

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IX.

STUDIES IN THE SEPTUAGINTAL TEXTS OF
LEVITICUS.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

I.

FOR the study of the Septuagintal text or texts of Leviticus we depend on four groups of authorities—MSS., versions of the LXX, citations in patristic and other ancient writings, and extant Hexaplar notes. Each one of these is encumbered with peculiar difficulties, and the final result of a presentation of their evidence is generally to leave a feeling of hopeless bewilderment in the mind of the inquirer. Nevertheless, from time to time one lights on some more or less satisfactory clue which helps to unravel some part of the tangled skein; and it is with the result of such clues and with their use that the present inquiry is concerned. I stumbled on one while examining Leviticus xvi. for another purpose, and was led to look into the matter further by the results I there obtained.

It is necessary, first of all, to glance at the history of the Septuagint. The greatest landmark is the edition of Origen known as the Hexapla, from its six columns, giving the Hebrew text, a Greek transliteration, and the four versions of the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Origen patched and mended the Septuagintal text, with the help of the other versions, to bring it into accord with the Hebrew text of his day; and in the process he used asterisks to denote additions to the old Greek, and obels to mark passages

found in the Greek but not in the Hebrew. We know of two important later recensions: those of Lucian, used in Syria, etc.; and of Hesychius, which had currency in Egypt. There was, further, an edition, on the basis of the Hexapla, by Eusebius and Pamphilus. Quotations in authorities before Origen should give us a pre-Hexaplar text, and later the fathers of Antioch should quote Lucian, and the Egyptian fathers (notably Cyril) Hesychius. Thus we ought, theoretically, to find three main types of text in our MSS., and be able to connect these with versions and fathers; while a fourth type of text should be attested by the earlier quotations. In practice this is not altogether the case.

The first qualification to be made is not very serious. We sometimes find in older authorities readings which are attributed to a later translator or editor; e.g. Philo will present the text of the later Symmachus. Such instances merely suggest that the known translators often used earlier materials. Similarly Lucian no doubt presented an edition of the text that had been current in Syria before his time, and Hesychius presumably incorporated earlier Egyptian readings.

There are, however, more serious matters. Our MSS. have suffered from all the usual faults of a MS. tradition; but, in addition, we have many instances of MSS. that appear to represent a blending of two forms of text. It would be so natural for a priest to go from one country to another and to correct or annotate the Bible he had brought with him from some local text, that we cannot wonder at this. Such cases have naturally given us some curious texts; but by grouping the MSS. we can often make the necessary allowances for this. For example, in Leviticus, F and I present closely cognate texts; but two other MSS. that may be classed with the Hexaplar group—k and m—often agree with

them. It would seem, therefore, that these have been copied from MSS. in which the F1 text had been brought more or less into accord with the Hexaplar type. And this may be used further: when F and l disagree, the testimony of k and m, if not purely Hexaplar, may show us which of the other two has preserved the original reading of the recension.

The Hexaplar text is the easiest to trace, particularly in passages where G is extant; but the non-Hexaplar MSS. fall into many more than two groups. Accordingly it is necessary to trace the groups and then to study their mutual relations. It will be found that some groups are frequently found together, while others appear to be antipathetic.

At this point it is right to make some mention of the attempts to trace the text of Lucian. Lagarde thought he had found it in a group of MSS. that are represented in the larger Cambridge Septuagint by bw. This has, however, recently been challenged by Dahse and Hautsch,¹ and the latter has shown, by the citations of the Antiochian fathers, that bw do not contain their text. He himself is at fault in his attempt to trace Lucian in Genesis from these materials, because he unfortunately worked on the larger Cambridge Septuagint, which does not collate 20 of Holmes. The latter, however, says that this MS. contains "ipsum, ut videtur, textum quem habuit Chrysostomus in codice suo." Accordingly it would appear that a good modern collation of this MS. (which contains Genesis only) is essential to any inquiry into the Lucianic text. It is certainly worthy of note that in the first sixteen verses of chapter xlviii. there are no fewer than three instances of characteristic readings in which 20 and Chrysostom stand alone against all the other authorities; viz. ver. 1,

¹E. Hautsch, *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch: Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1909*, pp. 518-543.

λαβων for ἀναλαβων; ver. 6, á for όσα; and ver. 16, εὐλογησει for εὐλογησαι. I have not pursued this inquiry further.

In the last four books of the Pentateuch Hautsch finds that gn, dpt, and to some extent l, also 74 and 76, appear to be Lucianic. I think he is wrong in lumping together the four books, for the grouping of the MSS. in Exodus does not altogether hold in Leviticus, and as to l his evidence is very weak; but it is important to remember his conclusion as regards gn and dpt. Dahse, on the other hand, believes that in Genesis fi(i^a)r represent Lucian, and egj Hesychius. Others say that dpt are Hesychian. They may contain some Egyptian readings, but Hautsch's work appears to me to be fatal to this contention. In these circumstances a fresh investigation is certainly not out of place.

If there is difficulty with the MSS., there is at least as much with the versions. Nothing would be more natural than that missionaries making a rendering into a fresh language should compare various editions of the Greek or even Hebrew texts with a view to getting the best Bible possible for converts. It is an ancient conjecture that the Bohairic and Sahidic represent Hesychius; but, apart from differences between the two versions, neither of them corresponds at all generally with any extant MS. or group. In point of fact, nobody even knows whether they were made before or after Hesychius worked. The investigator soon finds that no version gives a pure Septuagintal text, uninfluenced by the later Hebrew; and that, on the other hand, probably no version fails to contain some pre-Hexaplar readings. Some of the versional readings may, further, be due to later corruption of the version itself, and others to the difficulty of rendering precisely into another language paraphrastic translations or additions for the sake of insuring clearness, etc.

The patristic evidence is extraordinarily unsatisfactory. The fathers seem to have quoted very largely from memory at the best of times, and it is quite common to find a writer citing the same text differently on two or more occasions. Cyril in particular is a notorious offender. Then, too, the patristic writings are themselves in a doubtful textual condition, and may often have suffered through scribal carelessness or zeal. Indeed, the whole inquiry rests on the most unsatisfactory basis, and it is only by doing the actual work that one can discover what is and what is not feasible. So many cautions have to be observed, and the difficulties are so numerous, that the progress made is necessarily very slow. In my own work I have benefited largely by what has been done by my predecessors, and particularly by Dahse's published work. I understand that in Leviticus Dahse has in some cases reached the same results as myself independently, — indeed, he has anticipated me by several years. But as, at the time of writing, his work on Leviticus is not yet published, and we differ to a very considerable extent, I have thought it best to go on without reference to him. The exact range of our agreements and differences is unknown to me; but I think it will be found that we hold very divergent opinions on the ascription of different groups to the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions.

