

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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

THE HEXAPLARIC STRATA IN THE GREEK TEXTS OF DANIEL¹

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL

AN extensive and, in consequence of many other duties, protracted study of the text of Daniel has brought me to definite views upon the Hexaplaric elements in the Greek MSS and the Versions dependent upon Origen's work. As these

¹ Symbols used in this essay and in those by Drs. Benjamin and Gehman following:

- A Codex Alexandrinus
- Α Arabic Version
- B Codex Vaticanus
- Ⲅ^B Coptic-Bohairic Version
- Ⲅ^S Coptic-Sahidic Version
- c ⓪ text of the Chigi MS
- Ⓢ Septuagint
- Ⓣ Hebrew-Aramaic text
- h ⓪ text in Hippolytus
- Ⓣ Old Latin Version
- Lu Lucian
- Or[Ⓞ] Constantinopolitan-Origenian text (A-group)
- Or[Ⓣ] Palestinian-Origenian text (V 62 147)
- Q Codex Marchalianus
- Ⓢ Syriac Version ("Peshitta")
- V Codex Venetus (HP 28)
- Ⓢ Vulgate
- Γ Codex rescriptus Cryptoferratensis
- ⓪ Theodotion

The MSS figures as in Holmes-Parsons (HP), except 28 ↔ V. In Dr. Benjamin's essay a b c represent respectively V 62 147.

results affect all the uncial Greek MSS for that book except B (i. e., A Q Γ and V — Holmes-Parsons 23), the Lucianic group, and the Bohairic-Coptic and Arabic Versions (doubtless the Armenian), they are far-reaching and, if corroborated in the other biblical books, will go far in providing a genealogical scheme for the tracing of the Hexaplaric influence. While the writer finds similar results when he has experimented with the text of other O. T. books, e. g., Job, the evidence he presents here is entirely confined to Daniel. This is a brief and compact book which appears to have been handled as a unit by the translators. Also, paradoxically perhaps, its simplicity of diction in the first half and its obscurity in the second have both tended to fidelity on the part of translators, barring Ⓢ (Septuagint), so that it is an admirable subject for critical experimentation.

In the present chaos of O. T. literary criticism no general positive results have been attained either as to the placing of the Greek uncials (which are often most sophomorically cited as *implicite* prime documents, without critical treatment of them in their groups), or in regard to the authority of the secondary Versions and their affinities with the Greek groups; so that they are either over-appreciated as prime authorities or on the other hand ignored for the one thing for which they have value, i. e., as evidence for the respective Greek groups which lie back of them. As for the Greek cursives, they are almost entirely ignored; *vide* the commentaries, among which Cornill's *Ezekiel* stands out as a notable exception. Only when a scholar like Lagarde puts out a composite text of a group of minuscules (his "Lucianic" text), are those MSS generally considered, and then on the great man's authority and because he has prepared a convenient manual text. I have come to wonder whether the accepted custom of symbolizing uncials and Versions with capital letters and cursives with small, has not had a most unfortunate psychological effect upon not only young students but also scholarship. Without doubt, if we say V instead of HP 23, the MS will be far more imposing; it will find place in critical apparatus, attain aristocratic rank. But the tag does not make it of any greater

worth. Even such an admirable apparatus as that of Swete's has an unfortunate effect; it is swallowed uncritically and as exclusive of other evidence. For this line of criticism I would refer the reader to the capital remarks made by G. F. Moore, *AJSL* 29 (1912-13), pp. 39, 56.

All Greek MSS of the "Theodotionic" family (Θ) are affected by the Hexapla. Even the comparatively pure text of B has its occasional contaminations from that source. But leaving aside this unique uncial authority, with its near congeners, e. g., 89 130 h² and particularly the Old-Latin and Sahidic-Coptic, sisters of B,³ the balance of the MSS fall into three groups, which also must include the dependent Versions.

1) I begin with the Lucianic group, because it is a fairly definite quantum. This group has been determined by Lagarde, Field,⁴ and others in their study of other books, and consists, for Dan., of 22 36 48 51 231; to these should be added 229 (a MS of Theodoret's Commentary) and the Chigi Theodotonic text (= c⁵). This text exhibits the well known characteristics

² I so symbolize the citations of Dan., some two-thirds of the whole book, contained in Hippolytus's Commentary, now accessible in full in Bonwetsch's edition in vol. 1 of the Berliu Fathers.

³ The Syriac (vulgarly, Peshitta) is antecedent to Origen; see Wyn-gaarden, *The Syriac Version of the Book of Daniel*, Univ. of Penna. Thesis, Leipzig, 1923.

