QUINTA/E' IN FOUR REIGNS¹,²

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 The approach developed here depends heavily on two unpublished dissertations; that of S. P. Brock, 'The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel', D. Phil.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 Samuel² [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.

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, Quinta, 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 τῆς E' innumeratas prier incognitae e versione Syro-Hexaplarum 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.  
\(^10\) Ibid. 62.  
\(^12\) Ibid. xliii-xlivi.  
\(^13\) Ibid. xlivi.
In 1902 F. C. Burkitt, while admitting that Quinta contained a variety of elements, 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'. He discussed one such instance and noted three others.

In 1960 D. Barthélemy reviewed Quinta in the Minor Prophets, suggesting, 'Etant données les caractéristiques identiques de 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 ἔκδοσις comme on l’a cru jusqu’ici, mais ἔκδοσις κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους.

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

In 1974 G. Howard re-examined Barthélemy's claim that the Hebraising καίγε recension R and Quinta were identical in the Minor Prophets. 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'.

15. Ibid. 218-219.
16. Ibid. 218-219.
22. Devanciers 213-217, and especially 221.
25. Ibid. 22.
In *Les devanciers d'Aquila Barthélemy* elaborated a theory to account for the presence of the καίγε 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'.

Or, as R. A. Kraft put it diagrammatically:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{col. 5, normal 'LXX'} & \text{col. 6} & \text{col. 7} \\
2 \text{ Kings} & \text{Pal. 1} & \text{Pal. 2} & \text{‘LXX’}(=b \circ c_2 e_2) \\
\end{array}
\]

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 βγ 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.


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 κάιγε, it 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 Règnes). 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 βγ et en 1 R 22). Quan à la 6e colonne (= θ') il y a placé ne 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col.5, normal 'LXX'</th>
<th>col.6</th>
<th>col.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 King</td>
<td>A mixed text of</td>
<td>Pa1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the κάιγε type</td>
<td></td>
<td>'LXX' (= b o c₂ e₂)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 L in Four Reigns,34 a relationship which, on other grounds, world justify the appellation 'la Septante ancienne'.

30. Études 275. Cf. 273, 'J'affirme cependant tout aussi clairement que, pour les sections βγ et γδ, 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 βγ et à la 7e colonne pour γδ 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 transmiss ion et la fantasie des scribes'.

33. Cf. Etudes 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), despite some of them being asterisked in the hexaplaric tradition. This is because Origen used 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).

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

4:40 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.

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

40 Omission in v presumably through parablepsis:

13:25 בֵּן uacat v ] + υιου αδερ A (sub * α' θ' ε' S)

39 + υιου αδερ B L

+ αδερ d e f i j m p q s t w z

Omission in v probably through υιου-υιου óμι:

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 Zusatze 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 * δέβρας α' σ' θ' ε' S)

Omission i v might be tendentious: aux epo6nnaav τον κν και απεστειλεν [κς] εν αυτοις τους λεοντας.41

22:13 יהוה uacat B i v + τουτου A N rell (sub * δέβρας α' θ' ε' S)

Omission i B i v through haplography: ΒΙΒΛΙΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΠΟΙΕΙΝ.

B. Other places where ε' = L = OG

7:12 רוחו יט את היפר ] ek της πολεως ] ek της γης A v S42 ek της πολεως α' σ' θ' Smg

12:4(5) γαλαζιο λαβη B S ] αναβη A N rell (ανεβη ν') σ' θ' ε' Smg 43

22:20 בשלום εν ειρηνη ] εν ιλημ A A S44 εν ειρηνη δέβρας α' σ' θ' ε' Smg

40. α' σ' θ' ε' presumably read ΠΙΠΠι; 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 ב ו ב.

