

1.4 Secondary Translations

In ancient times, the Bible was translated from its source languages into the different languages listed in → 1.3. Some of these translations were translated into additional languages because the primary translations were no longer understood in the countries in which Christianity had been accepted. Most secondary translations were made from LXX: Latin (Old Latin [→ 1.4.1]), Coptic (→ 1.4.2), Ethiopic (→ 1.4.3), Syriac (Syro-Lucianic [→ 1.4.4], Syro-Hexapla [→ 1.4.5]), Jacob of Edessa's Syriac translation (1.4.6), Armenian (→ 1.4.7), Georgian (→ 1.4.8), Christian Palestinian Aramaic [CPA] (→ 1.4.9), Old Church Slavonic (→ 1.4.10), Arabic (→ 1.4.11), and Gothic (→ 1.4.12). Earlier views about the preparation of translations from the Peshitta (→ 1.4.3 with regard to the Ethiopic translation) or the Armenian translation (→ 1.4.8.3) turned out to be incorrect. In the latter case, we would have been dealing with a tertiary translation. On the other hand, there are Arabic translations made from the Peshitta (→ 2.5.8.1), and a ninth-century translation into Arabic made by the monk Pethion from the Peshitta is known for the Prophets (→ 6–9.2.8).

In some cases, secondary translations co-existed with primary translations within the same language environment, although some translations were replaced by others. Thus the primary translation into Latin (Vulgate [→ 1.3.5]) in due course replaced the earlier secondary translation (Old Latin [→ 1.4.1]) into that language; the primary translation into Syriac, the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4), coexisted with the Syro-Hexapla (→ 1.4.5), Jacob of Edessa's translation (→ 1.4.6), and the Christian-Palestinian translations (→ 1.4.9); the primary Arabic translations (→ 1.3.6.1–2) co-existed with several secondary versions (→ 1.4.11).^{new xref}

As in the case of the primary translations, the secondary translations are very significant for understanding the literatures written in those languages and the cultures that developed around them, the languages in which they were written, the exegesis embedded in the translations, and the textual criticism of the primary versions from

which they had been translated, and rarely also the Hebrew text, in the latter case, mainly the Old Latin translation (→ 1.4.1.10).

The secondary translations were translated from other translations and not from the source language, although several doubts have been voiced regarding possible influences from the source languages and/or other primary or secondary translations. In some cases, the Hebrew source text influenced the secondary translations, as in the case of the Old Latin (→ 1.4.1.4) and the Ethiopic translations that had been influenced by several sources (→ 1.4.3.3).

Within the framework of this compendium, the study of the secondary translations involves various aspects that these translations have in common:

1.4.0 Introduction

1.4.0.1 Background and Origin

While a limited amount of information is available regarding the secondary translations that were prepared by individuals (the Armenian translation [→ 1.4.7]), little is known with certainty about the origin, development, and dates of the other translations.

The translation enterprises were of a different nature, prepared at different times by different types of persons. Some of them had more expert knowledge of the source languages than others, and all of them were driven by different approaches towards the text and the act of translating. Most translations were of the literal type, and most of them were made by Christians. Indeed, the story behind most secondary translations is closely connected to the advancement of Christianity in the world.

1.4.0.2 Need for Translating Scripture into Additional Languages

The translations, primary and secondary, were not prepared as scholarly enterprises but they served

a purpose in the communities speaking these languages. Hebrew, and later Greek, Scriptures were translated into other languages out of necessity within the context of the Christian communities because after a certain period these languages were no longer understood by the followers of these religions.

Christianity. If the Hebrew Scripture text was no longer understood by Jews after a certain period, even less so was that text understood by Christians. However, that problem is less relevant as early Christians no longer turned to the Hebrew Bible but to that in Greek, and that procedure lasted only as long as Christians knew Greek. For some time, Greek-speaking Jews and Christians made use of LXX and its early and late revisions (→ 1.3.1.2). However, soon afterwards, other Christians who did not know Greek were in need of translations of the Greek Scriptures, which were by then considered an inspired Scripture source. Thus, as Christianity expanded to the East and West, both the Old and New Testaments were circulated in Greek garb, and an immediate need arose to translate these texts into the languages of the many new Christian communities. In the case of Latin-speaking countries, from the end of the second century C.E. onwards we see the first attestations of the VL translation in North Africa (→ 1.4.1.4). Additional secondary translations were made from LXX in many other languages.

1.4.0.3 Different Translation Styles

All secondary translations, even the most literal ones, involve elements of interpretation, which often involve a move away from the plain sense of Scripture. This change of the plain sense is often slight, but it sometimes amounts to a distortion of the original meaning of the text. See further the analysis with regard to primary translations (→ 1.3.3).

1.4.0.4 Nature of the Translation Enterprises

When analyzing the corpora of the ancient translations, we should abandon a natural tendency to compare them with modern enterprises. These an-

cient translation enterprises were not organized projects, but rather involved the translation of individual Scripture books carried out with no overall planning of the collection of Scripture books as a whole. There were no organizing sessions in which the content of the translated corpus was determined and there was no central organizing board that compiled a set of instructions as to how to approach the translating activity.

Further, the first translator in each translation enterprise struggled with more challenges than those who worked subsequently, as he had to determine the procedures to be used (approach to the translation, translation technique) as well as the translation vocabulary. These first translation units often guided the later translations in matters of approach and translation vocabulary.

1.4.0.5 Relations between Translations

Each ancient translation was created as an independent enterprise in a new language in a distinct cultural setting, and from the outset cross-translational influences are unlikely because of these different settings. However, in the course of the transmission of the translations, influences from other primary and secondary translations were felt, such as those described for the Ethiopic translation (→ 1.4.3.7.1).

1.4.0.6 Internal Revision

Most, possibly all, translations underwent stages of revisional activity still recognizable in a variety of sources. In every instance, there remains uncertainty regarding the shape of the original translations.

- a) *Change towards the Proto-Masoretic Text.* The most frequent revisional activity involves the changing of the original wording of the secondary translation towards the proto-Masoretic text when the original text of that translation deviated from it.
- b) *Christianizing changes*
- c) *Inter-translational revision.* Jacob of Edessa's translation of several Scripture books changed the Peshitta translation occasionally on the basis

of LXX (→ 1.4.6.2). Likewise, several translations were revised in various directions; see the analysis of the Ethiopic translations (→ 1.4.3.7), the Georgian translations (→ 1.4.8.4), the Armenian translations (→ 1.4.7.5), etc.

1.4.0.7 Scope

The scope of the biblical books differs from translation to translation, usually closely following LXX traditions (see → 1.4.2.2 for the Coptic translations). An extreme example is that of the Ethiopic canon, the largest canon in Christianity, that contains eighty-one books (→ 1.4.3.2). Together with the different scopes, the secondary translations present the Scripture books in different sequences, usually closely following LXX traditions (see → 1.4.2.3 for the Coptic translations and → 1.4.9.2 for CPA).

1.4.0.8 Original Form of the Translations

Because of the complex history of the secondary translations, it is difficult to reconstruct the original text of the secondary translations. In each biblical book a different logic needs to be followed (see → 1.4.3.5 for the Ethiopic translation). There were many different early translations of the Old Latin as is visible in the apparatus of the Benedictine edition (→ 1.4.1.6). Likewise, there were several translations into the ancient Georgian language (→ 1.4.8.1–3), into Ethiopic (→ 1.4.3.5), and Armenian (→ 1.4.7.5) as well as into other languages.

1.4.0.9 Textual Affiliations

The secondary translations were translated from a specific form or several forms of a primary version that often may be identified. They are therefore used in the textual analysis of the primary versions in order to establish specific textual traditions. Thus, the Armenian version often serves as a good representative of the Hexapla and the Lucianic text, and this pattern varies from book to book (→ 1.4.7.5) and similar affiliations are visible in the Georgian translations (→ 1.4.8.4.2–3). Likewise, the Syro-Lucianic translation of Isaiah is based on the Lucianic revision of LXX (→ 1.4.4), while another Greek version, the Syro-Hexapla (→ 1.4.5) is

based on Origen's Hexapla. These textual affiliations probably reflect a certain geographic pattern, but more research is in order on this point.

1.4.0.10 Date

It is difficult to assign a date to the secondary versions, since in most cases more than one version was composed in a single language. The earliest secondary translation is the group of Old Latin versions begun in 200 C.E. (→ 1.4.1.4). The first Ethiopic translation may probably be assigned to the late-fourth and early-fifth centuries (→ 1.4.3.1); later Ethiopic translations are attested well into the Middle Ages. The earliest Georgian versions were prepared between the fifth and seventh centuries until the Middle Ages (→ 1.4.8.2). The Syro-Hexapla was created in approximately 615 (→ 1.4.5) and the translation of Jacob of Edessa in approximately 700 (→ 1.4.6.1). These are only some examples.

1.4.0.11 Use

Translations were not prepared for abstract purposes such as use in a library, although this was the official purpose of the translation of the Torah into Greek according to the *Letter of Aristaeas*. Translations fulfilled a need in the community and they were used in the public reading of Scripture in all the languages of the translation in the various religious contexts.

1.4.0.12 Inspiration

Tradition and religious beliefs play a role in the definition of sacred texts. An inspired status has been and is claimed for four translations: LXX, the Vulgate, the Targumim, and the Peshitta. Little is known about claims of inspiration for secondary translations.

There are no studies dedicated to the combined evidence of all or most of the secondary translations.

Emanuel Tov

1.4.1 *Vetus Latina*

1.4.1.1 Name and Nature

The Old Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible (*vetus latina, antiqua translatio*) renders LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) in its Old Greek text into Latin. It is not a single and complete translation but denotes all Latin translations prior to Jerome's Vulgate (end of the fourth century; → 1.3.5).¹ It may be the case, however, that some stages of the text of VL are later than Jerome (→ 1.3.5). VL is, therefore, a complete and systematic collection of everything that has been transmitted, directly or indirectly, of the oldest Latin Bible in a wide sense. The critical value of VL lies in the highly literal character of the translation and in the antiquity of its text, which precedes the recensions of LXX. The main problem with this version is that we do not have a text but *several* text types; besides, VL manuscripts are rather scant and therefore the main sources for these texts are patristic literature and liturgical witnesses, generally considered quite secondary.²

1.4.1.2 Scope of the Corpus

The corpus formed by these versions constitutes the Bible used by the Latin Fathers before the fifth century, among them even several who lived after Jerome. The complete corpus includes also the version of the apocryphal or deuterocanonical books and of the New Testament. The study of the value and features of the latter contributes to a better knowledge and assessment of the translations of the books of the Hebrew Bible.³

1.4.1.3 Sequence of the Books

The order of the books in the manuscript tradition presents some changes. In the organization of the African Bible of the middle of the third century C.E., the numeration of the psalms differs from those that are known in the Hebrew and Greek texts.⁴ Beuron's edition gives an

idea of the more representative sequence, including the books of the Septuagint absent in the Hebrew Bible.⁵ After the Pentateuch and Judges follow Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, 2–4 *Esdras*, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Wisdom, Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets, and 1–2 Maccabees.

1.4.1.4 Original Form, Date, and Milieu

Christian literature in the Latin language had its beginnings at the closing of the second century in North African communities that most likely spoke Latin. The very first Latin translations were created probably within the framework of liturgical catechesis, as was the case of the Targumim in the Jewish world (→ 1.3.3). Tertullian's (ca. 160–220 C.E.) writings already contain many biblical quotations, possibly quoting them from memory. However, these quotations cannot be attributed with certainty to a Latin translation in existence at that time. In the middle of the third century, Cyprian of Carthage (died 258) in his *Ad Fortunatum* and particularly in his *Libri III ad Quirinum*, also known as *Testimonia*, provides numerous biblical quotations that are lengthy and faithfully transmitted. Cyprian was already using a translation known in his time and its text agrees substantially with later manuscripts. This translation is known as the "African" version not only because it has certain linguistic idiosyncrasies requiring it to be located in Africa, or because it reflects a supposed African dialect, nor for the possible African origin of the translator, but simply because this was the Latin translation circulating in Carthage during the time period around 250 C.E. There is no known documentation testifying to the existence of other Latin versions in the rest of the Christian world.⁶ The VL version is a Christian work. Insufficient data exists to suppose that the biblical texts in Latin originated in

¹ Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala*.

² Haelewyck, "Les premières versions latines de la Bible," 121.

³ Fischer, "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache."

⁴ Bogaert, "L'ancienne numérotation africaine."

⁵ **Vetus Latina*.

⁶ Bogaert, "La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge"; Gribomont, "Les plus anciennes traductions latines"; Schulz-Flügel, "The Latin Old Testament Tradition."

Jewish communities of North Africa that probably spoke Latin as evidenced by their epigraphy. The available documentation does not mention the use of Latin in synagogue worship. Blondheim assumed the existence of a Hebrew original as the ultimate source of VL.⁷ Cassuto and, in a more nuanced way, Kedar-Kopfstein also propose a direct use of a Hebrew text.⁸ Tertullian seems to know a version of the New Testament but not a translation of the Pentateuch that he could have cited. The early Christian translators, some perhaps of Jewish origin, could use a specific Jewish vocabulary in Latin. Tertullian and Augustine testify that the Jews of their environment designated Friday afternoon (*προσάββατον* or *παρασκευή* in Greek, lit. “Sabbath-Eve” or “preparation”) with the typical Latin name *cenapura* “Friday.” The African and European witnesses of the Gospels use this term (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:14, 31, 42), which was gradually replaced in the European manuscripts by *parasceue* “preparation,” a Judeo-Hellenistic term, or by *praeparatio* “preparation.”⁹ The influence of the Hebrew world is felt in a Christian translation like that of Judith. The text attested by the manuscript VL¹⁰⁹, probably from before the year 400, includes the addition to Jdt 8:6 of *in diebus festis qui in memoriale domus Israhel* “in the festive days which are in memory of the house of Israel.” This seems to be a general allusion to *Megillat Taanit* that could betray a Jewish intervention without mediation of the Greek text. However, no ancient Latin version, except for that of Jerome, made use of the Hebrew text. The Hebraisms present in VL come from LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), the *kaige*-Th (→ 1.3.1.2) recension or the revisions of Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus (→ 1.3.1.2).¹⁰ Later on, Jewish communities themselves used the translations of Jerome

(→ 1.3.5). The textual tradition of VL is divided into two groups, designated as African and European. They are distinguished by the vocabulary and, to a lesser extent, by the character of the translation. Moreover, the translator of each book has his own preferences and vocabulary. A Greek word was not translated by the same Latin word. The text of some books has reached the present day in a form very close to the text used by Cyprian. This is the case of books not revised by Jerome such as Wisdom of Solomon (→ 11.15) and Ben Sira (→ 11.4). After the old African text of Cyprian came a more advanced African text attested by Ticonius, an Italian text, and another European text transmitted by Lucifer of Cagliari in the mid-fourth century. Towards the end of the fourth century, different recensions known as “European” were already circulating in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. The history of VL is basically that of a progressive “Europeanization” of the African text, in the sense of improving the style and vocabulary of the text and adapting the translation to Greek models different from those used by the first translator of each book.¹¹ The African text underwent continual adaptations to the liturgical vocabulary of the various places where it spread.

Augustine complained in his time that, given the spread of Greek manuscripts and the knowledge that Latin-speaking Christians had of Greek, many believed themselves authorized to insert corrections into the Latin text. Jerome qualified the state of the Latin text in his time as *vitiosissima varietas* (“excessively error-ridden panoply,” *Praefatio in Iudith*).¹² This situation led to a state of such textual confusion that it soon became intolerable. However, the differences among these recensions should not create the impression that different original translations existed, since they all retain traces of the archetypal African text.

It has long been debated whether there was only one translation that subsequently branched out into the extant variety of text forms, or whether sev-

⁷ D. Blondheim, *Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina: Études sur les rapports entre les traductions bibliques en langue romane des Juifs au Moyen Age et les anciennes versions* (Paris: Champion, 1925).

⁸ Cassuto, “The Jewish Translation of the Bible into Latin”; Kedar-Kopfstein, “The Latin Translations.”

⁹ Bogaert, “La version latine de Judith,” 7–32, 181–212 (22); Quispel, *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica*, 426.

¹⁰ Kraus, “Hebraisms in the Old Latin Version of the Bible.”

¹¹ Fischer, *Genesis*, 15*.

¹² Billen, *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch*, 66–67.

eral versions coexisted for a certain time from the beginning. Augustine compares the small number of translators of the Greek version with the countless number of those who dared to translate the Scriptures into Latin from any Greek manuscript that might be available. Thus, he speaks of an “unlimited variety of Latin translators,” which seems to point to the existence of numerous independent versions (*Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas*; *De Doctrina Christiana* 2:11).¹³ Jerome seems to share this view when he speaks of “unskilled translators” (*imperiti translatores*; *Praefatio in Proverbia*), but he seems to attribute the textual variety rather to the ignorance and neglect by revisors and copyists (*scriptorum vitio depravata* “corrupted by the error of scribes”; *Praefatio in Job*). For posterity remained the influential phrase of Jerome *apud Latinos tot sint exemplaria quot codices* “among the Latins there are as many versions as there are manuscripts” (*Praefatio in libro Iosue*),¹⁴ lamenting that every manuscript gave a new type of text. This judgment has contributed decisively to an almost total disregard of the Old Latin text in biblical textual criticism.

The question of multiple versions or a single version cannot be addressed in general terms, but needs to be considered book by book given that the Old Latin is not a homogeneous work. Until the mid-twentieth century it was generally thought that the discrepancies between the preserved texts were due to the diversity of concurrent translations. But studies like those of Capelle¹⁵ and De Bruyne and Sodar¹⁶ as well as the published *Vetus Latina* volumes by Beuron have suggested otherwise. Examples include the Heptateuch,¹⁷ Proverbs,¹⁸ and Isaiah.¹⁹ The erroneous

reading *nocuiis* “into hurtful objects” in Isa 2:20 attested by Tertullian and all the extant witnesses versus the original reading *noctuis* “to the night birds” (LXX *νυκτερίσι* “to the bats”) is evidence of the basic unity of the Latin version of Isaiah.²⁰

That plurality of text types developed from an original single translation is explained by two mechanisms acting sometimes simultaneously. Within the Latin tradition itself, and as the text types spread from North Africa to Europe in the third century C.E. and even more so in the fourth, the syntax and vocabulary were more incorrect or outdated, which demanded the appropriate correction and updating. The original text was a slavish tracing of the Greek word order, modes, tenses, and even the cases (to an accusative, genitive, or dative corresponded the same cases in Latin). This gave the Latin text a strange style that annoyed Jerome and Augustine and many others. Eventually, the vocabulary was cleared of Africanisms, words or expressions frequently used in the witnesses of the African writers.

In the process of diversification of the VL text, there was also a tendency to review it according to Greek models diverging from the basis of the first translation. The Old Greek text of biblical books (→ 1.3.1.1) underwent several recensions or revisions (→ 1.3.1.2), which were the origin of the Alexandrian text, the Hexaplaric recension, and the Lucianic or Antiochene recension, not to mention other recensions or the text transmitted by the catenae. The VL versions evolved in parallel to the text of the Greek recensions. In due time, variants typical of the different Greek recensions entered the VL tradition, in particular from the *kaige* and Hexaplaric recensions. Augustine made use of the traditional text of his church in Africa, of the text coming from north Italy, and even sometimes of the revision by Jerome (→ 1.3.5).²¹ In some passages of *Quaes-*

¹³ I. Martin, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, De Doctrina Christiana, De vera religione* (CCL 32.4.1; Turnhout: Brepols, 1962).

¹⁴ Gryson, **Biblia Sacra: Praefatio sancti Hieronymi in libro Iosue*, 285.

¹⁵ Capelle, *Le texte du psautier latin en Afrique*.

¹⁶ De Bruyne and Sodar, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées*.

¹⁷ Fischer, *Genesis*.

¹⁸ Schildenberger, *Die altlateinischen Texte des Proverbien-Buches I*.

¹⁹ Gryson, *Esaias 1–39*; Gryson, *Esaias 40–66*.

²⁰ Petitmengin, “Recherches sur les citations d’Isaïe chez Tertullien.”

²¹ Bogaert, “La Bible d’Augustin”; De Bruyne, “S. Augustin reviseur de la bible.”

tiones in Heptateuchum, Augustine compares the Greek version with a Hebrew text (*interpretatio ex hebraeo* “interpretation from the Hebrew [text]”) that cannot be another one than that reflected by Jerome’s version (Judg 2:13; 3:17, 31; 7:6; 8:26–27; 10:1; 15:8).²²

All the factors mentioned (numerous text forms, textual corruption, careless language and style, etc.) were determinant for the need felt in the fourth century C.E. for a complete revision of the old version and the making of a new Latin version. From this century on, the *Vulgate* version of Jerome (→ 1.3.5), a mix of old revisions and new translation, gradually replaced the old version. The VL-Psalms were the texts that most resisted the introduction of the Vulgate text. Many of them, following the fifth century, had an appendix of biblical poems, with Isa 5:1–9 among other examples. The manuscripts of VL remained in circulation until the end of the eighth century, but most of them were damaged or lost and their text was carelessly mixed with Vulgate readings. The text of the purest VL version is preserved in those books that were not reworked by Jerome, precisely those that are not part of the Hebrew Bible: Wisdom of Solomon (→ 11.15.4), Ben Sira (→ 11.4.5), Baruch (→ 11.2.1.4), Epistle of Jeremiah (→ 11.2.4.4), and 1–2 Maccabees (→ 11.10.1.4; → 11.10.2.4).

1.4.1.5 Evidence (Direct and Indirect)

The manuscript tradition of VL has reached us in a mostly fragmentary state. In addition, manuscripts that preserve parts of this version are not very old, although it has always to be taken into account that manuscripts of recent date can preserve quite ancient texts very faithfully. The situation is different for each of the biblical books and the proportions of patristic quotations and manuscript tradition also vary from book to book. The Pentateuch with Joshua and Judges is well known in a

single translator’s work. Ruth survives only in the ninth/tenth century Codex Complutensis (Madrid University ms 31); Ezra–Nehemiah and the apocryphal books 3–4 *Esdras* are known in full, as are 2 Chronicles and Canticles. Esther is well represented in the manuscript tradition. Our evidence is especially scarce for Samuel–Kings, 1 Chronicles, Job, Proverbs, and the Prophets. Very few manuscripts of Isaiah have been preserved (some fragments of codices and a few liturgical manuscripts), but there are abundant patristic quotations of the book, up to ca. 17,000.

1) Quotations of Latin Fathers (→ 21.8; → 1.7.2).²³

The VL of the Old Testament is mostly attested in quotations in patristic literature. While these quotations are often very free, some are very faithful to the original. Particularly important are the quotations by Cyprian, Lucifer of Cagliari, Tyconius, Jerome, Augustine, and some florilegia such as the *Liber de diuinis scripturis* (or *Speculum*, a pseudo-Augustinian work). All Latin Fathers before the fifth century and a good number after Jerome quote in their works the text of the old versions. Patristic quotations often constitute the only channel through which VL has come down to us and also allow us to accurately locate VL texts in time and space, which is rarely possible based only on the testimony of manuscripts.²⁴

2) Manuscripts.²⁵ There is no extant single manuscript that covers the whole range of biblical books. The oldest manuscripts do not go back to a time before the fifth century. They are mostly fragmentary or palimpsests. Among them, we can mention approximately 500 palimpsests with text from a lectionary, probably from Gaul, as well as the Quedlinburg Fragments, of a fifth-

²³ Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins*.

²⁴ J. Frede, “Bibelzitate bei Kirchenvätern: Beobachtungen bei der Herausgabe der ‘Vetus Latina,’” in *La Bible et les Pères: Colloque de Strasbourg (1er–3 octobre 1969)* (Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1971), 79–96.

²⁵ For an inventory, see Fischer, *Verzeichnis*; Gryson *Altlateinische Handschriften*, Vols. 1–2.

²² O. García de la Fuente (ed.), *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum: Obras completas de San Agustín XXVIII: Edición bilingüe* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1989), 651, 657, 667, 673, 679, and 717; La Bonnardière, “Augustin a-t-il utilisé la ‘Vulgate’ de Jérôme.”

century illuminated manuscript containing portions of Samuel–Kings.

The VL manuscripts are classified numerically according to the order of biblical books. Numbers 1–89 are New Testament books; 91–96 are marginal glosses from some Bibles from Spain; 100–11 the Octateuch; 115–22 Samuel–Kings and Chronicles; 123–29 Ezra–Nehemiah; 130–59 Tobit, Judith, and Esther; 160–64 Job; 165–73 Wisdom Books; 173–94a Prophets; 195–218 Maccabees; 250–75 biblical songs transmitted independently from the Psalter; and finally 300 and following correspond to the Psalter. Gryson's repertoire of the Latin ecclesiastical authors contains information on each manuscript regarding codicological and paleographical data, contents, reference to editions of the text, and brief information on the text type, followed by a selected bibliography. The repertoire leaves some unassigned numbers in case of future finds. In quite a few manuscripts there is a mix of VL and Vulgate text.

- 3) Glosses or additions to the translations of Jerome (→ 1.3.5), as those present in Spanish Vulgate Bibles (Beuron 91–95), which cover books from the Heptateuch, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, Job, Proverbs, and Isaiah. Seven hundred and eighty glosses belong to the Heptateuch and 150 to Job. In Genesis, the text is of types VL^S (fourth-century African) and VL^I (European). In 1–4 Kingdoms, it is closer to Lucifer and Palimpsest 115, as well as to the Antiochene Greek (→ 1.3.1.2). In Job, it can be related to Ambrosius and in a smaller proportion to Augustine. These glosses are the only witnesses of the Antiochene recension. In Proverbs, they come from Cyprian's text and are related to VL¹⁶⁵ and to Ambrose. In Isaiah, they come from Jerome's commentary to that book.
- 4) *Capitula* and *tituli*. The Vulgate (→ 1.3.5) presents some series of *capitula* placed at the beginning of biblical books. When they are repeated within the text itself or on the margins they constitute the *tituli*. These reproduce a VL text and not the Vulgate's, and thus preserve VL vocabulary of the summarized passage or, rather, the first words of

the VL pericope.²⁶ Some of these series have a Donatist origin.²⁷

- 5) Liturgical texts. A good portion of the VL text has been preserved in biblical readings and hymns used in Christian liturgy. The most-used poems with VL text are Exodus 15; Deut 9:26–29; 32:1–43; Judges 5; 1 Sam 2:1–10; Isa 5:1–7(9); 26:1–8, 9–20; 38:10–20; 60:1–5; 66:10–16; Lam 5:1–22; Dan 3:26–45(56), 52(57)–88(90); Habakkuk 3; Jonah 2:3–10(11). The very conservatism of the liturgical tradition explains the fact that copies of the Psalter are the most numerous, and palimpsests and papyri are included among them. Until very recently, local recensions of the Psalter continued to be used in Rome, Milan, and Toledo. The claim has habitually been made that the *Psalterium Romanum* is to be connected with a first (cursor) revision by Jerome, but this is unlikely according to De Bruyne.²⁸ The *Psalterium Gallicanum* is Jerome's second revision (based on the Origin's *Hexapla*) of a VL-Psalter.²⁹
- 6) Vulgate (→ 1.3.5). The textual tradition of VL has often been transmitted together with *Vulgate manuscripts*. This is the case for manuscripts of a family of Spanish Bibles that reproduce in the margin, in the form of glosses, a considerable number of readings from VL gathered from very different sources. Among them, the *Codex Gothicus Legionensis* deserves special mention; it is a manuscript of the Vulgate from the close of the tenth century with marginal readings taken from VL.

1.4.1.6 Editions

Still indispensable is the collection of quotations compiled by Sabatier in his work *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu Vetus Italica*.³⁰

²⁶ De Bruyne, *Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latina*.

²⁷ P.-M. Bogaert, "Les particularités éditoriales des Bibles comme exégèse implicite ou proposée: Les sommaires ou *capitula* donatistes," in *Lectures bibliques: Colloque du 11 nov. 1980* (Bruxelles: Institutum Iudaicum, 1982), 7–21.

²⁸ De Bruyne, "Le problème du psautier romain."

²⁹ Estin, *Les Psautiers de Jérôme*.

³⁰ Sabatier, **Bibliorum*.

The publication of the critical edition of this version began in the Benedictine monastery of Beuron in 1949. Up to 2015, the volumes corresponding to Genesis,³¹ Ruth,³² Isaiah,³³ and Esther³⁴ have appeared, and those of Canticles (E. Schulz-Flügel), Tobit (J.-M. Auwers), and Judith (P.-M. Bogaert) are being prepared.

The edition offers first the Greek text with those Greek variants that agree with the Latin text, which appears under the Greek text according to the different text types. Thus, in Isaiah, we find the standard text from the end of the second century or beginning of the third (sigla x), followed by the African types: Cyprian's text known in Africa during the mid-third century (κ) and a revised form thereof, used by African authors in the fourth and fifth centuries (c); then come the European types (E), in two different forms, one attested by authors who were oldest and furthest from Rome such as Lucifer of Cagliari and Hilary of Poitiers; and that transmitted by Jerome and some authors of the fifth century. Augustine's text is at times African and at times European. O indicates the LXX translation that Jerome reproduces as the second *lemma* (the first one is the Vulgate) in his commentary to Isaiah. In some books, though seldom in Isaiah, it is possible to determine the European text: M represents a form of text particular to the region around Milan, witnessed mostly by Ambrose. Finally, R corresponds to Lucifer's text and S to the Spanish type. Therefore, the edition of VL does not reconstruct an original or an archetype. Generally speaking, neither is it possible to reconstruct the archetype of the different recensions and text types. Cyprian's VL text in the third century is not closer to VL than the text read in the Roman church during the Passover Vigil around 600 C.E.³⁵

³¹ Fischer, *Genesis*.

³² Gesche, *Ruth*.

³³ Gryson, *Esaias 1–39*; Gryson, *Esaias 40–66*.

³⁴ Haelewyck, *Hester*.

³⁵ Fischer, *Genesis*, 24*.

1.4.1.7 Auxiliary Tools

Fundamental instruments for the study of VL are the repertoires of manuscripts and quotations of Latin Fathers published in the *Vetus Latina* series from Beuron: Fischer, *Verzeichnis*; Gryson, *Répertoire général*; Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, Vols. 1–2. The repertoire attempts to collate, as much as possible, all quotations until the implementation of Carolingian reforms (800), thus showing the transition from Old Latin to the Vulgate.

To the previous works, should be added the *Vetus Latina Database* edited by Gryson, which is available on CD-Rom and also accessible online (www.brepolis.net/vld_en.html). References to Fathers should be verified and checked in each case, as the identification of non-explicit biblical references is always delicate, given that Vulgate concordances are not valid for the Greek-translated VL.

The Beuron Institute has produced thirty-nine monographs on the history of the Latin Bible: *From the History of the Latin Bible: Complementary Monograph Series*, edited by Roger Gryson. This series includes editions of patristic texts and studies of particular questions concerning the transmission of the Bible. As a conclusion to the complete work, a large Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin concordance of the whole Latin Bible is planned, whose progress follows that of the edition (<http://www.vetus-latina.de>). The *Bulletin de la Bible Latine* published by P.-M. Bogaert since 1955 is extremely useful.

1.4.1.8 Translation Technique

VL is characterized by its extreme literalness. In Ps 73(MT 74):5 *sicut in exitu super summum* “as though into the upper entrance” the expression *super summum* “upper” reflects literally ὑπερᾶνω/לְמַעְלָה. This literalness is far away – stylistically speaking – from the precepts that governed classical Latin literature. It has been interpreted as a reflection of the translator's lack of skill or of his inability to carry out a literary translation. Nevertheless, present research has partially modified this assessment, justifying literalness in the light of aesthetic principles different from those of classical

literature. The first translators had a rather high cultural level.³⁶ But it is true that the typical VL translation “to the letter,” laden with Hellenisms and vulgarisms, inspired rejection among the cultured classes. Also, this version enriched the lexical patrimony of the Latin language through the coining of new words, the development of new meanings, and the diffusion of lexical combinations that enabled new compounds.³⁷

The ancient version was written in the vernacular of the people, as shown by the frequent carelessness in pronunciation (*famis* for *fames* “famine” in Gen 41:57), the use of vulgar or late Latin terms (*manducare* for *comedere* “eat” in Hos 9:3), Greek loanwords (*agoniare* “strive” Sir 4:33; *zelus* “zeal” Wis 5:18), imitations of Greek (*paranympus* “advisor” lit., “bride’s male attendant” Gen 26:26), Aramaic loanwords (*mammona* “mammon/wealth” Matt 6:24), grammatical or syntactical deviations with respect to classical Latin (*magis bonus* “more good” Wis 8:20), constructions introduced by *quod* or *quia*, instead of the classical construction with accusative and infinitive (*et vidit deus lucem quia bona est* “and God saw the light, that it was good” Gen 1:4), etc. Frequently, a fluctuation can be seen between a Greek loanword and a Latin term with different shades of meaning: *diabolus* “devil” – *adversarius* “adversary”; *synagoga* “synagogue” – *congregatio* “congregation”; *eleemosyna* “mercy” – *iustitia* “justice.” Some Latin terms acquire new meaning owing to biblical influence: *gentes* “nations” is applied to “pagans” (Ps 79:10); *peccatum* “failing” also means “sin” or “fault” (Gen 18:20); *fides* “trust” also means “religious faith” (Hab 2:4). In Gen 17:12, VL translates *διαθήκη* “covenant” as *testamentum* “will/testament,” whereas Jerome, translating from the Hebrew, renders *בְּרִית* “covenant” as *foedus* “treaty” or *pactum* “agreement.”

In this semantic field, numerous words acquired a new meaning but also preserved the former

one: *sacramentum* “oath” in classical Latin, translates the many meanings of *μυστήριον* in LXX: “hidden truth,” “salvific divine ruling,” “featured teaching of the doctrine,” and “typological prefiguration”; *dilectio* and *caritas* take the meaning of “love” which in turn represents that of *הַחֶבֶד* (“love between spouses” in Canticles); *gloria* “glory” translates *δόξα*, which matches the Hebrew *כְּבוֹד* “transcendent majesty of God,” giving word to the neologism *glorificare* “glorify.” Many other terms acquired new meanings in different associations. Such is the case, e.g., of *uita* “life”; *mors* “death”; *salus* “health”; *iustitia* “justice”; *spiritus* “breath/soul/life”; *caro* “flesh”; *paenitentia* “repentance/penance”; etc.

Greek loanwords are frequent: *plasmare* “form”; *abyssus* “abyss”; *blasphemia* “blasphemy”; *scandalum* “temptation/inducement of sin”; *brabium* “prize in games”; *exstasis* “terror/amazement/ecstasy”; etc. Some attempts at style are not rare either, such as *interpretatio per circuitum* in *bona voluntas* “good will” = *εὐδοκία* “favor” (*NETS) in Ps 5:13 or the rhetorical *variatio* in Isa 19:22 where the Greek *καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτοὺς ἰάσει* “and he will heal them with healing” is turned into *et sanabit eos sua misericordia* “and he will heal them with his mercy.”

Through Greek, some Hebraisms have entered into the Old Latin text, such as the use of elative genitive (*uanitas uanitatum* “futility of futilities”; *caeli caelorum* “heavens of heavens”; *saecula saeculorum* “century of centuries”) or of etymological pleonasm (*gaudens gaudebo* “rejoicing I will rejoice”; *dixit dicens* “saying he has said”) or others such as *accepit in* (*εἰς* = *-i*) *uxorem* “he accepted as wife”; *minus ab* (*ἀπό* = *ab*) *angelis* “less than the angels”; *murmurauerunt super me* “they have complained against me” (*ἐπί/ὑπέρ* = *super*). In this way, explanations can be given for the usage of feminine instead of neuter in *unam* (*μία* = *תּוֹרָה*) *petii a Domino, hanc* (*ταύτην* = *הַתּוֹרָה*) *requiram* “One thing I have asked from the Lord, this will I seek” in Ps 27(26):4 or the expression of the comparative via a positive and the preposition *a*: *a vocibus* (*ἀπὸ φωνῶν* = *תּוֹרַת מְרַבִּים*) *aquarum multarum* “than the noise of many waters” (Ps 93:4). Lexical Hebraisms

³⁶ Boscherini, “Sulla lingua delle primitive versioni latine dell’Antico Testamento.”

³⁷ Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*; Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel*.

are the divine names *Sabaoth*, *Eloim*, *Cherubim*, *Satan*, or the liturgical expressions *alleluia*, *hosanna*, *amen*.³⁸

1.4.1.9 Inner-Translational Phenomena

In the study of VL, as in that of any other version, the first task consists in identifying the internal variants produced during the textual transmission: copy errors, omissions and additions, linguistic or stylistic revisions, influences of the Vulgate tradition in the pre-Jerome text, etc. For example, in Judg 9:20, the VL reading (*Lugdunensis*) *exeat ignis et Abimelec et mecaedat uiros Sicimorum* “may fire come and Abimelech and *strike me* the men of Sikima” contains two errors: *et* for *ex* and *mecaedat* for *comedat*. Both can be corrected easily with the Greek ἐξέλθοι πῦρ ἐξ Αβιμελεχ καὶ καταφάγοι τοὺς ἄνδρας Σικιμῶν “may fire come from Abimelech and devour the men of Sikima” (*NETS) and with the reading in the following context *et exeat ignis a principibus Sicimorum comedat domum Abimelec* “may fire come from princes of Sikima and devour the house of Abimelech.” In Cant 1:15, *vide si speciosa* “look, if beautiful” translates ἰδοὺ εἰ καλή “look, you are beautiful” (*NETS) confusing the verbal form εἶ “you are” with the conditional particle εἰ = *si* “if.”

The history of VL is the history of a continuous revision of its text to adapt it to a Greek text that differed from those used in the primitive version as well as to tastes, style, and vocabulary that changed with the development of the Latin language. For example, the term *cenapura* “Friday/Sabbath” was replaced by *parasceue* (παρασκευή “Friday”); *sacramentum* “secret” by *mysterium* “mystery”; *itaque* “accordingly” by *ergo* “therefore” and *igitur* “thus”; etc. African vocabulary was replaced by European vocabulary.³⁹ The differences among these recensions should not create the impression that different original translations existed, since they all retain traces of the archetypal African text. This is

³⁸ Braun, “L’influence de la Bible sur la langue latine”; Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*.

³⁹ Cf. H. von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (TUGAL 33; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909) on the evolution of vocabulary and African and European characteristics.

particularly certain in the case of books that underwent a slow process of development, such as Proverbs and even Genesis.

1.4.1.10 Reconstruction of the Parent Text(s)

In spite of the scant and fragmentary material preserved, its complex recensional history, and the mix of vulgar and literary style, VL is a witness of great value for the Greek text before the period of the great uncial manuscripts of the fourth century.⁴⁰ The textual tradition of VL is much richer and more varied than the Greek tradition. VL translates a Greek text of the second century, i.e., a text that is earlier than the recension of Origen. Its text therefore has considerable text-critical value. VL contributes to the knowledge of the oldest text of the Septuagint version and even at times of Hebrew variants unknown in the remainder of the manuscript traditions.⁴¹ In Samuel–Kings (→ 3–5.2.1.2), VL readings, especially when attested also by Josephus (→ 21.3), the Coptic (→ 3→ –5.2.2), the pre-Hexaplaric stratum of the Armenian (→ 3→ –5.2.5.3; → 3→ –5.2.5.4) and Georgian (→ 3→ –5.2.7) versions, as well as by the Hebrew parallel readings of Chronicles (→ 5.3.2; → 5.3.3; → 20.2.2), go back to a pre-Lucianic text that preserves the Old Greek (→ 5.4; → 5.5) and help to recover a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from MT. In Judges and Samuel–Kings, the VL textual tradition contains readings that correspond to the Greek *kaige* text, juxtaposed to the old readings based on the pre-Lucianic and Old Greek original.⁴²

A typical example is the double translation of the Hebrew אֶל־עַל־הַצָּבָא “over the army” in 1 Kgs 4:4 and LXX-3 Kgdms 2:46h: ἐπὶ τῆς δυνάμεως “over the force” (*kaige*) = *dux virtutis* “commander of the force” (recensional reading) and ἐπὶ τῆς στρατιάς “over the army” (Old Greek) = *dux militiae* “commander of the army” (original VL reading).

⁴⁰ Fischer, “Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek”; Ulrich, “Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation.”

⁴¹ Treballe, “From the Old Latin through the Old Greek to the Old Hebrew.”

⁴² Treballe, “Textos ‘Kaige’ en la Vetus Latina de Reyes (2 Re 10,25–28).”

Qumran biblical manuscripts (→ 1.2.2) demonstrate that until 70 C.E. several books of the Bible circulated in two or more editions or different textual forms. It is meaningful that in those books the VL text witnesses the oldest LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), reflecting a Hebrew text different from MT (→ 1.2.2) and, at times, readings unknown to the rest of textual traditions, both in Hebrew and in other ancient versions.

- *Exodus*. VL (*Monacensis*, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 6225 = VL¹⁰⁴) attests to a different version of Exodus 36–40, where LXX lacks some sections of MT, and in a few places also adds details. *Monacensis* reflects a Greek text representing the oldest Greek form.⁴³
- *Deuteronomy*. In Deut 27:4, “even though only one surviving Greek witness attests ‘Mount Gerizim,’ VL was translated from some form of an ancient LXX manuscript which read ‘Mount Gerizim.’”⁴⁴
- *Judges*. VL (*Lugdunensis*), followed by Lucifer of Cagliari, represents a Greek Antiochene text (LXX^{54 59 75 314}), attesting a purer pre-Hexaplaric text than the LXX^A and LXX^B texts.
- *1–4 Kingdoms*. VL (*Vindobonensis*) represents a pre-Lucianic Greek text, very close to the original Greek version, which was based on a Hebrew text different from that of the Masoretic tradition.
- *Jeremiah*. VL (*Wirceburgensis*) omits Jer 39(46): 1–2, marked with an asterisk in Origen’s Greek text. This agreement shows that these verses did not appear in the Old Greek (→ 7.3) and neither did Jer 39(46):4–13 (→ 6–9.2.1).⁴⁵
- *Ezekiel*. VL (*Wirceburgensis*) and the Greek manuscript LXX⁹⁶⁷ (→ 8.3) are the only witnesses preserved that show that the order of Ezekiel 37–39 according to MT is not original. The oldest text

followed the sequence 38; 39; 37 and omitted Ezek 36:23c–28⁴⁶ (→ 6–9.2.1).

- *Daniel*. Papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ represents the more original form of the Greek text (→ 18.3.1), showing the order of chs. 1–4; 7–8; 5–6; and 9–12, followed by the stories of *Bel and the Dragon* and *Susanna*. This arrangement is found in the Latin writer Quodvultdeus.
- *Canticles*. VL presents the same verse order in Daniel 5 as LXX^{R 952} and some Coptic witnesses (Cant 5:12, 14b, 13, 14a, 15).
- *Job*. VL quotations of the Latin Fathers attest a shorter text (as compared with MT) very close to the Greek original.
- *Esther*. “The Greek model of the Old Latin (La-GrIII) represents the first Greek translation of the book, and the other two forms, the L text (GrII) and the LXX text (GrI), are later.”⁴⁷
- *Ezra–Nehemiah* (Esdras B in LXX). Several VL readings witness a lost Greek model.

The VL textual tradition of the deuterocanonical books is purer than that of the books of the Hebrew Bible, whose translation by Jerome (→ 1.3.5) contaminated their VL text. The VL version provides information about early versions of the texts of these books. Thus, the VL text of *Baruch* (→ 11.2.1.4), transmitted together with Jeremiah, knew four textual forms, two of them dependent on the Old Greek (→ 11.2.1.4). In *Ecclesiasticus/Ben Sira* (→ 11.4.5), VL preserves the original order of the text against the whole Greek manuscript tradition (→ 11.4.3) that has Sir 33:13b–36:10 before Sir 30:25–33:15a. *Judith* has been transmitted in three forms: that of “LXX,” the “Lucianic” text, and that of manuscript LXX⁵⁸ (→ 11.9.3; → 11.9.1), followed by VL (→ 11.9.5). The closer the variants are to the text of LXX⁵⁸, the higher is the guarantee of originality. In *Tobit* (→ 11.14.8), VL, although not free of corruptions and contaminations, contributes to the reconstruction of the text of the Sinaitic recension (G¹¹), the

⁴³ Bogaert, “L’importance de la Septante et du ‘Monacensis’”; Bogaert, “La construction de la tente (Ex 36–40) dans le *Monacensis*.”

⁴⁴ Ulrich, “The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh^a.”

⁴⁵ Bogaert, “Les trois formes de Jérémie 52”; Bogaert, “Le livre de Jérémie en perspective: les deux rédactions antiques”; Bogaert, “La *vetus latina* de Jérémie: texte très court.”

⁴⁶ Bogaert, “Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante.”

⁴⁷ Haelewyck, “The Relevance of the Old Latin Version for the Septuagint,” 439.

oldest of the three types of Greek texts (→ 11.14.4). In 1 Maccabees (→ 11.10.1.4→), the VL text often departs from the known Greek manuscript tradition (→ 11.10.1.2). In many cases, it is attesting a lost Greek text, superior to the one we know. In 2 Maccabees (→ 11.10.2.4), VL and the Armenian version (→ 11.10.2.6) bear joint witness to a now-lost short form of Greek text (→ 11.10.2.2). Most of the VL additions in Wisdom (→ 11.15.4) go back to the first Greek translation (→ 11.15.2).

1.4.1.11 Relevance for Exegesis

The VL version underscores above all the importance of taking the Greek version into consideration (→ 1.3.1.1). Jerome himself, before converting to *veritas hebraica*, took his first steps as translator by revising the VL version according to Origen's Greek text (→ 1.3.5). The Old Latin version does not present exegetical phenomena of the Targumic kind, which might reflect particular interpretations on the translated biblical passages. The translation came out of the version of texts read in liturgy and from collections of *testimonia* that give an idea of which passages were used the most in Christian teaching and which were more often retained in memory. The first *testimonia* (→ 21.8) were transmitted in the context of anti-Jewish polemics, a fact that indicates the importance of Jewish communities and their proselytism in Africa during the second and third centuries.⁴⁸ They are earlier than Tertullian, who incorporates them into his works *Adversus Judaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem* (Book IV). Later, Commodianus collected around sixty *testimonia* in his *Carmen apologeticum*, among them one of messianic content composed of the passages Num 24:17; Isa 11:1, and Isa 11:10 (*Carm.* 291–92); the text of Num 24:17 was already part of a *testimonia* at Qumran (4Q175; → 2.1.7). Also, Cyprian's *testimo-*

nia aid anti-Jewish polemics (*ad Quirinum* 1) or develop messianic prophecies in reference to Jesus Christ (11). Others of a later period allude to Christian discipline (111) or disposition for martyrdom (*Ad Fortunatum*.) These collections of *testimonia* practice a typological exegesis according to which the Bible interprets itself via cross-references between books.

Tertullian also developed the typology of Adam and the tree of paradise until Christ's cross, going through Abel, Isaac, Judah, and, especially, Moses. Cyprian draws from Abel different lines of succession, such as Abel, Jacob, Joseph, David, Elishah, and Zechariah; or Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, David, and the prophets.⁴⁹ The books quoted most often by Tertullian, Cyprian, and the Latin Fathers are the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and Psalms.

Exegesis in the Latin tradition is developed through the plurality of coexisting versions of a same word or expression. Thus, Ambrose collects in *De Isaac* 3:6 four different versions of the Greek word ἀδολεσχῆσαι “to meditate” (**NETS*) in Gen 24:63: *abalienari* “to abstract”; *deambulare* “to take a walk”; *exerceri/exercere* “to practice”; and *halucinari* “wander in mind.”⁵⁰ In this way, Isaac's going to meet Rebecca becomes a spiritual search, *meditatio et exercitium*, best expressed by the word *halucinari*.⁵¹ Despite Augustine's insistence for *pietas* “piety” (θεοσεβεία “fear of God,” *Enchiridion* 2), Jerome's version *timor domini* “fear of the Lord” following the Hebrew prevailed (*On Christian Doctrine* 11,8). We lack studies on the interpretation of the Old Testament or the Hebrew Bible made by the VL version through the vocabulary and the translation options preserved in its rich textual tradition.

⁴⁸ M. Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire AD 135–425* (trans. H. McKeating; Littman Library of Jewish Civilization; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); W.H.C. Frend, “A Note on Jews and Christians in Third-Century North-Africa,” *JTS NS* 21 (1970): 92–96; J. Daniélou, *Les origines du christianisme latin* (Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée 3; Paris: Cerf, 1978), 223–24.

⁴⁹ V. Saxer, “La Bible chez les Pères latins du III^e siècle,” in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible: Bible de tous les temps 11* (eds. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri; Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), 339–64.

⁵⁰ “De Isaac vel anima,” in *Sancti Ambrosii Opera* (ed. C. Schenkl; CSEL 32.1; Vienna: Tempsky, 1896), 646, lines 8–10.

⁵¹ G. Nauroy, “L'Écriture dans la pastoral d'Ambroise de Milan,” in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible* (eds. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri; Bible de tous les temps 2; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 371–408 (388–90).

VL has contributed to the coining of the most meaningful terms of Western theology, as well as numerous expressions and formulae in Latin liturgy.⁵² As a result, the Latin Bible is a prominent source of information not only for theologians, but also for historians and linguists.

1.4.1.12 Relevance for Literary Analysis

In the books mentioned above in which the Greek version and manuscripts from Qumran prove the existence of textual forms different from the Masoretic text-type (→ 1.2.2; → 1.3.1.1), the testimony of VL, which is usually shorter or characterized by a different layout and order of the units that compose the text, contributes to the study of those textual forms. VL omits 2 Sam 5:4–5, which is missing also in 4QSam^a, Josephus, and 1 Chronicles 11, indicating a pre-Lucianic and probably Old Greek reading.⁵³ For the literary criticism of 2 Kings 10–17, it would be risky not to take the VL text into account, which reflects a very particular form of these chapters. Namely, the episode of Elisha's death (2 Kgs 13:14–21) appears between 2 Kgs 10:30 and 31, in relationship to Jehu's reign and not that of Joash, as is the case in MT. Also, the doublet in 2 Kgs 10:25–28 indicates the complexity of the Greek model followed by the Latin translation. The Hebrew MT locates the battle against the Arameans in Aphek (2 Kgs 13:17), while VL places this battle in *Aserot*, Hebrew חצ'רוֹת "Ḥatseroth," a place mentioned in the Samaria ostraca (*Ostrakon* 22), dated about two decades later than the events in the biblical story.⁵⁴

Billen, A.V., *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927).

Blaise, A., *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Strasbourg: Librairie des Méridiens, 1954).

Bogaert, P.-M., "Bulletin de la Bible Latine (1955–1973)," *RBén* 74–78 (1964–1974); 90 (1980): 93–116; 91 (1981):

⁵² Bibliography in Mohrmann, *Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens*; Meershoek, *Le latin biblique d'après Saint Jérôme*.

⁵³ **DJD* XVII, 120.

⁵⁴ J. Trebelle, "Textual Criticism and the Literary Structure and Composition of 1–2 Kings / 3–4 Reigns: The Different Sequence of Literary Units in MT and LXX," in Kreuzer–Meiser–Sigismund, **Septuaginta* 2012, 55–78; Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*, 149–66.

117–36; 93 (1983): 137–64; 108 (1998): 359–86; 110 (2000): 135–51; 112 (2002): 152–67; 114 (2004): 179–204; 116 (2006): 132–63; 118 (2008): 148–70; 120 (2010): 145–79; 123 (2013): 385–413.

Bogaert, P.-M., "La version latine de Judith dans la première Bible d'Alcala," *RBén* 78 (1968): 7–32, 181–212.

Bogaert, P.-M., "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante: Ézéchiel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978): 384–95.

Bogaert, P.-M., "L'ancienne numérotation africaine des Psaumes et la signature davidique du Psautier (Ps 151)," *RBén* 97 (1987): 153–62.

