The *Samareitikon*, the “κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν” Marginalia in Codex M, and P. Carl 49

Bradley John Marsh, Jr.

University of Oxford, Oriental Institute, Oxford, UK

bradley.marshjr@orinst.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship between the Samaritan Greek translation of the Pentateuch, i.e., the *Samareitikon*, and an obscure 5th cent. fragmentary papyrus of Exodus, Carl 49. The latter has been recognized previously as transmitting a text of the Septuagint which was obviously revised towards some kind of Semitic source. It is argued here that the Semitic base upon which Carl 49 was revised was not Jewish but Samaritan. This is based on a textual analysis of the fragment which reveals important connections with the Samaritan textual tradition, specifically the Samaritan Targum. Further, this analysis may possibly be confirmed by external evidence, namely an obscure marginal reading designated κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν found in codex M, the heavily annotated 7th cent. Octateuch MS.

Keywords

Samareitikon – Exodus – Samaritan Targum – Codex M

1 The *Samareitikon*: A Brief Historical Introduction

Western scholars first encountered readings purported to have come from a Samaritan Greek version of the Pentateuch with the publication of the Sixtine LXX in 1587. Therein, Pierre Morin, the edition's collator, supplied at the end of each chapter selected variant readings culled from catena MSS from the Vatican Library. Some of these readings were designated by the curious moniker τὸ σαμαρειτικόν, or “the Samaritan”. This same collection of readings was

reprinted one year later in the Latin-Sixtine and was also incorporated into Johannes Drusius' commentary on the hexaplaric fragments (1622).

Editions and studies of LXX including these readings made no real significant comments on the origins or nature of this τὸ σαμαρειτικόν, that is until the same were reprinted yet again in the *London Polyglot* (1653-57) edited by Brian Walton. In his lengthy introduction, Walton noted (*Proleg.* xi, §15 and 22) that these σαμαρειτικόν readings seemed to have a special relationship with the Samaritans' Aramaic Targum (ST). Edmund Castell, who collected these in the *Polyglot's* sixth volume (that providing textual variants), put forth a stricter conclusion: the fragments labeled τὸ σαμαρειτικόν always derived from ST.¹ This WALTON-CASTELL hypothesis, namely, that there is a special, largely direct correlation between the *Samareitikon* and ST, was embraced by Frederick Field in his greatly influential 1875 edition of hexaplaric remains.² Later, Abraham Geiger in 1876 and Samuel Kohn in 1894 also accepted this hypothesis, though the former believed the σαμ-readings were merely marginal Greek glosses based on ST, while the latter argued them to be the remnants of a complete translation the Samaritans had made of their Aramaic version.³

2 The Publication of Gießen Fragments

Then in 1911, Alfred Rahlfs and Paul Glaue published two MSS from Egypt transmitting fragments of Gen and Deut dated to the 5th-6th century CE.⁴ In their study, Rahlfs and Glaue argued the fragments of Deut contained remnants of the *Samareitikon*.⁵ They based this theory primarily on the reading

1 For an outline of this early period with bibliographic references, see my "Early Christian Scripture and the Samaritan Pentateuch: A Study in Hexaplaric Manuscript Activity" (DPhil thesis, The University of Oxford, 2016), pp. 18-20.

2 *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt ...* (2 vols., Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), pp. lxxxii-lxxxiv. The Pentateuch fascicle was first published in 1871. For an English translation of Field's lengthy introduction, see *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Translated and annotated by Gérard J. Norton, with the collaboration of Carmen Hardin; Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), esp. pp. 154-156, where an English translation of Castell's conclusion is provided (see p. 156, n. 36).

3 For a brief summary of these two positions, see R. Pummer, "The Greek Bible and the Samaritans", *REJ* 157/3-4 (1998), pp. 269-358, esp. pp. 280-282 (with references).

4 *Fragmente einer griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs* (MSU 1/2, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911).

5 The readings are labelled 'Gie' in the Göttingen apparatuses. See *Deuteronomium* (J.W. Wevers [ed.], Vol. 111/2, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006²).

Αργαριζιμ⁶ found in Deut 27:4 and 12 as well as other, more minor contacts with Samaritan textual tradition.⁷ In addition to the transliterated Samaritan temple mount, Rahlfs/Glaue believed Gie’s translation of זקנים “elders” with συνετοί “wise ones” derived from ST’s חכמים.⁸ Consequentially, they held that Gie was then “identical” with the σαμαρειτικόν supposedly cited by Origen (d. ca. 254 CE), thus predating him.⁹ Yet, while maintaining there was a correspondence between τὸ σαμαρειτικόν/Gie and ST, the former could not be a translation of the latter.¹⁰ Instead, they noted that Gie at times diverges from ST, and they even felt that its translator appeared to have “directly used” LXX.¹¹ Nevertheless, they still acknowledged what is perhaps their theory’s greatest weakness,¹² admitting that no σαμαρειτικόν readings survive in Deut which could confirm their hypothesis.¹³

3 Reactions to Rahlfs and Glaue’s Findings

The most sustained challenge to the Rahlfs-Glaue hypothesis was put forth by Emanuel Tov, who held that Gie was not a translation of either the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) or ST, but a revision of LXX towards MT.¹⁴ Tov contradicted Rahlfs/Glaue by arguing that (a) translating זקנים with συνετοί cannot conclusively verify a Samaritan provenance since the same equivalency also occurs in Jewish *Targumim*.¹⁵ Likewise, (b) Αργαριζιμ cannot be a specifically Samaritan sectarian reading because the OL reads (*in*) *monte Garzin* in Deut 27:4 and 12, indicating Gie here reproduced “an ancient, not yet sectarian, variant reading”.¹⁶ Tov also argued (c) Gie’s utilization of the “Jewish” *Qere perpetuum* κύριος could

6 The form is believed to be one word; see R. Pummer, “APTAPIZIN: A Criterion for Samaritan Provenance?” *JSJ* 18 (1987), pp. 18-25.

7 *Fragmente*, pp. 55-56.

8 *Fragmente*, pp. 45-46. Rahlfs believed the same for σοφον at Gen 37:3 in the Geneva pap. (pp. 66-67).

9 *Fragmente*, p. 60.

10 *Fragmente*, p. 62. Specifically *contra* Kohn.

11 *Fragmente*, pp. 55-57.

12 As pointed out previously by E. Tov, “Pap. Giessen 13, 19, 22, 26: A Revision of the LXX?” *RB* 78 (1971), pp. 355-383, esp. p. 362.

13 *Fragmente*, p. 62.

14 “Pap. Giessen”. The article was later reissued in a revised form in his *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 439-475. For discrepancies between the data as presented in his 1971 article versus the revised form, see A. Schenker’s article referenced below (pp. 107-08, n. 12). Unless otherwise noted, I cite from the 1971 version.

15 “Pap. Giessen”, pp. 369-70.

16 “Pap. Giessen”, p. 374.

not be Samaritan because the Samaritans used the *Qere šēmā* or pronounced יהוה as *Ιαβε*.¹⁷ He also pointed out several readings which disagreed with ST. In the end, though Tov acknowledged it is possible Gie could be a Samaritan revision of LXX, he believes this scenario improbable, instead preferring to view its text simply as a revision, of unknown provenance, akin to the *recentiores*.¹⁸

Despite the influence of Tov's widely cited article, not all have followed his lead. Key to understanding Tov's analysis is his full and unqualified acceptance of the WALTON-CASTELL hypothesis, specifically Kohn's version. For example, noted Samaritanologist Reinhard Pummer, whose earlier 1987 article argued against insisting every instance of *Αργαριζμ* must derive from a Samaritan source,¹⁹ later published in 1998 the most detailed analysis of the *σαμ*-readings to date. Therein, he generally supports Tov's textual construal of Gie but differs on the final analysis. Pummer's investigation, aided by the publication of a reliable critical edition of ST edited by Abraham Tal in the 1980s, leads him to conclude that only those readings agreeing with MS J, the earliest strand of ST, are "potentially significant".²⁰ As a result, the *σαμ*-group collectively fails to show adequate exclusive correspondence to the earliest strand of ST. Thus, Pummer concludes that "it can no longer be taken for granted that the Samareitikon passages have a close affinity to [ST]".²¹ Consequently, since Pummer rejects the WALTON-CASTELL hypothesis, he does not preclude the possibility that Gie could be Samaritan.²²

