

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

PART I  
THE EVIDENCE

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 1. ARRANGEMENT

In this section I propose to collect all instances of quotations with a non-septuagintal text. For the sake of clearness we do well to arrange our enumeration from the point of view of attestation. Hitherto the aberrant text was connected exclusively with the two closely related mss UF which, however, neither cover the entire field of observation nor display this peculiar text throughout. The first chapter therefore deals with such passages as are found in UF or a combination of mss of which U or F form part; the second with others where, though UF are missing, the same type of aberrant text can be observed. The great majority of these instances have in common the fact that the remaining part of the evidence attests the traditional text of the Septuagint. We then present the few remaining passages in which the aberrant text is found alone.

In each chapter the arrangement of the different Philonic treatises involved will follow that of Cohn-Wendland's edition. Each quotation will be followed by explanations of its special aspects. From these certain standards of judgement will immediately emerge which, however, require some brief preliminary comment.

## 2. STANDARDS OF JUDGEMENT

### A. LEMMA ALTERATIONS

From the formal aspect the expository treatises of Philo have this much in common with the ancient commentaries on classical books, secular and Christian, that at least the main quotations head the exposition. In this kind of writing it is a common and much observed feature that the wording of the heading quotation (the 'Lemma') differs very often from the shape of text which can be inferred from the exposition. The reason for this discrepancy is that the main body of quotations has always been exposed to a degree of modification from which its parts were immune in so far as they are interwoven with the exposition, and too closely knit into the context to be subject to similar interference. The writings to which such commentaries were dedicated were considered classic in some way or other and, more than that, the o.r. in Greek was Scripture. Therefore it may have appeared advisable to keep the sacred text up to date by conforming it to the received text of a certain period other than the original commentator's. This temptation was all the more irresistible from a further point of view. Copies of expositions of classical or sacred texts (e.g. Catena) often give only the comment, whilst omitting the text upon which the author comments as this seemed easy to restore. When it was re-introduced it may have been taken from a different recension, notwithstanding the obvious fact that in this case text and exposition failed to go well together. It would even happen that mistakes

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE EVIDENCE

were made as to the identity or extent, or even place and existence, of the re-introduced quotations. All this resulted in what are technically called *Lemma alterations*.

The consequences are easily drawn. Whenever Lemma and exposition do not fit the first thing must be to check the exposition for the type of text on which it is based. This type of text, of which fragments and portions are usually still found within the exposition, can with a very high degree of certainty be supposed to be the one which the expositor used and wrote down in his book. Whatever Lemmata should prove irreconcilable with the author's own type of text are therefore bound to be secondary. Very different reasons may account for their introduction, and to these we shall turn immediately.

### B. REASONS FOR LEMMA ALTERATIONS

#### (i) *Assimilation*

One reason may be the influence exercised upon a passage by a parallel one which gives an almost identical content in different wording. Here we have to ask ourselves carefully to what extent existing variants may be due to the interference of parallel passages. The technical expression for this is *assimilation*. It explains—and rules out—many variants in the New Testament and in the Septuagint as well.

#### (ii) *Assimilation of Lemma and Exposition*

A further influence may derive from the fact that the expositor, while leaving the quotations in their original shape, in his exposition uses a different style as shown by dialect, word-formation, choice of words, and syntax. Here there are plenty of opportunities for accidental or intentional changes. An assimilation may thus affect both Lemma and exposition, and a whole scale can be imagined, beginning with slight dialectical modifications which may look like a mere matter of spelling, and ending in some complete transformation of style. This type of corruption is more likely to be found in stages of transmission more remote from the author. Changes of this kind therefore make gravely suspect any evidence in which they are detected.

#### (iii) *Influence of more recent Recensions or Translations*

When dealing with quotations from the Greek o.t. we should always remember the fact that it existed in very different forms. The Septuagint was a much revised text. During the centuries the Hebrew text underwent many changes both quantitative and qualitative, and now and then the Greek would be adapted to the contemporary Hebrew. As a result old and new mixed freely, and this all the more since Origen's Hexapla opened a way for the more recent Jewish translators, the 'Three', Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, readings of whom were freely introduced, first perhaps in the margin of the LXX, later, by copyists, in the text itself. Amongst our evidence there is hardly one MS which does not disclose some influence from these later stages of transmission. Therefore, whenever we find a seemingly striking

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## STANDARDS OF JUDGEMENT

originality in a quotation, perhaps in a successful and close connection with the Hebrew original, this must not lead us to think at once that here we certainly have something authentic that has since been lost. On the contrary we have to check such readings by comparing them with every known form of the Greek Bible, including the more recent translators, and only where any possible connection is ruled out are we likely to be facing a hitherto unknown form of text.