The evidence of Hexaplar notes is meagre, and, like our other authorities, subject to a certain amount of corruption. Nevertheless, it affords some valuable material.

The problem of referring the types of text represented by the non-Hexaplar groups of MSS. to the recensions to which they respectively belong (which must be the first step towards recovering the original texts of those recensions from these groups) appears insoluble at first sight, but yields

to treatment with careful study. If we eliminate the ordinary cases of corruption due to the well-known sources of error, we shall find that the groups when compared afford us numerous resemblances and differences. Such resemblances may be due to (1) Hexaplar or Hebrew influence, (2) common descent from a particular recension, (3) correction of a text belonging to one recension from a text belonging to another recension, (4) the preservation of pre-Hexaplar readings in groups belonging to different recensions where the other groups have been accommodated to the Hexaplar text. This looks bewildering; but in practice it is not always difficult to disentangle the cases, and for two reasons. On the one hand, the MSS. of the Hexaplar group and the Massoretic text usually make it easy to discern what resemblances are due to the first cause. On the other hand, the number and quality of the resemblances and the general character of the groups are of great assistance. If, after finding that a particular group agrees in some twenty non-Massoretic readings with the Lucianic versions and fathers, we suddenly discover an instance where it joins an Egyptian version or group in presenting a non-Massoretic reading while our other witnesses agree with the Massoretic text, we may safely conclude that the reading is pre-Hexaplar and not specifically Lucianic or Egyptian, and this conclusion will be strengthened if the reading is found in a pre-Hexaplar authority such as Philo. On the other hand, readings that are found only in witnesses commonly Lucianic or commonly Egyptian will presumably be Lucianic or Hesychian as the case may be. We shall have occasion to watch these principles in operation when we come to the tables of readings, and accordingly I think it unnecessary to cite examples at this stage.

The larger Cambridge Septuagint is the basis of our work,

and the MSS. are accordingly cited by its notation. The uncials are designated by capital letters, and thirty cursives by the twenty-six letters of the alphabet and a_2 , b_2 , c_2 , d_2 , respectively. There is, however, one complication. In Genesis, b denotes 19 of Holmes, and where it was wanting the Cambridge editors cited 108 under the symbol b . From Exodus onwards, they decided to cite both MSS. regularly, and accordingly use b to denote their agreement. Where they differ, 19 is cited as b' . Where a MS. has been corrected, the original reading is indicated by an asterisk. In the case of BAF a superlinear 1 denotes corrections by the original scribe, and superlinear a , b , etc., later hands. In other MSS. the superlinear a denotes corrections by the same or an approximately contemporary hand, and superlinear b corrections by a later hand. The patristic abbreviations present no difficulty. With regard to the versions, for the Bohairic superlinear l and w denote, respectively, the editions of Lagarde and Wilkins; for the Sahidic, superlinear c and m those of Ciasca and Maspéro; for the Ethiopic, superlinear c and f Dillmann's MSS. C and F; and for the Latin, superlinear r , v , w , and z signify, respectively, Robert's edition, Vercellone's *Variae Lectiones*, Ranke's edition of the Würzburg palimpsest, and the Munich palimpsest.

In Leviticus the principal non-Hexaplar groups of MSS. are, roughly, as follows: BAyNha₂, Fl, gn, dpt, ejsvz, bw, fir, qu. The best authority for the Hexaplar text is G where extant, and it is supported in varying degrees by Mackmox. Of these, m and (to a less extent) k agree largely with Fl, suggesting that texts of this type were corrected from Hexaplar texts and from the ancestors of these cursives; c has similar affinities to bw ; while other relationships will emerge as we proceed. This first grouping is intended to be merely

approximate. It is evidenced by the tables, which are printed to illustrate other points as well and therefore need not be proved separately. For convenience, I cite b_2 with the Hexaplar group.

One other matter requires mention before we proceed to the actual readings. For some reason, quite a number of authorities change in character at the beginning of Leviticus. Thus Dr. Swete writes of the Armenian: "Mr. McLean, who has collated the greater part of the Octateuch, informs me that the Armenian shows a typical Hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus, agreeing closely with the Syriaco-Hexaplar version, and in varying degrees with the MSS. that compose the Hexaplar group. The Hexaplar element [he adds] is much less in evidence in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, but again appears strongly in Joshua, Judges, and Ruth."¹ There are many other instances. For example, the MS. g to a great extent goes with ej in Genesis-Exodus, giving a group egj ; but in Leviticus we have to deal with gn as one and $ejsvz$ as another. B and A are members of a group $BAyNha_2$ in Leviticus, but I doubt whether this holds in Exodus. The following table, which I have compiled for the purpose of tracing the MSS. which appear to present Egyptian readings in Exodus xxxii.-xxxiv., certainly does not favor the hypothesis. On the contrary, it suggests that, except where one or other is influenced by the later Hebrew, B and A form a group. Why so many witnesses change in character at the end of Exodus is a question I cannot answer. Possibly it has some connection with the fact that the Greek Church seems to have taken no lessons from Leviticus, except in chapter xxvi. It may be that those who desired a text of a particular type for church use in the case of Genesis and

¹ Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (2d ed.), p. 119, n.

