Martin Karrer

The New Leaves of Sinaiticus Judges[1]

1. The leaves, the scribe and the most important correctors

In 1975, a wall of the Sinai monastery was renovated. Surprisingly, folios and fragments of the codex Sinaiticus (S) surfaced. The conservation and digitization took more than 30 years. The remains became accessible for the public not before 2009 (online since July 6, 2009). We are indebted to the editors for their intriguing work.[2]

A major part of the new fragments and folios belongs to Judges.[3] Judges 4:7 to 11:2 are well preserved on five leaves. Surely, the centuries have left their traces; there are damages, water spots and bleeding throughs (e.g. folio 3r). Yet, the text can be read unambiguously.

The leaves are written by scribe A.[4] This scribe exhibits a script of elevated quality, yet is unfortunately also known for many slips.[5] Our leaves confirm his reputation: The script is careful and elegant – and shows significant mistakes (examples in table 1).

A typical case are homoioteleuta, e.g. the parablepsis from ἄγγελος κυρίου, "angel of the Lord" in 6:21 to ἄγγελος κυρίου, "angel of the Lord" in 6:22. S* skips more than an entire line between v. 21 and 22. A corrector (S1, working immediately after scribe A) adds these lines again.

Other errors pertain to a confusion of letters. Scribe A writes e.g. σώσομεν "we will save (bread)" instead of δώσομεν, „we will give (bread)" in 8:15. Once more corrector S1 rectifies that.

---

[1] Paper read at the presentation of the new leaves of Sinaiticus Judges in London, July 6, 2009 (British Library) and expanded for the Septuagint conference in Stellenbosch, South Africa, August 2009.

[2] I cite the text according to the excellent digital edition: http://www.codexsinaiticus. org/de/manuscript.aspx?book=6&lid=de&side=r&zoomSlider=0.

[3] Some fragments of Joshua have also been found.

[4] This scribe has written parts of the Septuagint (cf. e.g. Numbers) as well as large sections of the New Testament.

[5] Cf. DIRK JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Texts and Studies, Third Series, 5; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007), 243–245 etc.

Table 1: Corrections in Sinaiticus

	Sinaiticus prima manus	*Correction*	*Judges B Rahlfs (Vaticanus)*	*Judges A Rahlfs*[6] *(a group of manuscripts including Alexandrinus)*[7]
Homoioteleuton Judges 6:21s.	[21]... καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου [22] οὗτος ἐστιν ...	S1 adds (after ἄγγελος κυρίου): ἐπορεύθη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ [(22)] καὶ εἶδεν Γεδεων ὅτι ἄγγελος κυρίου	[21]... καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπορεύθη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ [22] καὶ εἶδεν Γεδεων ὅτι ἄγγελος κυρίου οὗτός ἐστιν ... „[21]... and the angel of the Lord departed from his eyes, [22] and Gideon perceived: That is an angel of the Lord..."	[21]... καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἀπῆθεν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ [22] καὶ εἶδεν Γεδεων ὅτι ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐστίν „[21]... and the angel of the Lord went out of his sight, [22] and Gideon perceived that it was an angel of the Lord..."
scribal error 8:15	σώσομεν ... ἄρτους „we will save ... bread"	S1: δώσομεν „we will give..."	δώσομεν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ... ἄρτους „we will give bread to the men"	δώσομεν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν σου ... ἄρτους „we will give bread to your men"

---

[6] ALFRED RAHLFS (ed.), *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes* I (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935), and ALFRED RAHLFS and ROBERT HANHART (ed.), *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes; duo volumina in uno* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006) I.405–494.

[7] Rahlfs's A-text covers three subgroups, as was recognized in the ongoing research (ILMARI SOISALON-SOININEN, *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* [AASF B 72/1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1951], and others). But a new edition is missing. Therefore our first review of S Judges uses Rahlfs and Hanhart. Orthographic differences between the manuscripts of Rahlfs's A-group are neglected in the table.

A third instance bears on doublings: 5:20 doubles the line παρετάξαντο
οἱ ἀστέρε ἐκ τρίβων αὐτῶν; now ca[8], a younger, but very important correc-
tor, working between the 5th and the 7th century, corrects the text.[9]

The sequence of corrections is characteristic for the Sinaiticus; S1 and
ca prove to be the most important hands in that sequence (cb1/2 and cc will
be mentioned in II).

2. Judges 5:12 and the textual history of Judges

Not every case of correction is beyond doubt. Thus at first glance we read
a homoioarkton in the song of Deborah S 5:12; one line beginning with
ἐξεγείρου / ἐξεγείρον seems to be omitted in S against A (codex Alexandri-
nus and the other witnesses of the A-text; table 2). But the same line is
missing in the Masoretic and the B-text of Judges as well. Therefore it is
more probable that corrector ca of S inserts the line according to another
textual form (a form similar to the A-text).

A second variant, one line later, underlines the tendency: ca adds
ἐνισχύει in S similar to ἐνισχύων of the A-text. The variants (ca imperative
/ A-text participle) may reflect the same unvocalized Hebrew text, most
probably חזק (חזק can be vocalized as imperative and participle).[10] Conse-
quently the variants recommend the use of two different Hebrew versions,
one presenting a longer text (including חזק; the "Vorlage" for the A- and
ca-variants), and one presenting a shorter text (the "Vorlage" for the S*-B-
text).

