The problem of proto-Lucian has plagued text critics of the Septuagint for well over a century, but has recently received renewed attention with the discovery of the documents from the Judaean desert. The names that spring to mind immediately in this connection are those of Dominique Barthélemy and Frank Moore Cross, who in a variety of articles has sought to come to terms with the problem. Emanuel Tov in a recent article has attempted to shed some new light on the problem, and he plays a kind of mediating role between the positions of Barthélemy and Cross. To compile a lengthy list of literature on the proto-Lucanian problem in its full dimensions would not require a great deal of effort but is hardly warranted by the scope and focus of the present note.

That the problem of proto-Lucian in Samuel-Kings (Reigns) is a real and complex one, which has yet to be solved to the satisfaction of interested scholars, is obvious to any one acquainted with the field of textual criticism. The question to be raised, however, is whether extreme caution ought not to be exercised in transferring the problematics of one section of the Greek Old Testament to another book or books. The inherent danger one faces is that of setting up superstructures which have been arrived at deductively but which lack basis in fact. To state the obvious, the existence of a proto-Lucanian text (or variae lectiones) presupposes that a Lucianic text has been isolated. Where the latter has not been identified at all or has not, at least, been isolated with a reasonable degree of certainty, it would appear hazardous in the extreme to

---

1 Cf. principally Les Devanciers d'Aquila, Suppl. VT 10 (1963).
3 Perhaps the best known and most extreme example of this is de Lagarde's Lucanian Genesis. J. W. Wevers has shown that in fact not even a Lucianic group of manuscripts can be isolated in Genesis: Text History of the Greek Genesis (Göttingen, 1974), chapter 10.
speak of pre- or proto-Lucianic witnesses. The second question that needs to be raised before any given document can be labeled Lucianic or proto-Lucianic is whether the "characteristic" readings are not better explained as original readings and are, therefore, unable to tell us anything more than what the Old Greek text (= LXX) read. In what follows the focus will be on the Greek Psalter.

In his survey essay entitled "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible" Bruce M. Metzger supplies what he calls "a list of seven ... pre-Lucianic witnesses to a form of text which, at least in part, resembles the Lucianic recension" in the Old Testament. His list includes the Vetus Latina, the Peshitta, some quotations in the writings of Justin Martyr, biblical citations in Josephus, Old Testament references in the New Testament, a John Rylands papyrus (= Rahlfs 957) of the second century B.C. which comprises a few pieces of Deuteronomy, and an early papyrus containing in fragmentary form Psalm lxxvii 1–18 of the Septuagint Psalter. According to the late Sidney Jellicoe "to the early witnesses to the Lucianic text mentioned by Professor Metzger... there must now be added Papyrus Fouad inv. 266 [= Rahlfs 942] of the first century B.C. . . ." The Fouad papyrus contains portions of both Genesis and Deuteronomy. It is well to remember that for the former Wevers has been unable to isolate a Lucianic text group. As for Deuteronomy—Professor Wevers informs me that the Fouad papyrus is certainly not pre- (i.e. proto-) Lucianic (whatever group of manuscripts is given the siglum Λ), since the readings that would have to form the basis of such an argument are part of the original LXX. Consequently, even if (or when) Lucian's recension is identified for Deuteronomy, there is so far no evidence for proto-Lucian in that book.

Concerning the Psalter fragment which has been designated as proto-Lucianic, Metzger has stated,

A papyrus fragment (Rahlfs' no. 2054) dating from the third (or possibly the second) Christian century, contains the Greek of Psalm 77:1–18 in a form which exhibits several significant agreements with the Lucianic text, some of which are against all other witnesses cited by Rahlfs in his edition of Psalmi cum Odis. In other words, fully half

---


a century before Lucian made his recension in Syria, a Greek text circulated in Egypt which anticipated certain of Lucian's characteristic readings (p. 33).

Credit is due to Metzger for using the language of caution; less cautiously Jellicoe speaks of "witnesses to the Lucianic text" (p. xxxvii), leaving the distinct impression that in the enumerated witnesses we are in actual fact dealing with Lucian or proto-Lucian. An enumerative survey of witnesses which perhaps (or in some cases apparently) contain some proto-Lucianic readings is in the process of becoming a checklist of witnesses to a proto-Lucianic text. Emanuel Toy similarly compiles a list of proto-Lucianic witnesses, among which he cites "two so-called 'proto-Lucianic' papyri, namely the Manchester Pap. Ryl. Greek 458 of Deut. and Pap. 2054 of Psalms" (p. 104).

