

QUINTA/E' IN FOUR REIGNS^{1, 2}

By David G. Deboys

When Origen compiled his multi-columned Hexapla,³ that aptly named 'monument to misguided industry',⁴ he used

1. 'Reign', as H. St. J. Thackeray pointed out ('The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings', *JTS* 8 [1906-7] 263) 'rather than "kingdom", was the meaning of βασιλεία in Hellenistic times'.
2. The approach developed here depends heavily on two unpublished dissertations; that of S. P. Brock, 'The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel', D. Phil. Oxford 1966, and my own, 'The Greek Text of 2 Kings', M. Litt. Oxford 1981. I wish to thank Dr. Brock for the judicious manner in which he guided my search, and for placing his own monumental expertise in Septuagint studies so freely at my disposal.
3. Space forbids any detailed re-examination of previous work on the Hexapla, but we note our working assumptions: (1) Origen's purpose in compiling the Hexapla was apologetic. See especially Brock, 'Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament', *TU* 10 (1970) 215, reprinted in S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York, 1974) 343. For an assessment of P. Nautin's critique of Brock, Origène. Vol. 1. *Sa Vie et son Oeuvre* (Paris, 1977) 347, see Deboys, *Greek Text* 23. Origen was not engaged in an attempt to restore the 'original' Septuagint, as some earlier scholars had asserted (e.g. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel*² [1913] xli-xlii; H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, rev. edn. R. R. Ottley [1914, repr. New York, 1968] 60, though S. Danielle ingeniously attempts to combine the two approaches 'Bible Greek: The Septuagint' in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 4, col. 853. (2) The fifth column of the Hexapla contained a revised text (see J. W. Wevers, 'Septuagint' in *IDB* 4. 275, for a succinct statement of the facts; als. Brock, *Recensions* 37-42); that is, it was a maximal text - it contained all the Septuagint material *sub obelo* and all the supplied material *sub asterisco*.
4. Wevers, 'Proto-Septuagint Studies', in *The Seed of Wisdom, Festschrift for T. J. Meek* (Toronto, 1954) 58.

not only the three Jewish Greek versions of Aquila (α'), Symmachus (σ') and Theodotion (θ')⁵ but also (and not comprehensively) the three anonymous versions known to us as Quinta, Sexta and Septima.⁶ Thus his 'Hexapla' in places contained more than six columns.⁷ It is with the fifth version, Quint/e', that we are here concerned.⁸

I PREVIOUS INVESTIGATION

Quinta has spasmodically attracted scholarly attention. Prior to this century we note only two works. The earlier is by B. Walton, who reviewed the ancient ecclesiastical testimony to Quinta in his *Prolegomena*,⁹ and then noted that Quinta (with Sexta and Septima) appears to have covered only part of the Old Testament.¹⁰ The other is by F. Field, who also reviewed the patristic evidence.¹¹ Field drew special attention to ϵ' in iv R: 'In libro Regum iv, quem Heptaplarem fuisse constat, lectiones $\tau\eta\varsigma$ E' innumeras prius incognitas e versione Syro-Hexaplari in lucem protraximus'.¹² Then, basing himself mainly on the Quinta attestations in Hosea, he offered an assessment of Quinta's style.¹³

-
5. There is no modern study of Aquila or Symmachus in iv R known to me.
 6. The problem of where Origen found Quinta and Sexta (*cf.* Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* [Oxford, 1968] 118-119) is beside the point here. Summary discussion of Quinta may be found in Swete, *Introduction* 53-56 and 66-67; and in Jellicoe, *Septuagint* 118-121.
 7. *Cf.* Field, *Fragmenta* xiv-xv; and Jellicoe, *Septuagint* 115-118.
 8. This article is a revision and expansion of chapter five of my dissertation: Deboys, *Greek Text* 173-181.
 9. B. Walton, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (London, 1657).
 10. *Ibid.* 62.
 11. F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1875) xliii.
 12. *Ibid.* xliii-xliv.
 13. *Ibid.* xliv.