Bogaert, P.-M., "La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge: Aperçu historique, état des questions," *RTL* 19 (1988): 137–59, 276–314.

Bogaert, P.-M., "Les trois formes de Jérémie 52 (TM, LXX et VL)," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (eds. G.J. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 1–17.

Bogaert, P.-M., "Le livre de Jérémie en perspective: les deux rédactions antiques selon les travaux en cours," *RB* 101 (1994): 363–406.

Bogaert, P.-M., "L'importance de la Septante et du 'Monacensis' de la Vetus latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (Chap. 35–40)," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. M. Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 399–428.

Bogaert, P.-M., "La Bible d'Augustin: État des questions et application aux sermons Dolbeau," in *Augustin prédicateur (395–411): Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly (5–7 septembre 1996)* (ed. G. Madec; Collection des études augustiniennes Série antiquité 159; Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998), 33–47.

Bogaert, P.-M., "La *vetus latina* de Jérémie: texte très court, témoin de la plus ancienne Septante et d'une forme plus ancienne de l'hébreu (Jr 39 et 52)," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relation between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 51–82.

Bogaert, P.-M., "La construction de la tente (Ex 36–40) dans le *Monacensis* de la plus ancienne version latine: l'autel d'or Hébreux 9,4," in *L'enfance de la Bible hébraïque: Histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (eds. A. Schenker and P. Hugo; Monde de la Bible 52; Geneva: Labor et fides, 2005), 62–76.

- Boscherini, S., "Sulla lingua delle primitive versioni latine dell'Antico Testamento," *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere (La Colombaria)* 26 (1961–1962): 207–29.
- Braun, R., "L'influence de la Bible sur la langue latine," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible* (eds. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri; Bible de tous les temps 2; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 129–42.
- Burkitt, F.C., *The Old Latin and the Itala: With an Appendix Containing the Text of the St. Gallen Palimpsest of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896).
- Capelle, P., *Le texte du psautier latin en Afrique* (Collectanea biblica Latina 4; Rome: Pustet, 1913).
- Cassuto, U., "The Jewish Translation of the Bible into Latin and its Importance for the Study of the Greek and Aramaic Versions," in *Biblical and Oriental Studies 1: Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973), 274–319.
- De Bruyne, D., *Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine* (Namur: Godenne, 1914).
- De Bruyne, D., "Le problème du psautier romain," *RBén* 42 (1930): 101–26.
- De Bruyne, D., "S. Augustin reviseur de la Bible," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (1931): 521–606.
- De Bruyne, D. and B. Sodar, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées* (Abbaye de Maredsous: Desclée de Brouwer, 1932).
- Estin, C., *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures* (Collectanea biblica Latina 15; Rome: San Girolamo, 1984).
- Fischer, B., *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Handschriften und Kirchenschriftsteller* (VL 1; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1949).
- Fischer, B., (ed.), *Genesis* (VL 2; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1954).
- Fischer, B., "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache: Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte," in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ed. K. Aland; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972), 1–92.
- Fischer, B., "Limitations of Latin in Representing Greek," in *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (ed. B.M. Metzger; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 262–374.
- Gesche, B., (ed.), *Ruth* (VL 4.5; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 2005).
- Gribomont, D., "Les plus anciennes traductions latines," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible* (eds. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri; Bible de tous les temps 2; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 43–65.
- Gryson, R., (ed.), *Esaias 1–39* (VL 12.1; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1987–1993).
- Gryson, R., (ed.), *Esaias 40–66* (VL 12.2; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1993–1997).
- Gryson, R., **Altleinische Handschriften* 1.
- Gryson, R., **Altleinische Handschriften* 2.
- Gryson, R., (ed.), **Vetus Latina Database*.
- Gryson, **Répertoire général*.
- Gryson, R., and J.-M. Auwers, "L'histoire du texte latin d'Isaïe au miroir du cantique d'Ézéchias," *RTL* 24 (1993): 455–77.
- Haelewyck, J.-C., "Les premières versions latines de la Bible," in *Les premières traditions de la Bible* (eds. C.-B. Amphoux and J. Margain; HTB 2; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 1996), 121–36.
- Haelewyck, J.-C., (ed.), *Hester* (VL 7.3; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 2003–2008).
- Haelewyck, J.-C., "The Relevance of the Old Latin Version for the Septuagint with Special Emphasis on the Book of Esther," *JTS NS* 57 (2006): 439–73.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, B., "The Latin Translations," in Mulder, **Mikra*, 299–338.
- Kraus, M., "Hebraisms in the Old Latin Version of the Bible," *VT* 53 (2003): 487–513.
- La Bonnardière, A.-M., "Augustin a-t-il utilisé la 'Vulgate' de Jérôme?" in *Saint Augustin et la Bible* (ed. A.-M. La Bonnardière; Bible de tous les temps 3; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1986), 303–12.
- Lee, K.H., "Translations of the Old Testament: II. Latin," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. S.E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 784–92.
- Meershoek, G.Q.A., *Le latin biblique d'après Saint Jérôme: Aspects linguistiques de la rencontre entre la Bible et le monde classique* (Nijmegen-Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1966).
- Mohrmann, C., *Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens* (4 vols.; Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1958–1977).
- Petitmengin, P., "Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible* (eds. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri; Bible de tous les temps 2; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 89–128.
- Quispel, G., *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica: Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel* (ed. J. van Oort; Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 55; Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- Rönsch, H., *Itala und Vulgata: Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata* (Marburg: N.G. Elwert'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1875; reprint Munich: Hueber, 1965).
- Sabatier, **Bibliorum*.

- Schenker, A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Schildenberger, J., *Die altlateinischen Texte des Proverbien—Buch 1* (Beuron: Beuronischer Kunstverlag, 1941).
- Schulz-Flügel, E., "The Latin Old Testament Tradition," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*, Part 1: *Antiquity* (ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 641–62.
- Stummer, F., *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928).
- Süss, W., "Das Problem der lateinischen Bibelsprache," *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift* 27 (1932): 1–39.
- Trebolle, J., "Textos 'Kaige' en la Vetus Latina de Reyes (2 Re 10,25–28)," *RB* 89 (1982): 198–209.
- Trebolle, J., "From the Old Latin Through the Old Greek to the Old Hebrew (2 Kgs 10,25–28)," *Text* 11 (1984): 17–36.
- Ulrich, E., "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings IOSCS* (ed. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academion, 1980), 121–65.
- Ulrich, E., "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint," in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985), 67–80.
- Ulrich, *DSS.
- Ulrich, E., "The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh^a," in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies: Florilegium Complutense* (eds. A. Piquer Otero and P.A. Torijano; JSJSup 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 362–75.

Julio Trebolla Barrera

1.4.2 Coptic Translations

1.4.2.1 Name and Nature

The Coptic translation of the Old Testament renders the Septuagint into the Egyptian-Coptic language. In its beginning (third and early fourth centuries), there must have been several translation attempts since we possess different biblical translations in different Coptic dialects. But only a single complete translation of the Old and New Testaments in the Sahidic dialect has survived because this translation represented an organized

and concentrated initiative authorized very probably by the Orthodox Church in Egypt and it became the standard version of the Bible until the twelfth century. From the twelfth century onwards, the Bohairic version replaced the Sahidic. The text-critical value of the Coptic translations lies in their antiquity and in the fact that they seem to transmit several stages of the textual development of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1; → 1.3.1.2). Like VL (→ 1.4.1), the Coptic versions are important for the textual history of the Greek text as they were translated before most extant Greek manuscripts were copied. These versions may open a window to early Greek text traditions, which are not transmitted in the Greek manuscripts. We have both, text types that reflect the earliest Greek text type (OG),¹ and text types that reflect early recensions² of LXX. We should also bear in mind that the Coptic translations emerged in Egypt parallel with the earliest extant Greek manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments. However, the crucial problem of the Coptic translations is the fragmentary state of their transmission and the dispersal of the extant manuscript leafs practically all over the world. Consequently, the majority of research must still be dedicated to the reconstruction of the manuscripts. There are, therefore, only few modern text editions and almost no critical editions.

1.4.2.2 Scope of the Corpus

The corpus of the Sahidic Coptic Bible comprised the Old Testament according to the Septuagint, including the deuterocanonical books, and the New Testament. We have every reason to believe that the corpus of the Sahidic Coptic Bible corresponds to the canon of biblical books given by Athanasius in his thirty-ninth festal letter (367 C.E.; → 1.1.2.2), of which we possess a Coptic translation.³ The Bohairic Coptic version, i.e. the version of the Coptic Bible used in the Coptic Church since the twelfth century and until today, transmits merely the Pen-

¹ CopBoh-MinP (→ 6–9.2.2.2), CopSa-Job (→ 11.4.2).

² CopSa-Jer (→ 6–9.2.2.1.3).

³ L.T. Lefort, *S. Athanase, Lettres festales et pastorales en copte* (2 vols.; CSCO 150–151 Scriptores coptici 19–20; Louvain: Imprimerie orientale L. Durbecq, 1955), 1.18–20.

tateuch, Job, Psalms, and the Prophets in complete form. The remaining texts⁴ are attested only in excerpts mostly in the form of readings in liturgical books. From the other dialects of Coptic, we have only sparse attestations and their transmission generally ends in the fifth century.⁵

1.4.2.3 Sequence of the Books

As far as the fragmentary state of the manuscripts allows us to see, the sequence of the books follows LXX closely (→ 1.3.1.1; → 1.1.2.2). The sequence of books in the Pentateuch and the Latter Prophets was apparently fixed at an early date; however, there are some exceptions that are not present in all witnesses and that probably reflect a Greek *Vorlage*.⁶ The sequence of the Wisdom Books seems to have been somewhat flexible, e.g., Job sometimes appears before and sometimes after Proverbs.⁷

It is very likely that the canonical sequence of books corresponded to the aforementioned enumeration in Athanasius' thirty-ninth festal letter. At least, this seems to be confirmed by a book catalogue on an ostrakon from the Theban area (seventh to eighth century) in Upper Egypt that contains the catalogue of the library of the Monastery of St. Elijah.⁸ The catalogue displays the following sequence of books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, (1–2) Ezra,⁹ the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms. Later, among a series of literary works, Job is added together with Proverbs. Apparently, the library did not have a complete Old Testament, but the sequence of

books until Ezra corresponds exactly to that of LXX. Interestingly, the library possessed instead two volumes of Isaiah (papyrus and parchment), three volumes of the Psalms (papyrus and parchment), one volume of Job (papyrus), and one volume of Job and Proverbs (parchment). The close association of Job with Proverbs later became canonical for the Bohairic version.¹⁰ Astonishingly, the Copt-Akh version of the Minor Prophets has adopted a particular sequence in which the first three books (Hosea, Joel, Amos) follow the Hebrew order. The Bohairic version, for its part, associates the Minor Prophets with Daniel.¹¹

1.4.2.4 Original Form, Date, and Milieu

Firstly, we have to take into account that strong bilingual milieus developed in Egypt no later than the third century B.C.E. particularly in the *metropoleis* of the Ptolemaic and Roman eras. Numerous extant manuscripts preserve a long tradition, mostly in the priestly circles of the Egyptian temples, of translations from Egyptian into Greek and from Greek into Egyptian.¹² We also have to bear in mind that the Septuagint was translated in Egypt itself and that the famous Alexandrian school of grammarians and later biblical exegetes may also have exerted influence on those bilingual milieus.¹³

¹⁰ → 11.4.2.

¹¹ → 6–9.2.2.2.1.

¹² D.J. Thompson, "The Multilingual Environment of Persian and Ptolemaic Egypt: Egyptian Aramaic, and Greek Documentation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R.S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 395–417; J.-L. Fournet, "The Multilingual Environment of Late Antique Egypt: Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Persian Documentation," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R.S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 418–51, esp. 430–45; T.S. Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the Language of the Hijra: Rise and Decline of the Coptic Language in Late Antique and Medieval Egypt," in *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (eds. H. Cotton et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 401–46; A. Papaconstantinou (ed.), *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt: From the Ptolemies to the Abbasids* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

¹³ D.G. Martinez, "The Papyri and Early Christianity," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R.S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 590–622, esp. 590–91.

⁴ There is no Bohairic text of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Judith, Tobit, 1–4 Maccabees, Ecclesiastes, Bel and the Dragon, and Susanna.

⁵ Cf. Takla, "Introduction," 74–75.

⁶ Cf. → 6–9.2.2.1.3.

⁷ Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica* 1.3, 71–74 (sa 75); Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica* 1.3, 33–37 (sa 27).

⁸ R.-G. Coquin, "Le Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Couvent de Saint Élie 'du Rocher,'" *BIFAO* 75 (1975): 207–39; see esp. 209–19.

⁹ Although it is most likely that the Sahidic translation included Ezra and Nehemiah (Esdras A and B) as in LXX, no manuscript witness has come to light so far, → 19.4.2.

The novel approach of writing the Egyptian language using the letters of the Greek alphabet and some additional signs borrowed from the Demotic script – for the Egyptian phonemes that Greek could not render – could theoretically have been “designed” in pagan circles. But the Coptic script became standardized and used widely only in Christian circles beginning in the third but prominently so in the fourth century.¹⁴

The first attestations of a Coptic translation work of biblical texts are glosses to Greek manuscripts of Isaiah and the Minor Prophets¹⁵ dated to the third century. Among the oldest preserved manuscripts are: P. Bodmer VI, a peculiar version of Proverbs written in an archaic script and language (“Proto-Sahidic”);¹⁶ a complete papyrus codex with an Akhmimic version of Proverbs;¹⁷ and a series of miscellany manuscripts combining books of the Old Testament, New Testament, and literary texts of different genres.¹⁸ The Sahidic manuscript London BL Or. 7594, for example, contains Deuteronomy, Jonah, Acts, and the Apocalypse of Elijah,¹⁹ whereas the early Fayyumic manuscript P. Hamburg Bilinguis 1 comprised the Acts of Paul in Greek, Qohelet in Greek and Fayyumic Coptic, as well as Canticles and Lamentations in Fayyumic Coptic.²⁰

¹⁴ Fournet, “The Multilingual Environment of Late Antique Egypt: Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Persian Documentation,” 431.

¹⁵ Cf. → 6–9.2.2.1.1 and → 6–9.2.2.2.1.

¹⁶ Cf. → 12.4.2.1; R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer VI: Livre des Proverbes* (CSCO 194/195 *Scriptores Coptici* 27/28; Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1960).

¹⁷ Cf. → 12.4.2.1; A. Böhlig, *Der achmimische Proverbientext nach Ms. Berol. orient. oct. 987* (Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Aegyptens 3; Munich: Robert Lerche, 1958).

¹⁸ Feder, “Die koptische Übersetzung des Alten und Neuen Testamentes im 4. Jahrhundert,” 65–93, esp. 71.

¹⁹ Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica* 1.1, 84–88 (sa 15).

²⁰ B.J. Diebner and R. Kasser, *Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1: Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus Bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg* (Cahiers d’Orientalisme 18; Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1989); for another early Fayyumic miscellany manuscript, see H.-M. Schenke and R. Kasser, *Papyrus Michigan 3520 und 6868(a): Ecclesiastes, Erster Johannesbrief und Zweiter Petrusbrief im fayyumischen Dialekt* (TUGAL 15; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003).

All these manuscripts come from Upper Egypt because the climate and the arid ground preserved them well. However, there can be no doubt that an even greater manuscript production must have taken place in the Nile Delta, and especially in Alexandria, but due to the humid climate and moist soil of that area almost no traces have survived. In light of the fact that the Bohairic dialect was used in the western Nile Delta, it is all the more astonishing that two early Bohairic papyrus codices (also labelled as “Proto-Bohairic”) have survived: P. Vatican Copto 9, a papyrus codex of the Minor Prophets,²¹ and P. Bodmer III containing John and Gen 1:1–4:2.²²

As P. Bodmer III belongs to a collection from Upper Egypt known under the name Bodmer Papyri, we may assume that exceptionally these Bohairic manuscripts were produced in or transferred to Upper Egypt.

To sum up, the earliest witnesses of Coptic biblical texts are dated paleographically to the late third century and first half of the fourth century. These are almost exclusively papyrus manuscripts (frequently still without the later-preferred quire structure) combining often the Old Testament, New Testament, and other texts to form miscellany-like compilations. Although examples of codices of a single biblical book already existed, they do not yet seem to have been the preferred format. There are extant biblical texts from this early period in all the Coptic dialects, often with different text types, and therefore it seems likely that there were different and probably unrelated initiatives to translate the Bible into Coptic.²³ However, for

²¹ Cf. → 6–9.2.2.2.1; the manuscript is still unpublished. See N. Bosson, “Le Papyrus Vatican Copte 9 des Petits Prophètes,” in *Coptic Treasures from the Vatican Library: A Selection of Coptic, Copto-Arabic and Ethiopic Manuscripts: Papers Collected on the Occasion of the Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies (Rome, September 17th–22nd, 2012)* (eds. P. Buzi and D.V. Proverbio; Studi e Testi 472; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2012), 73–84.

²² Cf. → 2.5.2.2; R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer III* (CSCO 177 *Scriptores Coptici* 25; Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1958).

²³ Feder, “Die koptische Übersetzung des Alten und Neuen Testamentes im 4. Jahrhundert”; cf. Diebner and Kasser, *Ham-*

Cop^{Akh}, the early biblical translations of this Coptic dialect depend generally on Cop^{Sa}.²⁴

It is also important to mention that the biblical translations in the fourth and fifth centuries were produced at the same time and often in the same region as the translations of famous Gnostic and Manichean texts from Egypt. So, we can assume a certain competition between theological rivals also in translating Scriptures, which, by the way, confirms exactly our historical knowledge of this period in Egypt.²⁵

Many of the manuscripts mentioned above have no known provenance, and, particularly in the case of the miscellany manuscripts, they were probably formatted for private ownership. Nevertheless, the primary source of the biblical manuscripts are monastic libraries.²⁶ The oldest monastic library (third to fifth centuries) we know of is the library of a Pachomian monastery at Dishna in Upper Egypt, not far from the Theban region.²⁷ The heterogeneous composition of this collection,²⁸ pagan literary texts (e.g., Menander) and Christian literature (Bible, Apocrypha, and miscellaneous literary works) in Greek (39 %) and Coptic (58 %) side by side, however, leaves doubts about its monastic origin. Nevertheless, we find in the Pachomian

burger Papyrus Bil. 1, 51–56, for a short summary of all dialectal versions.

²⁴ Diebner and Kasser, *Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1*, 54–55; Nagel, “Old Testament, Coptic Translations of,” 1836a–40a (1837b).

²⁵ The fact that some texts in the Mesokemic dialect are evidently from Melitian schismatics, especially those from the Monastery of Apa Thomas at Wadi Sarga, suggests that the biblical translations in this dialect may have originated, at least partly, in Melitian circles; F. Feder, “Mesokemic or ‘Middle Egyptian’ – the Coptic Dialect of Oxyrhynchos (?),” in *Christianity and Monasticism in Middle Egypt* (eds. G. Gabra and H. Takla; Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2015), 31–40.

²⁶ H. Maehler, “Bücher in frühen Klöstern Ägyptens,” in *Spätantike Bibliotheken: Leben und Lesen in den frühen Klöstern Ägyptens* (eds. H. Froschauer and C.E. Römer; Nilus 14; Vienna: Phoibos, 2008), 39–47.

²⁷ See, most recently, J.M. Robinson, *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri: From the First Monastery's Library in Upper Egypt to Geneva and Dublin* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2013).

²⁸ R. Kasser, “Bodmer Papyri,” in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* 8:48b–53b.

monastery at Dishna the first examples of biblical Old Testament manuscripts in Sahidic Coptic on parchment with the expected sequence of books (according to LXX) and codicological arrangement.

Unfortunately, the Dishna find seems to have been an isolated case since no other known monastery of the pre-Arab Conquest period (before 641 C.E.) has preserved such a high number of biblical manuscripts. We have no more than scarce traces of the biblical Scriptures of the better-known Pachomian monasteries such as Tabennese, or other big and important monastic sites²⁹ such as Bawit (Apa Apollo),³⁰ Dayr el-Bala'izah,³¹ or those in western Thebes. Also the eminent Monastery of Apa Jeremiah, not far from the old Egyptian capital Memphis, yielded only a few codices found by chance.³²

However, by far the most comprehensive sources of Coptic Christian literature are the once-outstanding libraries of the Monastery of St. Shenoute, widely known as the “White Monastery,” near Sohag in Upper Egypt,³³ and the Archangel

²⁹ Cf. J.E. Goehring, *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (SAC; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999); A. Delattre, “La vie quotidienne dans les monasteries égyptiens,” in *Spätantike Bibliotheken: Leben und Lesen in den frühen Klöstern Ägyptens* (eds. H. Froschauer and C.E. Römer; Nilus 14; Vienna: Phoibos, 2008), 49–58.

³⁰ S.J. Clackson, *Coptic and Greek Texts Relating to the Hermitic Monastery of Apa Apollo* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

³¹ P.E. Kahle, *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt* (2 vols; London: Oxford University Press, 1954).

³² On the discovery, acquisition, and description of the five codices, see H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), ix–xx; L.A. Shier, “Old Testament Texts on Vellum,” in *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* (ed. W. Worrell; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942), 23–167 (esp. 27–32); C.T. Lamacraft, “Early Book-Bindings from a Coptic Monastery,” *The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 20/2 (1939–1940): 214–33.

³³ T. Orlandi, “The Library of the Monastery of Saint Shenute at Atripe,” in *Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest* (eds. A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, and J. van der Vliet; Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 31; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 211–31; H.N. Takla, “Biblical Manuscripts of the Monastery of St. Shenoute the Archimandrite,” in *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt*, Vol. 1: *Akhmim*

Michael Monastery at Phantoou (al-Hamuli) in the Fayyum Oasis.³⁴ These monasteries continued to flourish under Muslim rule (since 641 C.E.) and the bulk of the preserved manuscripts date from the eighth to twelfth centuries. Their libraries have contributions especially in biblical manuscripts and increased our knowledge of the Sahidic version of the Old and New Testaments.

The “White Monastery” alone probably possessed about 100 biblical codices (Old and New Testaments).³⁵ Unfortunately, the leaves and sometimes even parts of leaves of the manuscripts were sold separately and dispersed almost all over the world between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries.³⁶ This dispersal remains today the major obstacle to a reconstruction of the Sahidic Bible. However, the remains of the library of the Archangel Michael Monastery, although they also suffered from dispersal, had a better fate because the bulk of the 1910 find was purchased by the wealthy American collector Pierpont Morgan for his collection in New York. Morgan’s acquisitions preserved for us the few examples of intact or almost intact Sahidic Bible manuscripts (Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; 1–2 Samuel; Isaiah) from the ninth or tenth centuries.³⁷

and *Sohag* (eds. G. Gabra and H.N. Takla; Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2008), 155–67; S. Emmel and C. Römer, “The Library of the White Monastery in Upper Egypt,” in *Spätantike Bibliotheken: Leben und Lesen in den frühen Klöstern Ägyptens* (eds. H. Froschauer and C.E. Römer; Nilus 14; Vienna: Phoibos, 2008), 5–14.

³⁴ S. Emmel, “The Library of the Monastery of the Archangel Michael at Phantoou (al-Hamuli),” in *Christianity and Monasticism in the Fayoum Oasis* (ed. G. Gabra; Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2005), 63–70.

³⁵ Cf. Takla, “Biblical Manuscripts of the Monastery of St. Shenoute the Archimandrite,” 159–60.

³⁶ C. Louis, “The Fate of the White Monastery Library,” in *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt*, Vol. 1: *Akhmim and Sohag* (eds. G. Gabra and H.N. Takla; Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2008), 83–98; T. Orlandi and A. Suci, “The End of the Library of the Monastery of Atripe,” in *Coptic Society, Literature and Religion from Late Antiquity to Modern Times: Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Rome, September 17th–22nd, 2012* (eds. P. Buzi, A. Campani, and F. Contardi; OLA; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

³⁷ L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pier-*

These later manuscripts, if compared with those from the much older Bodmer find, may serve to test whether the Sahidic version was translated in the fourth or fifth century and if this version was still in use in the tenth to twelfth centuries. Although the lack of critical editions and pertinent studies on the textual history makes a definitive view of the development of the Sahidic Bible almost impossible, some editions and studies allow at least in the case of some books for a comparison of the published Bodmer manuscripts with the text of the younger ones from the “White Monastery” or the Archangel Michael Monastery.

E.g., for the Pentateuch (cf. → 2.5.2.1), Jeremiah (→ 6–9.2.2.1.3), and Lamentations (→ 13–17.2.2), we can observe that their text remained almost unchanged (some visible revision efforts did not change the base text in principle) from the fourth or fifth century to the twelfth century, and therefore their text must be based on an original translation from no later than the fourth century.

But the Coptic textual history of other biblical books suffered a different fate. When compared with other well-recorded early dialectal versions (Cop^{palBo}, Cop^{Akh}), it is clear that an early Sahidic text form of Proverbs (→ 12.4.2.3) and the Minor Prophets (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3) had been replaced or thoroughly revised subsequent to the fourth century.

For most of the other books, any estimation would be based merely on speculation. The conclusions drawn for the few books mentioned above should as well be at least reconsidered when further investigation based on critical editions provides more detailed data.

Thus, based on the number of extant manuscripts, the Sahidic version was the standard Bible for the Coptic Church for the post-Arab Conquest era from the seventh to the twelfth centuries. That the Sahidic version was in use across Egypt is demonstrated by the Archangel Michael Monastery whose surviving manuscripts can be dated by colophon to the ninth or tenth century.

pont Morgan Library (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts 4 Oriental Series 1; Leuven: Peeters, 1993), 5–22.

The Archangel Michael Monastery is situated in the Fayyum Oasis where the Fayyumic dialect was spoken and written but it possessed almost exclusively Sahidic manuscripts of the Bible.³⁸

Apart from an early manuscript of the Minor Prophets (→ 6–9.2.2.2.1) and an excerpt from Genesis (→ 2.5.2.2), the Bohairic version is late (the earliest witnesses date to the ninth century) and does not cover the whole Old Testament (cf. → 1.4.2.2). It replaced the Sahidic version as the standard Bible for the Coptic Church after the twelfth century. It remains unknown when the Bohairic version was created and if there were more early translations into Bohairic.

The Fayyumic version is only attested sporadically, mostly in witnesses from the third to the fifth centuries. However, there has been no comprehensive evaluation of the extant biblical manuscripts in Fayyumic to date.³⁹ For that reason, we do not have a detailed overview of the timespan covered by the Fayyumic manuscripts.

As already pointed out, the Mesokemic version could have been produced in heretical Melitian circles, and the Akhmimic version seems to depend completely on the Sahidic. Both versions are not extant after the fifth century.⁴⁰

1.4.2.5 Evidence (Direct and Indirect)

Considering the antiquity and richness of the Coptic versions, the fragmentary state of preservation and extreme dispersal of the manuscripts can only be termed lamentable. As already mentioned, our principal manuscript source, the library of the “White Monastery,” may have possessed around

100 Bible codices, but not a single codex seems to have survived intact. For the most part, less than a half of the leafs of a manuscript are extant and are, as a rule, dispersed among several collections. Therefore, indirect attestations of the biblical text are indispensable for a reconstruction of the Coptic version. By chance, the only examples of complete codices come from the Monastery of Archangel Michael (Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; 1–2 Samuel; Isaiah) are housed today in the Morgan Library and Museum in New York.⁴¹

Horn provided a scheme with four principal lines of transmission for the Psalms manuscripts⁴² that is exemplary in this respect and is outlined here. As a rule, only the Sahidic manuscripts reflect all four types of transmission.

- 1) Text manuscripts: These are codices of a complete book or a sequence of books or single leafs/fragments from dispersed codices.⁴³
- 2) Bible texts in the service of the Coptic Church (*ritualia*): This concerns pericopae in lectionaries, *horologia*, and other liturgical manuscripts.⁴⁴
- 3) Quotations and allusions in Coptic literature (→ 21.10): Old Testament quotations appear in patristic-ecclesiastical literature, Coptic-Gnos-

⁴¹ Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, 5–22.

⁴² J. Horn, “Die koptische (sahidische) Überlieferung des alttestamentlichen Psalmenbuches: Versuch einer Gruppierung der Textzeugen für die Herstellung des Textes,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* (eds. A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 97–106 (with some subdivisions within the main groups); cf. also → 10.4.2.1.

⁴³ The only systematic reference tool to these manuscripts is Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica*, which also attempts a codicological reconstruction of the manuscripts.

⁴⁴ For a comprehensive overview of the Sahidic liturgical sources, see D. Atanassova, “The Primary Sources of Southern Egyptian Liturgy: Retrospect and Prospect,” in *Rites and Rituals of the Christian East* (eds. B. Groen et al.; Eastern Christian Studies 22; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 47–96. For the Bohairic liturgical sources, cf. U. Zanetti, “Bohairic Liturgical Manuscripts,” *OCP* 61 (1995): 65–94. In Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica*, liturgical codices have the siglum L, e.g., sa 212L, or lit, e.g., sa 16lit.

³⁸ The few surviving Psalm fragments in Fayyumic were reused as pastedowns of Sahidic manuscripts. Possibly, an older Fayyumic library in the monastery was replaced at a certain date before the ninth century; cf. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, lxx, and 449–51.

³⁹ A. Boud’hors, “Manuscripts and Literature in Fayyumic Coptic,” in *Christianity and Monasticism in the Fayyum Oasis* (ed. G. Gabra; Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2005), 21–31.

⁴⁰ For an overview of the approximate amount of extant text in these Coptic dialects, cf. Takla, “Introduction,” 74–75.

tic literature, and in the New Testament. Non-biblical Coptic literature suffered from the same dispersal as the biblical manuscripts. For that reason, to date there is no systematic compilation of biblical quotations. The only pertinent study pertains to the Old Testament quotations in the Gospels.⁴⁵ Therefore, the only way to search for biblical quotations in Coptic literature is to consult the individual publications. However, publications without indices and with wrongly identified quotations make this a time-consuming enterprise. Moreover, it is sometimes not a trivial question to decide from which biblical book a quotation is taken if its actual use in a (con)text conceals its clear identification.⁴⁶

- 4) Casual texts (*occasionalia*): These are texts, for private reading, exercises, or for magical purposes (esp. as amulets). The many lacunae that one encounters when editing a book, particularly of the Sahidic Coptic Bible, necessitates the exploration of this textual group, and sometimes astonishing results can be obtained from it.⁴⁷

Additionally, a speciality of groups 1 and 2 are Greek-Coptic (mostly Greek-Sahidic) bilingual

⁴⁵ P. Luisier, *Les citations vétéro-testamentaires dans les versions coptes des Évangiles: Recueil et analyse critique* (Cahiers d' Orientalisme 22; Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1998).

⁴⁶ See J. Horn, "Die Präsenz des Alten Testamentes in der ägyptischen christlichen Frömmigkeit, aufgewiesen an zwei Werken der koptisch-sahidischen hagiographischen Literatur," in *Sprachen, Mythen, Mythizismen: Festschrift für Walter Beltz zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. A. Drost-Abgarjan and J. Tubach; Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft 32; Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 2004), 355–82; cf. also Feder, **Biblica Sahidica*, 18–26, 57–58; and A. Boud'hors, "Le rôle des sermons de Chénoute dans l'histoire du texte de Jérémie en copte-sahidique," in *Digitale Edition der koptisch-sahidischen Septuaginta (I): Fragestellungen und Herausforderungen, Band zur internationalen Tagung vom 26./27. April 2013 im Koptischen Kloster der Jungfrau Maria und des Heiligen Mauritius in Höxter-Brenkhausen* (eds. H. Behlmer, F. Feder, and U. Pietruschka; Halle: Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, 2015) (<http://menadoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/id/1453421>), 19–26.

⁴⁷ An ostrakon in the collection of the Egyptian Museum, Leipzig (seventh century) transmits e.g. precisely the Sahidic text of Lam 3:39–46, 49–51; cf. Feder, **Biblica Sahidica*, 51–52.

texts, which naturally play an important role in Septuagint studies.⁴⁸

1.4.2.6 Editions

Again, the extreme dispersal of the manuscripts and the extraordinary effort needed for the reconstruction of most codices has up to now limited the number of edited manuscripts and, in particular, edited biblical books. The quality and reliability of the nineteenth- and some early twentieth-century editions, particularly of the Bohairic texts, is comparatively limited as well, and in some cases the manuscript basis of the editions is not obvious. Specialized surveys must be consulted (→ 1.4.2.7) for the incalculable number of fragments published in periodicals and series.

1.4.2.6.1 Sahidic Version

1) Editions

- a) Based on the whole manuscript tradition and indirect evidence, including *variae lectiones* to LXX:

Feder, **Biblia Sahidica* (Jeremiah, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Baruch).⁴⁹

- b) Based on a selection of manuscripts and some indirect evidence:

Drescher, J., *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II)* (CSCO 313–314 Scriptores coptici 35–36; Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1970).

- c) Editions of individual manuscripts with consultation of a limited number of other witnesses:

Rahlf's, *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1901).

Worrell, W.H., *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part 1: The Coptic Psalter* (University

⁴⁸ Cf. Nagel, "Griechisch-Koptische Bilinguen des Alten Testaments," 231–57.

⁴⁹ This is the only critical edition in the sense of an editio critica that systematically refers to LXX.

- of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 10; New York: Macmillan, 1923).
- Worrell, W.H., *The Proverbs of Solomon in Sahidic Coptic according to the Chicago Manuscript* (OIP 12; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931).
- Goehring, J.E., *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex MS 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (CSCO 521 Subsidia 85; Louvain: Peeters, 1990).
- 2) Manuscript Editions
- Budge, E.A.W., *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter: The Text in the Dialect of Upper Egypt: Edited from the Unique Papyrus Codex Oriental 5000 in the British Museum* (London: Kegan Paul, 1898).⁵⁰
- Thompson, H., *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Certain Books of the Old Testament from a Papyrus in the British Museum* (London: Henry Frowde, 1908).
- Thompson, H., *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther in the Sahidic Dialect* (London: Oxford University Press, 1911).
- Till, W., and P. Sanz, *Eine griechisch-koptische Odenhandschrift (Papyrus Copt. Vindob. K 8706)* (Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica 5; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1939).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer VI: Livre des Proverbes* (2 vols.; CSCO 194–195 Scriptorum Coptici 27–28; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1960).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XVI: Exode 1–XV, 21 en sahidique* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII: Deutéronome 1–X, 7 en sahidique* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XXI: Josué VI, 16–25, VII, 6, –XI, 23, XXII, 1–2, 19–XXIII, 7, 15–XXIV, 23* (Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1963).
- Shore, A.F., *Joshua 1–VI and Other Passages in Coptic: Edited from a Fourth-Century Sahidic Codex in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin* (Chester Beatty Monographs 9; Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1963).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XXII et Mississippi Coptic Codex II: Jérémie XL, 3–LII, 34, Lamentations, Épître de Jérémie, Baruch 1, 1–V, 5 en sahidique* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1964).
- Kasser, R., *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII: Esaïe XLVII, 1–LXVI, 24 en sahidique* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1965).
- Kasser, R., and P. Luisier, “P. Bodmer XL: *Cantique des Cantiques* en copte saïdique,” *Or* 81 (2012): 149–201 + pls. 29–43.
- 3) Miscellany Publications
- Many Sahidic manuscripts have been (sometimes randomly) published in miscellany volumes with biblical texts from one (larger) collection, but, unfortunately, often without any effort to reconstruct the codicological context of the manuscript leaf. Until we possess critical editions of the individual biblical books, these miscellanies must be consulted:
- Ciasca, **Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*.
- Maspero, G., *Fragments de la version thébaine de l’Ancien Testament* (Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire 6.1; Paris: IFAO, 1892).
- Wallis Budge, E.A., *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912).⁵¹
- Worrell, W.H., *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection* (University of Michigan Studies Humanistic Series 10; New York: Macmillan, 1923).
- Till, W., *Koptische Pergamente theologischen Inhalts*, Vol. 1 (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien [Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer] 2; Vienna: Druck und Verlag der österreichischen Staatsdruckerei, 1934).

⁵⁰ The text edition of this publication is not reliable.

⁵¹ The text edition of this publication is not reliable and can only be used together with H. Thompson, *The New Biblical Papyrus: A Sahidic Version of Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts of the Apostles from MS Or. 7594 of the British Museum: Notes and a collation by Sir Herbert Thompson* (printed for private circulation, 1913); Peter Nagel is preparing a new edition of Deuteronomy from this manuscript.

Till, W., "Saidische Fragmente des Alten Testaments," *Mus* 59 (1937): 175–237.

Lefort, L.T., "Coptica Lovanensia," *Mus* 50 (1937): 5–52; *Mus* 51 (1938): 1–32; *Mus* 53 (1940): 1–66.⁵²

Shier, L.A., "Old Testament Texts on Vellum," in *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* (ed. W. Worrell; Humanistic Series 46; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942), 23–167.

Torallas Tovar, S., *Biblia Coptica Montserratensis: P. Monts. Roca II* (Orientalia Montserratensis 2; Barcelona: Publicaciones de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 2007).

1.4.2.6.2 Bohairic Version

1) Editions

a) Based on a selection of manuscripts and some indirect evidence:

Tattam, H., *Duodecim Prophetarum Minorum libros in lingua Aegyptiaca vulgo seu Memphitica ex manuscripto descriptos et cum manuscripto Johannis Lee, J.C.D. collatos latine edidit* (Oxford: Typographeo academico, 1836).

Tattam, H., *Prophetæ Majores in Dialecto Linguae Aegyptiaca Memphitica seu Coptica* (2 vols; Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1852).

de Lagarde, P., *Der Pentateuch koptisch* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1867).

de Lagarde, P., *Psalterii Versio Memphitica* (Göttingen: Akad. Druckerei, 1875).

Porcher, E., *Le livre de Job: Version copte bohairique* (PO 18.2; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1924), 211–339.

Burmester, O.H.E., and E. Devaud, *Psalterii versio memphitica e recognitione Pauli de Lagarde: Réédition avec le texte copte en caractères coptes* (Louvain: Imprimerie J.-B. Istas, 1925).

Burmester, O.H.E., and E. Dévaud, *Les Proverbes de Salomon: Texte Bohairique* (Vienna: Adolf Holzhausen, 1930).

Peters, M.K., *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*, Vol. 5: *Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 15; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).

Peters, M.K., *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*, Vol. 1: *Genesis* (SBLSCS 19; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).⁵³

Peters, M.K., *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*, Vol. 2: *Exodus* (SBLSCS 22; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

Bosson, N., R. Kasser (†), and H. Quecke (†), *Le Papyrus Vatican Copte 9 des Petits Prophètes* (Documenti e riproduzioni; Vatican City, forthcoming).

2) Manuscript Editions

R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer III* (CSCO 177 Scriptores Coptici 25; Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1958).

1.4.2.6.3 Akhmimic Version

1) Manuscript Editions

Till, W., *Die achmîmische Version der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten (Codex Rainerianus, Wien): Herausgegeben mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Wörterverzeichnis* (Coptica IV; Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel-Nordisk Forlag, 1927).

Malinine, M., "Version achmimique des Petits Prophètes," in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (The Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute 2; Boston: The Byzantine Institute, 1950), 365–415.

Böhlig, *Der achmimische Proverbientext nach Ms. Berol. orient. oct. 987* (Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Ägyptens 3; Munich: Robert Lerche, 1958).

Böhlig, *Proverbien-Kodex/The Book of Proverbs: Faksimile des Codex Ms. or. oct. 987 der Deutschen*

⁵² Republished in a compilation: L.T. Lefort, *Les manuscrites coptes de l'Université de Louvain*, Vol. 1: *Textes littéraires* (Leuven: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1940).

⁵³ Peters' planned complete edition of the Bohairic Pentateuch stopped after Exodus, possibly because his editorial methods and the reliability of his text presentation had been repeatedly criticized; cf., e.g., W.-P. Funk, "Peters' Coptic Pentateuch," *JQR* 79 (1989): 243–47.

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1963).

2) Miscellany Publications

Lacau, P., "Textes coptes en dialects achmimique et sahidique," *BIFAO* 8 (1911): 43–109.

Lefort, L.T., "Fragments bibliques en dialects achmimique et sahidique," *Mus* 66 (1953): 1–15.

1.4.2.6.4 Fayyumic Version

1) Manuscript Editions

Diebner, B.J., and R. Kasser, *Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1: Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg: Canticum Cantorum (coptice), Lamentationes Ieremiae (coptice), Ecclesiastes (graece et coptice)* (Cahiers d' Orientalisme 18; Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1989).

Schenke, H.-M., and R. Kasser, *Papyrus Michigan 3520 und 6868(a): Ecclesiastes, Erster Johannesbrief und Zweiter Petrusbrief im fayyumischen Dialekt* (TUGAL 15; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003).

2) Miscellany Publications

Till, W., "Wiener Faijumica," *Mus* 49 (1936): 169–217.

Boud'hors, A., and C. Nakano, "Vestiges bibliques en copte fayoumique au Musée du Louvre," *Journal of Coptic Studies* 5 (2003): 17–53 (pls. 1–12).

1.4.2.6.5 Mesokemic Version

1) Manuscript Edition

Gabra, G., *Der Psalter im Oxyrhynchitischen (Mesokemischen/Mittelägyptischen) Dialekt* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo: Koptische Reihe 4; Heidelberg: Heidelberg Orientverlag, 1995).

1.4.2.7 Auxiliary Tools

The fundamental and most recent auxiliary tool for the Sahidic Old Testament manuscripts is the **Biblia Coptica* catalogue by Schüssler, whose last fascicle appeared in 2015.⁵⁴ Despite all efforts by Schüssler and his collaborators to catalogue at least the Sahidic manuscripts – for the other dialects nothing comparable is available – there is still an incalculable number of manuscripts hidden in collections and remote publications that are not yet catalogued systematically. Thus, for a complete overview (although a really complete overview is probably not more than a wish), one has to consult *all* older repertoires and lists.

After the First World War, when the flood of different publications of Coptic biblical texts had almost reached the state of dispersal of the manuscripts, an overview of these publications became an indispensable need. Arthur Vaschalde published a repertoire of Coptic biblical texts, which must still be consulted:

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Premier Groupe: Textes Sahidiques I: Ancien Testament," *RB* 16 (1919): 220–43, 513–31.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Premier Groupe: Textes Sahidiques I: Ancien Testament (suite)," *RB* 29 (1920): 91–106, 241–84.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Premier Groupe: Textes Sahidiques II: Nouveau Testament," *RB* 30 (1921): 237–46.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Premier Groupe: Textes Sahidiques II: Nouveau Testament (suite)," *RB* 31 (1922): 81–88, 234–58.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible, Deuxième Groupe: Textes Bohairiques I: Ancien Testament," *Mus* 43 (1930): 409–31.

⁵⁴ Schüssler, **Biblia Coptica*, Vol. 1.1–4 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995–2000 [sa 1–120]), and Vol. 2.1–2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012–2015 [sa 121–260]) are dedicated to the Old Testament. Schüssler planned at least two further fascicles (**Biblia Coptica*, Vol. 2.3–4) but he died tragically in a car accident in October 2013. The 2015 fascicle was prepared for publication by Hans Förster and Frank Feder.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Deuxième Groupe: Textes Bohairiques II: Nouveau Testament," *Mus* 45 (1932): 117–56.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Troisième Groupe: Textes en Moyen Égyptien," *Mus* 46 (1933): 299–306.

Vaschalde, "Ce qui a été publié des versions Coptes de la Bible: Quatrième Groupe: Textes Akhmimiques," *Mus* 46 (1933): 306–13.

Vaschalde's list was followed by two sequels, which also must still be consulted today:

Till, W., "Coptic Biblical Texts Published After Vaschalde's Lists," *BJRL* 42 (1959/1960): 220–40.

Nagel, P., "Editionen koptischer Bibeltexte seit Till 1960," *APF* 35 (1989/1990): 43–100.

In addition, studies on the reconstruction of manuscripts and their provenance, catalogues of museums and collections, and the plenary reports on the Coptic Bible in the acts of the International Congresses of Coptic Studies (ICCoS) provide information about Coptic biblical texts.⁵⁵

A very welcome development in Coptic and biblical studies is the new long-term German project that began in January 2015 at the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities: *The Complete Digital Edition and Translation of the Coptic Sahidic Old Testament*.⁵⁶ The project uses and further develops the online database system and the Virtual Manuscript Room (VMR) that was cre-

ated initially for the edition of the Greek New Testament at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) at the University of Münster.⁵⁷

The technological revolution of the digital age promises to fulfill the hopes and dreams of one hundred years of scholarly efforts for the reconstruction and edition of the Coptic-Sahidic Old Testament. The project objectives are:

- Collection and cataloguing of Coptic manuscripts of the Old Testament in an online database system;
- Transcription and analysis of the manuscript texts to create a digital edition;
- Comparison and analysis of the textual tradition for the production of a critical edition of the individual books of the Coptic Old Testament;
- Translation of the Coptic text of the edition into English, German, and Arabic.

The close cooperation with the colleagues of the INTF at Münster, working on the same standards for the Coptic-Sahidic New Testament, will permit in the future to display the manuscripts online and to search the texts of the whole Coptic Bible within the VMR. Subsequently, on the basis of international cooperation, the biblical texts of the other Coptic dialects also will be included so that one day the complete Coptic transmission of the Bible will be available online. The progress of the project can be followed on its website.⁵⁸

1.4.2.8 Translation Technique and Inner-Translational Phenomena

The transmission of the Coptic translation in the earliest period (third to fifth centuries) in several dialectal witnesses presents in itself a certain diversity in translations in Egypt. The high percentage of Greek loanwords in all Coptic dialects is not a safe criterion for a judgment on the translation technique because this is to a large extent also due

⁵⁵ For a relatively up-to-date overview, cf. Feder, "Zur Geschichte der Erforschung der koptischen Septuagintaübersetzung," 31–39; and Takla, "Introduction." Nathalie Bosson gave the last plenary report on the Coptic Bible at the congress in Cairo, 2008. It will be published in *Coptic Society, Literature and Religion from Late Antiquity to Modern Times: Proceedings the Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Rome, September 17th–22nd, 2012* (eds. P. Buzi, A. Camplani, and F. Contardi; OLA; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

⁵⁶ <https://adw-goe.de/forschung/forschungsprojekte-akademienprogramm/koptisches-altes-testament/>.

⁵⁷ <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/>.

⁵⁸ <http://coptot.manuscriptroom.com/home>.

to the bilingual situation in Egypt following the Ptolemaic rule over Egypt (→ 1.4.2.4).⁵⁹

However, the widespread presence of Greek loanwords must have had an influence on the translators when searching for the right equivalent in a difficult case, enabling them to make use of the Greek lexeme. Closer investigation reveals though that sometimes Coptic translators “translated” one Greek loanword with another more common Greek-Coptic loanword. This complicates the assessment of textual variants because in such a case we do *not* have a variant reading from a different Greek text form, but a variation within the Coptic language. In particular, the translation of καί “and,” for which there is no single direct equivalent in the Egyptian-Coptic language, could mislead scholars who have little or no knowledge of Coptic to assume a variant reading when καί is, for example, rendered with δέ. On the other hand, it is a criterion of striving for formal equivalency if, as in the case of the Bohairic translation, ογοζ was patterned on the Greek usage for translating καί directly though this is inconsistent with the norms of Coptic.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, the percentage of Greek loanwords in Coptic may be higher in translated literature – together with the Bible and with Patristic literature this is certainly a major part of Coptic Christian literature – than in literature written genuinely in Coptic (works of Pachom, Shenoute, and their successors). The *Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic* (DDGLC) project will investigate and analyze statistically whether or not this is true.⁶¹

The lack of pertinent studies based on editions excludes a synthetic description of the translation technique of the Coptic translations. However, for some books, we do have such studies and their results will be summarized here. Mink and Askeland for the Coptic New Testament and Feder for the *Corpus Ieremiae* have already provided some

general observations embedded in the framework of biblical translations.⁶² Nevertheless, most of the conclusions drawn here are of a preliminary nature and hopefully will be developed further in more detailed studies.

1.4.2.8.1 Sahidic Version

The Sahidic version is early (fourth century) and translates its Greek *Vorlage* in a literary manner, respecting the norms of the target language rather than striving for formal equivalence with the source text. Later, this early translation obviously appeared to be too free and underwent sporadic unsystematic revision in order to make it correspond more closely to the Greek model. But the original translation was not changed profoundly in this way.⁶³

1.4.2.8.2 Bohairic Version

The comparison with the Sahidic version of Jeremiah, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, and Baruch uncovered an obvious striving for formal equivalence with the source text, sometimes to such an extent that the rules of the Coptic language were no longer observed. According to studies on literalism in ancient biblical translations,⁶⁴ the Bohairic translation uses the most obvious criteria for literalism: copying of the word order in the

⁵⁹ Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 79–103; G. Mink, “Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments: Die sprachlichen Probleme bei ihrer Bewertung für die griechische Textgeschichte,” in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ed. K. Aland; ANTF 5; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972), 160–299; C. Askeland, *John’s Gospel: The Coptic Translations of its Greek Text* (ANTF 44; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012); cf. also the study of Perttilä on 1 Samuel: E. Perttilä, “Sahidic 1 Samuel – A Daughter Version of the Septuagint” (PhD diss., Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki, 2013), which will be published soon.

⁶⁰ These observations are based completely on the investigation of Jeremiah, Lamentations, and the Epistle of Jeremiah; cf. Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 55–64. The text of Baruch (→ 11.2.1.6), however, was revised thoroughly; cf. Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 56, 64–69.

⁶¹ J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); cf. also S. Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” *GRBS* 20 (1979): 69–87.

⁵⁹ It can be estimated reasonably that the proportion of Greek loanwords (on all semantic levels) in the Egyptian-Coptic language in late antiquity was about 40 percent.

⁶⁰ Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 86–94.

⁶¹ <http://research.uni-leipzig.de/ddglc/index.html>; the project was recently transferred to Berlin.

source text (division into elements and segments, and the sequence in which these elements are represented) and regular lexical equivalents (consistency of rendering). Although this is not always observed strictly, it forms a clear contrast to the Sahidic version.⁶⁵

The two known early Bohairic witnesses reveal a different picture.⁶⁶ The Genesis passage in manuscript P. Bodmer III was clearly “translated” from a Sahidic *Vorlage* (→ 2.5.2.2), and manuscript P. Vatican Copto 9 (Cop^{palBoh}-MinP) seems to be an original translation based on a Greek model with a strong connection to Old Greek. In the Minor Prophets, we can follow several early Coptic translations and it cannot be excluded that the later “classical” Cop^{Boh}-MinP text is a revision of the older text (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3).

1.4.2.8.3 Akhmimic Version

Although the Akhmimic version is early (third to fifth centuries), the few extant or partly extant books, Exodus (→ 2.5.2.2), Proverbs (→ 12.4.2.3), and the Minor Prophets (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3), seem to prove its dependence on a Sahidic model, however not without features of its own that point to an intermediate position in the textual history.

1.4.2.8.4 Mesokemic Version

Despite its limited extant remains, the Mesokemic version belongs to the earliest attestations of Coptic biblical translations, as third-century glossaries to Isaiah (→ 6–9.2.2.1.1) and the Minor Prophets (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3) prove. Although this version seems to have become obsolete by the fifth century, it is of note that there are Mesokemic fragments of Genesis, 2 Kingdoms, Job, Isaiah, Hosea, and Amos. But only the complete preserved text of Psalms allows a study of its translation character. The Mesokemic Psalm book, extant in only one manuscript, seems to be based partly on the Sahidic version (→ 10.4.2.2). However, pending more detailed

studies that could shed light on the question, it remains unknown whether it represents *per se* an original translation based on a Greek *Vorlage* similar to that of the Sahidic text.