To reiterate what was stated earlier, the identification of Proto-Lucianic readings presupposes the identification of Lucian. In the case of the Psalter, it is well known that, according to Jerome, the ΚΟΙΝΗ text was widely associated with the name of Lucian (cf. Metzger, p. 5). Whether in fact the numerically vast textual family which Rahlfs designated with the siglum $L$ has any connection with Lucian the martyr of Antioch is not at all clear. It is readily apparent upon even limited investigation that $L$ of the Psalter does not manifest the distinctive characteristics of Lucian in Samuel–Kings. It would, therefore, perhaps be advisable to speak of the Byzantine text of the Psalter in place of Rahlfs's $L$ until the question has been more fully investigated. But even if one assumes that $L$ constitutes basically the Lucianic recension of Psalms, does it follow that any papyrus which shares a certain number of readings with $L$ and at the same time antedates Lucian of Antioch ought to be labeled proto-Lucianic?

Psalter papyrus 2054 was first published, without facsimile, by Medea Norsa in Bulletin de la Société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie 22 (1926), pp. 162–4, and was assigned to the second century A.D. by its editor. The excerpt from Psalms was written on the verso of a roll which on the recto contains a register of bank διαγραφῆι.

---


7 The papyrus (recto as well as verso) was reprinted as PSI VIII, 921. On the date of 2054: "La scrittura sembra piuttosto della fine del secolo II che non de secolo III" (p. 90).
for the year A.D. 143–4. If one allows the usual maximum of fifty years for re-use of the papyrus the Psalm must have been written around A.D. 200. Rahlfs, however, preferred to date 2054 to the third century, a date also proposed by the editors of Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts on palaeographical grounds. Now, whether one adopts the one date or the other, 2054 must be pre–Lucianic in date; whether it is proto–Lucianic textually must now be investigated. We begin with a list of deviations from Rahlfs’s text in Psalmi cum Odis (meaningless orthographical variants are not included):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>1. Ps. lxxvii 5 τοῦ</th>
<th>om. B 2054 2110^o 2149^o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. αὐτά] αυτον B’Sa He* 2054 2096(vid)^11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 6 αὐτά] om. S La^G Aug Ga 2054 2149 = MT^12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 7 αὐτῶν 2054^z εαυτῶν 2054^C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. ἐκζητήσουσιν L’2054 2110 2149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. 8 τὴν (καρδίαν) om. 2054 (not noted by Rahlfs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. αὐτῆς^1*] (ThtP 2054 2149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. αὐτῆς^2] εαυτῆς 2054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. 10 τὴν] om. 2054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. ἡθελον] η/εβουληθσαν L’55 2054 2110 2149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. 12 ἐναντίον] ενυπτον 2054 (=πειον) 2110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. σιγύπτω 2054^z αιγυπτου R T 2054^c 2110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. 13 ἔστησεν] παρεστησεν L’2054 2110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. ὡςει] ως eις S R 2054 2149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. 17 τοῦ] om. 2054(vid) 2110. Norsa (= PSI) has</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


12 The absence of the explicit object constitutes the Old Greek text (contra Rahlfs), αὐτά was introduced into verse 7 under the influence (at least in part) of verse 5.

13 The absence of the explicit object constitutes the Old Greek text (contra Rahlfs), αὐτά was introduced into verse 7 under the influence (at least in part) of verse 5.
ετιτου, Kenyon (et al.) reads eti. Though the lettering is not as clear as one might wish, etitou is unequivocally ruled out because of space.

Two minor matters of reconstruction need to be dealt with before we can take a close look at the substantive textual variants. In verse 6 both editions of 2054 give περη[ ] (και). Rahlfs's text, which is supported by all textual witnesses known to him, has περησόμενοι. The v in 2054 in place of θ poses no serious problem since the papyrus was rather carelessly written. What does pose a problem is the size of the lacuna. To fill the lacuna (within the line) with [σομενοι] would be unacceptable because of length, and for that reason (presumably) it was left blank by the editors. Two items are of interest for the reconstruction of 2054: 1) in place of περησόμενοι 2110 reads περησόνται; 2) the κ of the following και was corrected from α (not δ as Norsa thought). The reading of 2110 –σονται) is admittedly shorter than –σομενοι by only one letter, but this is sufficient to make it acceptable for the size of the lacuna in 2054. Furthermore, α under κ(αϊ) suggests that the scribe arrested his own mistake caused by parablepsis: περησόνται και ἀναστήσονται.

Secondly, column 2 line 1 commences in Norsa (= PSI) υιοι εφραιμ but in Kenyon (et al.) εφρα[ι]μ. We should read υιοι εφραμ. The υιοι (or whatever spelling the scribe, who had trouble with this word, used) is clearly needed at the beginning of the line (the whole column slants to the right), and ε is preferable both for reasons of space and to account for the pattern of ink traces. Though the fact is coincidental and irrelevant from the point of view of textual affiliation 2110 also reads εφραιμ.