⁴ See Field, *Hexapla*, i, pp. lxxxiv, seq., and the summary given by Yerkes for the Prophets in his Univ. of Penna. Thesis, "The Lucianic Version of the O. T. as illustrated from Jeremiah," *JBL* 37 (1918), pp. 163 ff.

⁵ With this symbol I indicate the Chigi Theodotonic text—Holmes-Parsons 88, those editors using the same symbol also for the unique Septuagintal text appearing in the same MS, which is best indicated by Ⓞ. The latter is the one presented in Swete's edition of the Greek O. T. on the lefthand page, on the basis of Cozza's final presentation of it in his *Sacrorum Bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta graeca et latina*, Rome, 1867, which also gives the Theodotonic text; the latter is omitted by Swete in his apparatus for Θ (Theodotion), as he lists there only uncials. For earlier printed editions of both texts see Simon de Maitres (de Magistris—the editorship of the anonymous publication is disputed), *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex tetralis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari chisiano codice*, Rome, 1762; and the anonymously published reprint of the same by J. D. Michaelis, Göttingen, 1778 (also 1774). An

of Hellenistic refinements and fresh translations, a large number of which appear as doublets, which, in c, are often asterisked. It aims at including the quantum of H (i. e., the Hebrew-Aramaic text), without rejecting the additions or readings of earlier origin.

2) A text represented by a group, members of which have occasionally been recognized to be Hexaplaric, although without the extended criticism that such an important attribution should involve. This group includes, to name the more important members, A Q Γ 106 35 230 42 *et al.* (the order of the numerals expressing my empirical judgment of their relative standing in the group), and the Arabic (Λ) of the Paris and London Polyglots, and the Bohairic, Tattam's ed. (C^B). Of these A and 106 run most closely together, the one can well be used to correct its partner; faulty productions as they are, they are the best representatives of the group in the Greek. But the faults of A (as well as of 106) are so glaring that it cannot be used as authority except with most stringent criticism. Indeed the list of capital errors is formidable and appalling. And the present writer regards it as most unfortunate, if the same conditions exist elsewhere in the O. T. (as in his experience they do), that A is taken by critics and critical apparatus as an immediately usable authority for text. But fortunately we possess in the Arabic Version, which is derived from this group, by far the best testimony to its text. This result, which had become my opinion in studying the group, is corroborated by Dr. Gehman's intensive treatment of Λ which follows this essay. C^B also certainly belongs to this group, so far as my

unfortunate confusion arose through the existence of two copies of the Chigi Θ in Parsons' hands; s. Field, ii, 766, 904; Nestle, in Tischendorf's Greek O. T., ed. 6, p. xxxvii; Swete, vol. 3, p. xii; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, pp. 16 f. and esp. the latter's animadversions. Parsons had indicated both the C and the Θ text with 88; but Field replaced this number with 87 for C . This confusion has been perpetuated by Swete in his apparatus, in which 87 is the symbol of Parsons' C text; however, in his list of MSS, *Introd.* 106, Swete enumerates 87 and 88 and identifies the latter with the C text. It may be added that the presence of several printed editions of the Chigi Θ enables us to obtain a view of a Lucianic text with comfort and convenience.

study of it in translation gives me a right to speak; it demands an intensive study for itself. Q runs along with the group, with however the independence in readings which characterizes it elsewhere, and which renders the Marchalianus still an enigma; if we accept the hypothesis of Hesychian origin, then Hesychius adapted the Hexaplaric revision to a variant basal form of Θ current in Egypt.

This group exhibits all the characteristics of the Origenian revision, so far as we may argue to the latter. It contains, as a superficial examination will show, the many plusses inserted to make up the Hebrew quantum as over against the abbreviating fashion of Θ (= B); for the brevity of Θ is most often, I believe, his own doing, is not due to his Hebrew copy. The group contains further earmarks of Origen's operations; his rather pedantic, literalistic rendering of the Hebrew, after the style of his master Aquila, e. g., word order (improving even upon the literalistic Θ , who nevertheless often preserves a real translator's independence), the careful use of particles and the article (e. g., avoidance of the article with a noun whose original is in the construct case), along with often a rectification of Θ 's barbarous grammar. It is distinct from Lucian, for often the Hebrew plus is represented by different complements in the two groups. On the other hand, Lucian often and in the large, when variety of translation is not concerned, agrees with the A-group, leading us to argue that Lucian made use of Origen's apparatus, an operation we should have expected. In a word, Lucian having been identified elsewhere, we must assume for this group, whose readings are far the most extensive in both Greek MSS and Versions, a source which ultimately goes back to Origen, the biblical master of the Greek Church. But is it the closest we can get to Origen? The conflate text we may prepare from the group—for none of the Greek MSS may be taken alone—is not at all consistent in the Origenian characteristics. I confess that with my growing conviction of its Hexaplaric character I increasingly felt a reluctance to ascribe it to Origen's hand in any immediate way.⁶