TABLE I

| Reference | Reading of M. T. | Egyptian variant | Authorities presenting Egyptian variant | Other Septuagintal readings where material | Authorities presenting such readings |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Exod. xxxii | 3 their (ears) | (ears) of their wives and of their daughters Sahidic | x 14, 16, 71, 77, 130 Lat ^r | of their wives | Ay F ^a M(mg)c gn dpt ejsvz fir Arm-ed Cyr |
| | 6 on the morrow | το πρωι Sahidic | h r | their (= M. T.) | B h a, M a k m x b, F ^a i bw qu |
| | 7 get thee down | το ταχος εντευθεν καταβηθι Sahidic | B a o r Cyr-ed † | = M. T. καταβηθι το ταχος καταβηθι = M. T. το ταχος καταβηθι εντευθεν καταβηθι το ταχος εντευθεν | all others. bw(pr και) f(om το)i Barn Or-gr x Eus qu Eth(vid) |
| | 28 about three thousand men | twenty-three thousand men Bohairic | r Lat ^v s (vid) Cyr-ed | = M. T. | A M rell Cyr † Thdt Boh Lat Syr (obelising the last three words): egjsvz prefix και. |
| xxxiii | 2 the Jebusite | + and the Canaanite (omitted earlier) Sah | Bab(ms)aho fir | | |
| | 8 to the tent | + την εξω της παρεμβολης Boh & Sah | aho fir d b M | + εξω της παρεμβολης | B w b, u Eth |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| xxxiii | 15 | go | πορευη μεθ' ημων Boh & Sah | o u (ὄμων) Arm Eth Syr Or-lat | πορευη = M. T. συμπορευη or προπορευη with variants. ἐνδοξασθησομεθα | B a h*r all others. |
| | 16 | ונפלינו | ἐνδοξασθησομαι Boh (ed Wilkins) | Bh fi M k δ* | | all others. |
| | 18 | Shewme, I praythee, my glory | ἐμφανισον μοι σεαυτον Sah (vid) | Bah o (prefixing reading of M. T.) r | equivalents of M. T. | all others. |
| | 19 | I will proclaim | λαλησω Boh | Bah u | = M. T. | all others. |
| xxxiv | 2 | come up in the morning | ἀναστας ἀναβηθι Sah | r x | | |
| | 5 | with him | vacat Boh | x Eth Cyr ½ | | |
| | 10 | אני | vacat Boh Sah | fi | | |
| | 11 | אנני | vacat Boh Sah | fi u Arm-ed Lat ^r | | |
| | 22 | (the) feast 2° | ἀρχη Sah | Bah r u (ἀρχη) Syr | = M. T. | all others. |
| | 26 | רביע | θησεις Sah | Ba r* | εισοσεις | all others. |
| | 28 | (and he wrote) on the tables the words of the covenant | τα ρηματα ταυτα ἐπι των πλακων της διαθηκης Sah | B r qu Cyr | τα ρηματα ἐπι των πλακων της διαθηκης = M. T. | aho ckmxn Arm Boh Lat Syr |
| | | | | | ἐπι των πλακων τα ρηματα ταυτα της διαθηκης | all others with minor variations, but f*o the Eth omit της διαθηκης. |
| | 29 | Mount Sinai | the mount Sah | Bah n x Cyr Lat Or-gr | | |
| | | the two | ιδου αι δυο Boh | fi* | ιδου δυο ιδου αι = M. T. | dpt Aya, Fl Mb ₂ egjsvz B & all others. |
| | 34 | that which | παντα οσα Boh | h y n dpt Eth (vid) | | |

Exodus found no reason to demand it in Leviticus; but I am not learned in liturgiology and cannot venture an opinion.

In the preceding table all the cases are instances of non-Massoretic versional readings; and where they are found in Cyril as well as in an Egyptian version a strong presumption is raised for regarding them as distinctively Egyptian.

If this table be carefully considered in the light of the fact that q, which goes with u, is missing from xxxiii. 7 to xxxiv. 27, it becomes obvious that Baho, x, fir, and qu are the MS. authorities which contain the largest proportion of Egyptian readings in Exodus, and that the text of Hesychius, so far as it has come down to us in Greek MSS., is to be sought among these. I have been careful to confine the list to instances of non-Massoretic versional readings. Where these are found in Cyril as well, a strong presumption arises that they may be Hesychian (see xxxii. 28; xxxiv. 28, 29). Here it may be added, that, in the investigation of Hautsch on the Lucianic text of these books to which reference has already been made, there are very few instances where any of these groups or MSS. seem to be at all sympathetic to the Antiochian fathers. Of the purely cursive groups, fir and qu appear to have least in common with the fathers of Antioch, just as gn and dpt seem to have most. The resemblances of qu and the Ethiopic (xxxii. 7; xxxiii. 8, 15) are also noteworthy.

Another observation to be made is, that, if B contains Hesychian material, it is impossible to trace the number of its resemblances to the Egyptian versions from the Cambridge Septuagint. This (with immaterial exceptions) presents the text of B, and generally only records divergences from that text in the apparatus. This makes it impossible (except where the Egyptian versions are specifically quoted) to say how far they agree with B.

On turning to Leviticus, I begin with the clue that first attracted my own attention, in the hope that it may serve to interest others in the subject. In chapter xvi. there is frequent mention of a goat, the word *χιμαρος* being regularly used; but in every instance there is a variant *τραγος* as will be seen by the table of its occurrences in that chapter:—

TABLE II

| Lev. xvi | MSS & fathers using <i>τραγος</i> | Remarks |
|-------------------|---|---|
| 5 | gn ejsvz b ₂ o h M(mg) Jul-ap-Cyr | Hexaplar note in v: LXX, the others <i>χιμαρους</i> . |
| 7 | gn ejsvz b ₂ o x M(mg) Jul-ap-Cyr Phil Barn | The same. |
| 8 | gn ejsvz b ₂ o x Jul-ap-Cyr | The same: a note in M attributes to Symmachus <i>εις στρατηγον</i> , an obvious corruption of <i>εις τραγον</i> . |
| 9 | gn ejsvz b ₂ o bw | gn omit the first clause of this verse containing the phrase. According to a Hexaplar note in M Symmachus had <i>εις τραγον ἀφιμερον</i> for <i>ἀποσημαιο</i> : v erroneously attributes to Aquila. |
| 10 1 ^o | ejsvz b ₂ o bw M(mg) | M lm dpt have <i>χιμαρος</i> . The rest omit the whole phrase which is wanting in MT and has come in from the first half of verse 22. |
| 2 ^o | gn ejsvz b ₂ o x qu N | M & v prefix an asterisk to the clause. Hexaplar note in v: LXX <i>χιμαρος</i> . |
| 15 | gn ejsvz b ₂ o Jul-ap-Cyr | Hexaplar note in v: LXX, the others <i>χιμαρους</i> . |
| 18 | gn ejsvz b ₂ | A similar note in v. |
| 20 | gn ejsvz b ₂ bw M(mg) | |
| 21 1 ^o | gn ejsvz b ₂ bw | |
| 2 ^o | gn svz b ₂ bw | ej omit the whole phrase. |
| 22 1 ^o | gn ejsvz b ₂ Thdt | |
| 2 ^o | gn ejsvz b ₂ bw | |
| 26 | gn ejsvz b ₂ bw | |
| 27 | gn ejsvz b ₂ bw | |

It should be added that, according to Holmes, Slav Mosq uses *τραγος*, and this is probably a Lucianic version; but, curiously enough, in the addition to verse 10 he records *χιμαρος* as the reading of Slav Mosq and Ostrog, though they follow the text of g closely in the rest of the addition. On this table it is clear that gn, ejsvz, and b₂ use *τραγος* regularly throughout the chapter, of set intent. In the case of h the word seems to be a gloss, as also in x (ver. 7, 8); while the text of o suggests that it is descended from some MS. in which somebody sought to replace the rarer *χιμαρος* by *τραγος*, but got tired of the process half way through the chapter. The cause for the variations of bw is not immediately obvious. It is to be noticed that Theodoret and Julian use the word, and that it has the support of Philo, who is older than Symmachus. Attention should further be drawn to the phenomena presented by the addition to verse 10: "And the goat shall bear upon him their iniquities into a desolate land." This is found in the Armenian, which is presumably Lucianic where it is not Hexaplar, Slav Mosq and Ostrog and the Old Latin, also in gn and dpt, which are the two groups that go most closely with the fathers of Antioch, and Im as well as ejsvz. We shall see hereafter that this group is founded on a text which in certain important respects is akin to that of gn and the Armenian. The addition, however, is missing from the Egyptian and Ethiopic versions fir, bw, and BAha₂ (y is here wanting). Of the MSS. that appeared in Exodus to contain Egyptian readings, only o, x, and qu present the addition. In these it may easily have been added from a Lucianic text. Further, the quotation from Theodoret in Cat. Nic. i. 1066 cites this half verse in the form presented by gn, the Armenian, and Slav here (*εἰς τὴν*, not *γῆν*) as following verse 10, and leaves on the

mind the impression that he almost certainly read the clause in this verse.