1.4.2.8.5 Fayyumic Version

Fayyumic fragments of a number of books are preserved (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Daniel, and Susanna) but only Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations are almost completely transmitted in two old manuscripts, P. Michigan 3520 (fourth century)⁶⁷ and P. Bilinguis 1 Hamburg (third or fourth century).⁶⁸ Although we possess two Fayyumic versions of Ecclesiastes and one of Canticles with a parallel Greek text, no pertinent study on the translation technique exists so far. One study on Lamentations revealed that the early version in P. Bilinguis Hamburg seems to be an independent translation, whereas later Fayyumic fragments show a revised text form tending towards Cop^{Boh}-Lam but not free of the influence of Cop^{Sa}-Lam.⁶⁹ Detailed investigations of the translation technique of the Fayyumic version would profoundly improve our knowledge of the early Coptic translations as compared to the standard Sahidic version.

1.4.2.9 Text-Critical Value and Reconstruction of the Parent Text(s)

We are still at the very beginning of an exploration of the textual history of the Coptic translations and their Greek source texts. We possess proper editions and/or pertinent studies only for a few books. However, Nathalie Bosson's formulation concerning the Minor Prophets also applies more generally:

⁶⁷ Schenke and Kasser, *Papyrus Michigan 3520 und 6868(a): Ecclesiastes, Erster Johannesbrief und Zweiter Petrusbrief im fayyumischen Dialekt*.

⁶⁸ Diebner and Kasser, *Hamburger Papyrus Bil. 1*.

⁶⁹ F. Feder, “Die fajjumische Version der ‘Klagelieder des Jeremias’ (Lam) des Papyrus Bilinguis 1 Hamburg,” in *Sprachen, Mythen, Mythizismen: Festschrift für Walter Beltz zum 65. Geburtstag am 25. April 2000* (Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientalwissenschaft 32; Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität, 2001), 161–203.

⁶⁵ Feder, **Biblia Sahidica*, 55–69, 83–103.

⁶⁶ For early Bohairic fragments of the New Testament, see Askeland, *John's Gospel: The Coptic Translations of its Greek Text*, 168.

The Coptic versions are characterized by their “extrême bigarrure” (“interlaced pattern”). They belong obviously to a phase in the textual history of the Coptic Bible subsequent to the first translations from a Greek base text (→ 9.3). This phase is marked by an intense activity of revision/recension. Indeed, it is often difficult to connect the Coptic OT witnesses to a well defined Greek textual family. Nevertheless, many of them are of particular importance for the history of the biblical text because some of their readings certainly give evidence of OG (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3).

The Sahidic version, which is dominant in the Coptic biblical tradition, seems to be characterized by an early recension of Old Greek that adapted its text *somewhat* to MT. This means that the Greek parent text of Cop^{Sa} contained a pre-Hexaplaric recension. This discovery was the result of a closer investigation of Jeremiah (→ 6–9.2.2.1.3) and Lamentations (→ 13–17.2.2).

However, some early witnesses display an earlier text form that was obviously later replaced: manuscript Crosby-Schøyen MS 193 (Cop^{Sa}-MinP), which shows a common textual substratum with Cop^{palBoh}-MinP (manuscript Vatican Copto 9), an early papyrus of Qohelet (→ 13–17.2.2.3), manuscript P. Bodmer XXI (Cop^{Sa}¹⁸) of Joshua (→ 11.4.2.3), and manuscript P. Bodmer VI of Proverbs (→ 12.4.2.3). A textual relation of these witnesses to the Old Greek (→ 1.3.1.1) is likely.

The Bohairic version in its “classical” form may be late and seems to depend mostly on a Greek parent text of the LXX^B and LXX^S family (Pentateuch, Psalms, Proverbs) or of the Alexandrian group, LXX^{A-Q} (MinP). Nevertheless, it is not clear if the Bohairic version was always translated independently from Cop^{Sa}. At least, the old Bohairic manuscript P. Bodmer III (Genesis → 2.5.2.2) definitely had a Sahidic *Vorlage*.

However, regular interferences appear in Jeremiah, Lamentations (→ 6–9.2.2.1.3), and the Minor Prophets (→ 6–9.2.2.2.3) that set Cop^{Boh} apart from the Greek uncial “mainstream” and also display that Cop^{Sa} and Cop^{Boh} share a common substratum. These relations may never be fully revealed as the Bohairic version does not transmit the whole Old Testament.

As for the Akhmimic version, a general dependence on Cop^{Sa} has been observed in all extant witnesses. However, in Proverbs and the Minor Prophets, Cop^{Akh} seems to display traces of an older stratum of Cop^{Sa} that was probably closer to Old Greek (→ 9.3).

Although the Fayyumic and Mesokemic dialects transmit fragments and sometimes almost complete texts of several books, unfortunately with very few exceptions⁷⁰ their text-critical value still remains unknown today.

Some text-critical observations may be added here that result from the few books that have already been investigated.

Rahlf’s supposition that Cop^{Sa}-Ps is an important witness of an Upper Egyptian recension and Cop^{Boh}-Ps is a representative of a Lower Egyptian recension, in Greek (→ 10.3.1) mainly attested by the uncial codices LXX^B and LXX^S, has been profoundly challenged by manuscript P. Bodmer XXIV (Greek) and a recently discovered Coptic Psalm codex in the Middle Egyptian dialect (→ 10.4.2.2). In fact, there were no Upper and Lower Egyptian recensions in the Coptic translations. The Greek parent text of Cop^{Sa}-Ps is still unknown while Cop^{Boh}-Ps belongs to the LXX^B and LXX^S family, and Cop^{Mes}-Ps represents a mixed text type. Therefore, we are dealing with different textual traditions in Coptic that cannot be ascribed to a certain geographical region.

The Coptic Minor Prophets are attested in old witnesses and in a number of different dialects. Thus, the Minor Prophets are particularly suitable candidates for a closer investigation of the early text history (cf. → 6–9.2.2.2.3). Cop^{Sa}-MinP and Cop^{Akh}-MinP present numerous readings that align with MT-MinP. These readings go back to a Greek model of a text like 8ḤevXII gr (→ 9.3). Cop^{Akh}-MinP is obviously the result of a revision/recension. Mistakes due to a wrong interpretation of the *lectio continua* prove that Cop^{Akh}-MinP is based on Cop^{Sa}-MinP. Cop^{Boh}-MinP is connected with the Alexandrian group (LXX^{A-Q}) and derives either from a Hesychian *Vorlage* (→ 1.3.1.2.7)

⁷⁰ → 1.4.2.8.

or directly from Cop^{Sa}-MinP with a later revision based on a Hesychian text.

The rare case of an old Bohairic version, Cop^{pal}-Boh-MinP (manuscript Vatican Copto 9), is especially interesting. It is of primary importance because its text is based on a Greek *Vorlage* closely related to LXX^w and, consequently, to OG-MinP (→ 9.3). Crosby-Schøyen MS 193 separates itself from the other branch of Cop^{Sa}-MinP, going regularly with Cop^{pal}Boh-MinP or even with Cop^{Boh}-MinP.

Cop^{Sa}-Job is regarded as the best witness of the pre-Hexaplaric or short version of LXX-Job (→ 11.3.1; → 11.3.2), whereas Cop^{Boh}-Job must be younger and represents the longer version of LXX-Job (→ 11.3.1) according to Origen's *Hexapla* and includes the asterisked material of Theodotion (→ 11.3.5).⁷¹

Cop^{Sa}-Dan is based on Theodotion (→ 18.3.1) generally following LXX^B, with most frequent correspondences to LXX^Q and LXX²³⁰, though not completely independent from Old Greek (→ 18.3.1).⁷² However, Cop^{Boh}-Dan belongs to the Hexaplaric tradition (→ 18.3.4).⁷³

The dispersal of Coptic manuscripts and their publications complicates the organization of a comprehensive bibliography. A continuous list in alphabetical order could be endless and even an intelligent selection would leave the reader with a toilsome search for their desired materials. Therefore, it appeared preferable to offer the bibliographical references in the text and at the point where they are appropriate. Reading the article the advantage of this distribution will become obvious. Thus, the entries given here are limited to the most compact and global accounts that offer an overview over the Coptic translations and, likewise, structured references.

Feder, F., "Die koptische Übersetzung des Alten und Neuen Testamentes im 4. Jahrhundert," in *Stabilisierung und Profilierung der Koptischen Kirche im 4. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zur x. Internationalen Halle-schen Koptologentagung 2006* (eds. J. Tubach and S.G. Vashalomidze; Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft 44; Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität

Halle-Wittenberg, 2007), 65–93 [<http://menadoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/urn/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-28951>].

Feder, F., "Zur Geschichte der Erforschung der koptischen Septuagintaübersetzung," in *Digitale Edition der koptisch-sahidischen Septuaginta (I): Fragestellungen und Herausforderungen: Band zur internationalen Tagung vom 26./27. April 2013 im Koptischen Kloster der Jungfrau Maria und des Heiligen Mauritius in Höxter-Brenkhausen* (eds. H. Behlmer, F. Feder, and U. Pietruschka; Halle: Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, 2015), 31–39 [<http://menadoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/id/1453421>].

Hallock, F.H., "The Coptic Old Testament," *AJSL* 49 (1933): 325–35.

Hyvernat, H., "Étude sur les versions coptes bibliques," *RB* 5 (1896): 427–33, 540–96; 6 (1897): 48–74.

Kasser, R., "Les dialectes coptes et les versions coptes bibliques," *Bib* 46 (1965): 287–310.

Nagel, P., "Griechisch-Koptische Bilinguen des Alten Testaments," in *Graeco-Coptica: Griechen und Kopten im byzantinischen Ägypten* (ed. P. Nagel; Martin-Luther-Universität Halle Wittenberg Wissenschaftliche Beiträge 1984/48; Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1984), 231–57.

Nagel, P., "Old Testament, Coptic Translations of," *The Coptic Encyclopedia* 6:1836a–40b.

Petersen, T., "The Biblical Scholar's Concern with Coptic Studies," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 241–49.

Takla, H., "An Introduction to the Coptic Old Testament," *Coptica* 6 (2007): 1–115.

Till, W., "Coptic and Its Value," *BJRL* 40 (1957): 229–58.

Frank Feder

1.4.3 Ethiopic Translation(s)

1.4.3.1 Background

The earliest account of the arrival of Christianity in Ethiopia comes from Rufinus of Aquileia who produced a set of additions to Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (*Hist. eccl.* 1, 9 and 10).¹ It includes a story of

¹ An English translation of the account by Rufinus (ca. 345–410 C.E.) can be found in M. Jones and E. Monroe, *A History of Ethiopia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 26–27. His account was repeated variously by Socrates of Byzantium (ca. 380–450 C.E.), Sozomen (early-fifth century C.E.), Theodoret of Cyrus (ca. 393–ca. 458 C.E.), and Gelasius of Cyzicus (active

⁷¹ → 11.4.2.3.

⁷² → 18.4.2.1–2.

⁷³ → 18.4.2.3.

shipwreck, the survival of two young brothers, Frumentius and Edesius, who were taken captive and grew up in the court of the king of Axum and became trusted with advising the king's young son. When they and the prince had grown they were allowed to leave the country and Frumentius returned to Alexandria where Athanasius made him bishop and sent him back to the region. Further literary evidence comes from a letter of Emperor Constantine preserved in the writings of Athanasius of Alexandria.²

A second category of evidence is provided by the inscriptions of Ezana, the King of Axum, from the second quarter of the fourth century. These mention a host of local deities but later shift and make reference to the Lord of Heaven. To this is added a third category of evidence in the coins minted late in Ezana's reign in which there is a shift from pagan symbols to the Christian symbol of the cross.

The Axum inscriptions contain quotations from the Ethiopic Bible, including brief texts from Job (→ 11.4.3), Psalms (→ 10.4.3), Isaiah (→ 6–9.2.3.1), Matthew, and John. These quotations provide us with the latest possible starting point for the translation into Gəʿəz of at least portions of the Ethiopic Bible: the late-fourth and early-fifth centuries C.E.

Ethiopia has several traditions regarding translators and revisers of Scripture in Ethiopic. These include Saint Frumentius,³ the founder of Ethiopian Christianity, the so-called Nine Saints⁴ who purportedly arrived in Ethiopia in the late-fifth or early-sixth century C.E. and, besides translating Scriptures,⁵ introduced monastic life to Ethiopia,

around 475 C.E.). For further information, see J.W. Clear, "The Ethiopic Version of 11 Chronicles" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1971), 1–13.

² Details of the sources of the literary evidence, and the following epigraphic and numismatic evidence can be found in W. Hahn, "Ezana," *EAE* 2:478–80.

³ G. Fiaccadori, "Sälama (Käšate Bərhan)," *EAE* 4:484–88.

⁴ See A. Brita, "Nine Saints," *EAE* 3:1188–91.

⁵ The fifteenth-century work called *Book of Mystery* tells of the arrival of the Nine Saints in Ethiopia with books of the law and doctrine. But the work also claims that most of the books of the Old Testament were translated from Hebrew into Ethiopic in the days of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba.

and Metropolitan Sälama (ca. 1348 to ca. 1390),⁶ called "the Translator," who is known to have translated many works from Arabic to Gəʿəz. Dillmann and many others have tried to set forth accounts of some chapter or another of the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament based on these traditional accounts,⁷ but all of these proposals have been provisional and await the full description of the textual history that can only be developed on the basis of textual data, i.e., established families of manuscripts bound together by shared variants.

1.4.3.2 Canon and Manuscripts of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church

Ethiopia is known for having the largest canon of biblical books within Christianity. In Ethiopian tradition, this canon is referred to collectively as "the eighty-one books." These include everything in the West's canonical and deuterocanonical lists, as well as works accorded pseudepigraphical status in the West. Most notable among these are the books of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Beyond these, it becomes impossible to clarify the exact extent of the Ethiopian canon since competing systems designate different works, coming to the total of eighty-one by different means.⁸

The earliest extant manuscripts of the Ethiopic Bible that can be dated with any certainty come from the mid-fourteenth century.⁹ Other manuscripts may come from as early as the twelfth century, but only a handful. This means that there is much about the early manuscript history and book culture of Christian Ethiopia for which there is no

H. Zotenberg comments on the work in his *Catalogue des manuscrits éthiopiens (Gheez et Amharique) de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1877), 127–31.

⁶ For information on Sälama's life and work, including a thorough list of the translations attributed to him, see P. Marrassini, "Sälama," *EAE* 4:488–89.

⁷ Dillmann, *Biblia*, Vol. 2, Fasc. 1: *Libri Regum, Paralipomenon, Esdrae, Esther* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1861), app. crit. See also Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible*, 31–72, and Knibb, *Translating the Bible*, 1–54.

⁸ See P. Brandt, "Bible Canon," *EAE* 1:571–73; Cowley, "Biblical Canon," 318–23; and Mikre Sellasie, "The Bible and its Canon," 111–23.

⁹ Uhlig, *Introduction*.

direct evidence. In the nineteenth and for most of the twentieth century there were not sufficient quantities of manuscripts available in Europe to produce a truly critical edition of any Old Testament book, and certainly not enough to localize with any precision the identity and character of discreet families of manuscripts.

In the last few decades, though, the situation has changed dramatically. From the 1960s through the 1990s, several microfilming projects produced image sets for thousands of Ethiopian manuscripts: the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library (some 9,600 manuscripts), Ernst Hammerschmidt's Lake Tana project (nearly 200 manuscripts), the UNESCO mobile microfilming unit (over 350 manuscripts), to mention three. And the twenty-first century has seen the rise of several digitization projects to produce digital-image sets for several thousand more manuscripts: for instance, the EthioSpare project (Denis Nonsnitsin, dir.), the Ethiopian Manuscript Imaging Project (Steve Delamarter, dir.), the Ethiopian Manuscript Digital Library (Meley Mulugetta, dir.), and several sponsored by the British Library's Endangered Archives Programme. The result is that scholars can assemble with relative ease at least thirty manuscripts of every book of the Ethiopic Old Testament, with half of these coming from the sixteenth century and earlier. This means that evidence is now at hand that represents the full manuscript history. At least one project – the Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament (THEOT, under the direction of the authors) – is currently under way to sketch the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament manuscript tradition.

1.4.3.3 The Socio-Political Environment That Affected Literary Production in Ethiopia

By its nature, any account of the textual history of the Ethiopic Bible will have to accord plausibly with what is known about the political, social, and literary history of Ethiopia. The evidence for the history of the Ethiopian church is not plentiful, especially before the fourteenth century. But there is clearly enough evidence to locate Ethiopia's historical setting generally within a network of social and literary developments that include Cop-

tic Orthodoxy, with its Coptic and Christian Arabic literatures, as well as with Syrian Orthodoxy and even with Armenian Orthodoxy. Scholars have posited to one degree or another influence on the Ethiopic biblical tradition from all of these traditions. But, certainly the location of the Ethiopic Orthodox church under the hierarchy of the Coptic Orthodox Church, centered in Alexandria, provides the primary wider context for understanding the development of Ethiopia's theological and literary traditions.

But beginning in the sixteenth century we must take into account the arrival of the Portuguese generally, in the 1540s, and the Jesuits,¹⁰ in particular, in the 1550s. These were followed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by other European explorers (like James Bruce)¹¹ and emissaries of governments and Bible Societies (such as Nathaniel Pierce and Henry Salt)¹² and by a host of Protestant missionaries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Each of these groups brought their own theological agendas to Ethiopia that they then proceeded to press, and the Ethiopians were not always completely resistant to these influences; they were often quite open to hearing and considering the views of the outsiders. Thus, the Ethiopian understanding of the task and outcomes of the textual transmission of the Bible may have been shaped somewhat by external influence in the later centuries of her history.

At the same time, it should be clear that Ethiopia has never accepted a Western text-critical program for the transmission of its Bible. The character of the forms of the Bible that they produced must be understood to be consonant with their own vision for what constitutes the most desirable form of the

¹⁰ See, for instance, the account by Caraman, *Lost Empire*, which introduces the reader not only to the history, but to the nature of the sources from which the history can be derived.

¹¹ J. Bruce, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile: In the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772 and 1773* (5 vols.; London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1790).

¹² N. Pierce and J.J. Halls, *The Life and Adventures of Nathaniel Pearce: Written by Himself, During a Residence in Abyssinia, 1810–1819* (ed. J.J. Halls; London: Colburn and Bentley, 1831); and D. Manley and P. Réé, *Henry Salt: Artist, Traveller, Diplomat, Egyptologist* (London: Libri, 2001).

Bible. In this regard, the traditional Ethiopian commentaries, the *andämta* – and especially that subset of notes called the *abänet* – are particularly revealing of the typical attitude toward textual variation.¹³ In short, instead of attempting to determine the oldest or best reading by some process of critical discrimination, the tendency is to list the variations and detail the usefulness of each one for right interpretation. Such an attitude tends to produce, in the standardized text and in the modern *Textus Receptus*, a conflatory text.

1.4.3.4 Printed Editions of the Books of the Ethiopian Old Testament¹⁴

The earliest printed edition of any Ethiopian biblical books was of the Ethiopian Psalter, which includes the 151 Psalms of David according to the LXX tradition (→ 10.4.3) and Canticles (→ 13–17.2.3.2). These were published in Europe by Potken in 1513.¹⁵ But it was the edition of the Psalter produced by Ludolf in 1701¹⁶ that became the standard work on which all subsequent European editions of the Psalter have been based, including that of the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition in 1815.¹⁷

Eventually, printed editions of the full Bible were produced in the twentieth century. A typeset, four-volume edition was produced between 1922 and 1926 in Asmara by Da Bassano.¹⁸ A decade later, by order of Emperor Haile Selassie, a great pandect was produced in the government scriptorium and a photolithographic edition was produced and circulated from that codex, which is still held at the Institute of Ethiopian Studies (shelf mark Eth^{IES} 77) in Addis Ababa.

¹³ See the exploration by Ralph Lee and Märiqeta Rodas Tadesa Ababa of the “Textual Variations [in Genesis] as Recorded in the Ethiopian *Andämta* Biblical Commentaries,” a paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL in Chicago in November, 2012.

¹⁴ For a thorough overview, see S. Weninger, “Bible, Gə‘əz Bible Editions,” *EAE* 1:569–71.

¹⁵ Potken, *Psalmi et Cantica*.

¹⁶ Ludolf, *Psalterium Davidis Aethiopice*.

¹⁷ *Psalterium Davidis Aethiopice* (London: J. & T. Clarke, 1815).

¹⁸ Bassano, *Beluy Kidan*.

1.4.3.5 History of Scholarship and the Production of Editions of Individual Books

Several obstacles have hindered the production of critical editions of books of the Ethiopic Old Testament. The first set of challenges has been methodological and ideological. Scholars in the West have judged the value of the Ethiopic Old Testament first on the basis of its relevance for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. As a daughter version of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), it clearly had none. Because of its Greek *Vorlage*, Septuagintalists have seen a certain value in the Ethiopic, but they have been interested in it only or mainly for the light it might shed on the textual history the Greek Bible. What this has meant in practice is that they have been interested not in the full textual history of the Ethiopic, but only in its earliest form – what they have dubbed the “Old Ethiopic” – and its Greek *Vorlage*. It has been standard practice in dissertation work to eliminate all manuscripts after the seventeenth century, which is to say just about half of the duration of the extant manuscript tradition. The relatively recent dissertations by Clear (→ 20.4.3.3)¹⁹ and Edele (→ 2.5.3.4)²⁰ are but two examples of this practice. However, some of the most interesting developments we know of take place *after* the seventeenth century. One can argue that this practice has led to an incomplete, if not distorted, view of the textual history. The second obstacle has to do with the lack of manuscripts described above. A third obstacle has to do with the narrow field of people trained in the languages necessary to explore the external relationships of the Ethiopic: in addition to Greek and Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, and Coptic would all have some evidence to commend themselves as possible influences on the Ethiopic.

Thus, the textual history of most of the books of the Ethiopic Old Testament has never been analyzed critically.²¹ Of those that have received some

¹⁹ J.W. Clear, “The Ethiopic Version of 11 Chronicles” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1971).

²⁰ B.A. Edele, “A Critical Edition of Genesis in Ethiopic” (PhD diss., Duke University, 1995).

²¹ For the particular details of bibliography and publication, we refer the reader to the specific articles in this volume and to Weninger's article mentioned above in n. 14.

attention, far and away the majority were performed on too few manuscripts.²² Mercer's study²³ used sufficient numbers of manuscripts, but employed faulty method (→ 13–17.2.3.3).²⁴ Thus, there are only four or five studies that have been based on sufficient quantities of manuscripts to be able to draw reliable conclusions about the nature of the textual history of a book of the Old Testament.²⁵ The most sophisticated demon-

stration of method probably goes to Fuhs who has produced successful critical editions for Micah and Hosea (→ 6–9.2.3.4)²⁶ based on eighteen and twenty manuscripts respectively.²⁷

But not even the studies by Fuhs have been able to avoid the accident of available evidence. Two of the oldest and consequently most influential manuscripts available to Western scholars, Eth^{Hunt 625} and Eth^{Cam 1570}, have turned out to be problematic. Despite its age, Eth^{Hunt 625} is not representative of the earliest attested textual family (widely called the "Old Ethiopic") but of a later, transitional form of the text. And the family affiliations of Eth^{Cam 1570} – important not only for its age but because it contains so much of the Ethiopic Old Testament – are among the most ambiguous of any of the early manuscripts, i.e., it is not a good representative of any of the known families of manuscripts. The actual positions of these two manuscripts within the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament have only become clear from the vantage point of studies that contain between twenty-seven and fifty manuscripts.²⁸

²² S. Grébaut (*Les Paralipomènes: Livres I et II version éthiopienne* [PO 23.4; Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie., 1932]) edited 1–2 Chronicles on the basis of only two manuscripts; J. Bachmann (*Dodekapropheten Aethiopum oder die zwölf kleinen Propheten der aethiopischen Bibelübersetzung* [2 vols.; Halle: Niemeyer, 1892–1893]) produced editions of Obadiah and Malachi on the basis of only three manuscripts; Dillmann's work (**Biblia*) on the Octateuch (1853), the four books of Kingdoms (1861–1871) and the deuterocanonical books of Baruch, Letter of Jeremiah, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Ezra, and 3 Ezra were based on only a few manuscripts; Dillmann's edition of Joel (1879) was based on only five manuscripts; O. Boyd's work (*The Octateuch in Ethiopic according to the Text of the Paris Codex with the Variants of Five Other Manuscripts* [2 vols.; ed. E. Littmann; Bibliotheca Aethiopica 3; Leiden: Brill, 1909–1911]) on Genesis (1909), Exodus and Leviticus (1911) was based on only a few manuscripts; O. Löfgren's editions (*Jona, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi Äthiopisch unter Zugrundelegung des Oxforde Ms. Huntington 625 nach mehreren Handschriften* [Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1930]) of Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (1930) were based primarily on one fourteenth-century manuscript (Eth^{Hunt 625}); F.M. Esteves Pereira produced works on Job ("Le Livre de Job: Version Éthiopienne," PO 2 [1907]: 565–688), Esther (*Le livre d'Esther: Version éthiopienne* [PO 9.1; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1911]), Amos (*O livro do profeta Amós e a sua versão etiópica* [Academia das ciências de Lisboa Separata de "Boletim do Segunda Classe" 11; Coimbra: Impr. da Univ., 1917]), and Ezra and Nehemiah ("Le Troisième Livre de 'Ezra (Esdras et Néhémie Canoniques) Version Éthiopienne," PO 13 [1919]: 643–736) on the basis of only a few manuscripts.

²³ S. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Text of the Book of Ecclesiastes* (Oriental Research Series; London: Luzac and Co., 1931).

²⁴ See the critiques recorded by Weninger, "Gə'əz Bible Editions," 150.

²⁵ O. Löfgren's edition of Daniel (*Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel* [Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1927]) was based on twelve manuscripts and was, perhaps, the first edition that has held up well. H.C. Gleave's *The Ethiopic Version of the Songs of Songs: Critically Edited* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951) was based on twenty manuscripts, six printed editions, and twenty-three of what are called in this edition

"service books." B.A. Edele's edition of Genesis ("A Critical Edition of Genesis in Ethiopic" [PhD diss., Duke University, 1995]) is based on twenty-two manuscripts and though the identification of families and analysis of the textual history have some weaknesses, the text of Genesis seems to be reliable.

²⁶ H.F. Fuhs, *Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Micha* (BBB 28; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1968); H.F. Fuhs, *Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Hosea* (BBB 38; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1971).

²⁷ Sadly, we have not yet been able to gain access to H. Pilkington's thesis on Ethiopic Proverbs ("A Critical Edition of the Book of Proverbs in Ethiopic" [PhD diss., Oxford University, 1978]). We anticipate the appearance of M.A. Knibb's forthcoming edition of Ezekiel (*The Ethiopic Text of the Book of Ezekiel: A Critical Edition* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015]).

²⁸ Studies currently under way in the framework of the Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament project have transcribed such quantities of manuscripts for Deuteronomy, Judges, Psalms, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, and Habakkuk. Reports on these studies will appear, e.g., under the title *Studies in the Textual History of Ethiopic Jonah* in the series *Ethiopic Manuscripts, Texts, and Studies* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications).

1.4.3.6 Tentative Nature of Any Conclusions regarding the Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament

Given the state of the field when it comes to reliable critical editions of the books of the Ethiopic Old Testament, we must be careful to stress that any conclusions regarding the stages of the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament must be regarded as tentative. What Ullendorff has said about the oldest form of the Ethiopic Bible is actually true of the entire textual history: “no views on the time, authorship, and *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic Bible translations can lay claim to any measure of finality.”²⁹

1.4.3.7 Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament

1.4.3.7.1 An Overview

The biblical citations embedded in the Axumite inscriptions leave little doubt that by the fifth and sixth centuries there existed an Ethiopic version of the Bible in Axum, translated from the Greek Old and New Testaments. That the *Vorlagen* were Greek (→ 1.3.1.1) has been established beyond doubt. Previous theories about Syriac influence depended upon faulty philology, failure to distinguish between Old Ethiopic witnesses and those having been revised against an Arabic translation (→ 1.4.11) of the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4), and uncritical interpretation of the Nine Saints legend.³⁰ But beyond this quite general statement about a Greek *Vorlage*, very little can be said about its scope or the precise nature of the Axumite Bible. Until recently, scholars have been willing to equate it with the text in the earliest extant manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But, given that the 700 years of extant manuscripts we do have bear clear witness to at least four major developments in the history of the Ethiopic text, to believe that the prior 1,000 years of manuscript history was essentially

uniform is highly implausible. Thus, claims about the precise Greek *Vorlage* of the Axumite Bible are, in many cases, going beyond the evidence. Still, the translations of the various books bear some of the distinctive readings of the various *Vorlagen* from which they were translated. Even where representations are relatively free, portions of the underlying text can often be reconstructed. For example, Eth-Dan derives from a text similar to minuscule LXX¹³⁰ (→ 18.4.3) and Eth-3 Ezra (= MT-Ezra–Neh) was copied from a Greek manuscript virtually identical to Codex Vaticanus (LXX^B; → 19.4.3). However, Eth-2 Chr may attest to a Lucianic or proto-Lucianic recension of the Greek (→ 20.4.3). What this means is that the corpus of Old Testament books was probably not translated from a standard form of the Greek text; individual books are therefore likely to have an individual character with reference to the Greek. But, regardless of their varying *Vorlagen*, the character of the inner-Ethiopian textual history is likely to have similar patterns as the entire corpus was taken up by successive programs of revision.

Having said this, probably the first impression that one should have about the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament has to do with the degree of uniformity that dominates the extant manuscripts. Though it is possible through the analysis of shared variants to identify at least four distinct branches among the extant indigenous manuscripts, the amount of text shared in common by all of them is well above 90 percent in absolute terms. Consequently, it may be misleading, in all but a few cases, to call any of these families a recension, if by this term we mean to imply the production of a form of the text that is quite new in relation to that which came before. Innovation, in any deep sense, is not characteristic of any of the stages of the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament. This point is made all the clearer with the discovery of three Gəʿəz manuscripts (Eth^{EMIP} 949, UNES 10.34, EMML 7942) whose characteristics as Ethiopian books appear in every way to be normal, and yet were translated from the Sixtine Vulgate (→ 1.3.5). The degree of innovation in these three manuscripts sets them apart from the rest to

²⁹ Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible*, 55.

³⁰ See R. Zuurmond, *Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum: The Synoptic Gospels* (3 parts; Äthiopistische Forschungen 27 + 55; Stuttgart/Wiesbaden: Steiner/Harrassowitz, 1989–2001), 1:90–132; and Niccum, “Ethiopic Version,” 69–88.

such a degree that it is clear that they stand not just as a distinct family of manuscripts, but that they stand completely outside the indigenous tradition.

The second major impression we should have about the textual history of the Ethiopic Old Testament is a corollary to the first: Among the extant manuscripts, the shape of the entire indigenous tradition is dominated by fidelity to the oldest text that emerges as the earliest extant.

For the biblical materials, Greek manuscripts made their way to Axum, presumably through the agency of Frumentius. As best we can tell, these codices may have attested to a LXX^B text, although a few books may have exhibited (proto-)Lucianic (→ 1.3.1.2) influence or include Hexaplaric readings (→ 1.3.1.2). Eth-Dan (→ 18.4.3), as expected, preserves Theodotion's text (→ 1.3.1.2), but Eth-Job (→ 11.4.3), too, contains numerous Theodotonic additions. Although the quality of translations varies widely and from book to book, in general the linguistic capabilities of the translators were poor. In some cases, large portions of text were therefore left untranslated (see, e.g., Daniel 11).

Unfortunately, we know little about the text before the fourteenth century. Recent dating of the Eth^{Abb Gar} gospels to the sixth century may provide a window into that period, as also might Eth^{EMML 6977}, a manuscript containing Eth-Job and Eth-Dan, which must date between then and the eleventh century. Inscriptions also provide some evidence, although often random and fragmentary, as well as biblical citations in earlier literature (e.g., the *Kebra Nagast*).³¹ However, what evidence does exist suggests that Ethiopia's history of transmission remained rather static and conservative for centuries.³²

International commerce and dialogue, the first clear signs of which reappear around the eleventh century, must have created opportunities for Ethiopians to recognize the deficiencies of their Bible. And by the time the manuscript evidence appears, we see evidence of scribes introducing sporadic

"improvements" under the influence of the Arabic (→ 1.4.11).

One cannot speak reliably of any recension during these early centuries, despite early tendencies by some scholars to speak of a first "Syro-Arabic" edition. "Transitional Text" better describes this slow collapse of the Old Ethiopic (if by this term we mean to indicate the form of the text that survived into this era.) During this period some books certainly received more attention (e.g., 1–4 Kingdoms; → 3–5.2.3.3), whereas others, such as Job (→ 11.4.3) and Isaiah (→ 6–9.2.3.1), perhaps because of their overall readability, were little affected. Still, by the fifteenth century, some of the major *lacunae* in the original biblical text still had not yet been filled in.

Interestingly, those books showing the greatest diversity between LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) and MT (→ 1.2.2) were the least modified. This state of affairs changed, however, with the advent of what we call the Standardized Text (also labeled the second Syro-Arabic or vulgar recension). Details about its origin are unclear, but the text type was demographically widespread and homogenous by the seventeenth century, so it must have had authoritative backing. The standardized form of the text was certainly the most copied well into the nineteenth century. Other factors continued to impact the development of the text, though. For example, the multiple versions of the Ethiopian Bible then circulating resulted in continued conflation. Indeed, the *Andemta* is an oral treasury of many of the text-critical discussions and decisions made throughout this period.³³ Greater participation in global Christianity also drew attention to the differences between the Bible of the Ethiopians and other believers. Arabic literature too continued to exert its influence.

Under all these influences, a certain degree of innovation continues to take place in the tradition. We mention here only three examples. First, in the seventeenth century both Eth-Job (→ 11.4.3) and Eth-Dan (→ 18.4.3) were significantly revised towards yet another Arabic text (→ 1.4.11). In the case of Eth-Dan, this included an accompanying

³¹ Niccum, "Citations," 1–11; cf. Knibb, "Text," 443–56.

³² Knibb offers a more cautious assessment, "Hebrew," 14–21.

³³ On the *Andemta*, see Cowley, *Apocalypse*.

commentary. Second, an old and very long recension of Eth-Cant (→ 13–17.2.3.2), which is preserved for us in Eth^{EMML}2064, developed a medium-sized form that was not infrequently copied in manuscripts of the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, alongside the common version that corresponds to the size of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) and is the usual form of the book copied throughout the extant manuscript tradition. Although some Ethiopians refer to this expanded version as the “Hebraic Edition,” it has little to no connection with the Hebrew.³⁴ Instead, its base text seems to be a transitional text, glossed with additional Gəʿəz strophes, perhaps stemming from Abba Giyorgis, who died in 1425.³⁵ Third, a cluster of pluses in Ps 151:6–7 developed into a longer recension that became fairly standard in the modern Textus Receptus.

For reasons we do not fully understand, royal scriptoria in the late-nineteenth century began to produce a form of the text that is distinguishable from the others that had come before. Grounded on the standardized form of the text, this effort, or more likely efforts, produced what we call the modern Textus Receptus. How successful this version will ultimately be remains to be seen, but the “Haile Selassie Bible” (Eth^{IES}77) has given distinct shape to the modern Ethiopian Bible.

1.4.3.7.2 The Axumite Bible

As we have explained above, there is enough evidence to believe in the existence of a Gəʿəz translation of some or all of the Bible in Axum by the fifth and sixth centuries. But, as we have also made clear: 1) we know very little about it; and 2) we can no longer simply equate it with the earliest attested text carried by the extant manuscripts of the fourteenth century and following. For this reason alone, it is perhaps important to name this form of the text Axumite Bible – though an entity with slight and indirect attestation – precisely so that we can differentiate it from the forms of the text to follow.

³⁴ Discovered through private conversations with Dr. Mer-sha Alehegne and *Kesis* Melaku Terefe.

³⁵ Cowley, *Interpretation*, 94–101.

As evidence accrues, it becomes clearer that the Greek Bible (→ 1.3.1.1) and related religious literature was translated into Gəʿəz earlier than some had previously expected. The wider range of dates previously espoused range from 350 to 678 C.E. They rested on errors and certain *a priori* assumptions. We now know that the year 678 often assigned to the translation of Ben Sira was a scribal error and not referencing the earliest translation.³⁶ Also, the supposed silence of Ethiopian Christianity during the fourth and fifth centuries must now be questioned. Organized Ethiopian monastic groups inhabited the Nitrian desert in 407 C.E., inscriptions reflect intimate knowledge of Scripture in the fifth century, and a “corpus canonum” of early-fourth-century Greek texts has been identified.³⁷ If the Nine Saints legend were historical, any religious impact they had was more social than textual.³⁸

1.4.3.7.3 Earliest Attested Form of the Text, or the Old Ethiopic

Scholars have been accustomed to refer to the earliest recoverable form of the text as the Old Ethiopic, or the *Versio Antiqua*, to equate it more or less with the Axumite Bible, and to believe that it had circulated for over a millennium virtually unchanged. Given that we can document the development of at least four major forms of the Ethiopic text in the last seven centuries (i.e., within the manuscripts extant from the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries), it seems implausible, on the face of it, that the previous thousand years should have seen no major developments. Further, in those few cases where we may possess manuscripts older than the usual fourteenth and fifteenth century (the Abba Garima Gospels, or Eth^{EMML}6977 in the Old Testa-

³⁶ Piovanelli, “Aksum and the Bible,” 5–6; and Rahlfs, “Bibelübersetzung,” 679–81.

³⁷ On Axumite monks in Egypt, see Synesius, *Epistula* 122; for epigraphic evidence, see Knibb, **Translating the Bible*, 46–54; on the “corpus,” see Bausi, “Background,” 532–41.

³⁸ Marrassini questions the Syrian identities of these saints (“Considerations,” 35–46); and Zuurmond suggests the legend might be thirteenth-century propaganda (*Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum*, 1.117).

ment), these manuscripts stand off from the rest to form their own witness, i.e., not as a perfect member of the remaining earliest extant manuscripts. There is growing awareness, then, that we must leave open the possibility that with the discovery of even older manuscripts, we may yet discover additional stages in the history of the text between the Axumite Bible and the earliest extant manuscripts today. In the articles on the books of the Ethiopic Bible in *THB* vol. 1, then, we may employ the common term Old Ethiopic, but when we do so we intend to limit it to mean simply the earliest extant form of the text, without perpetuating the assumption that it represents the Axumite Bible of old.

Judging by the nature of the transitional form of the text that follows, everything would suggest that the Old Ethiopic form of the text was highly revered, if the number and relative uniformity of the manuscripts are evidence for this. The biblical passages in homilies, liturgies, and other religious works cite a form of the text that is essentially identical to the Old Ethiopic.³⁹ And all other iterations of the Bible in Gəʿəz that come later descend from this one version.

Because the translators lacked facility in Greek, the Old Ethiopic is particularly marked by omission, from the deletion of problematic words to nearly complete chapters (e.g., Ezekiel 42–48; → 6–9.2.3.3). Otherwise, the character of the translation ranges from slavish rendering (where the Greek was relatively simple) to free paraphrase (where the original language proved more challenging). Even when the Greek was straightforward, the translators favored parataxis, the addition of words to balance phrasing, and making minor changes for clarity. As a result, transpositions, the presence or absence of *ⲁ* “and” and the inclusion of pronominal suffixes can only rarely be used to determine the reading of the *Vorlage*.⁴⁰

³⁹ The gospel of Matthew is the only exception; see Zuurmond, *Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum*, 1.143–54 and Niccum, “Citations,” 1–11.

⁴⁰ One may question whether an Ethiopian “translation technique” exists, but there are general proclivities. For discussion and description, see Hofmann, “Limitations,” 240–56;

1.4.3.7.4 Transitional Form of the Ethiopic Text

In most instances, the earliest extant manuscripts always cluster into two families, suggesting that at the time when the extant text moves into view there is already a process of development under way. Alongside the “Old Ethiopic” form of the text – and highly dependent on it – there has already emerged a form of text that is moving in a slightly different direction. We call this the “Transitional” form of the Old Ethiopic and believe this term better captures the agenda behind the text than other terms currently employed (i.e., Syro-Arabic Recension).⁴¹ The Transitional Text is a hodgepodge of Old Ethiopic manuscripts with varying degrees of Arabic-language influence. It seems reasonable to believe that rather than produced from a single monolithic effort, the text was slowly adapted concurrent with the renaissance of literary production associated with the increased contact between Ethiopian and Coptic (Arabic-speaking) clerics.

At first, freedom to alter and correct the biblical text developed very slowly, but the rapid expansion of religious literature in the fourteenth century attributed to Abba Salama may have accelerated the pace of change. Although he did not touch the biblical text, he and those working with him translated a number of Arabic works that contained citations of Scripture.⁴² Instead of translating the imbedded biblical texts from the Arabic, scribes supplied excerpts from their own Scriptures. That practice, though, could only have fur-

Zuurmond, *Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum*, 1.49–56; and Knibb, *Translating the Bible*, 55–86.

⁴¹ See Löfgren, *Daniel*, xlili–xlv.

⁴² The absence of any evidence of biblical translation or major revision during Abba Salama’s time (1348–1388) suggests that the attributions are erroneous, *contra* Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible*, 32–34 and 57–58. However, they need not be regarded as completely legendary, *contra* Zuurmond (*Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum*, 1.48–49). In the synaxarium for 20 or 21 Nahase, Abba Salama is credited with translating *ግጽ ሐዋርያት* “writings” a term encompassing much more than the canon. Since a large number of Arabic works appeared around his heyday, he likely led a movement that significantly increased Ethiopia’s spiritual repertoire without necessarily touching the biblical text.

ther highlighted the discrepancies. If nothing else, his activity likely sparked a desire for an updated version.

Surprisingly, though, some of the passages that would have invited the most attention, the major omissions, eluded “correction.” This raises questions about the motivations for making changes. It may be that contemporary theological debates or work on religious literature, including the liturgies, may have predetermined scholars’ perceptions as to which passages needed to be “fixed.”

There are no distinct characteristics of the transitional form of the text. It is an aggregate of sporadic “corrections” that took place over centuries from multiple Arabic sources (→ 1.4.11), and these show up as shared variants in one family of very old manuscripts.

1.4.3.7.5 Standardized Form of the Ethiopic Text

By the late sixteenth century, these developments had coalesced into a wide program that brought forth the Standardized Text, also identified by various scholars as the second Syro-Arabic Recension (and occasionally, though probably mistakenly, as the Academic Recension),⁴³ representing the culmination of the trajectories begun in the transitional era. Granting that the deficiencies of the Old Ethiopic sufficed to invite revision, it is also likely that the theological debates of the fifteenth century, particularly during the time of *Zar’a Ya’aqob*, who, interestingly, quoted the Old Ethiopic version of the Old Testament exclusively, underscored Ethiopia’s lack of a uniform Bible. It is probable also that the socio-political and literary developments taking place in Ethiopia because of energized relations between Ethiopia and her Coptic neighbors in Egypt played a role.⁴⁴

Whatever the underlying causes, this work was not a haphazard attempt to bring the Old Ethiopic text in line with other known witnesses. Perhaps the most important thing we can say is that it

almost certainly took place with royal or ecclesial sanction, for the manuscripts of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries are dominated by large numbers of manuscripts bearing their distinctive readings. The text type exhibits a high degree of uniformity and quickly prevails as *the* text in Gə‘əz.

One of the more remarkable traits of the Standardized Text is the reviser’s use of Hebrew (→ 1.2.2) in addition to Arabic (→ 1.4.11). Therefore, Marqoryos is perhaps to be connected to this revision. It is unknown whether he was responsible for all, part, or any of the work, but colophons and marginalia attribute to his erudition comparisons of at least Job, Daniel, and 3 Ezra (= MT-Ezra–Neh) with the Arabic (→ 1.4.11), Coptic (→ 1.4.2), and Hebrew versions (→ 1.2.2). Marqoryos was a common name, but Ullendorff proposes identification with a monk living in Palestine in the late-fifteenth century.⁴⁵

With regard to the text, although at times introducing radical changes, respect for the traditional Ethiopian Bible continually surfaces in the standardized form. Thus, the revisers retained many of the *lacunae* in the Old Ethiopic. Also, they frequently appended translations of the Arabic *Vorlage* (→ 1.4.11) to the Old Ethiopic rather than replacing its readings, producing a number of doublets as a result.

The new version was marked by Arabic grammatical constructions, some of which left their mark on the evolution of the Gə‘əz language. Otherwise, Arabic and Hebrew loanwords or transliterations joined their Greek counterparts. Where the reviser had difficulties deciphering the Arabic script, he also introduced a number of misreadings. Textually, the revision added Lucianic flavor (→ 1.3.1.2) to the Old Testament text.

The manuscripts that bear the standardized form of the text often divide into two or even three sub-groups. That is, there is a set of readings that bind these sub-groups together and set them apart from the other forms of the text; but there

⁴³ See, e.g., Fuhs, “Die ‘hebräische’ bzw. zweite arabischere Rezension,” in *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Hosea* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1971), 108–11, and the works cited there.

⁴⁴ For more on this, see A. Gori, “Arabic,” *EAE 1.301–04.

⁴⁵ See Esteves Pereira, “Le Livre de Job,” 569–70; Esteves Pereira, “Le Troisième Livre de ’Ezra,” 649; Löfgren, *Daniel*, xxiv–xxv; Ullendorff, **Ethiopia and the Bible*, 42–43; and Knibb, **Translating the Bible*, 44–45.

are also shared readings that define distinct subgroups within the family. It is too early to know for sure, but these may be some of the first indications of regional variation within the tradition.

1.4.3.7.6 Modern Ethiopic Textus Receptus

The paucity of attention given to the recent stages of textual transmission can, at last, be rectified. This is due in part to the recent access gained to excellent manuscript evidence for the modern Ethiopic Textus Receptus, found particularly in exemplary manuscripts from the government scriptoria of Emperor Menilek II (1868–1913), Empress Zewditu (1917–1930), and Emperor Haile Selassie (1930–1970). Some of the most impressive of these would be Eth^{ES} 77 (the so-called Haile Selassie Bible), and Eth^{Cer} 75 (ordered by Cerulli in 1930), both of which were monumental projects of the early Selassie scriptorium. However, the best representatives of the modern Textus Receptus remain manuscripts from Menilek's scriptorium and now preserved at Addis Alem (e.g., Eth^{EMIP} 1095, owned by Nebura 'Ed Kifle; and Eth^{EMIP} 1070, dated to 1914).

Although the extent of revision varies from book to book, the guiding principles of this version appear to be: 1) conflation, i.e., the preservation of significant textual variations known from elsewhere in Ethiopia's transmission history (producing at times triple readings); 2) greater conformity to MT (→ 1.2.2); and 3) alignment, to the furthest extent possible, with European published editions, including chapter and verse divisions and updated names of books. Again, though, a conservatism toward the traditional text remains, so that, for example, even the corrupted incipit of Nehemiah goes uncorrected.

1.4.3.7.7 Question of a Hebraic or Academic Form of the Text

Several references exist among traditional and Western scholars to an Academic, or Scholars, or Hebraic edition of the Ethiopic biblical text. Although the theory of such a form of the text has become almost commonplace, two factors complicate its identification. First, traditional and Western scholars apply the same terminology to two dif-

ferent text forms. The former apply the nomenclature to a text related to a tradition of scholarly opinion (see the discussion of *Andemta* commentaries below) that more often than not closely approximate the Textus Receptus.⁴⁶ The latter employ the language to identify a text indelibly shaped by collations against a Masoretic Hebrew source.⁴⁷

Perhaps the best case for a Hebraic "recension" could be made for the considerably longer form of Eth-Cant that became common from the late-seventeenth century onward.⁴⁸ It appears in many Psalters, in at least three biblical manuscripts, and even in one manuscript of the Lectionary for Passion Week (for Saturday morning) (→ 13–17.2.3.2.1). In contrast, a less intrusive and expansive adjustment of a Transitional Text toward MT appears in two manuscripts of Daniel (Eth^{BN} Abb 35 and Eth^{BL} Add. 24,991).⁴⁹ Likewise, Eth^{BN} Abb 35 and Eth^{EMIP} 881 stand off from the rest of the manuscripts attesting to Eth-Prov, and may provide a witness to an Academic Text (→ 12.4.3.5).

Beyond these three cases, though, we are unable to document another book of the Ethiopic Old Testament in which multiple manuscripts (i.e., a family) bear witness to something that may fit the description of such a form of the text. In many of its books, Eth^{Cam} 1570 presents a form of the text that defies integration into any of the other families. According to a colophon in this manuscript, Empress Maryam Sənä (sixteenth century) commissioned the royal scribe, Ya'əqob the Israelite, to create a Bible corrected against the Hebrew version (f. 146^r). But until we find at least one more manuscript carrying the same text, we cannot claim that it represents a distinct family of manuscripts. Similarly, Eth^{Bruce} 75 carries a unique version of Eth-Lam (→ 13–17.2.3.4.5) that has as yet no counterpart to make it a family.

⁴⁶ Discovered through private conversations with Mersha Alehegne and Ralph Lee. See also Cowley, *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation*, 94–101.

⁴⁷ See, in particular, the discussion in Löfgren, *Daniel*, xlv–xlvii.

⁴⁸ See Cowley, *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation*, 94–101.

⁴⁹ Löfgren, *Daniel*, xlv–xlvii.

Nevertheless, the most recent studies based on large quantities of manuscripts fail to document the existence of such a form of the text apart from the exceptions noted above. The question, then, of the existence of an Academic or Hebraic edition remains one of the great *desiderata* for Ethiopian textual studies.

1.4.3.8 Traditional Commentaries (*Andämta*) and Later Text History

The *andämta* commentaries, so named because of the repeated use of the Amharic word እንደም, meaning “and [there is] one [who says]” to introduce different views, is a corpus of commentary on the whole Ethiopic Bible, as well as other important literature, such as the *Books of the Monks*, and important prayers such as the *Wudasse Maryam* attributed to St. Ephrem. The commentaries give explanations verse by verse, giving first the Gəʿəz text known as የሊቃውንት ዘር “the scholars’ text,” which is often referred to as just the ዘር “seed” or ንባብ “reading.” This is followed by an often colloquial translation into Amharic called ዘይቤ; and then a commentary or ትርጉሜ in the form of ሓተታ “explanations”; ታሪክ “illustrative stories”; and ጥቅስ, “quotations.” The biblical text used in the *andämta* closely resembles Eth^{1ES} 77, completed in 1927.⁵⁰ The commentary sections are sometimes extensive, with the most notable being the notes on Rev 6:2, which lists thirteen different interpretations of the “white horse.”⁵¹ The interpretations are quite varied, are often mutually exclusive, and sources are rarely given. For instance, the “white horse” interpretation is taken as referring to the time of Tiberius and the crucifixion,⁵² and then to the time of Constantine and the official adoption of Christianity by the

Roman Empire,⁵³ reflecting a view that any interpretation of the Bible is incomplete, and that there is more to discover.

The tradition is fundamentally oral. According to Ethiopian tradition, however, it was by an imperial decree of 1674 that the *andämta* commentaries were committed to writing to resolve some disputes on interpretation,⁵⁴ but it seems likely that the tradition substantially predates this. There is no direct evidence of the tradition’s earlier development, but there are some rare Gəʿəz commentaries bearing some similarity to the *andämta*.⁵⁵ There is, however, no Tigrinya commentary tradition, but it seems logical that the Amharic commentary became necessary as Gəʿəz ceased to be widely spoken. All of the internal evidence of the *andämta* corpus, through its use of “language, historical references to named Ethiopian emperors, other references to Ethiopian history, Ethiopian geographical references, Ethiopian teachers named in the commentary, general outlook, and MS evidence, conclusively demonstrates that the Gondar kingdom is the temporal and geographical provenance of the definitive formulation of the *Andämta* Corpus.”⁵⁶

Digitized copies of fifty-four *andämta* manuscripts are deposited in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church’s Mahibere Kidusan Research Centre, the Monastic Library of Debre Dimah St. George (East Gojjam), the British Library, and Hamburg University. Editions of commentaries on most books of the Bible are available printed by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, used by Cowley in his work on Revelation.⁵⁷ In recent years, several translations have been published by Harrassowitz in Germany,⁵⁸ but

⁵⁰ Anonymous, መጽሀፍ ቅዱስ በግዕዝና በአግርኛ የተጻፈ, Vol. 1: *The Protestant Canon: Genesis–Ester*; Vol. 2: *The Protestant Canon: Job–Malachai* (omitting Psalms); Vol. 3: *Jubilees, 1, 2, 3 Macabees, Enoch, Ezra Apocalypse, 1 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, ‘the rest of Jeremiah’, Susanna, ‘the rest of Daniel’*; Vol. 4: *Psalms, and the New Testament as Universally Accepted* (London: no publisher given, 1927); see also, Cowley, “Biblical Canon,” 320.