⁶ Cornill (pp. 49 ff.), following Rosenmüller, *Scholias* to Eze., I, p. 36, came to exactly the same conclusion that I have reached as to the

3) There is another group of Greek MSS to be taken into consideration, one which has not the honor of a place in the usual apparatus, nor has it hitherto been studied with definite results, although two of the MSS have been an object of keen interest to certain text-critics in other books of the O. T. These MSS are HP 23 62 147. In an essay following this Dr. Benjamin presents a collation of these MSS from photographic copies obtained from Oxford and Venice especially for our work, the first such copies to be made. He presents the necessary statements to be made. Suffice it here to say that, subsequently to the time of Holmes-Parsons, 23 has come to be recognized as an uncial, and now takes its proper place with the capital letter V (Venetus), and so it is accordingly symbolized below.⁷

intimate relation of Λ with A. My own judgment cannot be better expressed than in his comment, p. 55: "Wir sehen also auch bei Λ eine reinere und unverfälschtere Gestalt der ägyptischen Rezension, als bei A"—with one exception. His characterization of the group as "Egyptian" and "Hesychian" (s. at length pp. 66 ff.) is entirely fallacious. The position in the group of the Coptic, by which he means particularly the Bohairic, and the Ethiopic (pp. 35 ff.), does not involve Egyptian origin as to text; it is to be explained best by my hypothesis of the Melchite origin of the group (see below). As for the Ethiopic, Abyssinia had its political bonds with Byzantium.

⁷ The whole of the Venetian Codex, containing Job 30 e—4 Macc., now exists in photographic reproduction in the Library of the Philadelphia Divinity School, and is at the service of scholars. The Daniel texts of 62 and 147 are similarly at hand there. These valuable reproductions,—in the case of V the first to be made—were secured through the interest of the Trustees of the Yarnall Library of St. Clement's Church, deposited in the School, and of the Faculty, who administer the fund of the Yarnall Library. I would express my particular obligations to Mr. Cowley, Librarian of the Bodleian Library and to the Librarian of St. Mark's Library at Venice, for their interest and helpfulness, as also to the excellent photographers they procured for me. It does seem passing strange that no effort was made to procure a photographic copy of the codex for Swete's edition, which has used it on basis of a collation by Klostermann for the Books of the Maccabees alone; it was excluded otherwise, because the rule of the edition allowed only the use of such MSS "as are accessible in published facsimiles and photographs" (*O. T. in Greek*, 3, p. xv).

As for 62 and 147, Field included them in his Lucianic group which he discovered in the Prophets (*Hex. i, p. lxxxviii*). He was followed in this by Klostermann, Nestle, Liebmann; see the very full summary by Yerkes, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 ff. Klostermann made a special study of the idiosyncrasies of the two MSS for Hab. 3 and came (*Analecta zur Septuaginta*, 1895, p. 51) to the conclusion that they belong in their basic text to Lucian but are decidedly contaminated from the Hexapla. Cornill in the introduction to his *Ezechiel*, pp. 104 ff., diagnosed the peculiarities of 62 as over against the Lucianic group (the same as in Dan.), with the result that it contains a large number of unique readings which manifestly betray the hand of Aquila. W. O. E. Oesterley in his *Studies in the Greek and Latin Text of the Book of Amos*, Cambridge, 1902 (unnoticed by Yerkes), also treats these two MSS, pp. 9 ff., 17 ff., and comes, for that book, to no positive conclusion; he holds that § "almost invariably goes against them in their singular element"; but while he believes that Cornill is justified in regarding 62 as non-Lucianic, nevertheless he ultimately, p. 15, classes the two in the Lucianic group, not knowing where else to place them. Dr. Yerkes came to the conclusion that they stand at the end of the Lucianic development. Thus most of the critics come to the conclusion of Lucianic origin for the two MSS. Cornill is the exception, claiming for 62 Aquilanic character, treating it under the caption "Aquila", p. 104.⁹