(iv) *Deliberate Interpolation*

There remains one type of variant, the deliberate alteration. Here we must not forget that the LXX can often be understood only by going back to the Hebrew, from which it derived some strange misunderstandings. Indeed, the LXX abounds with misunderstandings of all kinds. To-day we are able to detect many of them, because we have learned to read the Greek and the Hebrew side by side. Obviously copyists could not do so. But even authors of recensions were often bound to be at a loss, and in such cases they were likely to introduce modifications, often seemingly small ones. This they did with a good conscience, for Scripture had to make sense, and the existence of corruptions in MSS was a fact well known to these learned or semi-learned men. These are scholarly interpolations, and hardly ever extend to the expositions.

These are the main types of corruption. More than one of them may be combined in a single passage, but, of course, being incidental, this combination does not allow for generalization.

It is through the sieve of these principles that any variants in our list of quotations will have to pass. It is rather close-meshed, yet its use is not unfair.

## 3. LIST OF PASSAGES DISPLAYING AN ABERRANT BIBLE QUOTATION

A. THE ABERRANT GROUP IS REPRESENTED BY UF,  
EITHER ALONE OR WITH OTHER MSS(i) *Legum allegoriarum* I [1]§ I (Gen. 2<sup>1</sup>):

מ	MAP=Ϝ	UFL
וַיְכַלֵּוּ	καὶ συνετελέσθησαν	καὶ ἐτελέσθησαν
הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ	ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ	οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ (om. L)
וְכָל-צָבָאָם	καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν	καὶ πᾶσαι (+αἱ U) στρατιαὶ αὐτῶν

[1] 'Codices MAPUFL. accedit versio Armenia. memoriam meliorem plerumque exhibent Arm. MAP, deteriore UFL' (Cohn, I *Proll.*, p. lxxxvi).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE EVIDENCE

Philo's own exposition is obviously based on the  $\mathfrak{G}$  text of MAP: τὸν νοῦν οὐρανὸν . . . καλεῖ. κόσμος δὲ νοῦ . . . As UFL differ from MAP in the quotation only, but agree in the exposition, their difference represents a Lemma alteration which was neither in Philo's LXX nor in his mind.

Not even the use of τελείωσις in Philo's exposition supports the ἐτελέσθησαν of UFL: we find τέλειος in § 3 as well, in the interpretation of the unquestioned συνετέλεσεν of Gen. 2<sup>2a</sup> (§ 2). In both instances Philo's choice of words indicates that he does not keep the genuine meaning of his text. Into what there meant *completing* he reads the Platonic idea of *perfection*, by a pun which the Greek vocable certainly admits, but which makes no sense within the Biblical context. [1]

[1] Only the compound verb συντελεῖν for הַלֵּב is found in the Pentateuch and the other more ancient parts of the LXX. In Ruth the simple (2<sup>21</sup>, 3<sup>18</sup>) and compound (2<sup>23</sup>, 3<sup>3</sup>) are used side by side, the only variant being 3<sup>18</sup> συντ. in the recensions L<sup>b</sup>R. I Esd. displays one example of the simple (8<sup>68</sup>), which in 6<sup>4</sup> is a mere slip of B\* only, and there are a further three examples in II Esd. (1<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>17</sup>) and a contested one in Dan. Θ' 11<sup>16</sup>. For the insertion found in A alone II Rg. 22<sup>39</sup>, καὶ τελέσω αὐτούς, which fills a gap from  $\mathfrak{M}$ , betrays itself as secondary, apart from its weak attestation, by the words immediately preceding: except in a Lucianic doublet ἐξέλιπον καὶ from the parallel Ps. 17<sup>39</sup>, these read unanimously ἕως συντελέσω αὐτούς.

