the present scholarship: when does it represent the Old Greek and in which cases are we dealing with stylistic changes by the Lucianic editor or with expansions according to Hexaplaric traditions, including the work of Origen as well as the later Jewish translators? What is the relationship between the *kaige* revision and Theodotion’s revision of the Septuagint? Did some of the authors of the New Testament know a *kaige*-type Septuagint text? How extensive was the influence of the *kaige* group and how can it be recognized?

In order to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the publication of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* by Dominique Barthélemy and to discuss the present state of “*kaige* studies”, a symposium was held in connection with the SBL International Meeting at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, in July 2013. The present volume *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila* consists mainly of papers presented at the St Andrews symposium, with a few additional papers that discuss related topics and similarly build on the legacy of Dominique Barthélemy. The editors are especially grateful for contributions by those colleagues who knew Dominique Barthélemy and were able to share some personal impressions of him.¹

Barthélemy’s discoveries are presented within the biographical context of this great scholar by **Adrian Schenker** in “What Were the Aims of the Palestinian Recensions, and What Did They Achieve? With Some Biographical Notes on Dominique Barthélemy”. Schenker clarifies the text-historical theories concerning the “Palestinian recensions”, including the *kaige* recension, as well as other less well-known features of Barthélemy’s general concept. The different datings of the Naḥal Hever scroll are discussed with reference to the emerging proto-Masoretic Hebrew text and the rabbinic exegesis, which created the need to produce a Greek text that corresponded to the Hebrew edition as closely as possible. The same learned circles responsible for the proto-Masoretic recension were probably initiators of the Greek Palestinian recensions. These recensions “were followed by the more complete and more systematic recensions of Aquila and Symmachus, which finally superseded the Old Greek Bible among Greek-speaking Jews”.

Barthélemy’s theory of the *kaige* recension developed somewhat over time. This development is explained by **Philippe Hugo** in his contribution “The Books of Kingdoms Fifty Years after the *Devanciers d'Aquila*: Development of the *Kaige* Theory within Barthélemy’s Works, and Some Implications for Present Research” and is illustrated by a number of examples of the application of the theory in Barthélemy’s text-critical work in the well-known *Critique Textuelle de l’Ancien Testament* (CTAT). Special attention is paid to Barthélemy’s evaluation of the Antiochene text preserved in the manuscript group *L* (19-82-93-108-127 in Rahlfs’s *Verzeichnis*; boc₂e₂ in Brooke-McLean): in the *kaige* sections of Samuel-Kings, *L* is supposed to preserve in a considerable number of cases the original reading against *Codex Vaticanus* (B). Hugo concludes that Barthélemy later on accepted the

1 In addition, the editors would like to thank Timo Tekoniemi for assistance in the finishing of this volume.

idea that the Antiochene text also contains traces of revisional activity. This underlines the principle that regardless of the underlying text-historical theory, text-critical work has to be done case by case without *a priori* assumptions concerning the quality of the witnesses.

In “Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the *Kaige* Revisers”, Anneli Aejmelaes demonstrates that Barthélemy was correct in recognizing the exegetical and theological dimension of the early Jewish revision of the Greek text. An example of such a theological issue is the notion of God regretting, a notion attested in multiple passages in the Hebrew Bible. On the other hand, in other passages it is explicitly stated that God does not regret, notably in the Torah and 1 Sam 15. This statement provided the motivation for *kaige*-type corrections that aimed at eliminating the translations of the Hebrew נחם *nip'al* by the Greek μεταμέλομαι ‘to regret’ or μετανοέω ‘to change one’s mind’ when the subject is God. These renderings were replaced by the verb παρακαλέομαι ‘to be comforted’, the passive voice for the regular rendering of the נחם *pi'el* ‘to comfort’. The analysis allows several far-reaching conclusions: 1. Early Jewish revisional activity is found sporadically outside the *kaige* sections of Samuel-Kings. 2. The Lucianic/Antiochene text is not totally untouched by the *kaige* revision. 3. Revisional activity on the Septuagint of the Historical Books is connected with the revision of the Hebrew text, which is again connected with the emerging scriptural status of these books. 4. This revisional activity on both the Hebrew and the Greek texts was exegetically and theologically motivated.

In her second contribution “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel”, Aejmelaes presents examples of early Jewish revisional activity in a book considered to be a non-*kaige* section.² The witnesses that most often transmit these readings are the B text and the Hexaplaric text. It is clear that the question is not of Hexaplaric influence in the B text; the changes are lexical variants and omissions, whereas typical Hexaplaric readings are plusses that the B text does not attest. A noteworthy feature is that the *kaige* readings in 1 Samuel are confined to a rather small group of witnesses. The observations corroborate the old view that Origen’s basic text was very close to the B text. On the basis of the findings, Aejmelaes suggests that the *kaige* revision is to be dated well before the fixing of the MT and that editorial activity on both the Hebrew and the Greek text must have coincided during the 1st century BCE, until 70 CE at the latest. That the B text is not as such a *kaige* text suggests that revised Greek manuscripts were used for comparison when copying new manuscripts, and readings from them were

2 A paper read at the Annual Meeting of the SBL in Atlanta 2015.

occasionally introduced into the new text. The emergence of the B text is associated by Aejmelaeus with the rise of Christian scriptoria in the second half of the 2nd century CE.

