Anneli Aejmelaeus, Drew Longacre, and Natia Mirotadze, eds. *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020. ISBN: 978-3525522097. Hardback, pp. 409. €150.00.

This volume is a collection of works from a group of scholars who attended an interdisciplinary symposium in Tbilisi, Georgia, in 2015. The volume focuses on "ancient literary cultures and the work of copyists, editors, and translators" (7). The papers are organized into three parts, "Ancient Scribal and Editorial Practices," "Textual History of the Hebrew Bible," and "Writing and Rewriting in Translation."

The first paper in the first part is Anna Kharanauli's "Origen and Lucian in the Light of Ancient Editorial Techniques." Kharanauli begins her paper with a discussion of the work of a grammarian in Alexandria. One of the key terms she identifies in this work is ἔκδοσις, which means the edition of the text. The ἔκδοσις would include the text, critical signs, annotations, and accompanying commentaries. Considering the Alexandrian origins of these grammatical practices and the Septuagint, Kharanauli asks if the recensions of the Septuagint are examples of ἔκδοσις. She concludes that the work of Origen and Lucian are examples of ἔκδοσις of the Septuagint and that they form the basis for the Caesarean and Byzantine textual types of medieval manuscripts, respectively. This demonstrates how the practices of the grammarian in Alexandria could change an ancient text.

In "Galen's Practice of Textual Criticism," Amneris Roselli discusses how Galen addressed text-critical issues when commenting on the writings of Hippocrates. The paper begins with a discussion of Galen's intellectual background, highlighting his interest in grammar and philosophy. Roselli then discusses Galen's commentaries, highlighting his text-critical practices, especially his belief that amendments to the text should be based on the truth and the author's thought, not the commentators' own inclinations. This indicates how conjectural emendation could change an ancient text.

The third paper is Julio Trebolle's "Pre-Lucian Readings of 3–4 Reigns in Marginal Notes of the Syrohexapla and in the Syriac Text of Jacob of Edessa." In this paper, Trebolle seeks to demonstrate that, contrary to prior theories, the readings in the marginal notes of the Syrohexapla and Jacob of Edessa are of pre-Lucianic origin. The paper begins with a discussion of

the textual history of the Hebrew Bible from the Hebrew text to primary and secondary versions. Trebolle discusses how some of these witnesses assist in identifying pre-Lucianic readings in the marginal readings in the Syrohexapla (76). Trebolle then analyzes the marginal readings in the Syrohexapla and the text of Jacob of Edessa, demonstrating the presence of pre-Lucianic forms. In terms of ancient scribal and editorial practices, this demonstrates the spreading of and incorporation of various textual forms in ancient witnesses.

The final paper in the first part is Kristin De Troyer's "The Scribe of the Marginal Notes of Manuscript 344 (Ra 344; BM v)." De Troyer discusses twelve examples of marginal notes in the text of the book of Joshua in this manuscript to discern "how a scribe read a text and how he composed marginal notes" (99). Most of the notes list variant readings between the Old Greek text and the Hebrew text at the time. She concludes that these notes came from both the scribe of the manuscripts and later scribes. De Troyer concludes further that the scribe of the manuscript "copied faithfully from a model manuscript and occasionally jotted down variants, which he had found in a hexaplaric manuscript" (108). She indicates that the scribe of the marginal notes followed a similar pattern. In this paper, De Troyer demonstrates how an ancient text can change through the addition of marginal notes.

The first paper in the second part is "MasPs^{a} and the Early History of the Hebrew Psalter," by Peter J. Gentry and John D. Meade, which discusses the role of the manuscript MasPs^{a} in the history of the Hebrew Psalter. Gentry and Meade begin with a physical description of the manuscript before discussing the character of the text, the layout of the manuscript, and the provenance of the manuscript. Throughout the paper, they compare this manuscript with the Aleppo Codex, a representative of the MT. They note the nearly identical text of the manuscripts and the similarity in layout. This leads the authors to conclude that these two manuscripts "can be traced either to a common source or that Aleppo came from an intermediate manuscript which was both derived and developed from MasPs^{a}" (139). This demonstrates how an ancient text may not change over the span of a thousand years.