In 1902 F. C. Burkitt,¹⁴ while admitting that Quinta contained a variety of elements,¹⁵ claimed that it 'contained an element ultimately derived from a pre-Massoretic Hebrew text' and that it alone preserved 'some notable readings of the genuine LXX'.¹⁶ He discussed one such instance and note three others.¹⁷

In 1960 D. Barthélemy reviewed Quinta in the Minor Prophets,¹⁸ suggesting, 'Etant données les caractéristiques identiques d- l'«édition selon les Hébreux» citée par Cyrille d'Alexandrie et de la version citée par le deuxième scribe du Barberini grec 549 sous le sigle ε' ce sigle ne signifie pas πέμπτη έκδοσις comme on l'a cru jusqu'ici, mais έκδοσις κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους'.¹⁹

In 1968, in a publication which changed the direction of twentieth century Septuagint criticism,²⁰ Barthelemy returned to the question of Quinta, arguing that the Dodekapropheton fragments (R) which he was editing, 'présentent. . . des relations caractéristiques avec la Quinta des hexaples'.²¹ This relationship he asserted was one of identity.²²

In 1974 G. Howard re-examined Barthélemy's claim that the Hebraising καίγε recension R²³ and Quinta were identical in the Minor Prophets.²⁴ He concluded, 'it does not seem out of place to say that his thesis is unproven. . . the agreements between R and Quinta are sufficient only to prove kinship, not identity'.²⁵

14. 'The so-called *Quinta* of 4 Kingdoms', *PSBA* (1902) 216-219.

15. *Ibid.* 218-219.

16. *Ibid.* 218-219.

17. 4 Kings 19:26-27; 23:4; 23:8; 13:1.

18. 'Quinta ou version selon les Hébreux?', in Festgabe für Walther Eichrodt = *TZ* 16 (1960) 342-353, reprinted in Barthelemy, *Études d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Göttingen, 1978) 54-65.

19. 'Quinta' 352-353 = *Études* 64-65.

20. *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10)(Leiden, 1968).

21. *Devanciers* 213.

22. *Devanciers* 213-217, and especially 221.

23. So called because of its characteristic rendition of $\square\aleph/\square\aleph$ by καίγε. There is a succinct summary by R. W. Klein, *The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1974) 23-24.

24. 'The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Text?' *Bib* 55 (1.74) 15-22.

25. *Ibid.* 22.

In *Les devanciers d'Aquila Barthélemy* elaborated a theory to account for the presence of the $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota\gamma\epsilon$ recension only in certain parts of the Books of Reigns. This included the following assertion: 'pour le quatrième livre de Rèines, Origène, continuant à copier dans sa cinquième colonne la première recension palestinienne a copié dans la sixième la seconde recension palestinienne et reporté à la septième la Septante ancienne'.²⁶ Or, as R. A. Kraft put it diagrammatically:²⁷

2 Kings	col. 5, normal 'LXX' Pal. 1	col. 6 Pa1.2	col.7 'LXX' (=b o c ₂ e ₂) ^{28,29}
---------	--------------------------------	-----------------	---

26. *Devanciers* 143. Although Barthélemy later wrote, 'Je reconnais que j'ai eu tort de me prononcer sur la "recension lucianique" alors que mon étude du texte antiochien n'avait ports que sur la section $\beta\gamma$ des Règnes' (*SCS* 2 [1972] 64, reprinted in *Études* 243), he has made no adequate attempt to establish a broad base in iv R for his assertions.
27. *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 482.
28. Manuscripts are cited in accordance with the notation of A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek* vol. 1 part 1 (Cambridge, 1906). All Greek evidence has been taken from Brooke-McLean, vol. 2 parts 1 and 2 (Cambridge, 1927, 1930), but contrary to their practice S readings are retroverted to Greek—usually on the basis of Field, *Fragmenta*, but sometimes on the basis of P. J. Bruns, *Curae Hexaplares in Librum IV Regum* in J. G. Eichhorn, *Repertorium für Biblische and Morgenlandische Literatur*, vol. 10 (Leipzig, 1782).
29. This manuscript group in the Books of Reigns represent the so-called Lucianic text (L). There is a significant amount of secondary literature on L in Reigns, though little directed primarily to iv R. The outstanding contribution remains A. Rahlfs' monograph, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbacher*, *Septuaginta-Studien* iii (Göttingen, 1911). Of the published surveys of work relating to L we note only three: E. Tov, 'Lucian and Proto-Lucian', *RB* 79 (1972) 101-113, reprinted in F. M. Cross Jr. and S. Talmon (eds.) *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (London, 1975) 293-305; E. C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 19)(Montana, 1978) 15-39; N. F. Marcos, 'The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms' in *De Septuaginta*, Festschrift for J. W. Wevers (Ontario, 1984) 161-174.

