Theodoret and the Antiochene Text of the Psalms

Reinhart Ceulemans

Abstract: In the critical edition of the Greek Psalter published by Alfred Rahlfs in 1931, the siglum *L* does not always denote the Antiochene text (i.e., “Lukian”) but rather the vulgar Byzantine text represented by the mass of minuscule manuscripts of the Psalms. This anomaly results from Rahlfs’s inevitably limited consultation of the commentary by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the most important witness of the Antiochene text. The present article shows that the available edition of this commentary (by Johann Schulze, 1769) represents Theodoret’s biblical text even less reliably than Rahlfs surmised and that the differences between the Antiochene and the koine text are by consequence more numerous than Rahlfs’s apparatus gives to show. Only new and critical research of (the manuscript transmission of) Theodoret’s commentary can uncover the “original” Antiochene text and distinguish it from its later, vulgar development.

Both in his 1907 study¹ and 1931 edition² of the Greek Psalter, Alfred Rahlfs showed how the immense popularity this text enjoyed in Late Antiquity and Byzantium (a popularity unrivalled by any other Septuagint book) not only resulted in an unparalleled amount of manuscript copies, commentaries, and catenae but also influenced the transmission of the text in a profound way. As a consequence, the textual history of the Greek Psalms is very different from that of other Septuagint books.

1. Alfred Rahlfs, *Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters: Nebst einem Anhang; Griechische Psalterfragmente aus Oberägypten nach Abschriften von W.E. Crum*, Septuaginta-Studien 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907); repr. *Septuaginta-Studien I–III: Vermehrt um einen unveröffentlichten Aufsatz und eine Bibliographie; Mit einem Nachruf von Walter Bauer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 105–360.

2. Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Psalmi cum Odis*, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931; repr. 1979).

A crucial role in this matter was played by the Antiochene text.³ A particular redaction of the Septuagint Psalter was shaped and used in Syria from the fourth century CE, not least by Christian authors like John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrrhus who operated in the Antioch region. Such was the situation also of several other Septuagint books—in the case of the Psalms, however, the use of the Antiochene text grew out to be far less restricted. Rahlfs's research revealed that it was the Antiochene text that from the sixth century onwards was used as the standard text of the Psalms in Byzantium (in liturgy and elsewhere).⁴ It became the "vulgar text," which pushed aside all other text types: almost all of the very many minuscule manuscripts of the Psalms transmit that koine text. Rahlfs argued that this popular use went hand in hand with a modification of the Antiochene text: the vulgar text of the Psalms is rooted in, but not identical with the Antiochene text.

Of crucial importance to Rahlfs's treatment of this topic is the commentary on the Psalms by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*CPG* 6202): it is precisely through this text that Rahlfs managed to see that the vulgar text developed out of the Antiochene one (of which, in general, Theodoret is a known representative). It was also through Theodoret's commentary that Rahlfs was able to deduce that the Antiochene and the later vulgar text are not identical (see below).

1. THEODORET'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS

In the 440s, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who is known as one of the most prolific authors of the so-called Antiochene "school" of exegesis, commented upon the entirety of the Psalter.⁵ Despite its length (almost seven hundred pages of running Greek text!), this commentary was very popular and copied very often. At least eighty manuscript witnesses are known to exist, which date from the ninth to the seventeenth century and contain the complete text or a substantial

3. Throughout this article, the term "Antiochene text" is preferred over that of "Lucianic recension."

4. Strictly speaking, the line of reasoning was the other way around: following in the footsteps of Friedrich Baethgen ("Der textkritische Werth der alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 8 [1882]: 407–22), Rahlfs first identified a vulgar text type and thereupon was able to perceive a link with the Antiochene one.

5. On the date of confection, see Martin Brok, "Touchant la date du Commentaire sur les Psaumes de Théodoret de Cyr," *RHE* 44 (1949): 552–56, and Brian Croke, "Dating Theodoret's Church History and Commentary on the Psalms," *Byzantion* 54 (1984): 59–74. Readers in need of a basic introduction to Theodoret's Psalter commentary will find useful information in the publications by Jean-Noël Guinot, especially *L'exégèse de Théodoret de Cyr*, ThH 100 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1995) and the articles reprinted in *Le dernier grand exégète de l'école d'Antioche au V^e siècle*, vol. 1 of *Théodoret de Cyr exégète et théologien*, Patrimoines christianisme (Paris: Cerf, 2012).

part of it.⁶ This very extensive direct tradition has never been fully documented let alone studied.

The popularity of Theodoret's commentary is also shown by the very prominent position it occupies in the catena traditions of the Psalms. Research has proven that very extensive sections or shorter fragments have been included in virtually all catenae on this book, sometimes in secondary position, but very often as one of the sources of primary importance.⁷ In other words, the number of catena manuscripts in which substantial parts (at times even the entire text) of the commentary can be found, is well over one hundred.⁸

Finally, a complete Old Slavonic translation of Theodoret's commentary has survived⁹ and pieces of one into Armenian.¹⁰ Both of those versions are old and

6. An overview was published by Alfred Rahlfs but is far from complete: *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, MSU 2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914), 405–6. The remark (405 n. 3) on the decreased popularity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries still appears valid.

7. The standard survey of Theodoret's presence in the catenae on the Psalms is offered by Robert Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," *DBSup* 1 (1928): 1135–37. The most complete (yet not centralized) information can be found dispersed over the four published volumes of Gilles Dorival, *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes: Contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire*, 4 vols., SSL 43–46 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986–1995), and the unpublished fifth one (PhD diss., Paris IV-Sorbonne, 1984). Compare also Ekkehard Mühlénberg, *Untersuchungen zu den Psalmenkatenen*, vol. 3 of *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*, PTS 19 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), passim.

8. It has been argued that, offering an important testimony, the catena tradition needs to be taken into consideration by the critical editor of Theodoret's text: see Dorival, *Chaînes exégétiques*, 5:2431. This claim might be true, but the direct tradition needs to be examined in full first: for the establishment of a critical edition, that tradition should have priority. The same remark is valid with regard to the testimony of the translations mentioned in the following notes.

9. Jacques Lépassier, *Étude linguistique et philologique*, vol. 1 of *Les Commentaires des Psaumes de Théodoret (version slave)*, Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves 7.1 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale—Institut d'Études slaves, 1968). Further references are offered by Margaret Dimitrova, "The Old Testament Commentaries in Medieval South Slavonic Manuscripts: Metatext, Context, and Translation," in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*, ed. Sydney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše, OLA 232 (Leuven: Peeters—Département Oosterse Studies, 2014), 405–22. To my knowledge, this translation has not been published.

10. This translation, too, is unpublished. See the research by Bernard Outtier: "La version arménienne du commentaire des psaumes de Théodoret: Premier bilan," *Revue des études arméniennes* 12 (1977): 169–80; "La version arménienne du commentaire des psaumes de Théodoret. Nouveaux témoins de la tradition directe," *Revue des études arméniennes* 17 (1983): 241–48; "Une page des relations byzantino-arméniennes: La réception des œuvres de Théodoret de Cyr en Arménie," in *L'Arménie et Byzance: Histoire et culture*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 12 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), 181–86. A part of the Armenian version itself was translated into Georgian (edited in

have been characterized as textual witnesses of significant importance. A Latin translation was also made, but as late as the second half of the sixteenth century.¹¹

The textual history of Theodoret's commentary has not been studied in detail. One knows that the text changed drastically in the course of its transmission and that a longer and shorter recension exist, but that is as far as our knowledge goes.¹²

The commentary was edited twice but never in a critical fashion. Jacques Sirmond (1642) published the text as he appears to have taken it from a single manuscript, which he did not identify.¹³ Side by side with the Greek text he printed Antonio Carafa's Latin translation (see n. 11). There are many differences between the Greek and Latin text, which certainly result from the fact that Sirmond relied on a manuscript other than the one translated by Carafa. In addition, the Greek text has been characterized as not offering the full commentary.¹⁴

In 1769, Johann Ludwig Schulze reprinted the edition by Sirmond (i.e., both Sirmond's Greek text and Carafa's translation) and also consulted some other sources.¹⁵ He claims to have collated the entire commentary with three manu-

1979: see the reference in "Une page des relations," 182 n. 3), which just like the Armenian text was transmitted under the name of Epiphanius of Salamis (CPG 3784).

11. *Beati Theodoretī Episcopi Cyri Interpretatio in omnes Davidis Psalmos: Cathena explanationum veterum sanctorum patrum in omnia tum Veteris, tum Novi Testamenti cantica*, trans. Antonio Carafa (Padua: Apud M.A. Gallassium Brixiensem, 1565). Carafa did not identify the Greek manuscript that he translated, but it was the *Vaticanus gr.* 1232: see Pierre Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul III à Paul V d'après des documents nouveaux*, Petite bibliothèque d'art et d'archéologie (Paris: Leroux, 1890), 70.

12. Even this information is very vague. See, for example, Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les travaux des Pères grecs et latins sur le Psautier: Recherches et bilan*, vol. 1 of *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, OrChrAn 219 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982), 134–36.

13. *Beati Theodoretī episcopi Cyri opera omnia in quatuor tomos distributa: Quorum plurima Graece, quaedam etiam Latine nunc primum prodeunt; Graeca cum manuscriptis exemplaribus diligenter collata, Latinae versiones ad Graecorum normam exactae et recognitae; Tomi I pars altera in qua sunt Interpretatio in Psalmos et Interpretatio in Canticum Canticorum*, ed. Jacobus Sirmond (Paris: Sumptibus S. Cramoisy & G. Cramoisy, 1642), 393–981. It is possible but not certain that the source manuscript was one that was kept in Paris at the time.

14. In codices of the direct tradition both E. Große-Brauckmann and M.-J. Rondeau found passages that are absent from Sirmond's edition. See Emil Große-Brauckmann, "Der Psaltertext bei Theodoret," in *Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1911): 339; repr. MSU 1.3 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1915), 74 (see the description of "Cod. 4"); and Rondeau, *Travaux des Pères grecs et latins sur le Psautier*, 135 (Sirmond testifies to the "recension courte").

15. *B. Theodoretī episcopi Cyri opera omnia ex recensione Iacobi Sirmondi denuo edidit, Graeca e codicibus locupletavit, antiquiores editiones adhibuit, versionem*

scripts that at the time were kept in Augsburg.¹⁶ For particular sections, he consulted additional witnesses in the form of two Florentine codices and the edition of some fragments by Jean Garnier.¹⁷ For most of the commentary, he only recorded in the apparatus the variants of these documents,¹⁸ but here and there he used their evidence (that of the Augsburg codices in particular) to change the text of Sirmond. Those changes to the text (corrections as well as additions: they are identified in the apparatus)¹⁹ served Schulze's main goal of presenting a Greek version that is more in line with the Latin translation than was Sirmond's text. It is with the same purpose that he also modified Carafa's Latin translation he printed side by side with the Greek text—modifications that are pointed out in no way whatsoever.