A similar variant is found in II Par. 7<sup>1</sup>, where  $\mathfrak{d}$ prt read ἐτέλεσεν instead of συνετέλεσεν (M. Johannesson, *Das biblische KAI EGENETO und seine Geschichte, Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforschung* liii, 1926, also printed separately, p. 195, n. 2). The provenance of these minority readings is easily settled. It is Aquila who uses τελεῖν and τελεῖσθαι consistently for הַלֵּב, whatever shades of meaning it may display. So he puts the simple verb, where  $\mathfrak{G}$  has συντελεῖν or συντελεῖσθαι (Dan. 9<sup>24</sup> and Ps. 58 (59)<sup>14</sup>). Where הַלֵּב Qal means *to languish, waste away*, he renders τελεῖσθαι, whereas  $\mathfrak{G}$  mostly uses ἐκλείπειν (Deut. 28<sup>32, 65</sup>; Ps. 30 (31)<sup>11</sup>, 68 (69)<sup>4</sup>, 71 (72)<sup>20</sup>). Equally Aquila has καὶ τέλεσον for the dubious הַלֵּבִי Prov. 24<sup>24</sup> (30<sup>1</sup>) ( $\mathfrak{G}$  καὶ παύομαι). The simple verb τελεῖν = הַלֵּב is a markedly modern feature. As shown above, it first emerges in the more recent parts of the LXX. It prevails in the N.T. Matthew particularly, when quoting from the LXX, replaces συντελεῖν by τελεῖν (Johannesson, *l.l.*). Finally τελεῖν dominates in Aquila. In the Pentateuch LXX, on the other hand, τελεῖσθαι renders כָּבַד Nifal *to bear the yoke of a god, serve him*, and this usage is reflected in a translation such as Deut. 23<sup>17(18)</sup>, where Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta I* (1841), p. 71, and Lagarde, *Mitteilungen* III, pp. 368 f., observed that the second half of the verse, . . . τελέσφορος ἀπὸ θυγατέρων . . . . τελισκόμενος ἀπὸ υἱῶν . . . , is a doublet of the first, πόρνη, πορνεύων. Here where the Hebrew reads וְשִׁבְרָה and שִׁבְרָה the authentic version calls them without reserve what they are in the eyes of the Law, whereas the doublet uses predications borrowed from the mystery religions.

The singular οὐρανός for שָׁמַיִם is considered the normal translation to such an extent that even the Hebrew expression *the heaven of heavens* would be rendered ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, as I have shown elsewhere. Therefore the Greek plural is found only once in the Pentateuch, and nowhere as a rule, whereas it is a distinct feature of the 'Three'. In the same way κόσμος is the exclusive rendering of עֲוֹלָם in the Pentateuch, whence it was taken over by the translator of Isaiah. στρατιά for עֲוֹלָם, on the other hand, is not in the Pentateuch and rare in the other books. It is, however, the uniform translation of Aquila. Symmachus is less consistent; but the few

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## LIST OF PASSAGES DISPLAYING AN ABERRANT BIBLE QUOTATION

§ 2 (Gen. 2<sup>2a</sup>):

𐤎	MAP	UFL
יְכַל אֱלֹהִים	καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς	καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς
בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἕκτη	ἐν ἡμέρα τῆ ἕκτη
מְלֶאכֶתוֹ	τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ	ἔργον αὐτοῦ
אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה	ἃ ἐποίησεν	ὃ ἐποίησεν

Here the two forms of text agree with  $\mathfrak{G}$  by displaying ἕκτη; ἕβδομη=𐤎 is found in Ep. Barn. xv and A'C'Θ' only. ἐν τῆ ἡμ. of  $\mathfrak{G}$  is closer to בְּיוֹם than both τῆ ἡμ. of MAP, which is also read by five minn. of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , and ἐν ἡμ. of UFL, which is not represented elsewhere. The plural τὰ ἔργα is confirmed by all mss in § 3. Therefore ἔργον ὁ is a Lemma alteration.<sup>[1]</sup> To sum up, these conflicting tendencies may best be reconciled by the assumption that in this quotation the variants of UFL are subsequent modifications entered into the MAP text, which here was the *Vorlage* of the UFL recension.

§ 16 (Gen. 2<sup>2b</sup>):

$\mathfrak{G}$	MAP	UFL
καὶ κατέπαυσεν	κατέπαυσεν οὖν	κατέπαυσεν οὖν
τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἕβδομη		τῆ ἕβδομῆ ἡμέρα
ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ		ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ
ὧν ἐποίησεν		ὧν ἐποίησεν

Here the two variants of UFL are of little consequence. As to the first, changes in the position of numerals and their form occur frequently, since at an earlier stage they

instances assigned to Theodotion are open to doubt. Lucian uses στρατιά=𐤎𐤅𐤛𐤏𐤁. For particulars see Appendix I.

