

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

LUCIAN AND PROTO-LUCIAN

TOWARD A NEW SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

Much new material on the Septuagint revisions has been revealed through archaeological finds and philological investigations. The present paper deals with one of these recently discovered revisions —the so-called proto-Lucianic revision. Since any analysis of this version is by its very nature closely related to Lucian's revision, we shall first outline the three major opinions proffered on the nature of his revision and the essence of the manuscripts *boc₂e₂*.

From Ruth 4:11 onwards, Lucian's revision is contained in *boc₂e₂*, as was suggested by Rahlfs on the basis of earlier suggestions by de Lagarde. Our remarks are limited to 1–4 Reigns since they have been the subject of the majority of investigations concerning Lucian's revision.

A. Rahlfs' thorough study *Lucian's Rezension*¹ formed the basis of the *communis opinio* on Lucian until two decades ago. Rahlfs described how, on the one hand, Lucian brought the OG into conformity with the Hebrew, while, on the other hand, he removed the OG from MT by freely revising its language and style. Rahlfs further realized, as had earlier scholars like Mez,² that Lucian's fourth century revision reflects many ancient variants, which Rahlfs named proto-Lucianic since they are also to be found in various sources preceding Lucian by several centuries. It was Rahlfs' great achievement to have described the three layers composing Lucian's text. As a rule, he underestimated the importance of proto-Lucianic elements.³

¹ See the analysis by N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism," in: Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 161–174.

² A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VIII der Archaeologie* (Basel 1895).

³ Cf. P.L. Hedley, "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the LXX," *HThR* 26 (1953) 69: 'Rahlfs has always admitted that Lucian may have used a Syrian text that differed from those current in other districts, but he has consistently depreciated the value of the recension.'

A completely novel view of the nature of boc_2e_2 was suggested in 1963 by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 89 ff. After describing the characteristics of the newly discovered *kaige*-Th revision, Barthélemy turned to an analysis of the second part of 2 Samuel in the Greek versions. He showed that in this section the main LXX manuscripts contain *kaige*-Th, while the OG is found in boc_2e_2 . In order to prove this hypothesis, Barthélemy showed that boc_2e_2 and the other manuscripts have a common basis, and he further demonstrated that *kaige*-Th revised the tradition embodied in boc_2e_2 in conformity to the Hebrew. Indeed, *kaige*-Th is more literal than boc_2e_2 , but this situation does not necessarily imply that *kaige*-Th revised boc_2e_2 . The relationship between *kaige*-Th and boc_2e_2 could be viewed differently:

1. Barthélemy's examples are selective and exclude those showing that boc_2e_2 are more literal than *kaige*-Th.
2. There is much internal evidence in boc_2e_2 indicating that they contain a revision, even in the second part of 2 Samuel.⁴
3. Barthélemy's conclusions refer to the whole of the LXX, while his investigation is limited to one section of Reigns.
4. Barthélemy dismisses the historical evidence concerning Lucian's revisional activities with too much ease.⁵

A third view of boc_2e_2 was proposed in 1964 by Cross, "Biblical Text." While analyzing 4QSam^a, Cross realized that this Hebrew source contains many proto-Lucianic readings.⁶ In light of this evidence, Cross suggested that boc_2e_2 are composed of two different layers: a substratum containing a proto-Lucianic revision of the OG toward a Hebrew text such as 4QSam^a, and a second layer containing the historical Lucian's corrections. These ideas were reinforced by Lemke,⁷ Shenkel, *Chronology*, Klein,⁸ Harrington,⁹ and O'Connell, *Exodus*.

While agreeing with the position that boc_2e_2 are composed of two layers,¹⁰ I would question whether the substratum is indeed a proto-

⁴ Cf. especially S.P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*, Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*," in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica* V (TU 103) 176-181 as well as his study quoted in n. 33.

⁵ Cf. Cross, "Biblical Text," 295, n. 44.

⁶ Cross has published only some examples of proto-Lucianic readings of 4QSam^a; see further *DJD* XVII (in press).

⁷ W.E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," *HThR* 58 (1965) 349-363.

