SYMMACHUS IN ANTIOCH?
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ANTIOCHIAN TEXT AND SYMMACHUS IN 1 KINGS (3 KINGDOMS)

Timothy Michael Law

The impact of the Hexapla on the production of the Antiochian recension (Ant) is evident, and in a number of studies appearing in each of the past seven decades one meets the same conclusion again and again: Whatever contacts he may have had with the Hexapla, Lucian shows a preference for the translation of Symmachus (Sym).[1] J. Ziegler commented on this preference for Sym in the *Einleitungen* to several of his Göttingen editons in the 1940s and 50s.[2] S.P. Brock's doctoral dissertation on the Greek recensions of 1 Samual made the

1   In this article, I will refer to Lucian as the one responsible for the Antiochian text, but only to simplify matters; I readily acknowledge the difficulties in the text history of the Antiochian recension, and would point readers to the fine study by T. Kauhanen, "Traces of the Proto-Lucianic Text", *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), 75–88, where some of the issues are discussed.

2   See, for example, J. Ziegler, *Duodecim Prophetae* (Göttingen Septuaginta 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), 84: "Wie diese Beispiele Zeigen, hat Lukian gewöhnlich aus Symmachus seinen Text nach M verbessert". Cf. idem, *Ezechiel* (Göttingen Septuaginta 16.1; Götingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952; 2nd ed. 1978), 52: "Auch hier hat Lukian die jüngeren griech. Übersetzer, namentlich Symmachus, ausgebeutet und uns dadurch wertvolle Wiedergaben der 'Drei' über-liefert, die eine nähere Untersuchung verdienen".

same connection in 1966,[3] and two years later J.W. Wevers reinforced the growing consensus.[4] E. Tov mentioned the issue in the 70s and in 1981 D.G. Deboys also confirmed the link in his unpublished thesis on the Greek text of 2 Kings.[5] More recently, a series of studies produced by N. Fernández Marcos has drawn the most attention to this question. In 1990, Fernández Marcos commented: "The relation of the Antiochian text with the 'Three' is another item that needs further investigation, promising fruitful results".[6] At Alison Salvesen's Rich Seminar in 1997 in Oxford, Fernández Marcos probed further, this time remarking on Ant's preference for Sym, though not ignoring similar ties to Aquila (Aq).[7] In 2005 a study on Sym and Ant in Ezekiel supported the findings of Wevers' more recent study of 2003, and resulted in a cautious conclusion: "Lucian manifests perhaps a *slight* preference

[3]   S.P. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel* (Torino: Zamorani, 1995), 171, 297.

[4]   J.W. Wevers, "Septuaginta Forschungen seit 1954", *Theologische Rundschau* 33 (1968), 73–74.

[5]   E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Towards a New Solution to the Problem", *RB* 79 (1972), 101–113, reprinted in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), 293–305, and in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 477–488; D.G. Deboys, *The Greek Text of 2 Kings* (M.Litt. Dissertation, University of Oxford, 1981), 14, 124, 183.

[6]   N. Fernández Marcos, "Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint", in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 228.

[7]   N. Fernández Marcos, "The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina", in A.G. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998), 408–420.

for Symmachus" (emphasis mine); "Some relationship between Symmachus and Lucian exists, but this should not be overemphasized…".[8]

The new edition of the Hexaplaric remains for 1 and 2 Kings (3 and 4 Kingdoms) for the Hexapla Project is now in progress, and at this stage I have collected and analyzed all of the readings that are uniquely attributed to Sym for 1 Kings; thus, I am now able to conduct a similar study of the relationship between Sym and Ant in 1 Kings. However, I will only compare with Ant the readings that are uniquely Symmachian, leaving aside such readings that possess double or triple attributions in the witnesses (e.g. *α′σ′*, *α′σ′θ′*, *οἱ λ′*, etc.).