The textual problems of the song of Deborah are notorious. Hence it is
worthwhile to append three additional observations. Firstly, the texts of
B/S and A/ca are too similar to descend from different translations (the
context and ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου Δεββωρα etc. in our verse are identical).[11]

---

[8] ca (corrector a in the c-group of Sinaiticus-correctors) was identified by HERBERT
JOHN MANSFIELD MILNE and THEODORE C. SKEAT, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex
Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), 46.

[9] Doublets and double translations are found in both textual groups of Sinaiticus
Judges (A-text and B-text): see JOSEPH SCHREINER, *Septuaginta - Massora des Buches
der Richter. Eine textkritische Studie* (AnBib, 7; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1957),
90–104.

[10] Judges 7:11 shows the equivalence of חזק q. and ἰσχύειν, 1:28 the equivalence of
חזק q. and ἐνισχύειν (cf. חזק pi. / ἐνισχύειν in 3:12; 9:24; 16:28).

[11] Cf. PHILIP E. SATTERTHWAITE, "Judges," in *A new English translation of the Sep-
tuagint and the other Greek translations traditionally included under that title*, ed. A.
Pietersma and B. G. Wright (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 195
(http:ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/07-judges-nets.pdf, read 2009/07/09): "The A and B
traditions probably derive from a single archetype, of which they represent different de-
grees of revision."

Secondly, the shorter text is known by the MT which may be revised against a lost older or alternative Hebrew text form. Thirdly, a following corrector of S, cb1 (working somewhat later than ca), completes the alterations of ca: cb1 replaces the following short ἀνάστα Βαραχ (S*, corresponding to MT) with the longer variant ἐξανίστασο Βαρακ κ(αὶ) ἐνίσχυσον Δεββωρα τὸν Βαρακ of the A-text resulting again in an expanded text compared to the MT.

Table 2: The corrections in Judges 5:12

MT	S*	B	Sᶜᵃ	A-Text
עוּרִי	ἐξεγείρου	ἐξεγείρου	add. 1 parallel	ἐξεγείρου
עוּרִי	ἐξεγείρου	ἐξεγείρου	A:	ἐξεγείρου
בוֹרה	Δεββωρα	Δεββωρα		Δεββωρα
			ἐξεγείρον	ἐξεγείρον
			μυριάδας	μυριάδας
			μετὰ λαοῦ	μετὰ λαοῦ
עוּרִי	ἐξεγείρου	ἐξεγείρου		ἐξεγείρου
עוּרִי	ἐξεγείρου	ἐξεγείρου		ἐξεγείρου
בְּרִי־שִׁיר ָ	λάλησον	λάλησον	add. 2:	λάλει
	ᾠδήν	ᾠδήν	μετ ʼ ᾠδῆς	μετ ʼ ᾠδῆς
קוּם	ἀνάστα	ἀνάστα	ἐνισχύει	ἐνισχύων
			(λάλησον ...)	ἐξανίστασο
רק	Βαραχ	Βαρακ		Βαρακ
(NRSV)	Awake,	Awake,	(Awake,	Awake,
Awake,	awake,	awake,	awake,	awake,
awake,	Deborah!	Deborah!	Deborah!)	Deborah!
Deborah!	Awake, awake,	Awake tens of	Awake tens of	Awake tens of
Awake,	speak with a	thousands	thousands	thousands
awake, utter a	song!	along with a	along with a	along with a
song!		people!	people!	people!
		Awake,	(Awake,	Awake, awake,
		awake,	awake!)	
		speak	Strengthen	speak
		with a song!	with a song!	with a song!
			(Speak a	Strengthening,
Arise Barak…	Arise Barach…	Arise Barak…	song…)	get up Barak…

These observations fit best to the following model of textual history: The song of Deborah circulated in a longer form when the "Vorlage" of the A- and ca-text was translated. That longer Hebrew text was shortened in the genesis of the later MT, but the Greek translation was preserved in a strong part of the textual tradition. Small Greek variants developed (reflected in the differences between ca and the A-text). At the same time some revisers of the Greek text were looking for an adaptation to the evolving shorter MT. They created a shorter Greek text (maybe in an uncontrolled, gradual

revision of the old translation). That shorter form got relevance in a part of Christianity and was used by the scriptoriums of S and B. However, the longer form sustained. Moreover, it won the supremacy in late antiquity again. That is why additional adaptations of S to the A-text came out (documented by the correction process of ca and cb1).

The data coincide to the otherwise known textual history of Judges. The Greek text of Judges is handed down to us in two main strands, as is recognized for more than 300 years.[12] One strand is supported by the Codex Alexandrinus, the so called Lucianic recension and other manuscripts; that is the "A-Text" in Ralphs' edition. The differentiation between three subgroups, A I (Alexandrinus-subgroup; with hexaplaric influences), A II (Lucianic family) and A III (manuscripts with a mixed text)[13] is relevant for a detailed study, but may be neglected in our first survey of Sinaiticus Judges. A II, referring to the manuscripts g l n w and the old Latin daughter translation, represents the best text of Judges (whereas the codex Alexandrinus shows some hexaplaric and some kaige-influences).[14] Rahlfs (1935) and Rahlfs-Hanhart (2006)[15] rightly print the A-text on top of the pages of their edition indicating the higher value of this textual form.