⁵¹ Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 229–32.

⁵² Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 231.

⁵³ Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 231.

⁵⁴ Yohannes (ed.), የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ ከልደተ ክርስቶስ እስከ ፳፻ [The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido Church History: From the Birth of Christ to the Year 2000 EC] (Addis Ababa: Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido Church, 2007), 187–88.

⁵⁵ For a discussion of these unpublished documents, see Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 35–45.

⁵⁶ Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 23.

⁵⁷ Cowley, *Apocalypse*, 159.

⁵⁸ M. Alehegne, *The Ethiopian Commentary on the Book of Genesis: Critical Edition and Translation* (Äthiopistische Forschungen 73; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011); M.A.

Cowley's seminal works remain unrivalled since their publication in the 1980s.⁵⁹ In his studies, Cowley sought to raise the deeper questions regarding the nature of the material, and its sources.

Cowley's primary focus was on the exegetical method, and he produced surprising evidence to show that a significant portion of the commentary material was sourced in the Church of the East, and in particular in the Arabic works of eleventh-century writer Abu'l-Faraj 'Abdallāh ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib al-'Irāqī,⁶⁰ in manuscripts mediated through Egypt⁶¹ most probably sourced by Metropolitan Sālama along with the biblical manuscripts mentioned above. Cowley also investigated

aspects of the hermeneutics in relation to Christology, the creation, the flood, and various other aspects. He concluded more broadly that the material was firmly to be placed in the Antiochene tradition of biblical exegesis, with the ultimate source of much material being Theodore of Mopsuestia, known in the commentary as መሳፍታን *māšafqan*, a metathesis of his Syriac title, ⲙⲟⲩⲩⲁⲛ "The Interpreter."

Amongst the many details in the commentary passages are a few textual variations, technically referred to as አብነት "example." Cowley regarded these as genuine variants, and Ralph Lee's work together with Tadese on Genesis confirmed that a significant proportion of the variations can be identified in the manuscript tradition.⁶² The አብነት are of several kinds, indicating variations in the spelling of names, or others that appear to favor one theological perspective over another. A proportion of the አብነት shows that scholars were aware of both LXX and MT readings of verses that were of didactic interest, and it is likely that they were introduced into the commentary during the production of the Academic text (→ 1.4.3.7.5).

Garcia, *Ethiopian Biblical Commentaries on the Prophet Micah* (Äthiopistische Forschungen 52; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999); K. Stoffregen-Pedersen, *Traditional Ethiopian Exegesis of the Book of Psalms* (Äthiopistische Forschungen 36; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995); T. Abraha, *La lettera ai Romani: Testo e commentari della versione Etiopica* (Äthiopistische Forschungen 57; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001).

⁵⁹ R.W. Cowley, "Preliminary Notes of the Baläandämta Commentaries," *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 9.1 (1971): 9–20; R.W. Cowley, *Ṣedqa haymānot: ya-bēta krestiyān haymānot wesānēwoč* (Addis Ababa: Berhannena Selam Press, 1971); R.W. Cowley, "The Beginnings of the Andem Commentary Tradition," *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 10.2 (1972): 1–16; R.W. Cowley, "Old Testament Introduction in the Andemta Commentary Tradition," *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 12.1 (1974): 133–75; R.W. Cowley, "New Testament Introduction in the Andemta Commentary Tradition," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 26 (1977): 144–92; R.W. Cowley, "Māmhər Esdros and His Interpretations," in *Sixth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies* (ed. G. Goldenberg; Tel Aviv: A.A. Balkema, 1980); R.W. Cowley, "Scholia of Ahob of Qatar on St John's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles," *Mus* 98 (1980): 329–43; Cowley, *Apocalypse*; Cowley, *Interpretation*.

⁶⁰ Graf, **G CAL* 1, 160–69.

⁶¹ Faultless has identified two manuscript traditions of his Gospel commentary, one representing his original writing, and a second one revised in Egypt, and reflecting more Miaphysite views. J. Faultless, "The Two Recensions of the Prologue to John in Iban Al-Ṭayyib's Commentary on the Gospels," in *Christians at the Heart of Islamic Rule: Church Life and Scholarship in 'Abbasid Iraq* (ed. D. Thomas; The History of Christian-Muslim Relations 1; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 177–98 (198). The sixteenth-century Ethiopic manuscript of the Gospel commentary, Eth^{BL Or} 732, appears to follow the Miaphysite recension produced in Egypt (Faultless, "Two Recensions," 187–88).

1.4.3.9 Appendix: Ethiopic Manuscripts Cited in the Articles on the Ethiopic Bible

Abb Gar – Abba Garima. The gospels date, perhaps, as early as the sixth century
 Ber Or Fl 3067 – Berlin, ms Orient. Fol. 3067; seventeenth century
 Ber Or Qu 283 – Berlin, ms Orient. Quart 283; sixteenth or seventeenth century
 Ber Or Qu 986 – Berlin, ms Orient. Quart 986; seventeenth or eighteenth century
 Ber Peter II, 42 – Berlin Staatsbibliothek, ms Petermann II Nachtrag 42; fifteenth century
 BFBS – British and Foreign Bible Society Octateuch (Dillmann Codex F), thirteenth or fourteenth century
 BL Add 18,994 – British Library, Add. 18,994; fifteenth century

⁶² In the 2012 annual SBL meeting, Ralph Lee reported on his work with Merigeta Rodas Tadese Ababa on "Textual Variations as Recorded in the Ethiopian *Andämta* Biblical Commentaries."

- BL Add 24,991 – British Library, Add. 24,991
 BL Or 484 – British Library Or. 484; eighteenth century
 BL Or 493 – British Library Or. 493; eighteenth century
 BL Or 501 – British Library, Or. 501; fifteenth century
 BL Or 732 – British Library, Or. 732; sixteenth century
 BN 2 – Bibliothèque Nationale, éth 2; 1666
 BN 5 – Bibliothèque Nationale, éth 5; fifteenth century
 BN 8 – Bibliothèque Nationale, éth 8; 1666
 BN 102 – Bibliothèque Nationale, éth 102 (Zotenberg's no. 3); thirteenth–fifteenth century
 BN Abb 35 – Bibliothèque Nationale, Abbadie 35; seventeenth century
 BN Abb 55 – Bibliothèque Nationale, Abbadie 55; ca. 1500
 BN Abb 57 – Bibliothèque Nationale, Abbadie 57; fifteenth century
 BN Abb 149 – Bibliothèque Nationale, Abbadie 149; nineteenth century
 Bruce 75 – Bodleian Bruce 75 (Dillmann VI); no date given
 Bruce 92 – Bodleian Bruce 92 (Dillmann XXVIII); eighteenth century
 Cam 1570 – Cambridge Add. 1570; 1588–1589
 Cer 75 – Cerulli 75; 1930
 Davies Axum 1 – Davies, Axum Church of Zion 1; late fifteenth/early sixteenth century
 Davies Axum 3 – Davies, Axum Church of Zion 3; 1664
 Davies Bizan 1 – Davies, Dabra Bizan Octateuch 1; 1530
 Davies Bizan 2 – Davies, Dabra Bizan Octateuch 2; 1416 or 1417
 Davies Kebran – Davies, Kebran Octateuch; 1417
 Davies Maq 1 – Davies, Maqale Octateuch 1; 1409
 EMIP 28 – EMIP 28, Eliza Codex 7; late nineteenth century
 EMIP 44 – EMIP 44, Eliza Codex 19; late twentieth century
 EMIP 87 – EMIP 87, Weiner Codex 4; twentieth century
 EMIP 141 – EMIP 141, Weiner Codex 36; nineteenth or twentieth century
 EMIP 145 – EMIP 145, Weiner Codex 40; nineteenth or twentieth century
 EMIP 161 – EMIP 161, Weiner Codex 56; 1865–1913
 EMIP 176 – EMIP 176, Alwan Codex 25; early twentieth century
 EMIP 625 – EMIP 625, Mekane Yesus Seminary 25; twentieth century
 EMIP 691 – EMIP 691, Capuchin Friary 37; twentieth century
 EMIP 743 – EMIP 743, Chelekot Silasie 2; eighteenth century
 EMIP 746 – EMIP 746, Chelekot Silasie 5; 1719
 EMIP 754 – EMIP 754, Chelekot Silasie 13; late eighteenth or early twentieth century
 EMIP 881 – EMIP 881, Chelekot Silasie 142; seventeenth century
 EMIP 949 – EMIP 949, Mekele Mikael 172; twentieth century
 EMIP 1029 – EMIP 1029, Mihur Gedam 54; fifteenth or sixteenth century
 EMIP 1063 – EMIP 1063, Addis Alem 21; nineteenth or twentieth century
 EMIP 1070 – EMIP 1070, Addis Alem 28; 1914
 EMIP 1074 – EMIP 1074, Addis Alem 32; seventeenth century
 EMIP 1088 – EMIP 1088, Addis Alem 46; nineteenth century
 EMIP 1095 – EMIP 1095, Addis Alem 53, owned by Nebura 'Ed Kifle; nineteenth century
 EMIP 1128 – EMIP 1128, Addis Alem 86; 1895 or 1896
 EMIP 1134 – EMIP 1134, Addis Alem 92; nineteenth century
 EMIP 2007 – EMIP 2007, Tweed Codex 58; eighteenth century
 EMLL 25 – EMLL 25, private library in Addis Ababa, originally from Gunda Gunde; sixteenth century
 EMLL 26 – EMLL 26, private library in Addis Ababa, originally from Gunda Gunde; fifteenth or sixteenth century
 EMLL 38 – EMLL 38, Church of Saint Raguel, Addis Ababa; late eighteenth century
 EMLL 51 – EMLL 51, Church of Saint Raguel, Addis Ababa; nineteenth century
 EMLL 348 – EMLL 348, church in Addis Ababa; twentieth century
 EMLL 554 – EMLL 554, church in Addis Ababa; early twentieth century
 EMLL 1163 – EMLL 1163, Holy Trinity Cathedral in Addis Ababa; eighteenth century
 EMLL 1481 – EMLL 1481, church in Karan, Eritrea; seventeenth century
 EMLL 1768 – EMLL 1768, Monastery of Ḥayq Eṣṭifānos; ca. 1500
 EMLL 2064 – EMLL 2064, private library in Wallo; fifteenth century
 EMLL 2080 – EMLL 2080, private library, Ḥayq Eṣṭifānos; early sixteenth century,⁶³ or fifteenth century⁶⁴

⁶³ Thus Uhlig, *Äthiopische Paläographie*, 419–20.

⁶⁴ Thus Sergew Hable Selassie, noted in *Catalogue of Ethiopian Manuscripts*, 6:147.

1.4.3 ETHIOPIC TRANSLATION(S)

359

- EMML 2082 – EMML 2082, Monastery of Ḥayq Eṣṭifānos; sixteenth or seventeenth century
- EMML 2093 – EMML 2093, Monastery of Ḥayq Eṣṭifānos; nineteenth century
- EMML 2388 – EMML 2388, Ankobarr Mika'el Church; 1768
- EMML 2436 – EMML 2436, Ankobarr Madḥane Alam Church; 1663
- EMML 2545 – EMML 2545, Ankobarr Giyorgis Church; 1908–1909
- EMML 3477 – EMML 3477, Church of Salla Dengay, Moga and Wadarra, Shoa; 1682–1706
- EMLL 4750 – EMML 4750, Boru Silasie Church, Wallo; eighteenth century
- EMML 6977 – EMML 6977, Jemmedu Maryam Church, Wallo; perhaps eleventh century or earlier.
- EMML 7942 – EMML 7942, provenance unknown; early twentieth century
- Frank Rüpp. II, 1 – Frankfurt MS. orient. Rüpp. II, 1; eighteenth century
- Frank Rüpp. II, 4 – Frankfurt MS. orient. Rüpp. II, 4 (Frankfurt Ms Or 10); eighteenth century
- GG 152 – Gunda Gunde 152; sixteenth century
- GG 181 – Gunda Gunde 181; sixteenth century
- Hav Cod – Haverford Codex Rendell Harris Collection 23 (EMIP 2111); seventeenth century
- Hunt 625 – Bodleian Aeth d.12, Huntington 625 (Dillmann VIII); fourteenth century
- IES 77 – Institute of Ethiopian Studies 77, the “Haile Selassie Bible,” Ge'ez and Amharic in parallel columns; 1934–1935
- IES 436 – Institute of Ethiopian Studies 436; fifteenth or sixteenth century
- IES 722 – Institute of Ethiopian Studies 722; late fifteenth century
- Martini 2 – Pistoia Biblioteca Forteguerriana Martini 2 (Zanutto 5); 1438
- Tana 9 – Tana 9; early fifteenth century
- UNES 10.18 – UNESCO 02.18, National Library, Addis Ababa; late nineteenth century
- UNES 10.04 – UNESCO 10.04, Dimma Qeddus Giyorgis Church, Gojjam; seventeenth or eighteenth century
- UNES 10.14 – UNESCO 10.14, Dimma Qeddus Giyorgis Church, Gojjam; eighteenth century
- UNES 10.35 – UNESCO 10.34, Dimma Qeddus Giyorgis Church, Gojjam; nineteenth century
- UNES 10.65 – UNESCO 10.65, Dimma Qeddus Giyorgis Church, Gojjam; eighteenth or nineteenth century
- Vat Borg 3 – Vatican Codex Borgianus Aeth. 3; 1314–1344
- Vat Etio 4 – Vatican Codex Etiopico 4; fifteenth century
- Vienna 16 – Vienna, Nationalbibliothek Cod. Aeth. 16; seventeenth century
- Bassano, **Beluy Kidan*.
- Bausi, A., “The Aksumite Background of the Ethiopic ‘Corpus Canonum,’” in *Proceedings of the xvth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies: Hamburg July 20–25, 2003* (ed. S. Uhlig; Äthiopistische Forschungen 65; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 532–41.
- Brandt, P., “Geflecht aus 81 Büchern – zur variantenreichen Gestalt des äthiopischen Kanons,” *Aethiopica* 3 (2000): 79–115.
- Brock, S., “Bibelübersetzungen 1:8 Die Übersetzungen ins Äthiopische: 2. Altes Testament,” *TRE* 6:206–07.
- Caraman, P., *The Lost Empire: The Story of the Jesuits in Ethiopia: 1555–1634* (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1985).
- Cowley, R.W., “The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today,” *Ostkirchliche Studien* 23 (1974): 318–23.
- Cowley, R.W., *The Traditional Interpretation of the Apocalypse of John in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 33; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Cowley, R.W., *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation: A Study in Exegetical Tradition and Hermeneutics* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 38; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- García, M.A., “Bible Commentary Tradition,” **EAE* 1:573–74.
- Hammerschmidt, E., *Ethiopian Studies at German Universities* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1970), 38–44.
- Heider, A., *Die äthiopische Bibelübersetzung: Ihre Herkunft, Art, Geschichte und ihr Wert für die alt- und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1902).
- Hoffmann, J., “Der arabische Einfluß in der äthiopischen Übersetzung der Johannes-Apokalypse,” *OrChr* 43 (1959): 24–53.
- Hoffmann, J., “The Ethiopic Version,” in *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (ed. B. Metzger; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 215–26.
- Hoffmann, J., “Limitations of Ethiopic in Representing Greek,” in *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (ed. B. Metzger; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 240–56.
- Knibb, M.A., “Hebrew and Syriac Elements in the Ethiopic Version of Ezekiel?” *JSS* 33 (1988): 11–35.
- Knibb, M.A., “The Ethiopic Text of Ezekiel and the Excerpts in *Gəbrä Ḥəməmat*,” *JSS* 34 (1989): 443–58.

freely. In the second era, however, his citations are influenced by a Syriac version closer to the Greek of LXX. Bearing in mind that the works of the second stage are later than 508 (the year in which Polycarp did his revision of the New Testament) and that in them the influence of a revision of the New Testament is found for the first time, Jenkins concludes that Philoxenus is making use of a new Syriac version of the Old Testament that could well be the work of Polycarp. In fact, another of Jenkins' important conclusions is that the citations of Isaiah in the late works of Philoxenus agree with Syl.

Jenkins also compares the marginal reading of Syh-Isa 9:6 with MT, Peshitta, LXX (and its Lucianic variants), and other citations of that verse in the works of Philoxenus, and he concludes that this marginal variant appears to have undergone an editorial revision: its basis is probably the Lucianic recension of Isaiah, but its final form is closer to the Syro-Hexapla than to the source of the Old Testament citations in Philoxenus. Finally, Jenkins, after a textual study, dismisses Gwynn's thesis that the Syriac translator of Cyril of Alexandria's *Glaphyra* has used OPh when translating his citations. Rather, they seem to be a direct translation from the Greek of the work.

In conclusion, it appears that Philoxenus, in his final stage, used a Syriac translation closer to the Greek than to the Peshitta. Specifically, his citations of Isaiah agree with Syl, which may be the only manuscript witness to a hypothetical OPh.

Ceriani, A.M., "Esaiae Fragmenta Syriaca: Versionis Anonymae et Recensionis Jacobi Edesseni," in A.M. Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliotheca Ambrosiana* v.1 (Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1868), 1–40.

Delekat, L., "Die syrolukianische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaja und das Postulat einer alttestamentlichen Vetus Syra," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 21–54.

Fox, D.J., *The Matthew-Luke Commentary of Philoxenus: Text, Translation and Critical Analysis* (SBLDS 43; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

Gwynn, J., *Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909).

Jenkins, R.G., *The Old Testament Quotations of Philoxenus of Mabbug* (Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

Lebon, J., "La version philoxénienne de la Bible," *RHE* 12 (1911): 413–36.

1.4.5 Syro-Hexapla

1.4.5.1 Why a New Syriac Translation?

In order to understand the birth of a new Syriac version of the Bible, it is necessary to understand the circumstances that surrounded the Syriac-speaking Christian communities, since it was they, and not the Jewish community, who came to use and transmit the first version, the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4).

The Roman province of Syria, where Christianity was born and expanded, was bilingual for the first few centuries of the present era: Aramaic (and its dialect, Syriac) shared daily life with Greek, the language of empire and commerce. Moreover, the great theological centers of Syriac Christianity, Edessa, Nisibis, and Arbela, were very well connected to Antioch, the natural outlet to the sea in that area, a commercial center and a powerful center for the diffusion of Greek culture.¹

These circumstances make it understandable that the Syriac-speaking Christian community, which used the Peshitta, should be open to the influence of the great theology of the Greek Fathers, who used the Greek translation (LXX). A testimony to this influence is the great number of Greek works translated into Syriac. In time, especially in the work of the translation into Syriac of the Greek theology based on LXX, conflict began to be felt, for the Scripture citations in the Greek Fathers did not coincide in form with those of the Syriac translation. In the background, the battle began to be waged that had already been engaged on other fronts: the tension between the *Hebraica Veritas*, to which the Peshitta testified, and the apostolicity of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), which the Greek Fathers transmitted.

¹ Cf. H.J.W. Drijvers, "Syrian Christianity and Judaism," in *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (eds. J. Lieu, J. North, and T. Rajak; London: Routledge, 1992), 124–46.

As early as the fourth century, one of the most important representatives of the opinion in favor of LXX was Theodore of Mopsuestia, a Syriac exegete who wrote in Greek and who had an enormous influence on the Syriac church of the East and the West. His commentaries on Scripture were immediately translated into Syriac and his exegesis was followed by many authors. Theodore of Mopsuestia considered that the best way to approach the original Hebrew text was through LXX rather than through the Peshitta. The known and providential origin of LXX (seventy elders who, working independently, came up with the same translation), its word-for-word translation, and the use made of it by the apostles made it superior to the Peshitta, which was of unknown origin and which departed from the Hebrew text in its concern for the end meaning.²

As a result of this context, the Peshitta itself, which continued to be used as a version of the Bible, began to experience the influence of LXX, taking into itself, through the process of manuscript transmission, many secondary readings that originated with LXX and that were known through the Syriac translations of the exegetical commentaries of the Greek Fathers.³ It is not surprising, therefore, that as time went by the need was felt to have available a Syriac translation of Scripture made from the Greek of LXX.

The first attempt at a translation from the Greek was promoted by Philoxenus of Mabbug, at the beginning of the sixth century. At his request, a translation that seems to have consisted of the New Testament (a new translation, more literal) and a part (Psalms, Isaiah?) or all of the Old Testament (translated from LXX), was completed in 508 C.E. Unfortunately, no textual record of the complete or partial translation of the Old Testament has come down to us.⁴ A century later, Paul of Tella would

carry out the only complete translation into Syriac of the Greek Bible (LXX → 1.3.1.1) that has come down to us, known as the Syro-Hexapla (Syh).

1.4.5.2 Paul of Tella and the Origins of the Syro-Hexapla

Around 612–13, the Syriac patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius, arrived in the city of Alexandria, fleeing, together with five of his bishops, from the advance of the troops of the Persian king, Khosrau II. They all found refuge in the monastery of Enaton, where two of the bishops, Paul of Tella and Thomas of Harkel, at the urging of Athanasius, were to dedicate their time to producing a new translation of the Old Testament and New Testament, respectively. This version would be characterized by extreme literalness with regard to its source, the Greek. The new version of the Old Testament prepared by Paul of Tella would be known as the Syro-Hexapla, because it was based on the fifth Greek column of Origen's Hexapla (Hex; → 1.3.1.2).

The work must have been completed between 615 and 617, if we pay heed to the dates that are indicated by the colophons preserved in some ancient manuscripts.⁵ Be that as it may, the work had to have been completed before the devastation of Alexandria in 619. The unity of style of the whole translation leads to the conclusion that Paul of Tella was the only one in charge of the whole work, regardless of whether he may have been assisted by a team of collaborators (among them, the colophons highlight the deacon Mār Tūmā, who should not be confused with the bishop Thomas of Harkel).

The Syro-Hexapla did not manage to supplant the most widespread Syriac version, the Peshitta, and in fact, many doubt that it was intended to, given the excessive literalism with which it was conceived. Precisely because of this, it was an instrument much appreciated by theologians (in the oriental church also),⁶ who found in this

² Cf. Ter Haar Romeny, "The Peshitta and its Rivals."

³ Cf. the cases that Carbajosa offers for the Psalter (I. Carbajosa, "The Syriac Old Testament Tradition," in *Eastern Crossroads: Essays on Medieval Christian Legacy* [ed. J.P. Monferrer-Sala; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007], 109–30), and → 10.3.4.

⁴ Cf. → 1.4.4.

⁵ Cf. Vööbus, *The Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 37–40.

⁶ As can be deduced from the letter of the patriarch Timothy I and from the testimony of Isodad of Merw (ninth century).

version a means of access to the readings of LXX and the other Greek versions. In the thirteenth century, Bar Hebraeus undertook a campaign in favor of the Syro-Hexapla in which he exalted the virtues of this latter version in comparison to the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4).⁷ He had little success, if we take note of the few manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla that have come down to us.

1.4.5.3 *Vorlage* of the Translation

The name Syro-Hexapla derives from the assumption that the Syriac version was based, as some colophons state, on Origen's work in six columns (Hexapla). Paul of Tella is supposed to have translated the fifth column (Origen's recension of LXX) into Syriac and to have noted in the margins the alternative readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (→ 1.3.1.2), as can be seen in the manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla that have come down to us. Some have even gone so far as to state that Paul of Tella worked from the original of Hexapla (→ 1.3.1.2), brought to Alexandria from Caesarea,⁸ a hypothesis that must be discounted as it finds no support in the sources.

The question of the Greek *Vorlage* of the Syro-Hexapla must be considered on a book-by-book basis, since the manuscripts that have come down to us have also transmitted the colophons, translated into Syriac, that were found in their Greek sources. The information found in them varies from one book to another. In some books, no colophon at all has been transmitted, for which reason we can do no more than make suppositions based on other books. As we examine the colophons, we find that the books of the Syro-Hexapla have been translated from copies of the "Hexapla" (ܗܝܚܘܢܩܝܢܐ), the "Tetrapla" (ܚܘܪܘܩܝܢܐ), and even of the "Heptapla" (ܗܝܚܘܢܩܝܢܐ).⁹ In most of the cases, the

colophons allude to the activity of the copyists, and even correctors, Eusebius (died in 339) and Pamphilus (died in 309), who carried out a most important labor of preservation and transmission of Origen's work in Caesarea some decades after the death of the Alexandrian.

In the books of Proverbs, Qohelet (linked in the same manuscript as Proverbs), Canticles, and Lamentations, the colophons indicate that the Greek manuscript from which they are translated is a copy of an exemplar of Hexapla copied in turn by Eusebius and Pamphilus (→ 11.4.4.1). In other cases, it is indicated that the Greek copy originated in Hexapla but has been corrected or compared (by Pamphilus or Eusebius) to another manuscript (3 Kingdoms), to the Tetrapla (Joshua), or to manuscripts of SP (Exodus and Numbers).

In other books, the colophon refers to a Greek *Vorlage* in the Tetrapla (Judges, Ruth, Job, Minor Prophets, and Daniel), sometimes corrected with Hexapla (Genesis). The books of Job (linked by its colophon to the Tetrapla; → 11.4.4.1) and Psalms (without any indication about its origin, although with Hexaplaric readings in the margins) constitute a rare exception within the Syro-Hexapla. Indeed, the Greek text of LXX to which both books testify is distinct from what we know of the fifth column of Hexapla. Perhaps this is a result of the work of recension carried out by Eusebius and Pamphilus in Caesarea,¹⁰ or perhaps of the Lucianic recension to which readings from the other Greek versions have been added.¹¹

Finally, in 4 Kingdoms, the colophon presents the Heptapla as the basis from which the book has been translated into Syriac, while in Isaiah

"Colophons of the Syrohexapla," 261–77; Jenkins, "Hexaplaric Marginalia," 73–87.

¹⁰ Jenkins, "Hexaplaric Marginalia."

¹¹ A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), 60–70; R.J.V. Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History and the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (eds. R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 178–204.

⁷ Cf. Mingana, "Syriac Versions," 395.

⁸ Cf. Torrey, "First Esdras and Nehemiah," 65–74; K. Lake and H. Lake, *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus et Friderico-Augustanus Lipsiensis: The Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), x.

⁹ Cf. Vööbus, *The Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 44–47; Mercati, *Nuove note di letteratura biblica*, 1–6, 26–48; Jenkins,

the final inscription refers neither to Hexapla nor to the Tetrapla, but to a copy that Eusebius and Pamphilus corrected in Origen's own library.

The disparity of information provided by the colophons makes it necessary to think that the translation of Paul of Tella is not based on a single Greek codex but on several sources, even if they are all linked to the Hexaplaric work of Origen (with the possible exception of Isaiah and Psalms?), unless we prefer to think that the only codex that Paul of Tella used is responsible for having integrated different Hexaplaric traditions into a single manuscript.

Still to be answered is the question of what the form was of the Origenian work from which the Syro-Hexapla was derived. Hexapla? Tetrapla? Heptapla? All of these? This is a question still very much discussed today (→ 11.4.4.1). It is evident that the expression Hexapla refers to the original work in six columns of the Alexandrian theologian and, in this sense, the Syro-Hexapla as a whole refers to that initial work (its body reflects the fifth column and the margins the rest of the variant readings). However, it is hard to imagine that Origen's work was copied retaining all six columns and, therefore, that it was spread as such by Christian communities. On the contrary, the record indicates that perhaps Origen himself, and undoubtedly one of those who preserved his work, Eusebius and Pamphilus, copied the original work in the Tetrapla format, eliminating the first two columns (the Hebrew text and the Greek transcription of it).¹² Concerning this, it is indicative that a good number of colophons in the Syro-Hexapla refer explicitly to this format.

So then, does Tetrapla indicate a four-column format? Not necessarily. It could instead indicate a text that testifies to four versions, that is, a format identical to the one we find in the Syro-Hexapla (and in Greek codices LXX^Q and LXX⁸⁸): in the body, the Origenian recension of LXX (fifth column of Hexapla) and, in the margins, variant readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.¹³

¹² Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6.16.

¹³ Cf. Jenkins, "Colophons of the Syrohexapla."

In fact, the colophon of the Syro-Hexapla to the Minor Prophets could be read in this sense: "The Twelve Prophets were taken in transmission from a copy that was like the version of the Tetrapla." It seems more logical that Origen's work should have been transmitted this way, just as the manuscript tradition testifies. If this is the *Vorlage* of the Syro-Hexapla, it could well be called the Syro-Tetrapla, as Jenkins suggests.¹⁴

1.4.5.4 Manuscript Testimonies and Editions

The principal manuscript witness to the Syro-Hexapla is manuscript C 313 inf. (eighth–ninth century, from the Syrian monastery in the Valley of Nitria) in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, which appears to form part of a larger codex, the first part of which (Pentateuch and the Historical Books) was known by Andreas Masius (1514–1573), but is lost today. The part that has been preserved in the Ambrosian Codex contains, in this order, the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Wisdom, Sirach, Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Daniel (with Greek additions: Susanna, Bel and the Dragon), Ezekiel, and Isaiah. Ceriani published a photolithographic version of this codex in 1874.¹⁵

The remainder of the books have been coming to light progressively in different manuscripts, most dating from the seventh to ninth centuries. Joshua was the only book that Masius managed to edit before the first part of the Ambrosian Codex was lost.¹⁶ It is also found, with lacunae, in manuscript BL Add. 12.133. Exodus (manuscript BL Add. 12.134), Judges and Ruth (manuscript BL Add. 17.103),¹⁷ 3 Kingdoms (manuscript BL Add. 14.437), and 4 Kingdoms (manuscript Par. Syr. 27) have been preserved in their entirety. Genesis, Numbers, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy (these last two with a great many lacunae) were partially attested in some manuscripts and were edited by

¹⁴ Jenkins, "Colophons of the Syrohexapla," 268.

¹⁵ Ceriani, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus*.

¹⁶ Masius, *Josuae*.

¹⁷ Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*.

Ceriani,¹⁸ de Lagarde,¹⁹ Goshen-Gottstein,²⁰ and Baars.²¹ In 1964, Vööbus discovered the Midyat Codex (twelfth century), which contains the books of the Pentateuch, from Gen 32:9 through Deut 32:25,²² with some lacunae within it, and with this he managed to complete the majority of the Syh-Pent, although some passages still remain unat- tested.

Of the books 1–2 Kingdoms (1–2 Samuel), 3 Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1–2 Chronicles, only small frag- ments or chapters in lectionaries are preserved and especially in chains of citations.²³

1.4.5.5 Translation Techniques

The Syro-Hexapla translation is extremely slavish. It reproduces the Greek of its *Vorlage* word for word, including the order, constantly violating Syr- iac grammar (in its attempt to reproduce all the details of the Greek) and syntax.²⁴ Most notable are the use of the separate possessive pronouns by way of the possessive particle ܐܘܪܝܢ (departing from the custom of the Peshitta, which uses the forms suffixed to the noun), the utilization of the particle ܐܘܪܝܢ “while” with the perfect, and the abun- dance of compound verbal forms. It is understand- able that a translation with these characteristics would not supplant the popular or Peshitta version,

and would, rather, serve “academic” functions, be- ing used by exegetes as a means of accessing the Greek versions. Even so, in some manuscripts, indi- cations for liturgical reading have been found. The characteristics of the translation are kept constant throughout the whole work, a sign that the hand, or at least the authority, of Paul of Tella permeated all the labor.

1.4.5.6 Value for Textual Criticism

The slavish character of its translation represents the greatest virtue of the Syro-Hexapla in the field of textual criticism. In fact, it constitutes a privileged witness to the Greek text of the fifth column of the Hexapla (Origen’s recension of LXX; → 1.3.1.2) and of the other Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and in some books such as Psalms, the sixth and seventh columns; → 1.3.1.2), which, in many cases, have not come down to us in their original language. Indeed, the work of Origen was lost and we can only gain access to it through the Syro-Hexapla and some Greek manuscripts (especially LXX⁹ and LXX⁸⁸) that attest the fifth column and the readings of the three rival Greek versions. Even so, there are a good number of variants of these three versions that have only been preserved in the margins of the Syro-Hexapla.

Another of the virtues of the Syro-Hexapla is that it has preserved the Aristarchian symbols that Ori- gen used in his fifth column to indicate the Greek material that was not present in LXX but was in the Hebrew text, and vice versa. Thus it is understand- able that the great work of reconstruction of the Hexapla carried out by Field²⁵ (today in large part superseded by the discoveries of new Hexaplaric material) had as its main basis the witness of the Syro-Hexapla. The extreme literalness of its trans- lation allowed Field to restore with considerable certainty the Hexaplaric text of LXX and the vari- ants of the other Greek versions.

Although the literalness of the Syro-Hexapla translation facilitates the reconstruction of Greek readings, it is necessary to be prudent and study well the Syriac-Greek lexical correspondences in

¹⁸ Ceriani, *Pentateuchi Syro-Hexaplaris quae supersunt cum notis*.

¹⁹ P. de Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae a Paulo de Lagarde Collectae quae ad Philologiam Sacram pertinent* (Göttingen: Dietrich, 1892).

²⁰ Goshen-Gottstein, “Neue Syrohexaplafragmente,” 162–83; Goshen-Gottstein, “A New Text from the Syrohexapla,” 19–28.

²¹ Baars, *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*.

²² Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla*.

²³ Torrey, “Portions of First Esdras and Nehemiah”; J. Gwynn, *Remnants of the Later Syriac Version of the Bible*; Goshen-Gottstein, “Neue Syrohexaplafragmente,” 162–83; De Boer, “A Syro-Hexaplar text of the Song of Hannah,” 8–15; Baars, *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*; Liljeström, “Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla,” 49–61.

²⁴ Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, 1–59. Cf. also M. Liljeström, “Observations on the Mode of Translations in the Syrohexapla,” 89–100, and Lund, “Syntactic Features of the Syrohexapla of Ezekiel,” 67–81.

²⁵ Field, *Hexapla*.

each book²⁶ (especially in those cases in which the alternative readings of the three Greek versions have been preserved) in order to avoid erroneous back translations. A second caution is related to the confidence we have in both the Aristarchian symbols that the Syro-Hexapla has transmitted to us and in the attributions of the variant readings to the various Greek versions. Law has carried out an exhaustive study of the asterisked and obelized material in Syh-3 Kgdms that charts the course to follow in each book to ensure the reliability of access to the Hexaplaric material.²⁷ His study has made it possible to recover our confidence in the transmission of the Aristarchian symbols, which the research of Fritsch on Proverbs had called into question.²⁸ Barthélemy, for his part, has shown that, on occasion, the Syro-Hexapla erroneously attributes an alternative reading to a particular Greek version; he also offers some criteria for identifying possible errors in the Syriac version.²⁹

Moreover, the Syro-Hexapla has preserved the LXX text of Daniel that, shortly after Origen, was supplanted in the Greek Christian manuscript tradition by the text of "Theodotion." Outside of the Syro-Hexapla, only a few Greek manuscripts preserve the original text of LXX-Dan.

Baars, W., *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts: Edited, Commented upon and Compared with the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).

de Boer, P.A.H., "A Syro-Hexaplar Text of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel ii.1-10," in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday 20 August 1962* (eds. D.W. Thomas and W.D. McHardy; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 8-15.

Ceriani, A.M., *Pentateuchi Syro-Hexaplaris quae supersunt cum notis: Accedunt nonnulla alia fragmenta Syriaca* (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1863).

²⁶ In this regard, the correspondences offered by Weitzman and Hiebert for the books of Hosea and Psalms, respectively, are useful: Weitzman, "The Reliability of Retroversions of the Three from the Syrohexapla," 317-59; Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History."

²⁷ Law, *Origenes Orientalis*.

²⁸ Fritsch, "Treatment," 169-81.

²⁹ Barthélemy, **Studies*, 469-97.

Ceriani, A.M., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus: Photolithographice editus curante et adnotante* (Monumenta Sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim bibliothecae Ambrosianae 7; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1874).

Fritsch, C.T., "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs," *JBL* 72 (1953): 169-81.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., "Neue Syrohexaplafragmente," *Bib* 37 (1956): 162-83.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., "A New Text from the Syrohexapla: Deuteronomy 34," in *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus: Studies in Early Christian Literature and its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East* (ed. R.H. Fischer; Chicago: Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1977), 19-28.

Gwynn, J., *Remnants of the Later Syriac Version of the Bible, Part 2: Old Testament: Extracts from the Syro-Hexaplar Version of the Septuagint Made in the Seventh Century by Paul of Tella: Genesis, Leviticus, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Nehemiah: With Introductions, Notes, and Reconstructed Greek Text* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1909).

ter Haar Romeny, R.B., "The Peshitta and its Rivals: On the Assessment of the Peshitta and Other Versions of the Old Testament in Syriac Exegetical Literature," *The Harp* 11-12 (1998-1999): 21-31.

Jenkins, R.G., "Colophons of the Syrohexapla and the Textgeschichte of the Recensions of Origen," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (ed. C.E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 261-77.

Jenkins, R.G., "Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question," in Salvesen, **Hexapla*, 7-87.

Law, T.M., "La versión syro-hexaplaire et la transmission textuelle de la Bible grecque," in *L'Ancien Testament en syriaque* (eds. F. Briquel Chatonnet and Ph. Le Moigne; Études Syriaques 5; Paris: Geuthner, 2008), 101-20.

Law, T.M., *Origenes Orientalis: The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms* (De Septuaginta Investigationes 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

Liljeström, M., "Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla: The Song of Hannah in Barberiniani Orientali 2 as a Test Case," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 49-61.

Liljeström, M., "Observations on the Mode of Translations in the Syrohexapla," in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography v: Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project, New Orleans 2009, and Other Contri-*

Both authors agree in pointing out that Jacob used the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) as the basis for his revision. This text would have then been corrected with manuscripts of the LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), especially of the Antiochian or Lucianic recensions (→ 1.3.1.2), and with the Syro-Hexapla version (→ 1.4.5), through which he could have had access to Hexaplaric readings. The fact that the division of the text in 1–2 Samuel follows the tradition of the Lucianic manuscripts (that conclude 2 Samuel at 1 Kings 2:11) says much about the nature of the Greek manuscripts that Jacob utilized to revise his Syriac text. The final result was still to be completed with glosses by Jacob himself, or from the commentaries of Severus of Antioch, with the objective of clarifying difficult passages. The result is an eclectic text of little value for textual criticism, if we exclude the information that it can provide about the Lucianic manuscripts utilized to correct the text.

It remains to be clarified whether Jacob, in his work of revision, had access to the Hebrew Bible and whether he knew Hebrew well enough to consult the original text in complicated passages. Some authors, on the basis of his handling of Hebrew sources, think that Jacob was trilingual (Syriac, Greek, and Hebrew). Salvesen sums up the different opinions about this and concludes, after a study of various works by the bishop of Edessa, that nothing proves that Jacob knew Hebrew or consulted the biblical text in that language. In her opinion, access to the Hebrew sources came to him through the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the “Hebraios,” or through commentators who, in turn, used those versions. The most that can be granted him is “a minimal knowledge of Hebrew biblical tradition.”⁴

1.4.6.3 Character of the Revision

Jacob of Edessa's revision goes beyond the production of a new biblical text in Syriac. He introduced into his work the first Syriac “Masorah,” incorporat-

Ms. Vat. Sir. 5 e la recensione del V.T. di Giacomo d'Edessa,” *OrChr* 2 (1902): 409–20; for Wisdom, W. Baars, “Ein neugefundenes Bruchstück aus der syrischen Bibelrevision des Jakob von Edessa,” *VT* 18 (1968): 548–54.

⁴ Salvesen, “Did Jacob of Edessa Know Hebrew?” 457–67.

ing an apparatus of marginal glosses that clarified the pronunciation of some terms (the Syriac text was not vocalized) and noted textual variants. He also incorporated a division into chapters and summaries of content.

Taking as a basis the text of the Peshitta, what were the criteria that guided Jacob of Edessa's revision? The studies of Saley and Salvesen on 1–2 Samuel can serve as a starting point. On the one hand, the language of the Peshitta has been updated, adapting it to the Syriac of the early eighth century. For example, the word ܐܘܪܝܫܝܢ “city” is replaced with ܐܘܪܝܫܝܢ “town,” and the verb ܘܫܘܢ “inform” with ܘܫܘܢܐ “to make known,” changes attributable perhaps to a shift in the semantic range of the original terms in the Peshitta. The particles ܘܟܝܢ “also/and,” ܘܗܝܢܢ “then,” and ܘܗܝܢܢ “now” are frequently added, corresponding to the Greek particles *καί* “and,” *δή* “then,” and *νῦν* “now,” respectively. Other additions are the relative pronouns that clarify the ambiguous Syriac relative pronoun ܐܘܪܝܫܝܢ, the demonstrative pronouns to reflect the Greek definite article, and the perfect of the verb ܐܘܪܝܫܝܢ “to be” as an auxiliary corresponding to the Greek imperfect.⁵

On the other hand, Jacob's text tries to resolve the sense difficulties and ambiguities that the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) presents. When the Greek alternative text is clear, he incorporates its reading (sometimes it is a reading exclusive to the Lucianic recension; → 1.3.1.2) or he even corrects the Peshitta according to the sense of that reading.⁶ Sometimes an accident of translation (or of manuscript transmission) has brought about *haplography* in the Peshitta, which is remedied in Jacob's revision by incorporating the missing text from the Greek. At other times, the Greek text does not clarify the difficult reading in the Peshitta, in which case Jacob of Edessa introduces explanations of his own.

⁵ Cf. Salvesen, *The Books of Samuel*, xi–xii.

⁶ It cannot always be clarified whether the Greek reading comes directly from Greek manuscripts or by way of the Syro-Hexapla. In the studies on 1 Samuel, unfortunately, the attestations of the Syro-Hexapla (→ 1.4.5) are very scarce and, because of this, the studies of Saley and Salvesen are limited on this point.

However, there are times when the text of the Peshitta is not ambiguous but is different from the Greek (→ 1.3.1.1). When the readings are complementary, Jacob's revision incorporates both; when they are mutually exclusive, one of them is incorporated in the margin as a variant.

In spite of the description just given, Jacob's revision does not follow a consistent method. At times, we would expect a correction based on a Greek reading but it is not made. Or rather, we cannot find logical reasons for many of his additions and alterations. The final result is an expanded and clarified biblical text that shows that Jacob of Edessa, in his relationship with Scripture, was more concerned about the content (what the text means) than about the form (what is transmitted in the manuscripts).⁷

What was the final objective of this revision? Was it intended to replace the other Syriac or Greek versions as a biblical text for use in liturgy, devotion, and study? It is hard to say. In some manuscripts of this revision, indications of its liturgical use are preserved. Nevertheless, we can say that his peculiar version did not prevail, as is shown by the fact that manuscript transmission was soon interrupted. Very probably, the manuscripts that are preserved come from the same exemplar, which was copied in 719, a few years after the death of Jacob and in the geographical environs where the revision originated. There are no indications that this revision had any influence at a later time or further away from this geographical area. The fact that the text contained obvious expansions, together with the decline of the Greek language in the monophysite Syrian Orthodox Church and the prejudices that surrounded the memory of Jacob of Edessa, must have been decisive in this revision being condemned to oblivion.

1.4.6.4 Manuscript Evidence and Editions

The five manuscripts of Jacob of Edessa's version that are preserved are the following: BL Add. 14429 (1–2 Samuel; 1 Kings 1:1–2:11; → 3–5.2.4); BL Add.

⁷ Cf. Salvesen, "Jacob of Edessa and the Text of Scripture," 244.

14441 (Isaiah; → 6–9.2.4.4); Vat. Sir. 5 (Ezekiel; → 6–9.2.4.4); BN Syr. 26 (Pentateuch; → 2.5.4.3); BN Syr. 27 (Daniel and Susanna; → 18.4.4.2, → 11.3.3). In addition, Baars has published a fragment of Wisdom according to this revision (Wis 2:12–24; → 11.15.3).⁸ The only complete book that has been published so far is that of 1–2 Samuel.⁹

ter Haar Romeny, R.B., (ed.) *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of his Day* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Saley, R.J., *The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 9; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

Salvesen, A., "Jacob of Edessa and the Text of Scripture," in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World* (eds. L.V. Rutgers et al.; CBET 22; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 235–45.

Salvesen, A., *The Books of Samuel in the Syriac Version of Jacob of Edessa* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 10; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

Salvesen, A., "Did Jacob of Edessa Know Hebrew?" in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (eds. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg; JSOTSup 333; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 457–67.

Ignacio Carbajosa

1.4.7 Armenian Translations

1.4.7.1 Origin and Historical Data

The story of the translation of the Bible into Armenian is related in Koriwn's *Life of Mashtots*, written in the early 440s.¹ Here, we learn that it was Mashtots' who, ca. 406, invented the Armenian alphabet, in Syria; the city is not named but he had met with the bishops of Edessa and Amida. Following this, he travelled to Samosata where a scribe designed the shape of the letters. The work of translation into Armenian began with the book of Proverbs,² perhaps because it stood at the be-

⁸ Baars, "Ein neugefundenes Bruchstück."

⁹ Salvesen, *The Books of Samuel*.

¹ Abeghian, *Life*.

² Koriwn, *Life*, ch. 8.

ginning of a manuscript that included only a part of the Bible. The language of the parent text is not specified: Was it Syriac or Greek? Given the close ties to Syria, it makes sense that the translators worked from Syriac manuscripts but Koriwn says that Mashtots' had sent students to Samosata to study Greek. At any rate, this question of a Syriac or Greek parent text continues to bedevil research on the various parts of the Armenian Bible.³

Mashtots' and his students returned to Armenia and continued their work of translation. He then travelled to Constantinople where he was received by the Greek Patriarch, Atticus, and returned home with books of the Greek church fathers. Following further preaching trips,⁴ Mashtots' and Sahak devoted themselves to improving the literary situation of Armenia. The Catholicos Sahak began to write and translate, as formerly. From what language(s) is not specified. Then students were sent to Syria and on to the West and sometime after the Council of Ephesus (431) these students returned to Armenia with "reliable (հուսաւորութիւն) copies of the God-given writings," i.e., the Scriptures, patristic works, and church canons. Next Koriwn states, in ch. 19:

the blessed Sahak, who earlier had rendered the collection of ecclesiastical books from the Greek language into Armenian – as well as much true wisdom of the holy patriarchs – again, with Eznik, set himself to establish (հաստատել) the earlier, chanced-upon and hurried translations by means of the true (ճշմարիտ) exemplars that had been brought. And they also translated much commentary on the Bible.

The question is, what does հաստատել (lit., "he was establishing") mean? Did they *revise* the earlier translations and, if so, *all* of them? Indeed, had *all* the Scriptures been translated by that time? What is meant by հուսաւորութիւն "reliable" and ճշմարիտ "true"? Were the manuscripts brought back from Constantinople thought to contain, say, the most

highly regarded form of the text in that city? In the light of modern textual research, I am inclined to think that reference is being made, for the Old Testament, to manuscripts that reflected the work of the great Origen and Lucian (→ 1.3.1.2): for details, see the contributions devoted to individual books (e.g., → 2.5.5; → 11.4.5).

This two-stage presentation of the work of translation, i.e., initial translation and "establishing" it, has led to a frequently repeated generalization that the Armenian Bible was translated from Syriac (→ 1.3.4) and then revised on the basis of Greek witnesses. What actually occurred is a far more complex process than this simple assertion suggests (for example, → 2.5.5 [Pentateuch]; → 10.4.5 [Psalms]; → 18.4.5 [Daniel]; → 20.4.5 [Chronicles]).

1.4.7.2 Scope of the Corpus; Manuscripts

Armenian manuscripts of the Bible generally contain the books included in the LXX, with the books of the so-called Apocrypha following the historical books, and with the Twelve Prophets following Isaiah. There are about one hundred complete Bibles extant; in addition, there are partial Bibles that contain only the Pentateuch, the Wisdom books, the Old Testament or part of it, other combinations, or, in the case of Psalms, sometimes a single book. For example, about one hundred manuscripts preserve Deuteronomy, 150 contain Job, and 125 contain Daniel. These manuscripts are preserved largely in four major manuscript libraries: the Matenadaran (Yerevan), the Jerusalem Patriarchate, San Lazzaro (Venice), and Vienna, in order of size of collection.

Dating of the Textual Tradition

Though the Armenian translation of the Bible was made in the fifth century, manuscripts date predominantly from the medieval period, from the thirteenth century and later. In the Cilician period, there was a massive growth in manuscript production and, as it happens, rather developed text forms came to dominate the textual tradition by the sheer number of witnesses attesting them. A few earlier text fragments are extant, such as the eighth-century fragment of Job that contains

³ For examples, see Cowe, "Two Armenian Versions."

⁴ Koriwn, *Life*, chs. 16–18.

about two dozen verses from Job 37 and 38 (→ 11.4.5) or the fragments preserved as fly leaves in later manuscripts.

1.4.7.3 Zohrapian's Edition

The principal edition of the Armenian Bible is that of Zohrapian, published in 1805. It is a diplomatic edition: manuscript Venice 1508, dated 1319, is printed as text and, for the Old Testament, six other manuscripts and the edition of Oskan (1666)⁵ are cited in an apparatus. Zohrapian uses imprecise terminology like “some witnesses” or “one exemplar” to identify readings at variance from his base text in an apparatus, but his edition stands head and shoulders above many editions of texts in his day because he does not tamper with the text: it is a faithful copy of his base manuscript. Manuscripts can change their textual character from one book to another and that is true of manuscript Venice 1508: in Deuteronomy (→ 2.2.5) and Job (→ 11.4.5), its text is a developed text with many secondary readings, but in Psalms (→ 10.4.5) it is a first-rate witness to the original Armenian text; in Ecclesiastes (→ 13–17.2.5.3) it again preserves an early form of the text. That is, as is true of all manuscripts, collations are required to assess the textual purity of individual witnesses.

1.4.7.4 History of Research: Arm 1 and Arm 2

The modern study of the Armenian version began with Lyonnet.⁶ His *Les Origines* has deservedly influenced all subsequent scientific research because of the methodology that Lyonnet adopted. He attempts to “get behind” the late type of text preserved by Zohrapian's manuscript, and the text of the Gospels in his edition, to recover evidence of a translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron*. In order to recover the earlier text form, he examines quotations of the Gospels in Armenian historical and ecclesiastical authors; Armenian translations of Greek and Syriac ecclesiastical writings, under the assumption that translators would replace rather than translate quotations of the text; the Georgian

version (→ 1.4.8), often thought to derive, at least in part, from the Armenian; and, finally, the text as preserved in Armenian liturgical books, such as lectionaries. This was a groundbreaking approach. Lyonnet designated the earlier text form as “Arm 1,” and the later as “Arm 2.” Both his methodology and his terminology have been used in attempts to recover the earliest form of the text in other parts of the Bible.⁷

Translation Technique

Arm 1 and Arm 2 differ in terms of translation technique. In contrast to Arm 2, which tends toward literalism and the reproduction of grammatical forms of the parent text, Lyonnet called attention to a different set of translation traits in Arm 1: the use of a finite verb rather than circumstantial participle; addition of personal pronouns after the verb; the frequent use of *ete* “that” to introduce a citation, corresponding to *d* in Syriac; phrases like “land of the Egyptians” rather than “Egypt”; the orthography of proper nouns (e.g., *Isahak* in Arm 1, as opposed to *Sahak* in Arm 2); Syriacisms, like the repetition of cognates, as in ԳՈՐԾ ԳՈՐԾԷ, “(our Father) works work” (John 5:17).⁸ Cowe made an insightful comparison of the translation technique of Arm 1 and Arm 2 in Chronicles.⁹ Zohrapian's edition of Ecclesiastes reproduces Arm 1 in the text and extensively cites Arm 2 in the apparatus (→ 13–17.2.5.3). That Arm 1 and Arm 2 are extant for some books does not mean that both translations exist, or ever existed, for all books of the Old Testament. Preparation of the critical edition of Job (→ 11.4.5) did not uncover two forms of text, Arm 1 and Arm 2; Job does not display the literalism characteristic of Arm 2 but has features identified with Arm 1.