More recently, Adrian Schenker contested Tov's negative assessment of Gie's alleged Samaritan provenance vis-à-vis LXX.²³ To him, scholars should expect the *Samareitikon* to have been a specifically Samaritan revision of LXX, parallel to the Jewish recensional activity evinced by the other *recentiores*.²⁴ For Schenker, *Αργαριζμ* represented the key instance where the reviser of

17 "Pap. Giessen", p. 375, from Theodoret, *Quaest. in Exod* 15. See, however, S. Lowy who argues Theodoret's information is incorrect (*The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis*, *Studia Post-Biblica* 28, Leiden: Brill, 1977, pp. 273-74, with n. 870).

18 "Pap. Giessen", pp. 376-77, esp. p. 382.

19 Pummer argued that a given occurrence of *Αργαριζμ* (or other analogous spelling) is alone insufficient to establish a Samaritan origin since the contracted toponym occurs also in Jewish, Christian, and Roman sources suggesting that this terminology had drifted beyond the Samaritan community itself.

20 "The Greek Bible", p. 306. Examples include Gen 49:24, Exod 8:17(21), 9:4, 10:7(a), 13:13, 16:31, 28:11, Lev 25:5, 26:24, Num 29:1, and 31:16.

21 "The Greek Bible", p. 310.

22 "The Greek Bible", p. 310.

23 "Textgeschichtliches zum Samaritanischen Pentateuch und Samareitikon zur Textgeschichte des Pentateuchs im 2. Jh. v. Chr.", in Menachem Mor and Friedrich V. Reiterer (eds.) *Studia Samaritana: Samaritans—Past and Present* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 105-121.

24 "Textgeschichtliches", p. 119.

Gie tipped his hand (following Rahlfs/Glaue), since הרגרזים was never *transliterated* anywhere in LXX.²⁵ Tov’s interpretation of the OL of Deut 27:4 is irrelevant since the translator still *translated* הר (via Greek) with *mons*.²⁶

Most recently, Jan Joosten has argued against both Tov’s categorization of Gie as well as Pummer’s denying significance to σαμ-readings agreeing with ST MSS other than J. Instead, Joosten accepts a modified version of the WALTON-CASTELL hypothesis contending that the Samaritans revised LXX in accordance with their own evolving Hebrew text and exegetical traditions (i.e., ST and their reading tradition).²⁷ Indeed, he asserts that agreements between Gie and LXX probably reflect an era when the Samaritan community regarded LXX as common property between themselves and “Jerusalem-based Judaism”.²⁸ As for their Targum, Joosten believes that “Samaritan traditions, like Jewish ones, are multiple, and sometimes contradictory”.²⁹ Thus, σαμ-readings agreeing with ST MSS other than J (e.g., Gen 50:19, Exod 13:13, Lev 25:5) are not a problem; further, even those disagreeing with ST possibly represent exegesis the MS tradition no longer preserves (e.g., Exod 3:22; 16:31). Thus, Joosten holds ST was not the *Samareitikon*’s only *Vorlage* but merely “one of the inputs which went into the production of the *Samareitikon*”.³⁰

Whether one adheres to either Tov’s, Pummer’s, or Joosten’s construal of the WALTON-CASTELL hypothesis, it can be held with confidence that the *Samareitikon* likely had a meaningful relationship to ST. Determining the nature of this relationship more precisely, however, requires additional evidence.

4 The κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν Marginalia in Codex M

Codicologically speaking, as Joosten has recently pointed out, the earliest attributed σαμαρειτικόν readings are not in hexaplaric sources, nor is there any evidence whatsoever showing Origen encountered or was otherwise

²⁵ “Textgeschichtliches”, pp. 109–11.

²⁶ “Textgeschichtliches”, pp. 110–12. Schenker’s treatment of the OL evidence is particularly helpful.

²⁷ “Septuagint and Samareitikon” in Cana Werman (ed.), *Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), pp. 1–15, esp. pp. 14–15.

²⁸ “The Samareitikon and the Samaritan Tradition” in Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch. (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012* (WUNT 325, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), pp. 346–59, esp. 358. See also his “Septuagint and Samareitikon”, pp. 13–15.