When we add to this the fact that Cyril¹ knew the text of this chapter with *χιμαρος, not τραγος*, it seems to me reasonably probable that this reading is Lucianic, *not* Hesychian or Hexaplar, and that Lucian adopted *τραγος* in this chapter. I shall hereafter show that gn, the Armenian, dpt, and bw have close relations among themselves, and I believe that these are the main sources to which we must look for Lucian. At any rate, the Hexapla and Hesychius clearly read *χιμαρος*.

I now turn to a further set of phenomena. Of the group ejsvz, v in particular contains Hexaplar notes citing readings under the title ο' (=LXX). Of this MS. v we know very little at present, because it is collated for the first time in the larger Cambridge LXX. Swete says that it dates from the tenth century. But the notes contained in it are older, as appears from their sometimes exhibiting scribal errors (e.g. α' for σ') and from their being sometimes 'found — though usually without the attribution of source — in other MSS. Of these, s occasionally presents the authorities. In the following table I have collected those notes of v which attribute a reading to ο' (but no others) in the first eighteen chapters of Leviticus, supplementing them by the notes of s that contain a similar attribution for the chapters in which v is lacking. The headings of the different columns sufficiently explain the contents of the table, but I have not thought it desirable to include all the marginal readings of MSS. The fact that an alternative reading is recorded in a marginal note does not help us in deciding what text the body of the MS. contains.

¹ Cat. Nic. i. 1067.

TABLE III

| Reference | Readings of εἰς | Authorities agreeing with this group | Hexaplar note of v or s where v is missing | Authorities presenting the reading attributed by the note to ε' (the LXX) | Remarks |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|---|
| Lev. I 6 | ἐκδειραντες | B ^h ackmob, Fl gn dpt b r | ο' δειραντες | B ^a Aya, GMx w fi* qu Clem Cyr † | |
| 8 | ἐπιθησουσιν | B ^o fort Gc g Arm dpt fi Boh Lat Or-lat | ο' ἐπιτωθασουσιν | B ^a Aya ₂ , Makmoxb, Fl bw qu | e n r omit the whole phrase from <i>lapus</i> in verse 7 to the same word in verse 8. Slav Ostrog & Georg <i>im-roman</i> . |
| 9 | ὄλοκρυτωμα | gn Arm w | ο' καρτωμα | BAya ₂ , GMackmoxb, Fl dpt b fir qu | |
| 10 | omit the whole phrase. | kx i* Eth: G prefixes the Hexaplar obel | ο' και ἐπιθησει την χειρα ἐπι την κεφαλην αὐτου | All other authorities: but Flm gn Arm dpt b b ₂ Boh show minor variations. | |
| 12 | (τα ἐπι του πυρος) ἐπι το θυσιαστηριον | a ₂ co (comits the sec- ond ἐπι) kmo Fl fir | ο' θ' ο' τα ἐπι του πυρος τα ἐπι του θυσιαστηριου: α' . . . ἐπι του θυσιαστη- ριου | BAyh GMakxb, Fl gn dpt w ir qu BAya ₂ , GMacx gn dpt bw qu | m f b all have different readings. |
| 13 | ὄλοκρυτωμα | gn Arm M(mg) | ο' καρτωμα | all others: x has both words. | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| I | 14 | ἀπο των περιστερων | BAya ₂ Makmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fr | ο' ἀπο των περιστεριδων: α' θ' η' ἀπο των υἱων τῆς περιστερας: ο' η' ἀπο νε- οσσων περιστερας ο' κερπωμα | περιστεριδων G i qu: περιστωνδων c | |
| | 17 | ὀλοκαυτωμα | gn Arm b ₂ w | | BAya ₂ GMackmoxb ₂ Fl dpt b fir qu | |
| II | 2 | πλησει την δρακα | gn dpt [<i>inplebit</i> Boh Lat] πληση b r: πλησου- σι w | ο' πληρη την δρακα: α' πληρωμα δρακος αὐτου: ο' πληρης της δρακος: θ' πληρης την δρακα | Aya ₂ GMackmoxb ₂ F fi qu: πληρης B: πληροι h i | Gac Arm Boh have την δρακα αὐτου (sub asterisco G). |
| III | 1 | αὐτο (after βων) | Mkmx(ω)b ₂ Fl ^{ms} dp(ω)t ir qu Boh Cyr | ο' ἐκ των βων αὐτος(?) | h gn ^a b: αὐτου BAya ₂ Gaco F w f: Arm Eth omit. | MT NHT = αὐτος |
| | 5 | οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰααρων οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐπι το θυσιαστηριον (e omits the first οἱ) εὐωδίας | BAha ₂ Mackmxb ₂ Fl gn pt bw fir qu all. | ο' οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰααρων ἐπι το θυσιαστηριον ο' εὐδοκίας | Go Eth: <i>sacerdotis</i> Lat | ο' = MT: y is missing to IV 27: d has <i>ιερεῖς</i> Ἰααρων. Perhaps ο' is a clerical error. |
| | 6 | θυσια (σωτηριου) | cmoxb ₂ Fl fi qu | οἱ λ̄ εις θυσιαν εἰρηικων: ο' θυσιαν σωτηριου | BAha ₂ GMak dpt bw | gn θυσιας: r omits the whole phrase. |
| | 13 | παρα τας θυρας | all. | ο' ἐπι τας θυρας | 30 of Holmes | |
| | 15 | τους δυο | Mmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir qu Lat | α' θ' ο' τοις δυο . . . : ο' ἀμφοτερους τους | BAh Gack | k adds δυο: a ₂ omits both words. Georg τους δυο. a reads <i>ἔστιν</i> only: m has an entirely differ- ent reading for the whole phrase. |
| IV | 9 | το ὄν | gn dpt: το A fir: τω ο | ο' ὁ ἐστιν | Bha ₂ GMckxb ₂ Fl bw qu | |

