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.\(^3\)

---

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$_2$e$_2$ 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$_2$e$_2$. In order to prove this hypothesis, Barthélemy showed that boc$_2$e$_2$ and the other manuscripts have a common basis, and he further demonstrated that *kaige*-Th revised the tradition embodied in boc$_2$e$_2$ in conformity to the Hebrew. Indeed, *kaige*-Th is more literal than boc$_2$e$_2$, but this situation does not necessarily imply that *kaige*-Th revised boc$_2$e$_2$. The relationship between *kaige*-Th and boc$_2$e$_2$ could be viewed differently:

1. Barthélemy’s examples are selective and exclude those showing that boc$_2$e$_2$ are more literal than *kaige*-Th.
2. There is much internal evidence in boc$_2$e$_2$ 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$_2$e$_2$ 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$_2$e$_2$ 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$_2$e$_2$ are composed of two layers,\(^10\) I would question whether the substratum is indeed a proto-


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


\(^10\) The fact that diametrically opposed tendencies are visible in boc$_2$e$_2$ makes such an assumption very plausible.