The difficulties should be apparent. Not only do I restrict my survey to a very limited number of readings, since they must be unique Sym readings, but the number is reduced even further because I only consider those Sym readings that coincide with Ant. That the Hexaplaric remains are fragmentary in nature does not help the situation, but instead prevents one from making more thorough syntactical comparisons between the translator and Lucian that might otherwise be fruitful. Finally, as Wevers and Fernández Marcos have already noted, Ant often takes readings that belong to Sym and places them in new constructions that are better suited to the new context, thus obscuring Sym's original reading.[9] Nonetheless, even with such challenges a study of Symmachus and the Antiochian text

[8]   N. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", in F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne (eds.), with the collaboration of Brian Doyle, *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 151–161. Cf. J.W. Wevers and D. Fraenkel, *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel* (MSU 26; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 115–116.

[9]   Cf. Wevers, *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel*, 115. See also Fernández Marcos, "The Textual Context of the Hexapla", 409–410.

of 1 Kings is still necessary as we continue to learn more about this second century Caesarean Jewish translator and his Christian adopters.

There are 117 readings in 1 Kings that are uniquely attributed to Sym. Some of these are single words, others small clauses, and fewer longer sentences. Of these 117 readings, only 20 show a possible connection to Ant, about 17% of the total stock of unique Sym readings in 1 Kings. This percentage is thus not much higher than the 10% Fernández Marcos found in Ezekiel.[10] In this study I will only investigate the 13 readings that have the most probable connection.[11]

The presentation of the evidence below will follow Hebrew verse numbering, and will involve (1) the Hebrew text (MT); (2) the text of *Codex Vaticanus* (B);[12] (3) the text of the Hexaplaric recension (*O*), represented in 1 Kings by *Codex Alexandrinus* (A) and 247 (Brooke and McLean: x); (4) the text of Ant established by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz[13]; (5) the fragments of Symmachus (Sym, *σ'*) based on

---

[10] Fernández Marcos' study produced 15 cases out of 150 unique Sym readings where contact between Ant and Sym could be proven. See his "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 160. Ezekiel is, however, a much larger book.

[11] There are another seven readings which are more uncertain, though still possible. These will be shown in a future study.

[12] The assumption that B, for the most part, represents the Old Greek (OG) is not accepted here. Every reading must be analyzed on a case by case basis. Theories regarding the relationship between καίγε, Ant, and the OG should be considered tentative for the moment, until the Göttingen editors for these books finish their work and allow us to know more about the textual history. The editions being prepared by A. Aejmeleaus (1 Kingdoms), P. Hugo (2 Kingdoms), and J. Trebolle Barrera and P. Torijano Morales (3–4 Kingdoms) are already proving many of these long cherished theories are too simplistic to be useful.

[13] N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*, II: *1–2 Reyes*, (TECC 53; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1992).

the critical edition now in preparation for the Hexapla Project; and (6) where necessary for the argument, the texts of the Syrohexapla (Syh), the Armenian version (Arm), and the *Vetus Latina* (VL).

Finally, each example will be discussed. The readings have been divided between those that show agreements with the text of Ant and those which show agreements between Sym and some member of the Antiochian group.

A. Agreements between Symmachus and the Antiochian Text

The following examples are readings shared by both Sym and Ant, which may have been passed from the former to the latter, but are in any case possible indications of a shared textual history.

§1 *1 Kgs 3:10*

MT	וַיִּיטַב הַדָּבָר בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנָי
B	καὶ ἤρεσεν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου
O, Ant	καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον Κυρίου
Syh	ܘܫܦܪ # ܡܠܬܐ܇ ܩܕܡ ܡܪܝܐ
σ′	ὁ λόγος

The addition is a minor one, but the text of Syh attributes the asterisked addition to Sym, and *O* and Ant incorporate the new reading. The addition could have been introduced into the Hexaplaric stream by any of the 'Three', and in cases like these it is less likely that Ant is specifically concerned that the reading comes from Sym than that the aim is simply representing the Hexaplaric addition.[14]

---

[14] T. Kauhanen was correct to stress this to me in Helsinki. N. Fernández Marcos suggests the possibility that Syh could have had a preference for Sym, but in preparing the critical edition of Hexaplaric fragments for 1 Kings, I found a nearly identical number of readings for Aq. A rough count produced 178 readings for