⁸ R.W. Klein, "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns," *HThR* 61 (1968) 492-495.

⁹ D.J. Harrington, "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 1-17.

¹⁰ The fact that diametrically opposed tendencies are visible in boc_2e_2 makes such an assumption very plausible.

Lucianic *revision*. Has it really been established that this substratum was a revision rather than simply another Greek text? If such an assumption is necessary to explain the elements in boc₂e₂ which approximate the LXX to MT, it must be pointed out that Lucian derived such elements mainly from the 'Three' and the fifth column of the Hexapla, as shown by Rahlfs.

In light of the above reflections and of my own study of Lucian, a new working hypothesis on the nature of boc₂e₂ is suggested here. Like Cross, I propose that boc₂e₂ in the books of Reigns are composed of two layers. The second layer is the historical Lucian, and I suggest that its substratum contained either *the* OG translation or any OG translation. Although the term proto-Lucianic (or pre-Lucianic) should probably be continued as a designation of the OG substratum, one should not assume a proto-Lucianic *revision* as such, since the existence of such an intermediary stage has not been proven. Our proposal thus forms a compromise between the views of Barthélemy and Cross.

The working hypothesis is supported by the following arguments:

1. The text of boc₂e₂ is evidenced in a wide range of sources, both before and after Lucian's supposed *floruit* (300 CE). Of these sources, the sources preceding Lucian are particularly noteworthy. These include:

4QSam^a (see Cross, "Biblical Text"),

two early papyri: the Manchester P. Ryl. Greek 458 of Deuterono-my¹¹ and P. 2054 of Psalms,

the various fragments of the *Vetus Latina*,¹²

the substratum of the Armenian translation,¹³

the text quoted by Josephus,¹⁴

the text quoted by Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*,¹⁵

¹¹ Cf. the literature quoted by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 220-223 and in addition: J. Hempel, *ZAW NF* 14 (1937) 115-127; A. Allgeier, *Biblica* 19 (1938) 1-18; J. Hofbauer, *ZKT* 62 (1938) 385-389.

¹² B.M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden 1963) 31-32 mentions several studies on the relationship between Lucian and the *Vetus Latina*. See further: Wellhausen, *Samuel*, 221-224; H. Voogd, *A Critical and Comparative Study of the Old Latin Texts of the First Book of Samuel*, unpubl. diss. Princeton 1947; R. Thornhill, *JThSt* 10 (1959) 233-246; J. Cantera, *Sefarad* 23 (1963) 252-264; idem, "Puntos de contacto de la 'Vetus Latina' con la recension de Luciano y con otras recensiones griegas," *Sefarad* 25 (1965) 69-72; cf. also Brock's study mentioned in n. 33.

¹³ Cf. B. Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch* (Lund 1968) 158; idem, "Some Remarks on the Daughter Versions of the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 5 (1972) 7-9.

¹⁴ Cf. A. Mez, *Die Bibel von Josephus* (Basel 1895); A. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 80 ff.; H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus, The Man and the Historian* (1929; repr. N. Y. 1967) 87 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. D.J. Harrington, S.J., "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 1-17.

the text quoted by various Church Fathers: Clemens of Alexandria,¹⁶ Theophilus of Antioch (cf. Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 114 ff.), Tertullian,¹⁷ Hippolytus (see Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 123 ff.), Cyprian,¹⁸ and Origen.¹⁹ To these sources one should probably add the Coptic translation of the LXX²⁰ and certain elements in the Peshitta.²¹

Contrary to the beliefs of some scholars,²² I disagree with the opinion that the enumerated sources have been retouched by so-called 'Lucianic revisers.' In some instances such an assumption is either impossible or close to impossible.

The list of sources which reflect the text of *boc*₂*e*₂ after the historical Lucian is equally large. It contains both the text quoted by various Church Fathers²³ and the text reflected in the Gothic, Slavo-nic, and so-called Syro-Lucianic translations of the LXX. Some of these sources are undoubtedly based on Lucian, but in other cases it has yet to be determined whether the post-Lucianic sources are based on the ancient substratum of *boc*₂*e*₂ only or whether they reflect the Lucianic text as a whole. This is especially true since some of these sources are very close to Lucian's *floruit* and/or are not derived from the area of Antioch.