V has been parsimoniously treated by the critics. Lagarde notes in his famous edition of the Lucianic text, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior graece*, p. iv, that he

⁹ This group may well have different characteristics in different books, and the similarities of the MSS may equally vary in proportion. Cornill finds 147 far less characteristic than 62; cf. what he says at length on 62, p. 104 ff., and the brief comparison with 147, p. 64; but in Dan. the two run closely together. Burkitt, *Rules of Tyconius*, p. cviii, observes that "the MSS 62, 147 contain Luc. readings, but their singular element is often akin to the Old Latin." And Ranke in his *Par palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium* (containing £ for Dan.) observes (p. 410) the identity of £ with 62 and MSS of Lucianic character. For some remarks on this "Lucianic" element in £ see the conclusion of this paper.

had copied almost the whole of 23 in 1869, doubtless to be used in the Second Part which never appeared. Cornill, pp. 15, 65, assigns 23 offhand to the Lucianic group. Oesterley does not treat it. Its relation to 62, 147 is treated below. As Dr. Benjamin notes, the collation of it in HP is very inadequate.

My own first position, taken independently, agreed with Cornill's judgment. But I have to come to see that this group, along with V to a less degree, is a unique and perhaps generally faithful representative of Origen's own revision.⁹ The Aquilanic earmarks (e. g., the use of $\sigma\nu$ = RN) are just such as we know were introduced by Origen in his revision. If the A-group manifests in an inconsistent way the Aquilanic-Origenian literalness of translation, this small group carries it out consistently, so that the critic can usually predict what the readings of the group will be. The peculiar Aquilanic vocabulary is not largely represented—for it seems that Origen eschewed most of those etymological solecisms—but such cases of vocabulary occur, and these words are corroborated as doubtless Aquilanic in some other MSS.

For the character of this text, represented variously by those three MSS, I refer to Dr. Benjamin's full and exact collation which, especially in the case of V, is far more complete than that of Holmes-Parsons. He has presented them, in collaboration with the present writer, not only in their relation to \S and to Θ but also to the A-group and to Lucian. I will here but summarize my position, leaving the proof of my thesis to the demonstration of those data.

As over against my predecessors, who hold to a Lucianic *plus* Hexaplaric origin, I maintain that the group is Origenian ("Hexaplaric") with no Lucianic characteristics; and that where Lucian agrees with this group, he is dependent upon the family text of the latter—thus exactly reversing the order hitherto

⁹ Whether the text is that of the Tetrapla or the Hexapla remains to be established, and this problem is beyond my purview; we must bear in mind that the Origenian problem is complicated by his two editions, of the temporal and substantial interrelations of which we are ignorant.

assumed. The demonstration of my position lies in this: that where the A-group and Lucian agree, they agree with the group under consideration, i. e., the latter represents the common basis of the other two. And when those two groups part company with ours, generally the reason is obvious. The one or the other is affected by stylistic reasons which abhorred the pedantry of our group; or the A-group deliberately falls back upon the elder "authorized version," that of Θ , presenting I think it may be said, no readings of evident Origenian origin which are not found in our group; or Lucian introduces fresh translations, but these largely appearing in doublets (for Lucian's text was evidently a "marginal Bible").

Of these three MSS, 62 and 147, both comparatively late and poorly written, run very closely together, but with differences indicating an extensive history behind them, a token of the infinite variety that can develop between closely related congeners. They contain besides their errors many contaminations, e. g., glossed citations from Θ (common in all Θ MSS). V, a finely written MS, is by no means so consistent; it has made its deliberate selection of such readings from the family tree as it preferred, and is a far less constant witness to the group. Many of its variant readings from the received text of the Church are marked with the asterisk, indicating that it possessed a good literary tradition. Accordingly even within this small group we find varieties: V, although an uncial and much older as a MS, is not nearly as important for the determination of the text of the group as its far less respectable sisters. But it must have extracted its readings from the common progenitor or stock of 62 and 147.