Andrés Piquer investigates “The Minuses of the B 509 Manuscript Group in III–IV Regnorum”. Manuscripts B and 509 often join against many or most of the other witnesses in attesting a shorter reading, even against clear *kaige* readings in Kings. Piquer classifies the instances according to their agreement with the MT: in the *kaige* section the agreement with the MT is probably due to *kaige* revision, while in the Old Greek section the situation is more complex. While the possibility of accidental omission has to be considered, it seems that some of the minuses are likely to attest the original shorter text. In such instances other textual traditions have supplemented the text with Hexaplaric readings. The findings of the study demonstrate that grouping the Septuagint witnesses and classifying their typical patterns of variants requires a nuanced and cautious approach. The scholar should resist the temptation of assigning any set values to readings, versions, and groups.

A question directly related to the *kaige* revision is the nature of the Antiochene (Lucianic) text. In some books, e.g., 1 Samuel, the Lucianic reviser introduced a number of Hexaplaric readings into the text. Interestingly, the situation is different in the books of Kings, where the extent of the Hexaplaric reworking in the Antiochene manuscripts is much less significant in both quantity and quality. Building on the observation that manuscript 127 attests a considerably larger number of Hexaplaric readings than the other manuscripts of the *L* group, **Pablo Torijano** concludes in “How Much Hexaplaric Material Entered into the Antiochene Textual Tradition?” that the Hexaplaric material attested by 127 was not present in the 4th century Antiochene text. Differences between the Hexaplaric additions attested by manuscript group *O*—in Kings A and 247 (x in Brooke-McLean)—and *L* call into question the exact nature of the Hexaplaric text used in the Antiochene tradition. Is it Hexaplaric at all? The gradual Hexaplarization witnessed by the Antiochene witnesses is comparable to the process that led from the “predecessors of Aquila” to the later Jewish recensions. Torijano provides a list of 400 cases of Hexaplaric additions attested by either *O* alone or together with *L*, or by each textual family in a different form.

The next two papers by **Julio Trebolle** and **Tuukka Kauhanen** witness two very different perspectives on the use of the Old Latin (OL) witnesses for the Books of Kings. While none of the early Latin witnesses attests a purely Antiochene text, it is well known that their readings often coincide with those of *L*. How should this agreement be explained? Trebolle holds that such agreements confirm the old age of the Old Latin version. This

version was originally *a single translation* which was later revised at different times and locations. The result is a multitude of often diverging Latin witnesses (manuscripts, marginal readings, and quotations by Latin patristic authors). That Antiochene readings are often supported by the Old Latin version, gives, in turn, more weight to the claim that the Antiochene text has preserved the Old Greek reading considerably more often than generally assumed. Kauhanen, by contrast, maintains that the disagreements between the different Latin witnesses show that they attest altogether *different translations*. Moreover, the quotations by Latin Christian authors do not necessarily witness underlying Old Latin translations but may be *ad hoc* translations by the author. Regarding the quotations, the special problems relating to their use (such as possible adaptation by the author or corruption by the scribes) often make the agreements between a patristic author and the Antiochene text doubtful.

In “Readings of the Old Latin (Beuron 91–95) reflecting ‘Additions’ of the Antiochene Text in *III–IV Regnorum*” Trebolle approaches the mentioned questions with an analysis of the Old Latin marginal readings in five Spanish Vulgate exemplars (Latin codices 91–95). These marginal readings attest a number of plusses that coincide with the readings of the Antiochene text, especially in the *kaige* section. After the analysis, Trebolle concludes that these putative additions are not additions at all; they are actually Old Greek readings. This finding gives strength to Barthélemy’s proposal that in the *kaige* sections the Antiochene text is very close to the Old Greek. According to Trebolle, the assumption that the Antiochene text is a revision of the Old Greek text, advocated especially by Sebastian Brock and Natalio Fernández Marcos, is partly based on a negative assessment of the critical value of the Old Latin version. Trebolle argues that, considering the big picture of the history of the biblical text, it is more conceivable that the agreements between the old layer of the Antiochene text and the Old Latin ultimately witness a Hebrew text different from the proto-Masoretic text. The practical outcome is “that a critical edition of *III–IV Regnorum* has to follow in the *kaige* sections a text close to the early layer of the Antiochene text reflected in the OL version”.

