

The Quedlinburg Itala: New Text-Critical Insights from an Almost Forgotten Manuscript

Martijn Beukenhorst, RSCS – UCLouvain

Abstract: Recent research into the Old Latin of Samuel–Kings has shown the usefulness of this manuscript tradition for textual criticism, while also showing the complex nature of its individual witnesses. This article looks at the Quedlinburg Itala, La¹⁶, one of only two remaining manuscript witnesses of the Old Latin text of Samuel–Kings. Even though only six leaves are preserved, the Quedlinburg Itala represents an important and extremely valuable witness to the complexity of the textual history of the Old Latin. The aim of this article is to look at the text-critical value of the preserved textual segments by discussing important variants preserved in Quedlinburg, specifically 2 Sam 2:29, 2 Sam 2:31, 1 Kgs 5:30, and 1 Kgs 6:3. Quedlinburg is an unaligned document that has seen several changes in its transmission history. It nonetheless provides us with useful new insights in multiple text-critical issues.

Introduction

The Old Latin (OL) has long been considered an important element in reconstructing the text of Old Greek (OG), as the OL likely translates an early form of the Septuagint, relatively free from recensional influences.¹ Especially in the case of Samuel–Kings, where many witnesses of the

Many thanks to Matthieu Richelle, Andrés Piquer Otero, and Pablo Torijano Morales for their helpful remarks when writing this paper, as well as to the two anonymous *TC* reviewers, whose suggestions greatly helped improve this paper.

1. On the nature and relevance of the OL for the Septuagint, see, among others, Julio Trebolle Barrera, “From Secondary Versions through Greek Recensions to Hebrew Editions: The Contribution of the Old Latin Version,” in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, ed. Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 181–216; Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, “The Vetus Latina (Old Latin),” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, ed. Alison Salvesen and T. M. Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 623–38.

Septuagint are influenced by the recensions, the OL plays an important text-critical role.

Recently several scholars have argued that the OL, while extremely useful in Samuel–Kings, should be used with caution. Especially articles by Tuukka Kauhanen and Bonifatia Gesche have pointed out that the OL is not as uniform as previously thought.² When comparing different OL witnesses, it is obvious that the text has been changed. Every witness should be treated with caution when trying to use it to reconstruct the Old Greek.

This diversity of the OL witnesses has called for more detailed research into individual witnesses. Recent works by, for example, Kauhanen, on the quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari, and Timo Tekoniemi, on Vindobonensis (La¹¹⁵), as well as the older works by Ciriaca Morano-Rodríguez and Antonio Moreno-Hernandez on the Spanish Marginal Glosses (La^{91–95}) have helped scholars to understand the OL of Samuel–Kings.³ However, much work remains to be done, and one of the manuscripts that has seen little treatment is the Quedlinburg Itala (La¹¹⁶). In this paper, I will try to shed a light on a part of this relatively unknown manuscript.

2. Tuukka Kauhanen, “Septuagint in the West: The Significance of the Post-Lucianic Latin Witnesses for the Textual History of Kings,” in *Die Septuaginta—Orte und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung Veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 309–25; Bonifatia Gesche, “The Versions of the Vetus Latina and Their Relation to the Versions of the Septuagint in 1 Kings,” in *Die Septuaginta—Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz: 6. Internationale Fachtagung Veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016*, ed. Michaela Geiger, Martin Meiser, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 256–73.

3. Tuukka Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1–2 Kings*, SCS 68 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018); Timo Tekoniemi, “Is There a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum in the Text of 1 Kings of the Old Latin Manuscript La115?,” in *On Hexaplaric and Lucianic Readings and Recensions*, ed. Dionisio Candido, Joshua Alfaro, and Kristin De Troyer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021), 115–34; Tekoniemi, “The Position of Old Latin Manuscript La115 in the Textual History of 2 Kings: Identifying Kaige and (Proto-)Lucianic Readings in a Kaige Section,” *TC* 27 (2022): 1–15; Ciriaca Morano Rodríguez, *Glosas marginales de “Vetus Latina” en las Biblias Vulgatas españolas: 1–2 Samuel* (Madrid: CSIC-Instituto de Filología, 1989); Antonio Moreno Hernández, *Las Glosas marginales de “Vetus Latina” en las Biblias Vulgatas españolas: 1–2 Reges* (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1991). On the (possible) impact of the marginal glosses (and the OL in general) on the scholarship of Kings, see, for example, Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

The Quedlinburg Itala

Historical Background

The Quedlinburg Itala is an OL manuscript probably made around the fifth century CE in Italy. It was discovered in the nineteenth century in the bindings of seventeenth-century parish and police records of the city of Quedlinburg in Germany. It consists of six leaves, five full and one very fragmentary, which contain fragments of Samuel and Kings, specifically 1 Sam 9:1–8; 15:10–18; 2 Sam 2:29–3:5, and 1 Kgs 5:16–6:7. Accompanying the fragments are miniatures illustrating the text. They were found in the bindings of three different books, where they had been used as scrap material bound around 1618.⁴ As the fragments are from three of the four books of Samuel–Kings, commonly found together in the Septuagint under the name Kingdoms, it is likely that the original document once held all four books. This would mean that it originally encompassed at least 380 pages of text, likely with numerous additional pages for illustrations.⁵ Given the impressive skill shown in the miniatures and the extensive use of golden lineage, this was probably an expensive manuscript created with the utmost care.

The name *Itala* comes from an early article by local scholar George von Mülverstedt, the first to discuss Quedlinburg. He connected it to the “Itala,” Augustine’s favorite Latin translation.⁶ However, this connection was already controversial at the time and was convincingly argued against by Hermann Degering and Albert Boeckler in their thorough analysis of the Quedlinburg Itala.⁷ The original manuscript was probably written and

4. For a proposed reconstruction of the history of the manuscript, see Hermann Degering and Albert Boeckler, *Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente* (Berlin: Cassiodor Gesellschaft, 1932), 8–16. One of the bindings has the name of the book binder Asmus Reitel written on it, which gives Degering a good lead in his research on where and when they were bound. However, the history of the manuscript before its binding is mostly the result of educated guesses by Degering and does not have much scholarly value. See also Inabelle Levin, *The Quedlinburg Itala: The Oldest Illustrated Biblical Manuscript* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 15.