TABLE III (continued)

| Reference | Readings of e ₁ v ₂ z | Authorities agreeing with this group | Hexaplar note of v or s where v is missing | Authorities presenting the reading attributed by the note to e' (the LXX) | Remarks |
|-----------|---|---|--|--|--|
| IV 18 | του όντος | F ^b Moxb ₂ gn dpt bw fir qu | ο' το όν προς τη θυρα | F ^a Gack: <i>quod est</i> Arm Boh Eth Lat ^r Bha ₂ GMkob ₂ Fl g e ₁ z w i qu | των ΒΑΗ: τω α ₂ : om. F ^a Im προ της θυρας m |
| | προς την θυραν (sv only of this group) | A acx n dpt b fr | | | |
| 20 | τω μοσχω (v sub θ') | g Arm (vid) dpt-w | ο' ο' τον μοσχον: α' τη δαμαλη | BAha ₂ GMackmoxb ₂ Fl n b fir qu | Slav τω μοσχω: Mosq adds <i>huic</i> & <i>Ostrogilli</i> . |
| 28 | ήν ήμαρτεν έν αύτη | BAyha ₂ Mackmxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw r qu | ο' λ' ήν ήμαρτεν και οίσει δωρον αύτου | Go fi Arm Boh Eth Or- lat Eus G(sub ^a)akx u Eus: οίσει το δωρον b: οίσει δωρον q | οίσει ΒΑΥα ₂ mo Fl fir: Slav + το δωρον αύτου w omits the whole verse. |
| | (και) οίσει το δωρον αύτου | h F ^b Mcb ₂ gn Arm dpt w Or-lat ¹ | | | |
| 29 | της άμαρτίας | BAyh Makmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt b fir qu | περι της άμαρτίας | a ₂ G Arm Eth: περι δ c | |
| V 4 | ή καλοποιησαι (e omits the whole phrase) λ sup ras z ^a | Mk Fl: ή κακοποιησαι m | ο' ή καλωσ ποιησαι | BAyha ₂ Gacodpt b'w fir qu: ή καλος ποιησαι g (n omits): ή κακωσ ποιησαι δ ^a b ₂ Phil-cod-unic: x omits. | j is missing from IV 34 to VI 2. |
| | (και λαθη αύτον) άπο όφθαλμων | dpt: άπο των όφθαλ- μων gn | ο' λ' και λαθη αύτον και ούτος γνω | GMckmoxb ₂ Fl fir qu Boh Eth Lat ^r Or-lat Eus Cyr-cod όδτωσ is read by α ₂ ac ^a kmx Fl dp s f Cyr-cod: all others = c'. | προ όφθαλμων ΒΑΥα ₂ α δ w Lat ^r : προ όφθαλ- μου b': Georg = gn fi ^a prefix και ούκ έγνω: r reads this for κ. δ. γ. |
| | και ούτος γνω (except s ούτως) | see column 5. | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------|--|---|---|--|---|
| VI 22 | ρομμον αἰωνιον τω κυριω (sub θ' v) | gn bw: ρομμος αἰωνιος B ^b : ρομμος αἰωνιος τω κυριω t: ρομμον αἰωνιον b ₂ (Slav Mosq) | ο' ρομος αἰωνιος | B ^a h ₂ Mkmox F fir qu: ρομος αἰωνιος τω κυριω Gac dp Arm | Ay* omit 19-23. Slav Mosq agrees with our group gn & Lw. |
| 28 | ἐψῆται | | ο' θ' ἐψῆθη: λ' ἐψῆθησεται | BAy k b ₂ F ir ^a : ὑψῶθη c(vid): ἐψῆθηg d: q omits: all others ἐψῆθη. | |
| VII 3 | ἐπι κολλυρων ἄρτων ἀζυμιτων | gn Arm dpt (κολλυρων) | ο' ἐπ' ἄρτοις ζυμιταις | BAy ₂ Gx bw fir u: h prefixes ἐπι κολυρων: a κολλυραις: ἐπ' (l ἐν, ἄρτοις ἀζυμιταις (l -ηται:)) Mk mob ₂ Fl Sah: ἐπι κολλυραις ἄρτων ζωμιταις c Gack Sah | q is missing from VI 31 to VII 16. M. T. (VII 13) על חלה (עלה עלה) v is missing VII 5-XI 40. |
| VIII 11 | 10 b of the M. T. after 11 (παντα τα) σκευη αυτης | BAyha ₂ Mmoxb ₂ Fl } gn dpt bw fir qu } h Mmoxb ₂ Fl dpt fir } qu Boh Lat } | ο' θ' και εχρισεν την σκηνην και παντα τα εν αυτη και ερρακεν | BAy ₂ Gack (which apparently has both readings) gn bw none. | |
| 17 | κατεκαισεν | all. | α' σ' ο' ενεπρισαν | | Probably ο' is a corruption of θ'. |
| XI 31 | των θνησιμων αυτων | Mkmoxb ₂ Fl gn Arm (vid) dpt bw fir qu Boh (vid) Eth (vid) Sah (vid) Lat ^m Cyr-cod | ο' θ' ε' αυτων τεθηκοτων | BAyha, Ga Cyr-ed: dpo των τεθηκοτων c | Slav agrees with our group & its allies. |
| 42 | αυτα | k Fl gn Lat ^m απ' αυτα m | ο' αυτο | BAyha, GMacoxb ₂ dpt bw fir qu: Arm Philo omit. | Slav Ostrog agrees with our group & its allies. |

¹ So the Cambridge editors. But in Latin this would be indistinguishable from the reading of G.

TABLE III (continued)

| Reference | Reading of εψαυ | Authorities agreeing with this group | Hexaplar note of υ or ς where υ is missing | Authorities presenting the reading attributed by the note to ε' (the LXX) | Remarks |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|--|
| XII 4 | καθισεται αι ημεραι svz (ej omit al) | BA (-ησεται) h ax gn p bw qu BAyha ₂ Mcmoxb ₂ gn dpt bw fir qu | ο' καθισθησεται ο' α' θ' ημεραι | B ^b ya ₂ GMkmo _b Fl t fir Gak Fl ej | d καθισσεθε: c corrupt. |
| XIII 2 | ελευσεται | Mmoxb ₂ Fl dpt Arm fir qu Boh Eth Lat ^v : ελευσεται Cyr-cod: εισελευσεται n | ο' λ' εχθησεται | BAya ₂ Gack bw. προσ-αχθησεται h: εισαχθη g | Georg agrees with our group & its allies. |
| 16 | εις λευκον (υ λευκον) | c gn Arm dpt Boh: λευκον h ^{bv} Mkmob ₂ l r qu Lat | ο' λευκη | BAyha ₂ Gax F fi: λευκην bw | Slav agrees with our group & its allies. |
| 25 | τριχα λευκην (sub θ' υ) | Mkmo _b Fl dpt fir qu Boh ^w (vid) Eth (vid) Lat | ο' σ' θριξ λευκη | BAya ₂ acx Boh ^l Sah pr η gn bw | G is wanting XIII 17-49: h λευκον θριξ. |
| 29 | (1) εαν υ (sub σ'): (2) ψ εαν sz: (3) ψ αν ej εν αυτω | (1) εαν BAYha ₂ Arm Cyr (2) ψ εαν Mc ^{a7} k m (ου) ο x Fl(o) g dpt bw f(o)ir Boh Sah Or-gr (3) ψ αν ac ^a b ₂ n qu gn Sah ^a | ο' εως αν γενηται εν αυτοις: α' οταν γενηται εν αυτω: θ' οτι γενηται εν αυτω | BAyha ₂ Mackoxb ₂ Fl dpt bw fir qu | εως αν appears to be a corruption of ω εαν or ω αν: Slav Ostrog = (2). m Arm Sah ^m omit. So too Georg. |