In “Lucifer of Cagliari and the *Kaige* Revision”, a different perspective is adopted by **Kauhanen** in his analysis of the most important Latin witness for Kings, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 371 CE). Kauhanen examines the relationship between the quotations by Lucifer and the *kaige* readings in Kings. A patristic author of the mid-fourth century could be expected to attest either the *kaige* text or the Antiochene text in a relatively pure form. The striking phenomenon in Lucifer’s quotations is that they follow neither; they

are completely (or almost completely) free from *kaige* influence and they mostly do not attest the recensional readings of the Antiochene text either. This observation corroborates the traditional view that the Antiochene text is a revised text. Moreover, taking into account occasional free modification and corruption, Lucifer's quotations can be used as a witness for the Old Greek when locating new *kaige* readings in Kings. Kauhanen suggests ten such readings with some probability.

Much of the research on *kaige* is focused on lexical features. In "Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel", **Raimund Wirth** broadens the view to the realm of syntactical phenomena, namely that of changing tenses.³ Changing the historical present to the aorist is a well-known *kaige* feature. Wirth presents statistical data on the differences between the frequencies of the historical present in the B text and the Antiochene text. While in the latter there is also a tendency to change the historical present to a past tense, it has still preserved a greater number of them in the *kaige* section. In the Books of Samuel a definite change can be observed precisely in verse 2 Sam 10:6; Wirth proposes this verse as the beginning of the *kaige* section. Occasionally, an original historical present has likely been lost under two different revisions and Wirth suggests that in those cases it should be conjectured in the critical editions. The case with the Greek imperfect is somewhat less complex, but it still requires close attention. The *kaige* revisers would not accept a Greek imperfect as the translation of a Hebrew imperfect consecutive or a Hebrew perfect (or perfect consecutive). The Antiochene text, on the other hand, not only keeps many of the Old Greek imperfects but even increases their number. Wirth stresses the necessity of combining the knowledge of the translation technique of the Old Greek, of the principles of the *kaige* recension, and of the principles of the Lucianic recension in order to make sound text-critical decisions in the *kaige* section of Samuel.

The consequences of Barthélemy's discovery of the *kaige* recension are by no means restricted to the Historical Books. **Gerard Norton's** "The Legacy of *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* for the Study of the Greek Psalter" offers insights into the discussion following *Devanciers d'Aquila*, and in particular, the controversy pertaining to the dating of the famous Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (2110 in Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis*). The publishers of the papyrus dated it to the late third or possibly the early fourth century CE, while Barthélemy suggested a considerably earlier dating: second century CE, i.e., before Origen's Hexapla (ca. 240 CE). Since the papyrus is famous for its Hebraizing features, the assessment of this important witness depends

3 A paper read at the Annual Meeting of the SBL in Atlanta 2015.

decisively on whether it is dated to the pre-Hexaplaric or post-Hexaplaric era. Norton goes through the discussion between Dominique Barthélemy and Albert Pietersma on the dating and the text-historical interpretation of the papyrus, revealing interesting methodological differences between these two scholars. This contribution also offers a personal view on the development of Barthélemy's scholarship and thinking from a person who knew him very well.

The discussion on *kaige* and its significance in the textual history of the Septuagint continues. This volume certainly does not resolve all the open questions, but hopefully, it helps further the discussion by clarifying some crucial points. In order to fully understand the nature of the *kaige* group, we need a great deal more research on the textual material, but we also need an understanding of the history of research and an open mind for new perspectives. In all these respects, Dominique Barthélemy certainly gave us an example to follow.

Anneli Aejmelaeus & Tuukka Kauhanen

Adrian Schenker O.P.

What Were the Aims of the Palestinian Recensions,
and What Did They Achieve?
With Some Biographical Notes on Dominique Barthélemy

1. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* in its Biographical Context

In his *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, Dominique Barthélemy made two discoveries of major consequence for Septuagint research. The first of these concerned the text form of the Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets, discovered in August 1952¹ in a cave of Naḥal Hever near the Dead Sea—he identified this as belonging to a new edition, a so-called recension, of the original Greek text. The purpose of this recension was to bring the text of the original Septuagint of this biblical book into closer conformity with the Hebrew (proto-Masoretic) text, given that this earlier Greek translation was not always in harmony with it. Second, he also demonstrated that this recension was present in many other books of the Greek Bible. Thus, he was able to fully describe the features of this recension and its intermediate place between the early Greek translation on the one hand, and the most developed Jewish recension, the “translation” of Aquila, on the other, this latter being in reality a “*surrecension*”, i.e., the recension of a recension. It is well known that Barthélemy had already seen the connecting links between the Old Greek translation, the recension of the Dodecapheton of Naḥal Hever, and Aquila’s revision in an article published in 1952.²

The discovery of this recension also allowed scholars to understand the place of other recensions, such as those of Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Quinta. Especially significant in this context was the fact that the text of the Lucianic or Antiochene witnesses in 1–4 Kingdoms could now partly be identified as being very close to the Old Greek (in the sections 2 Samuel

1 D. Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’Histoire de la Septante”, *RB* 60 (1953) 18–29, on p. 19; repr. in D. Barthélemy, *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires et Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 38–50. The article is dated September 1952.