The latter observation is ominous in terms of the reliability of Schulze's undertaking. Indeed, his collations have been characterized as being imperfect,²⁰ and his choice of sources is not very fortunate either. The edition by Garnier, for example, contains excerpts attributed to Theodoret in a manuscript of the catena of Nicetas (*CPG* C 21): not only is this a young catena, but the particular manuscript used by Garnier has been exposed as a witness of inferior quality,²¹ and as a consequence the additions that Schulze made on the basis of Garnier's

Latinam recognovit, et variantes lectiones adieci; Tomus I, ed. Ioannes L. Schulze (Halle: Typis et impensis Bibliopolii Orphanotrophei, 1769), 601–1586. This edition is reprinted in PG 80:857–1998. Schulze presented his sources and methods (both in general and with respect to the Psalter commentary in particular) on pp. xiv–xix [= PG 80:23–27]. It is this information the reader finds summarized here.

16. Now all of them are in Munich. For their identification, I rely on Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 337 [= 72].

17. The edition is *Beati Theodoreti episcopi Cyri operum tomus V. nunc primum in lucem editus*, ed. Joannes Garnerius (Paris: Sumptibus viduae E. Martini et J. Boudot, 1684), 7–20 [*sic*: not 7–27, as written by Devreesse, "Chânes exégétiques grecques," 1136. Devreesse was also wrong in stating that these pages are reprinted in PG 84:19–32: those columns in fact reprint pp. 1–6 of Garnier's edition].

18. In addition, Schulze's apparatus contains comments on the Septuagint text and on readings from $\text{oi } \gamma'$ cited by Theodoret (those comments include occasional collations with some manuscripts and editions of the Septuagint and the Hexapla) as well as information taken from the editions of patristic fragments and catenae. See the presentation on pp. xviii–xx of Schulze's edition [= PG 80:27–28].

19. The additions are also marked with quotation marks in the main text (changed into square brackets in the PG reprint).

20. Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 337 [= 72].

21. The manuscript is not *Vaticanus* gr. 247, as indicated by Schulze (xviii = PG 80:26) but *Vaticanus*, *Palatinus* gr. 247. A negative judgment is passed on the quality of this codex not only for the fragments from Theodoret's commentary (Dorival, *Chânes exégétiques*, 3:511–12), but also for its other contents (e.g., Giovanni M. Vian, "I codici vaticani del «Commento ai Salmi» di Atanasio," *Vetera Christianorum* 13 [1976]: 128).

edition have been labeled as being inauthentic and *delenda*.²² A similar problem, typical of editions that isolate fragments from catena compilations, also haunts Schulze's reliance upon both Florentine codices and one of the Augsburg manuscripts: all three of them are catenae,²³ and it has been argued that some of the materials that Schulze added on their authority are in fact not Theodoret's.²⁴ Aside from these issues of authenticity, those catena manuscripts also suffer from the basic problem of not representing the direct tradition, which is the one that deserves preference, especially when it is as rich as that of Theodoret's commentary.²⁵ Both other Augsburg manuscripts do represent that direct tradition, but one of them is incomplete (breaking off at the exegesis of Ps 94:8) and does certainly not belong to the oldest strand of transmission.²⁶ The other is older and almost complete (although the very first section of Theodoret's preface and the exegesis of Pss 74 to 78:1 are missing) but poses problems of its own.²⁷

22. Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 340 [= 75] and Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 243.

23. The *Florentinus*, *Laurentianus Plut.* VI 3, the first Laurentian manuscript mentioned by Schulze, is a catena that relies on earlier compilations: see the references in CPG C 29 and Dorival, *Chânes exégétiques*, 4:419–62. The second manuscript from Florence, the *Laurentianus Plut.* V 14, was not attached to any catena type by G. Karo and I. Lietzmann, "Catenarum graecarum catalogus," *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1902), 65, but has now been identified as a witness of the abovementioned catena of Nicetas (Dorival, *Chânes exégétiques*, 3:499–500). The *Monacensis gr.* 359 (Schulze's "cod. 3") covers in its capacity as a witness of catena type VI (Karo and Lietzmann, "Catenarum graecarum catalogus," 30) only the first fifty Psalms—in the Munich manuscript even that section is not complete: see Marcel Richard, "Les premières chaînes sur le Psautier," *Bulletin d'information de l'IRHT* 5 (1956): 87–98 and "Les manuscrits de la chaîne du type VI sur les psaumes," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1973): 25–26; repr. *Opera minora* (Turnhout: Brepols; Leuven: University Press, 1977), nos. 70–71.

24. See Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 339 [= 74] (on the *Monac. gr.* 359).

25. Compare n. 8 above.

26. This manuscript, the *Monacensis gr.* 527 (Schulze's "cod. 2"), is dated to the fifteenth century.

27. The *Monacensis gr.* 478 (Schulze's "cod. 1"), which scholars date to the twelfth century, contains for the sections on Pss 73:18 to 74 and 79 to 88:8 many additions in the margins that are not Theodoret's: together they form a catena that appears related to types mentioned in CPG C 30 and C 27, although the precise nature of that relation is disputed (compare Mühlenberg, *Psalmekommentare*, 11–12 and Dorival, *Chânes exégétiques*, 3:92–96). Apart from that marginal catena, Große-Brauckmann pointed out the presence (in the main text of Theodoret's commentary) of many additions to the exegesis of Pss 51–100. Although spurious, many of them were included into the text by Schulze: see Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 338–39 [= 73–74] (and earlier Rahlfs, *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 175 [= 279] n. 2).

In sum, the quality of Schulze's edition is crippled by a poor choice of sources, poor collations, and poor text-critical criteria. Adding to these problems is the unknown identity of the manuscript used by Sirmond (the source that lies at the basis of this editorial tradition). One can only conclude that the most recent edition of Theodoret's commentary on the Psalms is untrustworthy and fails to offer a reliable picture of this text.²⁸

2. THEODORET IN RESEARCH ON THE ANTIOCHENE TEXT OF THE PSALMS

Such a conclusion poses problems to the scholar who aims to recover the Antiochene text of the Psalms, for in this process Theodoret's commentary plays a vital role. It was this text that made Rahlfs observe the link between the vulgar text of the Psalms, offered by the majority of Septuagint minuscule manuscripts, and the Antiochene text: he noticed that a great many of the readings he characterized as being typical of the vulgar text and which distinguish it from other text types could also be found in the commentary of Theodoret, who in general is known to have used the Antiochene text of the Septuagint.²⁹ At the same time, however, he saw that several readings offered by Theodoret differ from the vulgar text. Unsure how to interpret these differences, Rahlfs wondered whether they did not just result from the poor quality of Schulze's edition, which in 1907 was Rahlfs's only access to Theodoret's commentary.³⁰

That is why, at Rahlfs's request,³¹ Emil Große-Brauckmann carried out additional research on the Psalter text used by Theodoret in his commentary and why he not only compared it with the koine text and other text types but also consulted additional manuscripts of Theodoret's commentary, in order to fathom the reliability of Schulze's edition.³² Next to collating anew the three *Monacenses* that had been used by Schulze (cf. nn. 23 and 26–27), Große-Brauckmann collated two manuscripts of the commentary's direct tradition that are older than any of Schulze's codices. One of them contains almost the

28. See Devreesse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," 1136 (on Schulze's text): "Cette édition du commentaire de Théodoret n'inspire donc qu'une confiance limitée."

29. *Psalmi cum Odis*, 63: "Die lukianische Rezension finden wir ferner in Theodorets Kommentar zum Psalter, und gerade mit Hilfe dieses Werkes habe ich in S.-St. 2 [= Rahlfs's 1907 study, RCJ], S. 177 den Lukiantext des Psalters festgestellt."

30. Throughout his *Text des Septuaginta-Psalters*, 172–76 [= 276–80], Rahlfs mentioned the unreliability of Schulze's edition several times. See, e.g., 175 [= 279]: "... ergibt sich, wie dringend gerade Theodoret einer neuen Bearbeitung bedarf."

31. See Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 63–64: "Auf meine Veranlassung hat E. Große-Brauckmann den Psaltertext bei Tht auf sein Verhältnis zu L unter Heranziehung mehrerer Tht-Hss. untersucht."

32. Große-Brauckmann's article (see the reference in n. 14) appeared 1911, in the interval between Rahlfs's study and edition of the Psalter text.

complete text,³³ while the other one third of it.³⁴ Of yet two other (incomplete) manuscripts, evidence was included sporadically and indirectly.³⁵ Among the many useful observations that Große-Brauckmann offered in his study, there are some that are particularly pertinent to the topic of this article.³⁶

33. The *Berolinensis gr.* 4° 38 (“Cod. 4” in Große-Brauckmann’s terminology), is dated to the eleventh century, but some minor parts (one at the beginning and one at the end of the commentary) were supplemented by a hand from the fourteenth or fifteenth century—those were ignored by Große-Brauckmann. The codex offers a redaction of the commentary that is more extensive than the one edited by Sirmond (compare n. 14), but the lemma text is not always offered in full. The manuscript was destroyed in WWII (see <http://staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/die-staatsbibliothek/abteilungen/handschriften/abendlaendische-handschriften/signatureuebersicht/?action=permalink&request=31017859>).

34. The *Vindobonensis, theol. gr.* 294 (called “Cod. 184” by Große-Brauckmann) transmits the commentary on the first fifty Psalms only and even then incompletely: the beginning and ending of that section were added in the sixteenth century by Andreas Darmarius, not always on the basis of the commentary’s direct tradition. Große-Brauckmann believed the original layer to have been copied in the ninth/tenth century (which would make the codex one of the oldest known witnesses of the commentary; so also Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 323), but the more recent and detailed catalogue description dates it to the eleventh century: see Herbert Hunger and Wolfgang Lackner, *Codices theologici 201–337*, vol. 3.3 of *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek Museion*, Veröffentlichungen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Neue Folge, Vierte Reihe: Veröffentlichungen der Handschriftensammlung 1.3.3 (Vienna: Hollinek, 1992), 321–23.

35. Große-Brauckmann did not access these manuscripts directly, but through *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. Tomus tertius*, ed. Robert Holmes and James Parsons (Oxford: Clarendon, 1823). The first of these manuscripts, the *Florentinus, Laurentianus Plut.* XI 5 (“Cod. 288”), was dated by Große-Brauckmann to the twelfth century (so also Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 68), but was exposed by more recent and detailed analysis to have been written by two eleventh-century hands, while some smaller sections were supplemented in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries: see Sofia Kotzabassi, *Βυζαντινά χειρόγραφα από τὰ μοναστήρια τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀσίας* (Athens: Ἑφεσος, 2004), 103. In the preface to their edition of the Psalms, Holmes and Parsons stated that they only collated the section on Pss 1–18 (not 17, as mentioned by Rahlfs), which is why Große-Brauckmann only used its evidence for these first Psalms. The manuscript, however, contains the complete text of Theodoret’s commentary (and is—curiously—indeed mentioned by Holmes and Parsons in the apparatus to Pss 20:13 and 73:2). The second manuscript (“Cod. 210”) was lost already before 1911 (see Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 332) and is described by Holmes and Parsons as a manuscript that was written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century and which contains only the biblical text of the Psalms. On the basis of certain readings, however, Große-Brauckmann (“Psaltertext bei Theodoret,” 337 [= 72] and 340 [= 75]) surmised that this codex contained the commentary of Theodoret.

36. The following paragraphs summarize insights that can be gathered from Große-Brauckmann’s study. Compare the summary given by Rahlfs in *Psalmi cum Odis*, 64.

Confirmation was offered that Schulze's edition fails to offer a reliable text of Theodoret's commentary. The manuscripts collated by Große-Brauckmann differ from the edition remarkably often; and although many of their variants, which appear preferable, also occur in the manuscripts consulted by Schulze, they do not show up in his apparatus. A posteriori, Schulze's edition does not offer a trustworthy picture of the Psalter text used by Theodoret either. Große-Brauckmann found several passages where in Schulze's edition Theodoret's biblical lemma text is identical with the koine text, but where the manuscripts of the commentary give a different lemma—one that has singular readings or agrees with particular text types other than the vulgar text.³⁷ In that way, Große-Brauckmann³⁸ pointed out remarkable and/or frequent parallels between Theodoret's Psalter text and representatives of the so-called occidental text type (manuscripts R, 188 and 27: sixth, seventh and ninth century respectively),³⁹ the upper Egyptian text type (papyrus U from the seventh [?] century), the so-called A group (codex 55: tenth century)⁴⁰ and—most frequently and conspicuously—the *codex Vaticanus* (manuscript B, the main representative of the lower Egyptian type). These text types were characterized in Rahlfs's 1907 study as ancient, as a rule pre-Hexaplaric, and in any case older than the vulgar text; their transmission in Septuagint manuscripts is also much more limited than that of the koine text.

37. Also the opposite observation was made by Große-Brauckmann: in some cases the manuscripts give as Theodoret's biblical text a lemma that is identical with the koine text, while Schulze's edition has a different reading.

38. "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 364–65 [= 99–100]. Nomenclature of Psalter text types that I offer here is taken from Rahlfs's 1907 and 1931 publications. The sigla that are cited are those that can be found in Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis* and the updated redaction by Detlef Fraenkel, *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, Supplementum 1.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004). In addition to those mentioned here, Große-Brauckmann also listed codex 39 as a manuscript with which Theodoret's biblical text often agrees, but this witness was already lost when he carried out his research: he took its readings from Holmes and Parsons's edition. According to the preface of that edition, the manuscript was a parchment one from the ninth century (so also Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 330). In his *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 55 [= 159; siglum "E" instead of "39"], Rahlfs had carefully suggested that this codex regularly differs from the koine text.

39. On the latter manuscript's belonging to this text type, see Rahlfs, *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 54 and 99 [= 158 and 203; with use of the siglum "M" instead of "27"] and *Psalmi cum Odis*, 32. For codex 188, see *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 95–96 [= 199–200; with use of the siglum "H"] and *Psalmi cum Odis*, 32.

40. See Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 70 (adjusting *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 55 [= 159], which did not rely on complete collations). The A group was assembled by Rahlfs not so much on the basis of certain agreements between its members as because of their shared disagreement from the vulgar text.

At many *loci* in Theodoret's commentary, Große-Brauckmann found in the manuscripts a lemma text that agrees with these text types and differs from the koine text and about which he could decide with reasonable certainty⁴¹ that it was the Psalter text used by Theodoret—even when in many of those cases Schulze's edition simply cites the vulgar text. For some passages, the manuscript evidence of the commentary was not unisonous: some codices (notably the *Berolinensis* and the *Vindobonensis*) offer as Theodoret's biblical text a reading that agrees with that of the text types mentioned above, while other manuscripts (the *Monac. gr.* 478 and the *Monac. gr.* 527, in particular) give a lemma that is identical to the vulgar text. It is probable that in such cases, Theodoret's original text had the older, rarer non-vulgar Psalter reading, which in the course of the commentary's transmission was adapted to the ubiquitous koine text.

These findings of Große-Brauckmann not only showed that Schulze's edition of Theodoret's commentary must not be used for critical research on the textual history of the Psalms but also confirmed that Theodoret's Psalter text often differed from the later vulgar text—more often than Rahlfs surmised in 1907. In his study, Große-Brauckmann limited himself to the collection and analysis of these data: modestly, he did not attempt to interpret the evidence explicitly in view of the thorny issue that had Rahlfs command the study, that is, the precise relation between the Antiochene and the vulgar text of the Psalms and the extent to which Theodoret can be used to uncover the “original” Antiochene layer (see n. 45). Although Große-Brauckmann did not draw any explicit conclusions in this regard, his research undoubtedly marks an important contribution to this debate.

His 1911 study laid bare numerous parallels between the Psalter citations in the commentary of Theodoret and those in the exegesis by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*CPG* 3833) and John Chrysostom (*CPG* 4413) as well as the Syro-Hexapla.⁴² In general, Theodore and Chrysostom are known users of the Antiochene text, and in the case of the Psalter also the Syro-Hexapla was influenced by this text.⁴³ This is a strong confirmation that the Psalter text used by Theodoret is the Antiochene one.⁴⁴ Here and there this text is identical with

41. See, by way of example, Große-Brauckmann's term “sichere B-Lesarten” (“Psaltertext bei Theodoret,” 351 [= 86]).

42. Comparison between Theodoret's commentary and those by Theodore and Chrysostom is not always possible, since the latter two (at least in their form preserved at present) do not cover the complete Psalter.

43. Rahlfs took the Syro-Hexapla for a main witness of the Antiochene text, but this view was adjusted by Robert Hiebert, who identified it as a recension of the Syriac Philoxenian text, related in some way to the Greek Antiochene one. See the summary (with references) in Reinhart Ceulemans, “The *ὁμοίως* Notes in the Syro-Hexapla Version of the Song of Songs,” *OCP* 79 (2013): 9–10 n. 16.

44. Noteworthy in this regard is the fact that among the manuscripts that Große-Brauckmann listed as having a Psalter text with which Theodoret's commentary fre-

other, ancient text types of the Psalms, and at other times it goes its own way. In a similar way, it agrees to a large extent with the later vulgar text, but not completely (and less often than Schulze's edition gives to believe).