| | | | | | | |
|------|----|--|--|--|--|---|
| XIII | 30 | ἐν αὐτῇ | BAγ ₂ Mmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt fi qu | ο' θ' ἐν αὐτῷ | h ak bw r: αὐτα c(vid) | |
| | 36 | (της) ξανθίζουσης | koxb ₂ dpt ir qu: ξανθου- σης f: ξανθίζουσης M | θ' ο' της ξανθης: σ' . . . στιλβης | BAγha ₂ a c m(omits της) Fl gn bw | Slav Mosq agrees with our group & its allies. |
| | 38 | αὔγασματα αὔγαζοντα (sub θ' v) | yha ₂ Macmoxb ₂ F t bw fi u: αὔγαζοντα αὔγασ- ματα dp: αὔγασματι αὔγαζοντα g: αὔγασμα- τος n*: αὔγαζοντα l: αὔγασματα g Eth (vid) | ο' αὔγασμα αὔγαζον | Sah (vid): B*A k r Cyr- cod αὔγασμα αὔγαζοντα | |
| | 44 | λεπρος ἐστιν | BAy ha ₂ Mmox b ₂ Fl fir qu | ο' θ' ο' λεπρος ἐστιν ἀκα- θαρτος ἐστιν | ack g Arm dpt bw: λεπρος ἀκαθαρτος ἐστιν η | |
| XIV | 8 | ξυρρησεται | a ₂ F gn b | ο' ξυρρησεται | BAyNh Mkob ₂ dpt w fir qu: ξυρρησεται ac k ^b mx l | N begins in XIII 59: G's wanting XIV 6- 32: Ger rg agrees with our group & its allies. |
| | 21 | (ἐαν δε) πενης ἡ | M(mg)koxb ₂ g dpt fi qu Eth (vid) Lat ^s (vid): πενης η | ο' ἐαν δε πενηται | BAyNha ₂ Macm Fl bw r | Slav Georg agree with our group & its allies. |
| | 29 | (το δε καταλειφθεν) ἐλαιον (sub θ' v) | kmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt fir qu | ο' ο' το δε καταλειφθεν του ἐλαιου | yNha ₂ Mac bw: δω του ἐλαιου BA Sah | Georg agrees with ο'. |
| | 33 | προς Μωυσην (λεγων) ejvz (s inserts και προς 'Ααρων) | x | λ' ο' προς Μωυσην και προς 'Ααρων | Gs Arm (vid): προς Μωυ- σην και 'Ααρων BAyNha ₂ Mackmob ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir qu | Georg adds <i>et Aaroni</i> . |
| | 34 | ἐν κληρω | M(mg) oxb ₂ dpt θ(mg) fi Boh Cyr | ο' ἐν κτησει: οί λ' εις κατα- σχαιειν | BAyNha ₂ GMackm Fl gn bw r qu: Thdt omits. | |

TABLE III (continued)

| Reference | Readings of ejsvz | Authorities agreeing with this group | Hexaplar note of v or s where v is missing | Authorities presenting the reading attributed by the note to s' (the LXX) | Remarks |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|---|
| XV 1 | είπεν | M(mg) ob ₂ fir qu Eth ^f Lat ^r | ο' λ' έλαλησεν | BAyNha ₂ Mackmx Fl gn dpt bw | G is missing XIV 49-XV 25: Slav Mosq agrees with our group & its allies. |
| 2 | λαλησον (τοις υίοις 'Ισραηλ) (και) έρεις προς αυτους | BAyNha ₂ Mmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw ir qu BAyNha ₂ Mamoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw ir qu y Mmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir qu | ο' λ' λαλησατε τοις υίοις 'Ιηλ και έρειτε αυτοις | ack f Eth Lat ^a ck f Eth Lat ^a BANha ₂ ack | Slav agrees with our group & its allies: Lat <i>ad eos</i> . |
| 9 | έπισαγμα | Moxb ₂ Fl r qu Boh Eth Lat ^a | ο' έπισαγμα δνου | BAyNa ₂ ac gn dpt bw fi: έπισαγμα νοτου k* 130 of Holmes Eth | h is missing XV 8-33 m omits 7-9. y is missing from the third word of XV 12-XVI 34. |
| XV 12 | και σκευος | BAya ₂ Mackmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir qu | λ' ο' και παν σκευος | BAa ₂ ox F i | N is not quoted apparently through an oversight: Slav Ostrog=(1) t is missing XV 14-XVI 7: k omits XV 27. |
| | (1) νιφθησεται jsvz (2) πλυθησεται e | (1) Mack*mb ₂ l gn bw f qu (2) e k ^a pt r: πληθησεται d | ο' θ' νιφθησεται | | |
| 27 | ακαθαρτον νz (οι ejs) | | ο' θ' ο' ακαθαρτος | BANa ₂ GMacmob ₂ Fl gn dp ejs bw fir qu καθαροι x | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|----|---|--|---|---|--|
| XVI | 5 | δυο τραγουσ [see sepa | rate table on the oc | currences of this word | in this chapter <i>supra</i> | p. 509] |
| | 10 | ώστε (ἐξίλασασθαι) (s omits) | M fir qu : ώs dpt | ο' α' του (ἐξίλασασθαι) | BANha ₂ Gackmox Fl gn bw : b ₂ omits. Gackx s(mg) Sah | |
| | 22 | (ἐφ' ἑαυτω) τας ἀνομιαι | BANha ₂ Mmob ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir qu Mmob ₂ Fl gn Arm dpt fir qu Boh Eth Lat (vid) Cyr ½ Thdt | ο' σ' θ' ἐφ' ἑαυτω πασαι τας ἀδικιας αὐτων | BANha ₂ Gackx bw | |
| | 34 | ἐξίλασασθαι (sub α' v) | ob ₂ ir u : ἐξίλασσαι f | ο' λῶ ἐξίλασκεισθαι | BANha ₂ GMackmx Fl gn dpt bw Na ₂ ck s(mg) z (mg) | q is missing from XVI 12. G is missing XVII 10- XVIII 28. |
| XVII | 10 | (και) ἐπιστησω το προσωπον μου (ἐπι την ψυχη) | BAyh Mamoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir u BAyh Mmoxb ₂ Fl gn dpt bw fir u | ο' και στησω την ψυχη μου ἐπι την ψυχη | Na ₂ ack s(mg) z (mg) Or-lat | |
| XVIII | 4 | και πορευεσθε (j-σεσθε) | Mb ₂ Fl b' ir Boh Eth Luc : και πορευεσθε j δω u : και πορευεσθαι ο Phil- cod | ο' α' του πορευεσθαι | ckx : πορευεσθαι Ba ₂ n p Sah Clem : πορευεσθε AyNh dt Phil-ed : a ₂ g f omit. | |
| | 23 | μισερων ν (-αρων ejss) | BAyh*k*F*u | ο' μισαρων | Na ^h b ² a ₂ Mack ^b oxb ₂ F ^a η gn t b fir : μισαρων dp m : μυρον N*w x bw Eus : αὐτης a gn Arm- codd Lat : αὐτων A r | |
| | 25 | αὐτοις δι' αὐτην | ByNha ₂ Mckmob ₂ (ex corr)Fl(excorr)dpt fiu BAyNha ₂ Mackmox b ₂ Fl dpt bw fir u BAyNha ₂ Mackmox Fl gn dpt fi u | ο' αὐτη δι αὐτη[ην] : λῶ αὐτης ἐπ' αὐτην | authorities in cols 2 & 3: ἐπ' gn authorities in cols 2 & 3: αὐτης b ₂ : αὐτους bw : αὐτων r | |