2 Barthélemy, “Redécouverte”, 38–50.

11:2³–1 Kings 2:11 and 1 Kings 22–2 Kings 25), and partly as reflecting other Palestinian recensions belonging to the same family as the *kaige* recension.⁴ Codex *Vaticanus*, on the other hand, could now be recognized as a witness to the *kaige* recension in these two same sections, while in the sections 1 Samuel; 2 Sam 1:1–11:1 (or 9:13, according to Shenkel), and 1 Kings 2:12–21:43, it corresponds to another Palestinian recension. In Barthélemy's terminology, the term "recension" refers to a new edition of the early Greek Bible made by comparison with a Hebrew text considered as normative for the Bible text. He called these recensions "Palestinian" because they were produced in early rabbinic circles within the land of Israel or Palestine.

Barthélemy explained the changing nature of the Greek witnesses in 1–4 Kingdoms by referring to Origen's Hexapla. In various biblical books and sections thereof, for the Septuagint column, Origen made use of different Greek text forms with which he had first become acquainted in Egypt and later in Palestine. Regarding the sections 1 Samuel, 2 Sam 1:1–11:1 (or 9:13) and 1 Kings 2:12–21:43, he placed both in the fifth column, i.e., the Septuagint column, and in the sixth column, he placed a Palestinian recension, attested to by the text witnesses B on the one hand, and the Antiochene witnesses on the other. In the section 2 Sam 11:2 (or 2 Sam 10:1)–1 Kings 2:11 he added a seventh column where he placed the Old Greek text, attested to by the Antiochene text witnesses in a slightly corrupt state of preservation. As for the final section, 1 Kings 22–2 Kings 25, Origen reserved the fifth column for the *kaige* recension (B), the sixth for another form of the Palestinian recension, attested to by the Antiochene witnesses, and added a seventh column for the second Palestinian recension.⁵ From the Hexapla these text forms (i.e., the *kaige* recension, which is the most typical representative of the Palestinian recensions, two other less systematic Palestinian recensions, and the Old Greek) spread out into the text witnesses of the Greek Bible,

3 According to J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 117–20, the section begins at 2 Sam 10:1. Shenkel is followed on this point by P.-M. Bogaert/B. Botte, "Septante et versions grecques", *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément* 12 (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1996) 536–692, on pp. 592–3.

4 Thus the reason becomes clear why Barthélemy was inclined to speak of the *group* of Palestinian recensions in the plural. He considered the *kaige* recension as the most developed example of the Palestinian recensions, with two much less systematic recensions in circulation as well, witnessed by B and the Antiochene witnesses in different parts of 1–4 Kingdoms. S. Kreuzer, "Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta. Forschungsgeschichte und eine neue Perspektive", in S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 23–56, rightly calls to mind the consequence of such differences among the recensions: the less systematic they are, the closer they come to reflecting the Old Greek.

5 *Devanciers*, 142–3. Cf. also Bogaert/Botte, "Septante", 592–601 (overview and synthesis).

thus illustrating the great influence the Hexapla was destined to exert on the transmission of the Greek Bible.

Shortly after publication of the 1953 *Revue biblique* article, Barthélemy fell seriously ill. He found himself obliged to entirely interrupt his research, and, leaving the *École biblique* in Jerusalem, to go back to France to recover. He spent about two years away from scholarly work. It was a difficult and challenging time. A fruit of this experience was his book *Dieu et son image*, first published in 1963, the same year as the *Devanciers d'Aquila*.⁶ It was translated into many languages, and continues to be reprinted to the present day. It discreetly displays Barthélemy's personal way of interpreting the Scriptures through a faith perspective.⁷

In 1957 the Master of the Dominican Order, Father Emanuel Suarez, encouraged Barthélemy to accept the chair of Old Testament in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. In the winter term of that same year he began lecturing in Old Testament theology and exegesis. His teaching extended over thirty-four years without interruption. He retired in the summer of 1991. Gifted with outstanding rhetorical talents, he was a subtle interpreter of the Bible. Thus he succeeded in charming his many audiences, within and beyond the university. His manner was joyful. Most striking was his creative imagination, which was never at rest. His lecture rooms were crowded to capacity. Moreover, he served the university as Dean of the Theology Faculty. This was in 1966–1967, at a crucial moment when, after Vatican Council II, a reform of theological studies became necessary. He drew up and implemented the new theological curriculum, a responsibility that afforded him the opportunity to reveal his diplomatic skills. Later he was Vice-Rector, with responsibility for the planning and implementation of an important building programme in the university. He took great pleasure in holding together the overall supervision of these plans and minor details such as the dimensions and types of windows etc. The architects found in him a congenial partner when discussing technical problems. Accustomed to working hard and assiduously, he always had an eye for the playful nature of whatever activity he touched upon.

Towards the end of his life, Dominique Barthélemy had yet again to accept a total and definitive break from all his research. A cerebral hemorrhage prevented him from completing his monumental *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien*

6 D. Barthélemy, *Dieu et son image: Ébauche d'une théologie biblique* (Paris: Cerf, 1963); English translation: *God and His Image* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966).