1.4.7.5 Text-Critical Value: Textual Allegiances

Most of the Armenian Bible awaits a critical edition. Zeytunian's editions of the pentateuchal books¹⁰ are not “critical” in the sense of an eclec-

⁵ Oskan, *Bible*.

⁶ Lyonnet, *Les Origines*.

⁷ See Cox, “The Use of Lectionary Manuscripts.”

⁸ Lyonnet, *Les Origines*, 51–53.

⁹ Cowe, “Two Armenian Versions.”

¹⁰ A.S. Zeytunian (ed.), *Girk' Tsnndots': K'nnakan Bnagir* (*The Book of Genesis: Critical Text*) (“Matenadaran” ՄԻՒՄԻՆ);

tic text as close to the original as possible, like the Göttingen LXX. Their principal gain over Zohrapian lies in their more extensive collations, evidenced in the apparatus. Only Job exists in a critical edition among books that are part of the Hebrew Bible. However, on the basis of work done prior to the *Textual History of the Bible*, the following textual allegiances have been identified:

- Deuteronomy – Byzantine Greek text, influenced by the Hexapla (→ 2.5.5)
- Ruth – *kaige* Greek (→ 13–17.2.5.1)
- 1–2 Samuel, i.e., 1–2 Reigns – Lucianic Greek text (→ 3–5.2.5.3)
- 1–2 Chronicles, i.e., 1–2 Supplements – (→ 20.4.5)
 - Arm 1: based on a Lucianic Greek text
 - Arm 2: based on a Hexaplaric Greek text
- Epistle of Jeremiah – Greek (→ 11.2.4.7)
- Job – Lucianic Greek text (→ 11.4.5)
- Daniel – (→ 18.4.5)
 - Arm 1: derives from the Peshitta and a Lucianic Greek text simultaneously
 - Arm 2: revision of Arm 1 on the basis of another Greek text
- The Canticle of Azariah (= Dan 3:26–45) – (→ 11.3.7)
 - Arm 1: Lucianic Greek text (and Peshitta)
 - Arm 2: revision on the basis of a Greek text¹¹

It appears that the parent texts of the Armenian version of the Old Testament as it now exists were predominantly Greek and thus it is a witness to the text of the LXX (→ 1.3.1.1). Some traces of the

Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) exist in Genesis (→ 2.5.5), though these may not be text-based; in Psalms there is also evidence of such a connection (→ 10.4.5). See further in Cowe's entry for Arm-Lam (→ 13–17.2.5.4), the Peshitta element he has identified in the Armenian translation of that book.

Cowe has noted various kinds of agreements with the Peshitta in Arm-Dan (→ 18.4.5) that have the support of all fifteen manuscripts he used for his edition of Daniel and still more that are attested by part of the Armenian tradition: for example, at Dan 8:7, the majority of Armenian manuscripts attest *h* *Δερωγ* *ἰηρω* “from its hands,” i.e., “its power” (= Theodotion's *ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ*) whereas several manuscripts attest *h* *Δερωγ* *ρωζῆν* “from the he-goat.”¹²

1.4.7.5.1 Text-Critical Value

The text-critical value of the Armenian version lies in its early date, its textual affiliations, and the facility of Armenian in rendering Greek. In the case of Job (→ 11.4.5), it is as early as our earliest witness to the Lucianic text of that book (→ 11.3.6). From the standpoint of the Hebrew Bible, any remnants of Peshitta-based readings (→ 1.3.4) are of special interest. As it is often a Hexaplaric witness, the Armenian version preserves the literal translation of Theodotion (→ 1.3.1.2) where Origen added it to the LXX as, extensively, in Job (→ 11.3.5). The Hexaplaric character (→ 1.3.1.2.7) of the Armenian version is especially strong in Genesis and Exodus, as the frequent preservation of the Hexaplaric sign tradition indicates (→ 2.5.5). Finally, some Armenian manuscripts preserve as marginal readings translations of “the Three,” Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (→ 1.3.1.2), in substantial numbers (181) and sometimes uniquely (in sixty-nine instances).¹³

1.4.7.5.2 Theological Interpretations in the Armenian Translation

Like its parent text(s), the Armenian version is a large collection that is the work of various trans-

Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1985); A.S. Zeytunian (ed.), *Girk' Elits': K'nnakan Bnagir (The Book of Exodus: Critical Text)* (“Matenadaran” ՈՒՄԻՆ; Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1992); A.S. Zeytunian (ed.), *Girk' Ghevtats'wots': K'nnakan Bnagir (The Book of Leviticus: Critical Text)* (“Matenadaran” ՈՒՄԻՆ 4; Antelias: Cilician Catholicosate, 1993); A.S. Zeytunian (ed.), *Girk' T'wots': K'nnakan Bnagir (The Book of Numbers: Critical Text)* (“Matenadaran” ՈՒՄԻՆ 5; Antelias: Cilician Catholicosate, 1998); A.S. Zeytunian (ed.), *Girk' Erkrordounn Orinats': K'nnakan Bnagir (The Book of Deuteronomy: Critical Text)* (“Matenadaran”; Etchmiadzin: Mair At'or Surp Etchmiadzin, 2002).

¹¹ For bibliographical details, see Cox, “The Syriac Presence,” 48.

¹² Cowe, *Daniel*, 250–89 (285).

¹³ Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion*, 402.

lators. There is no single theological *tendenz* that extends across the corpus. At times, a certain nuance is introduced; at other times, there may be a word or two or a few words of interpretive addition, as in Arm 1 in Ecclesiastes; at still other times, there are more significant changes, as with the changes of the verb tenses in Arm-Pss. Occasionally there are notable exegetical shifts, as at the Arm-Ps 45:6, where God is said to be in the midst of the inhabitants of the city, “in the midst of them,” rather than “in its midst,” i.e., in the midst of the city.¹⁴ But broad generalizations should be avoided, especially because much of this type of analysis remains to be done.

Abeghian, M., (ed.) Koriwn. Vark' Mashtots'i (*The Life of Mashtots'*) (Yerevan: Haypethrat, 1941; repr. Delmar: Caravan Books, 1985, with introduction by K.H. Maksoudian) (Armenian; Eng. trans.: *Koriun: The Life of Mashtots* [trans. B. Norehad; New York: Armenian General Benevolent Union, 1964]).

Anassian, H.S., *Biblia Sacrae Versio Armena (Bibliographia)* (Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1976), 305–668 (Armenian; published as a monograph taken out of *Haykakan Matenagitut'wn B*).

Burchard, C., *Armenia and the Bible: Papers Presented to the International Symposium Held in Heidelberg, July 16–19, 1990* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

Cowe, S.P., “The Two Armenian Versions of Chronicles: Their Origin and Translation Technique,” *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 22 (1990–1991): 53–96.

Cowe, S.P., *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

Cox, C., “Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible: 1955–1980,” *RB* 89 (1982): 99–113.

Cox, C., “The Use of Lectionary Manuscripts to Establish the Text of the Armenian Bible,” in *Medieval Armenian Culture* (eds. T.J. Samuelian and M.E. Stone; University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6; Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), 365–80.

Cox, C., “Concerning a Cilician Revision of the Armenian Bible,” in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (eds. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Toronto: Benben, 1984), 209–21.

Cox, C., “The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint,” in *La septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: v Congreso de la IOSCS* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; Textos y Estudios “Cardinal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano” C.S.I.C., 1985), 25–35.

Cox, C., *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (SBLSCS 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

Cox, C., “The ‘Songs of Zion’ in Armenian,” in *The Armenians in Jerusalem and the Holy Land* (eds. M.E. Stone, R.R. Ervine, and N. Stone; Hebrew University Armenian Studies 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 33–59.

Cox, C., “Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible: 1980–2002,” *RB* 112–113 (2005): 355–68.

Cox, C., “The Syriac Presence in the Armenian Translation of the Bible: With Special Reference to the Book of Genesis,” *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 10 (2010): 45–67.

Cox, C., “The Armenian Bible: Status Quaestionis,” in *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era: From Manuscript to Digital Text* (ed. V. Calzolari, with the collaboration of M.E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 231–46.

Lehmann, H., and J.J.S. Weitenberg (eds.), *Armenian Texts, Tasks and Tools* (Acta Jutlandica 69/1; Humanities Series 68; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993).

Leloir, L., “Orientales de la Bible (Versions): Arméniennes,” in *DBSup* 6:810–18.

Lyonnet, S., *Les Origines de la Version arménienne et le Diatessaron* (BibOr 13; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1950).

Mathews, T.F., and R.S. Wieck, *Treasures in Heaven: Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts* (New York: The Pierpont Morgan Library, Princeton University Press, 1994) (includes relevant maps and historical information).

Oskan Erevants'i, ed., *Astuatsashunch' Hnots' ew Norots' Ktakaranats'. Neren Parunakogh (The Bible in the Ancient Armenian Translation from the Greek: With Introduction and Appendices)* (Amsterdam: Aera Armenorum 115 Christi, 1666) [Armenian].

Stone, M.E., “Armenian Canon Lists I – The Council of Partaw (768 C.E.),” *HTR* 66 (1973): 479–86.

Stone, M.E., “Armenian Canon Lists II – The Stichometry of Anania of Shirak (c. 615–c. 690 C.E.),” *HTR* 69 (1976): 253–60.

Stone, M.E., “Armenian Canon Lists III – The Lists of Mechitar of Ayrivank’,” *HTR* 69 (1976): 289–300.

Stone, M.E., “Armenian Canon Lists IV – The List of Gregory of Tat'ew (14th Century),” *HTR* 72 (1979): 237–44.

¹⁴ Cox, “The ‘Songs of Zion’ in Armenian,” 54–59.

- Stone, M.E., "Armenian Canon Lists v – Anonymous Texts," *HTR* 83 (1990): 141–61.
- Stone, M.E., "Armenian Canon Lists VI – Hebrew Names and Other Attestations," *HTR* 94 (2001): 477–92.
- Stone, M.E., "Armenian Canon Lists VII: The Poetic List of Arak'el of Siwnik' (d. 1409)," *HTR* 104 (2011): 367–79.
- Ter-Petrosyan, L.H., "The Series of Ancient Armenian Translations," in *Girk' Tsnmdots': K'makan Bnagir (The Book of Genesis: Critical Text)* (ed. A.S. Zeytunian; "Matenadaran" Hay Hnaguyn T'argmanakan Houshardzanner 1 [Ancient Armenian Translated Works 1]; Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1985), 5–78 [Armenian].
- Zohrapian, **Scriptures* (the introduction of the 1984 reprint is published separately as "The Zohrab Bible," in *Studies in Classical Armenian Literature* [ed. J.A.C. Greppin; Delmar: Caravan Books, 1994], 227–61. An electronically transcribed reprint of Zohrapian is available from T.A. Aivazian, London).

Claude Cox

1.4.8 Georgian Translations

1.4.8.1 Background

The textual history of the Old Georgian (Old Kartvelian)¹ translation of the Scriptures starts in the fifth century and stretches up to the early eighteenth century. This manuscript heritage has hitherto escaped academic attention on the whole, especially in Western scholarship. This is particularly evident when considering its exclusion from the critical apparatus of the Göttingen editions, in which no use of this corpus has been made. The Georgian *THB* articles, besides offering a reference survey of this vast and still almost-unexplored material, represent an attempt to fill the lack of interaction between Kartvelology and contemporary LXX studies. In accordance with the purposes of the present project, which foresees an interdisciplinary approach to the various traditions, particular attention is paid to the problem of establishing the relevance of the Georgian translation for comparative analysis.²

¹ On the Georgian literary language, its periodization, and writing system, see Tuite, "Early Georgian," 145–48.

² The discussion here includes only books of the Georgian

Research undertaken for the *THB* had to reckon with a number of limitations that represented an obstacle toward the achievement of such an ambitious goal. Firstly, to date, several Georgian translations, redactions, and subredactions of the biblical texts are awaiting study and critical publication. Secondly, manuscripts are normally stored in libraries to which access is limited. Thirdly, studies produced to date in the Georgian language belong almost exclusively to the category of bibliographical rarities, and translations into Western languages are not available. Moreover, collation (on a sampling basis) with Greek and other Eastern sources had to be produced expressly in order to formulate preliminary conclusions.

1.4.8.2 Manuscript Sources

Manuscripts of the Old Georgian Bible survive from late antiquity up to the modern period. However, before the late tenth century, documentary evidence is very limited and consists merely of a few fragments. The existing testimonies are described in several catalogues, depending on where they are stored today. The information offered in the first volume of the critical edition of the Old Georgian Octateuch is the most complete and updated and should be consulted for a more detailed study.³

1.4.8.2.1 Earliest Sources (Palimpsest Leaves and Other Fragments)

Earliest fragmentary sources can be divided into two categories: palimpsests of the fifth to seventh centuries; single parchment leaves of the ninth to early-eleventh centuries (in both cases, dating is susceptible to some fluctuations depending on the paleographic views of scholars).

The so-called Khanmeti ("xanmet'i") texts belong to the first category. This term was coined in the eleventh century by George the Athonite (Giorgi Mtac'mideli, ca. 1009–1065⁴) and can be

Old Testament that correspond to the Hebrew canon; deuterocanonical Scriptures are examined in *THB* 2.

³ *C'igni*, 1557–639.

⁴ On George's literary activity, see K'ek'elize, *Ist'oria*, 1,213–34; Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte*, 154–74.

rendered as “superfluous *x*’s.” It refers to the archaic use of *x*- as a verbal prefix. Over the centuries, it was expunged since copyists perceived it as being redundant.⁵ The presence of the Khanmeti forms in the translations enables them to be dated to the earliest period of the history of the Georgian language, namely the fifth to seventh centuries. Khanmeti texts of the Georgian Bible are to be found in palimpsests Georg^{Pa} (= Oxford, ms Hebrew 2672, fifth to sixth centuries: Jeremiah); Georg^{Pb1} (= Cambridge, Taylor-Schechter ms 12.183, fifth to sixth centuries: Jeremiah); Georg^{Pb2} (= Cambridge, Taylor-Schechter ms 12.741, fifth to sixth centuries: Jeremiah); Georg^{Pc} (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-999, fifth to sixth or sixth to seventh centuries: Genesis, Proverbs); Georg^{Pd} (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-844, fifth to sixth centuries: Isaiah); and Georg^x (= Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, geo. 2, seventh century: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Esdras/3 Ezra).

The following manuscripts constitute the second group of sources, namely the single parchment leaves: Georg^t (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, S-104 ninth century, lectionary: Num 24:5–27:18); Georg^m (= Sin. 34, tenth century: Gen 1:24–27); Georgⁿ (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-119b, tenth century: Exod 3:11–13); Georg^l (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-208a, tenth century, lectionary: Exod 19:14–20:17); Georg^q (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-208b, tenth century, lectionary: Ruth 1:1–4, 8–11, 14–17); Georg^{cb} (= Cambridge, add. 1890.1: 1 Kgdms 24:6–10). Additional manuscript evidence dates to the eleventh century: Georg^h (= Kutaisi no. 671: Gen 27:1–12); Georg^z (= Athos, Monastery of Zographou, first half of the eleventh century: Num 2:11–14, 16–19, 30–32).

1.4.8.2.2 Tenth-Century Lectionary Sources

Besides the abovementioned fragments, the earliest translations of the Georgian lectionary are

also to be found in four manuscripts of the tenth or eleventh century: Georg^{La} (= Tbilisi, National Parliamentary Library of Georgia, “Lectionary of Lagurk’a,” tenth century); Georg^{Lt} (= Mest’ia, Historical-Ethnographic Museum, “Lectionary of Lat’ali,” tenth century); Georg^p (= Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, geo. 3, 1040 C.E.); and Georg^{Sin} (= Sinai, Geo. 37, 982 C.E.).

1.4.8.2.3 Codices of the Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries

The first codex presenting a full Bible is Georg^o (= Mount Athos, Library of the Iviron Monastery, geo. 1, 978 C.E., in two volumes), which originally contained the entire Old Testament with the exception of Psalms, 1–2 Chronicles, and 1–4 Maccabees.⁶

An eleventh-century collection consisting mainly of prophetic books in the earliest translation is today split into codices Georg^l (= Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 7: Obad 9–21, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah 1–28) and Georg^{l2} (= Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 11: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obad 1–9, Jeremiah 28–52, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1 Esdras/3 Ezra, Ezra, Nehemiah, 4 Ezra/Apoc).

The “Gelati Bible,” written between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, represents the main testimony of the middle-Georgian corpus of Hellenophile translations made from LXX (→ 1.3.1.1). It is to be found in manuscripts Georg^{Ga} (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-1152, twelfth or thirteenth century: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Minor Prophets) and Georg^{Gb} (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-1108, twelfth century: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth). In both cases, the biblical versions are flanked by the translation of Byzantine exegetical commentaries. Two codices containing only Canticles may be attributed to the same period: Georg^u (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-65, 1188–1210 C.E., folios 211^v–214^v) and Georg^y (= Vi-

⁵ Tuite, “Das Präfix,” 34–61. See also žavaxišvili, “Xelnač’erebi,” 319–20; Šaniže, “Užvelesi,” 282–301; Saržvelaže, *Sazieblebi*.

⁶ Blake, “The Athos Codex,” 33–56.

enna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, geo. 4, 1160 C.E., folios 255^r–366^r).

A group of manuscripts dating from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries presents short redactions of biblical books: Georg^{Ja} (= Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 113, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: 1–4 Kingdoms, Qohelet); Georg^t (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-570, 1460 C.E.: 3–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, Esther, Tobit, Judith, 1 Esdras/3 Ezra, Ezra, Nehemiah); and Georg^D (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-885, seventeenth century: 1–2 Chronicles, Esther, Tobit, 1 Esdras/3 Ezra, Ezra, Nehemiah, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job). Codex Georg^F (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-646, fifteenth to sixteenth century: 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, Esther, Judith, 1 Esdras/3 Ezra, Ezra, Nehemiah) has a similar selection of books and contains texts that are widely considered to belong to the earliest translation corpus.⁷

Until the late seventeenth century, the Psalms were not included in the Georgian Bible and circulated separately from the remaining books (→ 10.4.6). They are extant in a large number of manuscripts⁸ dating from the ninth or tenth century (the oldest evidence is most likely represented by a papyrus manuscript from Sinai,⁹ two folios of which are currently preserved at the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg).¹⁰

1.4.8.2.4 Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sources

The second codex, preserving a full set of books, is the so-called “Mcxeta Bible” (Georg^S = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-51). It dates back to the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century and represents the first case in which the Psalms are included in the Georgian Bible. A number of contemporary sources are testimonies of the early

preparatory phases of the work that led to the creation of Georg^S: Georg^A (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H 1207: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy); Georg^K (= Kutaisi, no. 28: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy); Georg^E (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A 243, 1672 C.E.: Deuteronomy); and Georg^C (= Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-179, 1669 C.E.: Genesis, Exodus), which also represents one of the more recent manuscripts of the “Gelati Bible.”

The third full corpus of the Georgian Scriptures is the 1743 Moscow printed edition, widely known as the “Bakar’s Bible” (= Georg^B).¹¹

1.4.8.3 Date, Versions, Editions

The Bible must have been translated first into Georgian between the fifth and early seventh centuries. Establishing the origin of the earliest strata is an extremely challenging question that is far from being resolved.

On approaching this task, the influence of different traditions in the formative stages of the Georgian Bible should be taken seriously into consideration. Firstly, Greek Antiochian and Jerusalemian models have played a central role in the development of the corpus. At that time, Georgia, besides being subordinated to the Apostolic See of Antioch, had close ties with the Jerusalem church. Furthermore, translation activity from Greek was undertaken directly in the monasteries and in the scriptoria of the Holy Land. On the other hand, until the early seventh century, Georgian culture was constantly exposed to the influence of the Syriac and Armenian churches.

Editorial interventions were a constant feature of the textual history of the Georgian Bible. This resulted in the formation of several textual layers that reflected the use of various sources, among which were different recensions of LXX (→ 1.3.1.2).

⁷ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 100; Kurcik’ize, *Biblia*, 24.

⁸ Šaniže, *Psalmunis*, 013–029; Šaniže, *Psalmunta*; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 186–202; Kharanauli, “Einführung,” 249–50; Čelize, *Psalmunni*.

⁹ Šaniže, “Psalmunis,” 62–67.

¹⁰ Garitte, “Une édition,” 15.

¹¹ *Biblia: Brzanebita da c’arsagebelita sapasetata sakartvelos mepis*.

1.4.8.3.1 Fifth- to Eighth-Century Translations

In the absence of a historiographical tradition concerning the origins of the Georgian translation of the Scriptures, conclusions about exactly when it was written can only be drawn on the basis of an internal and comparative analysis.

The Psalms are generally considered to be the first book translated into Georgian,¹² since they are cited in the *Martyrdom of the Holy Queen Shushanik*, an original work of Georgian literature that may be attributed to 476–483 C.E.¹³ The manuscript evidence provided by the Khanmeti palimpsests indicates that a full version of the Octateuch and the Prophets was carried out no later than the fifth century.¹⁴ The earliest translation of the lectionary was carried out in Jerusalem and dates to the same period¹⁵ (however, it was revised repeatedly and expanded up to the eighth century).¹⁶

An intermediary redaction between the Khanmeti texts and Georg^o can be found in the eleventh-century collection Georg¹⁺¹². The Prophetic Books contained in these testimonies were most likely translated in the seventh century, due to the detectable traces of Haemeti (“*Haemet’i*”) forms.¹⁷ By analogy with the Khanmeti sources, Šanize has labeled with this term a group of texts of the seventh and eighth centuries. It means “superfluous ‘h’s” because of the use of *h-* as a verbal prefix.¹⁸

1.4.8.3.2 Eleventh-Century Translations

A new period in the history of the translation of the Scriptures opens in the eleventh century, when several books were retranslated from LXX. The first work produced was the version of Psalms undertaken by George the Athonite (Giorgi Mtac’mideli,

ca. 1009–1065).¹⁹ The second is known as the “Gelati Bible” (Georg^{Ga,Gb}) and was accomplished by the end of the eleventh century.²⁰ It includes the Octateuch and the Prophetic Books.

1.4.8.3.3 Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Translations

In the late seventeenth century, leading exponents of Georgian culture and of the Bagrationi dynasty advanced the idea of carrying out a printed edition of the Scriptures. The steps to achieving this goal were laid by the creation of the “Mcxeta Bible” (Georg^s) composed by Sulkhan Orbeliani (Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, 1658–1725) and his close collaborators. In this ambitious project, a key role was played by Prince Archil II (Prince Arčil II, 1647–1713), by King Vakhtang VI (King of Kartli and Kakheti Vaxt’ang VI, 1675–1737) and, later, by his sons Bakar and Vakhusti (Princes Bakari III, 1700–1750 and Vaxušt’i, 1696–1757).

The earliest printing was developed virtually simultaneously in Georgia and Russia, where it was strongly influenced by the contemporary revision process of the Slavonic Bible promoted by Peter the Great.²¹ Initially, only a few books of the Georgian Bible went to press. Extant are the 1705 and 1737 Moscow publications of the Psalms and, thanks to the launch of typography in Tbilisi, the 1709–1711 and 1722 editions of the Psalms,²² the New Testament, and the Prophets.²³ Bakar and Vakhusti fulfilled the project started several decades earlier by Sulkhan, Archil, and their father Vakhtang: the first full Georgian Bible (Georg^B) was published in Moscow in 1743.²⁴

¹² Kurcik’ize, *Biblia*, 42; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 186.

¹³ Xucesi, *C’ameba*, 35, 45.

¹⁴ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 57–76.

¹⁵ Tarchnišvili, *Le grand lectionnaire*; Danelia, *Čxenk’eli*, and Šavišvili, *Kartuli lektionaris p’arizuli xelnač’eri*; Renoux, “Quelques psaumes,” 57–60.

¹⁶ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 75–89.

¹⁷ Kurcik’ize, *Biblia*, 14–15; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 160.

¹⁸ Šanize, “Haemet’i,” 354–88.

¹⁹ The author’s colophon is also preserved (Kurcik’ize, *Biblia*, 44–46).

²⁰ Kurcik’ize, “Kartuli biblia,” 613.

²¹ Vatejšvili, *Gruzija*, 9–33. See also Šarašize, *P’irveli*; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 274–81.

²² *Davitni*.

²³ *Biblia, c’igni c’inasc’armet’q’velta da saxareba*.

²⁴ *Biblia: Bržanebita da c’arsagebelita sapasetata sakartvelos mepis*.

1.4.8.3.4 Editions

The text of the lectionary Georg^p is to be found in the 1987 printed edition,²⁵ which has replaced Tarchnišvili's previous publication,²⁶ while that of Georg^{La} is available in Čxenk'eli's book.²⁷

Synoptical critical editions including ancient and middle Georgian translations of the Bible, based on the whole manuscript tradition, are available for the Octateuch,²⁸ Jeremiah,²⁹ Ezekiel,³⁰ Qohelet,³¹ and, apparently, also for Esther.³² The Psalms are accessible in critical editions covering both versions.³³ The earliest recensions of Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Daniel, and Lamentations have been published with a Latin translation in *Patrologia orientalis*.³⁴ Diplomatic editions of the ancient versions of Job and Canticles exist today, too.³⁵ In several other cases, texts belonging to the oldest and middle corpus of translations are still unpublished (1–4 Kingdoms, Proverbs, Ezra–Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles).

The “Mxceta Bible” is available in Docanasvili's edition.³⁶ Only a few of the original 300 copies of “Bakar's Bible” have survived until the present day (one of them is currently kept at the National Centre of Manuscripts in Tbilisi and has the call number A-455).

An electronic version of the existing scholarly editions of the Georgian Bible is also available on

line within the “Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien.”³⁷

1.4.8.3.5 Overview Studies

The most comprehensive account of the history of the Georgian Bible is given in Melikišvili's book, published in 2009.³⁸ This work summarizes scholarly research produced in this field since the nineteenth century. A second monograph was published recently by Kurcik'iže.³⁹ Vatejšvili gives a detailed description concerning the history of the printed Bible.⁴⁰ Several overview articles focusing on the Georgian Bible have also been written in Western languages.⁴¹

1.4.8.4 Translation Character, Translation Technique, Inner-Translational Features

In the Old Georgian manuscript heritage it is possible to find each single book of the Bible in different translations that basically reflect the above-outlined phases in the history of this tradition. Two sets of texts are available for Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Daniel, Lamentations, and 1–2 Chronicles; three have survived of Genesis, Jeremiah, Psalms, Ezra–Nehemiah, Proverbs, Job, Qohelet, and Esther. In other cases, up to four (1–4 Kingdoms) or even five versions (Canticles) are to be found in the manuscript sources. Furthermore, as a consequence of the text being continually revised, even multiple redactions of the same work have survived until this day.

Translation technique is an issue still requiring thorough research, in particular when dealing with the earliest versions. As scholars have al-

²⁵ Danelia, Čxenk'eli, and Šavišvili, *Kartuli lektionaris p'arizuli xelnac'eri*.

²⁶ Tarchnišvili, *Le grand lectionnaire*.

²⁷ Čxenk'eli, *Lagurk'is lektionari*.

²⁸ *C'ignni*, Vols. 1–3 (1989–1991). The latter has replaced previous editions (Šaniže, *C'ignni*, 1:1–2).

²⁹ Danelia, *Ieremias*.

³⁰ Ckit'išvili, *Ezek'ielis*.

³¹ K'ek'elize, *Targmanebaj*, 180–226.

³² The edition of Georg-Esth published in 2014 (*Esteris c'ignis*) remained inaccessible to me. I suppose it is based on the entire manuscript evidence.

³³ Šaniže, *Psalmunis*; Čelize, *Psalmunni*.

³⁴ The editions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel have also appeared in this series (Blake and Brière, *The Old Georgian*, PO 29.3–5; 30.3).

³⁵ Šaniže, *C'ignni*, 1.2, 145–74; Saržvelaze, “Kebaj kebataj,” 164–74.

³⁶ Dočanašvili, *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri* (1981–1986).

³⁷ See: <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm?/texte/textez.htm>.

³⁸ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*.

³⁹ Kurcik'iže, *Biblia*.

⁴⁰ Vatejšvili, *Gruzija*, 9–33.

⁴¹ Goussen, “Bibelübersetzung,” 300–318; Blake, “Ancient Georgian Versions,” 271–91; Leloir, “Versions”; Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte*, 324–25; Birdsall, “Georgian,” 388–90; Van Esbroeck, “Les versions,” 474–79; Kharanauli, “Die Geschichte,” 58–68; Outtier, “L'Ancien Testament,” 215–20; Childers, “The Bible,” 170–72; Outtier, “Une énigme.”

ready acknowledged, a necessary precondition for investigating this problem correctly is a collation of the Georgian evidence with the Göttingen editions.⁴² In those rare cases in which the prototype was properly identified, it has been shown that the earliest biblical texts were rendered using a literal translation technique;⁴³ for instance, this is especially evident in the rendering of double preverbs.⁴⁴

1.4.8.4.1 Early Versions

Scholars have argued for the existence by the sixth century of a full Khanmeti corpus of the Scripture, currently preserved only in a few palimpsest fragments.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the origin of the earliest Georgian Bible should not be understood as the result of a single moment of translation, since the various Khanmeti manuscripts that have survived seem to belong to diverse late antique textual traditions.⁴⁶ The oldest group of Georgian translations is more likely the work of a number of authors who operated in various centers and who made use of prototypes that were heterogeneous from the point of view of textual filiation.

Agreement between Khanmeti and later sources dating from the tenth to the seventeenth centuries varies significantly in each case. Manuscript Georg^o features several linguistic archaisms and often coincides with the readings of the earliest palimpsests; this might indicate the ancient origin of the translations contained in this codex. However, cases can be found in which Georg^o deviates from both the Khanmeti version and the fifth-century lectionary (e.g., see Georg-Jer). Moreover, the available Haemeti traces in codices Georg¹⁺² point to the existence of a seventh-century intermediary tradition, which must be placed between the fifth- or sixth-century Khanmeti texts and the

tenth-century codex Georg^o. Therefore, it is not always easy to establish to what extent the text of the latter may be attributed to the original fifth- or sixth-century version or if, on the contrary, it should be seen as the result of subsequent revisions.

Similar conclusions can be drawn with regard to the relationship between Georg^o and the later sources. In several books, the former presents minuses or even major gaps (see in particular: Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges) that seem to have existed in its antigraph. Textual lacunas usually can be filled thanks to the late codices, namely Georg^{d,e,i,j,a}. Nevertheless, this group cannot in each case be understood as a testimony of the same textual tradition as Georg^o since, for its part, it contains omissions not attested elsewhere.

It is therefore possible to argue that multiple redactions may have existed already in the fifth and sixth centuries or, alternatively, that several editorial revisions occurred that may have led to major alterations of the original stratum.⁴⁷ It can be assumed that, in order to achieve reliable results, each single book should be studied separately both from the point of textual criticism and translation technique.⁴⁸

1.4.8.4.2 Eleventh-Century Versions

Unlike the ancient corpus, the eleventh-century texts of the Psalms and of the “Gelati Bible” can be reconstructed easily thanks to the direct witness of contemporary manuscripts. They stand out for the use of only LXX prototypes (→ 1.3.1.1), as well as for the literal translation method adopted by their authors.⁴⁹ In some instances, the earliest translations were used as a base source that was corrected according to contemporary Byzantine models containing Hexaplaric material and exegetical catenae

⁴² Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 37; Xaranauli, “Sak’itxebi,” 482–528.

⁴³ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 73.

⁴⁴ Outtier, “L’ Ancien Testament,” 215–20.

⁴⁵ Kurcik’ize, *Biblia*, 13.

⁴⁶ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 36, 68; Xaranauli, “Ein Chanmeti-Fragment,” 181.

⁴⁷ In classifying the Georgian translations, it was decided to label them according to a conventional criterion: for instance, Georg-Job 1 indicates the ancient translation, while Georg-Job 2 refers to the second translation, and Georg-Job 3 is the third one.

⁴⁸ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 37.

⁴⁹ Kurcik’ize, “Kartuli biblia,” 613.

(→ 1.3.1.2).⁵⁰ It has been argued that eminent philologists of this period such as John Petritsi (Ioane P'et'ric'i, eleventh-twelfth century) and Arsen of Ikalto (Arsen Iq'altoeli, d. ca. 1127) may have been involved in the preparation of these translations.⁵¹

1.4.8.4.3 Late Versions

The philological and editorial work that led to the creation of the "Mxeta Bible" started in the last third of the seventeenth century, as shown by codices Georg^{A,C,D}, which were commissioned by Sulkhan's father Orbel.⁵² In the following years, Sulkhan gathered additional material from the ancient and middle corpus of translations, as well as from the lectionary. Besides revising the text, he divided the Bible into chapters and verses, because this subdivision was missing in Georgian medieval sources. As a model for correcting the Scriptures, he chose the 1666 printed Armenian Bible (→ 1.4.7.3).⁵³ Reliance on the latter is also reflected in the insertion of titles in Hebrew at the beginning of each book. From a textual point of view, translations contained in manuscript Georg^S are highly contaminated; therefore, they cannot be regarded as reliable witnesses to the ancient versions.

In preparing the first printed edition of the Georgian Scriptures, Archil retranslated twenty-two books from Slavonic using as a model the 1663 Moscow printed Bible (→ 1.4.10). As the text of this edition is not split into verses, he was able to divide the Georgian version into chapters only. Archil's new translations were fully revised by Bakar and Vakhusti after his death in 1713. This became necessary when Peter the Great issued a decree requiring a revision of the 1663 Moscow printed Bible (1712). As Archil's work was based on the 1663 version, the Georgian editors were compelled to emend it using the drafts of the corrected version of the Slavonic

Scriptures that was being prepared at that time (the Georgian edition appeared several years before the revised Slavonic version, which was only printed in 1751).⁵⁴

1.4.8.5 Text-Critical Value of the Georgian Bible

Establishing the text-critical value of the Georgian translation for philological inquiry into the history of the Bible is a key issue in approaching this tradition. Studies produced during the last forty years contributed significantly to a complete revision of the early twentieth-century theory about the Armenian origin (→ 1.4.7) of the Georgian Scriptures.⁵⁵ On the one hand, they demonstrated convincingly that several translations belonging to the earliest textual stratum of this corpus clearly depend on Greek models (→ 1.3.1.1; → 1.3.1.2);⁵⁶ on the other hand, they have led to a reassessment of the relationship between the Armenian and Georgian versions, since the latter was shown to offer an insight into the early history of the former (→ 18.4.6.4).⁵⁷ Moreover, scholars started collating Georgian witnesses with the critical apparatus of the Göttingen editions.⁵⁸

Research produced for the *THB* here achieved a number of results that may be summarized as follows: a) collection of further evidence of the direct reliance on Greek prototypes; b) identification of the filiation from specific LXX text types (Lucianic, Hexaplaric, etc.; → 1.3.1.2); c) detection and documentation of unique textual features against the background of other traditions; d) further proof of the need for rethinking strategies of comparative study with the Armenian translation (→ 1.4.7). Nevertheless, despite the progress achieved, many

⁵⁰ Čelize, *Žveli kartuli*, 93–96; Giginešvili and Todua, *Gelaturi*.

⁵¹ Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 96; Kurcik'iže, *Biblia*, 21.

⁵² Vatejšvili, *Gruzija*, 16; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 274–81.

⁵³ Oskan, *Bible*.

⁵⁴ *Biblia, sirėč' knigi svjaščennago pisanija vetchago i novago zavėta*. See Vatejšvili, "Pervopečatnaja," 179–90.

⁵⁵ Marr, "Zametki"; Goussen, "Bibelübersetzung"; Blake, "O drevnegruzinskich versijach"; Leloir, "Versions"; Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte*, 324–25.

⁵⁶ Outtier, "L'Ancien Testament," 215–20; Melikišvili, *Targmanebi*, 36–37; Kurcik'iže, *Biblia*, 66.

⁵⁷ Childers, "The Bible," 172.

⁵⁸ Xaranauli, *Žveli aytkmis xanmet'i pragmet'ebi*; Xaranauli, "Einführung," 307–08; and Xaranauli, "Das Chanmeti-Fragment," 204–36.

questions inevitably remain unanswered and considerable work has yet to be accomplished before the parent text of the Georgian versions can be identified safely in each single case and definitive conclusions reached with regard to their relevance for LXX studies.

1.4.8.6 Appendix: List of Georgian Manuscripts

Georg^A = Tbilisi, National Center of Manuscripts, H-1207, seventeenth century;
 Georg^{Aa} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-38, thirteenth-fourteenth centuries;
 Georg^B = “Bakar Bible,” i.e. the Moscow 1743 printed edition
 Georg^{Ba} = Sinai 42, tenth century
 Georg^C = Tbilisi, National Center of Manuscripts, A-179, 1669 C.E.
 Georg^{Cb} = Cambridge, add. 1890.1
 Georg^{Cc} = Sinai 29, tenth century
 Georg^D = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-885, seventeenth century
 Georg^{Da} = Sinai 22, tenth century
 Georg^E = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-243, 1672 C.E.
 Georg^{Ea} = Graz University Library, no. 2, tenth century
 Georg^F = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-646, fifteenth to sixteenth century
 Georg^{Fa} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1798, tenth-eleventh centuries
 Georg^G = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1350, eleventh century
 Georg^{Ga} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-1152, twelfth – thirteenth century
 Georg^{Gb} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-1108, twelfth century
 Georg^H = Kutaisi, No. 671, eleventh century
 Georg^I = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-570, 1460 C.E.
 Georg^{Ia} = Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 113, thirteenth and fourteenth century
 Georg^{I1} = Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 7, eleventh century
 Georg^{I2} = Jerusalem, Library of the Greek Patriarchate, geo. 11, eleventh century
 Georg^K = Kutaisi, No. 28, seventeenth century
 Georg^L = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, S-104 ninth century
 Georg^{La} = Tbilisi, National Parliamentary Library of Georgia, “Lectionary of Lagurka,” tenth century

Georg^{Lt} = Mest’ia, Historical-Ethnographic Museum, “Lectionary of Lat’ali,” tenth century
 Georg^M = Sinai 34, tenth century
 Georg^N = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-119b, tenth century
 Georg^O = Mount Athos, Library of the Iviron Monastery, geo. 1, year 978, in two volumes
 Georg^P = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, geo. 3, 1040 C.E.
 Georg^{Pa} = Oxford, ms Hebrew 2672, fifth to sixth centuries
 Georg^{Pb1} = Cambridge, Taylor-Schechter ms 12.183, fifth to sixth centuries
 Georg^{Pb2} = Cambridge, Taylor-Schechter ms 12.741, fifth to sixth centuries
 Georg^{Pc} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-999, fifth to sixth centuries
 Georg^{Pd} = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-844, fifth to sixth centuries
 Georg^q = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-208b, tenth century lectionary
 Georg^s = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-51, “Mxeta Bible,” seventeenth-eighteenth century
 Georg^{Sin} = Sinai, Geo. 37, 982 C.E.
 Georg^U = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-65, 1188–1210 C.E., folios 211^v–214^v
 Georg^x = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, geo. 2, seventh century
 Georg^y = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, geo. 4, 1160 C.E., folios 255^r–366^r
 Georg^Z = Athos, Monastery of Zographou, first half of the eleventh century
 Georg^π = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-61, thirteenth century
 Georg^l = Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, Q-208a, tenth century

In Georgian:

Biblia: Brzanebita da c'arsagebelita sapasetata sakartvelos mepi bakar vaxt'angis zisata (Moscow: Bakaris st'amba, 1743).

Biblia, c'igni c'inasc'armet'q'velta da saxareba (Tbilisi: Vaxt'angis st'amba, 1709–1710).

Čelize, E., *Zveli kartuli saek'lesio lit'erat'ura* (Tbilisi: Axali ivironi, 2005).

Čelize (ed.), E., *Psalmunni: axali šesc'orebuli gamocema* (Tbilisi: Axali ivironi, 2006).

C'igni zuelisa aytkumisani, Vol. 1: *šesakmisaj, gamosl-vataj* (eds. B. Giginešvili and C. K'ik'viže; Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1989).

- C'ignni zuelisa aytkumisani*, Vol. 2: *levit'eltaj, ricxutaj, meorisa sžulisaj* (eds. I. Abulaze et al.; Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1990).
- C'ignni zuelisa aytkumisani*, Vol. 3: *iso navesi, msažultaj, rutisi* (eds. C. Kurcik'ize and U. Cindeliანი; Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1991).
- Ckit'išvili, T., *Ezek'ielis c'ignis zveli kartuli versiebi* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1976).
- Čxenk'eli, S., *Lagurk'is lekcioniari* (Tbilisis uxco enata p'edagogiuri inst'it'utis šromebi 2; Tbilisi, 1950).
- Danelia, K., S. Čxenk'eli, and B. Šavišvili (eds.), *Kartuli lekcioniaris p'arizuli xelnac'eri: zveli da axali aytkmis sak'itxavebi*, Vol. 1: *Nac'ili I* (Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba, 1987).
- Danelia, K., (ed.), *Ieremias c'inasc'armet'q'velebis zveli kartuli versiebi* (Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba, 1992).
- Davitni (psalmunebi)* (Tbilisi: Vaxt'angis st'amba, 1709).
- Dočanašvili, E., (ed.), *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri (moses xutc'igneuli, iso nave, msažulta, ruti)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1981).
- Dočanašvili, E., (ed.), *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri (mepeta I, II, III, IV, nešt'a I, II, ezras I, II, III c'ignebi)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1982).
- Dočanašvili, E., (ed.), *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri (t'obis, ivditis, esteris, iobis c'ignebi, psalmuni, igavta c'igni)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1983).
- Dočanašvili, E., (ed.), *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri (ek'lesiast'e, sibrzne solomonisa, keba kebata solomonisa, c'inasc'armet'q'velta c'ignebi – esaia, ieremia, baruki, ezek'ieli)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1985).
- Dočanašvili, E., (ed.), *Mcxeturi xelnac'eri (danielis, mcire c'inasc'armet'q'velta da axali aytkmis c'ignebi)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1986).
- Gigineišvili, B., and G. Todua (eds.), *Gelaturi bibliis k'at'enebi* (Tbilisi: Axali ivironi, 2011).
- K'ek'elize, K., *Targmanebaj ek'lesiast'isaj mit'ropane zmwrmel mit'rop'olit'isaj* (Tbilisi: Saxalxo sakme, 1920).
- K'ek'elize, K., *Zveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*, Vol. 1 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1980).
- Kurcik'ize, C., "Kartuli bibliia," in *Nateli krist'esi, sakartvelo*, Vol. 1 (ed. N. K'irtaze; Tbilisi, 2003), 610–26.
- Kurcik'ize, C., *Kartuli bibliia* (Tbilisi: Xelnac'erta erovnuli cent'ri, 2010).
- Melikišvili, N., *Bibliur c'ignta zveli kartuli targmanebi* (Tbilisi: Alilo, 2009).
- Mirot'aze, N., (ed.), *Esteris c'ignis zveli kartuli versiebi* (Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba, 2014).
- Šaniže, A., "Haemet'i t'ekst'ebi da mati mnišvneloba kartuli enis ist'oriisatvis," *Tbilisis universit'et'is moambe* 3 (1923): 354–88.
- Šaniže, A., "Xanmet'i ieremias k'embrizuli nac'q'vet'ebi," *Enimk'is moambe* 2.1 (1937): 29–42.
- Šaniže, A., (ed.), *C'ignni zuelisa aytkumisani 978 c'lis xelnac'eris mixedvit*, Vol. 1.1: *Dabadebisaj, gamoslvataj* (Tbilisi: Sak. sssr mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba, 1947).
- Šaniže, A., (ed.), *C'ignni zuelisa aytkumisani 978 c'lis xelnac'eris mixedvit*, Vol. 1.2: *Levit'eltaj, msažultaj, rutisi, iobisi, esaiajsi* (Tbilisi: Sak. sssr mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba, 1948).
- Šaniže, A., "Uzvelesi kartuli t'ekst'ebis aymočenis gamo," in *Kartuli enis st'rukt'urisa da ist'oriis sak'itxebi I* (Tbilisi: Tbilisis stalinis saxelobis saxelmc'ipo universit'et'is gamomcemloba, 1957), 282–301.
- Šaniže, M., (ed.), *Psalmunis zveli kartuli redakciebi X–XIII sauk'uneta xelnac'erebis mixedvit. I. t'ekst'i* (Zveli kartuli enis zeglebi 11; Tbilisi: Sakartvelos sssr mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba, 1960).
- Šaniže, M., "Psalmunis ori uzvelesi kartuli xelnac'eris šesaxeb," in *Mravaltavi* 6 (1978): 62–71.
- Šaniže, M., *Psalmunta c'ignis zveli kartuli targmanebi* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1979).
- Šarašize, M., *P'irveli st'amba sakartveloši* (Tbilisi: Sakartvelos sssr mecnierebata akademiis gamomcemloba, 1955).
- Saržvelaze, Z., *Xanmet' da haemet' t'ekst'ebši dadast'urebul zmnis p'irian pormata sazieblebi* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1971).
- Saržvelaze, Z., (ed.), "Kebaj kebataj," in *Kartuli mc'erloba*, Vol. 1 (Tbilisi: Nak'aduli, 1987), 164–74.
- Xaranauli, A., *Zveli aytkmis xanmet'i pragment'ebi da kartuli bibliis t'ekst'is ist'oriis sak'itxebi* (Ph.D. diss., University of Tbilisi, 2005).
- Xaranauli, A., "Kartuli bibliis c'armomavlobis k'vlevis ist'oria da metodologiuri sak'itxebi," in *Bizant'nist'ik'a sakartveloši* (eds. T. Dolize and N. Maxaraze; Tbilisi, 2007), 482–528.
- Xucesi, I., *Šušanik'is cameba* (ed. I. Abulaze; Tbilisi: Xelovneba, 1978).
- Žavaxišvili, I., "Axlad aymočenili uzvelesi kartuli xelnac'erebi da mati mnišvneloba mecnierebisatvis," *Tbilisis universit'et'is moambe* 2 (1922–1923): 313–91 (repr.: I. Žavaxišvili, *Kartuli damc'erlobata-mcodneoba anu paleoграфия* [Tbilisi: St'alinis saxelobis tbilisis saxelmc'ipo universit'et'is gamomcemloba, 1949], 274–366).

In other languages:

- Biblija, sirěč' knigi vetchago i novago zavěta, po jazyku slavensku* (Moscow: Pečatnyj dvor, 1663).
- Biblija, sirěč' knigi svjaščennago pisanija vetchago i novago zavěta* (St. Petersburg: Tipografija Aleksandro-Nevskogo monastyrja, 1751).
- Birdsall, J.N., "Georgian Translations of the Bible," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 387–91.
- Blake, R., "O drevnegruzinskich versijach Vetchogo Zaveta," *Izvestija Kavkazskogo Otdela Moskovskogo Archeologičeskogo Obščestva*, Vol. 6 (Tiflis: Tipografija gruzinskogo izdatel'skogo tovariščestva, 1921).
- Blake, R., "Ancient Georgian Versions of the Old Testament," in *HTR* 19 (1926): 271–97.
- Blake, R., "The Athos Codex of the Georgian Old Testament," in *HTR* 22.1 (1929): 33–56.
- Blake, R.P., and C.M. Brière, *The Old Georgian Version of the Prophets: Critical Edition with a Latin Translation* (PO 29.3; Paris: Firmin Didot, 1961).
- Blake, R.P., and C.M. Brière, *The Old Georgian Version of the Prophets: Critical Edition with a Latin Translation* (PO 29.4; Paris: Firmin Didot, 1961).
- Blake, R.P., and C.M. Brière, *The Old Georgian Version of the Prophets: Critical Edition with a Latin Translation* (PO 29.5; Paris: Firmin Didot, 1961).
- Blake, R.P., and C.M. Brière, *The Old Georgian Version of the Prophets: Apparatus Criticus* (PO 30.3; Paris: Firmin Didot, 1963).
- Childers, J.W., "The Bible in Georgian," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 2: *From 600 to 1450* (eds. R. Marsden and E.A. Matter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 162–78.
- van Esbroeck, M., "Les versions orientales de la Bible: une orientation bibliographique," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 399–509 (Georgian: 465–80).
- Garitte, G., "Une édition critique du Psautier géorgien," *Bedi Karthlisa* 11/12 (1961): 12–20.
- Gippert, J., Z. Sarjveladze, and L. Kajaia (eds.), *The Old Georgian Palimpsest: Codex Vindoboniensis georgicus 2* (Monumenta palaeographica Medii Aevi Series Ibero-Caucasica 1; Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).
- Goussen, H., "Die georgische Bibelübersetzung: A) Alte kirchliche Abhängigkeit Georgiens von Armenien: Die alte Übersetzung," in *OrChr* 6 (1906): 300–18.
- Kharanauli, A., "Einführung in die georgische Psalterübersetzung," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* (eds. A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000), 248–308.
- Kharanauli, A., "Das Chanmeti-Fragment aus Jeremia: Fragen seiner Entstehung und seiner Übersetzungstechnik," in *OrChr* 85 (2001): 204–36.
- Kharanauli, A., "Ein Chanmeti-Fragment der georgischen Übersetzung von Esra 1 (Fragen der Authentizität, Vorlage und Übersetzungstechnik)," *Mus* 116 (2003): 181–216.
- Kharanauli, A., "Die Geschichte der Übersetzung der georgischen Bibel," *Phasis* 7 (2004): 58–68.
- Leclair, L., "[Versions orientales de la Bible.] v: Versions géorgiennes," *DBSup* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1960), 6:829–34.
- Marr, N.J., "Zametki po tekstam sv. Pisanija v drevnich perevodach armjan i gruzin," *Christianskij Vostok* 2.2 (1913): 163–74; 2.3 (1914): 263–74; 3.3 (1915): 249–62; 4.3 (1916): 229–45 (repr. N.J. Marr, *Kavkazskij kul'turnyj mir i Armenija* [Erevan: Gandzasar, 1995], 124–78).
- Oskan Erevants'i (ed.), *Astuatsashunch' Hnots'ew Norots' Ktakaranats'*: (Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments) (Amsterdam: 1666).
- Outtier, B., "Un nouveau témoin géorgien de l'Ancien Testament avec des notes marginales hexaplaïres (4 Rois)," in *Poussières de christianisme et de judaïsme antiques: Études réunies en l'honneur de Jean-Daniel Kaestli et Éric Junod* (eds. A. Frey and R. Gounelle; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007), 271–75.
- Outtier, B., "L'Ancien Testament a-t-il été traduit en arménien et géorgien du syriaque?" in *L'Ancien Testament en syriaque* (eds. F. Briquel-Chatonnet and P. Le Moigne; Études syriaques, 5; Paris: Geuthner, 2008), 215–20.
- Outtier, B., "Une énigme enfin résolue? Le modèle de la traduction géorgienne de la Bible," in *Poikiloï Karpōi (Récoltes diverses) – Exégèses païennes, juives et chrétiennes: Études réunies en hommage à Gilles Dorival* (eds. M. Loubet and D. Pralon; Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 2015), 35–40.
- Renoux, C., "Quelques psaumes dans les documents liturgiques anciens géorgiens et arméniens," in *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels: Papers from the Tbilisi Colloquium on the Editing and History of Biblical Manuscripts* (eds. C.B. Amphoux, J.K. Elliott, and B. Outtier; NTSup 142; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 57–70.

Tarchnišvili, M., *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1955).

Tarchnišvili, M., *Le grand lectionnaire de l'église de Jérusalem (ve–viii^e siècle)* (Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1959).