Then in a new essay in his *Études*, in response to the 1972 colloquium, Barthélemy nuanced this view as follows, 'Le texte mixte de la 5e colonne se trouvant contenir alors (depuis 1 R 22) un texte de type $\kappa\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$, il aurait été normal qu'il consacre la 6e colonne à la "Septante" (comme il l'avait fait pour le dernier chapitre du troisième livre des Règles). De fait il a créé une 7e colonne pour y placer la "Septante" (qui sera donc citée comme "Quinta" et non plus comme "Théodotion", ce qui était le cas en $\beta\gamma$ et en 1 R 22). Quant à la 6e colonne (= θ) il y a placé une autre forme textuelle que je caractérisais en DA [*Devanciers*] comme une "seconde recension palestinienne". Aujourd'hui, je n'aurai plus l'audace de la qualifier de quelque manière que ce soit.³⁰

Or diagrammatically, following Kraft:

	col.5,	normal 'LXX'	col.6	col.7
2 King	A mixed text of		Pa1.2	'LXX' (= b o c ₂ e ₂)
	the $\kappa\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$ type			

In *Devanciers* Barthélemy advocated abandoning the term 'texte lucianique'³¹ because, 'c'est essentiellement la Septante ancienne, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue'.³² He has subsequently reaffirmed this position.³³

Thus there ought to be a demonstrable relationship between Quinta/ε' and $\underline{\text{L}}$ in Four Reigns,³⁴ a relationship which, on other grounds, would justify the appellation 'la Septante ancienne'.

30. *Études* 275. Cf. 273, 'J'affirme cependant tout aussi clairement que, pour les sections $\beta\gamma$ et $\gamma\delta$, les manuscrits antiochien sont, parmi les manuscrits grecs, ceux qui nous offrent "the oldest Greek available in manuscripts", les autres témoins tels que Josèphe, la Vielle Latine, le marginalia empruntés à la 6e colonne des hexaples pour $\beta\gamma$ et à la 7e colonne pour $\gamma\delta$ ne nous offrant que des données fragmentaires.'

31. *Devanciers* 127, 'Je propose donc que l'on renonce à ces designations dans la critique textuelle de la Septante'.

32. *Ibid.* 127. Cf. 26, 'Ce qu'on appelle texte lucianique n'est autre que la forme vulgaire de la Septante diversement corrompue selon les endroits par les accidents de transmission et la fantaisie des scribes'.

33. Cf. *Études* 271-273

34. Whether we take Barthélemy's hypothesis as expressed in *Devanciers* or the modification of it in *Études*.

II PLACES WHERE QUINTA EQUALS L

There are a number of places where ε' equals L equals the Old Greek (OG),³⁵ despite some of them being asterisked in the hexaplaric tradition. This is because Origen used a his Greek *Vorlage* in iv R a manuscript that was closely related to the archetype of v and was regularly corrupt (not infrequently against the rest of the tradition).³⁶

A. Places where ε' = L = OG, *despite the reading being sub asterisco*

4:40³⁷ לֹא־כֹל uacat g v] + φαγεῖν B A N rell (sub * α' σ' θ' ε' S)³⁸

Omission in g v because of homoioteleuton through parablepsis: ΑΝΔΡΑΣΙΝΦΑΓΕΙΝ.³⁹

10:10 יהוה uacat v] + κυρίου B A N rell (sub * α' σ' θ' ε', S)⁴⁰

Omission in v presumably through parablepsis: PHMATOΣKYEΙΣ.

13:25 בן הַדָּד uacat v] + υἱου αδαδ A (sub * α' θ' ε' S)
+ υἱου αδερ B L
+ αδερ d e f i j m p q s t w z

Omission in v probably through υἱου-υἱου ὄμ:
ΥΙΟΥΑΔΕΡΥΙΟΥΑΖΑΗΛ.

35. *I.e.* the earliest recoverable form of the text.

36. See Deboys, *Greek Text* 26-31, 'Origen's *Vorlage*'. This fact negates D. W. Gooding's suggestion that Origen may have begun with an eclectic text (in his review of I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Der Character der asterisierten Zusätze in der LXX*, *Gnomon* 33 (1961) 145). Neither is there evidence in iv R to support Gooding's claim that Origen chose from the variant readings available to him the one closest to H as his basal text, a criticism which applies similarly to Driver's assertion (*Samuel* xliii) that Origen 'assumed that the original Septuagint was that which agreed most closely with the *Hebrew text as he knew it*' (Driver's italics).