§2   *1 Kgs 6:5*

MT   וַיִּבֶן עַל־קִיר

B (6:10)   καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ᾿ αὐτὸν τοῖχον

O (6:10)   καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῖχον

Ant (6:10)   καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῖχον

VL   *fecitque*

σ᾿   καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ ἐπίβλημα

Ant is supported by VL, agreeing with Sym's ποιέω, while B and *O* have δίδωμι. The Ant reading may be a result of direct dependence upon Sym, but Ant could have changed the verb to harmonize with the ποιέω at vv. 4 (Ant 9) and 16 (Ant 17). In v. 4, ποιέω is Ant's verb for עשה and in vv. 5 and 16 it is a translation for בנה,[15] but because Ant was not likely to have had contact with the Hebrew text[16] these uses of ποιέω must have been chosen as stylistic harmonizations within Ant itself. Lucian could have changed the OG verb of v. 5 to agree with the uses of ποιέω that were surrounding it, but since ποιέω only occurs in v. 5 in Sym and Ant and at no other place in the Greek tradition, it might suggest that Ant made the harmonization after having been influenced by Sym.

§3   *1 Kgs 18:46*

MT   וְיַד־יְהֹוָה הָיְתָה אֶל־אֵלִיָּהוּ

B   καὶ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἠλειού

Sym, and 177 for Aq. See N. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 154; and earlier in his "The Textual Context of the Hexapla", 11–12 n. 9.

[15] There are also VL readings at vv. 9, 15, and 16 (*aedifico*) that are closer to the OG οἰκοδομέω than to the ποιέω of Ant.

[16] See Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 156; Wevers, *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel*, 115.

O, Ant	καὶ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τὸν Ἠλειού
Syh	ܘܐܝܕܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ‡ ܗܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܐܠܝܐ
Arm	*Ew jeŕn Teaŕn ełew i veray Eliayi*
σ'	ἐγένετο

The testimony from Syh only provides the addition of ἐγένετο, which is followed by *O* (=Arm Syh) and Ant (=Luc XVII, 68).[17] Moreover, with the sole exception of B, the addition is found throughout the entire Greek textual history. Syh attributes the reading to Sym, though this is a simple addition that might have come from any of the 'Three'. As we saw in example 1, that Syh has preserved the attribution to Sym does not mean that Sym was the only Hexaplaric version to introduce this change, but his is the only reading preserved.[18]

§4 *1 Kgs 19:20*

MT	כִּי מֶה־עָשִׂיתִי לָךְ
B, *O*	ὅτι πεποίηκά σοι
Ant	τί πεποίηκά σοι
Arm	*zinč' arari k'ez*
σ'	τί γὰρ πεποίηκά σοι

B and *O* have ὅτι for כי, but Ant (=158 Arm) changes the conjunction to the interrogative τί. If Ant has borrowed again from Sym, it has left out the γάρ; it was noted above, however, that Ant's use of Sym often

---

[17] Luc = Lucifer of Cagliari, a Latin writer whose text is often helpful for VL readings because long, continuous portions are preserved. The most up to date edition is G.F. Diercks (ed.), *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae supersunt* (CCSL 8; Turnholt: Brepols, 1978), 32.

[18] MS 127, from the Ant group, places ἐγένετο sub —.

involves the former modifying the latter's readings for their new context.[19]

§5   *1 Kgs 20:5*

MT	כִּי־שָׁלַחְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ לֵאמֹר
B (21:5)	ἐγὼ ἀπέστρεψα λέγων
O	ἐγὼ ἀπέστρεψα (ἀπέστειλα πρὸς σὲ λέγων 247)
Ant (21:5)	ἐγὼ ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς σὲ λέγων
σ′	ὁ ἀποστείλας πρὸς σὲ, λέγων

The כי introduces the speech of the messengers of Ben-Hadad, a discourse function that is understood by B *O* Ant. However, Sym does not translate the verse in this way, but makes the entire clause part of the identification of Ben-Hadad: "Thus says Ben-Hadad, the one who sent to you, saying…"

A Arm Syh agree with B using ἀποστρέφω, which in this case is the OG. The only Hexaplaric witness to differ is 247 which must have been influenced by the remainder of the Greek tradition which has ἀποστέλλω. Aq has ἀποστέλλω for שלח in 6 readings in 1 Kings,[20] but here it is Sym whose reading is shared by Ant.