Tuite, K., "Das Präfix x- in Frühgeorgischen," *Georgica* 13/14 (1991): 34–61.

Tuite, K., "Early Georgian," in *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor* (ed. R.D. Woodard; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 145–65.

Vatejšvili, D.L., "Pervopečatnaja gruzinskaja Biblija 1743 g. v ee svjazi so slavjanskimi biblijami," in *Fedorovskie čtenija, 1981* (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), 179–90.

Vatejšvili, D.L., *Gruzija i evropejskie strany: Očerki istorii vzaimootnošenij XIII–XIX veka: v trech tomach*, Vol. 3.2 (Moscow: Nauka, 2006).

Alessandro Maria Bruni

1.4.9 Christian Palestinian Aramaic Translation

1.4.9.1 Origin and Historical Data

The version of the Bible known as Christian Palestinian Aramaic (CPA) and also designated Palestinian Syriac is the Palestinian Aramaic dialect of Judea and Sinai. This dialect was most prevalent between the fifth and eighth centuries, but it continued to serve as a liturgical language for the Christian Melkite community into the thirteenth century. The written dialect is transmitted through the translation of Greek literature such as the Old and New Testament as well as patristic texts. Furthermore, some inscriptional relics that have been preserved in churches and monasteries (mosaics, stones, graffiti). The inscriptional testimonies are helpful for the localization of CPA's geographical distribution.¹ What makes the CPA Bible material unique and important is that it comprises textual witnesses of the first (fifth to eighth centuries) and the second (tenth to thirteenth centuries) periods for the Old Testament. They were transmitted

¹ See Müller-Kessler, *Grammatik*, pl. 1. Quite a number of new inscriptions displaying a similar distribution have come to our attention; cf. Puech, "Notes d'épigraphie," 75–94, fig. 205. Some of them even contain quotations from the Old Testament, e.g., the mosaic inscription with Ps 131(132):1 in Di Segni and Naveh, "Greek-Aramaic Inscription," 77–78.

in their original manuscripts without ever being copied, thus reflecting the original fourth-century written dialect. The reading and publication of the early-period manuscripts has been partially hindered by the fact that they are only extant in the form of palimpsests, overwritten in Arabic, Georgian, Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac. It has been less helpful that Syriac lexemes, forms, and syntactical constructions have been read into the first palimpsest publications, disguising important textual variants for Bible critics.²

In the chronological order of transmitted biblical textual witnesses of the Old Testament, the CPA translation is the second to youngest that has come to our attention. Most of the texts are biblical, but the remaining Old Testament corpus is rather scanty in contrast to the New Testament material, and most of it stems from lectionaries.

A short outline of the extant Old Testament CPA material shows what has been discovered to date. It was not until 1875 that the first Old Testament specimens were edited (Deut 6:4–5, 7–10, 11–12, 14–16 [Lectionary = Lec]; 7:25–26 [Lec]; Job 6:1–13 [Lec]*; 7:21 [Lec]*; 9:12–34 [Lec]*;³ 21:1–22 [Lec]; Prov 9:1–11 [Lec]; Isa 11:6–10; 14:28–15:5; 40:1–7, 9–12 [Lec]; 50:4–5 [Lec]). They stem from lectionaries except for two Isaiah fragments (Isa 11:6–10; 14:28–15:5), which were presumably written in the Monastery of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem. They are housed today in the National Library of Russia (St. Petersburg, Syr. 16).⁴

² Recent corrected text passages have not yet been integrated into the critical variant apparatuses of the relevant Old and New Testament editions. Similar omissions can be observed in Goshen-Gottstein and Shirun, *Syro-Palestinian Version*, which was edited posthumously by M. Bar-Asher in 2008. The edition was not updated by using the latest readings in the editions of Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff (*Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem*) and displays still the outdated readings of Land, *Anecdota*, and Pigoulewski, "Fragments syro-palestiniens," and omits the vital shelf numbers after the sigla. This applies also to the new fragments from Brock, *Catalogue*, which have not been integrated.

³ The passages indicated with an asterisk were identified much later. Job 7:21 was only edited in Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 145.

⁴ Land, *Anecdota*, 165–67, 173, 182, 185–87, 222–23; fully republished with improved readings and previously unpub-

In 1897, Lewis published *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary Containing Lessons from the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Prophets, Acts, and Epistles*. It contains readings from Old Testament passages (Gen 1:1–3:24; 6:9–9:19; 18:1–5; 18:18–19:30; 22:1–19; Exod 8:22b–9:35; 10:1–11:10; Deut 10:12–11:28; 12:28–14:3; Isa 3:9b–15; 7:10–16; 8:8–12:6; 25:1–3a; 35:1–10; 40:1–17; 42:5–10; 42:16b–43:14; 44:2–7; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12; 60–61:11; 63:1–7; Jer 11:18–20; Amos 8:9–12; Mic 5:2–5; Joel 1:14–2:11; 2:12–27; 3:9–21; Jonah complete; Zech 9:9–15; 11:11b–14; Psalms [only single verses]; Prov 1:1–19; 9:1–11; Job 16:1–10; 16:21–17:16; 21:1–34). Some missing pages were added in 1902 and 1906 (Exod 15:1–5a; Job 16:9b–19; Joel 2:31c–3:8).⁵ Lewis' *Lectionary* was edited with critical notes on the underlying Greek *Vorlage* by Nestle,⁶ but the manuscript is late and dates to the tenth or eleventh century.⁷ The *Liturgy of the Nile*, which was published at the same time, contains three more biblical passages (Gen 2:4–19; 2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 2:19–22; Amos 9:5–14a) but dates to the thirteenth century. Further examples came to our attention from a late *horologion* dated 1187 C.E., which was published in 1954 (Exodus 15:1–19; 1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 2:1–10; Isa 8:9–14; 9:2–7; 26:9–19; 38:9–20; Jonah 2:3–10; Habakkuk 3; Psalms 3–6; 16; 24; 29–31; 33; 37; 45; 53–56; 60; 62; 79; 83–85; 87; 89–92, 100–102; 118; 137–139; 142; 145; Dan 3:52–88 following the text sequence of Theodotion).⁸

Already 1896, two fragments from St. Catherine's Monastery were published, attesting to the text of 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms) 2:35k–36l; 35n–35o; 9:4–

lished passages in Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 62–64, 77–79, 116–22, 130–31, 137–39, 144–47. Brock, "Sinai," describes the background of the manuscripts, which were overwritten by the Georgian scribe Zosimi. Recent insights provided a definitive answer for the distribution of Sinai Georgian 34 over the CPA palimpsest manuscripts in St. Petersburg. See Müller-Kessler, "Codex Sinaiticus Rescriptus," 304.

⁵ Schulthess, "Fragmente," 249, 253–54; Duensing, *Texte und Fragmente*, 153; Lewis and Gibson, *Supplement*.

⁶ Nestle apud Lewis and Gibson, *Lectionary*, xl–lxiii.

⁷ Lewis and Gibson, *Lectionary*.

⁸ Black, *Horologion*, 23–46, where he outlined the divergences from the Greek versions and drew on the Syriac parallels.

5;⁹ and Job 22:3–12.¹⁰ Two further fragments with Ps 26(27):7 [Lec]; Prov 1:15b–19 [Lec]; Jer 1:11–17 [Lec]; Dan 3:24b–37 of the same manuscript as St. Petersburg, Syr. 16 were added in 1906.¹¹ The other fragments from two Bible manuscripts (Vatican, Sir. 623, 627) with Exod 12:28b–51; 14:18–27a; 15:7–20a; 16:2b–16:33; 16:34–17:17; 26:3b–11, 26b–36; 38:4b–18; Deut 12:17–25a; 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 1:9–20; 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms) 8:18–18,¹² probably originating from St. Catherine's Monastery, were edited in the same volume as St. Petersburg, Syr. 16. All are excellent witnesses of the first language stage of CPA.

In 1893, the first biblical fragment with Num 4:46–47; 4:49–5:2; 5:3–4, 6–8 was issued.¹³ It was the first CPA manuscript among the finds from the Cairo Genizah, of which more specimens were edited over the following one hundred years: Gen 49:24; 49:33–50:1a; Exod 28:1–12; Num 22:37–23:6; Deut 31:3–8a, 11c–14, 19c–21, 25b–29a; 2 Sam (2 Kgdms) 6:19–7:7; 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms) 14:21–15:4a; Isa 36:15c–37:4; Jer 12:12–13:6a, 23–25; 14:4–7a; 21:12–22:8a;¹⁴ 29(36):32–30(37):10; 31(38):4–20, 21, 28; 31(38):35–32(39):2, 35–44; 36(43):1–8; 36(43):25–

⁹ The recent identification of Sinai, Arabic 588, fol. 35 has the nearly complete Lucian addition of ^{correct?}

¹⁰ Gwilliam, Burkitt, and Stenning, *Biblical and Patristic Relics*, 33–34, 40–41.

¹¹ Duensing, *Texte und Fragmente*, 126–27, kept today in the Martin Schøyen Collection, Oslo (MS 35). Improved readings were added in Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 128, 149–50, 187–88. More unpublished fragments of the same codex were recently identified by the author in the pilot of the Sinai Palimpsests Project (Exod 4:31–5:1a; 5:3–4a, 6–7a, 8b–10a [Georgian NF 71, fols. 1+8]; and from another MS 1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 18:25–19:5 [Greek NF MG14, fol. 21] all unattested). The distribution of Codex Sinaiticus Rescriptus, consisting of diverging original manuscripts over many localities and hidden under various Georgian manuscripts, is a complex matter. It was described in Müller-Kessler, "Codex Sinaiticus Rescriptus."

¹² Duensing, *Texte und Fragmente*, 113–25, preceded by a detailed analysis of the text character in pp. 95–112.

¹³ Gwilliam, *Palestinian Version*, 4–7, pl. I. (Bodleian Library, MS Syr. c. 4).

¹⁴ Jer 22:4–8a (Bodleian, Heb. e. 73, fol. 42^v) is still unpublished, but with modern technology some more words have come to light.

37(44):10; 37(44):19–38(45):12, 14–22; 52:22–29; Ezek 22:11–20; Lam 1:10–18; Hos 14:4–10; Joel 1:1–6; 2:10–20.¹⁵

The Umayyad Mosque in Damascus also yielded CPA Bible manuscripts, but their origin is still obscure. The following fragments have been published: Gen 19:1–10; 49:24–50:12; Exod 36:16–18, 20–23; 39:11, 14, 39–40; 40:4–17; Num 13:19–33; 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 7:14–8:9.¹⁶

In 1909, a number of Old Testament fragments from the Codex Climaci Rescriptus (= CCR) surfaced that attest the text of Exod 4:14c–18; Deut 6:4–7:26; 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 1:1a; 2:19b–29a; 6:5–18; Isa 40:1–8; Jer 11:22b–12:8; Isa 53:9c–11a; Joel 2:12–14, 16c–20; Mic 4:1–3; Job 6:1–7:21; Pss 2:7a; 26(27):7; 40(41):1a, 4; 50(51):1; 56(57):1a; 109(110):1a, 3a; 131(132):1a; Prov 1:20–22. All of these fragments belong to a lectionary (CCR 3), whereas Job 1:21, Cant 5:2–3, and Jer 7:4 are only quotations in homilies (CCR 4).¹⁷ The two fragments with Lev 8:18b–30b and 11:42c–12:8b clearly derive from a Bible manuscript (CCR 7).¹⁸

A fragment of CPA-Josh came to light among the manuscript finds in Khirbet Mird. The exact text passage could not be identified but is possibly Josh 22:6–7, 9–10. More evidence from the Psalms dating to the late period has recently become known (Psalms 73; 80–82; 84–88; 101; 136; 145).¹⁹ In addition, earlier text witnesses from St. Catherine's Monastery were discovered in the form of palimpsests.²⁰ Among them are the previously

unattested passages Exod 4:31–5:1a; 5:3–4a, 6–7a, 8b–10 (Georgian NF 71, fol. 1+8) from the lectionary that is also preserved as St. Petersburg, Syr. 16 and in the Martin Schøyen Collection (MS), fol. 27, 64/65. Further specimens are two fragments from Bible manuscripts with 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 8:22b–9:8; 18:15–19:5. It is uncertain whether these two recently identified folios (Greek NF MG14, fols. 28, 21) belong to the same Bible manuscript as 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 1:9–20 (Vatican, Sir. 627).²¹ Among the new Greek manuscripts found in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai surfaced Job 3:11c–4:4a and Prov 11:1a–16a (Greek NF MG14, fols. 19, 20; unpublished) as well as an unattested lectionary with passages from Gen 8:9b–9:6; Exod 6:28–7:9; 14:24–15:9; Deut 10:12–17; 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 2:11–15; Isa 42:1–4; Jeremiah 1–10; Joel 3:1–4:8; Jonah 4:11; Pss 74(75):1; 129(130):1–2; Prov 9:7–10; Job 14:15b–22; 38:2–33 (Greek NF MG32; unpublished).

1.4.9.2 Scope of the Corpus

The CPA Bible is structured according to the LXX arrangement (→ 1.3.1.1), i.e., it contains all the MT books and the deuterocanonical texts. Not all biblical books have been preserved in the CPA version. Hardly any of the CPA manuscripts are complete except for two lectionaries,²² the *horologion* (1188 C.E.),²³ and the *Nile Liturgy* (thirteenth century),²⁴ which comprise some excerpts of

of Vienna, in collaboration with the authorities of St. Catherine's Monastery Sinai and under the technical director Michael Phelps of the Early Manuscript Electronic Library with an international team of experts who read and identify the texts. The catalogue is prepared in an electronic form for publication. The unpublished text passages are quoted here with the permission of the St. Catherine's Monastery. There is bound to be more unknown CPA Old Testament material.

²¹ The fragments were identified during the preparation of this article by the author.

²² There are more lectionaries extant, but they comprise only the Gospels.

²³ Black, *Horologion*, 23–46, added critical notes for the Old Testament passages and chapters. Schulthess, "Fragmente," 249–51, published the now-missing fragment containing Ps 143:8–12; Exod 15:1–5. It is doubtful that this missing fragment is parchment.

²⁴ Margoliouth, *Palestinian Syriac Version*.

¹⁵ Lewis and Gibson, *Taylor-Schechter Collection*. Many of the fragments were later identified and published in Baars, "Book of Lamentations," 224–27; Baars, "Epistle of Jeremy," 78–79; Goshen-Gottstein, *Syropalestinian Version*, 36, 47; Müller-Kessler, "Fragments," 207–21; Müller-Kessler, "Unidentified Fragment," 119–22; Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 19, 99–100, 164, 175–78, 180, 208–09, 211–12.

¹⁶ Schulthess, *Fragmente*.

¹⁷ Lewis and Gibson, *Codex Climaci Rescriptus*.

¹⁸ Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 50–53.

¹⁹ Brock, *Catalogue*, 87–88, figs. 418–35.

²⁰ All new palimpsest manuscripts are catalogued and photographed using various innovative spectral-imaging technologies to highlight the erased texts in the Sinai Palimpsest Project under the scholarly director Claudia Rapp, University

the CPA Bible. The only extensive Bible manuscript, containing Jeremiah, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, and Baruch was preserved as a palimpsest in the Cairo Genizah overwritten with rabbinic literature (Talmud Yerushalmi; *Gen. Rab.*). This manuscript is dispersed today in a number of collections (University Library, Cambridge; British Museum, London; Bodleian Library, Oxford; National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg).²⁵ A number of complete fragments with Exodus and Deuteronomy are preserved in another palimpsest manuscript (Vatican, Sir. 623).²⁶ Most of the Old Testament books survive only via lectionaries. Only the book of Jonah from the Lewis Lectionary is complete. Some books of the Prophets, Zephaniah and Malachi, are exclusively known through quotations from the New Testament the catecheses of and Cyril of Jerusalem.²⁷ In some cases it is not clear whether the folios belong to a Bible manuscript. In the meantime, the improved readings from the Genizah and other collections demonstrate that a number of folios carry headers of the biblical book *dmpqn* “of Exodus,”²⁸ *dlwy* “of Leviticus,”²⁹ *nby* “prophet,” *rymy* “Jeremiah,” *mn rymy* “Epistle of Jeremiah.”³⁰ Most telling is the double folio T-s 16.325, in which the final chapter of Hosea (14:4–10) is followed directly by Joel like in MT and in disagreement with the LXX arrangement.³¹

The CPA translation does not conform to a fixed *textus receptus* as was demonstrated by three variant texts of Isa 50:4, two deriving from lectionaries,

²⁵ A detailed manuscript description is found in Sokoloff and Yahalom, “Christian Palimpsests.”

²⁶ Duensing, *Texte und Fragmente*, 113–23.

²⁷ Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 31, 46.

²⁸ Header over Exod 15:7–20 in Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 31.

²⁹ Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 31, 46.

³⁰ Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 157, 169–170, 177–180.

³¹ They were initially published randomly by Lewis and Gibson, *Taylor-Schechter Collection*, 34–40; improved readings are found in Goshen-Gottstein, *Syropalestinian Version*, 92–94, and more, including previously unpublished fragments identified by Müller-Kessler, followed in Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 189–93.

early and late, and one Bible fragment. The three witnesses have different geographical origins and scribal hands. This textual diversity is confirmed by the new finds from St. Catherine Monastery, Sinai.³²

1.4.9.3 Dating of the Textual Transmission

To define the precise date of the first translation of the CPA Old Testament is a moot question. The whole situation is hampered by the fact that the early palimpsest manuscripts never carry colophons. However, it must be in the period between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. This is evident from a description by St. Egeria (*Aetaria*) connected with her pilgrimage to Palestine at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century. She observed a Greek-speaking bishop who was accompanied by a presbyter who translated the Bible lessons as well as the sermon into “Syriac.”³³ The need to translate the Bible into Christian Palestinian Aramaic might have satisfied the needs of the lower clergy who wanted to be able to comprehend the Bible and preach it in an understandable mode.

1.4.9.4 Translation Character

For the CPA translation, one has to differentiate between passages appearing in lectionaries and those in Bible manuscripts. There are also quotations extant in New Testament verses and in the catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem. In the biblical manuscripts, the CPA version is in most cases a literal translation of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1). An example can be found in Gen 49:24 *wʾštrw ǰydyʾ dʾdrʾyʾ byʾdh*/καὶ ἐξελύθη = τὰ νεύρα βραχιόνων χειρῶν αὐτῶν “And the sinews of the hands (CPA omits of the hands) of the arms were released” (T-S AS 78.405). It is all the more significant that in 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 18:29b–30 the CPA translation adds one-and-a-half verses only attested in Lucian and Origen:

³² Cf. Duensing, *Fragmente*, 91.

³³ See Metzger, *Early Versions*, 77.

*w't'bd dwyd mstn'(sic) lš'w[l] kwlhwn ywṁ[m] y' wnpq̄w
'wn 'rkwnyhwn dšwbt'y' nwkry' whw' mn swgy' dmp-
wqhwn hw' mtbwnn dwyd mn kw' 'bdw'y dmlk' w'ty'qr
šymyh lhd'*

και εγενετο σαουλ εχθρευων τον δαυιδ πασας τας ημερας
(30) και εξηλθον οι αρχοντες των αλλοφυλων και εγενετο
αφ ικανου εξοδιας αυτων συνηκεν δαυιδ παρα παντας
τους δουλους σαουλ και ετιμηθη το ονομα αυτου σφοδρα

“And Saul became hateful with regard to David (CPA:
“And David became hateful towards Saul”) for all
days. And the rulers of the foreign tribes went out.
And it happened as often as they went out, David
was more successful than all servants of Saul, and his
name was much honoured.”

Also in 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 9:1, CPA is close to LXX: *brh
dqbr ymyn'y* = υιοῦ ἀνδρὸς Ἰεμιναιῶ “the son of a
Yemenite man.” In the recent find of Prov 11:4, it is
noteworthy that half of a verse is added in the CPA
version [*sd*]yq' *kd m't* [*p*]rqrthwn [...] *dy wbhdw' hw'
'bdnhwn dšy'y* “the [right]eous [de]livers them
when dead ... and with joy, be it the annihilation
of the evil ones,” which is known from the Syro-
Hexapla (Milan, Ambrosiana), and is added after
v. 3 by a few LXX witnesses (Origen), but is not ex-
tant in MT.³⁴ The difference between the biblical
manuscript witnesses and the lectionary (= Lec)
passages is sometimes noticeable in tense and ex-
pression or word usage, as in the following exam-
ples:

- Joel 2:10: *wz'w* (Lewis Lec: *wyzw'wn*) *šwmy'
šymš' wzhr' yhš:wkwn wkwkby'y'rb* (Lewis Lec:
ytm'wn) *nhwrhwn* “and move heaven, sun and
moon (Lec: will move) and the stars will become
dark, their light will go down”
- Joel 2:14: *nkys' wqwrbn* (Lewis Lec, CCR 3: *wnkys'
wslwl*) *lmr' 'lhn* “the sacrifice and the burned
sacrifice and the libation for the Lord, our God”

The Bible manuscript with the text of Joel 2:10
tends toward the Peshitta, but also the text of Joel
2:14 from the Lewis Lectionary corresponds to the

Peshitta. The Cairo Genizah variants of these pas-
sages have more ancient lexemes, e.g., the verb *ntn*
in *wl' ytn lkwn* “and he will not give you” (Joel 2:19),
whereas both lectionaries show here Syriac influ-
ence by employing the verb *ytl*, *wl' ytl ytkwn* “and
he will not give you” (CCR3) and *wlyt 'n' yhb lkwn*
“I am not giving you” (Lewis Lectionary). The di-
rect dependence on LXX in CPA-Joel 2:16a is demon-
strated by the phrase *knšw qhl' qdšw knyšt' knšw šby'
'wlymy' wynqyn byzy* “assemble the people, sanc-
tify the congregation, choose the elders, assem-
ble the young, sucking the breasts” corresponding
to συναγάγετε λαόν, αγιάσατε ἐκκλησιαν, [ἐκλέξασθε
πρεσβυτέρους] συναγάγετε νήπια θηλάζοντα μαστούς
“assemble the people, sanctify the congregation,
choose the elders, assemble the young, and (which)
are sucking the breasts.” Sometimes CPA shows de-
viations from LXX as in the gloss *hyk šwšnt' dqrynwn*
“like the lily, which is *qrinon*” /ὡς κρίνον “like a lily”
(Hos 14:6; T-S 16.325, 1r). The expression *'l kwl-
hwn mgyry' byšy* “over all my evil neighbours” (Jer
12:14; T-S 16.322, 2r) corresponds to the Peshitta,
as the possessive pronoun “my” is lacking in LXX
(περὶ πάντων τῶν γειτόνων τῶν πονηρῶν “over all evil
neighbours”) and in Targum Jonathan (על כול שכני
הרעים “over all evil neighbours”). In Hos 14:4, the
singular forms סוס “horse” and יתום “orphan” of MT
as well as of LXX ἵππον “horse” and ὀρφανόν “or-
phan” are rendered by plural equivalents in CPA
swšw'n “horses” and *ytymy* “orphans.” The plural
forms in CPA correspond to the Peshitta and to Tar-
gum Jonathan. Baumstark argued hence that the
CPA version corresponds often to the Targum,³⁵ but
this cannot be upheld, since there does not seem
to be such a connection. Baumstark did not have
many of the CPA fragments at hand, as they were
only published much later. In reading שורמיד מלך א
“from the hand of the king of Assur” in Isa 36:18,
the Peshitta and Targum Jonathan agree with MT,
which reads מלך אשור “from the hand of the
king of Assur” while CPA has *mn byn 'ydw'y dmlkhwn
dswryy* “from the hands of the king of the Syrians”

³⁴ Information provided by Sebastian P. Brock.

³⁵ Baumstark, “Christlich-palästinensisch Pentateuch-
textes.”

and is thus clearly based on LXX in this verse (ἐκ χειρὸς βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων “from the hands of the king of the Assyrians”). CPA always employs *swry*’ for Ἀσσύριος. Similarly, in Isa 36:16, the *ʾn lyttwn šbyn tytbīkwn* “if you want to be blessed” of CPA is a literal translation of εἰ βούλεσθε εὐλογηθῆναι “if you want to be blessed.” Furthermore, CPA adds in Isa 36:19 *dmdynt*’ “of the city” as does LXX (τῆς πόλεως “of the city”).

1.4.9.5 Translation Technique and Inner-Translational Features

In its translation technique, the CPA version has to overcome certain incongruences of the Aramaic with the Greek language. Apart from non-existing case endings in CPA, complex Greek verbal expressions and abstract nouns cannot be rendered. However, in contrast to Syriac, CPA differentiates between undetermined and determined words. Whereas Greek has a tense system, CPA is based on aspects. It can employ the present tense for the Greek future tense. An example is *lyt ʾn ʾwn mwsp ʾwd dyšqwp* “I do not smite again” Gen 8:21 (Lec; Greek NF MG32) for οὐ προσθήσω οὖν “I shall not smite again.” But in the Lewis Lectionary the same expression is rendered with the future tense *lʾ ʾwn ywsp ʾwd dyšqwp* “I shall not smite again.” The so-called present tense is an “auxiliary construction” of an active participle with the independent personal pronoun. Greek participle constructions are quite often imitated with the particle *mn* plus the active participle as predicative,³⁶ e.g., *mn mpqd* = ἐπιτάσων “ordering” Gen 49:33, *mn mml* = λαλῶν “idle babbling” Job 9:27 (Lec), *mn npl* = ἐκπορευομένη “falling” Job 38:8 (Lec), *mn npšyn* = ζώντας “breathing” Ps 123(124):3. This questions the originality of this syntagm in Western Aramaic in general and points to Greek influence. There is no Semitic equivalent for many Greek particles; in most instances they were borrowed from Greek, but they do not occur on a regular basis in the Greek *Vorlage*. One notes *rʾ* =

ἄρα “then” (Ps 123[124]:3, 4); *ʾ* = ἢ “or”; *ʾwn* = οὖν “then”; *gr* = γάρ “but”; *dy* = δέ “but”; *dy* = δὴ “now”; *qygr* = καὶ γάρ “but”; and *tkʾ* = τάχα “perhaps” (Jer 36[43]:3). Semitic languages tend towards parataxis and not to hypotaxis as does Greek. Such syntactical constructions are awkward to translate into CPA.

CPA borrowed many Greek words, but they are not necessarily direct borrowings from the textual *Vorlage* of the translation. There are certain Greek lexemes that are employed for central religious terms: *dyʾtyqy* = διαθήκη “testament”; *kybwtʾ* = κιβωτός “arch”; *nyms* = νόμος “law.” Special terms for certain objects were also borrowed: *mksʾ* = ἄμαξαν “chariot” (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 6:7; Lec); *qrṭwl* = κάραλος, “basket” (Exod 39:39); *qyṣt* < κίστη “jug” (Exod 16:33); *lmPdyhwn* = τὰ λαμπάδια, “their lamps” (Exod 38:16); *lbs* < λέβητα “vessel” (Jer 1:13; Lec). Terms for objects of clothing were often borrowed from Greek: *zwnʾ* < ζώνην “belt” (Exod 28:4); *Pyryzwmʾ* < περιζώμα “belt” (Jer 13:2); *ʾṣṭwlytʾ* = τὴν στολὴν “garment” (Exod 28:3). The same is true for architectural terms: *bʾsys* = βάσις “base” (Exod 26:32); *bwmsʾ* = βωμόν “altar” (Num 23:2); *qyplydʾ* = κεφαλὴς “capital” (Jer 52:22); *qwiqwsyn* < κρίκους “clasps” (Exod 26:6); *qyṭwnh* < τοῦ κοιτῶνος “his chamber” (Joel 2:16); *nwsh* < ναοῦ “his temple” (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 1:9); *pyḡmyʾ* < πῆγμα “frameworks” (Deut 6:9; Lec). Greek military terms are widespread in late Aramaic, even in the Eastern Babylonian dialects; an example is *rkwñyhw* < οἱ ἄρχωντες “their leaders” (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 18:30). Certain flowers (*qrynwn* = κρίνον “lily”; Hos 14:6), and animal names are employed: *ʾšpyšyn* < ἄσπιδες “vipers” (Isa 11:8); *diʾqwnywn* < δράκων “dragons” (Jer 14:6); *[qyṭ]wswyʾ* = κήτη “whales” (Job 9:13; Lec), *prdwšʾ* = πάρδαλις “panther” (Isa 11:6). Other Greek loanwords are: *ʾpwlwgyʾ* = ἀπολογουμένων “speech” (Jer 31[38]:6); *krtys* = χαρτίον “writing sheet” (Jer 36[43]:4); *nyšwtʾ* < νήσους “islands” (Jer 31[38]:10). The word *καιρός* “time” and cultural interloans such as *qy[s]trʾ* = κασσίτερος “tin” (Ezek 22:20) and *zmrḡdʾ* = σμαράγδου “emerald” (Exod 28:9) occur frequently. Despite CPA’s dependence on Greek *Vorlagen*, such loan words are less frequent than in contemporary Jewish Aramaic texts. They are rather an indication of the Hell-

³⁶ The first to point this out was Kutscher, *Studies*, 57, but it had already been treated by Schulthess, *Grammatik*, 90.

enization of Western Aramaic, with the exception of the particles, than a direct influence through translation.³⁷

Certain proper names appear in the Greek transliterations but in non-inflected forms: *'bywd* = Αβιουδ "Abioud" (Exod 28:1); *'pq* = Αφεκ "Aphék" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 9:1); *'rymy* = Ιερεμιαμ "Jeremiah" (Jer 1:1; Lec); *'rmtm* = Αρμαθαμ "Harmathaim" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 1:19); *z'rd* = Σαρεδ "Sared" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 9:1); *bkyr* = Βαχιρ "Bachir" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 9:1); *hlqy'* = χελκιου "of Chelkias" (Jer 1:1; Lec); *yw'qym* = Ιωακιμ "Ioakim" (Jer 36[43]:32); *ywšy'* = Ιωσια "Iosia" (Jer 1:3 [Lec]; 36[43]:2); *ywšpt* = Ιωσαφατ "Iosaphat" (2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 1:18a; Lec); *kwzy'* = Οχοζιου "of Ochozias" (2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 1:18; Lec); *mlkwl* = Μελχολ "Melchol" (2 Sam [2 Kgdms] 6:21); *qys* = Κις "Kis" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 9:1); *rpsqys* = Ραψακου "of Rabsakes" (Isa 37:4); *swsqym* = Σουσακιμ "Sousakim" (1 Kgs [3 Kgdms] 14:25); *mwhb* = Μωαβ "Moab" (Isa 15:4); *mmbr'* = Μαμβρη "Mambre" (Gen 49:30); *qdy's* = Καδης "Kades" (Num 13:27); *rpydyn* = Ραφιδιν "Raphidin" (Exod 17:1); *sb'* = Σαβα "Saba" (Job 6:19); *sygwr* = Σηγωρ "Segor" (Isa 15:5); *tnys* = Τάνις "Tanis" (Num 13:23). Quite a number of names are hybrid forms, especially in the name of the prophets, which often appear in the non-inflected form. Examples in biblical headers include *hzqys* = Εζεκιου "Hezekias" (Isa 36:16); *mky's* = Μιχαϊας "Michah" (lectionary incipit);³⁸ *šwmns* = Σομνας "Somnas" (Isa 36:22). Far more often the appropriate original Semitic form is retained: *ywb* = אִיּוֹב "Job" (Job 21:1; Lec); *yshq* = יִצְחָק "Isaak" (Gen 49:31); *yš'* = יֵשׁוּעַ "Jesse" (Isa 11:10); *'lypz* = אֱלִיפָז "Eliphaz" (Job 4:1); **wkn'y* = כְּנִיָּהוּ "Coniah" (Jer 37[44]:1); *ywrm* = יוֹרָם "Joram" (2 Kgs [4 Kgdms] 1:18a; Lec). Sometimes the Semitic form appears even in plene spellings: *brwk* = בְּרֻךְ "Baruch" (Jer 36[43]:8); *gzyr* = גֶּזֶר "Gezer" (Jer 31[38]:39); *ywš-lym* = יְרוּשָׁלַיִם "Jerusalem" (Isa 36:20); *'ntwt* = אֲנָתוֹת "Anathoth" (Jer 11:23); *prn* = פָּרָן "Paran" (Num 13:26); *šdyqy'* = צִדְקִיָּהוּ "Zedekiah" (Jer 32[39]:1); *šm'y* = שִׁמְעַי "Shimei" (1 Kgs [3 Kgdms] 2:36). Oth-

ers, however, show deviating spellings without a Semitic etymological background: *hlqn'* = הֶלְקָן "Elkanah" (1 Sam [1 Kgdms] 1:1; Lec), resembling the Peshitta version *hlqn'*.

1.4.9.6 Text-Critical Value

In Septuagint studies, the text-critical value of the CPA translation is very controversial. For MT (→ 1.2.2), CPA is hardly of any importance. The CPA version of the Historical Books and Prophets is based on a LXX version (→ 1.3.1.1) that is infiltrated by readings of Lucian (→ 1.3.1.2) and Origen (→ 1.3.1.2) as illustrated by 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 19:2: *š'wl 'b' b' "dyqtwl ytk* = Σαουλ ὁ πατήρ μου ζητεῖ θανατώσαί δε "Saul, my father tries to kill you." Hexaplaric additions (→ 1.3.1.2) are noted in the Prophets. Sometimes the CPA version was even remodelled according to Hexaplaric texts. An example can be found in the double folio (T-S 16.325), where Joel immediately follows Hosea. Often, CPA is simply a straightforward translation from LXX: *mk qhl' sgd* "the people bent down praying" = κύψας δὲ ὁ λαὸς προσεκύνησεν "but the people bent down praying" (Exod 4:31); *ypgw' bn mwt' "hrb'* "death or sword might hit us" = μήποτε συναντήσῃ ἡμῖν θάνατος ἢ φόνος "if we are hit by death or murder" (Exod 5:3).³⁹ The question was raised if targumic affinities are noticeable at the beginning of Genesis 19.⁴⁰ Despite many statements to the contrary, hardly any correspondence with the Peshitta and reworking on the basis of the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) can be made out. This makes the CPA translation of less help for the reconstruction of the original LXX text (→ 1.3.1.1). It is debatable whether a better reading of LXX variants is preserved through this Palestinian version,⁴¹ since the text variants are different in lectionaries and Bible manuscripts, and can also be found in the paraphrased citations in the work of Cyril of Jerusalem.

³⁷ Cf. Kraus, *Lehnwörter*.

³⁸ Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, *Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament*, 198a:11.

³⁹ Both passages of Georgian NF 71, fol. 1^r+8^r are still unpublished.

⁴⁰ Baumstark, "Pentateuchtext," 201–25.

⁴¹ For this position, see Duensing, *Texte und Fragmente*, 112.

- Baars, W., "A Palestinian Syriac Text of the Book of Lamentations," *VT* 10 (1960): 224–27.
- Baars, W., "Two Palestinian Syriac Texts Identified as Parts of the Epistle of Jeremy," *VT* 11 (1961): 77–81.
- Baumstark, A., "Das Problem des christlich-palästinensichen Pentateuchtextes," *OrChr* 10 (1935): 201–24.
- Baumstark, A., "Neue orientalische Probleme biblischer Textgeschichte," *ZDMG* 89 (1935): 89–118.
- Black, M., *A Christian Palestinian Horologion* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1954).
- Brock, S.P., *Catalogue of Syriac Fragments (New Finds) in the Library of the Monastery of Saint Catherine, Mount Sinai* (Athens: Mount Sinai Foundation, 1995).
- Brock, S.P., "Sinai: A Meeting Point of Georgian with Syriac and Christian Palestinian Aramaic," in *The Caucasus between East and West: Historical and Philological Studies in Honour of Zaza Aleksidze* (Tbilisi: Sak'art'velos Xelnacert'a Evronuli C'entri, 2012), 482–94.
- Delekat, L., "Die Syropalästinische Jesaja-Übersetzung," *ZAW* 71 (1959): 165–201.
- Di Segni, L., and J. Naveh, "A Bilingual Greek-Aramaic Inscription from H. Qastra, near Haifa," *Atiqot* 29 (1996): 77–78.
- Duensing, H., *Christlich-palästinisch-aramäische Texte und Fragmente nebst einer Abhandlung über den Wert der palästinischen Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906).
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., *The Bible in the Syropalestinian Version, Part 1: Pentateuch and Prophets* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973).
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., and H. Shirun, *The Bible in the Syropalestinian Version, Part 2: Psalms* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2008).
- Gwilliam, G.H., *The Palestinian Version of the Holy Scriptures: Five More Fragments Recently Acquired by the Bodleian Library* (Anecdota Oxoniensia Semitic Series 1.5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893).
- Gwilliam, G.H., F.C. Burkitt, and J.F. Stenning, *Biblical and Patristic Relics of the Palestinian Syriac Literature from MSS in the Bodleian Library and in the Library of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai* (Anecdota Oxoniensia Semitic Series 1.9; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).
- Kraus, S., *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (Berlin: Calvary, 1899).
- Kutscher, E.Y., *Studies in Galilean Aramaic: Translated from the Hebrew Original and Annotated with Additional Notes from the Author's Handcopy* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1976).
- Land, J.P.N., *Anecdota Syriaca*, Vol. 4 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1875).
- Lewis, A.S., E. Nestle, and M.D. Gibson, *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary Containing Lessons from the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Prophets, Acts, and Epistles* (with critical notes by E. Nestle; London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1897).
- Lewis, A.S., and M.D. Gibson, *Palestinian Syriac Texts from Palimpsest Fragments in the Taylor-Schechter Collection* (London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1900).
- Lewis, A.S., and M.D. Gibson, *Supplement to a Palestinian Syriac Lectionary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907).
- Lewis, A.S., and M.D. Gibson, *Codex Climaci Rescriptus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).
- Margoliouth, G., *The Palestinian Syriac Version of the Holy Scriptures: Four Recently Discovered Portions (together with Verses from the Psalms and the Gospel of St. Luke)* (London: Society of Biblical Archaeology, 1897).
- Metzger, B.M., *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- Müller-Kessler, C., *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen, Part 1: Schriftlehre, Lautlehre, Morphologie* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1991).
- Müller-Kessler, C., "Christian-Palestinian-Aramaic Fragments in the Bodleian Library," *JSS* 37 (1992): 207–21.
- Müller-Kessler, C., "An Unidentified Christian Palestinian Aramaic Fragment in the Taylor-Schechter Collection: Isaiah 36:16–37:4," *BSOAS* 56 (1993): 119–22.
- Müller-Kessler, C., "Codex Sinaiticus Rescriptus (CSRG/O/P/S): A Collection of Christian Palestinian Aramaic Manuscripts," *Mus* 127 (2014): 263–309.
- Müller-Kessler, C., and M. Sokoloff, *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and the Apocrypha Version from the Early Period* (Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 1; Groningen: Styx, 1997).
- Müller-Kessler, C., and M. Sokoloff, *The Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem in the Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and the Apocrypha Version from the Early Period* (Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 5; Groningen: Styx, 1999).
- Perrot, C., "Un fragment christo-paléstinien découvert à Kirbet Mird," *RB* 70 (1963): 506–55.
- Pigoulewsky, N., "Fragments syro-paléstiens des Psalms CXXIII–IV," *RB* 43 (1934): 519–27.
- Puech, É., "Notes d'épigraphie christo-paléstinienne de Jordanie," in *In Memoriam Fr Michele Piccirillo, ofm (1944–2008): Celebrating His Life and Work* (eds.

- C. Dauphin and B. Hamarneh; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2011), 75–94.
- Schulthess, F., “Christlich-palästinische Fragmente,” *ZDMG* 56 (1902): 249–61.
- Schulthess, F., *Christlich-palästinische Fragmente aus der Omajjaden-Moschee zu Damaskus* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1905).
- Schulthess, F., *Grammatik des christlich-palästinischen Aramäisch* (ed. E. Littmann; Tübingen: Mohr, 1924).
- Sokoloff, M., and J. Yahalom, “Christian Palimpsests from the Cairo Geniza,” *Revue d’Histoire des Textes* 8 (1978): 109–32.

Christa Müller-Kessler

1.4.10 Old Church Slavonic Translations

1.4.10.1 Background

The Old Church Slavonic (= OCS)¹ tradition of the Old Testament, which derives mostly from LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) and to a lesser degree from the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5), remains poorly studied in terms of textual criticism.² Challenges arise in particular due to the extensive paleographic and recensional differences and the great linguistic heterogeneity of the witnesses, dating from the early eleventh up to the eighteenth centuries, as well as from the typologically diverse branches of the manuscript transmission and the intricate relationships among the available testimonies. In approaching the study of this corpus, the following key features should be taken into account particularly when investigating the earliest stratum of the translations and its history over the centuries.³

¹ There is a large volume of scholarly literature concerning the OCS language. For a reference introduction see at least: Jagić, *Entstehungsgeschichte*; Huntley, “Old Church Slavonic,” 125–87; Schenker, *The Dawn*.

² This overview and the set of articles prepared for *THB* vol. 1 cover translations of the Hebrew Bible only. For deuterocanonical Scriptures, see *THB* vol. 2.

³ Vernacular Slavonic versions such as the Old Czech tradition (see Pečírková, “Czech Translations,” 1067–174; *Česká bible*) and Francis Skorina’s (1490–1541/51) Bible are not taken into consideration in the present study (see Naumow, “Perevodny”; *Franciszek*). An exception is made only for the translations from MT-Psalms (→ 10.4.7), MT-Proverbs (→ 12.4.7), MT-Job (→ 11.4.7), MT-Five Scrolls (→ 13–17.2.7), and MT-Daniel

1.4.10.1.1 Two Writing Systems: Glagolitic and Cyrillic

The surviving codices of the OCS Scriptures have been copied in two distinct writing systems: the Glagolitic and the Early Cyrillic alphabets. The difficult issues of their origins, mutual relationship, local differentiations, and historical development cannot be discussed in this paper due to their complexity.⁴ Here, it suffices to note very schematically that Glagolitic was adopted, both in the context of the Western and Byzantine rites of the Christian church, at the very beginning and in the earliest periods of OCS literature (in Moravia, Pannonia, Bulgaria) and, subsequently, over several centuries, also in Croatia. The use of Cyrillic is closely linked to the spread of Orthodox Christianity in a vast area extending from the Balkans to the various regions north of the Black Sea and the Russian lands.

1.4.10.1.2 Glagolitic Origin of Cyrillic Texts

The overwhelming majority of the existing copies of the OCS Old Testament have come down to us in Cyrillic. Despite this, as far as the oldest textual layer of the Cyrillic tradition is concerned, the derivation from lost Glagolitic ancestors, at least in several instances, can safely be assumed. However, it still remains to be demonstrated definitively, on paleographic and textual grounds, to what extent translations of entire books of the Old Testament were originally created in Glagolitic script. Such a filiation is suggested by the insertion of single Glagolitic letters into Cyrillic manuscripts and can be proven on the basis of a number of recurring errors in literary works that result from the transposition from one writing system to the other.

Establishing when and where transliterations were undertaken is a difficult question that is

(→ 18.4.7), to which brief mention is made in the respective entries. They were undertaken in Ruthenia in the second half of the fifteenth century and are to be found in a sixteenth-century manuscript kept at the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius (f. 19, no. 262). With regard to the language, see Wexler, *Explorations*, 99–112.

⁴ For an overview of the problem, see Marti, “Historische Graphematik.” On Glagolitic script, see *Glagolitica*; Uspenskij, “O proischozdenii glagolicy,” 63–77; Žagar, *Uvod*.

linked closely to the more general problem of the switch from Glagolitic to Cyrillic in Old Bulgarian culture. Far from representing an immediate change of paradigm dating back to the late ninth century,⁵ this transition was rather gradual. In eastern Bulgaria (Preslav), the adoption of Glagolitic lasted up to the mid-tenth century,⁶ while in western Bulgaria (Ohrid) its use continued even beyond this period.⁷ Moreover, the possibility should not be excluded that multiple and independent processes of transcription of (perished) Glagolitic originals may also have occurred. This graphic conversion had a significant impact on the transmission of texts and today has major consequences for philological investigation. In fact, with the exception of the Psalms (→ 10.4.7), which is the only ancient translation of the Old Testament to have been preserved in eleventh-century Glagolitic copies, a paleographic-orthographic barrier stands between us and the primitive, pre-Cyrillic, formative stage of the OCS Bible's textual history.⁸

1.4.10.1.3 Linguistic Heterogeneity

A fundamental feature of the Cyrillic corpus lies in its deep linguistic heterogeneity. In the light of that parameter, the available witnesses can be divided into two major types consisting of manuscripts of South and East Slavic origin respectively. Each presents specific grammatical traits that moreover vary within the same group, depending on the wide diatopic and diachronic variety of spelling rules of the OCS language. The South Slavic category comprises sources mostly written in Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia, Athos, as well as in the Romanian territories (Wallachia, Transylvania, and Moldavia). The East Slavic legacy is formed basically of testimonies that were copied from scribes, who were natives of or worked in Old Russian principalities (Old Rus'), for the earliest period as well as, thereafter, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Muscovy, and the various lands of the Tsardom of Russia. It should

be emphasized that the East Slavic heritage represents the larger of the two classes and has a wider chronological extension.

1.4.10.1.4 Compositional Stages

Work on the textual criticism of the OCS Bible has to reckon with a number of inner-textual limitations, especially when dealing with those branches of the textual tradition that last for several centuries and span multiple areas of Slavia. Primarily, they are represented by the above-mentioned paleographic and linguistic features, specifically the co-existence in ancient times of two different scripts (Glagolitic and Cyrillic), the subsequent transliteration from one alphabet to the other, the variability of spelling rules and grammatical traits. Secondly, a major issue lies in the fact that translations were subjected continuously to revision from the very beginning of textual transmission and thereafter over the centuries. These ranged from mere inner-stylistic changes, primarily lexical, to corrections of readings towards LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) or the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5).⁹ Consequently, in the textual history of the OCS Old Testament, a number of compositional stages may be detected; depending on individual cases, books may have been thoroughly or partially affected by editorial interventions.

These features complicate the work of philologists. As a rule, they render the questions of whether or not there was a single archetype and whether this supposed original text may be safely reconstructed very problematic. In a certain sense, philological efforts towards the recovery of the primitive stratum of the OCS Bible may be considered as typologically very similar to the task of LXX scholars who attempt to reach the Old Greek text (OG) through the many layers found in the plethora of surviving testimonies.

1.4.10.2 Manuscript Evidence

The great mass of witnesses of the OCS Old Testament consists of manuscripts used in the context of Christian worship. In numerical terms, the cor-

⁵ Il'inskij, "Gde," 79–88.

⁶ Dobrev, "Kirilica," 301–15; Slavova, "Glagoličeskata," 35–46.

⁷ Turilov, "Posle," 94–97.

⁸ Veder, "The Glagolitic Alphabet," 375–87; "The Glagolitic Barrier," 489–501.

⁹ With regard to the alleged revision of OCS-Pent based on MT, see → 2.5.7.3.2.

pus of OCS-Ps (→ 10.4.7) is incomparably larger than that of the remaining sections of OCS Scriptures. Sources containing translations of entire writings intended for personal reading are quantitatively much less than those used for liturgical purposes.

1.4.10.2.1 Evseev's Inventory

According to Evseev's inventory, compiled between 1909–1911 and never published,¹⁰ the sum of liturgical Psalters and of lectionaries, *menaea* and *triodia*, containing selected readings from the Old Testament, totaled 3,352. In addition, the Russian scholar counted 714 further items, among which two-thirds were non-liturgical Psalters (both with and without exegetical commentaries). The remainder were represented by collections containing full translations of Old Testament writings. These computations were made on the basis of those testimonies, dating from the eleventh to the seventeenth centuries, that were accessible to Evseev when he compiled his index.¹¹

1.4.10.2.2 Psalms

The Psalms (→ 10.4.7) occupy a central position in the OCS tradition not only in numerical terms. This book covers the whole textual history of the OCS Bible and the OCS literature in all its linguistic, paleographic, and codicological variety.¹² The earliest surviving copy is the so-called “Novgorod Psalter,” a set of three waxed wooden tablets written in Cyrillic, which were discovered in 2000 and can be dated between the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. Together, they contain Psalms 75 and 76 and also Ps 67:4–6.¹³

A number of Glagolitic and Cyrillic parchment codices can be ascribed to the eleventh century on

paleographic grounds. The Glagolitic codices are the “Psalterium Sinaiticum” (*Sin.slav* 38+2/N) and the “Psalterium Demetri” (*Sin.slav*. 3/N).¹⁴ Of the Cyrillic codices, three East Slavic witnesses survive, which are known respectively as the “Byčkov” (St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Q. II. I. 73 + *Sin.slav*. 6), the “Eugenius” (St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, *Pogod*. 9 + Library of the Academy of Sciences, 4.5.7/Keppen, 19), and the “Čudov” Psalters (Moscow, State Historical Museum, *Čud.* 7).¹⁵

1.4.10.2.3 Old Testament Lectionaries

The OCS lectionary exists in two typologically different classes of testimonies, one being Cyrillic and the other one Croat Glagolitic.

1.4.10.2.3.1 Cyrillic Prophetologium

Among South and East Slavs who adopted the Byzantine rite, the liturgical readings from the Old Testament are included in the so-called “Parimijnik” (*Paroemiarium*), a book corresponding to the Greek Prophetologium.¹⁶ This translation is based on LXX (→ 1.3.1.1) and (in its earliest textual stratum) was originally composed in Glagolitic script. However, it survives only in Cyrillic manuscripts, the oldest of which dates from the late twelfth–early thirteenth centuries (Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 87, No. M 1685 *Grig.* 2).¹⁷ At least seventy copies of the OCS Prophetologium dating from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries are known to exist.¹⁸

¹⁰ Due to a series of unfortunate events, Rahlfs and Evseev's joint project (Rahlfs, “Dritter Bericht,” 21–25) was never finalized. Between 1913 and 1921, Evseev's inventory was lost (Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 620–21; Alekseev, *Tekstologija*, 130).

¹¹ Evseev, “Rukopisnoe predanie,” 440.

¹² MacRobert, “The Textual Tradition,” 921–42.

¹³ Zaliznjak and Janin, “Novgorodskij,” 3–25.

¹⁴ Editions: *Sinajskaja psaltyr'*; *Sinajski Psaltir*; *Psalterii Sinaïtici*; *Psalterium Demetrii*.

¹⁵ See *An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'*; Kolesov, “Evgenievskaja,” 58–69; and *Čudovskaja*, respectively.

¹⁶ Rahlfs, *Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen*; *Prophetologium*, Vol. 1; Miller, “The Prophetologion,” 55–76; Alekseev, *Biblija*.

¹⁷ Brandt, “Grigorovičev parimejnik”; Ribarova and Hauptova, *Grigorovičev parimejnik*, i–ii.

¹⁸ For a list of codices, see Michajlov, *Opyt*, i–cxlv. For textual features, see Michajlov, *Opyt*, 323–447; Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 719–28; Pičhadze, “Tipologija”; Alekseev, *Tekstologija*, 23–24.