The next paper is Emmanuel Tov's "The Possible Revision of Hebrew Texts according to MT." Tov begins by addressing the assumption that ancient sources are revised according to the MT, emphasizing that this is not always the case. He first looks at revisions of ancient translations of Hebrew texts, including the LXX and Targumim, concluding that cor-

rections to the MT are present in these translations. After surveying the revision of Hebrew manuscripts, Tov concludes that "correction towards MT, though theoretically possible, has not been substantiated in the scrolls that differ much from MT" (160). This demonstrates how some ancient texts change due to correction toward the MT, while others do not.

"Rewriting David and Goliath?," by Anneli Aejmelaeus, discusses the differences between the story of David and Goliath in the Septuagint and the MT. Aejmelaeus notes that the MT version of the story is about 40 percent longer than the version found in the Septuagint (166). She discusses two possibilities for the sources of the additions in the MT: an independent alternative account or a recomposition or rewriting of the initial account. She concludes that "the longer version of the story of David and Goliath had its origin in scribal interpretation, which aimed at filling gaps in the older narrative and highlighting certain features of the story" (179). Aejmelaeus highlights especially the shepherd motif in David's story and the bridges in this story to the Torah. In this article, she demonstrates how interpretation of the text can change the text.

The final paper in this section is "Multilinear Genealogical Networks: Expanding the Scope of Textual History," by Drew Longacre. Longacre begins by addressing the divide in the discipline between those looking for an initial text and those who focus on the "uniqueness of each editorial stage in the development of textual traditions" (181). He highlights the common ground between the two positions, "the genealogical interrelatedness of different text forms" (185). He describes these genealogical connections as a series of source-recipient relationships. With his model of "multilinear directional networks of genealogical relationships" (196), Longacre provides the common language that all can use to discuss the change of ancient texts.

The third section begins with Katja Kujanpää's "Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul's Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations." In this article, Kujanpää discusses the letters of Paul as a source of Greek readings circulating in the middle of the first century (202). She discusses the importance of knowing Paul's style and motives to understand how he may have altered the text he was quoting. This is because Paul is taking texts out of their initial context and putting them into a new context. Kujanpää gives several examples of how Paul adjusts the text to fit his argument by adding catchwords, emphasizing certain elements, adding clarifications, conflating quotations to be concise, and ensuring consistency in grammatical form. Based on this survey of the evidence,

she concludes that, "if Paul has to decide between preserving the original wording or highlighting the relevance and suitability of the quotation for the matter at hand, Paul tends to choose relevance" (217–18). In so doing, Kujanpää demonstrates that ancient texts can change to fit an argument.

"Creative Philology and Glosses: Secondary Versions of Kingdoms and Lexical Accumulation or Mutation," by Andrés Piquer Otero, focuses on the creation of long or composite readings in the secondary versions of Kings, including Coptic and Arabic texts (222). Otero begins by discussing examples of composite readings in the Sahidic version that combine different text-types. He then discusses late examples of similar readings in Arabic. Otero notes that, while these late readings have little impact on the production of eclectic editions, "their importance is considerable when approaching the cultural context of Middle Ages biblical transmission and the vision of relationships between textual traditions in the Arabic-speaking world" (230). He demonstrates how the desire to produce a text that endures can change an ancient text.

The next paper is S. Peter Cowe's "Scribe, Translator, Redactor: Writing and Rewriting Scripture in the Armenian Versions of Esther, Judith, and Tobit." Cowe begins by highlighting the diversity of experience in the ancient Near East in comparison to the globalization of modern times. He argues that this same diversity is found in ancient literature. In discussing the origins of the Armenian versions, Cowe discusses the cycle of interpretation and rewriting in the process of translating texts (243). After looking at several examples of the textual changes in the Armenian versions, Cowe concludes that the translator, while faithful to central aspects of the text, is "conscious of his or her responsibility to make the latter communicate to a readership in terms they will understand and appreciate" (266). Cowe demonstrates how a translator's desire to communicate effectively to his or her audience can change an ancient text.

"The Intermediate Version of the Book of Tobit in Its Greek Dress," by Jean-Marie Auwers, begins by discussing the origins and transmission of the book of Tobit. He introduces three versions of the Greek text: the short recension (Greek I), the long recension (Greek II), and the intermediate recension (Greek III). He argues that this intermediate recension is not an eclectic mix of the short and long recension (278). After comparing the three versions, Auwers concludes that Greek III "has rewritten the book in a more readable, coherent and succinct way" (286). This demonstrates how the desire to transmit a story rather than simply a text can change an ancient text.

The following paper is Natia Dundua's "What Can the Georgian Translation of the Book of Tobit Tell about G^{III}?" Dundua begins her discussion by addressing the Greek sources for Tobit, the three recensions discussed in the previous paper. She refers to the Greek I, II, and III recensions as G^{I}, G^{II}, and G^{III}, respectively. She then discusses the Georgian sources of Tobit, listing the relevant manuscripts. She lists numerous comparisons of the Georgian text to the three Greek recensions and other daughter translations. Dundua concludes that "the Georgian translation displays the character of the G^{III} textual form" (319). Therefore, the Georgian translation can potentially provide information about the Greek III text in areas where it is not extant when it disagrees with the other Greek versions and daughter translations. This demonstrates how an ancient text can be reconstructed from a translation.

Natia Mirotadze begins "The Old Georgian Version of the Book of Esther—All in One" by discussing the Greek versions of Esther and the relationship of the Georgian versions of Esther to these Greek versions. She notes that GeII, one of the Old Georgian versions, has similarities to all three known forms of the Greek text of Esther while containing material that is not attested elsewhere (322). Mirotadze demonstrates this by outlining the text of Esther for each version and showing specific instances where the text of GeII agrees with each version and where it is unique. She concludes that "all existing textual forms that were at the editor's disposal are interwoven" (357). This demonstrates how an ancient text can change by incorporating several versions into one.

The penultimate paper is "A Translation, Paraphrase, or Metaphrasis? Regarding Euthymius the Hagiorite's Versions of the Orations by Gregory the Theologian," by Magda Mtchedlidze. She defines the terms in her title and compares the translation of Gregory's Orations by Euthymius to the more literal translation by Ephrem Mtsire. Mtchedlidze concludes that "Euthymius is oriented toward the reader, caring more for their theological Christian education than familiarizing them with Gregory the Theologian as an author and preserving the individualistic and cultural nuances of his text" (386). She demonstrates that Euthymius focused more on making the text understandable than accurately translating it. Mtchedlidze ends with the unanswered question of whether such a text should be considered a translation or one of the other terms she defined. This paper demonstrates how a translator's focus on his or her audience can change an ancient text.

The final paper is Anna Kharanauli's "Septuagint Text Types in the Georgian Translations." Kharanauli describes how changes to the Septuagint to

incorporate readings that approximated to MT occurred in two stages, before and after Origin's Hexapla. Kharanauli examines pre-Origenian changes in Ezekiel, noting that changes often occur first in the margin and are later incorporated into the text. She then examines Origenian and post-Origenian changes in Jeremiah, Isaiah, and 1 Ezra. She concludes that Origen and other grammarians were not correcting the text in their work but preparing an ἔκδοσις, which is demonstrated in the diverse character of these works (407–8). Kharanauli demonstrates that change can happen to the text not as a result of correction but through comments and notes that are later incorporated into the text.

The papers in this volume come from a diverse group of scholars and discuss a diverse group of texts. Each paper includes more than enough data to support the arguments made by each author about how ancient texts could and could not be changed. The many demonstrations of the ways ancient texts can change are valuable to all textual scholars, not just scholars of the Septuagint.

Zachary Skarka
University of Birmingham