§6   *1 Kgs 22:16*

MT	עַד־כַּמֶּה פְעָמִים אֲנִי מַשְׁבִּעֶךָ
B	πεντάκις ἐγὼ ἐξορκίζω σε
O	ἔτι δὶς ἐγὼ ὁρκίζω σε
Ant	ποσάκις ἐγὼ ὁρκίζω σε
σ′	ποσάκις ἐγὼ ὁρκίσω σε

---

[19] Cf. Wevers, *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel*, 115. See also, Fernández Marcos, "The Textual Context of the Hexapla", 409–410.

[20] 1 Kings 5:15; 9:14; 12:3; and 21(20):7, 9, 10.

The original text of B has πεντάκις, which the first corrector changed to ἔτι δίς causing agreement with *O* (also = Arm Sah Syh), only for the second corrector to make a further change to ποσάκις, bringing it into alignment with Sym and Ant. Other than 55 121 245 246 247,[21] all other minuscules follows the readings of Sym and Ant. Thus, the witnesses for Sym's ποσάκις: Bᵇ Ant LXX-rel (-55 121 245 246 247) Aeth Thdt (190, 12; but with Ποσάκις ὁρκίζω σε ἐγώ).

The interrogative πόσος asks "how many?", and the ending -άκις changes the nuance only slightly, resulting in "how many times?". B's original reading is not read as an interrogative, but merely as a statement meaning "five times", and *O* entails the meaning "twice". Sym, however, preserves the sense of the Hebrew עד־כמה פעמים, and is followed again by Ant (cf. 2 Chron. 18:15).

That the ἐξορκίζω for the *Hiphʿil* participle משביעך is found in a καίγε section (here, γδ) of 1 Kings may suggest the OG verb was the ὁρκίζω of the majority Greek tradition.[22] This reading is further supported by *O* Ant and Sym, and B is the lone witness to ἐξορκίζω. Sym's verb is a future indicative, as the translator probably read the Hebrew participle in an immediate future sense. Even with the emphasis on style throughout his translation, Sym is also compelled to communicate accurately the meaning of his Hebrew text, a fidelity which can be seen also with the superfluous ἐγώ. The pronoun was in MT because the participle does not indicate person, but in the Greek, the additional use of ἐγώ is solely for the representation of the Hebrew.[23]

---

[21] 121 245 246 agree with *O*. Bᵃ, Arm, and Syh also agree with *O*.

[22] Though due caution should be exercised here. It is inappropriate to assume that all readings in a καίγε section are recensional without investigating all of the evidence. See n. 12 above.

[23] The context does not support the emphatic use of the pronoun.

The extent of Sym's relationship to the OG remains unclear.[24] If Ant is a possible witness to the OG in the καίγε sections of Kings,[25] and both Ant and Sym share the same verb form, it is possible that Sym and Ant both preserve the OG. Nonetheless, it is also possible that both the OG and Sym rendered the Hebrew with the simple verb form independently of one another, and only the καίγε revision substituted the more complex form.

B. Symmachus Preserved in some Witnesses to the Antiochian Text

The following seven Symmachian readings are adopted by some member(s) of the Antiochian group. While these were not considered by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz to have been the original Ant readings, one or more of the members of the Ant group can be credited with preserving a reading of Sym.[26] In the following examples, the three Antiochian witnesses are MS 127 and Theodoret (Thdt), which often agree with one another, and John Chrysostom.[27]

---

[24] See J. González Luis, *La versión de Símaco en los Profetas mayores* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, 1981), 363: "Sin embargo, la influencia de la Septuaginta en la versión simaquiana resulta patente, como era de esperar, pero probablemente nuestro traductor no conoció sino la Setenta recensionada". See also A.G. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (*JSS* Monographs 15; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991), 259–260.

[25] Though, see n. 12 above and the cautions of N. Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism", in A. Pietersma and C.E. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Missassauga, Ontario: Benben, 1984), 161–174, esp. 172–174; contra E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian".

[26] The possibility that a Sym reading is preserved in these witnesses as an anonymous Hexaplaric reading remains.