7 After Barthélemy's death in 2002, on the basis of his teaching notes in the last years of his life, a new book of biblical theology in the same vein was published: D. Barthélemy, *Le pauvre choisi comme Seigneur* (Paris: Cerf, 2009).

Testament. He had published three volumes himself.⁸ It was his second and final trial that he had to consent to.

2. What was the Scope of the “Palestinian” Recensions?

As mentioned above, Barthélemy used to speak of Palestinian recensions in the plural,⁹ at least for the books of Samuel and Kings. He called them Palestinian¹⁰ because they reflect the exegesis of the Jewish rabbinic scholars in that country around the beginning of our era.¹¹ Justin Martyr (died 165), who criticized the Jews for having altered the traditional Greek Bible, was active in Flavia Neapolis (Samaria). The Dodecapropheton scroll was found at the Dead Sea, where it had been brought during the second Jewish war (132–135). Thus it is likely that the recensional initiative originated in Palestine—Eretz Israel. Besides the full-fledged *kaige* recension,¹² there are signs of other recensional efforts preserved in the textual witnesses of the Greek Bible.

What does the term “assimilation” to the current Hebrew text (proto-MT) include? It is obvious that a more systematic choice of the Greek vocabulary in the interest of the Jewish exegesis of its time belongs to it. Barthélemy brilliantly clarified this aspect of the Palestinian recensional project. However, interventions on other points were equally part of the recensional intention, such as that of having the ends and beginnings of biblical books coincide in the Hebrew and Greek texts (in the Old Greek Bible the end of 2 Kgdms was in 1 Kgs 2:11 from where the *kaige* recension transported it to the end of 2 Sam 24 in conformity with the proto-MT).¹³ Similarly, the sequence of 1 Kgs 20–21 is in reversed order in the

8 D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament 1–3* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–1992), covering the historical and prophetic books; posthumously appeared, D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament 4: Psaumes* (Fribourg: Academic Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005); *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament 5 : Job, Proverbes, Qohélet, et Cantique des Cantiques* (same publishers as CTAT 4 : Fribourg – Göttingen 2015). The introductions of Barthélemy to the three first volumes of CTAT appeared in an English translation: D. Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament, An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (Textual Criticism and the Translator 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), representing a large harvest of Barthélemy’s researches in the textual history of the OT.

9 *Devanciers*, 141–2.

10 Barthélemy, “Chaînon manquant”, 23–6; *Devanciers*, 3–88.

11 Barthélemy, “Chaînon manquant”, 19, dates the Minor Prophets scroll of Nahal Hever at the end of the 1st c. AD.

12 Thus he often speaks about the *group* of Palestinian recensions, *Devanciers*, 139–43 etc.

13 *Devanciers*, 141.

Old Greek. In the *Hexapla*, Origen adopted the order of the proto-MT because he paid great attention to the differences of arrangement of sections between the Hebrew and Greek Bible,¹⁴ and because he considered the arrangement of the proto-MT as more authentic. For him, the original Bible was the Hebrew text of his time, whereas the Greek Scripture was but a translation. The Palestinian recensions allowed him to identify such matters. Long before the *Hexapla*, the authors of the Palestinian recensions corrected discrepancies in the sequence of sections. This has been confirmed by the Dodecapropheton scroll of Naḥal Ḥever, for there the Twelve Minor Prophets are arranged in the order of the MT.¹⁵ This is proof that the recension changed the original sequence of the Old Greek.

Beyond differences in semantics and the order of pericopes, Justin Martyr, the first external witness for the existence of the Palestinian recensions, was interested in the first place by differences of content.¹⁶ In modern terminology these may be called *literary variants*, i.e., readings of the proto-MT that differ from the Hebrew base of the Old Greek, and that were substituted in the recensions for the readings of the earlier Greek translation. There are many instances in the section 2 Sam 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11 where literary differences between the Old Greek (here attested to by Antiochene or Lucianic witnesses) and the *kaige* recension may be observed. A case is signalled by Barthélemy at 2 Sam 11:21 and 12:11 where the Palestinian recension transformed the original name Jerubbaal into Jeroboam.¹⁷ A similar correction of a name occurs in 2 Sam 19:25(24) where the recension replaces *Memphibaal* of the earlier Greek translation, with the name *Memphibosthe*, a secondary reading that had been introduced into the proto-MT for “theological” reasons.¹⁸ A quantitatively more important literary difference is 2 Sam 19:10–13 where the *kaige* recension in its B witness adheres more closely to MT than do the Antiochene witnesses.¹⁹ This corresponds to a *literary* difference

14 A. Schenker, “L’apport durable des Hexaples d’Origène. Bilan de la Lettre à Africanus, bilan aujourd’hui”, in M. Loubet/D. Pralon (ed.), *Eukarpa: Études sur la Bible et ses exégètes* (FS Gilles Dorival; Paris: Cerf, 2011) 385–94.