37. All references are to LXX versification; H in parenthesis if different.

38. Unless otherwise stated, the method of citation in the lemmas will be to give MT first, followed by the presumed reading of Origen's Greek *Vorlage* with its attestation.

39. Omission of material is characteristic of v in iv R (see Deboys, *Greek Text* 27-30).

17:25 יהוה uacat g v] + κυριος rell (sub * ὁ ἔβρ α' σ' θ'
ε' S)

Omission i v might be tendentious: aux εροθnnaav
τον κν και απεστειλεν [κς] εν αυτοις τους λεοντας.⁴¹

22:13 הַזֶּה uacat B i v] + τουτου A N rell (sub * ὁ ἔβρ α'
θ' ε' S)

Omission i B i v through haplography:
BIBΛΙΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΠΟΙΕΙΝ.

B. *Other places where ε' = L = OG*

7:12 מן הירר εκ της πολεως] εκ της γης A v S⁴²
εκ της πολεως α' σ' θ' S^{mg}

12:4(5) יעלה λαβη B S] αναβη A N rell (ανεβη v) σ' θ'
ε' S^{mg43}

22:20 בשלום εν ειρηνη] εν ιλημ A A S⁴⁴
εν ειρηνη ὁ ἔβρ α' σ' θ' ε' S^{mg}

40. α' σ' θ' ε' presumably read ΠΙΠΙ; see Field's note *ad*
loc. and below on 21:4.

41. Omission in g presumably due to homoioteleuton through
parablepsis: ΑΠΕΣΤΕΙΛΕΝΚΣΕΝΑΥΤΟΙΣ (see Brooke-McLean *ad*
loc.). Our layout of this example is not intended to
prejudge the question of L εις αυτους against εν αυτοις
for ביהב.

42. There is no problem with ε' and L, and the main tra-
dition, representing OG. What is puzzling is the A v
S reading. It is hardly credible in this context to
posit a H *Vorlage* with *מִן הַיַּרְרִי. Furthermore, the con-
junction of A S with v is very odd. We suspect
that v, as elsewhere, is thoroughly corrupt *and* rep-
resents Origen's *Vorlage* (despite our layout above) -
hence Origen'- attempt to 'approximate', as represented
by the α' σ' θ' ε' reading (which is also that of OG).
If this is correct, the reading in v may be explained
by initial 'dittography' in v's *Vorlage*, ΕΛΕΥΣΟΝΤΑΙΕΚ
ΤΗΣΓΗΣΠΟΛΕΩΣ, followed either by deliberate omission of
πολεως or ὄμ: ΤΗΣΓΗΣΠΟΛΕΩΣ.

43. A fine example of the singular readings with which B is
often corrupted in R, see Deboys, *Greek Text passim*.

44. It looks as if some H text read *בִּירְשָׁלַם - which is
possible contextually.

What must be noted, however, is that in all of these instances the reading ε' equals \underline{L} ⁴⁵ is also that of the overwhelming majority of MSS.⁴⁶

C. *Places where ε' = \underline{L} = OG ≠ majority text*

Are there any instances where ε' equals \underline{L} against the rest of the tradition which might be construed as OG? No unambiguous overall answer can be given but the following are the possible places:

6:6 ויקצב κ. απεκνισε] ε' κ. απεκλασε S^{mg}
κ. απεκλασεν ελισαιε \underline{L}^{-0}
κ. απεκλασεν g

The H verb only occurs elsewhere at Canticles 4:2 (קצובה) where it is rendered των κεκαρμενων. It is possible that απεκλασε represents OG, to which Lucian added a substantive; but the absence of recensional control/variation outside this passage to guide us means that we must suspend judgement.

6:23 בדודי μονοζωνοι] ε' πειραται S^{mg}
πειραται (-ταις b) \underline{L}

If we accept Barthelemy's analysis, L represents OG.⁴⁷ A. Rahlfs, however, viewed L as a correction, based on e", towards H.⁴⁸

45. Cf. also 25:6
התה רבלתה יερδεβλαθαν B] εις δεβλαθα maj (ε' S^{mg})
hab ρεβλαθα On

It would seem that OG either had *דבלתה in its H *Vorlage* or misread התה רבלתה as such. It is perhaps unwise to put much weight on ε' in an instance like this because of the fact that the difference between *r* and *d* in Syriac is only the difference between a superior and an inferior dot.