[27] The edition used for Thdt is N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: Editio critica* (TECC 32;

§7   *1 Kgs 6:27*

MT   וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־הַכְּרוּבִים

B (6:26)   καὶ ἀμφότερα χερουβεὶμ

O (6:26)   καὶ ἔθηκεν ἀμφότερα τὰ χερουβὶμ

Ant (6:26)   καὶ ἀμφότερα τὰ χερουβὶμ

Syh   ‡ ܘܣܡ ÷ܠܬܪܝܗܘܢ\ ܟܪܘܒܐ

σ′   καὶ ἔθηκεν

The καί was probably not asterisked in the Hexapla, but when the preserved reading is found in Syh, it is often included sub asterisk because of the attachment of the ܘ to the following word in Syriac. The other Greek texts have this καί, so the ἔθηκεν is the only element that should be asterisked. Sym's τίθημι is followed in the Greek tradition by *O*, as well as 52 123 236 and 242. Although Ant did not as a whole follow Sym, the addition of ἔθηκεν is preserved in 127.

§8   *1 Kgs 7:20*

MT   וְכֹתָרֹת עַל־שְׁנֵי הָעַמּוּדִים

B, *O*, Ant (7:9)   καὶ μέλαθρον ἐπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στύλων

σ′   καὶ ἐπιστύλιον πάλιν ἐπάνω τῶν στύλων

Unfortunately, there is no Syh reading for this section, the presence of which would have been very useful, since at 6:5 and 7:4 Syh uses a Greek loan word equivalent to Sym's ἐπιστύλιον (ܐܦܣܛܠܝܢ) and there are probably readings of Sym in the text of Syh for which there is no longer an attribution. In this verse, Thdt (141, 13-14) bears witness to

the reading, even though he does not attribute it to Sym: Μέλαθρον δὲ
κέκληκε τὸ νῦν παρά τινων ἐπίστυλον προσαγορευόμενον.[28]

§9   *1 Kgs 7:27*

MT   אֶת־הַמְּכֹנוֹת עֶשֶׂר
B, Ant (7:14) δέκα μεχωνὼθ
O (7:14)   τὰς μεχωνὼθ (μεχονὼθ 247) δέκα
σ′   βάσεις

   Transliterations of obscure Hebrew words are common to all of the
Greek versions. All three major Greek witnesses, B *O* Ant, trans-
literate, and there is a change of word order in *O*. The change in
word order might have been done by one of the 'Three', but one
cannot be sure since the witnesses only preserve one word. MT's
מכונה is a "fixed resting-place, base", which in this case was a stand
that held the laver. The Sym reading is preserved in M and 245, but
also in 127 and Thdt (141, 25-142, 2). Thdt's text reads: Τὰς δὲ **μεχωνὼθ**
τὼν Παραλειπομένων ἡ βίβλος **λουτῆρας** ὠνόμασεν· ὁ δὲ Ἰώσηπος τὰς **μεχωνὼθ**
βάσεις εἶπε, τὰς δὲ **χυτρογαύλους, λουτῆρας** ἐπικειμένους ταῖς **βάσεσιν**.[29] In
Thdt's text there is not only additional testimony to this reading of
Sym, but also the attestation of the same reading to Josephus. While
studies have confirmed Josephus's use of a proto-Lucianic text, an
alignment to the text of Sym has also been detected;[30] but the existence

---

[28] "…and what has been called μέλαθρον is that which is now called ἐπίστυλον by
some."

[29] "And the book of Chronicles names the "baths" μεχωνὼθ. And Josephus calls the
μεχωνὼθ "bases", and the "basins", "baths that lie upon the bases."

