

Bernard A. Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns, Volume 1, Majority Text, Volume 2, Analysis* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 50,51; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992, 1993). Pp. dxxiii + 110, xix + 152. ISBN 1-55540-785-4. \$???

The first volume of the two-volume monograph contains a text edition of what the author names “the Lucianic manuscripts” of the first book of Reigns (1 Samuel) of the LXX, and as such it provides an important service to scholarship. The reader can now easily make use of this important textual evidence which is presented in this monograph in a special way, namely as representing the “majority text” of the Lucianic manuscripts. It is now common knowledge that the Lucianic tradition is known mainly from four manuscripts which are best known by their sigla in the Brooke-McLean edition as boc2e2. When studying the evidence for the Lucianic text, scholars are used to collect the data from the apparatus of the Brooke-McLean edition, where they appear in the midst of a multitude of variant readings. On the other hand, in the books covered by the Göttingen Septuagint edition the same evidence is grouped into the group of “L” as well as in various sub-groups of “L”, but in these biblical books there is no justification for producing a separate text edition of L. In the text editions of these books the Lucianic data should remain part of the general LXX apparatus, since most of the Lucianic readings probably are subsequent to those included in the reconstructed Old Greek translations which forms the base text of the editions. In 1-4 Reigns, on the other hand, there is much justification for the separation of the Lucianic evidence from that of the other sources, since it serves as a witness to a completely different text, possibly even representing more original textual traditions than those included in the other manuscripts, including the reconstructed original text of the “Septuagint.”

For this reason B. Taylor decided to cull the evidence from the apparatus of the Brooke-McLean edition relating to the Lucianic text, first in his dissertation, written for the University of Pennsylvania with Prof. R.A. Kraft, and now in the first part of the monograph under review. He explains to the readers (pp. xii-xiii) that he chose a system of presentation different from previous ones. Previous systems of text editions are limited to the system of a diplomatic or eclectic presentation of the evidence, but the author preferred to present the evidence in a third system, named by him “the majority text.” In his own words, “the running text primarily consists of all the readings supported by a majority of the family, while the critical apparatus

contains the lists of the variants with their manuscript support, both family and non-family.” (p. xiii)

This majority text, which was created programmatically from the author’s electronic database of the variants of 1 Reigns included in Brooke-McLean, is printed as the “text” of the Lucianic manuscripts. This text has been created programmatically without the author’s intervention in individual instances, and since the text is the major component of the edition, that edition is in the main diplomatic, and hence is considered to be objective. The subjective element in this edition is visible only when the Lucianic evidence of manuscripts boc2e2 is split (two manuscript readings against two or against one and one; or four different readings), and in those cases the author uses his judgment for choosing readings on the basis of the following criteria: “the reading among the variants that either best accords with the overall characteristics of the family, or that best accounts for the other variants present (p. xiii).” However, except for the examples given in the introduction, the reader does not know in each individual case what the author’s reasons were for choosing a particular reading, but this lack of documentation is most commonly followed in other eclectic text editions as well. Minority readings thus adopted into the printed text are enclosed by square brackets, but this group of readings is small.

The text printed (the majority text) presents the author’s reconstruction of the original text of the Lucianic text tradition, although this claim is not made in so many words. It is helpful that the apparatus of variants includes a list of the other sources (Greek manuscripts only; no Church fathers or translations) agreeing with the minority variants of the Lucianic readings.

The principles of recording the readings in the text and apparatus are acceptable, with the sole exception of the principle explained on pp. xiv-xv according to which single manuscript readings omitting the reading of the other sources are not mentioned when agreeing with non-Lucianic readings.

The edition thus created definitely serves as a helpful research tool facilitating textual studies which hitherto were hampered by the technical difficulty that scholars had to sift the Lucianic readings from the plethora of details recorded in the Brooke-McLean edition. Among other things this edition removes the optical anomaly that readings of the Lucianic group, which may well reflect the so-called Old Greek, are included in the apparatus of the Brooke-McLean edition and

not in an eclectically produced text. That eclectic text often presents a Greek text which is later than some of the Lucianic evidence presented in the apparatus.

At the same time, other aspects of the critical edition endanger its usability:

1. The present edition serves as a tool facilitating the perusal of evidence in the Brooke-McLean edition, which is presented in two layers (the reconstructed majority text and the apparatus), and the edition should be viewed within the limitations of the Brooke-McLean edition. It is not clear whether the author claims to present the original text of the Lucianic textual tradition, but that original text would or should certainly be the goal in which other researchers would be interested. However, that goal cannot be reached in Taylor's book because of the self-imposed limitations of the computerized procedures employed by Taylor. For the reconstruction of the original text would involve complicated judgments of readings and studies about the value of the other possibly relevant witnesses to the Lucianic textual tradition briefly discussed by the author on pp. 2-5 of Vol 2. Thus the evidence of several sources relevant to the Lucianic tradition is disregarded in these two volumes: the Old Latin translation of the Septuagint, quotations of the Greek biblical text in the Syrian Church Fathers Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Greek paraphrase of Josephus, and even some details in the Hebrew 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. All these sources have been widely recognized to be closely related to the so-called Lucianic textual tradition, and the listing of evidence from these sources in an apparatus such as provided by Taylor could in many cases influence text-critical decisions regarding the so-called majority text of the Lucianic tradition or its variants. For example, if a minority reading of the group of manuscripts of  $\text{boc}2\text{e}2$  which is now recorded in Taylor's apparatus were to be joined by one of the Syrian Church Fathers or Josephus, in certain instances one might conceivably consider that reading, and not the majority reading, to reflect the original text of the Lucianic tradition.