46. One of the striking findings of Deboys, *Greek Text* was concerning the importance of the mass of miniscules, the majority or κοινή text, in iv R in representing OG. The κοινή text in iv R is not infrequently (a) uncontaminated by any prehexaplaric revision towards any 'evolving Hebrew text'; (b) uncontaminated by hexaplaric readings. But the κοινή text, like *all* other MS groupings in iv R, is a mixed text.

23:4 בשדמות קדרון

εν σαδημωθ κεδρων] ε' εν τω εμπυρισμω του χειμαρρου
κεδρων S^{mg}

εν τω εμπυρισμω του χειμαρρου
κεδρων L Luc

We may be dealing with a variant H text - Burkitt retroverted ε' as בשרפות קדרון.⁵⁴ But see Rahlfs' useful note where he regards L equals ε' as due to hexaplaric influence on L.⁵⁵

Thus, out of seven possible instances, in only one case does L equals ε' very likely equal OG (21:16); in three instances L equals ε' may equal OG (6:6, 23; 23:4); while in three instances L equals ε' does not equal OG (7:2; 9:1; 17:4). As there are over one hundred Quinta/ ε' attestations for iv R four agreements with L against the rest of the manuscript tradition are hardly enough to build on.

III PLACES WHERE QUINTA DOES NOT EQUAL L

What is more significant, however, are the following eighteen clear instances where L does not equal ε':⁵⁶

3:19 וכל עיר מבחור uacat] + κ. πασαν πολιν εκλεκτην A
x y A S (sub * σ' θ' ε')
+ εν τη μωαβ L r

ε' (with σ' θ') attests an approx to H which only the most hexaplaric witnesses incorporate.

4:42 לאיש אלהים לחם

προς τον ανθρωπον του θεου] + αρτους A x A S (pr
* α' σ' ε')

(Possible haplography in translator/'s/s' reading of H *Vorlage* or already absent from *Vorlage*.)

See 3:19 for comment.

5:17 אדמה uacat B i o u v E] + γη πυρρα S^{mg}+ γης L^o

+ * α' θ' γη S

+ απο της γης A

+ κ. (pr γης g) συ μοι

δωσεις εκ της γης της

πυρρας N rell

54. 'Quinta' 218.

55. *Lucians Rezension* 248.

This is an excellent example of the B group representing Origen's *Vorlage*, which he 'corrected' with α' θ' . \underline{L} apparently modified this to $\gamma\eta\varsigma$. The Quinta reading $\gamma\eta\ \pi\upsilon\rho\rho\alpha$ is nearest the N group, which probably represents OG.⁵⁷

6:5 אָהַבְתִּי אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתַי] ε' ουαι μοι κυριε S^{mg}
ω δη κυριε \underline{L}^o Thdt

It seems possible that ϵ' has suffered dislocation in transmission and should perhaps be read as ουαι κυριε μοι. In any event, ουαι has no MS attestation. (Aquila uses ουαι, but only for יהוי and אורי.⁵⁸ For אדה he uses $\acute{\omega}$, $\acute{\alpha}$, $\acute{\alpha}$, $\acute{\omega}$ μοι.)⁵⁹

8:9 (לְקַרְאֵת) אֹתוֹ] pr * α' θ' σ' ϵ' S
τω ελισαιε \underline{L}

ϵ' contains a putative approx, although all witnesses, bar \underline{L} , have the word.⁶⁰

9:28 עָמַד אֲבֹתָיו] + μετα των πατερων αυτου A x A S
(sub * α' σ' ϵ')⁶¹

See 3:19 for comment.

9:29 בֶּן־אָחָב לְיִזְרָעֵל] σ' ϵ' ιωραμ υιου
αχααβ S^{mg}

No MS contains the Quinta reading, which is an approx.

10:24 זָבַחְתֶּם אֹתָם] θ' ϵ' τα θυματα S^{mg}
τα θυματα B g i n L

11:4 יִשְׁבַּע אֶתְכֶם בְּבֵית־יְהוָה

ωρκωσε B] ωρκισεν αυτους εν τη διαθηκη κυ A S
(αυτους-κυ sub * θ' ϵ')

ωρκισεν αυτους ενωπιον κυ N \underline{L} rell^{r v}

Origen uses θ' ϵ' for an approx based on the defective archetype of Vaticanus, but both presuppose

56. Where no separate \underline{L} reading is given, \underline{L} agrees with the text cited in the lemma.

57. Cf. Rahlfs' text in his *Handausgabe*'.

58. J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila* (SVT 12)(Leiden, 1966) 178.

59. Reider, *ibid.* '62

60. v omits κ. επορευθη αζαηλ εις απαντησιν αυτου through και-και ομ.