42. There is no problem with ε' and L, and the main tradition, representing OG. What is puzzling is the A v S reading. It is hardly credible in this context to posit a H Vorlage with *ραμο ιε π. Furthermore, the conjunction of A S with v is very odd. We suspect that v, as elsewhere, is thoroughly corrupt and represents Origen's Vorlage (despite our layout above) - hence Origen's 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, ЕΛΕΥΣΟΝΤΑΙΕΚ ΤΗΣΓΗΣΠΟΛΕΩΣ, followed either by deliberate omission of πολεως or δι: ΤΗΣΓΗΣΠΟΛΕΩΣ.

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

44. It looks as if some H text read *בֵּירָל - which is possible contextually.
What must be noted, however, is that in all of these instances the reading \( \epsilon' \) equals \( L_45 \) is also that of the overwhelming majority of MSS.\(^{45}\)

C. Places where \( \epsilon' = L = OG \neq majority \text{ text} \)

Are there any instances where \( \epsilon' \) equals \( L \) 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. απεκλασε \[ ] \epsilon' κ. απεκλασε \( S^{mg} \) κ. απεκλασεν ελισαιε \( L^{-} \) κ. απεκλασεν \( g \)

The H verb only occurs elsewhere at Canticles 4:2 (περισε) 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 يبدو μονοζωνοι \[ ] \epsilon' πειραται \( S^{mg} \) πειραται (-ταις \( b \) ) \( L \)

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. \( \text{Cf. also 25:6} \)

It would seem that OG either had *רבלתה in its H Vorlage or misread רבלתה as such. It is perhaps unwise to put much weight on \( \epsilon' \) 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 minuscules, 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.
7:2 הִיהֵהּ μַהַּ εֶסְתָּאִי ] ε˚ εֶסְתָּאִי S^{mg} εֶסְתָּאִי ל L

L's reading of ε for μ ה interrogative is secondary; see the Excursus, (a).

9:1 תָּלִיְּרִיוֹן ק. δָּעְרֵו ] ε˚ ק. ποֹרֶעֵיתִּי S^{mg} ק. ποֹרֶעֵיתִּי ל A E Spec

L is probably secondary; see the Excursus, (b).

17:4 מַמָּאָא ] * ε˚ δוֹרֶא S^{mg}

L with a long doublet includes both readings (g = ε°). The fact that L contains both says something about L, not about which - if either - represents OG. In uacuo the decision would depend on whether OG in iv R commonly used transliterations, and if so for what; and secondly, on the practice of καίγε, if relevant. What is crucial here is that δορα is sub asterisco, i.e. Origen appears to have used the asterisk to approximate qualitatively to H. Hence L is clearly dependent ε˚ - via the Hexapla.

21:16 מַלְכֻוּת מַלְכֻוּת פָּלַהַנ ] ε˚ εֶקֶטֵז S^{mg} εֶקֶטֵז ל

It seems likely that L here represents OG. פָּלַהַנ never represents יֵלָב elsew here in iv R (usually כַּל or כַּל; 2:14 פָּלַהַנ; or in i-iii R, while εֶקֶטֵז does represent יֵלָב at iii R 4:23 (5:3) (no v11) and מַלְכֻוּת at iii R 10:13.

47. Devanciers 81.
48. Lucians Rezension 248.
49. Cf. Rahlfs, ibid. 248, L ε˚ 'ungriezisch'.
50. Cf. 17:3, and discussion of the passage in Deboys, Greek Text 85.
51. For the evidence that Origen did use the asterisk to effect qualitative change in iv R, see Deboys, Greek Text 75-76 on 4:39; p. 77 on 6:24; pp. 77-78 on 7:9; pp. 79-80 on 9:37; p. 81 on 12:4(5); pp. 82-83 on 15:5; p. 89 on 25:14. Already in 1952 Wevers had argued for Origen's use of the asterisk to bring about qualitative, not just quantitative, change in 'A Study in the Textual History of Codex Vaticanus in the Books of Kings', ZAW 64 (1952) 189.
53. Pace Rahlfs, ibid. 248.
We may be dealing with a variant H text - Burkitt retroverted ε' as בשרפות קדרון.  