In the course of a larger work on which I am engaged I have adopted the symbol Or^P for this group, i. e., "Origen-Palestinian," use of the coefficient symbol allowing room for Origen's name in other symbols. For the other, the A-group, I have for several reasons come to the conclusion that it represents the revision made by Eusebius of Caesarea for Constantine. That worthy tells the story, *Vita Constantini*, iv, 36, 37, how he was ordered by his royal patron to prepare fifty copies of the Scriptures in the finest and most exact form

for the use of the Christian throngs in his new capital, Constantinople. For this text, which I hypothetically identify with that prepared by Eusebius, I have adopted the symbol Or^C, i. e., "Origen-Constantinopolitan." For the collateral reasons which have led me to this hypothesis and the use of the corresponding symbol I refer to a footnote.¹⁰

¹⁰ When I had distinguished Or^P as primarily Origenian from the A-group I cast about for a hypothesis to place the latter group properly. It must be given a place in the history of the Bible text as an authorized version since it is the dominating group. My friend Prof. Max L. Margolis, from whom I always receive great stimulation and who has been engaged in a most rigorous piece of work on the text of Joshua, came to my help with the suggestion that I call the group Constantinopolitan, a term he had already applied to a group of his MSS; for he, too, had come to the hypothesis of a fourth revision, identical with Eusebius' work for the Emperor. At my request he has very kindly given me a statement of his results, which I here give:

"The Fourth Recension [postulated by the writer for Joshua—vs. Hexapla, Lucian, Hezychius] is C, at home in Constantinople and Asia Minor. We are helped in localizing the recension by the Armenian version (see Conybeare, *Scrivener-Muller*, ii, 151). The version is mixed, the Syro-Hexaplar entering into the make-up; but the basis is C. Jerome is ignorant of a fourth recension; but perhaps he was inexact, or the recension was in his day in process of constitution. Conybeare suspects relationship to the 50 copies ordered by Constantine from Eusebius. [The note then enumerates the members of the group for Joshua, in which appear the uncials A M V W and the Armenian.] The recension made use of Origen's Hexapla by passing over asterized elements. So far the procedure is mechanical. Elsewhere thought and skill are shown. What makes this recension noteworthy and gives it rank beside the three principal recensions, is the circumstance that the proper names often appear in a form which must have been the original antecedent to the corruptions in the *koine* present in the texts used by Origen. I suspect that C made use of the *koine* prevalent in Palestine, which naturally remained freer from corruptions; this Palestinian *koine* was only slightly touched by Theodotion; Urtheodotion is accordingly nothing but this Palestinian *koine*."

Dr. Margolis' statement, most interesting in many ways, serves me in corroborating my distinction of the A-group as one for which we must devise a hypothesis more exact than the too general name "Hexaplaric." Of course the attachment of the group to Eusebius' labors in preparing his 50 copies for Constantine is hypothetical, for we have no testimony to his handling of the text of Origen. I find that the text

While indeed we possess no detail as to the text of the Eusebian edition, we may be authorized to make the hypothesis that in the continuation of Origen's labors by Pamphilus and his younger friend Eusebius some revision of the master's text was effected. If our assumed Or^P represents the latter's text it could hardly have been acceptable to the Church for ecclesiastical use, with its variations from the received text and its literary uncouthness. We have reason to think of the Eusebian Authorized Version as a revision backwards of Origen's work, an assimilation of its more weighty gifts of scholarship, especially in regard to the plusses which brought up the Greek text to the quantum of §; with at the same time the salvage of as much of the elder text as was possible.¹¹

And the A-group, Or^C, is, as we have seen above, just such a composition, an Origenian text assimilated to the elder Bible. If this thesis is correct, we can then identify the Bible of Constantinople, as we find the Bible of Antioch in Lucian's text, both originating about the same time for similar practical purposes. And these two converge back for their Origenian background to a text which is best represented for us in Or^P.

critics in Old and New Testament only sporadically treat that illustrious event of the Eusebian edition. Credner, in his *Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanon*, 1860, pp. 205 ff., gives the most extensive study of the episode that I know of; he holds that the edition was meant to determine the authoritative canon of the Church. Tischendorf held to the view that his Codex Sinaiticus is one of Eusebius' copies, and so Gregory, *Einführung*, 434 ff. Cornill is the only O. T. critic, so far as I find, who assigns a group to "Eusebius and Pamphilus," pp. 79 ff., but he discovers it in a very different group from mine, namely in Q, the Chigi text (my c) and the Syro-Hexapla. However we may explain its origin, it is necessary to accept Dr. Margolis' view of a "Fourth Recension" in order to explain the strata of the Hexaplaric tradition.

¹¹ Just as Lucian, Pamphilus' contemporary, preserved the old along with the new. We have the same process in modern English versions. The Revised Version, not being largely approved by Church people, the American Episcopal Church authorized a "Marginal Readings Bible," in which the lector might use at his choice selected variants from the RV, given in the margin. The admirable Jewish Version has fallen back upon AV for literary style in contrast to the comparatively radical treatment of AV by RV.