15 *Devanciers*, 165.

16 Barthélemy, “Chaînon manquant”, 18, quotes as examples of such divergences in the *Dialogue with Tryphon*: § 120.4 (Gen 49:10), § 124.2–3 (Ps 82[81]:1–8), § 137.3 (Jer 7:18).

17 D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament: Vol. 1* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 257. The witnesses of the Palestinian recension are B_{a2} = 509.

18 *Devanciers*, 106–7; Barthélemy, *Critique 1*, 228–9.

19 P. Hugo, “Die antiochenische ‘Mischung’: L zwischen Altem und Neuem in 2Samuel”, in S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 109–32, on pp. 115–22.

between the Old Greek, preserved in the Antiochene witnesses, and the proto-MT, as reflected in B. This shows that, in such cases too, the authors of the Palestinian recensions brought the early Greek translation into greater conformity with the proto-MT. Other examples are easy to find.

Thus it seems reasonable to assume that the authors of the Palestinian recensions were well aware of all these kinds of variations. They wished to eliminate all of them through the assimilation of the earlier Greek Bible to the Hebrew base serving as the norm for their comparative work. They did not restrict themselves to the linguistic features (semantic and syntactic) of the correction. They eliminated literary differences as well, as Justin had observed. They corrected whatever seemed to be an unfaithful reproduction in Greek of the true Hebrew text.

Barthélemy did not go into the question of conformity on the *literary* level between the Old Greek and proto-MT in the project of the recensions. He was interested foremost in their linguistic features because these permitted him to discover and to identify the recensions.

3. The Dating of the Palestinian Recensions and its Implication for their Scope

Barthélemy dated the Naḥal Hever scroll of the Greek Dodecapropheton in the first c. AD on paleographic grounds.²⁰ He noted that the scroll was not the original text of the recension, but a copy of it.²¹ On the other hand, the paleographer of the scroll in vol. VIII of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, P.J. Parsons,²² has very cautiously and tentatively suggested the late 1st c. BC instead. Thus the possibility must at least be reckoned with that the recension was already undertaken in that century.

This implies an important consequence. It is possible that the idea and project of a recension had already begun at the time when the proto-MT was in the making. Barthélemy had shown that, as early as in the 1st c. AD, some consonantal readings, which are specific to the MT, appear in the biblical writings discovered in Qumran and in the other sites around the Dead

20 Barthélemy, “Chaînon manquant”, 19–20 (end 1st c. AD); *Devanciers*, 168–9 (middle of 1st c. AD).

21 *Devanciers*, 187–8, 198.

22 P.J. Parsons, “The Scripts and Their Date”, in E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll From Naḥal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyāl Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 19–26, esp. 25–6.

Sea where biblical manuscripts have been found.²³ This fact proves that the specific proto-MT must have come into existence at the latest somewhat earlier, around the 1st c. BC. This seems to be roughly the time of the composition of the Palestinian recensions. This proximity in time and place of the recensional project with the appearance of typical MT readings suggests a common context for both phenomena. People who fixed the consonantal Bible text to such a high degree of precision that they maintained the apparently pure *formalia* of the text without allowing the least freedom of change must also have been eager to have at their disposal a translation of that text, a translation that was free from unacceptable discrepancies between the original text and the Greek rendering—at least in so far as they wished to have a Greek translation. The extreme linguistic conformity of the Hebrew and the Greek in the *kaige* recension may thus have served not only exegetical interests, but also the possibility of applying the same methods of interpretation in both the Hebrew and Greek Bible. Perhaps it betrays the conviction that every element of the text is meaningful, be it small or great. Therefore a faithful translator is obliged to reproduce the original Hebrew text in such a way that none of its elements be neglected in the rendering.

In conclusion, the uncertain dating, opening a possible range of time extending from the 1st c. BC until the middle of the 1st c. AD, suggests proximity in time and place for the creation of the proto-MT and the composition of the Palestinian recensions. Justin Martyr's witness from the 2nd c. AD need not be an objection to such a date, earlier than that proposed by Barthélemy. For Justin does not at any point insinuate that the translation he criticizes as different from the Old Greek was a new Jewish translation recently created. The essential reason for undertaking a revision of the early Greek Bible in light of the Hebrew text current precisely at that time would have been the new conviction of the fathers of the proto-MT that this text was meaningful in every detail and in all its elements. Therefore a translation could not dispense with the duty of faithfully reproducing it with all its elements. In this respect the Old Greek could no longer be considered as satisfactory.

23 Barthélemy, "Histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament", in D. Barthélemy, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 341–64, esp. 351–4; Barthélemy, *Studies*, 383–409.

4. Did the Palestinian Recensions Paradoxically Contribute to the Rejection of the Old Greek Bible among the Jews of Palestine?