The second textual form is represented by Codex Vaticanus (B) and few accompanying younger witnesses. Alone the Vaticanus was known to Rahlfs. It stood isolated in the fourth century; hence the "B-Text" in Rahlfs' edition is Vaticanus (whereas the A-text of Rahlfs is a "Mischtext" of A and Lucianic manuscripts). B attests an early Jewish revision called (following the work of Barthélemy[16]) the "kaige" revision.[17] It is younger

---

[12] Since JOHN E. GRABE, *Biblia graeca. Septuaginta interpretum. Tomus I. Ex antiquissimo MS. Codice Alexandrino accurate descriptum* (Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1707–1709).

[13] See esp. SOISALON-SOININEN, *Textformen* (note 5) and WALTER R. BODINE, *The Greek Text of Judges. Recensional Developments* (HSM 23, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980). The most important translation is the Vetus Latina (sometimes showing alone the archetype; Bodine 135s.). More literature in ROBERT H. O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VT.S 63; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 369–382 and SIEGFRIED KREUZER, "Kritai. Einleitung", in: *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament, Vol. I Genesis bis Makkabäer* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 657–700 (658–61).

[14] KRISTIN DE TROYER laid attention on the hexaplaric influences in her planned (until now unpublished) presentation for the Sinaiticus conference London July 2009.

[15] See note 4.

[16] DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécaprophéton; trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat Palestinien* (VT.S 10, Leiden: Brill 1963).

and wasn't able to replace the A-text;[18] therefore it is printed beneath A in the edition by Rahlfs 1935 and Rahlfs-Hanhart 2006.

This sketch of the textual history highlights S* (the "prima manus", scribe A) as well as the work of the correctors in Judges. S* seems to be a second main witness for the "kaige"-text and its use in Christianity. ca on the other hand could have drawn on an excellent lost codex of the A-text.[19] We will study the overall relations (S-B; ca-A) in the following chapters. The ongoing research must examine the relation between ca and the sub-groups of the A-text and look for the exact place of the other correctors (cb1/2 and cc). The corrector "cb1" seems to have continued the work of "ca", namely the revision in direction to the A-text, as noted (we find A-variants in cb1 very often, cf. παρέδωκε[ν] in 6:1, κατίσχυσεν in 6:2, χορούς in 9:27 etc.). But the question of the old text-forms concentrates on S* and ca. We will focus on these witnesses.

3. Sinaiticus scribe A and the kaige-text

Sinaiticus scribe A (S*) conspicuously agrees with the B-text. As in B, many details manifest the affiliation to the so-called "kaige"-group. That textual form, the most important pre-Christian revision of Judges, tries to render the Hebrew Protomasoretic Text in an exact, sometimes nearly mirroring way.[20]

Two of the best known "kaige"-characteristics are to be found in Judges 9:49 S and B: אִישׁ / לְ-הָעָם is translated as "man" even though it has the distributive sense of „each / every one"; and גַּם (the Hebrew particle „also / too") is rendered as καί γε, "and indeed", regardless of the context. The consequence is the rough and ineloquent Greek text "And they – and indeed a man – cut down a branch everyman," contrary to the fluid idiom of the A-text (see table 3; cf. for καί γε 6:39; 9:19 too).

---

[17] Cf. esp. BODINE, *Greek Text* (note 13) and idem, "Kaige and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 45–57.

[18] The older textual form of the A-text remained the main Christian text in late antiquity; the great number of younger manuscripts belongs to that text.

[19] KLAUS WACHTEL valorized ca also concerning the New Testament text (Sinaiticus conference, London July 2009; the publication is forthcoming).

[20] We cannot deal with all of the kaige-characteristics in S and B Judges here; an overview is given in BODINE, *Greek Text* (note 13), 11–66.

Table 3: Judges 9:49

MT	Sinaiticus scribe A / Vaticanus	Alexandrinus / A-text
וַיִּכְרְת֣וּ גַם־כָּל־הָעָ֗ם אִ֣י ו ה	καὶ ἔκοψαν καί γε ἀνὴρ κλάδον πᾶς ἀνὴρ	καὶ ἔκοψαν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἕκαστος φορτίον [...]
And every one – also all of the troops – cut down a bundle (or branch).	And they – and indeed a man – cut down a branch everyman.	And they, namely every one, cut down a bundle.

The value of the "kaige-gam"-feature is sometimes disputed. A third example is beyond controversy: The revision attempts to discern the two Hebrew forms for "I", the short אֲנִי and the long אָנֹכִי. ἐγώ εἰμι becomes the rendering for אָנֹכִי, „I am", while the short אֲנִי is normally rendered by ἐγώ. The phenomenon produces a syntactic complication if אָנֹכִי is accompanied by a finite verb (table 4) as in Judges 5:3. The Hebrew text reads here in the Song of Deborah "I to the Lord; I, I will sing, I will play the instrument for the Lord, the God of Israel". The Alexandrinus reproduces the meaning of the Hebrew text in a fluid Greek idiom, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus offer the later recension with ἐγώ εἰμι: "[...] I *am*, I will sing … (and so on)".