61. o has incorrectly incorporated part of the approx: instead of OG εν τω ταφω αυτου εν πολει δαυειδ ο reads εν τω ταφω των πρων αυτου.

*ברית instead of MT בבית. \underline{L} , on the other hand, with N maj, presupposes *בעיני and represents OG.

11:12 הנזר] θ ε' ως εβδομηκοντα το νεζερ S^{mg62}
 σ το αγιον S^{mg}
 τον εζερ n v x⁶³
 τον ιεζερ g h i A^{-ed} uid
 τον αγιασμα \underline{L} r Thdt

v has dropped from the beginning of εζερ in the κοινή text through a form of haplography with preceding αυτον (AYTONTONEZEP). This is a straightforward case of a transliteration in ε' as against a translation in \underline{L} , which may be related to σ'.⁶⁴

17:11 (ויעשו) דברים רעים
 (κ. εποιησαν) κοινωνους (και)
 εχαραξαν] α' σ' ε' λογους
 πονηρους S^{mg65}

'G read the first word as דברים⁶⁶ - certainly, but how is εχαραξαν to be derived from רעים? It seems simplest to suppose a divergent H text with *ויכו.⁶⁷ ε' (with α' σ') attests an approx to MT.

17:14, 15 \underline{L} (with A x y A S) incorporates a long quantitative approx against maj text.⁶⁸ S^{mg} records ε' twice vis-à-vis the approx:
 חעור uacat] + τους ακριβασμους A x y A S
 + σ' ε' τας εντολας S^{mg}
 + την διαθηκην \underline{L} g r
 כרת uacat] + εκοψεν A x y A S
 + σ' ε' συνετελεσεν S^{mg}
 + διεθετο \underline{L} g r

-
62. The implication seems to be that v - read as νεζερ (*contra* Brooke-McLean) - again represents Origen's *Vorlage*, i.e. ως εβδομηκοντα.
63. It is unclear how Brooke-McLean have decided this is τον εζερ rather than το νεζερ.
64. On the latter possibility, cf. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension* 248.
65. But Bruns, *Curae* 71, 'A Σ Ε λογους πονηρους uel ρήματα κακά.
66. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (Edinburgh, 1951) 478.
67. נכה hi is represented by χαρασσειν at iii R 15:27, but only in B, \underline{L} reading εχαρακωσεν, A N maj επαταξεν. χαρασσειν only occurs in LXX elsewhere at Sir 50:27

17:25 ׁש uacat] + εκει A x y A S (sub * σ' ε')

See 3:19 f r comment.

19:21 עליו ep αυτον B i 0 c₂ E S^{mg}] προς αυτον A N tell^u
α' σ' ε' περι αυτου
S^{mg}

Note the slit L tradition. The reading επ for
על is a literalism. Either maj reading προσ or α'
σ' ε' περι would be more idiomatic: ουτος ο λογος
ον ελαλησεν κς / προς αυτον / περι αυτου.

19:26 וְשִׂרְפָה לְפָנַי קָמָה
κ. πατηματα απεναντι εστηκοτος] ε' κ. εμπυρισμος
απεναντι αναστασεως
σου S^{mg}

Burkitt, accepting Field's retroversion of ε' (as
above), retroverted ε' το *קָמָה לְפָנַי קָמָה.⁶⁹

20:3 את אשר οσα] ε' πως S^{mg}
ως L A E Chr (σ' S^{mg})

L follows a' against c', which ought not to be
emended to ως.

21:4 יהרה uacat B A L Cyr] + α' σ' θ' ε' ΠΙΠΙ S^{mg}
+ κς N tell A E S (+)

L lacks the apparently hexaplaric approx.

24:14 כל¹⁰ uaca] + πασαν A x y A S (sub * α' ε')
See 3:19 for comment.

The noteworthy thing about several of the places where
L does not equal ε' - 3:19, 4:42, 9:28, 17:25, 24:14 -
is that ε' joins one or more of 'the Three' in attesting
an approximation to H which is only present in the most
hexaplaric witnesses.⁷⁰ That ε' should contain

and iii Mac

68. Cf. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension* 245, 'G hat eine grössere Lücke infolge von Homoioteleuton; Hex ergänzt sie sub ast., nach Field aus 'A; auch L ergänzt sie, aber in freierer Wiedergabe.'