1.4.10.2.3.2 Croat Glagolitic Breviary and Missal

In the Croat Glagolitic sources, the biblical pericopes¹⁹ are to be found in the Breviary and Missal, the earliest exemplars of which (not taking into account fragments) date back to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.²⁰ It remains a matter of discussion when the OCS language was introduced into Croat liturgy and whether the rite used initially was Western, Byzantine, or of a mixed type.²¹ This corpus incorporates multiple strata, the earliest of which apparently derives from the common Glagolitic ancestors of the OCS Prophetologium.²² Over the centuries, it was progressively enlarged and revised by taking the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5) as its basis, from which the vast majority of translations were undertaken. In a few instances, a reliance on VL (→ 1.4.1) has also been argued.²³

Moreover, in the Croat Glagolitic Breviary, entire (or almost complete) versions dating from different periods of some Old Testament writings are also included. As for the books discussed in *THB* 1, they are: Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai (→ 6–9.2.7);²⁴ Psalms (→ 10.4.7); Job (→ 11.4.7); Ruth (→ 13–17.2.7);²⁵ Canticles (→ 13–17.2.7);²⁶ and Qohelet (→ 13–17.2.7).²⁷

1.4.10.2.4 Cyrillic Corpus of the Full Translations

Unlike the *Slavia Romana*, where the “Scripture as a whole” was a well-known entity since the second

half of the fourteenth century (Czech tradition),²⁸ the *Slavia Orthodoxa* first received its own complete Bible only at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.²⁹ Prior to this, in both the East and South Slavic areas, texts circulated only in sylloges of disparate structure.³⁰ With the exception of fragments,³¹ the earliest sources date from the second half of the fourteenth century.³²

A codicological history of the non-liturgical OCS Bible has still to be written. Therefore, it remains unclear how this corpus evolved over the centuries, from the beginnings of its textual history in the late ninth century up to the fifteenth century, when virtually every manuscript emerged.³³

A checklist of the existing Cyrillic evidence is available up to the year 1600, consisting of integral OCS translations of Old Testament books.³⁴ This work is compiled from scholarly literature and covers material other than OCS-Ps (→ 10.4.7). The inventory numbers 141 non-liturgical testimonies in total (both plain and commented), the vast majority of which (117 manuscripts) are of East Slavic origin. However, besides compendia containing short excerpts from the Bible,³⁵ some other categories of witnesses have also not been considered in

²⁸ See the perished Bible of Dresden of 1360 (*Die alttschechische Dresdener Bibel*).

²⁹ With regard to these two cultural-historical concepts, see Ziffer, “*Slavia Orthodoxa* und *Slavia Romana*.”

³⁰ Alekseev, “Biblejskij kanon”; Mathiesen, “The Typology.”

³¹ The most significant are: a) Moscow, State Historical Museum, *Čud.* 12, second half of the twelfth century, containing the OCS translation of Hippolytus’ *Commentarius in Danielelem* (→ 18.4.7.2); b) Moscow, Russian State Library, f. 205 no. 171, late thirteenth century, preserving parts of one of the OCS translations of Canticles (→ 13–17.2.7).

³² Among these may be mentioned a) National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, F.I.461, second half of the fourteenth century (Nikolova, “*Za naj-starija*,” 110–18), and b) Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 304/1, no. 1, second half of the fourteenth/early fifteenth century.

³³ On the question of the scarcity of manuscripts containing non-liturgical Slavonic texts until the fifteenth century, see Ziffer, “*Una premissa*,” 13–25; Alekseev, *Tekstologija*, 32–33.

³⁴ Codices of more recent origin and those containing vernacular translations are not taken into consideration in this paper (Mathiesen, “*Handlist*,” 6).

³⁵ Mathiesen, “*Handlist*,” 6–7.

¹⁹ See Graciotti, “*La tradizione*,” 125–80; Tandarić, *Hrvatskoglagojska*; Nazor, “*The Bible*,” 1031–37.

²⁰ Vajs, *Nejstarši Breviář*, 1–30; *Najstariji*, 3–42, 56–86.

²¹ In the history of Croat Glagolitic literature, the most obscure period is that of the earliest contacts with the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition (see Thomson, *A Survey*, 41–42).

²² Michajlov, *K voprosu*; Vajs, *Nejstarši Breviář*, cvii; Thomson, “*The Slavonic Translation*,” 633.

²³ Thomson, “*The Slavonic Translation*,” 663, 771, 837.

²⁴ For editions, see Vajs, *Propheta Ioel*; Vajs, *Propheta Oseas*; Vajs, *Propheta Habacuc*; Vajs, *Sophonias-Haggaeus*; Vajs, *Zacharias-Malachias*. See also Ribarova, “*Knjiga*,” 123–59, and Ribarova, “*Vajsova*,” 27–34.

²⁵ See Vajs, *Psalterium*; Vajs, *Liber Iob*; Vajs, *Liber Ruth*, respectively.

²⁶ Alekseev, *Pesn’*, 31–39.

²⁷ Vajs, *Liber Ecclesiastis*.

this calculation. In this regard mention should be made of the many copies of the Great Menologia (*Velikie minei čet'i*), compiled at the initiative of Archbishop Macarius of Novgorod (1526–1542), who later became metropolitan of Russia (1542–1563).³⁶

1.4.10.2.4.1 East Slavic Typologies

In the East Slavic group, the most common types are 1) Pentateuch (→ 2.5.7);³⁷ 2) manuscripts including Joshua (→ 3–5.2.7), Judges (→ 3–5.2.7), and Ruth (→ 13–17.2.7), at times followed by 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7),³⁸ and/or Esther (→ 13–17.2.7);³⁹ 3) The sixteen Prophets (→ 6–9.2.7) with catenae (except for Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi);⁴⁰ 4) Job (→ 11.4.7.3) both with and without commentaries;⁴¹ 5) small anthologies that include Proverbs (→ 12.4.7.1), Canticles (→ 13–17.2.7), Qohelet (→ 13–17.2.7), with the addition of Ben Sira (11.4.10) or Job (→ 11.4.7.3.1).⁴²

Moreover, in the East Slavic tradition, larger corpora are also known to exist. One is the so-called *Jewish Chronicle*, a chronographic compilation found in two codices dating from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries but originally assembled in 1262 on the basis of earlier translations.⁴³ It includes the Octateuch, 1–

4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7), Esther (→ 13–17.2.7), Daniel (→ 18.4.7.2), excerpts from Job (→ 11.4.7.2.1), Isaiah (→ 6–9.2.7.2.1), and Jeremiah (→ 6–9.2.7.2.2). A second corpus is to be found in the codex of the Russian State Library in Moscow, *Und.* 1, which was copied in the scriptorium of the Moscow Kremlin during the last quarter of the fifteenth century.⁴⁴ It contains the Octateuch, 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7), Esther (→ 13–17.2.7), Canticles (→ 13–17.2.7), Qohelet (→ 13–17.2.7), Proverbs (→ 12.4.7.1), and other texts. In addition, different collections also survive.⁴⁵

1.4.10.2.4.2 South Slavic Typologies

As far as the South Slavic legacy is concerned, the following types may be listed: 1) the Octateuch;⁴⁶ 2) the Octateuch with 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7);⁴⁷ 3) 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7) singly;⁴⁸ 4) 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7) combined with the sixteen Prophets (→ 6–9.2.7), the Sapiential collection, and Job (→ 11.4.7.3.2)⁴⁹ or, alternatively, with only part of this appendix⁵⁰ that circulated also separately;⁵¹ 5) Job (→ 11.4.7.3.2) individually⁵² or within the above-mentioned sylloges. Manuscripts containing integral translations of Qohelet, Esther, Ezra–

³⁶ Iosif, *Podrobnoe*.

³⁷ E.g., Russian State Library, Moscow: 304/1, no. 1, second half of the fourteenth/early fifteenth century; f. 256, no. 27, fifteenth century; f. 113, no. 8, year 1494.

³⁸ Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 304/1 no. 728, fourteenth century.

³⁹ E.g. National Library of Russia, St Petersburg, Q.I.2, late fourteenth century; Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 304, no. 2, late fourteenth century.

⁴⁰ E.g., Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 304/1, no. 89, late fifteenth century (with Glagolitic words and letters) and no. 90, year 1489.

⁴¹ E.g., State Historical Museum, Moscow, *čud.* 6, year 1394; Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 113, no. 605, sixteenth century.

⁴² E.g., Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 304/1, no. 730, early sixteenth century and the above-mentioned f. 113, no. 605.

⁴³ Besides Old Russian annals, this compilation furthermore includes translations from Greek of the works of Josephus, John Malalas, George Hamartolos, pseudo-Callisthenes (see Istrin, *Aleksandrija*, 315–43; Tvorogov, *Drevnerusskie*). The codices of the so-called *Jewish Chronicle* are Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, Moscow, f. MGAMID 279/658, late fif-

teenth century; Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Vilnius, 109/147, early sixteenth century.

⁴⁴ Kloss, *O proischoždenii*, 33.

⁴⁵ In this regard, mention may be made of Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 256, no. 28, sixteenth century, containing the Pentateuch, Joshua, Job, the sixteen Prophets, and Wisdom.

⁴⁶ E.g., Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 270, no. 1 (1431), early fifteenth century.

⁴⁷ E.g., Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 256, no. 29, year 1537.

⁴⁸ See Zagreb, Hrvatski povijesni muzej, R-38, mid-fifteenth century. One manuscript is known, in which the text is followed by a few excerpts from Jeremiah (→ 6–9.2.7.2.2; Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 178, no. 3750, second half of the fifteenth century).

⁴⁹ National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, F.I.461, second half of the fourteenth century.

⁵⁰ Bucharest, Library of the Romanian Academy, no. 171, fifteenth century.

⁵¹ State Historical Museum, Moscow, *ščuk.* 507, year 1475 (sixteen Prophets, Sapiential collection, Job).

⁵² State Historical Museum, Moscow, Sin. 202, year 1412; Bucharest, Library of the Romanian Academy, no. 96, year 1503.

Nehemiah, and 1–2 Chronicles are not extant in South Slavic Cyrillic tradition.

1.4.10.2.4.3 First Complete OCS Bible

The first complete OCS Bible was assembled in Russia in the last decade of the fifteenth century under the patronage of the archbishop of Novgorod, Gennadius (Gennadij Gonzov, ca. 1410–1505), and later became known as the “Gennadian Bible.” The earliest extant codex of this corpus is manuscript State Historical Museum, Moscow, *Sin.* 915, year 1499.⁵³ Besides the insertion of earlier OCS versions, new ones were also created taking as their basis a late fifteenth-century editions of the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5), among which are those printed by Anton Koberger (ca. 1440–1513) in 1487 (with commentaries by Nicholas of Lyra)⁵⁴ and by Nikolaus Kessler (1450–after 1519) in 1487 and 1491.⁵⁵

1.4.10.3 Origins and Dates of Translations

The earliest stratum of the OCS Bible is deemed to consist of texts necessary for liturgical use. It can be traced back to Cyril (Constantine) the “Philosopher” (826–869 C.E.) and Methodius (815–885 C.E.), the two Byzantine churchmen who were the founders of Slavonic letters within the framework of their missionary activity in Great Moravia (863–885 C.E.).⁵⁶

⁵³ Three other copies date from the second half of the sixteenth century: Moscow, State Historical Museum, *Sin.* 21 (year 1558), *Sin.* 30 (ca. 1570–1571), and Uvar. 1/652.

⁵⁴ *Biblia latina: Cum postillis Nicolai de Lyra et expositionibus Guillelmi Britonis in omnes prologos S. Hieronymi et additionibus Pauli Burgensis replicisque Matthiae Doering* (Nuremberg: Anton Koberger, 1487).

⁵⁵ *Biblia latina* (Basel: Nikolaus Kessler, 1487; 2nd ed. 1491). See also Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 655–59; Thomson, *A Brief Survey*, 55–58. Besides being included in larger corpora (on which see above), some of these new translations, such as Ezra–Nehemiah (→ 19.4.7) and 1–2 Chronicles (→ 20.4.7), circulated also in small East Slavic manuscripts starting from the late fifteenth century (Russian State Library, Moscow, f. 113, no.s 9 and 11; National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, *NSRK* Q 645).

⁵⁶ For a description of the available OCS sources related to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, see Mirčeva, *Opis*. On the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, see Dvornik, *Byzantine*. See also Betti, *The Making*.

The OCS translations of entire books of the Old Testament were essentially undertaken in two different epochs. The time frame proposed below should not be considered as being precise, but merely as the most reliable synoptic representation of a complex and still elusive textual history. The first period presumably extends from the late ninth to the first half of the tenth century. It embraces to a great extent the Old Bulgarian period of OCS literature, during which the reign of Symeon I the Great (893–927 C.E.; Tsar from 913 C.E.) stands out for its proliferation of ecclesiastical literary activity, due especially to the efforts of the disciples of Cyril and Methodius, who went to Bulgaria after the collapse of the Moravian mission.⁵⁷ The second period covers mainly the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In this second period, translation activity occurred in regions belonging both to the South and the East Slavic world. However, some of the full versions were or could well have been produced (and/or revised) between the two chronological extremes, namely in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, in the various geographical areas of Slavia.

1.4.10.3.1 First Stratum of the OCS Bible:

Liturgical Translations

The Epistle of Pope John VIII, written in Latin in 880 C.E., reveals knowledge of the existence of an OCS text of Psalms and of an Old Testament lectionary during the Cyrillo-Methodian period.⁵⁸ This testimony can be supported, at least for the Psalms, by the account found in ch. 15 of the *Life of Methodius*, a hagiographic OCS source composed in western Bulgaria between the late ninth and early tenth centuries.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ On Symeon's reign, see Shepard, “Bulgaria,” 567–85.

⁵⁸ *Monumenta*, 224: *Nec sane fidei vel doctrine aliquid obstat sive missas in eadem Sclavinica lingua canere sive sacrum evangelium vel lectiones divinas novi et veteris testamenti bene translatas et interpretatas legere aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere* “there is nothing contrary to genuine faith or doctrine in the singing of the mass in the Slavonic language as well as in the reading of the Holy Gospel or of the divine lectures from the New and Old Testaments, well translated and interpreted, or in the singing of all other offices of the hours.” Cf. Peri, “Il mandato,” 988–89.

⁵⁹ See Angelov and Kodov, *Kliment*, 191.

Research into the OCS Bible has shown that these external witnesses can be confirmed by data deriving from the analysis of the linguistic and textual evidence. Therefore, it may be safely assumed that the primitive body of the OCS Scriptures consisted of liturgical texts used in the context of Christian worship (see above → 1.4.10.2.2; → 1.4.10.2.3).

1.4.10.3.2 Second Stratum of the OCS Bible: Ninth- and Tenth-Century Translations

Establishing the dates and origins of the earliest OCS versions of entire books of the Scriptures that were intended for personal reading is still an unresolved question. The above-mentioned ch. 15 of the *Life of Methodius* also reports that Methodius, shortly before his death, rendered the Old Testament with the exception of 1–4 Maccabees from Greek into Slavonic. Moreover, he would have accomplished this enterprise in just a few months with the aid of tachygraphs.⁶⁰ Unlike the previous case (Psalms and the lectionary; → 1.4.10.3.1), the veracity of this account cannot be confirmed unequivocally by the examination of existing documentary material.

Firstly, the linguistic and textual dissimilarities among the oldest full translations render it very problematic to consider them the work of one individual.⁶¹ Secondly, with few exceptions, they do not preserve archaic linguistic traits that could permit a safe attribution to the earliest phases of OCS literature. Thirdly, regarding some books, an ancient textual stratum is totally lacking; moreover, for Ezra–Nehemiah (→ 19.4.7) and 1–2 Chronicles (→ 20.4.7), it has been untraceable since the late fifteenth century. In addition, the following observations have also been advanced. On the one hand, the view has been put forward that the attribution of the whole OCS Bible to Methodius, which is useless for liturgical purposes, had the ideological value of conferring higher prestige to the Old Bulgarian versions.⁶² On the other hand, it is also held that the sacred biographies of Cyril and Methodius

significantly implied the authorization of their followers to fulfill the task of rendering the Holy Writ into Slavonic.⁶³

Despite this, several scholars are firmly convinced that a number of texts should be regarded as residues of the version allegedly made by Methodius.⁶⁴ Criteria for the detection of this primitive layer are grammatical archaisms, the free approach to the original, and the general accuracy of translation, which are typical for literary works dating from the Cyrillo-Methodian period.⁶⁵ On this basis, it is assumed that OCS-Zeph, OCS-Hag, OCS-Zech, OCS-Mal (→ 6–9.2.7), OCS-Prov (→ 12.4.7), OCS-Ruth 1 (13–17.2.7), OCS-Qoh 1 (→ 13–17.2.7), OCS-Cant 1 (13–17.2.7), OCS-Dan 2 (→ 18.4.7), and OCS-Ben Sira (11.4.10) can be assigned to Methodius.⁶⁶ But other complete versions transmitted exclusively in Cyrillic manuscripts can only be traced back to the Symeonian period,⁶⁷ the distinction being made here between those belonging to the Ohrid and the Preslav literary schools, located respectively in western and eastern Bulgaria. They are OCS-Pent (→ 2.5.7), OCS-Former Prophets (→ 3–5.2.7); OCS-Latter Prophets (→ 6–9.2.7); OCS-Job 2 (→ 11.4.7.3), OCS-Dan 3 and 4 (→ 18.4.7).⁶⁸

⁶³ According to Cooper, ch. 15 of the *Life of Methodius* does not describe the translation process of the OCS Bible, but the divine authorization to produce it as a legitimate version of the Holy Writ. See Cooper, *Slavic Scriptures*, 36, 68, 73–74. See also Cooper, “The Bible in Slavonic,” 179–97.

⁶⁴ Alekseev, “Kirillo-Mefodievskoe,” 124–45; Nikolova, *Starobălgarskijat prevod* (Vol. 1), ix–xx; Pičhadzhe, “Perevody,” 139–47.

⁶⁵ Cyrillo-Methodian translations, which usually represent a precise rendering of the original, are moreover characterized by the extensive use of Graecisms at a lexical level.

⁶⁶ In this regard, however, one should consider Thomson's review of Alekseev's criteria for establishing which of the translations can be ascribed to Methodius (see Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 642–46).

⁶⁷ A number of literary sources dating from this epoch are commonly quoted by scholars in the debate about the Bulgarian origin (or revision) of the complete OCS translations of Old Testament books. Among these, mention should be made of at least the colophon of Gregory the Presbyter (→ 2.5.7.1.2), as well as the works of John the Exarch and Khrabr (see Nikolova, *Starobălgarskijat prevod* [Vol. 1], ix–xvi; Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 641–42, 646, 728).

⁶⁸ Unlike the alleged Methodian texts, these translations,

⁶⁰ See Angelov and Kodov, *Kliment*, 191.

⁶¹ Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 642.

⁶² Naumow, “Le traduzioni,” 213–14.

Consequently, with research as it stands today, no definitive conclusions can be drawn about whether a Methodian ancestor could have existed. In light of our current understanding of the corpus related to its paleographic, linguistic, and textual features, the following can be maintained reasonably. The oldest surviving OCS integral translations of Old Testament books, at least in the form in which they are presently available, represent a) a rearrangement of previous material dating back to Methodius or his disciples and b) texts which were first created in Bulgaria in the late ninth or early tenth century.

1.4.10.3.3 Later Translations up to the Sixteenth Century

Subsequent translation activity can be split into two sub-periods. The first comprises texts produced up to the early fifteenth century that originated among South Slavs and, in some instances, probably also among East Slavs. The second sub-period includes versions made in Russia, starting from the last decade of the fifteenth century.

1.4.10.3.3.1 First Sub-Period

As far as the Croat Glagolitic tradition is concerned, OCS translations of Job (→ 11.4.7) and Qohelet (→ 13–17.2.7) undertaken from the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5), can be dated back to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. As for the Cyrillic heritage, it has also been held that two versions with commentaries from LXX-Cant and LXX-Qoh (OCS-Cant 2; → 13–17.2.7; OCS-Qoh 3; → 13–17.2.7), found in a number of East Slavic Cyrillic codices starting from the thirteenth century, were probably carried out in Old Rus' between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁶⁹ However, this view is not shared widely since an earlier tenth-century Bulgarian origin has also been suggested.⁷⁰

besides being very often slavishly literal, are mostly marred by errors, which in several instances can be explained by an inaccurate transcription from Glagolitic originals.

⁶⁹ Alekseev, *Tekstologija*, 177–78; Alekseev, *Pesn'*, 16–19, 48–51.

⁷⁰ Lunt, "The OCS Song of Songs," 292–304; Thomson, "Made in Russia," 312.

The study of the Cyrillic tradition of Esther (OCS-Esth 2; → 13–17.2.7), consisting of thirty-one East Slavic copies dating from no earlier than the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, poses serious problems. Consensus about its dating, provenance, and *Vorlage* has not been reached. This version follows MT, but the latter is not recognized unanimously as its source. A number of scholars maintain it was produced by using a Greek intermediary model, now lost, that closely replicated the Hebrew text.⁷¹

New translations of 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7) and of Job (OCS-Job 4; → 11.4.7.4.2), based on LXX, were produced by South Slavs by the early fifteenth century. They have scarce manuscript attestation and apparently remained unknown to East Slavs.

1.4.10.3.3.2 Second Sub-Period

The existence of complete OCS texts of Ezra–Nehemiah (→ 19.4.7) and 1–2 Chronicles (→ 20.4.7) cannot be demonstrated on documentary grounds prior to the last decade of the fifteenth century. These books were rendered from the above-mentioned printed editions of the Vulgate (→ 1.4.10.2.4.3) within the framework of the compilation of the Gennadian Bible in Novgorod (Russia) by an anonymous author (whether he should be identified with the contemporary translator of 1–2 Maccabees [→ 11.10.1.7; → 11.10.2.8] remains a matter of speculation).

A few decades later, Archbishop Macarius of Novgorod commissioned Demetrius Gerasimov (ca. 1465–1536) to render into Slavonic the Commentary on the Psalms composed by Bruno of Würzburg. His translation was included in the Great Menologia. Further versions of Psalms (→ 10.4.7), Esther (= OCS-Esth 3; → 13–17.2.7), and 4 Maccabees, based on LXX, were undertaken in Russia by Maksim Grek (Maximus Triboles, ca. 1470–1555) between 1517 and 1531.⁷²

⁷¹ See Alekseev, "Russko-evrejskie," 166–82; Lunt and Taube, *The Slavonic*.

⁷² Thomson, "The Slavonic Translation," 789, 869.

1.4.10.3.4 Printed Editions of the OCS Bibles (Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries)

The first printed OCS Bible was assembled under the patronage of Prince Constantine of Ostrog in Volhynia and published by Ivan Fedorov in 1581 (1525–1583).⁷³ For the most part, it was based on the Gennadian Bible, whose texts were partially corrected towards the 1518 Aldine edition,⁷⁴ the *Complutensian Polyglot of 1514–1517, as well as South Slavic testimonies containing earlier OCS translations.⁷⁵

The second printed OCS Bible appeared in Moscow in 1663.⁷⁶ It was carried out under the supervision of Epiphanius Slavinsky (died 1675) and basically reproduces the Ostrog Bible with minor emendations made on the basis of LXX.⁷⁷ This edition was taken as a model for a number of late Georgian versions (→ 1.4.8.4.3).

In 1712, the Russian Tsar Peter the Great issued a decree requiring a correction of the 1663 printed Moscow Bible. For this purpose, a commission was established that was headed by Sophronius Leichoudes (ca. 1652–1730).⁷⁸ Different sources were used for amendments, among which were the London Polyglot of 1653–1657,⁷⁹ the 1518 Aldine and 1587 Sixtine editions.⁸⁰ The revision process lasted several decades and ended only in 1751 with the edition of the Elizabethan Bible.⁸¹

⁷³ *Ostrožskaja biblija*.

⁷⁴ *Sacrae Scripturae veteris novaeque omnia* (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri, 1518).

⁷⁵ Evseev, *Očerki*, 82.

⁷⁶ *Biblija*, 1663.

⁷⁷ An annotated exemplar of the Ostrog Bible with corrections is preserved at the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, Moscow, f. 1251. no. 149. See Zapol'skaja, "Obščij," 69. In the 1663 Bible, the Psalms are printed according to Epiphanius' revision.

⁷⁸ On Sophronius and his involvement in the revision of the 1663 Moscow Bible, see Živov, *Jazyk*, 93–94, 131.

⁷⁹ Walton, **Polyglotta*.

⁸⁰ *Sacrae Scripturae veteris novaeque omnia; Vetus Testamentum iuxta septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti v Pont. Max. editum* (Rome: Ex Typographia Francisci Zannetti, cum privilegio Georgio Ferrario concessio, 1587).

⁸¹ *Biblija*, 1751. On the history of the three printed Bibles, see Thomson, "The Slavonic Translation," 671–712.

1.4.10.4 Textual Criticism, Editions

The textual and paleographic features of the OCS testimonies, briefly outlined in the first part of this article (→ 1.4.10.1), impose serious restrictions on their text-critical examination. The intrinsic difficulty in investigating this material is heightened by the insufficient philological analysis of the manuscripts. This relates both to the amount of work that has been undertaken as well as the developed methodology of textual criticism.

1.4.10.4.1 Paucity of Critical Editions

When dealing with the study of the OCS Bible, one cannot avoid being struck by the paucity of critical editions. Apart from OCS-Gen (→ 2.5.7.3.3) and the Cyrillic OCS-Esth (→ 13–17.2.7),⁸² philological inquiry has been commonly based on evidence that has been far too restricted. This is shown by the examples of OCS-Exod and OCS-Lev (→ 2.5.7.3.3); OCS-Josh, OCS-Judg, and OCS-1–4 Kgdms 1 (→ 3–5.2.7.2); OCS-Ezek, and OCS-MinP (→ 6–9.2.7); OCS-Ps (→ 10.4.7); OCS-Ruth, and OCS-Cant (→ 13–17.2.7); OCS-Dan (→ 18.4.7). Moreover, in a number of instances, versions have been edited according to a single source only: OCS-Isa and OCS-Jer (→ 6–9.2.7); OCS-Ps (→ 10.4.7); OCS-Job 5 (→ 11.4.7.4.3); OCS-Qoh (→ 13–17.2.7).

In addition, several texts are still unpublished: OCS-Num and OCS-Deut (→ 2.5.7.3.3); OCS-1–4 Kgdms 2 (→ 3–5.2.7); OCS-Job 4 (→ 11.4.7.4.2); OCS-Prov (→ 12.4.7.1); OCS-Lam (→ 13–17.2.7); OCS-Ezra–Neh (→ 19.4.7), and OCS-1–2 Chr (→ 20.4.7). As a result, a significant part of the tradition remains inaccessible; therefore, far from being the outcome of solid textual analysis, conclusions can only be based on preliminary observations.

This shortcoming represents a severe disadvantage in our ability to understand the internal textual features of the vast majority of the OCS translations of the Scriptures. In addition, this circumstance limits the possibility of a precise appraisal of the parent text (see e.g. → 6–9.2.7).

⁸² See, respectively, Michajlov, *Kniga*, vols. 1–4 and Lunt and Taube, *The Slavonic Book*.

1.4.10.4.2 Methodology of Textual Criticism

A crucial task consists of sharpening the methodological approach towards the textual criticism of the OCS Bible. This necessity is quite evident when considering the serious remarks that have been expressed with regard to the discrepancy between theoretical formulation and praxis in the Salzburg editions of OCS-Lev (→ 2.5.7.3.3), OCS-Former Prophets (→ 3–5.2.7), OCS-Ps (→ 10.4.7), and OCS-Ruth (→ 13–17.2.7).⁸³ The detected incongruities are not surprising, especially when considering the current state of the debate on textual criticism in Slavic philology, which has shown itself reluctant to engage with regard to this topic seriously with cognate disciplines.⁸⁴

A chance for Slavists to address these issues more effectively may be offered by relying on earlier experience accumulated in the field of the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and of LXX. In fact, the latter boasts a rich conceptual framework as well as valuable practical background information.⁸⁵ To date, this opportunity remains totally unexploited, as is evident from a cursory glance at the available bibliography.⁸⁶ Even if each tradition has its own specific features, a typological comparison may prove to be extremely beneficial, particularly when bearing in mind the many empirical problems that must be addressed continuously by Slavists on the ecdotic level.⁸⁷

⁸³ *Die Methodbibel*, Vols. 1–9. See Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 718–19.

⁸⁴ See Bulanin, “Tekstologija.”

⁸⁵ See Tov, **HB, GB, and Qumran*, 247–70; Tov, **Collected Writings* 3, 121–31; and Tov, **TCU*.

⁸⁶ On the one hand, this problem was neither raised in Thomson's reference works (Thomson “The Slavonic Translation”; Thomson, *A Brief Survey*) nor in the most recent collective publication on the topic of the Slavonic Bible, which contains the proceedings of an international conference held in Varna (Bulgaria) in 2009 (See *The Bible*). On the other hand, in Alekseev's book (*Tekstologija*, 42–73), methodological discussion focuses mostly on the textual criticism of the New Testament, precisely on the statistical approach elaborated by E.C. Colwell (1901–1974; E.C. Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969]).

⁸⁷ The orthographic and morphological instability of the OCS language compels scholars to seek compromises. These

1.4.10.4.3 Future Tasks

In the light of what has been said above and indeed of what follows in the OCS articles of *THB 1*, the statement that Slavic biblical philology has already re-established its place in international scholarship⁸⁸ can be characterized as premature. The current state of the art in textual criticism of the OCS Bible does not permit drawing such conclusions. When looking at the revival of interest in the OCS Scriptures in the last twenty years, for which great merit should undoubtedly be attributed to Alekseev's and Thomson's works,⁸⁹ it seems far more appropriate to speak of a new beginning⁹⁰ rather than a consolidation of the discipline. The crucial task consists presently in creating the conditions for preparing a set of critical editions based on solid methodological reflection and on the whole manuscript tradition. However, there is no doubt that much effort is still required before this goal can be reached, in qualitative as well as quantitative terms.

1.4.10.5 Text-Critical Value

The OCS translations of the Old Testament have yet to be integrated into contemporary research on LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), even though the original intention was apparently to include this material in the Göttingen project.⁹¹

may imply a) orthographic normalization of sources and b) identification of a particular manuscript as a base text for an edition (for grammatical reasons, usually the oldest is chosen), whose witness is supplemented by the addition of variants, taken from one or more other codices.

⁸⁸ See Alekseev, “La ricerca biblica,” 275. In this scholar's opinion, recent works, such as his edition of OCS-Cant (Alekseev, *Pesn'*), succeeded in incorporating the results of twentieth-century textual criticism.

⁸⁹ See Thomson “The Slavonic Translation,” Thomson, *Dobrowsky*; and Thomson, *A Brief Survey*, as well Alekseev's *Tekstologija* and other publications quoted below.

⁹⁰ See Slavova, “Starobálgarskijat prevod.”

⁹¹ See Rahlfs, “Dritter Bericht,” 21–25. In Western scholarship, the first collation of the OCS Old Testament dates back to R. Holmes (1748–1805; *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus*, Vol. 1 [ed. R. Holmes; Oxford: e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1798], i–v); cf. Thomson, *Dobrowsky*, 47–49.

1.4.10.5.1 Current Situation

The scarce interaction in the field of textual criticism is imputable to both LXX scholars and Slavists. A striking example is how, on the one hand, the considerable amount of work carried out on OCS-Gen (→ 2.5.7) by Michajlov⁹² was ignored by Wevers in his edition and study of LXX-Gen (→ 2.4.1.1),⁹³ on the other hand, Wevers' publications on LXX-Lev (→ 2.4.1.3)⁹⁴ were completely neglected by the editor of OCS-Lev (→ 2.5.7) in the Salzburg series.⁹⁵

Moreover, in those rare cases in which collations with the Gottingen editions have been carried out (on the basis of a limited number of Slavonic sources), this comparison has been undertaken from the point of view of the OCS tradition and not that of the textual history of the Bible.⁹⁶ In this regard, see the remarks in → 6–9.2.7.3.3.

1.4.10.5.2 Need for a Comparative Approach

The need to establish the text-critical use of the OCS Scriptures for contrastive analysis has generally escaped academic attention. A negative role in the development of investigations on this matter may have been played by the opinion that this corpus is of little value for the study of LXX.⁹⁷ Such an assumption remains unproven as, to date, no scholar has undertaken the task of verifying the validity of this statement.⁹⁸

⁹² Michajlov, *Kniga*, Vols. 1–4; Michajlov, *K voprosu*; Michajlov, *Opyt*.

⁹³ Wevers, *Genesis and Text History of the Greek Genesis*. See → 2.5.7.4.

⁹⁴ E.g. Wevers, *Leviticus and Text History of the Greek Leviticus*.

⁹⁵ *Die Methodbibel*, 4. In this regard, it should be noted that a distinctive trait of the Salzburg editions consists precisely in the lack of propensity to take the Greek evidence into account. With the exception of two cases (*Die Methodbibel*, Vols. 2 and 5), there is even no reference to the Cambridge edition of LXX. The overall result is that the edited OCS translations have not been collated with their originals. When citing further similar examples of scarce integration, mention should be given to the cases of OCS-Dan (→ 18.4.7.4) and OCS-Job (→ 11.4.7). For the Octateuch, see Pičhadze, “K istorii,” 11, 49 no. 9.

⁹⁶ *Starobálgarskijat prevod*, 1–2.

⁹⁷ Thomson, “The Slavonic Translation,” 719.

⁹⁸ This applies to both Glagolitic and Cyrillic traditions.

A clarification of whether or to what extent this tradition offers data that could enrich contemporary scholarly debate on controversial issues of comparative textual criticism is a crucial issue that requires to be addressed. With this aim in mind, the investigation into the OCS Old Testament needs to be strengthened by a comprehensive update of the methodology. Texts should be investigated in a comparative way and, at the same time, research should cover both the textual features of the translation and the codicological history of the OCS tradition. Preliminary research conducted for *THB 1* has brought sufficient evidence to light to show that new perspectives can be envisioned by changing previous attitudes and ending the isolation of this corpus.

1.4.10.5.3 Exploring New Data

In at least a number of instances, it is possible to demonstrate safely and tangibly that the OCS translations from LXX, far from being of little value for textual inquiry into the primary version, reveal themselves instead to be a new source of knowledge for the Greek text and for its revisions in the first centuries C.E. In this regard, the two cases below merit special attention.

1.4.10.5.3.1 OCS Antiochene Text of Samuel–Kings

A fresh interdisciplinary approach to the second OCS translation of 1–4 Kingdoms (→ 3–5.2.7), apparently undertaken in Serbia in 1416, shows it to be an indirect testimony of the Antiochene recension of Samuel–Kings (→ 5.4; → 5.5; → 3–5.1.6.2).

A first analysis indicates not only that the OCS version includes proto-Lucianic readings,⁹⁹ but also that it apparently presented in 3–4 Kingdoms (1–2 Kings) a subdivision of the books that differs slightly from that found in the Greek codices LXX^b o c₂ e₂. As in the latter, OCS-3 Kgdms (1 Kings) similarly begins at 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 2:12; however, the OCS text ends at 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 11:43. Consequently, OCS-4 Kgdms consists of 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 12:2–22:54 + 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 1:1–25:30.

⁹⁹ See Tov, **Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 485–88.

Against the background of a literal translation technique, these features heighten the possibility that the early fifteenth-century OCS-1–4 Kgdms, rather than being a liberal reworking of its prototype, reflects a hitherto-untraced Greek codex of the Antiochene recension. Besides incorporating proto-Lucianic readings, the latter presents a peculiar arrangement of the text, not attested elsewhere in the surviving Byzantine tradition.

1.4.10.5.3.2 OCS Witness to Th-Dan

An examination of one of the earliest OCS versions of Daniel (→ 18.4.7.3) leads to a similar result. As shown by research undertaken for *THB*, OCS-Dan 2 represents an indirect witness to an otherwise-unknown Greek literary edition of Th-Dan with the same chapter order as that found in the earliest available manuscript of OG-Dan, namely in papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷.

1.4.10.5.4 Conclusion

With regard to the problem of appraising the value of the OCS Bible when investigating the textual criticism of LXX, the following conclusions should be drawn at this stage. This manuscript heritage can be said to have generally eluded academic inquiry, especially in Western scholarship. This is glaringly evident when considering its exclusion from the critical apparatus of the Göttingen editions, in which no use whatsoever of this corpus has been made.

The medieval origin of the OCS Scriptures, as opposed to the earlier late-antiquity dating of other secondary versions such as the Armenian and the Georgian, does not necessarily imply that they are of minor significance in comparative textual criticism. On the contrary, preliminary research undertaken for *THB* has shown firmly that this tradition, deemed previously to be of marginal significance, provides additional evidence if a new approach is promoted. Were such conditions to take shape, Slavic biblical philology could genuinely be expected to take its rightful place in international scholarship.

Alekseev, A.A., “Kirillo-Mefodievskoe perevodčeskoe nasledie i ego istoričeskie sud'by: perevody sv. Pisanija v slavjanskoj pis'mennosti,” in *Istorija, kul'tura, etnografija i fol'klor slavjanskich narodov: X Meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov: Sofija, sentjabr' 1988: Doklady sovet'skoj delegacii* (ed. I.I. Kostjuško; Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 124–45.

Alekseev, A.A., *Tekstologija slavjanskoj Biblii* (Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte Neue Folge A Slavistische Forschungen 24; St. Petersburg: Dmitrij Bulanin, 1999).

Alekseev, A.A., *Pesn' pesnej v drevnej slavjano-russkoj pis'mennosti* (St. Petersburg: “Dmitrij Bulanin,” 2002).

Alekseev, A.A., *Biblija v bogosluženii: Vizantijsko-slavjanskij lekcionarij* (St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2008).

Alekseev, A.A., “Biblejskij kanon na Rusi,” *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 61 (2010): 171–93.

Alekseev, A.A., “La ricerca biblica in Russia tra XIX e XX secolo,” in *La parola di Dio nella vita spirituale: Atti del Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa, Bose, 7–10 settembre 2011* (eds. S. Chialà, L. Cremaschi, and A. Mainardi; Magnano: Edizioni Qiqajon, 2012), 261–89.

Alekseev, A.A., “Russko-evrejskie literaturnye svjazi Kievskoj èpochi: Rezul'taty i perspektivy issledovanija,” in *Kenaanity: evrei v srednevekovom slavjanskom mire* (eds. V. Moskovič, A. Torpusman, and M. Členov; Jews and Slavs 24; Jerusalem: Gešarim, 2014), 166–82.

Altbauer, M., with the collaboration of H.G. Lunt (eds.), *An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'*, Vol. 1: *Photoreproduction* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1978).

Angelov, B.S., and C. Kodov (eds.), *Kliment Ochridski: Săbrani săčinenija*, Vol. 3: *Prostranni žitija na Kiril i Metodii* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarska Akademija na naukite, 1973).

Betti, M., *The Making of Christian Moravia (858–882): Papal Power and Political Reality* (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450 24; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

Biblija, sirëč' knigi vetchago i novago zavëta, po jazyku slavensku (Moscow: Pečatnyj dvor, 1663). *Biblija, sirëč' knigi svjaščennago pisanija vetchago i novago zavëta* (St. Petersburg: Tipografija Aleksandro-Nevskogo monastyrja, 1751).

Brandt, R., “Grigorovičev parimejnik: V sličeenii s drugimi parimejnikami,” *Čtenija v Imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskich* 168 (1894): 1–90; 170 (1894): 91–178; 193 (1900): 179–290; 197 (1901): 291–308.

- Bulanin, D.M., "Tekstologija drevnerusskoj literatury: retrospektivnye zametki po metodologii," *Russkaja literatura* 1 (2014): 18–51.
- Cooper, H.R., *Slavic Scriptures: The Formation of the Church Slavonic Version of the Holy Bible* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003).
- Cooper, H.R., "The Bible in Slavonic," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 2: *From 600 to 1450* (eds. R. Marsden and E. Ann Matter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 179–97.
- Česká bible Hlaholská: Bible Vyšebrodská (ed. L. Pacnerová; Prague: Slovanský ústav Akademie věd České republiky, Nakladatelství Euroslavica, 2000).
- Čudovskaja Psaltyr' XI veka, otryvok Tolkovanija Feodorita Kirrskago na Psaltyr' v drevne-bolgarskom perevode (ed. V. Pogorelov; St. Petersburg: Izd. otděl. russkogo jazyka i slov. Imperat. Akad. nauk, 1910). *Die alttschechische Dresdener Bibel, um 1370/Dražďanská anebo Leskovecká: Facsimile auf Grund der photographischen Aufnahmen von 1914 nach dem bei Kriegsabbruch verbrannten Original aus dem 14. Jahrhundert: Mit einem Geleitwort von Miloslav Kardinal Vlk* (eds. H. Rothe and V. Kyas; Biblia Slavica Abt. 1: Tschechische Bibeln 1.1; Paderborn: Schöningh, 1993). *Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 1: *Das Buch Rut* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 34; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1993). *Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 2: *Das Buch Richter* (ed. D. Atanasova; Die slawischen Sprachen 38; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1994).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 3: *Die Psalmen* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 37; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1994).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 4: *Das Buch Leviticus* (ed. I. Dadi-verin; Die slawischen Sprachen 40; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1995).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 5: *Die Bücher der Könige: das erste Buch Samuel* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 42; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1995).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 6: *Die Bücher der Könige: das zweite Buch Samuel* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 45; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1995).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 7: *Die Bücher der Könige: das erste Buch der Könige* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 47; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1996).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 8: *Die Bücher der Könige: das zweite Buch der Könige* (ed. D. Dunkov; Die slawischen Sprachen 48; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1996).
- Die Methodbibel*, Vol. 9: *Das Buch Josua* (ed. D. Atanasova; Die slawischen Sprachen 49; Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik der Universität Salzburg, 1996).
- Dobrev, I., "Kirilica," *Kirilo-Methodievska enciklopedija* 2: 301–15.
- Dvornik, F., *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs: ss. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1970).
- Evseev, I.E., *Kniga proroka Isaji v drevneslavjanskom perevode: v dvuch častjach*, Part 1: *Slavjanskij perevod knigi proroka Isaji po rukopisjam XI–XVI vv*, Part 2: *Grečeskij original slavjanskogo perevoda knigi proroka Isaji* (St. Petersburg: Pečatnja S.P. Jakovleva, 1897) [Two parts in one volume, 168 and 146 + III pages respectively].
- Evseev, I.E., "Rukopisnoe predanie slavjanskoj Biblii," *Christianskoe čtenie* 4 (1911): 435–50.
- Evseev, I.E., *Očerki po istorii slavjanskogo perevoda Biblii* (St. Petersburg: Tipografija M. Merkuševa, 1916).
- Franciszek Skoryna z Połocka: życie i pisma* (eds. M. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa and A. Naumow; Biblioteka Duchowości Europejskiej 3; Gniezno: Collegium Europaeum Gnesnense, 2007).
- Glagolitica: Zum Ursprung der slavischen Schriftkultur* (ed. H. Miklas; Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Philologische Abteilung/Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 41; Vienna: Verl. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., 2000).
- Graciotti, S., "La tradizione testuale dell'antico lezionario croato," *Ricerche slavistiche* 20–21 (1973–1974): 125–80.
- Huntley, D., "Old Church Slavonic," in *The Slavonic Languages* (eds. B. Comrie and G.G. Corbett; London: Routledge, 1993), 125–87.
- Il'inskij, G.A., "Gde, kogda, kem i s kakoj cel'ju glagolica byla zamenena 'kirillicej'?" *Byzantinoslavica* 3 (1931): 79–88.
- Iosif (Archimandrit), *Podrobnoe oglavlenie Velikich Čet'ich Minej vsrossijskogo mitropolita Makarija, chranjaščichsja v Moskovskoj patriaršej (nyne Synodal'noj) biblioteke* (Moscow: Sinodal'naja tipografija, 1892).
- Istrin, V., *Aleksandrija russkich chronografov: Issledovanie i tekst* (Moscow: Universitetskaja tipografija, 1893).
- Jagić, V., *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913).
- Kloss, B.M., *O proischoždenii nazvanija "Rossija"* (Moscow: Rukopisnye pamjatniki Drevnej Rusi, 2012).

- Kolesov, V.V., "Evgenievskaja Psaltir," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae: Dissertationes Slavicae: Sectio Linguistica* 8 (1972): 58–69.
- Kulik, A., et al. (eds.), *The Bible in Slavic Tradition* (Studia Judaoslavica 9; Leiden: Brill, 2016).
- Lunt, H., "The OCS Song of Songs: One Translation or Two?" *Die Welt der Slaven* 30 (1985): 279–318.
- Lunt, H., and M. Taube, *The Slavonic Book of Esther: Text, Lexicon, Linguistic Analysis, Problems of Translation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).
- MacRobert, C.M., "The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 921–42.
- Marti, R., "Historische Graphematik des Slavischen: Glagolitische und kyrillische Schrift," in *Die slavischen Sprachen: Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung* (eds. K. Gutschmidt et al.; Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 32.2; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2014), 1497–513.
- Mathiesen, R., "Handlist of Manuscripts Containing Church Slavonic Translations of the Old Testament," *Polata knjigopisnaja* 7 (1983): 3–48.
- Mathiesen, R., "The Typology of Cyrillic Manuscripts (East Slavic vs. South Slavic Old Testament Manuscripts)," in *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, September 1983*, Vol. 1: *Linguistics* (ed. M.S. Flier; Columbus: Slavica, 1983), 193–202.
- Michajlov, A.V., *K voprosu o literaturnom nasledii sv. Kirilla i Mefodija v glagoličeskich chorvatskich missalach i breviarijach: Iz istorii drevne-slavjanskogo perevoda kn. Bytija pr. Moiseja* (Warsaw: Tipografija Varšavskogo učebnogo okruga, 1904).
- Michajlov, A.V., *Kniga Bytija proroka Moiseja v drevne-slavjanskom perevode* (4 vols.; Warsaw: Tipografija Varšavskogo učebnogo okruga, 1900–1908).
- Michajlov, A.V., *Opyt izučeniya teksta knigi Bytija proroka Moiseja v drevne-slavjanskom perevode*, Vol. 1: *Parimejnyj tekst* (Warsaw: Tipografija Varšavskogo učebnogo okruga, 1912).
- Miller, J., "The Prophetologion: The Old Testament of Byzantine Christianity?" in *The Old Testament in Byzantium* (eds. P. Magdalino and R. Nelson; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010), 55–76.
- Mirčeva, B., *Opis na prepisite na slavjanskite izvori za Kiril i Metodij i technite učenci* (Kirilo-Methodievski studii 23; Sofia: Bălgarska Akad. na Naukite, Kirilo-Methodievski Naučen Centăr, 2014).
- Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Vol. 7: *Epistolae Karolini aevi*, Vol. 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928).
- Naumow, A., "Perevody Franciska Skoriny v kontekste cerkovnoslavjanskogo perevoda Biblii," in *Translation and Tradition in Slavia Orthodoxa* (eds. V. Izmirlieva and B. Gasparov; Slavische Sprachgeschichte 5; Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2012), 10–25.
- Naumow, A., "Le traduzioni della Bibbia presso gli slavi ortodossi dei Balcani," in *La parola di Dio nella vita spirituale: Atti del Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa, Bose, 7–10 settembre 2011* (eds. S. Chialà, L. Cremaschi, and A. Mainardi; Magnano: Edizioni Qiqajon, 2012), 213–40.
- Nazor, A., "The Bible in Croato-Glagolitic Liturgical Books," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 1031–37.
- Nikolova, S., "Za naj-starija bălgarski srednovekoven răkopis na Starija Zavet," *Starobălgarska literatura* 28–29 (1994): 110–18. *Ostrožskaja biblija. Fototipičeskoje pereizdanie teksta s izdanija 1581 g.* (Moscow: Slovo-Art, 1988).
- Nikolova, S., and R. Zlatanova (eds.), *Starobălgarskijat prevod na Starija zavet*, Vol. 1: *Kniga na dvanadesette proroci s tălkovanija* (Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na naukite, Kirilo-Methodievski naučen centăr, 1998).
- Pečirková, J., "Czech Translations of the Bible," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 1167–200.
- Peri, V., "Il mandato missionario e canonico di Metodio e l'ingresso della lingua slava nella liturgia," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 30 (1998): 9–69.
- Pičhadze, A.A., "Tipologija parimijnyh čtenij knigi Ischod," *Palaeobulgarica* 10.1 (1986): 20–34.
- Pičhadze, A.A., "K istorii čet'ego teksta slavjanskogo Vos'miknižija," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 49 (1996): 10–21.
- Pičhadze, A.A., "Perevody Biblii na drevnie jazyki: cerkovnoslavjanskij," *Pravoslavnaja ènciklopedija* 5: 139–47.
- Prophetologium*, Vol. 1: *Pars prima, lectiones anni mobilis continens*, Fasc. 1–6 (eds. C. Høeg and G. Zunz; Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Lectionaria 1; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1939–1970).
- Psalterii Sinaitici pars nova (monasterii s. Catharinae*

- codex slav. 2/N*) (ed. F.V. Mareš; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997).
- Psalterium Demetrii Sinaitici (monasterii s. Catharinae codex slav. 3/N) adiectis foliis medicinalibus*, Vol. 1 (eds. M. Gau et al.; Vienna: Holzhausen, 2012).
- Rahlfs, A., "Dritter Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen: Berichtsjahr 1910," in *Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Jahre 1911* (1911): 21–25.
- Rahlfs, A., *Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen der griechischen Kirche* (MSU 1.5; Berlin: Weidmann, 1915).
- Ribarova, Z., "Knjiga proroka Jone," *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 37 (1987): 123–59.
- Ribarova, Z., "Vajsova proučavanja prijevoda Malih proroka iz Brevijara Vida Omišljanina," *Slovo: časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 44–46 (1994–1996): 27–34.
- Ribarova, Z., and Z. Hauptova, *Grigorovičev Parimejnik*, Vol. 1: *Tekst so kritički aparat* (Skopje: Makedonska Akademija na naukite i umetnostite, 1998).
- Ribarova, Z., and Z. Hauptova, *Grigorovičev Parimejnik*, Vol. 2: *Leksika* (Skopje: Makedonska Akademija na naukite i umetnostite, 2014).
- Schenker, A.M., *The Dawn of Slavic: An Introduction to Slavic Philology* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Shepard, J., "Bulgaria: The Other Balkan 'Empire,'" in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 3: c. 900–c. 1024 (ed. T. Reuter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 567–85.
- Sinajskaja psaltr': glagoličeskij pamjatnik XI veka* (ed. S.N. Severjanov; St. Petersburg: Rossijskaja Gosudarstvennaja Akademičeskaja Tipografija, 1922).
- Sinajski Psaltir, glagolski raskopis od XI vek* (ed. M. Altbauer; Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite, 1971).
- Slavova, T., "Glagoličeskata tradicija i preslavskata knjižnina," *Palaeobulgarica* 23.1 (1999): 35–46.
- Slavova, T., "Starobălgarskijat prevod na knigite ot Starija Zavet: edno novo načalo," *Palaeobulgarica* 24.1 (2000): 112–16.
- Tandarić, J.L., *Hrvatskoglagoljska liturgijska književnost: rasprave i prinosi* (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1993).
- Taseva, L., et al. (eds.), *Starobălgarskijat prevod na Starija zavet*, Vol. 2: *Kniga na prorok Izekiil s tãlkovanija* (Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na naukite, Kirilo-Methodievski naučen centăr, 2003).
- Thomson, F.J., "Made in Russia: A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," in *Millenium Russiae Christianae: Tausend Jahre christliches Russland, 988–1988: Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien 16; Cologne: Böhlau, 1993), 295–354.
- Thomson, F.J., "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 605–920.
- Thomson, F.J., *Dobrowsky and the Slavonic Bible: A Companion Volume to the Proceedings of the International Conference Josef Dobrovský, Fundator Studiorum Slavicozum, Prague, 10th–13th June 2003* (eds. V. Vavřínek, H. Gladkova, and K. Skwarska; Prague: Slovanský ústav AV ČR, 2004).
- Thomson, F.J., *A Brief Survey of the History of the Church Slavonic Bible from its Cyrillomethodian Origins until its Final Form in the Elizabethan Bible of 1751* (Slavica Gandensia 33.2; Ghent: Department of Slav and East European Studies of the University of Ghent, 2006).
- Turilov, A.A., "Posle Klimenta i Nauma (slavjanskaja pis'mennost' na territorii Ochridskoj archiepiskopii v x – pervoj polovine XIII v.)," in B.N. Florja, A.A. Turilov, and S.A. Ivanov, *Sud'by kirillo-mefodievskoj tradicii posle Kirilla i Mefodija* (St. Petersburg: Aletejja, 2000), 83–162.
- Tvorogov, O.V., *Drevnerusskie chronografy* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1975).
- Uspenskij, B.A., "O proischozdenii glagolicy," *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1 (2005): 63–77.
- Vajs, J., *Liber Iob* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1903).
- Vajs, J., *Liber Ruth* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1905).
- Vajs, J., *Liber Ecclesiastis* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1905).
- Vajs, J., *Propheta Ioel* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1908).
- Vajs, J., *Propheta Oseas* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1910).
- Vajs, J., *Nejstarši Breviář hrvatsko-hlaholský (Prvý Breviář Vrbnický)* (Prague: Nákl. Král. České Společnosti Náuk, 1910).
- Vajs, J., *Propheta Habacuc* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1912).
- Vajs, J., *Sophonias-Haggaeus* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1913).