[30] See A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel:
Jaeger & Kober, 1895); H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New
York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929), 85–86; E.C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of
Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1978); V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro,

of Symmachian readings prior to the historical Symmachus, and the relationship of these readings to the proto-Lucianic text, is a question that still needs answering.[31]

§10 *1 Kgs 11:36*

MT	לְמַעַן הֱיוֹת־נִיר לְדָוִיד־עַבְדִּי כָּל־הַיָּמִים לְפָנַי
B	ὅπως ᾖ θέσις τῷ δούλῳ μου Δαυειδ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ
O, Ant (11:34 Ant)	ὅπως ᾖ θέλησις τῷ δούλῳ μου Δαυὶδ (Δαυὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου 247) πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἐνώπιον μου
Syh	ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܫܪܓܐ ܠܕܘܝܕ ܥܒܕܝ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܝܘܡܬܐ ܩܕܡܝ
Arm	*vasn mnaloy čragi cařayi imowm Dawtʻi zamenayn awowrs ařaji im*
σ′	ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαμένειν λύχνον Δαυὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας) ἔμπροσθέν μου

   In MT, the subordinate clause is introduced by a preposition indicating purpose, and is followed by an infinitive construct of היה, a construction which only occurs here and at Jer 44:8. In 1 Kgs 11:36, the purpose of David's son receiving one tribe is so that David will always have a lamp in Jerusalem. The metaphorical language emphasizes the continued existence of the line of David (cf. 1 Kgs 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19 and the parallel 2 Chr 21:7).[32] The main Greek texts translate the preposition with an adverb ὅπως + subjunctive since the Greek trans-

---

"Some Remarks on Josephus' Biblical Text for 1–2 Kings", in Cox (ed.), *VI Congress*, 277–285; E.C. Ulrich, "Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel," in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 81–96.

[31] For a discussion of this problem see N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, trans. W.G.E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 133–139.

[32] Cf. also Ps 132:17; Prov 13:9; and Job 18:6.

lators understand this is a metaphor. B uses θέσις ("position"); the θέλησις (here, "goodwill, favor") of *O* and Ant might be from a corruption of θέσις,[33] but might also be by attraction to the same metaphor in 2 Kgs 8:19.[34] Nonetheless, Sym translates the meaning of the Hebrew, as he does again at 1 Kgs 15:4. MT's copula is rendered with the infinitive of διαμένω (cf. also Eccl 3:14), which is then incorporated into Arm as the infinitive *mnam*. Finally, with respect to Δαυὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου, the word order of Sym, matched by 247 Aeth Syh Thdt (155, 1-2), might be dismissed as minor, and could possibly be explained by the translation technique of Thdt, but since Thdt often shows knowledge of the Hexapla and of Sym's translation, there may be justification for seeing a point of contact here.[35]

§11 *1 Kgs 12:10*

MT	קָטָנִּי
B, *O*, Ant	ἡ μικρότης μου (om μου 247)
σ'	τὸ σμικρότατόν μου μέλος

The clause in MT reads: "My little (finger?) is thicker than my father's loins". The main Greek witnesses render the phrase literally with "my smallness." Sym clarifies what he believes to be the meaning of the metonymic קטן with "my smallest limb", which is also a rare instance where Sym reverts to an Attic form.[36] In Hellenistic

---

[33] So J.A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1967), 247.

[34] At 2 Kgs 8:19, λύχνος has made it into the three major Greek texts, but the B text there is καίγε. Thus, we may see Hexaplaric influence on the Greek tradition.

[35] Thdt is only different in the genitive rather than the dative case: Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου μου.

[36] See Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, 263–264. Similarly, J.R. Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos* (TECC 22; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 282–283; T.M. Law,

Greek, the adjective was always μικρός, and the superlative in -τατος was becoming extinct. Even still, one might discern the influence of Sym on two Ant witnesses with this older Attic form: 127 and Thdt (155, 16-17) have σμικρότης.[37]

§12 *1 Kgs 15:4*

MT   כִּי לְמַעַן דָּוִד נָתַן יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו לוֹ נִיר בִּירוּשָׁלָם לְהָקִים אֶת־בְּנוֹ אַחֲרָיו

B   ὅτι διὰ Δαυεὶδ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Κύριος κατάλειμμα, ἵνα στήσῃ τέκνα αὐτοῦ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν

O   ὅτι διὰ Δαυεὶδ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς κατάλειμμα ἐν Ἰσραήλ, ἵνα στήσῃ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν (αὐτοῦ 247)

Ant   ὅτι τῷ Δαυὶδ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Κύριος κατάλειμμα, ἵνα στήσῃ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν

Syh   ܚܠ ܢܐܟܠܠ ܢܘܝܕ ܝܗܒ ܡܢ ܠܗ ܡܬܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܙܝܕ ܐܠܗܐ ‡ ܐ ܣ ܠ ܟܣܐܝܘܪܠ‹
ܐܬܒܠܐ ܢܘܣܝܕ ‡ ܐܠ ܠ‹ܚܬܘܘܡ, ܚܠܟܘ

σ′   ἀλλὰ διὰ Δαυὶδ ἔδωκε κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ λύχνον ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ὥστε στῆσαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ μετ᾽ αὐτόν

The Greek witnesses are straightforward rendering כי with ὅτι, but by using ἀλλά, Sym shows his awareness of the discourse function of the conjunction. The clause that follows, and indeed the whole of v. 4, highlights the faithfulness of Yʜᴡʜ to David, even in the light of the sins of Jeroboam (v. 3). Only Ant does not render למען with διά. After the verb, the Greek witnesses have a dative pronoun αὐτῷ for the Hebrew לו, but Sym omits αὐτῷ altogether. Perhaps he saw the

---

“The Translation of Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Reigns)”, in Melvin H.K. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 277–292. But cf. González Luis, *La versión de Símaco en los Profetas mayors*, 284–286.

[37] This form also occurs in Ant 1 Kgs 13:24. Also, it is possible that an Atticizing tendency, independent of Sym, is at work here.

resumptive pronoun as a redundant element, or made the change on the basis that YHWH did not give this lamp to David directly, but that the lamp was set up on David's behalf. Still, he could have omitted the αὐτῷ because of its nearness to αὐτοῦ, which was left out of the other Greek witnesses; keeping both would have exactly reproduced MT, but would have made the Greek more awkward. B and Ant agree with Κύριος κατάλειμμα, while *O* Syh Thdt agree with Sym by inserting ὁ θεός after Κύριος. The remainder of the verse is straightforward in all of the Greek witnesses, with the exception of τέκνα receiving the article in *O* and Ant. While this article is indeed in Sym's text, it could have also come from Theodotion as the attribution in Syh shows.

§13   *1 Kgs 20:37*

MT	וּפָצֹעַ
B, *O*, Ant (21:37)	καὶ συνέτριψεν
Syh	ܘܡܚܝܗܝ
σ'	καὶ ἐτραυμάτισεν αὐτόν

The Greek translators read the unvocalized infinitive as a perfect and translate with the aorist. Sym does the same, but adds a pronoun to clarify the object of the verb. The syntax of MT (ויכהו האיש הכה ופצע) eliminates the need for the pronoun since the last two words are infinitive absolutes and the object is marked by the suffix attached to the finite verb. Nonetheless, for clarity in the Greek translation, Sym must have thought it made more sense to add the accusative pronoun anyway.

The reading for Sym comes from the margin of Syh. Here, it is worth noting that the main text of Syh has the object pronoun in place, even though the Syriac translator has chosen a different verb. In the Greek tradition, the pronoun is only found in N, with a possible

ascription to Sym. The Antiochian father John Chrysostom supplies the pronoun (thus, καὶ συνέτριψεν αὐτόν) in his *Adversus Iudaeos*,[38] and is therefore Sym's only link with Antioch.

Conclusion

I have now evaluated the 13 readings in which Ant appears to have some form of contact with Sym. Six of these Symmachian readings were shown to be related to Ant, while seven others were preserved in some member of the Antiochian group. That there should be any agreement at all is not entirely surprising when one remembers that the stylistic concerns of both the recension and the Caesarean Jewish translator were the same: To produce a smoother, more readable text than that of the heavily Semitic OG.[39] Nonetheless, to return to the original question, the dependence of Ant upon Sym cannot be established with even the same certainty as, say, the dependence of Jerome upon Sym.[40] With the available evidence for 1 Kings, the most one can say at this point is that there was some form of the translation of Sym known in Antioch. Whether this was a full version, a partial version, or simply fragments in the margins of Greek manuscripts is impossible to know for sure, though the latter is the most plausible. In that, I would agree with Wevers' conclusion at the end

[38] As no updated edition of *Adversus Iudaeos* exists, the text here is from *PG* 48:873.

[39] Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel*, 298; González Luis, *La versión de Símaco en los Profetas mayores*, 277–282, 288–300; Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos*, 279, 280, 286; Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, 263–264; Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 130; idem, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 155.

[40] See Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos,* 326–328; Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, 265–281.

of his own study of Ezekiel, that the Antiochian recensor "did not have the text of Sym before him".[41]

In this study, I was unable to examine the relationship between Ant and the other Hexaplaric versions, though this too would be a worthwhile study. In Fernández Marcos's study of Ezekiel, he had already begun to locate links between this recension and Theodotion,[42] just as I briefly noted similar connections between Ant and the Hexaplaric versions. A similar study on 2 Kings will also have to be conducted so that the examples from that book, which in *Codex Vaticanus* is entirely καίγε, may be compared with these from the non-καίγε portions.

While these studies will doubtless further our knowledge of this issue, the largest and most important ground for discovery in future inquiries will no longer be in locating the agreements between the extant attributed readings of Sym and Ant. With the critical edition of Ant established, and with the publication of the Greek-Hebrew indices of the historical books of Ant,[43] the most fruitful area of investigation for the legacy of the Hexapla in Antioch lies in the text of Ant itself. Rummaging through the text of Ant on the hunt for readings that were integrated into this recension from the Three, but have otherwise been lost in the history of the transmission of the Hexapla, may indeed be the sort of study that will shed the most light on this fascinating relationship.[44]

---

[41] Wevers, *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel*, 114. Cf. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 161, n. 29.

[42] Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 157.

[43] N. Fernández Marcos, M.V.S. Díaz-Caro, and J.M. Cañas-Reíllo (eds.), *Índice Griego-Hebreo del Texto Antioqueno en los Libros Históricos* (2 vols.; TECC 75; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2006).

[44] See similar comments by Fernández Marcos in "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel", 157.

סומכוס באנטיוכיה?
היחס בין נוסח אנטיוכיה לסומכוס בספר מלכים א (מלכויות ג)

טימותי מייקל לו

המאמר דן בשאלת הזיקה בין העיבודים היווניים של תרגום השבעים, ובעיקר ביחס
בין נוסח סומכוס, מעבד יהודי בן קיסריה, ובין נוסח לוקיאנוס, מעבד נוצרי בן אנטיוכיה.
ההנחה, הרווחת בספרות המחקר, שלוקיאנוס הושפע מסומכוס, נבחנת במאמר זה מחדש
לאור איסוף כל שרידי העיבודים היווניים במסגרת מפעל ההקספלה, הן במקורם היווני
הן בלשונות תרגום (סורית, לטינית, ארמנית). המחבר דן במאמר זה בעדויות הנוגעות
לספר מלכים א (מלכויות ג), ומתמקד בגרסאות הייחודיות של סומכוס (להבדיל מגרסאות
המשותפות לכל ה׳שלושה׳). מבין 117 גרסאות שכאלה, 20 בלבד (17%) משותפות
לנוסח אנטיוכיה, ורק ב־13 מתוכן קווי השיתוף ממשיים. שלושה־עשר מקרים אלה
נדונים בפירוט, תוך שהמחבר מבדיל בין שש גרסאות משותפות המתועדות בוודאות
בנוסח אנטיוכיה ובין שבע גרסאות משותפות אחרות המתועדות רק בחלק מעדיו.
מסקנתו היא שלא ניתן להוכיח השפעה ברורה של סומכוס על לוקיאנוס (בניגוד, למשל,
להשפעתו השקופה של סומכוס על הייירונימוס), וקווי הדמיון מתבארים לפחות בחלקם
במדיניות העיבוד הדומה שנקטו שני המעבדים. המחבר גם מעלה בזהירות את ההשערה
שנוסח סומכוס היה ידוע באנטיוכיה אך לאו דווקא בשלמותו אלא בצורת מבחר
גרסאות מתוכו שנרשמו בשולי כתבי־יד הקספלריים, ומשום כך השפעתו על לוקיאנוס
לא יכלה אלא להיות מוגבלת ביותר.