69. 'Quinta' 216-217. Burkitt noted that the consonants of the reconstructed latter part of Quinta's reading are identical with those proposed by J. Wellhausen, who pointed them thus: קָמָה לְפָנַי קָמָה.

70. Cf. 17:11 where the unasierisked α' σ' ε' approx has only influenced one strand of the Vetus Latina: see above for the approx, and Brooke-McLean for L.

approximations towards H against the main manuscript tradition in itself disqualifies it from representing OG. A particularly fine example where L, with the κοινή text, represents OG against ε' is 11:4 (see above).

IV CONCLUSION

In short, Quinta/ ε' can not be equated with the Lucianic text, nor with the Old Greek (Barthélemy's 'la Septante ancienne'). Quinta's relationship with 'the Three' is marked, and it clearly contains a (partial) prehexaplaric revision towards the Hebrew. Burkitt was right to claim that Quinta in iv R is made up of a variety of elements; but of these only some indubitably represent the Old Greek. If Origen did place the Old Greek in one of his Hexapla columns in iv R it was not in the seventh.

Excursus: Lucianic variation-units⁷¹ in 'καίγε' and 'non-καίγε' sections.

One of the main features of the discussion of the Lucianic text in Deboys, *Greek Text*, was the articulation of a set of criteria with reference to the Books of Reigns to facilitate its stratification in iv R.⁷² Criterion 7 read 'that variation-unit in the καίγε sections which is identical with the same pattern in the non-καίγε sections is secondary'.⁷³ I now wish to modify this: that variation-unit in a 'καίγε', section which has an identical or very closely similar counterpart in a 'non-καίγε' section is secondary.

(a) Lucianic reading of εἰ for μη interrogative in iv R

At first glance this appears to be a new control for the καίγε recension. This is because μη interrogative is

71. 'By variation-unit we do not mean an individual variant reading in a particular manuscript . . . [but] a length of the text wherein our manuscripts present at least two variant forms', E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune, 'Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings', *JBL* 83 (1964) 254, reprinted in Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9)(Leiden, 1969) 97.

72. *Greek Text* 104-106.

73. *Ibid.* 106.

reasons to recognise the \underline{L} v11 with $\epsilon\iota$ in iv R as secondary, harmonising to the more common form in iv R, rather than reflecting OG.^{79,80}

- (b) *Lucianic reading* of πορευου for δευρο, representing ךָלְה imperative (ךָל)

This occurs at 4:7, 29; 5:19; 7:9;⁸¹ 8:1, 8, 10; 9:1.⁸² At 1:3⁸³ and 4:25⁸⁴ \underline{L} omits δευρο. \underline{L} may readily be convicted of being secondary by reference to i R: ךָל (לְכָה)/δευρο occurs there nine times,⁸⁵ which \underline{L} deviates three times:

i R 9:9 לְכָה δευρο] δευτε και A \underline{L} c d i p q t x z
 20:21 מַצְהָר ךָל δευρο ευρε] βαδισας ανελου \underline{L} z^{mg}
 23:27 לְכָה δευρο] ηκε \underline{L}

Thus, although the iv R substitution of πορευου for δευρο does not occur in i R there is sufficient evidence to indicate that L was ready to alter δευρο. There is, consequently, no reason for supposing L's πορευου vii in iv R to be anything other than secondary.

8:8, 9; 10:15, 23 (for ךָל). Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance* 373, give 1:2 as $\epsilon\iota$ interrogative. In fact, it is $\epsilon\iota$ conditional.

79. The same appears to be true in $\beta\gamma$: $\epsilon\iota$, interrogative occurs ten times; $\mu\eta$ interrogative six or seven times - L changes this to $\epsilon\iota$ once, to $\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\eta$ once, and omits it once.
80. Rahlfs' text is, consequently, mistaken in reading $\epsilon\iota$ at 6:32.
81. L^o πορευθωμεν for δευρο κ. εισελθωμεν.
82. L^o πορευθητι.
83. For לְכָה . The Hexaplaric text reads πορευθητι (A x y A Σ; also h u E).
84. δευρο correctly *sub obelo* S.
85. 9:5, 9, 10; 14:1, 6; 16:1; 17:44; 20:21; 23:27.