When we come to examine the supposed relationship between 2054 and L only variants 5, 10 and 13 are of relevance. The reading of ἑαυτῆς in lxxvii 7 where it is supported by LThP 2054 2149 is useless for our purpose since 2054 reads ἑαυτῆς for αὐτῆς in verse 8 as well, and 2054C has ἑαυτῶν for αὐτῶν in verse 7 (cf. Rahlfs, Psalms cum Odis, on lxxvii 8). As for the genuine variants, it should be noted at the outset that one can no longer speak of L and 2054 "against all other witnesses", as Metzger still could on the basis of the information in Rahlfs's Psalms cum Odis. In all three instances we now have additional support from 2110, an early and excellent witness to Rahlfs's Upper Egyptian text. In two out of the three instances we have still further support from 2149, a text which does not fit into any one textual family delineated by Rahlfs.
The reading of ἐκζητήσωσιν (L' 2054 2110 2149) in lxxvii 7 can be understood on purely palaeographical grounds, since ω and ου in some hands are similar (e.g. 2054 col. 1 line 12 where ἐαυτῶν looks remarkably like εαυτουν). What is telling is that the ω/ου variant more often than not cuts across text family lines. Furthermore, in the immediate context it is, of course, easy to see why, with ἰνα plus two subjunctives preceding, ἐκζητήσωσιν would be made to conform. If one asks whether this variant can show textual affiliation the answer must perforce be in the affirmative. About the likelihood of this, I suggest, even the most daring text critic would have serious doubts. In any case L and 2054 no longer stand alone.

ἡ ἐβουλήθησαν for ἠθελον in lxxvii 10 (L' 55 2054 2110 2149) is a variant of considerably more substance than the preceding, and undoubtedly constitutes the most important evidence for the proto–Lucianic argument. The question that must immediately be raised, however, is whether the reading of 2054, which is supported not only by the numerically vast L group but also by the ancient testimony of 2110 and 2149, is perhaps original to the Greek Psalter.

Both (ἐ)θέλειν and βούλεσθαι are well attested in the LXX as a whole and statistically are roughly equal. Such is not the case, however, in the Psalter where (ἐ)θέλειν was used as the standard equivalent for ἡπς and as a result appears with considerable frequency. Out of 24 occurrences of the root ἡπς the Greek translator chose ἐθέλειν (or θέλημα) 20 times to render it. In one passage, I (LXX) li (MT) 8, for presumably contextual reasons ἵνα γὰρ ἀληθεύω ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλον ἡγάπησα renders ἡ ἐθέλησαι τὸ ἄλλο
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The question now is whether to choose ἠθελον or ἐβουλήθησαν
(possibly ηβ-) in lxxvii 10 as the original text. Both have admittedly solid manuscript support. However, (ἐ)θελεῖν is used exclusively for ḫpṣ elsewhere in Psalms. Furthermore, the frequency of (ἐ)θελεῖν in contrast to the infrequency of βούλεσθαι suggests that the more common word has ousted the less common, in a significant number of witnesses. If such be the case ἐβουλήθησαν and not ἦθελον is to be preferred as the original reading. Perhaps of further relevance is the fact that (ἐ)θελεῖν is the overwhelming favourite in the New Testament, adding possibly further to the likelihood of the substitution of (ἐ)θελεῖν for βούλεσθαι.

In the third place we come to παρέστησεν (L' 2054 2110) for ἔστησεν in lxxvii 13. There is no good reason to doubt the originality of the latter. In the context (ἔστησεν ὃδετα ὡσεὶ ἀσκόν) a change to παρέστησεν seems more likely than the reverse. No leverage can be obtained from translation equivalency since ὕστημα (hi.) occurs three times in Psalms (xli 13, lxxiv 17, lxxviii 13) and is translated by three Greek verbs. Similarly, ὕστημα (ni.) is translated differently in all four of its occurrences.

What we have here is an ancient variant attested by 2054 as well as the Upper Egyptian text. It is also found in L. Admittedly, it is not impossible that some textual connection exists at this point, though the variant by no means furnishes us with an ironclad case. Nevertheless, it is this meagre variant that must bear the full weight of any proto-Lucianic argument that involves 2054. And must the same then be argued for 2110?

What I have attempted to show is that 2054 of the Greek Psalter has little if indeed anything at all to do with L. Consequently, it cannot be a proto-Lucianic witness (if L equals Lucian), and one hopes it will no longer be cited as such. Certainly of greater interest than its ill-considered affinity with L are the variants it shares with 2110, though even here they are too few to include 2054 in the Upper Egyptian text group. Like the important Chester Beatty manuscript of Psalms (2149) and many other less extensive texts, 2054 belongs to no text-family so far delineated. It belongs with what Rahlfs called "Mischtexte und nicht sicher einzureihende Texte" (Psalmi cum Odis p. 6), and nothing more. To call 2054 proto-Lucianic robs the term of any possible meaning. If proto-Lucianic witnesses exist for the Psalter, they have yet to be discovered.