It cannot be coincidental that so many diverse sources reflect a proto-Lucianic text in the books of Reigns. The only solution appears to be that all the above-mentioned sources reflect elements of either *the* OG or a single OG translation underlying Lucian's revision. The non-Lucianic manuscripts contain a different, and, sometimes later, text tradition. We shall later dwell on the differences between *boc*₂*e*₂ and the non-Lucianic manuscripts.

2. The studies dealing with the character of the assumed proto-Lucianic revision stress that this revision generally left the OG unrevised (see especially Shenkel, *Chronology*). This view is based upon a

¹⁶ Cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 136 (pace Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 118 ff.).

¹⁷ Cf. P. Capelle, *Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique = Collectanea biblica latina IV* (Rome 1913) 200 (pace Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 138 ff.).

¹⁸ Cf. especially B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus Latina der vier Königsbücher," *Miscellanea biblica et orientalia R.P. Athanasio Miller oblata = Studia Anselmiana XXVII-XXVIII* (Rome 1951) 169-177; Capelle, *Le texte*, 203-204.

¹⁹ Rahlfs, *Lucian's Rezension*, 139 ff.; D. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 136 ff.

²⁰ Cf. J.B. Payne, "The Sahidic Coptic Text of I Samuel," *JBL* 72 (1953) 51-62; however, it is not certain whether the Old Coptic text is as early as Payne surmises (250 CE).

²¹ See the data collected by Th. Stockmayer, *ZAW* 12 (1892) 218-223; however, Stockmayer's conclusion, which is phrased in the title of his article ("Hat Lucian zur seiner Septuagina-revision die Peschito benützt?": yes!), cannot be vindicated.

²² See especially L. Dieu, "Retouches lucianiques sur quelques textes de la vieille version latine (I et II Samuel)," *RB NS* 16 (1919) 372-403.

²³ Asterius Sophista, Diodore of Tarse, Eustathius, Lucifer, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jacob of Edessa.

comparison of translation options in boc₂e₂ and the OG which shows that both have a common vocabulary, on Shenkel's investigation of the identical chronological systems of the two as opposed to the chronological systems of MT and *kaige*-Th (ibid., *passim*), and on the fact that both traditions start the third book of Reigns at 1 Kgs 2:11.²⁴ But if the assumed proto-Lucianic revision is so close to the OG and frequently left it unrevised, would it not be more logical to characterize the substratum of boc₂e₂ as OG rather than a proto-Lucianic revision?

3. It has been recognized (e. g., Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 128 ff.) that the contents of the Hexapla's sixth column in the second part of 2 Samuel are very close to boc₂e₂. For Barthélemy the sixth column thus contains the OG, while the other manuscripts in that section contain *kaige*-Th. For Cross, "Biblical Text," 295 it contains the proto-Lucianic revision 'in relatively pure form.' Since in this section Origen placed *kaige*-Th in the fifth column, it would be more likely that the Hexapla's sixth column would contain the OG than an unknown revision about which we possess no records. Furthermore, a probable parallel is found in 2 Kings, where Burkitt suggested that the *Quinta* contains the OG.²⁵ As in the second part of 2 Samuel, the main manuscripts of 2 Kings contain *kaige*-Th, and here, also, boc₂e₂ resemble one of the columns of the Hexapla, in this case the *Quinta*. However, the resemblance between boc₂e₂ on the one hand, and the sixth column on the other, has yet to be investigated in detail.

4. Klein²⁶ has shown that the additions in the Greek Chronicles harmonizing that text with 2 Kings reflect the textual tradition of boc₂e₂ rather than *kaige*-Th.²⁷ This situation would seem to indicate that the translator of Chronicles took the OG as his basis.²⁸

5. Shenkel demonstrated that in the synoptic sections of Samuel and Chronicles the Greek Chronicles is based on the OG of Samuel.²⁹ He found that in the *kaige*-Th sections there is a much greater agreement

²⁴ Cf. Shenkel, *Chronology*, 10 ff. and section 2 of the appendix to this paper.