One result of wide scope for all biblical criticism arises if this thesis can be corroborated for other books of the Bible, New as well as Old Testament. Codex Alexandrinus can finally be assigned for its parent text to Constantinople, and that text can be fixed as to age and genealogy—a far more important point than the fixation of the date of the MS. At present the voices of scholars are hesitant on the subject. May they become more definite for the attribution not only of A but at least of all the uncials in their proper group connections!

On the other hand Codex A is not, I believe, physically Constantinopolitan; it is Egyptian, an Alexandrian copy of the Textus Receptus of the Melchite Church in Egypt, the faithful daughter of Byzantium. A proof of this origin is found in the fact that the usual Βαλτασαρ = Belteshazzar appears in the Codex as Βαρτασαρ, i. e., the change of liquids after the rule of the Egyptian vernacular.¹² Corroboration of this view comes from Λ, the sister, but after a better master text, of A. For A is best referred to the Melchite Church in Egypt. My position was reinforced by the monograph of the Rev. J. F. Rhode, *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch* (Thesis at the Catholic University of America, 1921), who, in discussing (pp. 21 ff.) the rise of the Arabic Versions, attributes their origin to the needs of the Melchite Church. For further development of this argument I refer to Dr. Gehman's essay, in which he presents most interesting evidence for the extremely early origin of Arabic versions of the Bible.

If the above results be justified, we are placed in the happy position of being able to identify the two strata of the Origenian work, the original Tetrapla-Hexapla, witnessed to approximately by Or^P; and the subsequent. Eusebian(?),

¹² We may suppose that Daniel's second name had become current in the Coptic speech and so the change was naturally entered into the Egyptian codex. The exchange is maintained also in 51 in representing Belshazzar's name (which all other Gr. MSS represent equally by Βαλτασαρ); but after that point A uses the common Βαλτασαρ for both the king and Daniel, e. g. 512. Similarly in 111 Αμερσαρ appears for Αμελσαρ; and so 106.

revision, which became the authoritative text of the imperial Greek Church. And consequently we can locate, for Dan., the uncials A V Γ, also in large part Q, which, if they are to be used critically, must first be given their genealogical assignments. Only one stratum of the great Christian movements towards revision of the Bible text would then remain obscure, the assumed Hesychian version.

The results outlined above might be carried out indefinitely, with attempt to re-create the master text in each group by intensive study of all the Greek MSS and attendant VSS. A *caveat* however is to be entered against the ease of such an exact operation. For there must be postulated, as my experience shows, the presence of a variety of forms of the pre-Origenian text of Θ. For we discover, in addition to the revisions introduced by Origen and Lucian, a considerable number of minor variations which appear to represent variant texts of Θ, as used respectively by Origen and Lucian. There might be postulated three such varieties: the basal texts of the B-group (the eldest, Egyptian?), of Origen (Palestinian), of Lucian (Syrian). I am firmly convinced of an origin of Θ previous to the traditional assignment of "Theodotion" to the second Christian century; in which case there would be an extensive early history of that text, which may have divided into several distinct groups. This primitive element of variation must accordingly be allowed for in diagnosing the differences among the later major groups. For instance, as has long been remarked, there exist similarities between the Lucianic (or Antiochene text) and Western readings, i. e., of the Old Latin (ℒ). The same is true of Daniel. There are minor identities between Lucian and ℒ, hardly sufficient, however, to demand the hypothesis of any thoroughgoing pre-Lucianic revision. The variations among the primitive texts of Θ are those of local crystallization, similar to the phenomenon of the Oriental and Occidental texts of the Massoretic Bible. For such agreements between Lucianic readings and ℒ I would argue to an origin of the latter's text from Syria. The condition is similar to the phenomenon of the so-called Western readings in ℒ of the New Testament with their counterparts in the text of the

Eastern Scriptures, e. g., the Syriac. Antioch rather than Egypt would then have been the distributing point of the Scriptures for the West.¹³

¹³ For the problem of the relation of Lu and L cf., e. g., L. Dieu, "Retouches lucianiques sur quelques textes de la vieille version latine (I et II Samuel)," *Revue biblique*, 16 (1919), 372—403; he holds the theory that the agreements are to be explained in part by a common primitive text, and that in addition Lucianisms have been inserted by a gradual process—a complicated theory. But we have first to identify Lucian's *Vorlage* and then his own contributions. For an account and criticism of recent studies on the Lucianic text s. G. F. Moore, *AJSL* 29 (1912—13), pp. 37—62, "The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint."