THE GREEK TEXT OF THE BOOK OF RUTH:
A GROUPING OF MANUSCRIPTS ACCORDING TO
ORIGEN'S HEXAPLA 1).

BY

RAYMOND THORNHILL

Durham

An obvious step on the road to establishing Hexaplaric readings is, of course, to call in the aid of the Syro-Hexaplar version 2) which best of all has preserved for us the Aristarchian signs used by Origen; the asterisk to mark his additions to the Greek, where the Hebrew had a fuller text, and the obelus to mark the passages which, while being present in the νομική Septuagint, were lacking in the Hebrew text.

The asterisked passages of the Book of Ruth as given in the Cambridge Septuagint are i 1, 2, 12 (twice), 13, 22, ii 11, 23, iii 7 (twice), iv 1, 13, 16—thirteen occurrences in all. There is no authority in the Cambridge Septuagint for eight other instances quoted by RAHLFS as asterisked in his Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth, viz. i 8 (twice), 16, 21, ii 2, iv 120, 4 and 1320. But RAHLFS is certainly right in asserting that these passages are so marked. The Cambridge editors A. E. BROOKE and N. McLEAN 3) took, as their authority for the Syro-hexaplar evidence, LAGARDE's Bibliothecae Syriacae, following carefully the text which he printed, but apparently ignoring his footnotes. Now in i 8, LAGARDE, op. cit., p. 187, following RORDAM 4), has omitted the asterisks in his printed text, but by footnotes has duly marked them as present in the MS 5). The other six passages B-M note as obelized rather than asterisked. Here again they follow LARGARDE's text and ignore his notes. LARGARDE indeed

1) This, with some additions, is the substance of a paper read at the meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study held in Nottingham, July 1952.
2) Henceforth abbreviated as S-H.
3) Henceforth cited as B-M.
4) Libri judicium et Ruth secundum versionem Syriaco-Hexaplaparem, quos ex codice Musei Britannici nunc primum edidit, Graece restituit notisque criticae illustravit T. SKAT RORDAM. Havniae 1861.
5) FIELD, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, I, p. 479, also prints the asterisks.
found asterisks in his manuscript but, seeing that they did not square
with the evidence—for the word or words did not in fact occur in
the Masoretic text—took the liberty, in each case, of printing
an obelus in his text, while indicating the alteration in a footnote 3).
It is a pity that the Cambridge editors have marred their superb
work, rich treasure-house as it is of manuscript evidence, by failing
to note these emendations.

Let us consider these passages seriatim:

i 16 ἀναλόγα ἁμώμωτα; with the addition ἐκεῖ sub ast. S-H, read
by glnowe2 ptv.
i 21 γάρ; with the addition γάρ sub ast. S-H, read by glnowe2
ptv.
i 2 δὴ ἡ ἀπομερία. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ; with the addition Νοε民居 sub
ast. S-II, read by glnowe2 ptv.
iv 1 φιλονόμοι. καθίσον ὅδε, κρύφθει; with the addition
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τίς ἐί σύ, κρύφθει sub ast. S-H, read by (g)e2
ptv. 5)
iv 4 μετὰ. εἰ; with the addition μετὰ sub ast. S-H, read by glnoe2
ptv.
iv 13 γραμμ. καὶ ἔτεκεν; with the addition αὐτῷ sub ast. S-H, read
by bglnowe2 ptv. 3)

It is at once apparent, first, that such a use of the asterisk con-
tradicts Origen’s practice—for the asterisked words are not in
the Hebrew; and, secondly, that all these “non-Hebrew” readings
occur in a certain manuscript-family.

RAHLFS, op. cit., p. 61-66, is undoubtedly right in his explanation
of the above passages. These passages, he says, did not belong ab
initio to Origen’s recension but were a later insertion in the Sep-
tuagint-text of S-H from the text-form that is present in gln etc; 4)
the text-form in question is Lucianic with its Nebengruppe ptv; 5)
and thus we see that these additions were taken over into S-H from
the native Syrian recension of the Greek bible. 6) Similarly, in iv 110,

1) FIELD prints asterisks but, in each case, remarks in parenthesis “fortasse
obelus”.
2) g does not read ὁ δὲ εἶπεν.
3) On the presence of b vide infra iv 13.
4) Op. cit., p. 63; “... erst nachträglich aus der in 54 (= g) etc. vorliegenden
Textform in den hexaplarischen Septuagint-Text eingefügt sind.”
5) RAHLFS’ group is rather larger since he surveys a wider field of MSS. than
B-M.
Bibelrezension aufgenommen hat.”