SHORT NOTES

AN UNRECOGNISED OCCURRENCE OF THE MONTH NAME ZIW (2 SAM. XXI 9)

It is the great merit of Père Barthélemy to have shown, in his Les Devanciers d’Aquila \(^1\), the great importance and antiquity of the text of the Septuagint minuscules, traditionally designated as ‘Lucanian’, in certain of the historical books, and in particular in the sections of 1-4 Kings (i.e. 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings) referred to by Thackeray as βγ (= 2 Samuel xi 2-1 Kings ii 11) and γδ (= 1 Kings xxii-2 Kings).

According to Barthélemy, the so-called ‘Lucanian’ text (which he prefers to call ‘Antiochene’) represents, in βγ and γδ, the original Greek translation, uncontaminated by the early revision on the basis of the Hebrew, designated by him as the ‘Palestinian Recension’, which has deeply influenced the mainstream of the Greek manuscript tradition. Barthélemy’s main conclusions appear to have been generally accepted \(^3\), although his view of the ‘Antiochene’ text is too simpliste, and requires some modifications \(^4\), for this text contains strata of several different origins, including elements which may plausibly be attributed to the historical Lucian, c. 300 AD\(^5\).

The implications of Barthélemy’s findings for the textual criticism of the Hebrew text of those parts of Samuel and Kings where the ‘Antiochene’ text represents the only Greek text uninfluenced by the ‘Palestinian Recension’ have surprisingly hardly begun to be


\(^2\) J. D. Shenkel, in his Chronology and Recensional Development of the Greek Text of Kings (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 117-20, puts forward evidence that βγ began at x 1, rather than xi 2.

\(^3\) And indeed developed, in connection with Hebrew recensions, by F. M. Cross, in HTR 57 (1964), pp. 281-99, and IEJ 16 (1966), pp. 81-95; Cross maintains, on what appears to be rather flimsy evidence, that the Antiochene text already represents a very early revision (“Proto-Lucanian recension”) on the basis of a Hebrew text, and that the original Greek is entirely lost in βγ. Some criticisms of Cross’ reconstruction will be found in G. Howard’s “Frank Cross and recensional criticism”, VT 21 (1971), pp. 440-50.
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exploited. Indeed one has to look back to the older commentaries, such as those of KLOSTERMANN, WELLHAUSEN and DRIVER, to find any serious (if often uncritical) attention paid to the 'Lucianic' text (as it was then known to them, as a result of DE LAGARDE’s edition 1). In the following I hope to demonstrate something of the interest that the 'Antiochene' text has for the textual critic of the Hebrew Bible, even though, in its present form, this text may have been somewhat corrupted in the course of transmission.

The end of 2 Samuel xxi 9 reads as follows in the MT and Greek:

MT bymy gsr br?šym thit gsr istring
LXXrell. ἐν ἡμέραις θεσσαλοῦ ἐν πρῶτοι ἐν ἀρχῇ θεσσαλοῦ κριθῶν
‘Ant.’ ἐν ἡμέραις κείων — — ἐν ἀρχῇ θεσσαλοῦ κριθῶν

LXXrell. reflect the text of MT, as do the Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate, although these versions deal with the syntactic difficulties of the Hebrew 2) in slightly different ways. The ‘Antiochene’ text, however, represents a shorter text, and in its present form would be translated “in the days of spelt (or emmer), at the beginning of the barley harvest”. The opening phrase at once arouses suspicion, for not only does it make little sense, but it also introduces a serious chronological difficulty, in that emmer, or spelt, was harvested later than barley 3).

Zéal, which normally refers to Triticum monococcum or T. dicoccum in Greek, occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible, although the singular ζεά 4) renders ksmt, ‘emmer’, in LXX Isaiah xxviii 5, and in α’ at Ex. ix 32 and Ezek. iv 9 (LXX and θ’ δυσσα). There is a remote possibility, however, that ζεά was intended to represent ἱρυμ, ‘barley’, for some of the Byzantine lexica speak of ζεά as ‘a kind of barley’ 6). If such were the case, the ‘Antiochene’ text would preserve elements of a double rendering of ἱρυμ, but against this it should be stressed that nowhere else does ζεά represent ἱρυμ in the LXX, nor does it ever occur as a variant to χριθῶν.

How, then, is ζείων to be explained? I believe the answer is a

1) 1883. Twelve years earlier, WELLHAUSEN, in his brilliant and compact Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, occasionally made use of readings in 'Lucianic' manuscripts, which he knew of only from HOLMES-PARSONS; see especially pp. 221-4.
2) Usually corrected to br’ bymy.
3) Cp. Ex. ix 32-1, also the Gezer calendar.
4) So, evidently, the manuscripts: ζεά is the more usual form in Greek.
5) Thus, e.g., in the SUDA: ζεά: σίδης, χριθής. Compare JEROME’S remarks on ksmt, quoted by FIELD, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, at Ezek. iv 9.