²⁹ “The Samareitikon”, p. 350.

³⁰ “The Samareitikon”, pp. 353–54.

responsible for the inclusion of Samaritan readings in the Greek MS tradition (*pace* Rahlfs).³¹ To the contrary, *σαμαρειτικόν* readings are mostly preserved in the margins of catena and other LXX MS sources, chiefly dating to the 10th cent. CE and later (*e.g.*, MSS 135, 416, 344, et al).³² Specifically, the earliest extant, attributed *σαμαρειτικόν* readings are found in codex M (BnF, Coisl. 1). Within the margins of this 7th cent. witness, three explicitly labelled readings are found at Exod 28:9, Lev 15:3, and Lev 15:8. It is further known that other, unattributed *σαμ'*-readings were transmitted in this witness' margins, since many of these are properly labeled in other sources. Thus, M's scribe(s) had clearly interacted with something called the *σαμαρειτικόν*, even if indirectly.

A matter of interest for the *σαμ'*-passages in M is the conspicuous marginal annotation *κατά Σαμαρειτών* found at Exod 3:6 and 15. These marginalia were first recorded—without comment—by Bernard de Montfaucon;³³ Field followed his lead, omitting these from his listings of *σαμ'*-readings in both his *Prolegomena* and *Appendix*.³⁴ Later analyses ignored these with respect to the *σαμαρειτικόν* fragments, save Kohn and Pummer.³⁵ At Exod 3:6, codex M (fol. 39b, left-hand margin)³⁶ produces this curious marginal note:

ΑΚ	ακ' (= α')
ΑΠΕΚΡΥΨΕΝ:	ἀπέκρυψεν:
ΚΤΑ	κατά
ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΩΝ:	σαμαρειτών:

This annotation was apparently indexed to the running text at *ἀπέστρεψεν*. From the start, it should be observed that this instance does not adhere to the

³¹ Joosten, "The Samareitikon", pp. 347-48.

³² The "Samaritan" readings in hexaplaric sources (such as those in the sources of the Syrohexapla, translated ca. 613/16-20 CE, and Procopius of Gaza, d. 538 CE) are of a very different type and are better attributed to Caesarea-based hexaplaric activity likely undertaken by Eusebius of Caesarea (d. ca. 340 CE) and his circle. For an outline of the historical data leading to this conclusion, including a hypothesis as to how a copy of the SP (in Samaritan script) could have been deciphered by Eusebius and his team, see "Early Christian Scripture". An abbreviated outline of the differences between the hexaplaric and non-hexaplaric Samaritan groups can be had in my forthcoming "The Samaritan Pentateuch in Greek" in the *Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, A. Salvesen, T.M. Law, and J. Joosten (eds.).

³³ See the reprint of his 1713 edition of hexaplaric fragments in *PG* 15:352.

³⁴ *Hexapla*, 1:85, n. 14.

³⁵ Pummer, "The Greek Bible", p. 305 (following Kohn, "Samareitikon und Septuaginta", *MGWJ* 38 [1894], pp. 1-7, 49-67, here p. 54).

³⁶ The BnF has reproduced the codex which can be had here: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84683074>.

regularly occurring format used by the scribe when recording multiple *recensiones* as providing the same variant reading for an individual lemma. Usually the scribe(s) would produce such in the format: Source¹-Source²-variant reading. Previously Kohn, basing himself on Field's edition, believed that only the Samaritan attribution should be upheld at 3:6, given that ST (here translating סתר with בסה/י, not סמר as usual) corresponds to the marginal reading.³⁷ Recent MS evidence shows Kohn's rejection of the Aquila attribution cannot be sustained.³⁸ Nevertheless, as both MT and SP have the same Hebrew סתר, it would not be unusual if both Aquila and “κατὰ σαμαρειτῶν” adopted the same Greek.