These insights were integrated by Rahlfs in the preface to his 1931 edition. They confirmed the suspicion he had in 1907, namely, that the koine version is a later development of the Antiochene text and that both are not identical. In those cases where Theodoret's biblical text differs from the large body of Septuagint minuscule manuscripts, it is Theodoret who witnesses to the "original" Antiochene text, while the Septuagint minuscule manuscripts represent a later development that characterizes the vulgar text and that is alien to the "original" Antiochene text.⁴⁵

Convincing as his hypothesis may be, Rahlfs was unable to put it into practice in the actual edition. He did not succeed in seeing through the dominant influence of the koine version and reaching back to the Antiochene text,

quently agreed (see n. 38), is a codex "269," which is the *Vaticanus, Palatinus gr. 44*. This is not a Septuagint manuscript but a witness of the so-called Hesychius Antonelli, a commentary on the Psalms that is attributed to Hesychius of Jerusalem (*CPG* 6552; on the identification of this manuscript as a commentary, see Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, 242—in his 1907 study (21 and 55 [= 125 and 159]) Rahlfs had still treated it as a common Septuagint manuscript). It is possible that just like Theodore and Chrysostom, the Hesychius Antonelli was a user of the Antiochene Psalter text (see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 67–68), but confirmation requires further research.

45. *Psalmi cum Odis*, 66: "Tht weicht, wie in S.-St. 2 [= Rahlfs's 1907 study, *RC*] und Mitt. d. S.-U. 1 [= *Große-Brauckmann's study, RC*] betont ist, manchmal sicher vom gewöhnlichen *L*-Texte ab.... Der ursprüngliche antiochenische Text wird also nicht überall so gelautet haben wie der spätere offizielle Text der griech. Kirche." See already earlier, *Text des Septuaginta-Psalter*, 236 [= 340; stress mine]: "[Die Rezension Lucians] hat im Laufe der Zeit alle übrigen Texte verdrängt und ist, *allerdings wohl nicht ganz unverändert* ..., zum offiziellen Texte der griechischen Kirche geworden." It should be pointed out explicitly that in this article I use the term "original Antiochene text" (compare "der ursprüngliche antiochenische Text" in Rahlfs's citation) only to refer to the text that was used especially in Syria from the fourth to sixth centuries (which popular terminology would call the "Lucianic recension," see n. 3) as it is contrasted with the koine text that is a later development of it. The term does not in any way refer to any supposed elements in the Antiochene (/Lucianic) text that pre-date the fourth century (i.e., the so-called proto-Lucianic problem, or what P. L. Hedley called "the ancient element in the Lucianic text")—that is a topic that receives no treatment whatsoever in this article (neither did it in Rahlfs's publications). Many studies fail to understand what Rahlfs meant with the "original Antioche text" and by consequence misjudge his edition: examples include P. L. Hedley, "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint," *HTR* 26 (1933): 57–72; Albert Pietersma, "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter," *VT* 28 (1978): 66–72; Larry J. Perkins, "The So-Called 'L' Text of Psalms 72–82," *BIOCS* 11 (1978): 44–63.

obscured as it was by the domination of the *Vulgärtext*.⁴⁶ The main reason for Rahlfs's failure is precisely the unreliability of his way of access to the commentary of Theodoret: Große-Brauckmann's work had confirmed Rahlfs's suspicions about the inferior quality of Schulze's edition (compare n. 30 above). Although realizing that the Antiochene and the koine text are not identical, Rahlfs in the end saw no other solution than to identify them in his edition:⁴⁷ the siglum *L* in the apparatus, chosen to refer to "L[ukian]," in fact always denotes the large body of younger Septuagint manuscripts (i.e., the *Vulgärtext*), also in cases where it differs from Theodoret's commentary and from the Antiochene text.

3. THE IMPORTANCE OF FURTHER RESEARCH

This treatment of the Antiochene text in the apparatus is poor and is another element that keeps Rahlfs's edition from giving a reliable representation of the textual history of the Septuagint Psalter.⁴⁸ The ultimate reason for this deficiency is the untrustworthiness of Schulze's edition. Today, this is still the most recent edition of Theodoret's commentary: when one wishes to improve upon Rahlfs's work, new research on Theodoret's text is needed. It should be stressed that the work by Große-Brauckmann is certainly no finishing point: it confirmed that Schulze's edition fails to represent in a correct way the biblical text used by Theodoret but did not replace it with systematic research. The following pages aim to illustrate how further critical research of Theodoret's commentary can bring us to identify the Antiochene text and distinguish it from the koine text in a better way than Rahlfs did in the apparatus of his *Psalmi cum Odis*.

The following two examples show how consultation of further⁴⁹ manuscript witnesses of Theodoret's commentary lends further support to Rahlfs's

46. *Psalmi cum Odis*, 69 (stress mine): "Diese vielen Zeugen lehren, daß auch der Lukiantext im Laufe der Zeit Veränderungen erlitten hat, und daß wir den später üblichen Text nicht ohne weiteres für den ursprünglichen Lukiantext halten dürfen. Doch scheint es mir sehr schwierig, das Ursprüngliche mit genügender Sicherheit festzustellen."

47. For this, Rahlfs was severely criticized, for example by Albert Pietersma ("The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast, MSU 24 [Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 12–32), but also by other scholars. None of them, however, were in turn able to improve upon Rahlfs's work.

48. One might recall that, in opposition to all subsequent Göttingen editions, that of the Psalms does not take as completely as possible the Greek transmission into account up to the sixteenth century (and does not rely on own collations of all witnesses). An all-encompassing view on the textual history could in other words from the outset not be reached.

49. Große-Brauckmann himself directly collated two manuscripts of Theodoret's commentary that were not used by Schulze (see nn. 33–34). For this article, I consulted

decision (taken on the basis of Große-Brauckmann's research) to mistrust Schulze's edition.