In the first place, it is to be noted that by *o'* is meant a Hexaplar text that closely resembles the text of G, though it is not identical with it. It may further be said that the Hebrew it represents differs only very slightly from the Massoretic text. The most important instances are vi. 22 (M.T. 13), where the reading of G and its allies corresponds to the Massoretic text, and *o'* fails to do so; vii. 3, where gn, Arm, dpt, ejsvz, give the Massoretic text; xv. 9, where presumably *δνου* should have been obelized; xv. 12, where *o'* represents a Hebrew that differed from the Massoretic text through the dittography of the כּל of כּלִי, thus giving πσν; and xvii. 10, where *o'* and its allies have "soul" for "face." But substantially the *o'* of the notes is the text of our best Hexaplar authorities, and corresponds very closely with the Massoretic text, though here and there it has a slightly different Hebrew. Secondly, I wish to draw attention to the sources of the readings so far as they are known to us. Clearly ejsvz is connected with a recension which consciously and confessedly differs from the "LXX" of the notes, and incorporates readings some of which are known to come from Theodotion (iv. 20; vi. 22; xiii. 25, 38; xiv. 29), Symmachus (xiii. 29), and Aquila (xvi. 34). The author of this recension therefore drew on all these renderings for his material. In other cases variants are attributed to the LXX and Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, leaving us to conjecture whether the renderings adopted are pre-Hexaplar or due to some fifth interpreter or to the author of the recension himself. In the next place, no doubt is possible as to what witnesses incorporate this recension. They are gn and the Armenian and the Slavonic, and to a less extent dpt. The Armenian is not always quoted; but, if the readings of gn be examined, it will be seen that the differences are such as can be explained

either by the ordinary causes of MS. corruption (e.g. iii. 6, where gn has *θυσιας* for *θυσια*, apparently from the following *σ* of *σωτηριου*, and v. 4, *καλοσποιησαι* for *καλοποιησαι*), or else by Hexaplar influence on the one text or the other (e.g. iii. 1, where the reading of *n* is actually due to a corrector, and i. 10, where *ejsvz* omit an obelized phrase). On the other hand, stress should be laid on the number of resemblances between gn and *ejsvz* and on the curious recensional character of some of them. In i. 9, 13, 17 *ὄλοκαυτωμα* is substituted for *καρπωμα*, to represent burnt offering. In the LXX both words are used throughout this chapter as the equivalent of the same Hebrew; but, except in verse 4, gn regularly substitutes *ὄλοκαυτωμα(τα)* for *καρπωμα* (ver. 9, 13, 14, 17), and is followed by *ejsvz*, though in verse 10 *ej* read *ὄλοκαρπωματα* by a natural conflation. Other recensional readings in this list appear to be those in iv. 9; v. 4; vi. 22; vii. 3. Another feature is the agreement in vi. 28 between *ejsvz* and Slav Mosq. The following passages may be compared: vi. 6 (M.T. v. 25), ordinary reading *εἰς ὃ*, *ejsz*, Slav Mosq, *ἦς*; vi. 31 (M.T. vii. 1), ordinary reading *κριου*, *ejsz*, b', Slav Ostrog, *κυριου*; xvi. 26, ordinary reading *διασπαλμενον*, *ejsvz*, Slav Mosq, *διαστελλομενον*. These coincidences are suggestive, in view of the fact that the Slavonic texts are probably Lucianic (so far as they are Septuagintal) and certainly late.¹ None of them suggests a different Hebrew from the ordinary Septuagint (for vi. 31 is merely a Greek corruption); but it is possible that they should all be regarded as later modifications of the Lucianic text, so far as this can be restored from our other authorities. For the present, we may leave this table with one other remark, viz. that *bw* is frequently to be found among the authorities con-

¹The translation was made in the eighth century.

TABLE IV

| Lev. X | Reading of ejsz | Other authorities for the reading | Alternative readings | Authorities for alternative readings | Remarks |
|--------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | θυμαμα | ord | θυμαματα | B ^b A gn dpt | |
| 2 | ἀπεθανοσαν | Mob, ir qu | ἀπεθανον | ord | |
| 3 | ἐστιν | ord | + το ρημα | bw Boh Sah | ord = M. T. |
| | εἶπεν 2 ^o | ord | ἐλαλησε | bw | bw = M. T. |
| 4 | υἱους του ἀδελφου | ord | ἀδελφους | bw (n omits) | bw = M. T. |
| | ὕμων | ord | + συν τοις χιτωσιν αὐ- των | h F ^b gn Arm dpt | ord = M. T. |
| 5 | συν | g Arm F ^b M(mg) | ἐν | ord | n omits the verse. |
| | εἶπεν | ord | ἐλαλησεν | bw | bw = M. T. |
| 6 | ἐλασфар | ord | pr προς | y gn dt | M. T. pr ὅ |
| | vacat | k Boh ¹ Eth | τους καταλημμενους | ord : G obelises. | |
| | ὁ θυμος | c | θυμος | ord | |
| | οἱ δε | ord | οἱ | B*Ay ₂ , t* i* | |
| | vacat | ord | ὁ | B lm fir | |
| 7 | ἐλαιον γαρ | F ^b Moxb, gn pt fir | γαρ ἐλαιον | BAyha, Gackm l d bw | |
| | | qu | | | |
| 9 | ἐαν | F ^b ob, qu | ἀν | ord (y omits) | |
| 10 | ἀκαθαρτων | ord | καθαρων | gn Arm fir Eth Lat | |
| | καθαρων | ord | ἀκαθαρτων | Philo | |
| | | | | gn Arm fir Eth Lat | |
| | | | | Philo | |
| 11 | δσα | Mkimoxb, F ^b l dpt qu | δ | BAyh Gc gn bw fir | (a a, omit) |

taining the Hexaplar reading. It may be necessary to refer again to this list at a later stage of our inquiry.