5. As estimated by Levin, *Quedlinburg Itala*, 16.

6. George von Mülverstedt, “Über den Kirchenschatz des Stifts Quedlinburg,” *Zeitschrift des Harz-Vereins für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 7 (1874): 210–63, specifically 251–63. On the translations Augustine used, see, for example, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, “Les bibles d’Augustin,” *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 37 (2006): 513–31.

7. Degering and Boeckler, *Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente*, 26–28. They argue in

illustrated in Rome around the first half of the fifth century, although there is some debate about the dating and location.⁸ The illustrations found in the manuscript is what made the Quedlinburg Itala famous, as it is the oldest extant illustrated biblical manuscript, at least in the West. Most scholarship so far has focused on the pictorial tradition, and hardly any attention has been given to the text, especially from a text-critical point of view.

Previous Studies

The relevance of previous studies in this context is small. Several articles were published in the nineteenth century by German scholars.⁹ Most of their discussion focuses on the miniatures, which were seen as much more important than the text. The part of their discussion that does treat the text focuses mostly on what the Quedlinburg manuscript exactly was and how it related to other OL manuscripts, but their understanding of the OL and the relationship between different manuscripts was small.

The largest investigation into the Quedlinburg Itala was done by Degering and Boeckler in 1932. Latin philologist Degering discussed the textual issues, and art historian Boeckler provided an analysis of the miniatures and the pictorial tradition. Especially Degering's new transcription together with a short analysis and transcription notes is impressive. These notes provide the most extensive published analysis of the text of

favor of sticking with the name *Itala*, as it provides a short and popular way of referring to the manuscript, a convention that has since been followed by all scholars.

8. Levin discusses several theories for dating the Quedlinburg Itala but, based on a comparison of the script with other manuscripts from the same period, concludes that "the manuscript was produced in a major Italian centre in the fifth century, possibly at some time during the second quarter of that century" (Levin, *Quedlinburg Itala*, 24).

9. Von Mülverstedt, "Über den Kirchenschatz"; Wilhelm Schum, "Das Quedlinburger Fragment einer illustrierten Itala," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 49 (1876): 121–34; Adalbert Düning, "Ein neues Fragment des Quedlinburger Itala-Codex," *Quedlinburger Gymnasialprogramm* (1888): 1–24; Victor Schultze, *Die Quedlinburger Itala-Miniaturen der königlichen Bibliothek in Berlin, Fragmente der ältesten Christlichen Buchmalerei* (Munich: Beck, 1898). Von Mülverstedt was the official archiver for Magdeburg and discovered leaves 3 and 4. Shortly thereafter, the mayor of Quedlinburg discovered leaves 1 and 2. As an archiver, von Mülverstedt was not the best placed to interpret these findings, which prompted the short monograph by Schum. Düning later discovered the fifth leaf, which prompted his article. Schultze attempts to bring all the findings together, but his focus is mostly on the miniatures, and while he gives a transcription, he does not provide much new insights into the discussion on the textual history.

Quedlinburg to date, although they mostly discuss the choices in the transcription.¹⁰ Their use for text-critical questions is limited, as Degering is interested only in providing a good transcription and does not look at possible text-critical issues.

As the illustrations found in the Quedlinburg Itala are important from an art-historical perspective, the more recent scholarship that references Quedlinburg tends to focus on this. This work is mostly in a larger context of early Christian illustrations. In this line we find the most recent full study of Quedlinburg, by Inabelle Levin in 1985.¹¹ She provides a new transcription based on Degering's work, although she mostly improves the legibility of Degering's transcription, filling in abbreviations and indicating letters that are difficult to read. She also provides high-quality images of all the leaves, which is a great contribution to the scholarship. Her research is excellent but of little use in a text-critical context. As an art historian, she is almost uniquely interested in the analysis of the pictorial tradition, and she provides little comment on the transcription or text-critical issues.

Recently, the Quedlinburg Itala has attracted some interest from Septuagint scholars,¹² most notably the 2018 article by Gesche mentioned above. Gesche attempts to relate all major OL witnesses of Samuel–Kings to each other and in doing so also devotes some time to Quedlinburg. She argues that “the Quedlinburg manuscript is influenced by the Hexaplaric tradition and belongs to a late recension of the text,” and “it is in some aspects related to the Spanish glosses in respect to its chronology and the character of the text.”¹³ Gesche focuses on the Quedlinburg passages in Kings, and, while her work is valuable in the larger context of the OL of Kings, her conclusions on Quedlinburg may merit some more nuance.

Set-Up of This Article

The aim of this article is to give a concise overview of the manuscript and to look at ways in which readings found in Quedlinburg could contrib-

10. Degering and Boeckler, *Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente*, 45–64.

11. Levin, *Quedlinburg Itala*.

12. In 2021, the Quedlinburg Itala was briefly analyzed by Tekoniemi in a short paper he gave at an online conference. He was at the UCLouvain in March 2022, and he generously shared some of his findings with me, as well as discussing my own views. I am incredibly grateful for his help, and this paper would not have been the same without him.

13. Gesche, “Versions of the *Vetus Latina*,” 268.

ute to the larger context of textual criticism of Samuel–Kings. Classifying Quedlinburg among the other Septuagint witnesses is complex, and thus it is not easy to give all elements the place they deserve. The OL has been proven to have preserved many interesting readings that have been used to solve text-critical problems.¹⁴ Can Quedlinburg, despite its fragmentary nature, be of similar use? Can the Quedlinburg manuscript be useful for our understanding of the Hebrew text? To look at the possible use of Quedlinburg, one must first briefly study the relationship Quedlinburg has with the different versions and manuscripts that we have of the Septuagint. At first sight, Quedlinburg seems to be quite similar to the other OL witnesses, but closer inspection shows that it might be more complex.