Table 4: Judges 5:3

Hebrew Text	Vaticanus	Sinaiticus Scribe A	Alexandrinus / A-text
אָנֹכִ֣י	ἐγώ εἰμι	ἐγώ εἰμι	ἐγὼ
לַֽיהוָ֖ה	τῷ κυρίῳ	τῷ κυρίῳ	τῷ κυρίῳ
אָנֹכִ֣י	ἐγώ εἰμι	ἐγώ εἰμι	
אָשִֽׁירָה	ἄσομαι	ἄσομαι	ἄσομαι
אֲזַ ר	ψαλῶ	ψαλῶ	ψαλῶ
לַֽיהוָ֖ה	τῷ κυρίῳ	τῷ κυρίῳ	
אֱלֹהֵ֥י	τῷ θεῷ	τῷ θεῷ	τῷ θεῷ
יִשְׂרָאֵֽל	Ισραηλ	Ισραηλ	Ισραηλ
I to the Lord; I will sing, I will play the instrument	I *am* to the Lord, I *am* I will sing, I will play the instrument	I *am* to the Lord, I *am* I will sing, I will play the instrument	I to the Lord; I will sing, I will play the instrument
for the Lord, the God of Israel.	for the Lord, the God of Israel.	for the Lord, the God of Israel.	for the God of Israel (or: I will sing to the Lord; I will play the instrument for the God of Israel.)

A last instance:[21] The revision transliterates the Hebrew proper names more exactly than the A-text (see the examples in table 5).

Table 5: Names

Hebrew	Alexandrinus (A-text)	Vaticanus and Sinaiticus scribe A
כֶּמה / Shechemah „to Shechem" (ending with „he locale") 9:1	εἰς ικιμα / „eis Sikima", to Sikima (the directional "he" is understood as part of the name)	εἰς υχεμ / Shychem
מיר / Shamir 10:1.2	Σαμαρεια / Samareia (usual Greek)	αμειρ / Sameir
פלשתים / Philistines 10:6.7	ἀλλόφυλοι / foreigners (free Greek rendering)	Φιλιστειμ / Phylistieim (Philistines)
הבעלים / the Baals (masculine plural) 10:6	αἱ Βααλειμ / the Baals feminine	οἱ Βααλειμ / the Baals (masculine plural)

If we follow A, the translator focuses on the Greek target language and culture. He takes the "he locale" in Shechemah as if it was a Greek plural with alpha and consequently declinated ικιμων (genitive 9:57).[22] He ignores the Philistines of the old Judges's time and updated the Hebrew פלשתים as "foreigners". He associates "Baalim" (foreign Gods) in the devaluation "shamefully deities" and writes a Greek feminine against the Hebrew masculine; this is a fine example for the effect of a Hebrew Ketib-Kere in the Greek language – we hear the feminine "aischyne" (shame) or Hellenistic town-Goddesses.[23] Romans 11:4 (the only evidence for Baal in the New Testament) demonstrates that the feminine form was widespread

---

[21] One could add e.g. οὐκ ἔστιν for אין. But the best example, Judges 18:7 (B vs. A) is not preserved in Sinaiticus.

[22] KREUZER, "Richter" (see note 13), 682–3 (Exkurs Sichem) gives an overview concerning the variants of Shechem in Judges and the other parts of LXX.

[23] For the correlation with αἰσχύνη (shame) see KREUZER, "Richter" (see note 13), 664, for the correlation to Hellenistic town-Goddesses ANDREAS VONACH, "'Η Βααλ in der Jer-LXX. Erschließung neuer Horizonte als Übersetzungstechnik," in *Horizonte biblischer Texte. FS J.M. Oesch*, ed. A. Vonach and G. Fischer (OBO, 196; Fribourg/Göttingen: University Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 59–70 (cf. ANDREAS VONACH, "Jeremias", in: *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament, Vol. II Psalmen bis Daniel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2696–2814 (2730.2739). Cf. PIERRE-MAUICE BOGAERT, Baal au féminin dans la Septante, in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (ed. M. Karrer/W. Kraus (WUNT, 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 416–434.

until at least the New Testament times (Paul uses the text of 1 Kgd / LXX
3 Kgd 19:18 with Βάαλ).

Sinaiticus* conversely returns to the source language, to Shychem,
Sam(e)ir, Philistines and the masculine "Baalim" against the actualization.
In this way, the codices not only show a historical development – the freer
translation is older – but primarily different concepts and modes of trans-
lating.

4. Value and provenance of Sinaiticus first hand

As a consequence scribe, A of Sinaiticus doubtlessly represents a text near
to or belonging to the "kaige"-group. Yet, the revision started from an
older text. Therefore S* sometimes might preserve old readings. The dis-
cussion was started by K. de Troyer, D. Parker and others. We list some
examples (cf. table 6).

Table 6: Old readings?

	MT	*S**	*B*	*S^{ca}*	*A-text*
4:11	אֵלוֹן־דְ by the tree/oak	πρὸς δρυός	ἕως δρυός	(πρὸς) δρῦν	πρὸς δρῦν
5:4	טפו מים the heavens dripped	ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐστέναξεν	ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔσταξεν	ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐξέστη	ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐξεστάθη
5:6	נת Anath	Αναθεν	Αναθεν	Αναθ	Αναθ
7:4	זֶה יֵלֵךְ אִתְּ הוּא יֵלֵךְ אִת (of whom I say) This one shall go with you, he shall go with you.	οὗτος πορεύσετε μετὰ σοῦ αὐτὸς οὐ πορεύσεται μετὰ σοῦ (end of the verse)	οὗτος πορεύσεται σὺν σοί αὐτὸς πορεύσεται σὺν σοί (it follows a second phrase)	deletion of οὐ. cb1 adds the end of the verse in a form near to A and B.	οὗτος πορεύσεται μετὰ σοῦ αὐτὸς πορεύσεται μετὰ σοῦ (it follows a second phrase)