2. None of the readings of the manuscripts  $\text{boc}2\text{e}2$  has been examined in the originals, so that Brooke-McLean's mistakes and imprecisions (of which we know from the listings in the Göttingen editions of other books) are perpetuated.

3. No stand is taken with regard to earlier editions of the Lucianic text of 1 Reigns. This is not so serious an oversight in the case of the edition of P. de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior graece* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1883) since that edition is recognized as a bad example of Editionstechnik, but it is a serious omission in the case of the edition by N.

Fernández Marcos and J. Ramón Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega, I, 1-2 Samuel* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 50; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1989). That edition does refer to the various witnesses of the Lucianic group as listed above, and among other things the edition is based on those authors’s detailed studies of the Syrian Church Fathers edited by them in separate text editions.

Volume 2 of Taylor’s work provides an analysis of the relevant data in his computerized database from which among other things the text edition has been produced. The nature and creation of that database are described in detail (pp. 15-28), followed by a statistical analysis of the relations between the manuscripts. The author is aware of the limitations of his methods, but nevertheless he embarks upon an investigation of the relations between the manuscripts, especially that of manuscripts  $\text{bc}2\text{e}2$  to B and A in conjunction with the discussion of overall theories on the origin of the LXX. The relation between these sources was investigated by Taylor with novel systems of measuring, viz., an investigation of the number of minority readings of manuscripts B and A, that is, readings in these manuscripts agreeing with less than half of the manuscripts in Taylor’s database. The procedures followed are outlined in detail, but the reader misses a discussion of the logic behind the examination. No examples are given, but the procedure is clear. Taylor examined the minority readings of B (by his count comprising less than five percent of the words in that manuscript), and he found, for example that the two congeners of B,  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_2$ , as expected, agree with B in respectively 62 and 68 percent of these minority readings of B. On the other hand, the members of the Lucianic group agree only in 9 to 11 percent with the minority readings of B. On the whole, Taylor showed that the members of the Lucianic group are the furthest removed from codex B, but when A is taken as the collation manuscript, they are closer to that manuscript than B is. Taylor next discusses the relevance of these data to the overall question of the nature of the Lucianic evidence. The complete data relating to all the manuscripts are provided in tables 39ff. in the appendix, but it is not clear to the reviewer why the number of the minority readings of B is listed as 926 on p. 40, as 673 on p. 46, and as 519 on p. 131. At the same time, the statistics concerning B on these different pages are more or less the same.

Chapter III discusses the characteristics of what Taylor calls the “Lucianic majority variants,” that is, readings shared by three or more Lucianic sources. The discussion is subdivided into

categories of variation, such as omissions, substitutions, and transpositions. In each category the manuscript support of the non-Lucianic manuscripts for the Lucianic readings is tabulated in detail. In this part of the book some examples are mentioned, allowing the reader to get some insights in Taylor's analysis. Among other things, Taylor isolated some of the characteristic Lucianic recensional features, summarized on pp. 96-97, but the reader is not told how many of these features had been mentioned previously in the scholarly literature.

Chapter IV provides an "analysis of the Lucianic minority variants." These minority variants had been defined on p. 56 as comprising "two or one" variants. The terminology may be somewhat misleading, since two clusters of two Lucianic readings are considered by Taylor to be two minority readings. The underlying assumption in this analysis is that there was one original Lucianic reading in each case (cf. the general conclusions on p. 128), and that part of the Lucianic evidence may have been corrupted in the course of the textual transmission. This assumption is probably correct, and the analysis would have benefitted much from the evidence of the Old Latin, Josephus, and the Syrian Church Fathers (as mentioned above), all of which have been disregarded in the analysis. The different types of textual corruption have been reviewed by Taylor on pp. 99-100 (haplography, dittography, scribal emendation, harmonization). The minority readings are analyzed according to the same categories of textual variation as the majority variants (base text readings, omissions, substitutions, transpositions, and additions). Three characteristics of individual manuscripts were noted on p. 124.

In the general conclusions on pp. 127-128 Taylor reiterates his feeling (not proof) that B reflects the Old Greek translation, and "that the Lucianic manuscripts do not share the distinctive characteristics of MS B that set it apart as the exemplar of the Old Greek."

There is a bibliography, but no index.

Emanuel Tov

Hebrew University

Jerusalem