(1) As Theodoret's lemma text of Ps 26:6b, Schulze's edition (770 = PG 80:1052C) cites *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ*. This reading is the koine one: it can be found in nearly all minuscule manuscripts of the Psalter.⁵⁰ It was indeed known to Theodoret, but he explicitly cited it as a variant reading that differs from his lemma text: "Ἐνία μέντοι τῶν ἀντιγράφων, *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως ἔχει καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ* (Schulze 771 = PG 80:1052D–53A, italics mine). It would only make sense that Theodoret's lemma text reads differently, and so it does. Both of the manuscripts consulted by Große-Brauckmann cite the reading *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* (without *καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ*) as the lemma text, as does also the *Monac. gr.* 527 consulted earlier by Schulze.⁵¹ On the basis of this information, and because of the fact that this shorter reading is the one that Theodoret commented upon in his exegesis, Rahlfs cited in his apparatus *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* as the reading of Theodoret, against Schulze's edition.⁵² This decision is now confirmed by other manuscripts of Theodoret's text: both the *Venetus, Marcianus gr.* 20 (f. 67) and the *Parisinus gr.* 844 (f. 61^v) give the shorter reading *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* (without *καὶ ἀλαλαγμοῦ*) as Theodoret's biblical text.

(2) As Theodoret's lemma text of Ps 44,13a, Schulze's edition (893 = PG 80:1193D) offers *καὶ προσκυνήσεις αὐτῷ. Καὶ θυγάτηρ Τύρου ἐν δώροις*—a reading that is identical to that of the koine text.⁵³ It indeed seems to be present in all the manuscripts consulted by Schulze. In his exegesis, however, Theodoret appeared to hint that his Psalter text had a plural form, agreeing with the Old Greek *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῷ θυγατέρες Τύρου ἐν δώροις*.⁵⁴ This reading was indeed found by Große-Brauckmann in the manuscript evidence of the commen-

four additional codices: the Venetian and Parisian manuscripts mentioned below and the *Atheniensis*, EBE 1, which is dated to the tenth century by Ioannes and Alkibiades I. Sakkelion, *Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Athens: Ἐθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1892), 1. These four parchment manuscripts offer almost the complete text of Theodoret's commentary in direct tradition and are among the oldest witnesses—none of them was used by Rahlfs or Große-Brauckmann.

50. [Excerpt from Rahlfs's apparatus:] *ἀλαλαγμου* B' R' Ga A' 2021 2030] *αινεσεως και ἀλαλαγμου* L: hanc lectionem nouit etiam Tht.

51. See Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 358 [= 93], on the one hand, and p. 770 nn. 7–8 in Schulze's edition (= PG 80:1052 nn. 74–75), on the other hand.

52. [Excerpt from apparatus:] *ἀλαλαγμου* B' R' Ga A' 2021 2030] *αινεσεως* U' Tht'. See also Rahlfs, *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 172 [= 276].

53. [Excerpt from Rahlfs's apparatus:] *προσκυνήσουσιν* B' 2013' R''(R* -nesin) Ga Tht'HeThCh A'] -νησεις L 1219 | *θυγατερες* B' 2013' R'Aug Tht'HeThCh A'] *θυγατηρ* S Ga L.

54. Compare Rahlfs, *Text des Septuaginta-Psaltern*, 172–73 [= 276–77].

tary that he consulted, but only in one codex.⁵⁵ For Rahlfs, this was sufficient proof to cite in his edition Theodoret as a witness to the text [...] προσκυνήσουσιν [...] θυγατέρες [...], against Schulze's edition.⁵⁶ This decision is fortunate, since the very same reading can be found in three further manuscripts of Theodoret's commentary: the *Marcianus* gr. 20 (f. 117^v), the *Parisinus* gr. 844 (f. 104), and the *Parisinus* gr. 1051 (f. 121^v).⁵⁷

These two examples show how the consultation of further manuscript evidence of Theodoret's commentary confirms the suspicions against Schulze's edition. The manuscripts mentioned here are among the oldest witnesses of the commentary:⁵⁸ the *Marcianus* gr. 20 has been dated to the end of the tenth or beginning of the eleventh century,⁵⁹ and both Parisian codices to the ninth (*Paris. gr. 1051*)⁶⁰ and tenth (*Paris. gr. 844*)⁶¹ centuries respectively. They lend further support to Rahlfs's decision to not always accept the text of Schulze's edition. Both examples also reveal how important this topic is to research on the textual history of the Psalter, since in both cases Schulze's edition makes Theodoret's biblical text agree with the vulgar version, whereas in fact it is very probable that the bishop of Cyrrhus read a biblical text that differs from that koine one. The fact that in both examples the correct reading of Theodoret agrees with the Syro-Hexapla and (in the case of Ps 42:13) also with the commentaries of Theodore and Chrysostom confirms that it offers the original Antiochene version.

In sum: in both examples discussed here, the *L* reading in Rahlfs's apparatus does not offer the Antiochene text, but the different, vulgar text. In these cases Rahlfs was aware of this, but three further examples show that the same phenomenon might be involved in cases where Rahlfs did not suspect it.

(3) In verse 17:20, Rahlfs edited between square brackets two stichs that are lacking in the Hebrew Psalter: ῥύσεται με ἐξ ἐχθρῶν μου δυνατῶν | καὶ ἐκ τῶν μισούντων με. The apparatus shows that these stichs cannot be found in all

55. Große-Brauckmann, "Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 352 [= 87]. The *Berolinensis* also has the reading θυγατέρες, but not προσκυνήσουσιν.