πρὸς δρυός ("to the oak") in 4:11 S* seems to combine πρός from the A-text
and δρυός form the B-text. But πρός with genitive is a correct Greek trans-
lation against the normal translation technique in the Septuagint (there He-
brew עד is normally rendered with ἕως). Therefore it is possible that S*

preserves an old text which was altered later in B to the more common ἔω δρυός, in A to the frequent πρός with accusative.[24]

The song of Deborah shows three alternatives in 5:4 (or four, if we add the grammatical variant of ca): The heaven groaned (ἐστέναξεν in S*), dripped (ἔσταξεν B) or convulsed (in the A-text passivum divinum ἐξεστάθη, in ca medium).[25] The metaphor of the groaning heaven forms the most intensive of these images. Should it be the oldest text? The variants could be explained by small lapses in hearing or writing.

The MT and the Lucianic manuscripts have the name Anath in 5:6. A writes Kenath, B and S Anathen. The preposition ἐν follows immediately. Therefore Rahlfs meant that the scribe of B erroneously doubled "en". The critical edition normalized the name as Anath (Rahlfs B Anath). But now S has the same Αναθεν ἐν. Therefore Anathen is unlikely to be a mistake. It could be an ancient variant for the proper name.[26] Moreover the shortening of Anathen to Anath adjusts the name to the protomasoretic Hebrew, and it avoids the unattractive Greek articulation "(Anath)en en". Hence Anathen could be the older expression and Anath a younger form of the name in MT.

In 7:4 (the Gideon story) the people is too numerous in the eye of the Lord. A choice is necessary. S* refers the choice shortly: Whom the Lord says "this one will go with you (Gideon), the same (meant is the other one whom the Lord excludes) will not go with you". A- and B-text expand the phrase. Now the sense is "of whom I (the Lord) say to you, 'This one will go with you', he will go with you; and of whomever I say to you, 'This one will not go with you,' he will not go with you." Two correctors adapt the text of S to the longer form; ca deletes οὐ, and cb1 adds the end of the verse according to A B. Nevertheless S* is understandable in itself; its reading could be an old text (along to the rule of "brevior potior"). However, one must be cautious; omissions are common in S scribe A. S* may be a secondary shortening (αὐτός "the same" is used in an uncommon way) reasonably rectified by the correctors.

As we see, none of these (and other) variants can be decided at the moment. The next years must bring a detailed and thoroughgoing comparison of S with the A-text as well as with B. Then the discussion can assess the value of S and balance it to the value of B. In any case, the evidence demonstrates the importance of S*.

---

[24] That example is best discussed by KRISTIN DE TROYER in her planned (until now unpublished) presentation for the Sinaiticus conference London July 2009.

[25] Cf. DAVID PARKER, *Codex Sinaiticus. The Story of the World's Oldest Bible* (London: British Library London, 2010), forthcoming also in German translation: Codex Sinaiticus. Geschichte der ältesten Bibel der Welt, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2012).

[26] DAVID PARKER, *Codex Sinaiticus*.

The affinities between our scribe A and Vaticanus raise a further question: Are the codices written in the same region? The question is old, but it hasn't been solved until today. In 1938, Milne and Skeat doubted the possibility of a localization of S and yet allowed "to suggest [...] Caesarea, or at least Palestine, as the provenance".[27] Later on Skeat strengthened Caesarea.[28] The main arguments are known. Caesarea was a center of codex production in the 4th cent. (Euseb, v. Const. IV, 36 f.; cf. III, 1), and some geographic variants of our scribe A seem striking on first glimpse: Antipatris in Mt 13:54 (corrected by S1) and Καισαριας instead of αμαριας Act 8:5 (corrected by ca) point into the region of Caesarea. Still, geographical variants are very frequent in S, and the differences between B and S (different order of books etc.) contradict to any thesis combining the provenance of B and S.[29]

The dissent directs the interest to the geographical variants in Judges. One of them may be discussed: the itacism   μᾶ   (read "hîmas"), "we", instead of ὑμᾶς, "you", in 10:12 (as so often later corrected by "ca"; table 7). The context differs slightly in the A- and B-S-text. The A-text presents a fluid Greek translation of 10:11s. reading מִצְרַם (Egypts) instead of מ. צרם (from Egypt) and the word order Madiam-Amalek (as in 6:3.33; 7:12); perhaps the translator used a today lost form of the Hebrew text. The B-S-text on the other hand tries to map all the Hebrew elements of a proto-Masoretic text. The reviser consequently renders מ in מְ צרם disturbing the syntax (the translation of the following "ands" is not altered) – a known phenomenon of the kaige-revision. Our passage gives a fine example for the connection of S Judges to the kaige-revision history.

---

[27] Milne and Skeat, Scribes (op. cit. note 8), 66–69 (quotation 69).

[28] Theodore C. Skeat, "The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine," *JThS.NS* 50 (1999): 583–625.

[29] More critics in Marco Frenschkowski, "Die Geschichte der Bibliothek von Caesarea," in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Th. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas (Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 2; Leiden etc.: E. J. Brill, 2006), 53–104: 91–93; Jongkind, *Scribal Habits* (note 7) 253s.; Ulrich Schmid, review of Jongkind, Scribal Habits, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008): 128–132 (131: "Bei einem Codex, den Skeat mit der Handschriftenproduktion des Euseb von Caesarea in Verbindung bringen wollte, würde man doch wohl eine ursprungsnähere Version des Kanon-Apparates annehmen wollen, als sie uns in Gestalt des Codex Sinaiticus entgegentritt.") and Harry Y. Gamble, Codex Sinaiticus: the book and its readers in the fourth century, paper held at the Sinaiticus-Conference London, July 2009.

Table 7: Judges 10:11s

	MT	A-text	B	S first hand	S^{ca}
v. 11	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה [...] הֲלֹא מִמִּ צְרַיִם [...]	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος [...] οὐχὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτοι [...]	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος [...] μὴ οὐχὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου [...]	as B but	
v. 12	וְצִדוֹ ים ו מֶלֶק וּמָעוֹן לְחִצוּ אֶתְכֶם וַתִּצְ קוּ אֵלַי וָאוֹ ִ ה אֶתְכֶם	καὶ ιδώνιοι καὶ Μαδιαμ καὶ Αμαληκ ἐξέθλιψαν ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκεκράξατε πρός με καὶ ἔσωσα ὑμᾶς [...]	καὶ ιδωνίων καὶ Αμαληκ καὶ Μαδιαμ οἵ ἔθλιψαν ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐβοήσατε πρός με καὶ ἔσωσα ὑμᾶς [...]	[...] μᾶς [...]	ὑμᾶς as B (corresponding to Hebrew אֶתְכֶם)
		11 And the Lord said [...]: Did not the Egyptians [...] 12 and Sidonians and Madiam and Amalek oppress you hard, and you have called to me, and I saved you [...]?	11 And the Lord said [...]: (Was it) not from Egypt [...] 12 and Sidonians and Amalek and Madiam, who oppressed you, and you cried to me, and I delivered you [...]?	12 [...] and Amalek and Madiam, who oppressed us hard [...]	

The itacism μᾶς in addition actualizes the sense. The writer communicates: "(Was it) not from Egypt [...] and from Sidonians and (were not) Amalek and Madiam, who oppressed us (!) hard [...]?"Αμαληκ and Μαδιαμ Μαδιαμ are indeclinable and can be read as nominatives (against the genitive ιδωνίων). The "we"-group of the variant shows a conspicuous fear of tribes in the east and south of Judah (Amalek and Madiam) who could come from the East (cf. Judges 6–8) and in the end threaten the coast region.

However the argumentation is questionable. The syntax is breaking between Sidonians and Amalek (surely, it breaks in every case), and the explanation of the itacism by an unintentional error is perhaps more simple.[30] Therefore the evidence based on the itacism must be disputed. We must wait until a chemical analysis of the lime used in the production of the parchment of S is done; for chemical elements in the lime could clear the provenance of the folios.

Hence the task remains open. The critics have an advantage over the proponents of Caesarean origin. Though, if our scribe, the scriptorium or their "Vorlage" would have special connections to the environs of Caesarea and Judah, a third point might become of concern: The kaige text was localized by Barthélemy as a Palestinian revision.[31] In the end, there could be some local continuity of the textual form.

5. Corrector ca and the A-text

The corrector ca not only amends obvious mistakes (e.g. 8:15 and 10:12; see tables 1 and 7). He also collates another form of the text of Judges as noted. A similar tendency of ca is known for other parts of the Septuagint.[32] The new leaves of Judges allow more information:

ca uses a text close to the tradition of Alexandrinus and the Lucianic manuscripts (we saw paradigms and could add 9:57; ca there replaces "Shychem" by "Sikimôn" parallel to the A-text). Some variants differing from the A-text seem to be very old (table 2 concerning Judges 5:12, against Alexandrinus). They remind us to reconstruct a forerunner for all our textual traditions (the Old Greek).

The matter is of importance since none of our witnesses presents a "pure" text without contacts to the alternative textual form. S and B sometimes preserve old readings against the kaige-tendencies,[33] and reversely Rahlfs's A-text holds some hexaplaric und kaige-influences: Baal is often understood as masculine (A-text 6:25.28.30 etc.) besides the old feminine in 10:6. ἀνήρ ("man") is occasionally applied for אִישׁ in the distributive

---

[30] Itacisms are typical for the scribes of Sinaiticus (JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits* [note 7] 90–94), and some are semantically relevant; cf. e.g. the μᾶς – ὑμᾶς-itacism in Hab 1:5 scribe B2.

[31] Cf. BARTHÉLEMY, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, 3f. I thank Siegfried Kreuzer for this hint and others.

[32] Cf. ALFRED RAHLFS and DETLEF FRAENKEL, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments / Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Supplement zur Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarium Gottingensis editum, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 202.

[33] S and B e.g. decline ιχιμων in 9:49.

sense of "each / every one" (A-text 7:7.23 as in B S*). We read καί γε in
A-text 8:31 as well as in B S*. Even the today most acknowledged kaige
characteristic, ἐγώ εἰμι with finite verb for וֹכִי א is not missing throughout;
The A-text shows it in 6:18 (B and S have it in 5:3; 6:18, B furthermore in
11:27.35).

Therefore future research must reconstruct the development from the
archetype to the families of the A-text (bearing old variants and some
kaige-tendencies) and from there to the manuscripts of the later kaige-text
(S, B) without forgetting that the kaige-manuscripts can hold old readings,
too. All variants must be considered separately, the more so as the B-group
has some peculiar characteristics (additional to kaige in a narrow sense),
which are again spreading into the A-text. One of them is the equivalence
of צעק and βοᾶν;[34] we find it in the codex Alexandrinus of 10:12 as well as
in B and S; Rahlfs appropriately decided for the alternative ἐκεκράξετε
found in Lucianic manuscripts (see table 7).

The corrector ca is a part of that history. He usually introduces a variant
of the A-text where he changes S*; we saw examples and can e.g. add
κλάδον-φορτίον in 9:49 (not visible in table 3). On the other hand, he ac-
cepts most of the hexaplaric or kaige-variants found in Rahlfs' A-text. He
abstains from adjusting the masculine Baal in S to a Greek feminine (even
in 10:6). He allows καί γε in 8:31 (as A), ἀνήρ in 7:7 etc. (as A) and the
difficult construction of ἐγώ εἰμι with finite verb in 6:18 (as A). Moreover,
he does not correct καί γε in S 9:49; hence καί γε seems to be acceptable in
a broader recensional process. Last not least he accepts the verb βοᾶν, the
mentioned peculiarity of the B-text, in 10:12 (with the Alexandrinus
against the better Lucianic texts). Evidently, the contact between the tex-
tual forms A and B is going on in the 5th to 7th centuries. The memory of
"kaige"- and B-forms does not dwindle away in spite of the majority of
Lucianic manuscripts in late antiquity.

All in all, ca performs a text of the A-group with old and young vari-
ants. The corrector is an additional witness supporting the priority of that
textual group. His work is of good quality, but will be seldom be decisive
if standing alone. Thus it would be wrong overrating the value of ca. More
can be said when the comparison between ca and the families of the A-
group is accomplished which could not be done here (our first overview
shows special affinities to A I, the Alexandrinus-subgroup).

---

[34] BODINE, *Greek Text* (note 13), 71.

6. One last example: Judges 4:18–21

The story of Sisera in ch. 4 illustrates the complexity of the textual trans-
mission. According to the basis text, Deborah has overcome the adverse
general Sisera. Sisera is fleeing and comes to hide in the tent of a woman
called Jael. Jael seems to help him. She covers him with the curtain of her
tent or with a rug (4:18). Still, he is thirsty; she gives him a drink and cov-
ers him again (according to the Hebrew text and Sinaiticus* 4:19). The A-
text states precisely "she hid his face"; the addition "face" meets the in-
tended meaning. A second addition follows in the next verse (4:20): The
hidden Sisera speaks to Jael. The translator assumes that he opens the cov-
ering to be heard. Thus, the A-text adds that Jael hid him again, and now
repeats the whole phrase of the end of v. 18 (καὶ συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ
δέρρει αὐτῆς).

   We cannot exclude that A translated a longer Hebrew text (cf. above
concerning 5:12), but the origin of the variants in our passage are more
likely to be due to Greek rhetoric. The repetition of relevant motifs is an
idiom in ancient public speaking, the repetition in the end of sentences an
epiphora. Thus the variants of the A-text in vv. 19 and 20 show a stylistic
phenomenon of the target language. They are most probably due to the
rhetoric of a free and vivid translation technique.

   At the same time, the A-variants move away from the wording of the
Hebrew text (at least in the form as we know it). Hence the kaige revision
does not accept it. B and S* (scribe A) perform a short text, literally paral-
lel to MT.

   The corrector ca again contradicts: The free, colourful translation needs
priority. As a consequence, ca returns to the vividly narrated story of the
older Greek A-text (the variants can be seen in table 8).

   Another variant of the story gives additional insights into the techniques
of translation and motives for correction. The Hebrew hapax legomenon
שְׂמִיכָה v. 18 signified curtain or rug. The translation witnessed by the A-
text thought of a curtain[35] and creates the sense: Jael takes the curtain
which covers an important part of the tent, probably the female room – it is
"her" curtain[36] – und hides Sisera with it (συνεκάλυψεν).

---

[35] Such a curtain was used to cover parts of the tent, as Ex 26:13 proved (in LXX
δέρρις and συγκαλύπτειν). The translator perhaps knew the vocabulary from Ex 26:13
(without thinking of a cultic context).
[36] Against S* and B, the Hebrew בשׂיכה is vocalized as determined noun and the de-
termination rendered by the possessive pronoun. Perhaps the translator did not think of a
special curtain, but his syntactic construction evokes the curtain of the female room on
the side of the readers.

Table 8: Judges 4:19s.

	Hebrew text	*Vaticanus and Sinaiticus scribe A*	*Sinaiticus corrector ca*	*A-text*
4:19	וַתְּכַסֵּהוּ׃	... καὶ περιέβαλεν αὐτόν ... and she (Jael) covered him (Sisera)	deletes the phrase of scribe A (the first hand) and inserts καὶ συνεκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ... and she (Jael) hid his (Sisera's) face	καὶ συνεκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ... and she (Jael) hid his (Sisera's) face
4:20			*addition ...* *καὶ συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δέρρει αὐτῆς* *... and she (Jael) hid him (Sisera) in her curtain (leathern covering).*	*... καὶ συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δέρρει αὐτῆς* *... and she (Jael) hid him (Sisera) in her curtain (leathern covering).*

Though, the verb συγκαλύπτειν, "veil completely", was known from Gen 9:23 too where Shem and Japheth covered the nakedness of their father. Therefore a sexual association became possible in the way of reception (even if it was not intended by the old translator): A man is coming into the tent of a woman, and the woman takes the curtain to her room to hide his nakedness.