To provide a good overview of these various elements, this article is divided into three different sections. The first section provides a general overview of the Quedlinburg manuscript: its complexities, how it relates to other OL witnesses, and how it relates to the different Septuagint manuscripts and versions we have. My hypothesis is that Quedlinburg preserves an early form of the OL, translating a Greek text similar to the proto-Lucianic Greek text. This translation has seen little external influences but has seen some internal reworking throughout its transmission process. The second section looks at how the Quedlinburg manuscript, despite its complexities, has preserved a translation of OG readings, without kaige or Hexaplaric influences found in some other LXX witnesses. Finally, the third and main section looks at interesting readings where Quedlinburg can help us solve text-critical problems.

There is an important note to be made before looking at the text. I will often refer to “Quedlinburg reads/has/finds” to indicate a certain reading. However, it is highly unlikely that these readings are because of changes made in the fifth century. Like most manuscripts, the Quedlinburg manuscript has preserved a text that is much older. If the manuscript would have been heavily changed in the fifth century, one would expect influences from the Vulgate, but I have not found traces of this. Therefore, Quedlinburg is almost certainly copying an older manuscript that already had all these readings.

14. See, for example, Julio Treballe Barrera, “From the ‘Old Latin’ through the ‘Old Greek’ to the ‘Old Hebrew’ (2 Kings 10:23–25),” *Textus 11* (1984): 17–36; Adrian Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); Timo Tekoniemi, *The Textual History of 2 Kings 17* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021).

The Difficulty with Understanding the Nature of the Quedlinburg Itala

The OL witnesses of Samuel–Kings that have received scholarly attention have all been related in some form to the proto-Lucianic text as the basis for their translation.¹⁵ In Samuel–Kings, the proto-Lucianic text has often preserved the OG, which was likely also the basis for the OL. This can most easily be observed in the kaige sections, as there the five Lucianic manuscripts have preserved a text that is mostly free from kaige influences. Quedlinburg seems to follow this general trend in the OL, preserving a translation that tends to agree with the Lucianic text without having any of the Lucianic features.¹⁶

As shown in the following table, 1 Sam 15:12 is a good example of how Quedlinburg agrees with the proto-Lucianic text.¹⁷

15. Of the witnesses that have seen recent scholarly attention, Vindobonensis is probably the closest to the proto-Lucianic text, followed by the marginal glosses, which is followed by Lucifer of Cagliari. For further discussions, see Bonifatius Fischer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibeltexte* (Freiburg: Herder, 1986); Tuukka Kauhanen, “Lucifer of Cagliari and the Kaige Revision,” in *The Legacy of Barthelmy: Fifty Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Tuukka Kauhanen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 146–68; Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari*; Tekoniemi, “Identifying Kaige and (Proto-)Lucianic Readings”; Tekoniemi, “Is There a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum”; Morano Rodríguez, *1–2 Samuel*; Moreno Hernández, *1–2 Reges*; Julio Treballe Barrera, “Textual Affiliation of the Old Latin Marginal Readings in the Books of Judges and Kings,” in *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink sj*, ed. Georg Braulik, Norbert Lohfink, Walter Gross, and Sean E. McEvenue (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 315–29.

16. This is mostly the case in the other OL manuscripts as well. For discussions of possible Lucianic readings found in the OL, see Julio Treballe Barrera, “Readings of the Old Latin (Beuron 91–95) Reflecting ‘Additions’ of the Antiochene Text in 3–4 Kings,” in Aejmelaeus and Kauhanen, *Legacy of Barthelmy*, 120–45.

17. Legenda for the table: all versions have the same sections on the same lines; sections in grey are sections that have not been preserved in Quedlinburg, as they would have been on a different leaf; [-] means this version has a minus; [>] and [<] mean that this version has this section in a previous place, either afterward [>] or previous [<]; [text] in square brackets means that this reading is barely legible or fully missing from the manuscript, t(e)xt in round brackets means that this appears abbreviated in the manuscript; a long dotted line ----- means the manuscript does not have the full verse but only from this place onward. The text for Quedlinburg comes from Levin, *The Quedlinburg Itala*; the text for LXX^B (Vaticanus) comes from Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts: The Later Historical Books* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1935); the text for

Quedlinburg	LXX ^B	LXX ^L	MT
et ante [lu]cem	καὶ ὄρθρισεν	καὶ ὄρθρισε	וַיִּשְׁכַּח
samuel	Σαμουήλ	Σαμουήλ	שְׁמוּאֵל
[-]	[-]	[-]	לְקַרְאֵת שְׂאוּל בְּבָקָר
abiit	καὶ ἐπορεύθη	καὶ ἐπορεύθη	[-]
in obuiam,	εἰς ἀπάντησιν	εἰς ἀπάντησιν	[-]
[-]	Ἰσραήλ	τῷ Ἰσραήλ	[-]
[-]	πρωτ̄	πρωτ̄.	[-]
et renun[ti]arunt	καὶ ἀπηγγέλη	ἀπηγγέλη	וַיִּגְדּוּ
samuel dicentes,	τῷ Σαοὺλ λέγοντες	τῷ Σαμουήλ λεγόντων	שֶׁמֹשׁוּאֵל לְאַמְר
abiit saul	Ἦκει Σαμουήλ	Ἦκει Σαοὺλ	בְּאִשְׁאוּל
in carmellum,	εἰς Κάρμηλον,	εἰς τὸν Κάρμηλον	הַכַּרְמֶלָה
et	καὶ	καὶ	[>]
[-]	[-]	ἰδοὺ	וְהִנֵּה
samuel	[-]	[-]	[-]
adduxit ad se manu(m)	ἀνέστακεν αὐτῷ χεῖρα.	ἀνέστακεν ἑαυτῷ χεῖρα.	מְצִיב לוֹ יָד
et circumegit	Καὶ ἐπέστρεψε	Καὶ ἀπέστρεψε	וַיִּסֵּב
currum.	τὸ ἄρμα	τὸ ἄρμα	[-]
[-]	[-]	αὐτοῦ,	[-]
[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]

LoC: *et ante lucem, et Samuhel abiit in obuiam Israel*. [the rest is missing]
 MG (La⁹¹⁻⁹⁵): [beginning is missing] *abiit Saul in Carmelum et ecce Samuel adduxit ad se manum et circumegit currum suum* [...]