56. See the excerpt from the apparatus in n. 53.

57. In the last manuscript, the form θυγατέρες is in fact combined with the reading προσκυνήσεις.

58. For the dating of these manuscripts, I rely on the information offered in the catalogue descriptions (see the following notes).

59. Elpidio Mioni, *Thesaurus Antiquus: Codices 1–299*, vol. 1 of *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti*, Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali, Indici e Cataloghi n.s. 6 (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, 1981), 34.

60. Henri Omont, *Ancien fonds grec: Théologie*, part 1 of *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Picard, 1886); repr. as the first part of Henri Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements* (Paris: Leroux, 1898), 211.

61. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire*, 158.

Septuagint witnesses: some have both lines, others only the first, and none of the stichs are preserved in *L'*, a siglum that refers to the combination of the large mass of minuscule manuscripts and Theodoret's commentary.⁶² In Schulze's edition (707 = PG 80:980B), indeed no sign of any of both lines can be found, but this is quite problematic: the exegesis shows that Theodoret knew the third stich.⁶³ Indeed, both the *Marc. gr.* 20 (f. 42) and the *Paris. gr.* 844 (f. 29^v) give this stich in Theodoret's lemma text. It is likely, then, that against Rahlfs's apparatus, Theodoret does not agree with *L* (but with the Syro-Hexapla instead).

(4) The apparatus of Rahlfs's edition shows that in Ps 49:10a, the vulgar text and Theodoret together (= *L'*) read ἀγοῦ instead of the much more poorly attested δρυμοῦ.⁶⁴ Schulze's edition (927 = PG 80:1233A) indeed gives ἀγοῦ as Theodoret's lemma text. However, three of the four ancient witnesses that were consulted for this article have the reading δρυμοῦ instead: *Paris. gr.* 1051 (f. 133^v), *Paris. gr.* 844 (f. 115), and *Atheniensis, EBE* 1 (f. 82^v). Confronting this evidence with Rahlfs's apparatus, one sees that this reading can also be found in the Syro-Hexapla and in uncial manuscript T, an ancient witnesses of the Antiochene text.⁶⁵ This invites the assumption that Theodoret read δρυμοῦ, that this is the Antiochene reading and that, against Rahlfs's apparatus, it differs from the koine text.

(5) According to the apparatus of Rahlfs's edition, the large body of minuscule manuscripts as well as Theodoret (= *L'*) added the words ἐν τῇ δόξῃ μου to the end of Ps 56:8.⁶⁶ Schulze's edition (980 = PG 80:1293A) indeed offers this addition in Theodoret's lemma text, but one notices that the Greek author nowhere cited it in his exegesis of the verse. Interestingly, in the *Paris. gr.* 844 (f. 129^v), these words ἐν τῇ δόξῃ μου were added by a later hand: the original text lacks them and thus agrees with the text of other witnesses of the Antiochene text (such as Theodore of Mopsuestia).

62. [Excerpt from Rahlfs's apparatus:] 20³⁻⁴ hab. B' U' R'' A', 20⁴ > S Sy, 20³⁻⁴ > Ga *L'*: cf. S.-St. 2, p. 43. 62/63; uerba uncis inclusi, quia ex 18 repet. uid.

63. Compare the line ῥύσεται με ἐξ ἐχθρῶν μου δυνατῶν with the way in which Theodoret paraphrased the biblical text: Ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον τῆς αὐτῆς ἀξιώσει με βοήθειας, καὶ κρείττων ἔσομαι τῶν δυσμενῶν, καὶ μάλιστα πλείστην ἔχωσι δύναμιν (Schulze 707 = PG 80:980B; italics mine).

64. [Excerpt from Rahlfs's apparatus:] δρυμου B'' 2013' R TSy 1219' ἀγοῦ *L'* A: ex 11².

65. On this role of T (seventh century), see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 63. (The siglum is explained in Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis* and the updated edition by Fraenkel, *Überlieferung*.)

66. [Excerpt from the apparatus:] ἀσομαι καὶ ψαλῶ B' R'' Ga TSyTh 55] + ἐν τῇ δόξῃ μου *L'* (Th^p σου pro μου; cf. Mitt. d. S.-U. 1, p. 88): ex 107².

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

These last three examples show that the differences between the Antiochene text of the Psalms (represented amongst other witnesses in Theodoret's lemma text) and the later koine text could very well be much more numerous than the apparatus of Rahlfs's Psalter edition gives to show. For the three verses in question, Rahlfs followed Schulze's edition without any ado,⁶⁷ but consultation of further manuscripts of Theodoret's text seems to indicate that the edition is incorrect.

With his 1907 study and 1931 edition, Rahlfs designed the theoretical framework for a critical recovery of the "original"⁶⁸ Antiochene text: Theodoret's commentary offers the key to that recovery but is available only in an unreliable edition. That edition cannot be used, since it very often fails to reproduce the biblical text used by Theodoret and instead offers a lemma text that is brought in closer alignment to the koine text, which dominated the manuscript transmission. This process took place more often than Rahlfs surmised: the siglum *L* in his apparatus refers even less often to the original Antiochene text than he knew.

Today, Rahlfs's theoretical framework still needs to be put into effect. This can only be done through new and critical research of Theodoret's commentary. Such research needs to start from the manuscript tradition of that text: collations need to show which manuscripts occupy relevant positions in the stemma,⁶⁹ and the biblical lemma text and citations of those witnesses need to be investigated. Only then can the original Antiochene text be distinguished from the later development that is the *Vulgärtext*.

67. Examples 4–5 were in fact mentioned by Große-Brauckmann ("Psaltertext bei Theodoret," 355 [= 90] and 353 [= 88]).

68. On this term, see n. 45.

69. Obviously, the stemmatic position also needs to be determined for the manuscripts mentioned in the last part of this article—only then can the observations articulated here be meaningful.