Verse 15's occurrence of this same designation is unfortunately not indexed to anything in the running text, nor is there any attending variant reading. The part of v. 15 immediately adjacent to the note (Οὕτως—Ἰακώβ) reads in precise agreement with LXX, and the only variation between MT and SP for that portion is the latter's *waw* before יצחק אלהים. Kohn attempted to connect the notation to the anonymous ἐπικέκληται recorded in another MS at v. 18. However, his reason for this is unclear; possibly, he misread Field.³⁹

The most challenging aspect of these marginalia is the unique form of the attribution. Strictly the annotation could be read to mean “against the Samaritans” or “according [to the (acc.)] of the Samaritans”. Certainly, the situation in 3:6 ostensibly admits the latter possibility. Kohn believed the laconic annotation was shorthand for κατὰ ἐρμηνείαν Σαμαρειτῶν.⁴⁰ With respect to the designations κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν and σαμαρειτικόν, however, it is important to remain open to possibilities given the very early age of the MS. With respect to “Samaritan” labels, M itself only records these here and a paltry three other instances as follows:

Exod 28:9 (fol. 38b)	ΤΟ ΣΑΜ' ΣΑΡΔΙΟΥ	τὸ σαμ' σαρδίου
Lev 15:3 (fol. 81b)	ΤΟ ΣΑΜΑΡ ΕΣΠΙΛΩΣΕΝ	τὸ σαμαρ' ἐσπίλωσεν
Lev 15:8 (fol. 81b)	ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΠΤΥΓΗ	τὸ σῶμα(sic) πτύση

37 Kohn, “Samareitikon”, p. 54.

38 See Wevers' App¹¹: ἀπεστρεψεν] α' (absc 64 321) ἀπεκρυψεν (επ. 85; ...]κρυψεν 64 321) M 64-707 85'-127(s nom)-344(s nom). Pummer, when reiterating Kohn's analysis, carefully did not deny the ascription to Aquila.

39 “Samareitikon und Septuaginta”, p. 54; also Pummer, “The Greek Bible”, p. 305. The reading ἐπικέκληται is found only in 64^{ms}.

40 “Samareitikon und Septuaginta”, p. 54.

Conspicuously, the fully spelled-out *σαμαρειτικόν* of later MSS is unrepresented. It is thus logical to presume that, to the scribe(s) of M, TO CAM', TO CAMAP', and KATA CAMAPEITΩN were one and the same; this is particularly possible since the more ambiguous designation was provided first and only later made clearer. One would rationally expect that the designation had not yet been standardized in Christian scribal circles.

But are there other possibilities? One might consult other such annotations in the witness before confirming this analysis. In fact, there are two such similar remarks also transmitted in M. The first is at Gen 19:24, where the scribe wrote *ση. (= σημειῶσαι) κατὰ Ἰουδαίων*.⁴¹ This notice served not as shorthand indicating a variant reading, but as an indicator flagging up a proof-text which was used to contradict the Judaic rejection of the Trinity.⁴² The second such occurrence, and more directly related to the present discussion, is the anonymously recorded *scholion* at Num 19:13 (fol. 111b). This note, which is identified by other sources as Apollinaris of Laodicea's (d. ca. 390 CE), states that this passage argues "very strongly" against the Samaritan denial of the resurrection.⁴³ The Samaritan denial of the resurrection was of course a common subject exploited by patristic writers, often in heresiological or exegetical works.⁴⁴ For instance, Origen discussed this in his *Comm. in Matt.* (17.29) where he expands upon Matt 22:32, observing that both the Sadducees and Samaritans rejected the resurrection. Matthew 22:32 quotes Exod 3:6 in providing a proof-text for resurrection, having Jesus add to this "He is God not of the dead, but of the living" (NRSV). This surely is the key to understanding the *κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν* note at v. 15. This is why that annotation has no marginal reading or index marker. It was placed next to the lines containing "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob", a repetition of that from 3:6, which was parroted as a proof-text (via Matt) for the resurrection against the Samaritans by Origen and others.⁴⁵

As for the note at Exod 3:6, the case is less clear. Was it meant to refer to the marginal *ἀπέκρυψεν* or to the running text a few lines above it: "I am the God

41 See Field, *Hexapla*, 1:35, n. 12.

42 For the relevant patristic references, see *La Bible d'Alexandrie. L'Genèse* (transl. with notes and introduction by M. Harl, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986), p. 182.

43 See Devreesse, R. *Les Anciens Commentateurs Grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (Fragments. tirés des Chaînes)* (Studi e Testi 201. Vatican: BAV, 1959), p. 142. See G. Dorival's partial translation in *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Les Nombres* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), p. 382.