- Vajs, J., *Zacharias–Malachias* (Veglae: Academia palaeoslavica veglensis, 1915)
- Vajs, J., *Psalterium palaeoslovenicum croato-glagoliticum*, Vol. 1: *Textus, annotationes, tabulae* (Prague: Sumptibus academiae palaeoslavicae veglensis, 1916)
- Vajs, J., *Najstariji hrvatskoglagolski misal: s bibliografskim opisima svih hrvatskoglagolskih misala* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1948).
- Veder, V., “The Glagolitic Alphabet as a Text,” in *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam* (eds. M.-A. Dürriegl, M. Mihaljević, and F. Velčić; Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka Biskupija, 2004), 375–87.
- Veder, V., “The Glagolitic Barrier,” *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 34 (2008): 489–501.
- Wevers, J.W., (ed.), *Genesis* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Wevers, J.W., (ed.), *Leviticus* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 2.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers, J.W., *Text History of the Greek Genesis* (MSU 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Wevers, J.W., *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wexler, P., *Explorations in Judeo-Slavic Linguistics* (Contributions to the Sociology of Jewish Languages 2; Leiden: Brill, 1987).
- Žagar, M., *Uvod u glagoljsku paleografiju*, Vol. 1: *x. i XI. st.* (Biblioteka Hrvatska jezična riznica; Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2013).
- Zaloznjak, A.A., and V.L. Janin, “Novgorodskij kodeks pervoj četverti XI v.: drevnejšaja kniga Rusi,” *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5 (2001): 3–25.
- Zapol'skaja, N.N., “Obščij” *slavjanskij literaturnyj jazyk: tipologija lingvističeskoj refleksii* (Moscow: “Indrik” 2003).
- Ziffer, G., “Una premessa cronologica allo studio della tradizione manoscritta slava orientale antica,” *Russica romana* 4 (1997): 13–25.
- Ziffer, G., “Slavia Orthodoxa und Slavia Romana,” in *Die slavischen Sprachen: Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung* (eds. K. Gutschmidt et al.; Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 32.2; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2014), 1308–19.
- Živov, V.M., *Jazyk i kul'tura v Rossii XVIII veka* (Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 1996).

Alessandro Maria Bruni

1.4.11 Arabic (Christian) Translations

1.4.11.1 General Remarks

Biblical versions in Arabic were produced over many centuries on the basis of a wide range of source languages and in varying contexts. The oldest Arabic Bible versions have come down to us from an early stage of the Arabicisation of late-antiquity communities, for whom scriptural translation was the initial vehicle in reforming their communal identity and adapting it to a new world at a time of profound political and cultural change. Biblical lore in Arabic echoes with abundance in the Qurʾān and early Muslim literature, with direct quotations being conspicuously absent. In contrast, the emergence of Arabic translations of the Bible may be considered as a counterpoint to the Scripture of Islam to some extent. They were produced by different groups whom the Qurʾān calls “People of the Book” (*ahl al-kitāb*): Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian, in their multiple denominations. Many of these translations resulted from the need for more accessible versions of the respective sacred texts. Each group created and maintained a clearly distinctive corpus of biblical versions in Arabic, based on MT (→ 1.2.2), LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), Peshitta (→ 1.3.4), or Coptic (→ 1.4.2) as *Vorlagen*. It is for this reason that Arabic versions are more numerous by far than all other translation traditions.

Another important characteristic is the great mobility of these traditions and their fluid, multilayered state of textual transmission.¹ This can be illustrated, for instance, by Saadia Gaon’s (882–942 C.E.) originally Judeo-Arabic translation of the Pentateuch (→ 2.4.10), which was adopted by Samaritans, as well as the West Syriac and Coptic Churches. Translations of East Syriac provenance

¹ The illustrative statement of S. de Sacy in his description of manuscript Paris, BnF, Ar. 8 is indicative. It states that he “hit upon the manuscript Arabic 12 [ancient fonds, i.e., Paris, BnF, Ar. 8 today], containing the Samaritan Arabic version of Abu Said, supplemented by a Coptic priest from the Hebrew-Arabic version of Saadia on behalf and at the expense of the opulent Jacobite scholar, Atiya Ibn Fadlallah Abyari”; cf. *Memoires d’histoire*, 1:113.

were prone to be borrowed by West Syriac communities and even disseminated among the Mozarabs at the western fringes of the Islamic world. Some of the Arabic translations in use among the Copts are of either Melkite or West Syriac origin (→ 2.5.8). In the course of diffusion from one contemporaneous cultural context to another, texts were often significantly transformed and adapted to the setting of the receptor community. As a result, translations were not infrequently adjusted to the readings of another canonical biblical text. This habit led to not a few versions of mixed *Vorlagen* text types, in which, for instance, one finds equal affinities to the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) and LXX (→ 1.3.1.1), or MT (→ 1.2.2) and the Coptic Bible (→ 1.4.2). Yet, changes also occurred over time in diachronic transmission. Older registers of Arabic may not have been understood by later copyists and readers. The same is true for the specific translation language, a *translationese* as it were, which was modeled on a formal equivalence to the source language as a didactic technique, often had grammatical rules of its own, and was never employed for texts other than translations. These features were habitually subjected to later modifications. It is, thus, plurality and variability that constitute the major trait of Arabic translations of the Bible.

Furthermore, textual standardisation was never brought into effect, also as Arabic never reached the status of an official church language, as did Syriac and Coptic. Although it appears that especially those translations that are attested in great numbers had a preferred, popular standing within their respective communities, none of them underwent a process of becoming canonically or liturgically binding. With regard to both their biblical texts and liturgical traditions, Arabic-speaking Christian churches have demonstrated and also cultivated, in a certain way, great variety over the course of history.

1.4.11.2 Text-Critical Value of the Biblical Traditions in Arabic

The technical advancement of printing with movable types in oriental languages soon introduced also Arabic versions to the canons of *philologia*

sacra.² It was via these early printed editions that European scholars first became aware of Arabic versions of the Bible on a large scale, which played a significant role in the clarification of obscure passages in the Scriptures. Specimens of this achievement include Giustiniani's (1470–1536) Polyglot Psalter,³ as well as the Paris (1629–1645)⁴ and London (1653–1657)⁵ polyglots at a later stage. Their importance for textual criticism was stressed, for example, by Wakefield in his *Oratio de laudibus & utilitate trium linguarum* (1524).⁶ In 1578, Junius issued a Latin translation of an Arabic version of the Acts of Apostles and the Epistles to the Corinthians, in which he discussed the value of variants in comparison with the received Greek text.⁷ A similar approach was pursued by Kirstenius in his *Vitae quatuor Evangelistarum, ex antiquissimo codice Arabico Caesario* (1608).⁸ Sionita and Hesronita, in *Grammatica Arabica Maronitarum*⁹ and Erpe-

² For details, the reader is referred to Vollandt, "Some Historiographical Remarks," and to Vollandt, *Biblica Arabica*.

³ A. Giustiniani, *Psalterium, Hebreum, Grecum, Arabicum et Chaldecum, cum tribus Latinis interpretationibus & glossis* (Genoa: Petrus Paulus Porrus, 1516).

⁴ Le Jay, **Biblia*.

⁵ Walton, **Polyglotta*.

⁶ Wakefield, *On the Three Languages*, 24.

⁷ Junius, *Sanctorum Apostolorum Acta*. His translation of the letters of 1 John, Galatians, and Hebrews in Arabic remained in manuscripts.

⁸ Cf. Smitskamp, *Philologia Orientalis*, 119–20.

⁹ G. Sionita and J. Hesronita, *Grammatica Arabica Maronitarum* (Paris: Blageart, 1616), folios aii^r–aii^v. Cf. F. Schelling, "Ueber die arabische Bibelausgabe von 1752," *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur* 10 (1782): 154–64; J.C. Döderlein, "Von Arabischen Psalteren," *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur* 2 (1778): 151–79 and 4 (1779): 57–96; O.G. Tychsen, "Ueber die Quelle aus welcher die Handschrift der Arabischen Version in den Polyglotten geflossen ist," *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur* 10 (1782): 95–110; O.G. Tychsen, "Untersuchung ob R. Saadjah Haggaoon Verfasser der arabischen Uebersetzung des Pentateuchs in den Polyglotten sey," *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur* 11 (1782): 82–112; S.G. Wald, "Über die Arabische Übersetzung des Daniel in den Polyglotten," *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur* 14 (1784): 204–10; F.T. Rinck, "Über eine ungedruckte arabische Übersetzung des ersten Buchs Moses zu Mannheim," *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur* 3 (1790–1791): 665–69; Hug, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 378–402;

nus, in the preface to his *Pentateuchus Mosis Arabice* (1622),¹⁰ elaborate on the use of Arabic translations for theologians for a better understanding and elucidation of some of the more obscure terms in the Scriptures. Most of the founding figures of Semitic philology, including Spey (d. ca. 1600), Bedwell (1563–1632), Theunisz (1569–1637), Nisselius (1624–1662), and Petraeus (1624–1672), published Arabic versions of scriptural books out of similar concerns. Arabic versions were used in critical editions of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Holmes' *Vetus Testamentum ex versione Septuaginta interpretum* acknowledges having used four Arabic versions from the Bodleian Library in Oxford.¹¹ Further, an Arabic version of the Gospels was used by Tischendorf (1849) to improve his earlier edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece*.¹² Also, the first four editions of Alford's (1859–1871) New Testament contain variants from Arabic versions.¹³ The apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* contains references to the Arabic portions of the Paris Polyglot.¹⁴ In addition, some early text books on biblical textual criticism include chapters on the Arabic tradition.

However, it became clear that Arabic translations are to a great extent secondary – if not tertiary – versions and rather late in comparison, for example, to the Targumim (→ 1.3.3) or the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4). Further, since preference has been given mainly to primary versions based on the Hebrew and Greek original texts, their value for textual criticism remained a matter of debate. Levin admits

Swete, *Introduction*, 110–11.

¹⁰ T. Erpenius, *Taurat Mūsā an-nabī alaihi as-salām id est Pentateuchus Mosis Arabice* (Leiden: Maire, 1622).

¹¹ R. Holmes and L. Bos, *Vetus Testamentum ex versione Septuaginta interpretum juxta exemplar Vaticanum* (Glasgow: Ex Prelo Academico, 1822).

¹² K. von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Leipzig: Winter, 1849).

¹³ H. Alford, *The Greek New Testament with a Critically Revised Text* (London: Rivingtons, 1859–1871). Yet, following the criticism of the *Edinburgh Review* 94 (1851): 29, stating that they are “of very little use in the present stage of critical investigation of the text,” the ensuing editions dispense with them.

¹⁴ **BH*¹. For details, see Wevers, “The Arabic Versions of Genesis,” 8–11.

a “textgeschichtliche Bedeutung.”¹⁵ Peters stresses the text-critical importance of some translations, such as that of al-Ḥārith b. Sinān (→ 2.5.8) or that of Isaac Velasquez with regard to the Latin Gospels.¹⁶ The value of al-‘Alam’s translation of the Prophets for the study of the Alexandrian text type has been pointed out frequently (→ 6→ –9.2.8.1). However, to reiterate the statement of Margoliouth, scholars agreed that biblical translations into Arabic are “of the slightest possible importance.”¹⁷

1.4.11.3 Rise of Arabic Translations

Much of the origins are veiled to us today. Parts of the Arabic Bible are only attested in manuscripts from the ninth century onwards. The question whether or not translations were available prior to their literarisation, especially before the rise of Islam and its formative first centuries, has instigated not a few scholarly debates. Available documentary sources, far from being void of dispute, remain a puzzling matter to this day.

If Muslim accounts are to be relied upon, certain Jews and Christians in the Arabian Peninsula were in the habit of elucidating their Scriptures in Arabic orally, at least in some form and to some extent. Suffice it to mention the often-quoted statement given in the name of Muḥammad’s companion, Abū Hurayra, in al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*: “the people of the book (*ahl al-kitāb*) would read the Torah in Hebrew and translate and explain it in Arabic to the people of Islam (*ahl al-islām*).”¹⁸

In light of the linguistic situation among these communities in the Arabian Peninsula, the possibility that Jews and Christians were accustomed to elucidating parts of the Bible in Arabic orally cannot be rejected, and is, in fact, likely. These

¹⁵ Levin, *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung*, 1.

¹⁶ Peters, “Psalm 149” and Peters, “Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen.”

¹⁷ As quoted by Jellicoe, **SMS*, 267. Similar verdicts are found in Roberts, “Orientalische Bibelübersetzungen”; Nestle, “Bibelübersetzungen,” 91; De Lagarde, *Die vier Evangelien*, 1; Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction*, 366.

¹⁸ Krehl and Juynboll, *Le recueil des traditions*, 3:198; 4:441, 495. The statement is repeated by Ibn Kathīr (1302–1373 C.E.), *Al-Bidaya wa-l-nihaya*, 2:133.

oral translations would have served internal educational and liturgical purposes and were not intended primarily for use beyond the community boundaries, for example, for apologetic or proselytising purposes. Early Muslims, as it has been demonstrated, had no direct access to an Arabic translation of the Bible, although they knew much about its contents. This knowledge was gathered principally, indeed solely, from oral sources.¹⁹

Be this as it may, the possibility of translations appearing in *writing* had its proponents. Particularly noteworthy in this context are the views of Baumstark.²⁰ Not only did he postulate that Arabic translations of the Gospels and Psalter were committed to writing even prior to the Qurʾān, he also claimed that a direct line of transmission could be drawn to the Arabic Gospels found in manuscripts originating from the Melkite monasteries of Mar Saba, Mar Chariton, and St. Catherine's. He expressed his contention that the transla-

tion type exhibited in those manuscripts emerged either among the tribal confederations of Christian Ghassanids or the Lakhmids and hence has to be regarded as pre-Islamic. His assumption is based upon an *argumentum ex silentio* that missionaries sent to these tribes would have employed vernacular languages for liturgy, as was the case for instance with Syriac (→ 1.3.4), Coptic (→ 1.4.2), Georgian (→ 1.4.8), and Ethiopian (→ 1.4.3) in the East, and Gothic (→ 1.4.12) in the West. At a later stage, this version was adopted among Melkites for missionary purposes among Christian Arabs, from where it also reached Arabia. However, this scenario has been met with severe critique.²¹ The impulse to commit previously oral traditions to writing, on the Arabian Peninsula or elsewhere, has been explained as an apologetic reaction to the appearance of the *written* Qurʾān, as the clearly visible Scripture of the Muslims.²² Despite lacking evidence, the possibility of written Arabic translations in pre-Islamic times continues to be the subject of debate.

¹⁹ As noted by Lazarus-Yafeh, "Tawrāt," 393: "Actual quotations from the Torah in the Qurʾān are very few and inexact (cf. v. 45 with Exod. xxi. 25–6, and III, 87, with Gen. xxxii. 33). Some are taken from other books of the Hebrew Bible (cf. XLVIII, 29, with Ps. i. 3, lxxii. 16, or xcii. 14) and from the Mishna (see v. 32, which gives the original version of Sanhedrin iv. 5) ... Most of their [i.e. the early Muslims] information, however, seems to have been gathered orally from Jews, up to the 9th/15th century." The complex transmission of the Judeo-Christian biblical material into early Islamic literature is, in my view, unrelated to the history of biblical versions and should be regarded as an independent discipline. The methodological premise that this influx was related to existing translations, as claimed in varying degrees by Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre*, 132; Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri*, 2:257–58; Newby, *A History of the Jews*, 67; and Cheikhō, *Le Christianisme*, 254–83, is questionable.

²⁰ Baumstark, "Problem," and Baumstark, "Arabische Übersetzung." Several scholars followed Baumstark in his argumentation or referred to him indirectly. Examples include Rhode, *Arabic Versions*, 14; Algermissen, "Pentateuchzitate," 10–13; Al-Maqdasī, "Naql al-kutub"; Peters, "Psalm 149"; Khoury, *Wahb b. Munabbih*, 258; Khoury, "Quelques Réflexions sur les citations"; Khoury, "Quelques Réflexions sur la première"; Shahīd, *Byzantium and the Arabs*, 440, and Newby, *A History of the Jews*, 67. All of these scholars have no doubt that pre-Islamic translations existed. Also Tobi ("On the Antiquity" and "תרגומים קדומים") has claimed a pre-Islamic provenance of early non-Saadianic translations into Judeo-Arabic from the Genizah corpus (→ 2.4.9).

1.4.11.4 Contextualising Evidence

Documentary evidence concerning the emergence of the biblical translations into Arabic in the first Islamic centuries is strikingly absent from Christian sources. Neither the letter of Timothy I, Catholicos of the Church of the East between 780 and 823 C.E., dealing with biblical studies of his time nor 'Abd Īshō's (d. 1318 C.E.) rhymed canon of East Syriac authors mention translations of the Bible or parts thereof.²³ The encyclopedia by the Coptic scholar Shams al-Ri'āsa Abū al-Barakāt, also known as Ibn Kabr (d. 1324), though containing an inventory of Christian-Arabic writers, exhibits only sparse references to translations.

²¹ For example, in Graf, *GCAL 1:36, 41; Levin, *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung*, 8–11; Trimmingham, *Christianity among the Arabs*, 225–26; Blau, "Reste arabischer Bibelübersetzung"; as well as in Griffith, "Gospel in Arabic," and Griffith, "Monks of Palestine."

²² Griffith, "When did the Bible?"

²³ For Timothy's letter, see Braun, "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I," and ter Haar Romeny, "Biblical Studies." 'Abd Īshō's canon is published in Badger, "Abdisho' bar Brika."

In contrast, Muslim authors refer to the Arabic Bible frequently. Despite the fact that translations are cited primarily in polemic contexts, some authors provide limited, yet valuable, contextualising evidence. For example, Mālik b. Dīnār (eighth century, Baṣra) mentions that he visited the library of a Christian monastery at night and purloined a book (*kitābā min kutubihim*, i.e., a book of the Bible) in order to peruse it.²⁴ The report seems to be fictional, as is the pseudo-biblical verse mentioning Adam that he cites. The theologian, polemicist, and man of letters, Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr al-Jāhīz (d. 255/869), furnishes a short critique of contemporary Christian and Jewish translations in his *al-Radd ʿalā al-naṣārā*, “Refutation of the Christians.”²⁵ His disapproval is directed against selected features of translation technique, such as literal, anthropomorphising renditions, which are acceptable in terms of neither linguistic nor theological considerations. Despite the obvious polemical position of al-Jāhīz, the possibility remains that he had some first-hand familiarity with Christian and Jewish Arabic translations in the ninth century.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutayba (828–889 C.E.), polymath in the fields of philology and literature, reports that “the Torah, the Psalms (Arab. *al-zabūr*) and all the remaining book of God – he shall be exalted – have already been translated into Arabic.”²⁶ His statement draws upon the claim that the number of different Arabic versions attests to the lack of reliable transmission, in contrast to the Qurʾān, which in Muslim belief is untranslatable. Further, a prominent account of biblical translators is found in al-Masʿūdī’s (896–956 C.E.) historiographical work *Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-l-ishrāf*.²⁷ It is situated in a section dedicated to the Greek kings, in Arabic *dhikr mulūk al-yūnāniyyin*. Drawing from material in the *Letter of Aristeas*, he reports King Ptolemy of Alexandria’s commission of the Septuagint. Prompted by this context, al-Masʿūdī fur-

nishes a lengthy discussion of contemporary translators of the Bible into Arabic. He recounts that the Septuagint had been rendered several times. The best version available, he continues, was that of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq, the renowned East Syriac translator of the ninth century. However, no manuscript trace of that translation has come down to us. What is more, the numerous references to Ḥunayn b. Ishāq in medieval Arabic biographic literature lack mention of the translation and its existence has consequently to be regarded as doubtful.²⁸ It is likely that it became attributed to the name of Ḥunayn merely due to his fame as a translator from Greek into Arabic.

Of no lesser prominence is Ibn al-Nadīm’s (d. 995 or 998) section on biblical books and their interpreters, Arab. *fī asmāʾ kutub al-sharāʾiʿ al-munzala ʿalā madhhab al-muslimīn wa-madhāhib ahliha* “On the names of books of law that were revealed to the Muslim denomination and denominations of their people.”²⁹ It consists of three parts, dealing with Muslim, Jewish, and Christian authors respectively. Taking into account the geographical and temporal proximity, his bibliographical sources for Jewish (e.g., Saadia) and Christian traditions, which emerged out of first-hand communication with a monk named Yūnis (e.g., East Syriac authors, such as ʿAbd ʾIshōʿ b. Bahriz, Pethion [→ 3–5.2.8; → 6–9.2.8], and Timothy 1), appear quite accurate and correspond closely to our present state of knowledge on the scholars mentioned. By contrast, his account of the Muslim scholar Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām remains dubious.³⁰ He was active at the

²⁴ As reported by Al-Iṣbahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ*, 2:375.

²⁵ For details, the reader is referred to Goldstein, “Saʿādiya’s ‘Tafsīr’ in Light of Muslim Polemic,” and Steiner, *A Biblical Translation in the Making*, 100–08.

²⁶ Saqqar (ed.), *Tāʾwīl Mushkil al-Qurʾān*, 16.

²⁷ De Goeje (ed.), *Kitāb al-tanbīh*, 112–13.

²⁸ For example, in Ibn al-Nadīm’s fihrist, he passes unmentioned in the chapter on biblical translators; see below. The section dealing with Ḥunayn’s writings dispenses with a reference to biblical translations. No mention of a Bible translation is found in the biographical accounts on Ḥunayn by Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa (cf. Müller, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, 1:200–203, 218). For Ibn al-Qiftī, cf. Lippert, *Ibn al-Qiftī’s Taʾrīḥ*, 171–77; for Ibn Khalikān, cf. ʿAbbās, *Fawāt ʿal-wafayāʾ*, 3:217–18; and for Ibn Sāʿid al-Andalusī, cf. Cheikho, *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt*, 36–37.

²⁹ Ramaḍān, *al-Fihrist*, 37–40.

³⁰ Nestle, “Bibelübersetzungen,” 91, identifies him as the Jewish convert ʿAbd Allāh b. Salām (d. 663), an attribution that is followed by Krachkovskii, “On a Translation of the Bible”; Graf, **GCAL* 1, 88–89 n. 2; and Adang, *Muslim Writers*, 19–20.

time of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd (reigned 786–809 C.E.) and is reported to have “translated” (Arab. *tarjama*) the Sabian book of the Ḥunafā’ (*Kitāb al-ḥunafā’ wa-hum al-Ṣābiyyūn al-ibrāhīmīyya*), as well as the Torah, Prophets, and Gospels from Hebrew, Greek, and Sabaic. As cited by Ibn al-Nadīm, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh describes his translation as follows:

... I have abridged the material, which is unnecessary for an understanding of the reasons for their [i.e., the *Ahl al-kitāb*] disagreements and differences. I have included what is needed for proof against them from the Qur‘ān and the traditions concerning the Prophet, may God bless him and give him peace, and from his companions, as well as the people of the Book who became Muslims, among whom were ‘Abd Allāh b. Salām, Yāmīn b. Yāmīn, Wahb b. Munabbih, Ka‘b al-Aḥbār, Ibn al-Tihān, and Baḥīr, the monk.³¹

Although Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh stresses that he “translated” the Torah and Gospels letter by letter (Arab. *ḥarfā ḥarfā*), it is arguable whether he indeed produced a running translation. Such an endeavour would be far from plausible also in terms of acquaintance with the source languages. Instead, we may assume that Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh composed a work related to the fields of *Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyyā’/Isrā’īliyyāt* “Stories of the Prophets/biblical or Rabbinic accounts” or *A‘lām al-nubuwwa* “Signs of Prophethood” and incorporated biblical material in order to testify to Muḥammad’s prophethood. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that major representatives of that genre, such as ‘Abd Allāh b. Salām, Wahb b. Munabbih, and Ka‘b al-Aḥbār, are mentioned in the context. The verb *tarjama*, in the meaning of “compiling short biographic accounts,” is a common designation for the composition of reports on biblical figures in its *Islamicised* form (Arab. *tarājim*). Wahb b. Munabbih, in recounting how he compiled accounts related to David’s Psalms (Arab. *zabūr Da‘ūd*), uses the same term.³²

As has become obvious, Christian and Muslim documentary evidence is of limited use for establishing the origin of Christian translations of biblical books into Arabic. Contextualising accounts, such as those which we possess concerning the emergence of Judeo-Arabic versions (→ 1.3.6.1), are not available and our main sources remain the manuscripts themselves. Muslim accounts of biblical translations into Arabic are seldom free of a polemic undertone and do not always distinguish proper translations from the transmission of biblical material into Muslim literature. Nonetheless, it can be gathered that Muslim authors became increasingly aware of the fact that Christians were involved in a translation enterprise of their Scriptures from the second half of the ninth century onwards.

1.4.11.5 Manuscript Corpus

Thus, it is certainly not a coincidence that manuscripts containing biblical books in Arabic begin to be attested on a larger scale in the ninth century. In the first stage, the communities that produced these texts concentrated on the books that were central or significant for conducting internal affairs. This applies first and foremost to texts used in a liturgical context, but also to books of certain popular appeal, such as the Wisdom literature. Translations of the Psalms and almost the entire corpus of the New Testament of Christian provenance are attested prior to the ninth century. As with other traditions, the Arabic “canon” was quite fluid. The books of Ben Sira, Job, and some pseudepigraphic books are found in many early Arabic versions. Only thereafter do we encounter translations of the Pentateuch, and most other books of the Old Testament. The Historical Books seem to be the least appealing for translation both in Christian and Jewish contexts. Most of the medieval versions were abandoned in early modern times and replaced by either hand-written copies of the **Biblia Sacra Arabica* (1671–1673) or lectionaries.

The majority of the manuscripts are preserved today in European collections, including the Bod-

³¹ Ramaḍān, *al-Fihrist*, 39.

³² Cf. Khoury, *Wahb b. Munabbih*; Khoury, “Quelques

Réflexions sur la Première”; and Khoury, “Quelques Réflexions sur les Citations.”

leian Library in Oxford, the British Library in London, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, and many others. There are some clerical collections in the Near East, of which the one at St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai is the most important. Only very few of these manuscripts have been subjected to in-depth study.

Complete sets of biblical books in one manuscript copy, as with surviving samples in the Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Latin manuscript traditions, are rare and have only emerged in imitation of printed copies. Commonly, manuscripts exhibit only groups of books, such as those of the Pentateuch, the Historical Books, the Prophets (Major and/or Minor), Psalms, or the sapiential books. Any manuscript copy of a collection of biblical books in Arabic will therefore very likely contain an amalgam, of which each section has a long and separate textual history, the work of several translators done at different times. In this respect, the Bible in Arabic does not differ from the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) or the Septuagint (→ 1.3.1.1). It is not uncommon to find versions of different *Vorlagen* side by side. The large bulk of manuscripts is written in Arabic letters. However, it is not uncommon to find the Arabic translation in Syriac and on rare occasions in Greek script.

- 'Abbās, I., (ed.), *Ibn Khallikān: Fawāt 'al-wafayāt wa-'al-dhayl* (Beirut: al-Dār al-Thaqāfah, 1973–1974) [Arab.].
- Abbott, N., *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri* (3 vols; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957–1967).
- Adang, C., *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible: From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm* (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science 22; Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Algermissen, E., "Die Pentateuchzitate Ibn Hazms: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der arabischen Bibelübersetzungen Münster" (Ph.D. diss., University of Münster, 1933).
- Badger, G.P., "Abdisho' bar Brika (Ebed-Jesu): Metrical Catalogue of Syriac Writers," in G.P. Badger, *The Nestorians and Their Rituals* (London: J. Masters, 1852), 361–79.
- Baumstark, A., "Das Problem eines vor-islamischen christlich-kirchlichen Schrifttums in arabischer Sprache," *Islamica* 4 (1931): 565–66.

- Baumstark, A., "Arabische Übersetzung eines altsyrischen Evangelientextes und die in Sure 21:105 zitierte Psalmenübersetzung," *OrChr* 3.9 (1934): 165–88.
- Blau, J., "Sind uns Reste arabischer Bibelübersetzung aus vorislamischer Zeit erhalten geblieben?" in J. Blau, *Studies in Middle Arabic and its Judaeo-Arabic Variety* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 291–96.
- Braun, O., "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9. Jahrhunderts," *OrChr* 1 (1901): 299–313.
- Cheikho, L., *Ibn Sā'id al-Andalusī: Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Umam* (Beirut: al-Maṭba'a al-Kāthūlikiya, 1912) [Arab.].
- Cheikho, L., *Le Christianisme et la Littérature Chrétienne en Arabie avant l'Islam* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1989) [Arab.].
- Corriente, F., "The Psalter Fragment from the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus: A Birth Certificate of Nabaṭī-Arabic," in *Eastern Crossroads: Essays on Medieval Christian Legacy* (ed. J.P. Monferrer-Sala; Gorgias Eastern Christianity Studies 1; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007), 303–21.
- Eichhorn, J.G., (ed.), *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* (18 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1777–1801).
- Eichhorn, J.G., (ed.), *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur* (10 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1787–1801).
- de Goeje, M.J., *Al-Mas'ūdī: Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-al-ishrāf* (Leiden: Brill, 1894) [Arab.].
- Goldstein, M., "Sa'adya's 'Tafsīr' in Light of Muslim Polemic against Ninth-Century Arabic Bible Translations," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 36 (2009): 173–99.
- Graf, G., *GCAL 1.
- Griffith, S.H., "The Monks of Palestine and the Growth of Christian Literature in Arabic," in *Arabic Christianity in the Monasteries of Ninth-Century Palestine* (Brookfield: Variorum, 1992), 1–28.
- Griffith, S.H., "The Gospel in Arabic: An Inquiry into its Appearance in the First Abbasid Century," in *Arabic Christianity in the Monasteries of Ninth-Century Palestine* (Brookfield: Variorum, 1992), 126–67.
- Griffith, S.H., "When Did the Bible Become an Arabic Scripture," *Intellectual History of the Islamic World* 1 (2013): 7–23.
- ter Haar Romeny, R.B., "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East: The Case of Catholicos Timothy I," in *Papers Presented at the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1999: Historica, Biblica, Theologica et Philosophica* (eds. E.J. Yarnold

- and M.F. Wiles; StPatr 34; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 503–10.
- Hug, J.L., *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1847).
- Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya fī al-tārīkh lil-Imām 'Imād al-Dīn Abī al-Fidā' Ismā'il ibn 'Umar ibn Kathīr al-Qurashī* (14 vols.; Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1929–1939) [Arab.].
- Al-Iṣbahānī, *Hīyat al-awliyā' wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā'* (10 vols.; Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī. Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1932–1938) [Arab.].
- Jellicoe, *SMS.
- Junius, F., *Sanctorum Apostolorum Acta: ex Arabica translatione Latinè reddita: addita obscurorum aliquot difficiliumque locorum* (Heidelberg: apud Joannem Mareschallum Lugdunensem, 1578).
- Kashouh, H., *The Arabic Versions of the Gospels: The Manuscripts and their Families* (ANTF 42; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012).
- Kirstenius, P., *Vitae quatuor Evangelistarum: ex antiquissimo codice Arabico Caesario* (Breslau: typis Arabicis ac sumptibus Authoris, 1608).
- Khoury, R.G., *Wahb b. Munabbih, Part 1: Der Heidelberger Papyrus PSR Heid Arab 23: Leben und Werk des Dichters* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972).
- Khoury, R.G., “Quelques Réflexions sur la Première ou les Premières Bibles Arabe,” in *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 24–27 juin 1987* (ed. T. Fahd; Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Antiques 10; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 549–61.
- Khoury, R.G., “Quelques Réflexions sur les Citations de la Bible dans les premières générations islamique du et du deuxième siècle de l'Hégire,” *Bulletin d'études orientales* 29 (1989): 269–78.
- Krakhovskii, I., “On a Translation of the Bible into Arabic from the Time of Caliph al-Ma'mūn,” *Christianskij Vostok* 6 (1918): 189–96 [Russ.].
- Krehl, L., and T.W.J. Juynboll (eds.), *Le recueil des traditions mahométanes par Abou Abdallah Mohammed ibn Isma'il el-Bokhāri* (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1862–1908).
- de Lagarde, P., *Die vier Evangelien Arabisch* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1864).
- Lazarus-Yafeh, H., “Tawrāt,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 10: 393–95 (2nd ed., 2000).
- Levin, B., *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung: Vat. Borg. ar. 95 und Ber. orient. oct. no8* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1938).
- Lippert, J., (ed.), *Ibn al-Qifṭī's Ta'rīḥ al-hukamā': Auf Grund der Vorarbeiten Aug. Müller's* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903).
- Macdonald, M.C.A., *Literacy and Identity in Pre-Islamic Arabia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009).
- 'A. al-Maqdasī, “Naql al-kutub al-muqaddasa ilā al-'arabiyya qabla al-islām,” *al-Mashriq* 31 (1933): 1–12 [Arab.].
- Müller, A., (ed.), *Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a: 'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'* (3 vols.; Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Wahbiyya, 1882) [Arab.].
- Nestle, E., “Bibelübersetzungen, arabische,” in *RE*, 3:90–95.
- Newby, G.D., *A History of the Jews of Arabia: From Ancient Times to their Eclipse under Islam* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988).
- Peters, C., “Proben eines bedeutsamen arabischen Evangelien-Textes,” *OrChr* 3.11 (1936): 188–211.
- Peters, C., “Psalm 149 in Zitaten islamischer Autoren,” *Bib* 21 (1940): 138–51.
- Peters, C., “Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zur Frage der arabischen Bibeltexte,” *RSO* 20 (1942–1943): 129–43.
- Ramaḍān, I., (ed.), *Muḥammad ibn Iṣḥāq ibn al-Nadīm: al-Fihrist* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa, 1994) [Arab.].
- Rhode, J.F., *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt: A Study from Eighteen Arabic and Copto-Arabic MSS. (IX–XVII Century) in the National Library at Paris, the Vatican and Bodleian Libraries and the British Museum* (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1921).
- Roberts, B.J., “Orientalische Bibelübersetzungen, die arabischen [Übersetzungen],” in *RGG* 1:1200–01 (3rd ed. 1957).
- de Sacy, S., *Memoires d'histoire et de littérature orientales* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1818).
- Saqqar (ed.), M., *Abd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutaybah: Tā'wīl Mushkil al-Qur'ān* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1981) [Arab.].
- Scrivener, F.H., *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1883).
- Shahīd, I., *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1984).
- Smitskamp, R., *Philologia Orientalis: A Description of Books Illustrating the Study and Printing of Oriental Languages in 16th- and 17th-Century Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Sprenger, A., *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed* (Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1869).

Steiner, R., *A Biblical Translation in the Making: The Evolution and Impact of Saadia Gaon's Tafsir* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Swete, *Introduction.

Tobi, Y., "On the Antiquity of the Judeo-Arabic Biblical Translations and a New Piece of an Ancient Judeo-Arabic Translation of the Pentateuch," *Ben 'Ever la-Arav* 2 (2001): 17–60 [Hebr.].

Tobi, Y., "תרגומים קדומים בלשון הערבית-היהודית לתורה: קטעים חדשים," *Ha-ivrit we-ahayoteha* 4–5 (2005): 115–43.

Trimingham, J.S., *Christianity among the Arabs in Pre-Islamic Times* (London: Longman, 1979).

Vollandt, R., "Some Historiographical Remarks on Medieval and Early-Modern Scholarship of Biblical Versions in Arabic: A Status Quo," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 1 (2013): 25–42.

Vollandt, R., *Biblica Arabica: A Classified and Annotated Bibliographical History* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

Wakefield: *On the Three Languages (1524)* (ed. and trans. G.L. Jones; Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in Conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, R., 1989).

Wevers, J.W., "The Arabic Versions of Genesis and the Septuagint," *BIOSSCS* 3 (1970): 8–11.

Ronny Vollandt

1.4.12 Gothic Translations

1.4.12.1 Origin, Historical Data, and Nature

Although there might have been attempted Christianizations before Wulfila (ca. 311–383 C.E.), the proselytization of the Goths is inextricably linked with the polyglot missionary bishop who evangelized seven years in the Gothic lands on behalf of Eusebius of Nicomedia, Patriarch of Constantinople. After a Gothic persecution of Christians, Wulfila led a group of Goths (the later *gothi minores*) into the Byzantine Empire in 348 C.E. and remained their bishop for another thirty-three years. Several church historians demonstrate that during this period of his life Wulfila developed the Gothic script and translated the Bible (cf. esp. Philostorgius, Socrates, Sozomenus, Isidor of Seville).¹ In view of several small linguistic dif-

ferences between the extant biblical texts, Wulfila probably was assisted by a team of scribes or translators.² Whether the translation was originally intended for further evangelization, liturgical purposes, or another aim is not clear, but the arrangement of some New Testament manuscripts in sense-lines and several marks in the margin point to a liturgical use.

The real extent of the original Gothic Bible in general and the Gothic Old Testament in particular cannot be determined reliably. While most sources suggest that Wulfila translated the whole corpus, Philostorgius remarks that Wulfila omitted the Books of the Kingdoms in order not to pique the warlike Goths. This remark would entail the inclusion of a translation of Joshua, which seems to invalidate the reason given for the omission. For the Old Testament remains, → 1.4.12.2.

1.4.12.2 Scope of the Corpus

1.4.12.2.1 Manuscripts

The Gothic biblical manuscript tradition ceased sometime between the sixth and the ninth centuries C.E. While Walahfried Strabo observes that Gothic manuscripts were yet to be found (*De exordiis* VII 481),³ portions of only nine (now eight) biblical codices (Cod. Argenteus; Cod. Ambrosiani [A–E]; Cod. Carolinus; Cod. Taurinensis; Cod. Gissensis [perhaps burned in 1945, but photographs remaining]) have survived.⁴ All manuscripts have been dated to the first quarter of the sixth century C.E.⁵ Of these remains, only Cod. Ambrosianus D (Mailand, G. 82) contains a portion of the Old Testament, namely fragments of Nehemiah 5–7. Ad-

Historia ecclesiastica II 41 and IV 33; Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 37; Isidor, *Historia Gothorum* 8, respectively.

² Cf. Scardigli, *Translation*, 2364.

³ The Carolingian interest in Gotica is surveyed with reference to medieval sources by M.-L. Rotsaert, "Gotica 'Vindobonensia': Localisation, Sources, Scripta Theodisca," *Codices manuscripti* 9 (1983): 137–50, esp. 138–40.

⁴ A current survey of the Gothic witnesses is provided by Scardigli, *Translation*, 2363–64. Cf. C. Falluomini, *The Gothic Version of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles: Cultural Background, Transmission and Character* (ANTF 46; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015): 25–52.

⁵ Cf. Scardigli, *Translation*, 2363.

¹ Cf., Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica* II 5; Socrates,

ditionally, a short phrase and some numerals in Cod. Vindobonensis 795 listing the ages of eleven biblical patriarchs may refer to Genesis 5 and should be recognized as a textual witness.⁶ The content is too scanty for any text-critical use, but clearly suggests that several (maybe all) Old Testament books existed in the Gothic language. The palimpsest bifolium named Gothica Bononiensia published in 2013 might provide the missing proof that the Gothic Bible contained the whole Old Testament. Its undertext offers a Gothic homily or a preparation thereof containing some biblical phrases (from Genesis, Isaiah, Psalms, and maybe Proverbs). However, the text still needs to be examined in detail.

1.4.12.2.2 Indirect Evidence

While Hieronymus' answer (*Ep.* 106) to Sunnia and Fretela regarding a Psalter translation does not provide clear evidence for a Gothic Psalter, John Chrysostom reports (*Homilia* II [PG 63, 472]) that in Constantinople psalms were sung in the Latin, Syriac, Greek, and barbarian (i.e., in this context, Gothic) languages. Therefore, the existence of a Gothic Psalter seems probable.

Another important hint regarding the scope of the Gothic scriptures lies in the Old Testament quotations within the Gothic New Testament.⁷ Some of these contain variant readings that are known (and may derive) from the LXX manuscript tradition, and that are not attested within the corresponding New Testament readings. Diples in Cod. Argenteus and Cod. Carolinus mark Old Testament quotations and bear witness to the likelihood of an Old Testament translation.⁸

⁶ The Gothic entries are accompanied by Latin counterparts. Where they diverge, the Gothic follows the LXX (in a Byzantine text form, which was formerly assigned to Lucian by Lagarde), and the Latin presents the Vulgate. Obviously, the phonetics of these entries do not reflect classical Wulfianic Gothic. Cf. N. Wagner, "Zu den Gotica der Salzburg-Wiener Alcuin-Handschrift," *Historische Sprachforschung* 107 (1994): 262–83, esp. 264.

⁷ The Gothic quotations are collected and analyzed in: L. Busani, "Il vecchio nel nuovo."

⁸ Cf. Sigismund, "Anmerkungen," esp. 294–97.

1.4.12.2.3 Editions and Tools

Manuscript Ambrosianus D and the Goth-Neh fragments were discovered by Angelo Mai and first edited by Carlo Ottavio Castiglione. The preeminent critical edition is Wilhelm Streitberg's *Die Gotische Bibel*, Vol. 1: *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage*. The 7th edition (2000) was edited and supplemented by Scardigli. Snædal's and Petersen's *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic* (1998) reproduces Streitberg's text (6th edition) with only small, well-documented changes. All older editions are out of date, particularly with regard to the Old Testament remains, since Streitberg was able to use new collations of the Ambrosian manuscripts copied by Wilhelm Braun in 1912 following their restoration in 1910/1911, which have rendered already sixteen changes in Nehemiah 7. Undoubtedly, the older editions, containing many observations and annotations, deserve attention. Therefore, the editions of Bernhardt, Gabelentz/Löbe, and Uppström should be mentioned. A useful tool is the TEI text database provided by the Wulfila Project (University of Antwerp), using Streitberg's 2nd edition (1919).⁹ The *editio princeps* of the Gothica Bononiensia was published by Finazzi and Tornaghi (2013), a new transcription and edition has been made by Falluomini (2014).¹⁰

1.4.12.3 Dating the Textual Tradition, Original Form, and Milieu

While it seems probable from a methodological point of view that the Gothic text handed down is not identical to Wulfila's edition, the extent of alleged post-Wulfianic text-critical and linguistic changes and revisions has yet to be determined. But since Wulfila's text arose in a western Gothic context, and the remaining manuscripts were written against an Ostrogothic background, we have to assume some dialectal shifts. Interdependency between the Gothic and the Latin tradition(s) is not out of the question, but does not concern the Old Testamental witnesses. However, one should

⁹ <http://www.wulfila.be/gothic/> (last accessed 17.05.2013).

¹⁰ R.B. Finazzi and P. Tornaghi, "Gothica Bononiensia"; C. Falluomini, "Zum gotischen Fragment."

not disregard the fact that the Gothic biblical tradition was passed down via Ostrogoths and later through interested clergymen in the (chiefly) Latin environment of early medieval Italy and the Frankish kingdom.

1.4.12.4 History of Research

Because of the small size of the Vienna Genesis fragment, research has focused on Gothic Nehemiah and its Greek *Vorlage*. Already in the *editio princeps*, Castiglione noted a strong proximity to the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot. Ohrloff proved this observation, demonstrating the closeness to a LXX manuscript family, whose text form was defined by Lagarde as Lucianic (now Antiochene) soon after (→ 19.3.5). Doubts remain, however, since some readings seemed inexplicable, leading Kisch to the theory that the *Vorlage* was a LXX text that had been revised in accordance with the proto-Masoretic text. The problem was solved after Kaufmann demonstrated that a text passage, at first assigned to 2 Esd 2:8–42, actually represents the list in 2 Esdras 17 in the Antiochene-Lucianic LXX version. Kauffmann's assumption was affirmed by Langner, who also wrote the first and best commentary on Gothic Nehemiah.¹¹ Final objections disappeared following Braun's new collation (see above). The affiliation with the Antiochene text form of the LXX was proven conclusively by Hanhart in the Göttingen LXX edition of 2 Esdras.

1.4.12.5 Translation Technique

The translation technique of Gothic Nehemiah is analogous to that of the Gothic New Testament.¹² Overall, Wulfila and his Gothic scribes were proficient in diction and linguistic usage. Overall, the Gothic translation is literal and sensitive to word meaning,¹³ but it does contravene the genuine Gothic syntax on rare occasions. Therefore, many smaller deviations from the LXX *Vorlage* reflect

¹¹ See now also Sigismund, "Nehemia-Fragmente."

¹² Cf. Scardigli, *Die Goten*, 116–32.

¹³ E.g., we find *managei* "crowd/multitude/populace" for λάος "men/people/multitude" (Neh 5:13, 15, 18), but *þiuda* "people/heathens/gentiles" for ἔθνος "nation/people/gentiles" (Neh 5:17; 6:16).

Gothic idiom.¹⁴ Variability in parataxis and hypotaxis is quite typical of the Gothic translation, as is the adaptation of certain loanwords.¹⁵

1.4.12.6 Theological Interpretations

The Gothic version of Nehemiah is a faithful translation of its Greek parent text, which was associated with the Antiochene (Lucianic) text form. Almost all deviations from other LXX recensions and the critical restored text of the Göttingen LXX derive from their association with this text form and are not specific to the Gothic translation. In addition to small variations, the Gothic version highlights – being a representative of the Antiochene text tradition – the political distance and the differences in habits between Nehemiah and the previous leaders (esp. Neh 5:15–18/2 Esd 15:15–18). The hostility of the prophets, expressed clearly in Neh 6:14/2 Esd 16:14 LXX^{re11}, is diminished by the Gothic translation in line with its Antiochene *Vorlage* (→ 19.3.5).

1.4.12.7 Text-Critical Value

1.4.12.7.1 Textual Allegiances

In light of the Byzantine background of the Gothic evangelization, it is most likely that from the beginning Wulfila used a Constantinopolitan LXX version as the *Vorlage* of his translation. While traces of Latin influence may appear in Gothic New Testamental witnesses, all Old Testament fragments could be explained by the affiliation of the Gothic Nehemiah to the Antiochene text form (→ 19.3.5). Also, the various names from Genesis suggest a Constantinopolitan text family, whose manuscript members were labeled Lucianic (Antiochene) in older research.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. the non-literal rendering (Neh 5:18): [...] *jah ana þo alla hlaiþ fauramþleis meinis ni sokida, in þis ei ni kauridedjau þo managein in þaim waurstwam* "and for all this I did not seek the bread of my government, so that I would not oppress the people by these works" for the Antiochene LXX version (2 Esd 15:18): [...] *καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις ἄρτον τῆς ἡγεμονίας μου οὐκ ἐζήτησα, ὅτι ἐβαρύνθη τὸ ἔργον ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον* "and yet for all this I required not the bread of government, because the work was heavy upon this people."

¹⁵ E.g. the adaption *prauftes* for προφήτης "prophet" (Neh 6:14).

1.4.12.7.2 Text-Critical Value: Summary

The text-critical value of the Gothic Nehemiah, although often underestimated, is twofold. First, Codex Ambrosianus D is a companion to the great Greek biblical uncial manuscripts and is as old as (or even older than) e.g. Codex Coislianus (seventh century C.E.) and Codex Venetus (eighth century C.E.). The Gothic translation itself originated in the fourth century and is therefore – like some other versions – one of the earliest witnesses of the LXX tradition. Secondly, the Gothic translation is the earliest witness of the Antiochene text form of Nehemiah (the earliest Greek manuscript is Ra 121 [Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. 3; tenth century C.E.]; the earliest VL manuscript of Nehemiah, vL¹²⁵ [St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 722], is dated to the eighth century C.E.), and hence holds a key position in the reconstruction of that text form.

- Bernhardt, E., *Vulfila oder Die gotische Bibel* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875).
- Busani, L., “Il vecchio nel nuovo: Le citazioni veterotestamentarie nei frammenti gotici del Nuovo Testamento,” *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 10/n.s. 7 (1996): 1–113.
- Castiglione, C.O., *Ulphilae partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab Angelo Maio repertarum specimen, conjunctis curis ejusdem Maii et c. O: Castillionaei editum* (Mailand: Regii typis, 1819).
- Ebbinghaus, E.A., “The Gotica of Codex Vindobonensis 795,” in *Germanic Studies in Honor of Otto Springer* (ed. S.J. Kaplowitt; Pittsburgh: K & S Enterprises, 1978), 93–102.
- Falluomini, C., “Zum gotischen Fragment aus Bologna,” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 143 (2014): 281–305.
- Finazzi, R.B., and P. Tornaghi, “Gothica Bononiensia: Analisi linguistica e filologica di un nuovo documento,” *Aev* 87 (2013): 113–55.
- von der Gabelentz and J. Löbe, H.G.C., *Ulfilas – veteris et novi testamenti versionis gothicae fragmenta quae supersunt* (Leipzig: Gerstenberg, 1843; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1980).
- Hanhart, R., *Text und Textgeschichte des 2. Esrabuches* (MSU 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).
- Hanhart, R., *Esdrae liber II* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 8.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

- Kauffmann, F., “Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der gotischen Bibelübersetzung: Vorbemerkung: 1. Die alttestamentlichen Bruchstücke,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 29 (1897): 306–37.
- Kisch, A., “Der Septuagintal-Codex des Ulfilas: Das Nehemia Fragment,” *MGWJ* 22 (1873): 42–46, 85–89, 215–19.
- de Lagarde, P., *Librorum veteris testamenti canonicorum pars prior* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1883).
- Landau, D., “Pages 209 and 210 of the Ambrosian Gothic Palimpsest: Ezra 2:9–42 or Nehemiah 7:13–45?” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 140 (2011): 421–41.
- Langner, E., *Die gotischen Nehemia-Fragmente* (Sprotau: Förster, 1903).
- Ohrloff, O., “Die alttestamentlichen Bruchstücke der gotischen Bibelübersetzung,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 7 (1876): 251–95 (= *Die Bruchstücke vom Alten Testament der gotischen Bibelübersetzung kritisch untersucht, ein ergänzender Nachtrag zu der Ausgabe des Vulfila von E. Bernhardt* [Halle: Waisenhauses, 1876]).
- Scardigli, P., “Frühe Bibelübersetzungen: Gotisch,” in *Übersetzung-Translation-Traduction: An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Vol. III* (ed. H. Kittel; Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 26; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 2363–65.
- Scardigli, P., *Die Goten: Sprache und Kultur* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1973).
- Sigismund, M., “Die gotischen Nehemia-Fragmente,” in *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (eds. S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund; De Septuaginta Investigationes 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 211–65.
- Sigismund, M., “Anmerkungen zu alttestamentlichen Zitaten in der gotischen neutestamentlichen Bibelüberlieferung,” in Karrer–Kraus, **Septuaginta 2010*, 289–310.
- Snædal, M., and C.T. Petersen, “A Gothic Fragment of the Old Testament Reidentified: Landau vs. Kauffmann,” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 141 (2012): 434–43.
- Snædal, M., and C.T. Petersen, *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic* (2 vols., Reykjavik: University of Iceland Press, 1998).
- Streitberg, W.A., *Die gotische Bibel, Part 1: Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage mit Einleitung, Lesarten und Quellennachweisen sowie den kleineren*

Denkmälern als Anhang (ed. P. Scardigli; 7th ed.; Heidelberg: Winter, 2000 [2nd ed. 1919]).

Uppström, A., *Codices Gotici Ambrosiani sive Epistolarum Pauli Esrae Nehemiae versionis Gothicae fragmenta quae iterum recognovit per lineas singulas descripsit adnotationibus instruxit Andreas Uppström* (Stockholm: Samson et Wallin, 1864–1868).

Marcus Sigismund