Such an association abandoned the Hebrew sense; there the right to hospitality and its boundaries formed the underlying problem without sexual overtones. That may be the reason for the correction in the B-text (B S*). שְׂמִיכָה is now translated in the sense of a blanket (ἐπιβόλαιον; the word is a neologism, used firstly here and in Ez 13:18.21), and the verb כסה (pi.) is rendered by the corresponding περιβάλλειν (same root as in ἐπι-βόλ-αιον).

The corrected translation is more literal and more decent. However it loses the prickling tone of the A-text. "ca" restores the vivid, free translation against the scribe A of the Sinaiticus.

A further difference between A- and B-text follows in 4:21 (cf. 5:26). Jael does not protect Sisera. Quite the contrary, she kills him by beating a peg through the hiding blanket or curtain. The peg wrecks Sisera's temple, a very realistic scene in the Hebrew text. But the "Vorlage" of the A-text either referred to a lost Hebrew alternative or – more probably – translated free: Jael destroys the jaw (γνάθον) not the temple. The free translation evokes a widespread motif of the ancient cultures; the jaw signalized

power and aggression.[37] Thus Sisera who is introduced in 4:3 as a man shocking Israel by power (κράτος) loses power (including sexual power) and his life in the end. His jaw is broken into pieces; he cannot bite Israel any more. The A-text is constructed vibrantly throughout.

B and S scribe A (S*) return to the Hebrew רקה, temple, and interestingly ca does not correct the scribe A here. It seems that the "Vorlage" of ca did tolerate free translations as in 4:18 but not a mutation of the wording as in 4:21 (and 5:26).

Table 9: Judges 4:18.21

		Hebrew Texts	*Vaticanus / Si-naiticus scribe A*	*Sinaiticus corrector (ca)*	*A-text*
4:18		וַתְּכַסֵּהוּ שְׂמִיכָה	καὶ περιέβαλεν αὐτὸν ἐπιβολαίῳ	καὶ συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δέρρει αὐτῆς	καὶ συνεκάλυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δέρρει αὐτῆς
		and she (Jael) covered him (Sisera) with the curtain (or rug).	and she (Jael) covered him (Sisera) with a blanket.	and she (Jael) covered him (Sisera) in her curtain (leathern covering).	and she (Jael) covered him (Sisera) in her curtain (leathern covering).
4:21		וַתִּתְקַע אֶת־הַיָּתֵר רַקָּתוֹ	καὶ ἔπηξεν τὸν πάσσαλον ἐν τῷ κροτάφῳ αὐτοῦ	- (no correction)	καὶ ἐνέκρουσεν[38] τὸν πάσσαλον ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ αὐτοῦ
		and she (Jael) drove the peg into his (Sisera's) temple	and she (Jael) stuck the peg in his (Sisera's) temple		and she (Jael) hammered the peg in his (Sisera's) jaw

As a consequence we can categorize the form of text which was used by ca more precisely: That text belonged to the A-group but was more often adapted to the B-S-text than the best manuscripts of the A-subgroups. Therefore ca is an important witness for the older Greek text where it goes with the A-text, but has less value where corrections remain undone and perhaps also less value too where variants differ from known subgroups of the A-text.

---

[37] Cf. MARTIN KARRER, "Zähne: eine Kultur- und Kunstgeschichte," *Deutsche Zahn-ärztliche Zeitschrift* 63 (2008): 604–613 (esp. § 3.5.3).

[38] Rahlfs follows *O* against ἔθηκεν in the Alexandrinus (the variant there may be loaned from ἔθηκεν τὴν σφῦραν in the same verse).

7. Conclusion

The examination of the newly found folios of Sinaiticus Judges leads to the following conclusions:

1. The new leaves confirm the two acknowledged textual forms, A-text and B-text. Scribe A of Sinaiticus (first hand, S*) goes to a great extent with the Vaticanus (B). Corrector ca uses a "Vorlage" related to the A-text (Alexandrinus and Lucianic manuscripts). cb1 continues the work of ca.

2. The Old Greek of Judges – the textual form preceding both mentioned traditions (S-B as well as A-Lucianic texts) – hasn't been reconstructed yet. The need for a critical edition finds essential support by the new finds. They help clarifying the development from the archetype to the A- and the B-text. The A-text remains suitable as starting point for the reconstruction; and variants of ca assist it. S* and other correctors enrich the analysis by showing relevant and sometimes preferable alternatives.

3. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus Judges belong to the kaige-group showing some peculiarities (it would be wrong to unify the kaige-"recension"). The Christian scriptoria of B and S used that textual form whereas the A-text possessed priority elsewhere in the Old Church. The kaige-text nevertheless held some influence till corrector ca. That means that the Christian use of the Jewish scriptures allowed a variety of textual forms and an influence of Jewish kaige-traditions for a long time.

4. The differences between the S-B and the A-text evolve the problem of the right translation method between source and target language. The A-text is oriented towards the Greek target language and enriches the Hellenistic horizon of early Judaism. B and S are primarily indebted to the source language and work more literally (accurately in the transliteration of words etc.). A very modern task of translation theory has ancient predecessors.

5. The place of the Sinaiticus-scriptorium is disputed. The region of Caesarea is worth considering but far from certain.

6. Ongoing research has to specify the value of S* and ca in realizing a detailed analysis of the relation between S* and B and of the place of ca within the subgroups of the A-text.