44 See any number of examples in Pummer's *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (TSAJ 92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

45 See also Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387 CE) who followed this line of thought in his *Catechetical Lectures* (Pummer, *Early Christian Authors*, pp. 117-19).

of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (v. 6a)? If the former, then ἀπέκρυψεν may very well be one of the earliest σαμαρειτικόν readings. If the latter, then it ought to be interpreted just as the annotation at v. 15.⁴⁶ But if the scribe meant to indicate this, why was κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν not provided before (or rather above, in the MS) the Aquila reading? It should further be pointed out that no patristic evidence (that I know of) indicates that the reading ἀπέκρυψεν or ἀπέστρεψεν was ever used polemically against the Samaritans. The lemma ἀπέστρεψεν, however, was used polemically against the Jews, namely their having “turned away” from the divinity of Christ in much the same way Moses turned his face from the bush.⁴⁷ But if this kind of inference was what the scribe meant, why then did the note not also read (καί) κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, including both Jews and Samaritans? Why did he only write κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν?

As the evidence stands, Kohn’s interpretation could perhaps be cautiously upheld—but only for 3:6. In light of such ambiguity, can any further evidence shed light on this obscure marginal note?

5 Carl 49 and ἀπέκρυψεν at Exod 3.6

Irrespective of whether one is convinced by Kohn’s hypothesis, it ought to prompt examination of ἀπέκρυψεν. For this variant, certainly attested by Aquila, is also found in a peculiar Greek witness, one designated Carl 49 (Copenhagen, Univ.-Bibl. = Inv. P. Lange 32 A).⁴⁸ These fragmentary pieces⁴⁹ of parchment, dated to the latter 5th cent. CE,⁵⁰ contain a significantly revised text which was recensionally developed towards some kind of Hebrew base, a base Wevers

46 There is, in the MS, an index marker just previous to κατὰ Σαμ. which is not mirrored in either the running text or elsewhere in the margins. However, the annotation itself is to the left of the lines containing v. 6b and thus would logically be applied to something therein if not specifically ἀπέστρεψεν or ἀπέκρυψεν.

47 For which, see Cyril of Alexandria’s (d. 444 CE) comments on Exod 3:6, which were phrased more polemically by Procopius of Gaza (d. ca. 538 CE) in his *Comm. in Octateuch*. Cyril juxtaposed Moses’ turning his face away with Paul’s “unveiled faces” in 2 Cor 3:18. See F. Petit, *La chaîne sur l’Exode* (Ed. intégrale, vols. 2-3, *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 10, Lovanii: Peeters, 2000), pp. 101-02, specifically entries 92 and 93.

48 A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Supplementum* (revised by D. Fraenkel, Vol. 1, 1, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), pp. 183-84. The witness has since been assigned the Göttingen siglum 886.

49 Fragmentary attestation to Exod 3:2-6, 7-8, 12-13, 16-19 (see the *Supplementum*, p. 184, for specifics).

50 For the *editio princeps*, see A. Bülow-Jacobsen, and J. Strange, “P. Carlsberg 49: Fragment of an Unknown Greek Translation of the Old Testament (Exod. 3:2-6. 12-13. 16-19). Same

TABLE 1 Carl 49 and SP^a

	LXX	Carl 49	SP	MT
3.4	κύριος 1 ^ο	θς̄	"= Sam"	≠ יהוה
	κύριος 2 ^ο	ο θς̄	= אלהים MT SP; "F ^b "	
3.5	τα υποδημα	τα υποδηματα σου		"= מל; Sam"
3.6	αυτω	>	= SP	"= מ"
	του πατρος σου	των πρων σου	"= Sam"	≠ אבִיךָ
	απεστρεψεν δε	και απ[ε]κρυψεν	= ר(י)סת MT SP	
3.17	των Χαναν.	του χανא[...]		"= מ; Sam"
	κ. Χετταιων	κ. εθθאי[ו]	כאי = MT = ST ^j ≠ SP	
	κ. Ευ. κ. Α. κ. Φ. κ. Γ.	κ. Ευ. post κ. Γ.	"= Sam" ST	≠ MT
	Ευαιων	ευαιου		"= מ; Sam"
	Αμορραιων	-ρρεου		"= מ; Sam"
	Φερεζαιων	-ζαιου		"= מ; Sam"
	Γεργεσαιων	-σαιου	"= Sam"	> MT ^b
	Ιεβουσαιων	-σεου	= SP	"= מ"
3.18	ερεις	ερειτε (εριται cod)		"= מל; Sam"
	ινα θυσωμεν	και θυσιασωμεν	= SP	"= מ"
3.19	Φαραω	>	= SP	"= מ"

