

ARTICLE V.

STUDIES IN THE SEPTUAGINTAL TEXTS OF  
LEVITICUS.

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

III.

IN dealing with the groups that remain to be considered we must take a short course on account of the deficiencies of the apparatus. The group fir cannot be satisfactorily treated because its members separate so often that it is frequently impossible to discover what its true reading was. It should, however, be remembered that, as was shown in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1913, the MS. f in particular often has readings which are independently attested by the Latin Vulgate, and that, however carelessly it may be written, it must always rank as one of the most important Septuagintal authorities. I desire here to indorse the remarks made about it by Dahse in his "Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage" (vol. i.), with the reservation that I do not agree with his attribution of it. The group seems to me to be, in the main, either Hesychian or pre-Hexaplar.

Moreover, the method of treating the Egyptian versions, to which allusion was made in the first article of this series, renders the task of dealing with texts that are possibly or probably Hesychian much harder than that of handling the Lucianic groups. Of the three groups that remain—the B group, the F group, and qu—the third seems to present a text that is in some ways akin to the texts of Mob<sub>2</sub>. A very

important passage for our purposes is to be found in chapter v. 2. The text of B ends with *ἀκαθάρτων*, but F<sup>b</sup>GMacb<sub>2</sub>, gn, dpt, esvz (j is here missing), qu, Arm, Eth<sup>c</sup>, Or-lat, and Eus read, with minor variations, *των ἀκαθάρτων ἢ θησιμαιοῦ ἐρπετου ἀκαθάρτου και λαθη ἀπ' αὐτου και αὐτος μεμιανται και πλημμεληση*. This is clearly an addition to the original Septuagintal text; and, in fact, the asterisk is found in some MSS., though it is differently placed. The words are present in the Massoretic text. Now it happens that, in the minor variations, Mqub<sub>2</sub>, Eth<sup>c</sup>, and Or-lat hold together almost continuously, reading, *των ἀκαθάρτων και λαθη ἀπ' αὐτου και* [Eth<sup>c</sup> omits this word] *μεμιανται*. (It should be remarked parenthetically that the Greek translators appear to have read *γρω* for the Massoretic *γρω* earlier in the verse, and to have found it differently placed: and the displacement has led to some of the trouble.) Here the addition as found in qu, etc., is not so faithful to the Massoretic text as the reading of the Lucianic authorities; while G and Eus follow a middle course, omitting the words *ἢ τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου*, but retaining the other words which qu omit. Therefore we have here four important types of reading:—

(1) The original LXX, omitting these words: this is here represented by BAy(h)a<sub>2</sub>, F\*klm, ox, bw, fir, Boh, Lat. (In h the first few words of the addition are found; but, as we have previously had occasion to notice, this MS. gives us a text which has been glossed from some Lucianic source.)

(2) The Lucianic reading, agreeing most fully with the Massoretic text, represented with minor variations by F<sup>b</sup>ac, gn, dpt, Arm, and esvz.

(3) The reading of Eusebius and G, giving us the Palestinian text.

(4) The reading of Mqub<sub>2</sub>, Eth<sup>c</sup>, Or-lat, which is here  
Vol. LXXI. No. 281. 6

more remote from the Massoretic text than either of the other two. This reading is at least as old as Origen, whose quotations are not always Hexaplar.

Clearly Hesychius must have followed either (1) or (4)—probably the former. The passage is interesting for the history of the LXX as a whole and for the antecedents of the text of *qu* in particular. It may now be recalled that in chapter xvi. 10 *qu* and *Mob*<sub>2</sub> were among the non-Lucianic authorities that presented the Lucianic addition, which in some form was probably older than Lucian, as it occurs in the Latin.

On the whole, however, I see no reason to suspect *qu* of presenting a text that is in the main Hexaplar or Lucianic. It appears to me to be one of the least distinctive and interesting of those that have come down to us. The fact that it seems to be strongly Egyptian in certain chapters of Exodus of course proves nothing for Leviticus, and it is noteworthy that it seldom seems to present readings in this book that appear to be Hesychian. My studies have led me to agree with Dahse's conclusion that this group does not bear a recensional character, and I think it goes back to an archetype which presented the *κοινή*, more or less influenced by the general mixing of texts. It is thus largely pre-Hexaplar.