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':

3:19 כל 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 ליהם  
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 הים uacat B i o u v E] + γη πυρρα S
+ γης L o  
+ * α' θ' γη S
+ απο της γης A
+ κ. (pr γης g ) συ μοι
δώσεις 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'. L apparently modified this to γης. The Quinta reading γη πυρρα is nearest the N group, which probably represents OG.57

6:5 ω κυριε [ ε’ ουαι μοι κυριε Smg
ω δη κυριε 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 ἀρα and ἄρα.58
For ἀρα he uses ὄ, ἀ, ἄ, ἄμι.)59

8:9 αυτου 1ο [ pr * α' θ’ ο’ ε’ S
τω ελισαιε L
ε’ contains a putative approx, although all witnesses, bar L, have the word.60

9:28 το uacat ] + μετα των πατερων αυτου A x A S
(sub * α’ ο’ ε’)61
See 3:19 for comment.

9:29 ιωραμ βασιλεως ισραηλ ] ο’ ε’ ιωραμ υιου αχααβ Smg
No MS contains the Quinta reading, which is an approx.

10:24 ωρκωσε B ] ωρκισεν αυτους εν τη διαθηκη κυ A S
(αυτους-κυ sub * θ’ ε’)
ωρκισεν αυτους ενωπιον κυ N L rel r
Origen uses θ’ ε’ for an approx based on the defective archetyp of Vaticanus, but both presuppose

56. Where no separate L reading is given, L agrees with the text cited in the lemma.
57. Cf. Rahlfs' text in his 'Handausgabe'.
59. Reider, ibid. '62
60. v omits κ. επορευθη αζαηλ εις απαντησιν αυτου through και-και όμι.
61. o has incorrectly incorporated part of the approx:
instead of OG εν τω ταφω αυτου εν πολει δαυειδ o reads εν τω ταφω των πρων αυτου.
בְּרֵית instead of MT בֵּית.

L, on the other hand, with N maj, presupposes בְּיַעֲנִי and represents OG.

11:12

הנזר το ἐξερ θ ετες εβδομηκοντα το νεζερ S_{smg}^{62}
σ το αγιον S_{smg}^{62}
τον ἐξερ η εις L g h i A- ed uid
τον σχισομα L r Thdt

v has dropped from the beginning of ἐξερ in the κοινὴ text through a form of haplography with preceding αυτον (AYTONONTONEZER). This is a straightforward case of a transliteration in ετες as against a translation in L, which may be related to σ'.

17:11

רırken (דברים רעים)
(ק. εποησαν) κοινώνους (και)
εχαραξαν ] α' σ' ε' λογους
πονηρους S_{smg}^{65}

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

17:14, 15  L (with A x y A S ) incorporates a long quantitative approx against maj text. S_{smg} records ε' twice vis-à-vis the approx:

רhere uacat ] ὑπὸ σκριβασμους A x y A S
+ σ' ε' τας εντολας S_{smg}^{62}
+ την διαθηκην L g r

there uacat ] εκοψεν A x y A S
+ α' ε' συνετελεσεν S_{smg}^{65}
+ διεθετο L g r

62. The implication seems to be that v - read as νεζερ
(contra Brooke-McLean) - again represents Origen's Vorlage, i.e. ὡς εβδομηκοντα.
63. It is unclear how Brooke-McLean have decided this is τον ἐξερ rather than το νεζερ.
65. But Bruns, Curae 71, 'Α Σ Ε λόγους πονηρούς ueλ ρήματα κακά.
67. חָרָאָס הָא is represented by χαρασσείν at iii R 15:27, but only in B , L reading εχαρακωσεν, A N maj επαταξεν. χαρασσείν only occurs in LXX elsewhere at Sir 50:27
17:25 שְׁוָא uacat ] + בֵּאֵל A x y A S (sub * α' ε')
See 3:19 f r comment.