²⁵ F.C. Burkitt, "The So-called Quinta of 4 Kings," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 24 (1902) 216-219.

²⁶ Klein, "New Evidence" (n. 8).

²⁷ The alternative explanation that the historical Lucian harmonized the two Greek texts has been discussed by Klein and Allen in *HThR* 61 (1968) 483-495.

²⁸ This possibility, which seems to us the best explanation of the evidence, is rejected by Klein after some consideration: 'This pre-*kaige* text, which served as the source for the Par supplements, could be either the Old Greek hitherto unknown, or, as seems more likely, the proto-Lucianic recension' (ibid., 104).

²⁹ J. D. Shenkel, "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns," *HThR* 62 (1969) 63-85.

with *boc₂e₂* of Samuel than in the non-*kaige* sections.³⁰ An analysis of Shenkel's data proves that in all sections the Greek Chronicles is based upon the OG, which in the *kaige*-Th sections is reflected in *boc₂e₂*.

On the basis of these arguments suggesting that the substratum of *boc₂e₂* contains *the* OG or OG elements it seems that the study of *boc₂e₂* should be founded on a new basis. The contents of *boc₂e₂* should be studied anew, especially in light of the proto-Lucianic sources. While the above-mentioned arguments partially relied on previous research, a renewed investigation of *boc₂e₂* may support the working hypothesis suggested above.

When starting to elucidate the details of the working hypothesis in light of the above-mentioned arguments, one realizes the difficulties in defining criteria for unraveling the three layers of *boc₂e₂*, viz. the OG substratum, Lucian's borrowings from the 'Three' and the fifth column of the Hexapla, and Lucian's own corrections. Criteria have to be defined as to which elements belonged or could have belonged to any one of the three layers. One of the main problems is that certain characteristics of *boc₂e₂* which scholars have always assigned to the historical Lucian were already extant in Lucian's *Vorlage*. B. Fischer showed in 1951 (cf. n. 18) not only that the so-called Lucianic tendencies were already extant in La, but also that this version—no doubt an early translation of the OG—reflected some of these tendencies against *boc₂e₂* and the other manuscripts of the LXX. Thus, additions of subjects, objects and names, changes between nouns and pronouns, short contextual additions, harmonizing additions, specific translation equivalents, several doublets, some linguistic changes, and translations instead of transliterations³¹ are not late Lucianic phenomena, but belonged to the very first stratum of the LXX. To these examples one may add several in which *boc₂e₂* reflect the original Greek text which has been corrupted in all other

³⁰ According to Shenkel's statistics, 74% of the words of 1 Chronicles 17-18 agree with the Old Greek of 2 Samuel 7-8 (non-*kaige*) and 3% disagree with the Old Greek in favor of *boc₂e₂* in that section. On the other hand, 56% of the words in 1 Chronicles 19 agree with the *kaige* manuscripts of 2 Samuel 10 and 13% disagree with the same manuscripts in favor of *boc₂e₂*. The amount of agreement between 1 Chronicles 19 and the *boc₂e₂* manuscripts in 2 Samuel 10 is actually much greater than the numbers indicate: 1. the 56% agreement between 1 Chronicles 19 and the *kaige*-Th manuscripts of 2 Samuel 10 include many instances when *kaige* is identical to *boc₂e₂*; it would actually be more correct to state that in such cases 1 Chronicles agrees with *boc₂e₂* of 2 Samuel 10 while the *kaige* revision has left the text unrevised. 2. The number of assumed agreements between 1 Chronicles 19 and the OG of 2 Samuel 10 would have been larger than 13% if the historical Lucian had not inserted his own revisions in *boc₂e₂*.

³¹ Even though it appears illogical for original renderings to have been changed by a later hand to transliterations (mainly of unknown words), I hope to have established this process for some of the LXX revisers in Tov, "Transliterations."*

manuscripts. The most striking examples of proto-Lucianic elements are provided by readings which reflect early variants. These variants, which often are of importance for Biblical scholarship, form the largest group of proto-Lucianic readings (see the appendix).