a The quotation marks indicate comments found in Wevers' apparatus.
b The Jewish *Targumim* follow MT placing Hivite after Perizzite and lacking Girsashite.

believed was MT.⁵¹ Granted, the revision of ἀπέστρεψεν with ἀπέκρυψεν, is, in isolation, hardly meaningful evidence suggesting Carl 49 contains (or was influenced by) a Samaritan recension, as MT and SP both read ר(י)סת. Yet, there are several more striking readings which militate against Wevers' assessment. Note the four listed occurrences in *Table 1* where Carl 49 = SP ≠ MT. The reverse (Carl 49 = MT ≠ SP) occurs once. And the force of this last case is mitigated by the fact that 'and the Hittite' is supported by ST ms J.

Bülow-Jacobsen and Strange earlier noted that the ms has a few readings where "one may suspect differences between the Hebrew text behind [it] and

Codex as H 16 (Strasb. inv. 748)" *APF* 32 (1986), pp. 15-21. The editors compare the fragments' script to that of codex A and place it "in the latter half of the fifth century" (p. 16).
51 *Exodus* (Edited by J.W. Wevers, Vol. 11/ 1, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), p. 16. Bülow-Jacobsen and Strange followed adding: "There is no basis for ascribing the translation to any of the translators quoted by Origen in the *Hexapla*" (p. 16).

TABLE 2 Greek renderings of note in Carl 49

	LXX	Carl 49	Notes
3.4	τι εστιν	ιδου εγω	= α' θ' ιδου εγω F ^b (s nom) 64
3.5	μη εγγισης ωδε	μη ενγισης [συ] ναρπαγγη!	= טף תקרב אל ST ^a
3.6	απεστρεψεν δε	και απ[ε]κρυσεν	= “KATA ΣΑΜΑΠΕΙΤΩΝ”?; = α' and 458
3.18	η γερουσια	[οι] συναιτοι	= ST ^b = Gie (at Deut 25:7, 8) ^c
	πορευσωμεθα	πορευθηναι	= 458 (cp. απεκρυσεν in v. 6)
3.19	προησεται ημας	[σ]υγχαρησι υμιν	rd. -σει; ^d cf. ST: ימכן יתכן A ^e שבק *M ₂

a All ST evidence with quoted according to Tal's edition: *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition, Part I. Genesis, Exodus* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1980).
b וְחִימִי ST^{VMECB} וְחִימִי Tg^N וְחִימִי ST^J וְחִימִי ST^A וְחִימִי Tg^O PJ. On the relative age of MSS VMECB, see the introduction to Tal's edition. He places M “to a large extent” within the first period of ST (pp. 104-05).
c Cp. σοφων P. Gen. Inv. 99 (Gen 37:3).
d “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 17.
e Tal defines מכן “to let, permit”; see his *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* (2 vols., Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 468 (hereafter *DSA*).

[MT]”.⁵² As an example of this, they mentioned but one place where Carl 49 agrees with SP (των πρων σου). No further examples of agreement with SP were offered, and it is unclear if the Samaritan textual tradition was taken seriously as a possible base. For instance, the reading γεργεσαιου was compared with the “Syriac text” as opposed to SP.⁵³

Equally interesting are those qualitative readings which differ from LXX provided in Table 2. Concerning Greek renderings, Bülow-Jacobsen and Strange noted certain oddities, especially Carl 49's μη ενγισης [συ]ναρπαγγη.⁵⁴ This reading, which they translated “Do not approach hastily”, prompted unease, especially as they found that “[Carl 49's] translator is usually very faithful to the Hebrew”.⁵⁵ As a result they struggled mightily to explain it. They attempted to connect the reading to the root הלם, which “like συναρπαγγη, has a connotation