19:21 אֵלָיו אֲבוֹט B i 0 c 2 E Smg ] προς αὐτὸν A N rell u
α' σ' ε' περὶ αὐτοῦ
S

Note the slit L tradition. The reading ἐπ for
עליו is a literalism. Either maj reading προσ or α'
σ' ε' περὶ would be more idiomatic: οὗτος ο λόγος
ον ελαλησεν κς / προς αὐτον / περι αὐτου.

19:26 κ. πατηματα απεναντι εστικοτος ] ε' k. εμπυρισμός
απεναντι αναστασεφως
sou S

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

20:3 παρε 아α α_sa ] ε' πως
S
ως L A E Chr (σ' S)
L follows a' against c', which ought not to be
emended to ως.

21:4 פְּרָד uacat B A L Cyr ] α' σ' θ' ε' ΠΠΠΠ S
κς N rell  A E S (+ )
L lacks the apparently hexaplaric approx.

24:14 בְּלָה 1° 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

68. Cf. Rahlfs, Lucians Rezension 245, 'G hat eine grössere Lücke infolge von Homoioiteleuton; 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: לְפָנִי קֻמְ. 69
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’ cannot 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 ει 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


72. *Greek Text* 104-106.

unknown in i74 a d iii R, the two main 'non-καίγε' sections of Reigns. However, a collation of ει/μη interrogative throughout Reigns reveals L to be secondary. The critical evidence is from the early ‘non-καίγε’ chapters of ii R:

ii R 2:26 μη
3:8 μη ] om L
10:3 μη ] ouχι, L ζmg75

From this we learn (i) that pn interrogative does occur in a 'non-καίγε' section; (ii) that on at least one of these occasions L 'objected' to it.

With this in mind we may list the occurrences of pn interrogative in iv R:76

iv R 4:28 μη ] si L
6:27 μη ] om L A E77
6:32 μη ] ει B L g i A
    om b
    ει μη u
7:2 μη ] ει L
18:25 μη
18:27 μη
18:33 μη
19:12 μη

L reads ει for μη interrogative on two out of eight occasions, and once omits μη interrogative. Our analysis of these L v in iv R as secondary on the basis of ii R 3:8 and 10:3 is confirmed by the occurrences of EL interrogative in iv R - twelve times.78 Thus, there are good

74. Except at 21:15 (16) in e f l m s w.
75. If J. D. Shenkel (Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings [Harvard Semitic Monographs I][Cambridge, Mass.: 1968] 117-120) is correct, 2 Sam. 10:1-11 1 has been revised by καίγε. This, in fact, does not affect our argument as L does not read ει but ouχι.
76. E. Hatch and H A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1897; reprinted Graz, 1954) 919 inaccurately give 3:13 as μη interrogative. In fact, it is μη.78
77. The second occurrence of μη in the verse; first occurrence μη.78
78. 1:3, 6; 2:3, 5; 3:7, (11 hex); 4:13; 6:21, (32 B L b g i);
reasons to recognise the L v11 with ει 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 לָלַח imperative (לָלַח)

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

i R 9:9 לָלַח δְּרַע כָּל L א L כ d i p q t x z
20:21 מְצָה לָלַח δְּרַע \u2013 \ufffd וּרְבֵּה L z mg
23:27 לָלַח δְּרַע לָלַח \ufffd א 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 v1i1 in iv R to be anything other than secondary.

8:8, 9; 10:15, 23 (for יְהוָה). Hatch-Redpath, Concordance 373, give 1:2 as ει interrogative. In fact, it is ει conditional.

79. The same appears to be true in בֵּית: ει, interrogative occurs ten times; μη interrogative six or seven times - L changes this to ει once, to ει δη once, and omits it once.

80. Rahlfs' text is, consequently, mistaken in reading ει at 6:32.

81. L πορευθομεν for δευρο κ. εισελθομεν.

82. L πορευθητι.

83. For לָלַח. 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.