Since it can be proven that certain readings of boc_2e_2 were extant in pre-Lucianic sources, we have to consider the possibility that many typologically similar readings were pre-Lucianic as well. This point should not be overstressed, however, since it is not impossible that in some cases the historical Lucian was guided by the same principles as the original translators.

In concluding this point, the importance of La and other pre-Lucianic sources in pinpointing the ancient elements of boc_2e_2 should be emphasized.³² An investigation into the first stratum of boc_2e_2 is of primary importance for solving the enigma of boc_2e_2 .

A second line of investigation attempts to pinpoint readings which the historical Lucian derived from the 'Three' and from the Hexapla's fifth column. This investigation is limited by its very nature since Lucian's sources have been preserved only partially, but probably the majority of the quantitative revisions towards MT are derived from the 'Three' of the fifth column. The second category of proto-Lucianic readings in the appendix shows that some of Lucian's quantitative revisions may have been found in his Greek *Vorlage*.

The changes which Lucian himself introduced have to be further examined. One immediately thinks of several Atticizing changes such as the replacement of Hellenistic forms as $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\nu$ and $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$ with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\nu$ and $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu$, $\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\psi\epsilon\iota$ with $\lambda\acute{\eta}\psi\epsilon\iota$, and of the replacement of the passive aorist $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$ with the middle aorist $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$.³³

Lucian probably introduced certain stylistic corrections, such as the insertion of synonymous words. However, much investigation remains to be carried out in this field as well; a comparative study of translation equivalents in the different sections and manuscripts of the LXX should determine which boc_2e_2 synonyms were introduced by Lucian and

³² See J. Cantera, "La Vetus Latina y el Texto Masoretico, Hipotesis de una revision de la Vetus Latina a base del texto hebreo," *Sefarad* 23 (1963) 252–264; J.C. Treballe Barrera, "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings," *Textus* 11 (1984) 17–36; idem, "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)," *Textus* 13 (1986) 85–95; N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators—Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden/New York/Köln 1994); idem, "The Vetus Latina of 1–2 Kings and the Hebrew," in: Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 153–170.

³³ S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (Oxford 1966; repr. Torino 1996) discusses several Atticizing and stylistic changes by the historical Lucian. See further N. Fernández Marcos, "Literary and Editorial Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings," in: Cox, *VI Congress*, 287–304.

which were included in his *Vorlage*. In this respect also, La and other pre-Lucianic sources are of help.³⁴ All these studies can now be based on new editions of the Lucianic (Antiochene) text in 1–4 Reigns.³⁵

In conclusion, it is suggested here that the substratum of boc_2e_2 contains either *the* OG translation or any single OG translation. The non-Lucianic manuscripts contain *kaige*-Th in two sections in the books of Reigns, and in three sections they reflect a text which is usually described as the OG. This suggestion is acceptable for the *kaige*-Th sections: *the* OG is contained in the substratum of boc_2e_2 , while *kaige*-Th and the second stratum of boc_2e_2 reflect later corrections of this old substratum.³⁶ However, how should one explain the relationship between boc_2e_2 and the other manuscripts in the non-*kaige* sections? It appears that in these sections we should continue to characterize all non-Lucianic manuscripts as the OG. But in the instances in which boc_2e_2 deviate from the other manuscripts, a different view of the latter manuscripts is suggested for which two alternatives should be considered:

1. In his preliminary publication of 4QLXXLev^a,³⁷ Skehan has shown that in many details this text reflects the OG, while all extant manuscripts have been retouched. This situation shows the unreliability of the manuscripts of the LXX, especially when they reflect MT exactly. The situation in the historical books parallels the problem raised by 4QLXXLev^a: whenever the boc_2e_2 reading is at variance with MT or renders it freely, the reading found in the remainder of the manuscripts, as a rule, agrees with MT, and could thus represent a later revision. In other words, in the non-*kaige* sections the substratum of boc_2e_2 always represents the OG, while the other manuscripts as a rule reflect the OG, but at times their text may have been retouched.
2. It may be suggested that both the boc_2e_2 reading and the one found in the other manuscripts represent two parallel OG traditions.

³⁴ For example, of the few stylistic changes which Brock assigned to Lucian in his article mentioned in n. 4, two are already evidenced in La (cf. the translations of שְׁלִיחַ in 2 Sam 11:7 and of אָרַח in 2 Sam 11:11).

³⁵ N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega*, I-II (Madrid 1989, 1992); B.A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns, Volume 1, Majority Text, Volume 2, Analysis* (HSM 50,51; Atlanta, GA 1992, 1993).

³⁶ Since boc_2e_2 and the other manuscripts of the LXX are genetically interrelated in all sections of the books of Reigns, it is likely that the *kaige*-Th revision was based upon the OG substratum of boc_2e_2 . However, it has yet to be determined whether this substratum of boc_2e_2 was identical to the assumed *Vorlage* of *kaige*-Th or whether one should posit two closely related OG traditions (OG¹ and OG²).

³⁷ P.W. Skehan, *VTSup* 4 (1957) 148-160. Similarly the final publication (*DJD* IX).

Since the relationship between the readings of boc_2e_2 and that of the other manuscripts may, as a rule, be described as that between an original and its revision, one may prefer the first possibility. However, at the present stage of knowledge of the proto-Septuagint question it is hard to solve this problem. The substratum of boc_2e_2 is therefore characterized as containing either *the* OG or any OG translation. The latter possibility allows for the existence of other translations that might be grouped with the OG while different in some details.

As suggested above, the existence of a proto-Lucianic revision of the LXX has not been established. It is further suggested that the substratum of boc_2e_2 contains either *the* OG or any single OG translation. The correctness of the first suggestion does not hold an implication for the validity of the second.

APPENDIX

SOME CATEGORIES OF PROTO-LUCIANIC READINGS REFLECTED IN MANUSCRIPTS BOC_2E_2 IN REIGNS

1. *Proto-Lucianic variants* (π MT)—the majority of the proto-Lucianic readings fit into this category.

2 Sam 13:3	MT	יוֹנָדָב
	4QSam ^a	"[י]הוֹנָתָה"
	boe_2 Syrj (txt)	Ἰωνναθαν
	B* _{a2}	Ἰωναδαμ
	B ^{a(vid)} _b AMN rell Arm Co Eth Thdt	Ἰωναδαβ
	Jos. <i>Ant.</i> VII, 178	Ἰωναθης
	cf. Cross, "Biblical Text," 294	

2 Sam 18:2	MT	וַיִּשְׁלַח דָּוִד
	$\text{boz}^{\text{mg}}\text{c}_2\text{e}_2$	καὶ ἐτρίσσευσε Δαυεῖδ (וַיִּשְׁלַח דָּוִד)
	LXX ^{rell}	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Δαυεῖδ
	La ^{v.2}	<i>et tripartitum fecit</i>

2. $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2 = \text{La} = \text{MT} \pi \text{LXX}$ —the historical Lucian could have derived these readings from the 'Three' or the Hexapla's fifth column, but since they are reflected in La, they may have been original.

1 Sam 1:6	MT	בַּעֲבוּר הָרַעְמָה
-----------	----	---------------------

	boghe ₂ Chr(vid)	διὰ τὸ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτήν
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	La ^v	<i>quia ad nihilum reputabat eam</i>
2 Kgs 17:21	MT	קָרַע
	boc ₂ e ₂	ἐρράγη
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	La ^{CyPr}	<i>dissipatus est</i>

3. Ancient doublets

1 Sam 16:14	MT	ובעתהו
	boc ₂ e ₂ Syr ⁱ	συνεῖχεν... καὶ ἔπιλεγεν αὐτόν
	LXX ^{rell}	ἔπιλεγεν αὐτόν
	La ^v	<i>comprehendit ... et soffocabat eum</i>

Cf. further B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten ...", 177.

4. boc₂e₂ reflect the OG from which the corrupt text form of the other manuscripts has developed

1 Sam 9:24	MT	לאמר העם
	Nabe-osvwyz ^{mg} b ₂ c ₂ e ₂ ^{txt} Syh ^j mg Thdt	παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ
	(בואת העם)	
	B	παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους
	A	παρὰ τοῦ αἴου
	La ^b = boc ₂ e ₂	(acc. to Brooke-McLean)
1 Sam 10:2	MT	בנבול
	bioc ₂ e ₂	ἐν (τοῖς) ὀρίοις
	gv	τῷ ὀρίῳ
	LXX ^{rell}	ἐν τῷ ὄρει
	La ^{bv}	<i>in finibus</i>
1 Kgs 18:32	MT	תעלה
	oc [*] ₂ e	θαλα
	bz ^{mg} c ^a ₂ ?	θαλαα
	dip	θαλααν
	LXX ^{rell}	θάλασσαν

5. boc₂e₂ contain a translation while the other manuscripts contain a transliteration

2 Sam 17:29	MT	ושפות בקר()
-------------	----	-------------

a ^m gbgoz ^m g _{c2e2} Arm	γαλαθηνὰ μoσχάρια
LXX ^{rell}	σαφωθ βοῶν (or sim.)
La ^b	<i>vitulos saginatos</i>
La ^v	<i>lactantes vitulos</i>
Clem. Alex. I, 98	μοσχάρια γαλαθηνά

Cf. further B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten ...", 176.

6. *boc_{2e2}* add subjects or objects (these additions could reflect variants)

1 Sam 10:23	MT	—
	bhoxb _{2c2e2} Co	Σαμουηλ
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	La ^{bv}	<i>Samuel</i>
1 Kgs 21:20	MT	—
(20:20)	bioc _{2e2}	Ἡλιας
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	La ^{Luc}	<i>Helias</i>

Cf. further B. Fischer, "Lukian-Lesarten ...", 176.

7. *Contextual additions* (these additions could reflect variants)

1 Sam 30:15	MT	—
	Mbgiob ^b za _{2c2e2} Arm	καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	La ^v	<i>et iuravit ei David</i>
1 Sam 9:3	MT	—
	bdghiopc _{2e2}	καὶ ἀνέστη Σαουλ καὶ παρέλα- βεν ἐν τῶν παιδαρίων τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ζητεῖν τὰς ὄνους Κις τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ
	LXX ^{rell}	—
	S	"קם שאול ואול ודבר עמה לחד מ' טליא למבעא אענא דאבוהי

8. *The internal division of the books of Reigns*

The following sources of III Reigns start at 1 Kgs 2:12: *boc_{2e2}*, MS Vat. Syr. 162 (cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III, 16, n. 1), Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*

(book VII includes 1 Kgs 1:1—2:11), Diodorus, Theodoret, Syrj. Cf. further A. Rahlfs, *ibid.*, 186 ff.

9. Translation technique

1 Sam 9:27	MT b ^b b ^{txt} o ^z m ^g c ₂ e ₂ Arm LXX ^{rell} La ^b	(ב)קצה ἄκρον μέρος <i>in loco summo</i>
2 Sam 11:7	MT bo _c 2e ₂ LXX ^{rell} La ^b	(וישאל דוד) לשלום יואב ולשלום העם ולשלום המלחמה εἰ ὑγιαίνει Ἰωαβ καὶ εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ λαὸς καὶ εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ πόλεμος εἰς εἰρήνην Ἰωαβ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου <i>recte est Joab et recte est populus et recte est exercitus belli</i>
1 Sam 4:4	MT boz ^a 2c ₂ e ₂ LXX ^{rell} La ^{bv}	ישב הכרבים οὐ ἐπεκάθητο τὰ Χερουβιμ καθημένου Χερουβειμ <i>ubi sedebat in cherubin</i>

10. Grammatical changes

1 Sam 1:19	MT bo _c 2e ₂ LXX ^{rell} La ^v	וישתחוּוּ ... ויבאו προσεκύνησαν ... καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ προσκυνούσι ... καὶ πορεύονται <i>adoraverunt ... abierunt</i>
1 Sam 2:25	MT boz _c 2e ₂ Syrj Or Chr LXX ^{rell} La ^v Cypr	ואם ἐὰν δέ καὶ ἐάν <i>si autem</i>