The Palestinian recensions were doomed to fail in some books of the Bible, such as 1 Kings, Jeremiah, 1(3) Esdras, perhaps Ezekiel and Exodus 35–40, Job and Proverbs, and even in as recently published a book as Daniel. Indeed, in these books the differences in detail and in arrangement of pericopes are so many in number and so complex in nature that a recension would have had a hard time to heal all the discrepancies. Origen had described this almost impossible task in his letter to Africanus.²⁴ In these books, Theodotion, Aquila and Symmachus were more translators than mere correctors of a preceding edition. If a recension implies too large an investment in terms of changes to be introduced on all levels—equivalents between words, syntactical changes, transposition of verses and pericopes, and literary modifications—the idea of a revision of a preexisting text gets lost. A recension becomes instead a complete rewriting rather than the “retouching” of the earlier version.

This may have been the reason for the disfavour into which the Old Greek Bible fell with Jews after the 2nd c. AD. At that time the Greek-speaking Jews had Aquila and Symmachus for most books of the Bible in a form that corresponded to the proto-MT. Barthélemy attributed to the Palestinian recensions the following biblical books: in addition to the parts of 1–4 Kingdoms, already mentioned above: Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, a recension of Judges attested to in some textual witnesses of that book, the version of Daniel attributed to Theodotion, the supplements added to the Old Greek of Job and Jeremiah, the Quinta of Psalms, and the Twelve Minor Prophets of Naḥal Hever.²⁵ It seems that the Palestinian recensions did not include other books of the Bible in their project. Thus it is obvious that the Old Greek Bible was no longer necessary for Greek-speaking Jews. They had another Greek Bible closer to their contemporary Hebrew Scriptures.

5. Conclusion

The scope of the Palestinian recensions was concerned with the conformity of the Greek Bible with the proto-MT. This goal had become necessary with the selection of carefully-written manuscripts by learned scribes in the

²⁴ See n. 14 above.

²⁵ *Devanciers*, 47.

2nd and 1st c. BC, who prepared an accurate edition of the Hebrew Bible. Thus these manuscripts were to furnish the base for the proto-MT in the 1st c. AD. The same learned circles responsible for the proto-Masoretic recension were probably initiators of the project of the Palestinian recensions of the 1st c. BC and AD. For both, the new Hebrew and new Greek editions seem to have been created at the same period, in the same place, and with a similar approach to Scripture. The recensions of the Old Greek Bible tried to eliminate all differences between the proto-MT and OG (vocabulary, syntax, literary differences, sequence of *pericopae*). The Palestinian recensions, and especially the *kaige* recension among them, were the first attempts to assimilate the original Greek Bible to the newly created proto-MT. They were followed by the more complete and more systematic recensions of Aquila and Symmachus, which finally superseded the Old Greek Bible among Greek-speaking Jews.

Philippe Hugo

The Books of Kingdoms Fifty Years after the *Devanciers d'Aquila*. Development of the *Kaige* Theory within Barthélemy's Works, and Some Implications for Present Research

The discovery of the *kaige* revision by Dominique Barthélemy is beyond doubt one of the most important turning points in research on the textual history of the Septuagint (LXX). His watershed study of 1963, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, became and still is a beacon to which scholars orient their own research on the text and transmission history of the LXX.¹ Probably the field in which Barthélemy's hypothesis has produced the most fruitful results is the textual history of the books of Kingdoms.²

1. The Old Greek, *Kaige* and the Antiochene Text in Kingdoms

By identifying the *kaige* revision within two sections of the Books of Kingdoms (2 Kgdms 10:1–3 Kgdms 2:11 and 3 Kgdms 22:1–4 Kgdms)³ in the *codex Vaticanus* (B)—or, as Barthélemy called it, in the Palestinian text (Pal.)—he discovered and explained the origin of some linguistic features of these sections, which Henry St. John Thackeray had first hypothesized as a later layer of translation of Kingdoms.⁴ In the so-called *kaige*

1 See some previous assessments of Barthélemy's influence: R.A. Kraft, "Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy's *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later", *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 1–28; L.J. Greenspoon, "Recensions, Revision, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early Developments in the Greek Traditions", *Textus* 15 (1990) 153–67; J.W. Wevers, "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies", *BIOSCS* 21 (1988) 23–34.

2 Cf. P. Hugo, "1–2 Reigns", in J.K. Aitken (ed.), *The T&T Clark Handbook to the Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2015) 127–46; T.M. Law, "3–4 Reigns", in *ibid.*, 147–66. P. Hugo, "Basileion I und II / 1 und 2 Königtümer / Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel", in S. Kreuzer (ed.), *Einleitung in die Septuaginta (Einleitung in die Septuaginta (Handbuch zur Septuaginta 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2016) 207–31.*

3 J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 117–120, proved that 2 Kgdms 10:1–11:1 also belongs to *kaige*.

4 H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings", *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78; H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923²), 16–28.

sections, Barthélemy proved quite convincingly that the best witness of the Old Greek (OG) is to be found in the five manuscripts of the Antiochene text (*L*: 19–82–93–108–127; Brooke-McLean: boc_{2e}₂). This textual tradition remains untouched by the Origenian recension as well as by the *kaige* recension, because, as Sebastian Brock also demonstrated,⁵ it broke off from the main stream of the LXX at an early date, probably not later than the 1st c. CE, and experienced little influence from it. Its ancientness has been confirmed by its agreements with the Qumran fragments of Samuel, esp. 4QSam^a, with the *Vetus Latina*, and other daughter versions,⁶ Josephus, and Chronicles.

Barthélemy's hypothesis was widely adopted and up to now remains the standard theory for the textual history of Kingdoms, although his assessment of *L* as the best witness of the OG aroused discussion soon after the publication of the *Devanciers*. According to some scholars—among them one must mention Sebastian Brock, and more recently Natalio Fernández Marcos and Bernard A. Taylor⁷—if the *kaige* recension is not challenged, the nature of *L* as basically OG is denied.⁸ On the contrary, they emphasize the fact that *L* contains numerous marks of revision dated from the 4th c. CE: stylistic revisions and Atticistic tendencies, narrative harmonization, smoothing of difficulties, and facilitating interpretations.⁹

In very recent research, the question of the nature of the Antiochene text is still a crucial point of the scholarly debate. First, the extent of the agreements between *L* and the ancient witnesses such as 4QSam, *Vetus Latina*

5 S. Brock, *Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (Diss. Oxford 1966; Quaderni di Henoch 9; Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1996), 304.

6 Cf. A. Piquer/P. Torijano/J. Trebolle Barrera, “Septuagint Versions, Greek Recensions and Hebrew Editions. The Text-Critical Evaluation of the Old Latin, Armenian and Georgian Versions in III–IV Regnorum”, in H. Ausloos/J. Cook/F. García Matínez/B. Lemmelijn/M. Vervenne (ed.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 251–81.

7 Brock, *Recensions*; S. Brock, “Lucian *redivivus*. Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*”, *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968) 176–181; N. Fernández Marcos, “The Antiochene Text of the Greek Bible: A Revised and Edited Text”, in *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 27–37; B.A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of Reigns: Vol. 2: Analysis* (HSM 51; Atlanta: Scholar Press, 1993), 127–8.

8 See the insightful comments on Brocks' review by S. Kreuzer, “‘Lukian *redivivus*’ or Barthélemy and Beyond?”, in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the IOSCS. Helsinki, 2010* (SBLSCS 59; Atlanta: SBL, 2013) 243–61.

9 Cf. N. Fernández Marcos, “Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings”, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the IOSCS Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: SBL, 1987) 287–304.

or Josephus was recently challenged or nuanced.¹⁰ The textual character of B outside the *kaige* sections is also challenged, because several Hebraizing elements have been identified.¹¹ Finally, some scholars following Brock emphasize characteristics of revision in *L*,¹² while others tend to consider it as basically OG within as well as outside the *kaige* sections, thus bringing new arguments for that position.¹³

In dealing with the complexity of the Greek traditions, I tend to adopt a middle way between the two mentioned poles:¹⁴ *L* is basically OG within the *kaige* sections, but outside it has to be considered equally with B as a potential witness of the OG. Nevertheless, neither of them reflects the OG in a pure form. The text-critical theory always has to be confronted with the textual data. This confrontation brings to light in my opinion a relatively large layer of corrections, smoothing and stylistic adjustments in *L*. The unique way to determine the extent of this layer is to compare the readings case by case and avoid generalization.

The present paper aims to contribute to this debate, for once, not by bringing some new arguments for or against this or that position, but rather by observing Barthélemy's work and his own practice of text criticism. In the next section, I will recall and comment on some of his central affirmations in

-
- 10 T. Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (DSI 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012); R.J. Saley, "Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007) 63–73; R.J. Saley, "Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a", *BIOSCS* 41 (2008) 34–45. Concerning the agreements between *L* and early Christian literature, see M. Meiser, "Antiochean Readings of I–IV Reigns in Early Church Fathers", forthcoming; see also "Readings of the Old Latin (Beuron 91–95) Reflecting 'Additions' of the Antiochene Text in 3–4 Kingdoms" by Julio Trebolle in this volume.
- 11 A. Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek—Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*", in A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition: FS Sollamo* (JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–366; Kreuzer, "'Lukian redivivus' or Barthélemy", 259–61.
- 12 T.M. Law/T. Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer", *BIOSCS* 43 (2010) 73–87; Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem*, 191.
- 13 S. Kreuzer, "From 'Old Greek' to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?", in W. Kraus/R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 225–237; idem, "Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension)", in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the IOSCS, Ljubljana, 2007* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: SBL, 2008) 239–53; idem, "Translation and Recension: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns", *BIOSCS* 42 (2009) 34–51.
- 14 P. Hugo, "Die antiochenische 'Mischung': *L* zwischen Altem und Neuem in 2 Samuel", in S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund (ed.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 109–32.