The agreement with a proto-Lucianic text in this verse is clear: Quedlinburg clearly agrees with the names found in the Lucianic manuscripts, evident from the second reference to Samuel and the first reference to Saul, while LXX^B has a reversed order. Given the abundant manuscript evidence for the Lucianic order of these names,¹⁸ together with the evidence from

LXX^L (Antiochean) comes from Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega I: 1-2 Samuel* (Madrid: CSIC Press, 1989), and Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega II: 1-2 Reyes* (Madrid: CSIC Press, 1992); the text for MT (Masoretic Text) comes from Karl Elliger and Adrian Schenker, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Editio Quinta Emendata* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997); the text for the MG (marginal glosses) comes from Morano Rodríguez, *1-2 Samuel*, and Moreno Hernández, *1-2 Reyes*; the text for Lucifer of Cagliari comes from Kauhanen, *Lucifer of Cagliari*.

18. This order is attested in the uncials A and N, in the manuscripts a (707), b (19), c (376), h (55), i (56), j (243), l (370), n (75), q (120), t (134), v (245), x (247), z (554), b₂ (29), c₂ (127), e₂ (93), and in the Armenian text. All letter references to manuscripts come from Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, *Codex Vaticanus*. All number references come from the Göttingen edition, which is in preparation by Anneli Aejmelaeus and

the three OL manuscripts, it is likely that the OG had the same order as the MT and that the reading in LXX^B is the result of a mistake.

This verse also shows how Quedlinburg is different from the other OL witnesses. Comparisons with the quotations of the OL by Lucifer of Cagliari and with the marginal glosses show that Quedlinburg has several minuses: there is no reference to Israel, present in Lucifer, and no translation for ἰδοὺ (“see”) or αὐτοῦ (“his”), present in the marginal glosses. These minuses likely have different reasons. The lack of a reference to “Israel” probably stems from a copying mistake in the transmission history of Quedlinburg. The lack of equivalent for ἰδοὺ (“see”) or αὐτοῦ (“his”) could also be explained in this way, although it is more likely that “suum” in the marginal glosses stems from a Lucianic influence and that Quedlinburg has preserved the original OL translation. This could also be the case for ἰδοὺ (“see”); however, as Quedlinburg lacks an equivalent for ἰδοὺ in two more cases (1 Kgs 5:19, 20), it could be an intentional omission at some point in the transmission history of Quedlinburg. Quedlinburg does agree with the marginal glosses in the plus “Samuel” at the end of the verse, against all Greek LXX witnesses, which is likely a choice by the translator of the OL. What this verse shows especially well is how difficult it is to place Quedlinburg in the different manuscript traditions of both the Septuagint and the Old Latin.

This difficulty can be observed throughout Quedlinburg, as it is not always easy to explain the variants. Quedlinburg is clearly an unaligned document that is difficult to relate with any of the different Septuagint versions. As shown in the example above, it deviates more frequently from its Latin or Greek source text than the other OL witnesses. Differences between the Greek and the Latin are typically explained due to elements caused by the OL translator, who might have either omitted or added a minor element or slightly tweaked the text to create a coherent Latin text, or because of mistakes in the transmission process of the manuscript. The plus of “Samuel,” attested in both Quedlinburg and the marginal glosses, is a good example of slight modification in the OL.

However, in the case of Quedlinburg, there seems to be more differences with the Greek text than what is typically observed. Unfortunately,

Tuukka Kauhanen (for Samuel) and Julio Trebolle Barrera and Pablo Torijano Morales (for Kings). Many thanks to Pablo Torijano Morales for allowing me to use his notes on the equivalents between the system used by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray and the system used by the Göttingen edition.

the amount of overlap between the Quedlinburg and other OL witnesses is not extensive, making it difficult to judge the extent of uniqueness of Quedlinburg. Below are some examples of two basic tendencies found in Quedlinburg: independent omissions or additions of textual segments.

Independent additions of textual segments (titles, verbs, etc.)

- 1 Sam 9:1 et nomen ei **erat** Cis [Q]
καὶ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ [-] Κεῖς [LXX^{B+L}]
- 1 Kgs 5:25 et Solomon dedit **regi** Chirae [Q]
καὶ Σαλωμών ἔδωκεν [-] τοῦ Χειράμ [LXX^{B+L}]

Independent omissions of textual segments (internal logic not always clear, maybe deemed unnecessary?)

- 1 Sam 15:15 et boum [-] immolentur [Q]
et boum **ut** immolentur [the citations of Lucifer of Cagliari]
καὶ τῶν βοῶν, ὅπως τυθηῖ [LXX^{B+L}]
- 1 Kgs 6:1 profectionis [-] Istrahel [Q]
τῆς ἐξόδου **υἱῶν** Ἰσραήλ [LXX^{B+L}]

It is difficult to determine the reason for these variants in Quedlinburg and how they relate to the OG. There are some very minor indications of possible Hexaplaric influence on names, as in almost every case Quedlinburg has the name that is also found in the MT. The most obvious example for this is 1 Kgs 6:1c. Quedlinburg has “Xiiu,” for MT’s זיו (“Ziou”), against LXX^{B+L} Νεισῶ (“Nisan”).¹⁹ The Quedlinburg reading is shared only by the Hexapla and the Lucianic manuscript o (82).²⁰

19. In his notes on the transcription, Degering explains Xiiu as an aural mistake. The manuscript was read out loud for the copyist, who understood Ziou as Xiiu (Degering and Boeckler, *Die Quedlinburger Italafragmente*, 63).

20. According to the critical apparatus of Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, *Vaticanus*, there is little variation in this name—with almost all manuscripts representing a version of Νεισῶ. Origen and manuscript o (82) are the exceptions, with Origen: Ζιου and manuscript o (82): ζιου. It is, of course, possible that Quedlinburg, together with manuscript o, has preserved the OG and that all other manuscripts are a later development. Especially in the case of names, this is not completely unheard of. However, given the presence in the Hexapla and the general tendency in Quedlinburg for having the same names as the MT, it makes it more likely that the names in Quedlinburg were at some point corrected, possibly on the basis of a Hexaplaric manuscript or a manuscript influenced by the Hexapla.

Other than this slight Hexaplaric influence on names, Quedlinburg does not show any other signs of Hexaplaric, kaige, or Lucianic influences. A good example for this is 1 Kgs 6:5, where Quedlinburg agrees with LXX^B against the marginal glosses, which agree with the Lucianic text in the variant translation of a verb.²¹ In this case, the different verb in the marginal glosses and the Lucianic text likely represents a Lucianic variant, whereas Quedlinburg, together with Vaticanus, represents the OG.

This makes Quedlinburg a very interesting document for textual criticism, as it likely preserves an early version of the OL that has seen little later external influence on the text—meaning that many readings could be from the OG. Quedlinburg has concurrently some issues throughout its transmission history, especially when compared with the other OL witnesses. The example of 1 Sam 15:12 above shows this well. While it could be said that the differences between Quedlinburg and the other OL texts are minor, they do create some confusion, especially if Quedlinburg is the only witness for a certain plus or minus. Is it because Quedlinburg reflects the OG, or is it because of an anomaly in Quedlinburg’s transmission process? Because Quedlinburg is so fragmentary, it is difficult to find any consistency throughout the document, and variant readings could be variably explained. Nonetheless, there are some clear examples where Quedlinburg supports OG readings against both kaige and Hexaplaric readings.

Quedlinburg Supporting Old Greek Readings

A good example of how the OL in general and Quedlinburg in particular represents the OG comes from the first verb of 1 Sam 15:11. Quedlinburg (and other OL texts, such as the quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari) has “paenitet” (“he repented”). This is much closer to the Lucianic *Μεταμεμέλημαί* (“he repented”) than to the Vaticanus *Παρακέλημαί* (“he comforted, he consoled”). The MT has *נחמתו* (“he repented”). The term *Παρακέλημαί* (“he comforted, he consoled”) found in Vaticanus has been identified as a possible kaige reading by Anneli Aejmelaeus. The reason for this is that *Μεταμεμέλημαί* (“he repented”) with God as a subject could have been regarded as problematic: God does not repent.²² The support of the OL can provide additional support for the Lucianic reading as being OG.

21. MT: *וַיִּבְנֶה* (“and he built”); LXX^B: *ἔδωκεν* (“he gave”); Quedlinburg: “dedit” (“he gave”); LXX^L: *ἐποίησεν* (“he made”); MG: “fecit” (“he made”).

22. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Kaige Readings in a Non-Kaige Section in 1 Samuel,” in

Quedlinburg can be used not only to strengthen arguments on possible kaige readings but also to identify Hexaplaric influences. A good example is 1 Kgs 5:19: Quedlinburg reads “aedificabo” (“I will build”), a first singular future, which agrees with the reading in Vaticanus *οικοδομησω* (“I will build”), also a first singular future, against the Lucianic text, which reads *οικοδομησαι* (“to build”), an infinitive. The Lucianic text follows the MT, which has לבנות (“to build”) and is therefore likely Hexaplaric. Thus we have a second clear example of Quedlinburg providing us with a good OG reading.

As I mentioned in the introduction, the OL is a useful tool when trying to find the OG. In the two examples shown above, it is clear that Quedlinburg has preserved OG readings. However, they do not impact our understanding of the MT or of the textual history of the Hebrew. Although Quedlinburg likely represents an early form of the OL, it remains a complex manuscript with several small pluses and minuses unique to the manuscript. Using four examples, I will now show that Quedlinburg can nonetheless be very useful in solving text-critical issues.

Interesting Readings from the Quedlinburg Itala

The first example comes from 2 Sam 2:31, which is part of the narrative describing the war between David and Saul’s family after the battle of Gibeon between Abner and Joab. Quedlinburg only preserves the end of this story from verse 29. Quedlinburg is very close to the Lucianic text before verse 31, where Quedlinburg contains some interesting differences:

Quedlinburg	LXX ^B	LXX ^L	MT
et pueri dauid percusserunt de filiis beniaminin.	και οι παιδες Δαυειδ ἐπάταξαν τῶν υἱῶν Βενιαμειν.	και οι παιδες Δαυιδ ἐπάταξαν τῶν υἱῶν Βενιαμιν.	ועבדי דוד הכו [-] מבנימן
[-]	τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἀβεννηρ	ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ Ἀβεννηρ	ובאנשי אבנר
ccclx .	τριακοσίους ἐξήκοντα	τριακοσίους και ἐξήκοντα	שלש-מאות וששים
uiros	ἀνδρας.	ἀνδρας.	איש
ab illo .	παρ’ αὐτοῦ.	[-]	מתו:

The first difference is one between the LXX and the MT, where Quedlinburg agrees with both LXX^B and LXX^L: de filiis Benjamin; compare τῶν υἱῶν Βενιαμειν. The variant in the MT is likely due to a haplography with

מבני בנימן (“of the sons of Benjamin”) becoming מבנימן (“of Benjamin”), especially as בנימן (“Benjamin”) without the מ is attested in 4QSam^a and 2 Sam 2:15 has a similar problem.²³ Here the OG helps us to restore the Old Hebrew that was lost in the MT transmission.

The second element is where Quedlinburg becomes interesting. It does not have the reference to “the men of Abner.” This reference is present in all other versions except in manuscript a₂ (509). While Quedlinburg’s association with a single manuscript might not hold significant weight, the OL sometimes stands as the sole witness for some interesting readings. Manuscript a₂ (509) is close to the Vaticanus text and is known to preserve OG readings in nonkaige sections. Andrés Piquer Otero has argued that peculiar readings from this manuscript should be taken seriously but with caution.²⁴ Is Quedlinburg enough secondary evidence to argue for the OG having this omission?

Considering the intricate nature of Quedlinburg, particularly when considering other instances of omission, the judicious biblical scholar may be inclined to respond negatively. Nevertheless, the prevailing context prompts us to contemplate further. The double reference to the men of Benjamin and the men of Abner in one verse seems strange, especially as this is the only time such a double reference is found in this story. The reference to the men of Abner in this verse could be a later addition to the story that was inserted into the text from a marginal note that attempted to connect a general statement in verse 31 (David’s troops defeat the Benjaminites) to the conclusion of the specific story in verse 30 (Joab’s pursuit of Abner). Thus, given the context and the support from a₂ (509), it is entirely possible that Quedlinburg has preserved the OG, which did not yet have the reference to Abner.

23. The fragment of 2 Sam 2:31 found in 4QSam^a has only מבנימן, but the line above it clearly has enough place for מבני, as the reconstruction made by Cross, Parry, Saley, and Ulrich shows. In 2 Sam 2:15 4QSam^a has לבני בנימן, just like LXX^{B+L} (τῶν παίδων Βενιαμιν). Here the MT has only לבנימן, which is explained by Cross, Parry, Saley and Ulrich as “a case of haplography in M, where the scribe saw and recorded only one בני.” See Frank Moore Cross, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *Qumran Cave 4*, DJD XVII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 105. In his commentary on Samuel, A. Graeme Auld (*I and II Samuel: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011]) argues that the same haplography happened twice in the MT.

24. Andrés Piquer Otero, “The Minuses of the B 509 Manuscript Group in 3–4 Kingdoms,” in Aejmelaeus and Kauhanen, *Legacy of Barthelemy*, 54–68.

The second difference in this verse is how Quedlinburg agrees with Vaticanus in translating *παρ' αὐτοῦ* (“to him”) against the Lucianic text, which lacks a parallel. The Vaticanus/Quedlinburg translation of MT’s *מתו* (“they died”), a verbal form from the root *מות* (“to die”), has no parallel in any LXX translation. In Samuel–Kings *παρ' αὐτοῦ* (“to him”) commonly translates three different Hebrew equivalents: *מעמו* (“to him”; as in 1 Sam 1:17, 27; 20:7); *מאתו* (“to him”; as in 1 Sam 8:10, 2 Kgs 3:11; 5:20); *מאותו* (“to him”; as in 2 Kgs 4:5; 8:8). It is impossible to say which one of these three Vaticanus translates in the present verse, but this is not relevant here. The question here is what the OG was and what the impact of that would be on our understanding of the Hebrew.

At first sight one would argue that the Lucianic text has preserved the OG reading and that this is a (mistaken) Hexaplaric influence in both Vaticanus and Quedlinburg. However, Quedlinburg does not seem to have any Hexaplaric influences outside of the transcription of names. Furthermore, if we look more closely to the Lucianic text, we could argue that it, too, has some form of *παρ' αὐτοῦ* (“to him”): hidden in the change from *τῶν ἀνδρῶν* (“the men”) into *ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ* (“from the people”). The phrase *παρ' αὐτοῦ* (“to him”) refers to *τῶν ἀνδρῶν* (“the men”) but does so in a very Hebraistic style. The Lucianic redactor does not like these Hebraisms, and, by changing the longer formula *τῶν ἀνδρῶν* (“the men”) ... *παρ' αὐτοῦ* (“to him”) into the shorter *ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ* (“from the people”), the Lucianic redactor creates a better Greek text. Therefore, in this case the OG is likely found in both Vaticanus and Quedlinburg—however, without Quedlinburg we would have less reason to further investigate.

What remains is the question how this relates to the MT; that is, how does the aural mistake function? While it is impossible to give a decisive answer, the text preserved in the OG makes more sense. A double reference to the destruction of the Benjaminites, first as *הבו* ([the servants of David] destroyed [of the sons of Benjamin 360 men]) and then as *מתו* ([360 men] died), creates a somewhat strange sentence. Furthermore, it could be argued that the aural mistake happened due to the theme of the sentence already circling around death. Thus it is likely that the MT also originally read “to him” and mistakenly changed this into “they died.” However, it is not impossible that it happened the other way around and that the MT could have the original phrase. After all, it is easier to imagine someone inserting an aural mistake into a text that makes slightly more sense.

The second example is the numbers found in 1 Kgs 5:30. The chapter 1 Kgs 5 talks about the preparations for the temple, and this verse specifi-

cally talks about the number of overseers Solomon is going to appoint. This verse is highly problematic, and most problems go far beyond the scope of this paper. The table below shows a schematic comparison of this verse.

Quedlinburg	LXX ^B	LXX ^L	MT
praeter principes	χωρίς ἀρχόντων	ἐκτὸς τῶν ἀρχόντων	לבד משרי
qui constituerant	τῶν καθεσταμένων	τῶν καθεσταμένων	הנצבים
super opera	ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων	ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων	לשלמה
solomonis	τῶν Σαλωμών,	τοῦ Σολομώντος·	אשר על-המלאכה
tri[a] milia	τρεις χιλιάδες	τριχίλιοι	שלת אלפים
et .dc .	και ἑξακόσιοι	και ἑπτακόσιοι	ושלש מאות
magistr[i]	ἐπιστάται	ἐπιστάται	הרדים
[-]	[-]	τοῦ λαοῦ,	בעם
qui faciebant opera	οἱ ποιῶντες τὰ ἔργα.	τῶν ποιούντων τὰ ἔργα.	העשים במלאכה:

Notably, Quedlinburg agrees with the Vaticanus text instead of the Lucianic text. This is especially interesting when the numbers are concerned. There are many variant readings of the numbers among the different versions: 3,300, 3,500, 3,600, and 3,700. Especially interesting is the 3,500 in the Hexapla and 3,600 in Chronicles.

While these numbers do not have a major impact on the verse,²⁵ it is still worth determining the OG reading. These mistakes likely come from some form of misreading of the numerals in Greek (and possibly Hebrew) manuscripts. This is not uncommon, and Quedlinburg also contains similar mistakes.²⁶ However, given the closeness to the Vaticanus manuscript, it is unlikely that here it is due to a mistake. The Lucianic reading is found only in the Lucianic manuscripts. When the Lucianic reading is isolated and the OL and the Vaticanus text agree with each other, it often means that the Lucianic reading is not the OG. Therefore, the connection between Quedlinburg and Vaticanus likely means that the OG read 3,600 here. The MT, with the double “three” in 3,300, is suspicious and, given the possible

25. For example, “these variants have no value”: Bernhard Stade, *The Books of Kings*, trans. R. E. Brünnow and Paul Haupt (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1904), 83; “the following variants may be noted”: James Alan Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 139; “the numbers are unverifiable to us”: Martin J. Mulder, *1 Kings* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 222.

26. For example, Quedlinburg is the only manuscript that has $\overline{\text{xc}}$ (90,000, the thousand is likely implied) in 5:29, where all major LXX manuscripts have $\gamma\delta\omicron\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ $\chi\iota\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ (80,000) for MT 80,000 (ושמנים אלף). At some point in the transmission process, Quedlinburg must have read 90 instead of 80.

OG reading of 3,600, is likely mistaken. This is further reinforced by the fact that 3,600 is also found in Chronicles. There is a wider discussion to be had, especially with the Hexaplaric reading of 3,500, but that goes beyond the scope of this article.

The third example brings us back to Samuel, to 2 Sam 2:29:

Quedlinburg	LXX ^B (Vaticanus)	LXX ^L (Lucianic)	MT
	καὶ Ἀβεννήρ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς δυσμὰς ὄλην τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην καὶ	καὶ Ἀβεννηρ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς δυσμὰς ὄλην τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην, καὶ	ואבנר ואנשיו הלכו בערבה כל הלילה ההוא [<]
transierunt	διέβαιναν	διέβησαν	ויעברו
Iordane(m)	τὸν Ἰορδάνην	τὸν Ἰορδάνην	את־הירדן
et abierunt	καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν	καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν	וילכו
totam praetenturam	ὄλην τὴν παρατείνουσιν,	ὄλην τὴν παρατείνουσιν,	כל־הבתרון
et uenerunt	καὶ ἔρχονται	καὶ ἔρχονται	ויבאו
in castra	εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.	εἰς παρεμβολὰς	מתחנים:
Madiam	[-]	Μαδιάμ.	[<]

MG (La9–95): “*et abierunt per totam praetenturam, et uenerunt in castra Madian*”

The Lucianic text has an interesting *plus* at the end of the verse: it renders the MT reading מַחֲנִים (the dual of מַחֲנֶה; encampment, but in this context generally considered referring to the place Mahanaim) with the rather strange παρεμβολὰς Μαδιάμ (the encampments of Madiam/Midian). Vaticanus and all major manuscripts only have παρεμβολήν (the encampment). Besides the Lucianic manuscripts, only manuscripts g (158), z (554), and the OL as represented by both Quedlinburg (La¹¹⁶) and the Spanish Marginal Glosses (La^{91–95}) have the long version.²⁷

Adding to the strangeness of this verse is the rare παρεμβολήν (encampment) as a translation for מַחֲנִים (Mahanaim) in LXX^B, especially in Samuel–Kings. Most of the time MT מַחֲנִים as a place name in Samuel–Kings is transliterated with a version of Μαναιῖμ or Μαναιεμ (different Greek renderings of the place name Mahanaim), while the Lucianic text more often has the singular παρεμβολήν (the encampment).²⁸ The only

27. The numbers of the OL manuscripts follow the conventions of the Beuron institute, as the OL is not separated Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray according to the different manuscripts but indicated by a Gothic L.

28. As is the case in, for example, 2 Sam 2:8, 12; 17:24, 27; 19:33. In these examples the Vaticanus text has a version of Μαναιεμ (Manaiim), while the Lucianic text has παρεμβολήν (encampment).

time מַחֲנֵיִם has a longer translation attested in some manuscripts is 2 Sam 2:29. It could be argued that there is a parallel at the beginning of this story, in 2 Sam 2:8.²⁹ There LXX^B has a longer translation: ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς εἰς Μαναιεμ (“from the encampment to Manaim”) for MT מַחֲנֵיִם, while LXX^L simply has ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς (“from the encampment”), which highlights the peculiarity of the long translation in 2 Sam 2:29 in LXX^L.

How to explain this strange phenomenon? The first solution would be that Μαδιάμ is another variant Greek rendering of the Hebrew place name “Mahanaim.” After all, there is no consistency on how this name is rendered throughout the different manuscripts, and Μαδιάμ would presuppose only a metathesis of α and ι, as well as misreading of a ν for a δ, to get to Μαναιῖμ, the “common form.” Especially as Μαναιῖμ is already not a perfect transliteration of MT מַחֲנֵיִם, one could assume several attempts made to transliterate the name, with Μαδιάμ being one of them. The OG, as preserved in the Lucianic text and the OL, would then have had a double translation of מַחֲנֵיִם, either because the OG translator thought this verse merited more clarification or because it was glossed in at an early stage by a copyist. This could very well be similar to what happened in 2 Sam 2:8 in the majority of manuscripts, although it is difficult to see why it is found in LXX^B but not in LXX^L.

However, there are two elements that make this explanation at least somewhat problematic. First, παρεμβολὰς is a plural, not a singular, which is unique in Samuel–Kings as a translation for מַחֲנֵיִם as a place name. Furthermore, Μαδιάμ clearly refers to a different place name: to Midian. While Midian is not mentioned in this context, “the encampment of Midian” is found several times in Judg 7.³⁰ There MT מַחֲנֵיִם מִדְיָן (“the encampment of Midian”) is translated by the LXX with τὴν παρεμβολὴν Μαδιάμ (“the encampment of Midian”), which is quite close to the form found in 2 Sam 2:29 in LXX^L and the OL. Is the OG a translation of a Hebrew text with a reference to Midian, possibly reading מַחֲנֵיִם מִדְיָן? That would explain the strange occurrence.

It is not entirely clear why the text would have included a reference to Midian. The author may have wanted to make a connection to the story in Judg 7, where Gideon defeats the Midianites, to embellish David’s victory

29. Unfortunately, this verse has not been preserved in any of the important OL witnesses of Samuel–Kings.

30. Specifically in Judg 7:8, 13, 15. Many thanks to one of the reviewers of *TC* for pointing out this parallel.

over Abner. At some stage, this reference would have been edited out of the proto-MT text, likely because it was deemed too obscure. While this is definitely possible, a reference to Midian is a strange element in the story of David's victory over Abner and not something the author of Samuel is particularly known for. Furthermore, with the similar doublet found in LXX^B 2 Sam 2:8, it does not seem too far-fetched to presuppose a Greek origin for *παρεμβολὰς Μαδιάμ*, either through a gloss or because the OG translator thought the text needed clarification at this point. Quedlinburg has then preserved this OG reading in its translation, just as the marginal glosses.

The fourth and final interesting example comes from 1 Kgs 6:3. This section of 1 Kgs 6 talks about the dimensions of the temple, which differ between the LXX and the MT.³¹ Again, this subject is much larger than Quedlinburg, but in the previous verses Quedlinburg again tends to agree with the supposed OG readings.

Quedlinburg	LXX ^B	LXX ^A	MT
et aelam	καὶ τὸ αἰλάμ	καὶ τὸ αἰλαμ	והאולם
ante faciem templi	κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ,	κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ	על־פני היכל הבית
[-]	[-]	Κυρίου	[-]
. xx . cubitis	εἴκοσι	εἴκοσι	עשרים
in lo(n)gitudinem	ἐν πῆχει μῆκος	ἐν πῆχει τὸ μῆκος	אמה ארכו
[-]	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ	[<]
erat	[-]	[-]	[-]
in latitudine domus	εἰς τὸ πλάτος τοῦ οἴκου	ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τοῦ οἴκου,	על־פני רחב הבית
antefacies domus,	[>>]	[>>]	[>>]
et dece(m)	[-]	καὶ δέκα	עשר
cubitis latitudo	[-]	ἐν πῆχει τὸ πλάτος	באמה רחבו
eius	[-]	αὐτοῦ	[<]
[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
erat ,	[-]	[-]	[-]
[<<]	κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ οἴκου	κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ οἴκου.	:על־פני הבית

In this verse, the subject is the Ulam or Aelam, likely the porch of the temple. The Vaticanus text is clearly problematic, for half of the verse is missing. Most other manuscripts have the Hexaplaric reading *κατὰ πρόσωπον εἰς τὸ ὑψὸς τοῦ οἴκου δέκα πῆχεις πλάτος αὐτοῦ* (“in front of, according to the height of the house, 10 cubits [was] its width”) in this place. It is clear that Quedlinburg is not translating this but is rather a version of the text similar

31. For a good overview of the key issues in the description of the construction of the temple, including the differences between LXX and MT, see Peter Dubovsky, *The Building of the First Temple: A Study in Redactional, Text-Critical and Historical Perspective* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

to LXX^L, while the LXX^B reading is the result of an accidental omission. It is not exactly clear how LXX^B lost this part of the verse, as a mistake due to homoeoteleuton is not likely. But let us look first at the other details, before coming back to this Vaticanus mistake.

The dimensions of the Aelam are clear: 20 cubits in length and 10 cubits in width. The question lies in its positioning. The phrase על־פני רחב הבית (“before the face of the width of the house”) seems to connect the length of the Aelam to the width of the temple, as the width of the temple is also 20 cubits as in 1 Kgs 6:2. Coincidentally, this is also the only measure shared in all versions. According to the MT, the width of the Aelam is 10 cubits, but it says על־פני הבית (“in front of the house”). At first sight, this creates confusion, especially with the double על־פני (“in front of”). What is connected to the front of the temple: the length or the width?

Although the MT may be somewhat confusing, all major LXX witnesses have an equivalent text, and therefore there has been no reason to question this reading. The only difference is the translation of על־פני (“in front of”) with εἰς (“in”)/ἐπὶ (“on”), but that could be due to the translation technique. Quedlinburg significantly alters our perspective on the matter. Its text is notably less confusing, albeit still far from full clarity. Quedlinburg has the reference to “in front of the temple” straight after the description of the length of the Aelam.

Could Quedlinburg have preserved the OG reading? Or did Quedlinburg change the text to improve it? While the double reference to the positioning might be considered redundant, it does remove all the difficulties of the MT. Furthermore, it could explain two strange elements in the Greek: the nonliteral translation of the second על־פני (“in front of”) and the strange omission in LXX^B.

First, the nonliteral translation. If Quedlinburg has indeed preserved the OG, it would probably go back to *καὶ τὸ αἰλᾶμ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ, εἴκοσι ἐν πῆχει μῆκος [αὐτοῦ] εἰς τὸ πλάτος τοῦ οἴκου κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ οἴκου καὶ δέκα ἐν πῆχει τὸ πλάτος αὐτοῦ* (“and the Aelam in front of the temple, [was] 20 cubits in its length, in the width of the house in front of the house, and 10 cubits [was] its width”). The second and third instance of על־פני (“in front of”) would then follow each other in quick succession, which would explain the different choice in translation. The translator might have wanted to make a difference between the reference to the width and the reference to the position.

Second, the missing part in LXX^B. If LXX^B had indeed the Greek retroversion of Quedlinburg as given above, it could explain the omission due

to homoeoteleuton with *καὶ* in the next verse. The eyes of a copyist jumped from *καὶ* to *καὶ* in *καὶ δέκα ἐν πήχει τὸ πλάτος αὐτοῦ*.^{3a} *καὶ* [...], omitting the underlined section and thus giving us the text of LXX^B. The positioning of the phrase in LXX^L should then be explained through a Hexaplaric influence, which moved *κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ οἴκου* after a Hebrew text similar to the MT. While it is difficult to fully trust the text found in Quedlinburg, given these possibilities, it could be that Quedlinburg is the sole witness to the OG reading in this case.

Conclusion

This article has demonstrated the significance and potential utility of the Quedlinburg manuscript in textual criticism. Through the examples given, it becomes apparent that Quedlinburg is an intriguing but occasionally challenging manuscript. It preserves an early form of the OL translation of Samuel–Kings, resembling the proto-Lucianic text. While external influences on the text are minimal, except for potential Hexaplaric influences in personal names, a comparison with other OL witnesses reveals independent textual alterations in Quedlinburg—mostly unintentional, but internal reworking cannot be excluded.

Quedlinburg serves as a valuable witness to the OG text, displaying instances where it supports the OG against possible kaige or Hexaplaric readings. Four examples showcased in this article demonstrate the manuscript's usefulness for textual criticism. Three of these examples present OG readings originating from a distinct Hebrew *Vorlage*, with Quedlinburg's support being pivotal in their identification. To unlock Quedlinburg's full potential, further research on the OL of Samuel–Kings, ideally leading to a critical edition, is essential. The OL only lacks sufficient research to unleash its true value.