I now set out a table of noteworthy readings in chapter x., and I use "ord" to signify the ordinary Greek reading where it is unnecessary to specify in detail the authorities presenting it.

In this table ejsz separates itself from gn in some grammatical points (ver. 2, 9, 12 (*bis*)). In verse 6 we find it omitting a passage obelized by Origen; and this is a frequent feature of this text (see, e.g., its readings in i. 10; iv. 2, 5, 17; vi. 9 (M.T. 2)). It agrees with g in the characteristic *συν* for *ἐν* in verse 5, and in verses 4 and 10 its reading has been brought into accord with that of the ordinary Greek and Hebrew authorities. On the other hand, there is no trace of any Egyptian reading.

These characteristics are reproduced throughout the book. It differs from gn in grammatical points (e.g. Lev. ii. 1; viii. 35; xxii. 6), in changes to the Hexaplar or even Massoretic reading (e.g. vii. 28 (M.T. 38) ejsz and M.T. "Mount" for ordinary LXX "wilderness"); in textual corruptions (e.g. xiii. 30, ejsvz, M(mg), *λευκη* for ord. *λεπτη*), and sometimes by the addition of little explanatory glosses for which there was probably never any Hebrew equivalent (e.g. xv. 22, ejsvz add *το σωμα αυτου* after *λουσεται*; xxii. 28, ejsv(mg)z prefix *ἐκ ποιμνιου το προβατον*). On the other hand, there are passages where gn appears to have been assimilated to the Hexaplar reading, and ejsvz seems to join other authorities (such as dpt and the Armenian) in maintaining the original reading of the recension. Occasionally it happens that the group joins authorities which cannot be suspected of being Lucianic in maintaining a pre-Hexaplar reading (e.g. viii. 26, *κυριον*, M.T. and ord.; *του θεου*, ejsz, Lat, Mkmox, Fl, fir, qu; xiv.

33, *και Ἀαρων*, ord.; ejsvz, x omit). This is, however, infrequent, and may be due to the fact that the other Lucianic authorities have been assimilated to the Hexaplar text in the course of transmission. Very rarely it happens that ejsvz alone preserves an ancient Hebrew reading (e.g. xiii. 17, M.T. ord. *ידו*, ejsvz omit; xxi. 23, M.T. and ord. *το ἅγιον*; ejsvz *το ὄνομα*, which is also evidenced by the conflate readings of some other authorities.¹

It should be added that the group it represents is very numerous. In addition to ejsvz, the two MSS. of the *Catena Nicephori* appear to have belonged to the same family, as do also 16, 32, 73, and 77 of Holmes. It appears that this text was in use for church services (see Holmes's description of 16). No MS. that contains it extends beyond the *Octateuch*. Perhaps when the Cambridge editors publish their introduction to the *Octateuch*, light will be thrown upon the subject. It appears to me to be a subrecension made on the basis of a late Lucianic text with the assistance of the Massoretic text and a Hexaplar copy. It is not irrelevant to recall the fact that, in days when the *Hebraica veritas* was the ideal, Lucian's work was severely condemned. This might easily lead to a "revised version" of it such as is apparently found in these MSS. I have not found in *Leviticus* that it possesses any support from any patristic authority, and I think it is probably late. On the other hand, it is not certain that the Slavonic texts are unconnected with the text of this group.

It should be added that, within the group, ej are more closely related than any other two MSS., obviously descending from a common archetype (cp. xvi. 21).

I come now to other points that arise on this table. Sep-

¹ *το ὄνομα το ἅγιον*, kmb₂; *το ὄνομα του ἁγίου*, Slav Ostrog; *το ἅγιον ὄνομα*, u.

arate readings of bw are quoted only in the first five verses; but it is apparent, even in these, that its text is in some respects highly Hebraized. A noteworthy reading occurs in verse 4, where *συν τοις χιτωνι αυτων* is added in certain other authorities in the form in which g and the Armenian present this phrase in verse 5. The authorities are a later hand in F, gn, dpt, and the Armenian, i.e. Lucianic witnesses, and h. It will be remembered that similarly the chief Lucianic witnesses and some others added part of xvi. 22 to xvi. 10. Here, again, we probably have to deal with a Lucianic reading. With regard to h, it will be remembered that it generally goes with BAya₂; but in chapter xvi. it substitutes the Lucianic *τραγος* for *χιμαρος* on its first appearance; thereby leading to the conjecture that its text had been glossed from some Lucianic source, and a similar explanation would be in place here. Passing over smaller grammatical variations in verse 6 that may be Hesychian, we come to the transposition of "unclean" and "clean" in verse 10. The evidence of the Old Latin and Philo combined shows that this is pre-Hexaplar, and accordingly it is natural to suppose that this is one of the cases in which most of our authorities have been brought into conformity with the Hexaplar text. The unusual combination of gn and fir in isolation against all the other MSS. would thus receive a natural explanation. In verse 13 the Old Latin testifies to a pre-Hexaplar "the Lord commanded me," which may probably have replaced an earlier "the Lord commanded." The Masoretic text has "I was commanded," and apparently only l and x have retained the verb in the original active. Here *μοι* appears to be the text of Origen, *κυριος* the pre-Hexaplar preserved by dpt and fir, and *μοι κυριος* a conflate reading which has naturally arisen in most of our authorities. Pre-

sumably Lucian and Hesychius here retained the original Septuagint. In verse 18 it looks as if *εισηχθη* were the Hesychian form, and later in the same verse we have the same kind of confusion between "I was commanded" and "the Lord commanded" as in verse 13. But in this instance the Egyptian authorities all give "the Lord commanded me," merely differing as to the order of the words; and it seems clear that in this place Lucian and Origen agreed on "I was commanded," while Hesychius, whose reading here seems to be best witnessed by *y* and *ir*, read *συνηταξεν κυριος*. It is worth noticing that Flm here goes with the Egyptian group.