52 “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 16.
53 “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 21. This is confusing since the Peshitta provides all the nations in their plural forms without mention of the Gergashites. Presumably then they meant the Syrohexapla which does not really follow.
54 Bülow-Jacobsen and Strange interpret συναρπαγγη as a single lexeme (thus *LSJ*^{suppl}, s.v.), not as two separate words (so Wevers' App^l).
55 “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 20.

of violence”.⁵⁶ While [σ]ναρπαγγι is truly unique, the rendering clearly comes from ST’s אל תקרב עטף, which Tal renders “Do not come right away”.⁵⁷ One could react similarly to their comments on [οι] συναίτοι (= συνετοί). Bülow-Jacobsen and Strange suggested this “curious” rendering was selected in order to “remove the idea of ‘old’ from the normal concept of ‘old and wise’”.⁵⁸ However, this terminology has been connected with the Samaritan exegetical understanding of Israelite eldership in previous textual studies on Gie,⁵⁹ and within the wider context of Carl 49’s above-noted variants from MT/LXX should be understood as such here.

The sum of the evidence for these admittedly small fragments appears to support the conclusion that Carl 49 indeed represents a Samaritan Greek recension, irrespective of one’s interpretation of codex M’s κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν at 3:6. Both the quantitative and qualitative agreements according with the Samaritan textual tradition (against MT/LXX) support this judgment. Carl 49 thus shows obvious markers of Samaritan exegesis, including a significant and utterly unique agreement with ST’s idiosyncratic translation of הלם. By extension, Carl 49 may then also be related to Gie, assuming Rahlfs and Glaue’s initial analysis is correct.⁶⁰

Against our conclusion, one might insist that if this is true, then the fragments designated Strass 748 (Straßburg, Pap. gr. 748), containing bits of Gen 25:19-22 and 26:3-4, must also demonstrate Samaritan tendencies since both Carl 49 and Strass 748 come from the same codex.⁶¹ However, this objection is fallacious. Ancient codices could, from time to time, transmit differing recensions for different books (even at times within the same book!), something famously illustrated by codex B, a witness which is itself a century older than Carl 49. Thus, our analysis of Carl 49 does not depend upon, nor require confirmation from, Strass 748.⁶²

⁵⁶ “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 20.

⁵⁷ See DSA, p. 265 (sub חטף עטף A || לית [א] A M*ins; הכה M; להכה m; להכה C. The Jewish *Targumim* read: להכא / להלא / לקרב להכא / להלא).

⁵⁸ “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 21.

⁵⁹ *Fragmente*, pp. 45-46; cp. Tov’s remarks above.

⁶⁰ Fraenkel’s assessment is that Carl 49(/Strass 748) are somehow related to Gie (for which he apparently follows Tov), though he provided no analysis of Carl 49’s readings (*Supplementum*, pp. 184-85 and 132).

⁶¹ “P. Carlsberg 49”, p. 15. See also *Supplementum*, p. 367 (since assigned Göttingen number 886). Wevers’ assessment for Strass 748 was similar to that of Carl 49 (see his *Einleitung*, p. 29).

⁶² Compare Rahlfs’ remarks vis-à-vis P. Gen. Inv. 99 (*Fragmente*, p. 668, n. 3).

7 Conclusions

While debate continues over the precise nature of the *Samareitikon*, and whether or not this version is truly represented by Gie, the present discussion proposes that Carl 49 is indeed a witness to a Samaritan Greek recension. For when it differs from LXX, the witness clearly aligns with SP and ST against MT and the Jewish *Targumim*. The marginal annotation κατὰ Σαμαρειτῶν as found in codex M at Exod 3:6 (not that at v. 15) might support this hypothesis—but this is not necessary. If this proves convincing, then future discussions of the textual character of other alleged fragments of Samaritan Greek should be carried out in conjunction with the above-outlined analysis.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper formed “Excursus B” of my doctoral thesis, then supported by the Clarendon Fund. A revision of that same section was later given to one of the IOSCS sessions at SBL 2016. I would like to thank Alison Salvesen, Jan Joosten, and Stefan Schorch for their helpful remarks or suggestions on various aspects of this research. Any mistakes remain my own.