But with this the aberrant text has not yet been fully explained. In its last words we have to give preference to the reading of FL, πᾶσαι στρατιαὶ αὐτῶν, without the αὐτῶν inserted by U. If we neglect the plural, which is not borne out by the Hebrew and may be due to adaptation to οὐρανοί rather than to mere corruption or even a different Hebrew, we have a peculiarity which is found in Aquila only, namely the deliberate avoidance of the article even against the laws of Greek speech when there is no article in the Hebrew, that is to say in all cases where a construct state or a possessive suffix does not allow for an article, because both the genitive and the suffix provide the necessary determination.

This Hebraizing usage is unmistakably distinct from the elaborate rules about the omission of the article in classical Greek (Kühner-Gerth, § 462), though there may be occasional coincidences (Blass-Debrunner, §§ 252 ff.).

Thus this sentence consists exclusively of elements which all point very clearly in the same direction; for καὶ ἡ γῆ could not have been expressed more literally than as it stands in both alternative texts.

[1] ἔργον αὐτοῦ ὁ once more follows the usage of Aquila, first by keeping the singular of the Hebrew, and secondly by omitting the article.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE EVIDENCE

may have been written in numeral letters. The omission of πάντων could be due to haplography; but this explanation does not cover the identical cases of §§ 28, 63. It is worth mention that both groups are free of two intrusions from Heb. 4<sup>t</sup> which found their way into many MSS of  $\Theta$ .

§ 18 (Gen. 2<sup>3b</sup>). Here for once UFL read ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι with  $\Theta$ , whereas MA (and Cohn) display ποιεῖν ὁ θεός.

§ 19 (Gen. 2<sup>4</sup>). ἐγένοντο in U alone is more literal than the ἐγένετο of  $\Theta$  and the majority of the Philonic MSS, as a rendering of אֲמַרְתֶּם בְּהִבְרֵיתֵיכֶם in their (heaven's and earth's) being created, when they were created. Yet the repeated quotation ὅτε ἐγένετο in § 20 does not confirm U.

§ 21 (Gen. 2<sup>4f</sup>). The peculiar aspect of this section, which extends as far as § 27, is that the variants displayed by the UFL group do not appear in the Lemma, but in the subsequent repetition of parts of it. These modifications, though formally the opposite of Lemma alterations, are materially of the same kind.

In §§ 23 f. Philo twice quotes the πᾶν of πᾶν χλωρόν, and in both instances UFL display ἅπαν, which is taken from Philo's own speech, τὸ δὲ γενικὸν ἅπαν (§ 23 end). Whereas the Lemma reads πάντα χόρτον with the great majority of the LXX evidence, UFL have 'καὶ πᾶν' φησι 'χόρτον' in § 24 (as in  $\Theta$  120 111), but 'καὶ πάντα χόρτον' with all the others later in the same paragraph.

πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι and πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατεῖλαι are taken up in different ways in Philo's exposition, the former πρὸ τοῦ is replaced in §§ 22 f. by a thrice repeated πρὶν, but there is no repeated quotation; the latter is quoted afresh in § 24, and the explanation, introduced by τουτέστι· immediately after the quotation, retains its wording. From this we realize that Philo felt free to use both πρὶν and πρὸ τοῦ; but the former appears where he moves freely, and the latter only where the quotation exercises its influence upon the words immediately following. In UFL we observe an equalizing tendency in favour of πρὶν. For they leave it unchanged in §§ 22 f., but in § 24 they put πρὶν not only in the exposition, but even in the preceding quotation. Likewise πρὸ τοῦ διασπαρῆναι (Gen. 11<sup>4</sup>) is faithfully repeated from  $\Theta$  in the long initial Lemma of *confus.* § 1 (Gen. 11<sup>1-9</sup>), but when Philo comes to expound the words (§§ 118 ff.) he lends to his repetitions his own mode of speech—φασὶ γάρ· 'πρὶν διασπαρῆναι' (118); καὶ μὴν λέγουσι· 'πρὶν ἡμᾶς διασπαρῆναι' (120). As ἡμᾶς certainly is not in the LXX nor in Philo's § 1, we may take these references to be allusions rather than exact quotations, in spite of φασὶ γάρ and λέγουσι which are among his forms of quotation. Therefore we would best confine the inverted commas to διασπαρῆναι.

Whereas ἐργάζεσθαι is unanimously read in the Lemma and the repetition § 25, UFL put ἐργάσασθαι (-σεσθαι U is a slip) in the third quotation § 27 and moreover disclose their arbitrary ways by displaying ἐργάζεσθαι instead of ἐργάσασθαι in Philo's last reference to this passage in § 29.

[1] See Appendix II.



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## LIST OF PASSAGES DISPLAYING AN ABERRANT BIBLE QUOTATION

§ 28 (Gen. 2<sup>6</sup>). UFL display two variants from the  $\mathfrak{G}$  text of MAP. Instead of  $\epsilon\kappa$  (τῆς γῆς) they put ἀπό, as does cod. H in *opif. mundi* § 131, whereas there are no variants in *post. Cain.* § 127 and *de fuga et invent.* § 178. I refer here to parallel quotations in other Philonic writings simply for the reason that in *post. Cain.* § 127 Philo's exposition reads ἡ ἀνιοῦσ' ἀφ' ἡγεμονικοῦ πηγῆ, which might induce us to see in our passage, *alleg.* 1 § 28, an influence from Philo's own speech. But as there is nothing comparable in the more immediate context it would be unwise to insist on this explanation. It could be made plausible only if the change were observed more than once. This in fact is the case with the other change, the omission of πᾶν by UFL, for exactly the same omission is in § 16 (Gen. 2<sup>2b</sup>) and § 63 (Gen. 2<sup>13</sup>) as well, in all cases against  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

§ 31 (Gen. 2<sup>7</sup>). (a) Cohn puts ἐπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπον χοῦν λαβῶν, though λαβῶν is read by U only. This he defends (*Philologus* 59, 1900, p. 531) by referring to *opif. mundi* § 134 and  $\mathfrak{G}$ ; he characterizes the omission of λαβῶν in mss of  $\mathfrak{G}$  and Philo as a secondary adaptation to the Hebrew, which does make awkward Greek, it is true. Yet Cohn's argument is open to doubt on more than one score: as to the text of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , Cohn neglects the fact that λαβῶν, apart from being attested by none of the uncials (which in itself would not mean much) appears in three different places, an uncertain position, which is the mark of a secondary intrusion from a marginal addition. In fact λαβῶν is absent from all editions except the Complutensian and the Aldine. As to Philo, if FG should be considered too slight an attestation for the omission of λαβῶν in *opif. mundi*, it can hardly be seen how Cohn could be satisfied that here, in *alleg.* 1 § 31, U should be trusted without the usual support of FL. In this we remember that in § 1 (Gen. 2<sup>7</sup>) U, by inserting αἶ, had destroyed the idiomatic peculiarity of its group. We should also remember that in § 19 where U alone displays the aberrant text its reading is disclaimed by the following paragraph.

(b) γῆς MAP] χθονός UFL. Here γῆς is amply borne out by the following exposition: γήινος three times in § 31; ἀνθρωπον τὸν ἐκ γῆς, νοῦς. . . γεώδης § 32; γῆν, γήινος § 90 (and *opif. mundi* § 134). χθών for  $\pi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is of a more recent texture, as will be seen in the note on *heres* § 162 (p. 61).

(c) εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν UFL Arm.] ε. ψ. ζωῆς MAP. In a repeated quotation which forms part of the exposition § 32 ζωῆς is even read unanimously. But in Philo's own words which immediately precede this second quotation we read an uncontested εἰς ψυχὴν. . . νοεράν καὶ ζῶσαν ὄντως. As was maintained by Cohn (*l. l.*, pp. 529f.), ζωῆς in both passages is a mere corruption. It was caused by the preceding πνοὴν ζωῆς. Cohn less plausibly suggests Gen. 1<sup>30</sup> as a starting point. So the change could be explained alternatively as deriving from the immediate context or from a similar passage. [1]

[1] A glance at the other passages in which Gen. 2<sup>7</sup> is quoted is instructive for more than one reason. The correct ζῶσαν is found without variants in *somn.* 1 § 34. In *det. pot.* § 80 only U, which is of a different character here, displays ζῶσαν, whereas the others read ζωῆς. ζωῆς is read

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-62400-9 - Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible

Peter Katz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## THE EVIDENCE

§ 43 (Gen. 2<sup>8</sup>). ἔθετο] ἔθηκεν UFL. The latter is not confirmed by the repeated quotation in § 47, nor is there any variant to the ἔθετο of Gen. 2<sup>15</sup> which is quoted in § 53 (cf. p. 43, n. 1). So we must assert a Lemma alteration.

§ 52 (Lev. 19<sup>23</sup>):

ⲙ	Ⲅ	MAP (κελεύει)	UFL
ⲛⲉⲣⲗⲉⲧⲏⲙ ⲉⲣⲗⲏⲧⲏ	καὶ περικαθαριεῖτε τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ	περικαθαρίσαι τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ	καθαρίσαι τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν αὐτοῦ

The simple καθαρίσαι is nowhere used for *circumcise*, and ἀκαθαρσίαν is alluded to by ἀκάθαρτον in the exposition. The UFL text, on the other hand, finds its explanation from the Hexapla.

As Cohn has maintained against E. Nestle (the discussion in *Philologus* 59, 1900, pp. 257f. and 524ff.), the LXX nowhere retains the crude Hebrew imagery which speaks of the *prepuce of the heart* or the *ears* or the *lips*; this extreme literalness was only introduced by the more recent Jewish translations. With his feeling for variation the translator of Exodus renders עַרְל שְׂפָתַיִם by ἄλογός εἰμι in 6<sup>12</sup>, and by ἰσχνόφωνός εἰμι in 6<sup>30</sup>. In Lev. 26<sup>41</sup> הָעַרְלִי is ἡ ἀπεριτέμητος, as in Jer. 6<sup>10</sup>, 9<sup>26(25)</sup> Ezek. 44<sup>9</sup>; אֵת עַרְלֹת לְבַבְּךָ Deut. 10<sup>16</sup> is τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν, as in Jer. 4<sup>4</sup>. The hexaplaric tradition of Lev. 19<sup>23</sup> displays ἀκροβυστ(ι)εῖτε τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν αὐτοῦ, anonymously in Mv, with οἱ λοιποὶ in Field's sources, and also ἀκρόβυστον for עַרְלִים ~ ἀπερικάθαρτος Ⲅ in the continuation. This is Aquila, and Aquila only, as indicated by the following parallels: Exod. 6<sup>12, 30</sup> ἀκρόβυστος χεῖλεισιν; Deut. 10<sup>16</sup> τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν καρδίας ὑμῶν, also Jer. 9<sup>26(25)</sup>, Ezek. 44<sup>9</sup>. Therefore the identical text found in the Origenian and Lucianic evidence of Jer. 4<sup>4</sup> is bound to be Aquila as well. In Lev. 26<sup>41</sup> Ⲙⲁⲙ. presents the same aspect. In Jer. 6<sup>10</sup> ἀκάθαρτον τὸ οὖς αὐτῶν 'A'C'' is impossible for Aquila; it belongs to Symmachus alone, as is shown by Ezek. 44<sup>9</sup>. For the rest Symmachus does not confine himself to one pattern only, in this passage no more than in others. So in Exod. 6<sup>12, 30</sup> he tallies with the freer Greek of Ⲅ by putting οὗκ εἰμι καθαρὸς τῷ φθέγματι. Therefore the UFL text can only be interpreted as being half-way between the LXX and Aquila: the noun (but not the article) was interpolated from Aquila, and the compound verb wilfully changed into the simple.

unanimously in *alleg.* III § 161, yet in *codicibus melioris notae liber deest*. For the point I wish to make *heres* § 56 is the most interesting passage. For here the papyrus, which, as will be seen later on, is excellent and greatly superior to the more recent mss, stands out alone with the mistaken ζωῆς. This admits of only one conclusion: in an archetype prior to our entire evidence both alternatives already existed, one of them—we cannot tell which—as a marginal or interlinear note. This is the conclusion to which modern research into the special ways of transmission has been driven in the case of many ancient texts. For particulars I refer to Giorgio Pasquali, *Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo* (Firenze, 1934), and Günther Jachmann, *Der Platontext (Nachrichten v.d.Ak.d. Wiss. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1941, Nr. 7, also printed separately, Göttingen, 1942).*