In Tables IX. and X., certain readings of the B group in Leviticus xxii. and F1 in Leviticus xxv. are respectively taken as the standards. A number of the readings given merely illustrate the peculiarities of other groups (*gn*, *dpt*, etc.), which have been discussed in the previous articles and are cited for this purpose only. Such are readings in xxii. 3, 6, 10, 12, 19, 21, 23, 32; xxv. 2, 5, 6, 14, 29. It will be seen that the various groups fully retain the mutual relationships that we have already noted. Two readings in chapter

xxv. are quoted because of suggestive resemblances between Egyptian versions and particular MSS. The first is xxv. 14-15, where the misplaced *κατ* in f and the Bohairic is very important. No sense can be made of the word in this position; and the improbability that it should have been misplaced in this way independently in two different texts strongly favors the view that we have here a copyist's error that originated in Egypt. In the other passage (xxv. 29), the Sahidic,  $\alpha_2$ , and x present traces of a common origin.

Next, as to the relationship between the B group and F1. If these tables be carefully considered, it will be seen that, on the whole, these two groups are extremely alike, and that the differences between them in these two tables (apart from the usual sources of scribal error) are chiefly due to two causes: (1) Hexaplar or Hebrew influence on one of the two types (e.g. on B in xxii. 21; xxv. 2, 7, etc., on F in xxii. 5, 7, 18, etc.); and (2) slight grammatical revision of the F text (e.g. xxv. 10, *καττω*, 54). Generally speaking, the two groups belong to one and the same family. As has previously been remarked, m and k go closely with F1, though k is in many respects one of the most Hebraized of MSS. But there is one other fact to be noted, viz. that the F group rarely shares the readings of B that appear to be specifically Hesychian. This suggests that the F group goes back to an archetype which presented the *καττω* in a form similar to that on which Hesychius worked.

In Table IX., we have the readings of a new witness,  $\Delta_6$ . This is a fourth-century Sinaitic vellum text. In the readings quoted it always agrees with one or more members of the B group, except where it has a text that is peculiar to itself and may be due to individual scribal error (ver. 4, 13). It is to be observed that in verses 11, 13, and 28 it is the only

other MS. that supports members of this group; while in verses 10, 18, 19, and 31 it has readings that help to establish its close relationship to the group.

In chapter xxii. some of the more important pre-Hexaplar readings preserved by B and its allies appear to be in verses 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 18, 24, 28, and 31. In verse 22 the authorities in the fifth column seem to have kept the original LXX. In verse 30 *αὐτή* is a second rendering of אִתָּהּ, which is already represented by *ἐκείνη*. In chapter xxv. F seems to have retained pre-Hexaplar readings in verses 2 (*όταν*), 7, 32, 35, 36, and 52; while in verse 9 B and its allies appear to have a Hesychian reading, and the authorities in the fifth column have pre-Hexaplar readings in verses 10 (gn and its allies), 32, 33, and 50 (B and its allies). The addition to the text of dpt in verse 2 represents a not infrequent characteristic of this group, which seems to contain a certain number of Greek glosses over and above the class consisting of repeated phrases, which it shares with the Armenian and gn.

On the whole, it seems to me that the B group in Leviticus is descended, in the main, from a Hesychian text, though it has been influenced from other sources — particularly by the Hexaplar readings.

It may be well to note a few readings that appear to be specifically Hesychian. In ii. 13 the words *κυριω τω θεω ἱμων* appear (with minor modifications) in BAyha<sub>2</sub>, fi, bw, and Cyril; but they are omitted by the Massoretic text, all the other Cambridge MSS., the Armenian, Bohairic, Ethiopic, Latin, and Philo. It is noteworthy that the best pre-Hexaplar authorities here are on the side of the Massoretic text, and so lend special importance to Cyril's reading. In iv. 22 *καὶ ἀμαρτη* occur in BAha<sub>2</sub> (y is missing), x, b, fi, Boh<sup>w</sup>, and Cyr ½, being omitted in the Massoretic text, all the other

Cambridge MSS., Arm, Boh<sup>1</sup>, Eth, and in Cyr  $\frac{1}{2}$ . In v. 15  $\tau\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega\nu$  is read by BAy, Boh, and Cyr-ed; while most MSS., Arm, Eth<sup>c</sup>, Lat<sup>w</sup>, Or-lat, and Cyr-cod follow the Massoretic text in reading  $\tau\omega\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega$ . In vi. 30 (23) for  $\tau\omega$  = Massoretic text, A, ko, b', f, qu, M(mg), Or-lat, and Cyr-ed, read  $\tau\omicron\pi\omega$ . The testimony of Or-lat proves that this reading was pre-Hesychian, but Cyr-ed shows that it was adopted by Hesychius. In iv. 7 BAha<sub>2</sub>, w, Boh, Lat<sup>z</sup> (vid), and Cyr have  $\tau\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\kappa\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$ , where all the other Septuagintal authorities and the Massoretic text have a singular word. The fact that w here seems to present a Hesychian reading is not important, as this MS. goes back to a text that had been heavily glossed. Thus in Leviticus i. 13, 14; ii. 4, for  $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\kappa\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ , it reads  $\mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ , a corruption of Aquila's  $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ ; and in iii. 16 it actually presents  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu\ \mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  ("meaning  $\mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ ") as its text. But the other points of contact between Hesychius and bw may have importance in the ultimate tracing of the bw text.

Summing up the main results of our inquiry, we may say that, of the non-Hexaplar groups, qu and Fl do not appear to have a recensional character. Of the others, ejsvz seems to be a late recension, and gn and dpt have close relations to the Armenian and the Antiochian fathers. They show the impress of two minds, not of one; and, though nearly connected, must not be treated as a single recension. Ranged against them are BAyN  $\Delta_8$ ha<sub>2</sub> (which is largely Hesychian), and fir. Of this last group it is impossible to say much, owing to the vicissitudes which its text has undergone in transmission. Of the Hexaplar group, c has special relations to the Antiochian authorities, Mob<sub>2</sub> are connected with qu; and k and m, with Fl; o and x probably embody some

Hesychian readings. Of the B group, h has been largely glossed from some Lucianic source. Lastly, the group *bw* preserves a recension that has a marked character of its own, strongly influenced by the later Hebrew and largely recast, but containing many pre-Hexaplar readings and interesting points of contact, alike with Lucian and Hesychius. All our MSS. and groups contain pre-Hexaplar and Hexaplar readings, and all have been influenced by the general mixing of texts.

It is important to observe that the results we have attained for the book of Leviticus agree very largely with those reached by Rahlfs for the Psalter. This is the more interesting, as I had done most of the work for these articles before looking at his volume.<sup>1</sup> He holds that, in that book, B is Hesychian, that 55 (= h) contains many Hesychian readings, and that Hesychius took as the basis of his work an Egyptian text similar in character to that which formed the foundation of Origen's labors and altered it very little (p. 235). This latter finding entirely agrees with the facts we have had occasion to notice in Leviticus regarding the resemblance between the text of the B group and the F group, *Mob*<sub>2</sub>, *qu*, etc., and also the frequent separation of the authorities into two main types of text — those representing a Lucianic form and all others, either with or without Origen's asterisked or obelized passages. Further, Rahlfs points out that Lucian corrected a text that perhaps differed from the others to agree with the Massoretic, and freely altered it in many details (p. 236). This, again, fits in with the observations we have made for Leviticus. When he further adds that a Lucianic text with some modifications became the official text of the Greek Church, we are reminded

<sup>1</sup> *Septuaginta-Studien*, vol. II. (1907).

of Dahse's view that the lectionary  $d_2$  follows the text of  $d_{npt}$  in Genesis. But I think that in Leviticus there are more types of text than in the Psalms, and that this complicates the problem. In Kings he holds that the Ethiopic is pre-Hexaplar, in the Psalter mainly Hesychian. From what we have seen, it would appear that in Leviticus it certainly has a pre-Hexaplar basis. Undoubtedly in the readings we have had occasion to examine it has had none of the specifically Lucianic characteristics. Neither, on the other hand, is it quoted for distinctively Hesychian readings; but it often presents pre-Hexaplar characteristics, and is frequently seen in isolated agreement with groups or MSS. that appear to contain the  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\eta$  in a more or less unmixed form.

Further, though we have been unable to make much study of the Egyptian versions, for the reasons already noted, I think it not improbable that the remarks Rahlfs makes respecting the Sahidic in the Psalter may prove to be true of Leviticus also. He thinks that this version represents a pre-Hexaplar text which had not been influenced by a recension,<sup>1</sup> and shows with what license the text was treated. Now we have seen an addition in xxv. 2 and may note a couple of readings in the last verse of the book. To "Lord," Sah adds *Deus*; and for "to the children of Israel in Mount Sinai," it reads "in Mount Sinai to announce to the children of Israel," with Eth, which has "that he might speak" for "to announce," and f, which, however, has only the Sahidic order without its addition.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 219.

TABLE IX

Lev. XXII	Readings of BA <sub>1</sub> Nha <sub>2</sub>	Authorities agreeing with this group	Alternative readings where material	Authorities presenting alternative readings	Remarks
2	(το όνομα) το άγιον μου (BAha <sub>2</sub> )	b <sub>2</sub> Flkm js bw i u	μον το άγιον του άγιου μου	gn Arm dpt f Sah N Mac (pr μου) ox evz r	MT קדשי (שם). y begins in ver. 4: q is missing throughout the chapter: fragments of Δ <sub>6</sub> survive.
3	άγιωσις (BA) άπ' έμου	ord: -ουσις a <sub>2</sub> k r ord	άγιασις άπο προσώπου μου vacat	Nh Δ <sub>6</sub> cx F gn bw gn(om. μου) Arm dpt b <sub>2</sub> Eth <sup>e</sup>	MT מלפני
4	ό θεος ήμων λεπρα (BNha <sub>2</sub> )	Δ <sub>6</sub> Flkm dpt ord -αν Δ <sub>6</sub>	λεπρος ή ός pr η	ord Arm Boh Sah Eth A kmx gn dpt s bw f u bw	MT = ord
5	όστις (BAγ)			ord Arm Boh Sah Eth Cyr	MT שיש
6	αύτων (BAyh)	b <sub>2</sub> Arm-ed Cyr	αύτου	Na <sub>2</sub> Δ <sub>6</sub> ord Arm-codd Boh Sah Eth	MT בו
7	ούκ έδεται των (BAyha <sub>2</sub> ) έστιν αύτου (BAγ)	ord Δ <sub>6</sub> b <sub>2</sub> gn Cyr † bw	ού φαγεται pr άπο αύτου έστιν	ejsvz N ord Nha <sub>2</sub> Δ <sub>6</sub> ord Arm Boh Sah Cyr	ó σ' θ' ούκ έδεται v. MT מן MT = ord.
8	ού φαγεται (BNa <sub>2</sub> )	ord (with variations to φαγεται)	ούκ έδεται	Ay mgs of sv.	

9	αὐτο (B*Ay) (ἐαυ) δε (BAy)	Arm k r Eth	αὐτα 2 <sup>o</sup> vacat	ord Δ <sub>2</sub> ord Arm Boh (vid) Cyr	MT בו MT כִּי
	ὁ θεος (BAyha <sub>2</sub> )	Flkm dpt	vacat	N ord Arm Boh Eth Cyr-ed	MT = ord.
10	οὐ φαγεται 1 <sup>o</sup> ἡ	Δ <sub>2</sub> ckmb <sub>2</sub> Fl bw ord	οὐκ ἔδεται και	ord gn Arm dpt bw Eth	MT = gn.
	οὐ φαγεται 2 <sup>o</sup> ἐκ (των ἀρτων αὐτου)	Δ <sub>2</sub> cmb <sub>2</sub> Fl bw Δ <sub>2</sub>	οὐκ ἔδεται ἀπ' (αὐτων)	ord h	MT בו
11	(BAy)		vacat	ord Cyr	
12	των ἀπαρχων	ord	την ἀπαρχην	gn bw	MT בְּרִמְוֶה
13	λερωτ (ByNha <sub>2</sub> )	ord	pr ἀνω	A Δ <sub>2</sub> gn Arm mgs of sv	cp. LXX ver. 12: MT = ord.
	ἐκβεβλημενη (BAy Na <sub>2</sub> )	Flm fir	pr η	h Δ <sub>2</sub> ord Arm Boh	MT נ.
	ἦν (BAya <sub>2</sub> )	bw: η ον Δ <sub>2</sub>	η	ord Arm Boh Cyr	
	τον πατρικον (BAyN)	Δ <sub>2</sub> (vid) Cyr-cod †	+ αὐτης	ord Arm Boh	
	οὐ φαγεται (BAyNa <sub>2</sub> )	ord	οὐκ ἔδεται	h g a mgs of svz	
18	(συναγωγῆ) Ἰσραηλ (BAyha <sub>2</sub> )	ord	pr των υἱων pr υἱων pr filiorum	gn dpt N Fl akm bw Cyr Arm Eth	MT כִּי
	των υἱων 2 <sup>o</sup> (ByNha <sub>2</sub> )	Δ <sub>2</sub> (vid) n t Cyr-cod: post προσηλυτων g	pr ἀπο pr ἐκ vacat	A k d ord Arm Boh Eth Cyr- ed	MT = ord.
	τω θεω (BAyha <sub>2</sub> )	Δ <sub>2</sub> Flkm: κω τω θεω f	τω κω	N ord (bw om. τω) Arm Boh Eth Cyr-cod	MT = ord.
17	ἡμων (BAyha <sub>2</sub> )	ch <sub>2</sub> gn dpt bw	ἡμων	N Δ <sub>2</sub> ord Cyr-cod	



28	κυρω (BAyha <sub>1</sub> ) τα παιδια (BAyha <sub>2</sub> ) σφαζεις (BAyha <sub>2</sub> )	b <sub>2</sub> bw Δ <sub>2</sub> (vid) Arm Boh nom <i>liquet</i> Δ <sub>2</sub>	pr τω το παιδιον σφαζετε	ord Cyr ord Lat Cyr ord Arm codd Boh Eth Lat Cyr: <i>offeretis</i> Arm-ed gn Arm h Makmo Fl ejsvz ir u Boh	MT = ord. MT = ord.
29 30	χαρμοσυνης αυτη (BAyN <sub>2</sub> )	ord ord	αλευσεως vacat	ord Makmo Fl dpt ejsvz ir u d Eth lm bw k gn Arm pt	29 αυτο 30 αυτη: ο' αυτο αυτη: λ' αυτο αυτη v. It is really a second rendering of אָהַרְוֶה = <i>ekurep</i> . MT = ord: Sam = l3.
31 32	αυτας (h αυτα) οδ (το ονομα) του αγιου	Δ <sub>2</sub> m Boh <sup>w</sup> ord ord	+ εγω κυριος + μη το αγιον το αγιον μου το αγιον μου εγω κ̄ μου το αγιον εγω κ̄	ord Makmo Fl dpt ejsvz ir u d Eth lm bw k gn Arm pt	MT = ord: Sam = l3. MT אָהַרְוֶה (אָהַרְוֶה)

TABLE X

Lev. XXV	Reading of Fl	Authorities agreeing with this group	Alternative readings	Authorities presenting alternative readings	Remarks
2	δταν σαββατα	ord Eth ord	εαν pr και ποιησετε pr <i>facere</i>	BAyNha <sub>2</sub> Gcx gn dpt Sah	j and q are wanting in this chapter. MT כִּי MT שָׁבַת

TABLE X (continued)

Lev. XXV	Reading of Fl	Authorities agreeing with this group	Alternative readings	Authorities presenting alternative readings	Remarks
4	τω δε την ἀμπελον	ord ord	ἐν δε τω τον ἀμπελωνα	Maob, dpt esvz ir u n Arm Eth mgs of svz	
5	ἀγρου ἐκθερισεις	ord BAγ <sub>2</sub> m b <sub>2</sub>	ἀμητου ἐκθεριεις	gn dpt mgs of Msv ord	
6	της γης	ord	+ ὕμων	gn Arm pt (d τη γη ὕμων) bw Famg Gcx Sah	הארץ לכם MT
7	(παροικῶ) σου της γης (σου) (F)	Gckmxb <sub>2</sub> Sah a <sub>2</sub> esvz bw Eth	+ σου vacat τοις ἐν τη γη	'ord l ord	MT = Fl וְאֵשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן ... τοῖς ἐν τη γη v.
9	ἐξίλασμου	ord Thdt	ίλασμον	BAyNha <sub>2</sub> Cyr	
10	ἐνιαυτον	ord	+ ἀφσεως vacat	bw gn dpt f Boh Sah	MT = ord.
	ἐστιν πατριδα	m BA kmb <sub>2</sub> u	ἐσται μεριδα πατριαν	ord bw ord Cyr	
11	αὕτη ἔσται ὑμῶν	Mckob <sub>2</sub> dpt esvz r u: Cyr-cod (αὐτης)	ἔστιν αὕτη αὕτη	bw Arm (vid) ord: Eth pr <i>et sit vobis</i> : Boh pr <i>vobis est</i>	MT וְזֵאת
	(οὐδε) ἀμησετε	Ba <sub>2</sub> g: -ητε a u ἀμητε m	πρ μη μη ἀμησητε	GMk*: -erai c: -ηται o ord: Philo	
13	ἐν δε τω	km svz	ἐν τω	ord	

14	και άνθρωπος	ord ord	vacat έκαστος	f Boh <sup>1</sup> dpt	
15	μετα	ord	pr και	f Boh	
23	βεβαιωσιν	ord	βεβηλωσιν	Nh b, dpt bw u mgs of Msv bw u ord Boh Lat	
27	όπερ έχει	B*Ayh km r Sah	ό ύπαρχει ό ύπερχει	g Arm Eth ord	
28	αύτου ή χειρ	a, kmb <sub>2</sub>	τη χειρι έν τη χειρι ή χειρ αύτου	ord Boh Lat bw g Arm Eth ord	MT ירי = ord.
29	ήμερων	ord	+ τη πρασει αύτης ήμερολεκτος ήμερολεγδον + όγδοον + οστο αππι	dpt Arm: -δεκτος g: -δεκτον n M(mg) Gc: -δεκτον k a, x Sah	MT ימים
30	αύτης	BA m Arm Sah(vid) Cyr-ed: post όλος n.	αύτη	Gkx g dpt ord Boh Eth Cyr-cod	MT יל
31	και	ord	vacat	dpt fir Boh <sup>1</sup> Cyr-cod	MT = ord.
33	λυτρωσαμενος	BAyNha <sub>2</sub> Gckmx	λυτρωσθαι	ord	
35	(σου 1 <sup>ο</sup> ) ό μετα σου	Makmob <sub>2</sub> dpt esvz fir(om.ό) u Boh Eth Lat	vacat	ord	MT = ord.
36	κ̄ν (τον θεον) (F)	ckm gn Arm dt (p Lat om. the verse) Boh Sah	vacat	l ord	MT = ord.
43	μοχθψ (F*1)	M dpt	pr τψ	Fms ord	a ends in 43.
45	συγγενειων	k fi u Boh Eth	συγγενων	ord	
46	(έκαστος) ύμων	k r	vacat	ord	MT = ord.

TABLE X (continued)

Lev. XXV	Reading of Fl	Authorities agreeing with this group	Alternative readings	Authorities presenting alternative readings	Remarks
49	της σαρκος	km Boh	των σαρκων	ord: A adds της σαρκος later, after φυλης: h reads σαρκος for φυλης.	
50	ημερα (F*1)	km	ως	BANha, gn bw Arn Boh 1,at Famg ord Eth.	MT י'ב'ג
52	vacaṭ	km Arm Eth	ως ημερα	ord	MT = ord.
54	λυτρωσθηται	m: -εται k	και ι° λυτρωται	ord	