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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attr</td>
<td>Apparatus listing attributions (or lack thereof) to the reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td><em>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td><em>Clavis patrum graecorum</em>, ed. M. Geerard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NonGr  Apparatus listing the text of non-Greek witnesses for a reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>Sophocles, E. A. <em>A Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B. C. 146 to A. D. 1100).</em> New York: Charles Scibner’s Sons, 1900.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var</td>
<td>Apparatus listing variants to a reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wit 1**  Apparatus listing the primary witnesses to a reading.

**Wit 2**  Apparatus listing the secondary witnesses to a reading.

**LIST OF SIGLA AND SYMBOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α′</td>
<td>Aquila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ′</td>
<td>Symmachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ′</td>
<td>Theodotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o′</td>
<td>Text of Fifth Column of Origen’s Hexapla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οι γ′</td>
<td>οἱ τρεῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οι λ′</td>
<td>οἱ λοιποί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ἑβρ′</td>
<td>τὸ ἑβραϊκόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ σαμ′</td>
<td>τὸ σαμαρειτικόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non tr</td>
<td>Non-transposed: items that are transposed in the LXX but not the Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s nom</td>
<td>No attribution is given in this manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>The Samaritan Pentateuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamJ</td>
<td>Manuscript J of the Samaritan Targum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsec</td>
<td>Translated from the Samaritan Pentateuch as per the attributed manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamsecSyh</td>
<td>Greek Samaritan Pentateuch translation, retroverted from the Syro-Hexapla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syh</td>
<td>Syro-Hexapla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SyhT</td>
<td>Syro-Hexapla, Tur Abdin Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>※</td>
<td>Asterisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>÷</td>
<td>Obelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↕</td>
<td>Metobelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>Lemnisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Following a witness (e.g., 85*) indicates original reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Following a witness (e.g., 85c) indicates a corrected reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨⟩</td>
<td>Indicates the addition of signs, letters, or words against the tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨x⟩</td>
<td>Conjectured reading of x (x = α’, σ’, θ’, ϒ’, Ω’ λ’, Ωι γ’, τὸ σαμ’, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨?⟩</td>
<td>Indicates that no attribution can be made based on known data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{}</td>
<td>Indicates an erroneous use of signs or attributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°</td>
<td>After a number (e.g., 1°) indicates the 1st occurrence, 2nd occurrence, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te</td>
<td>Reading occurs in the text of a printed edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap</td>
<td>Reading appears in the apparatus of a printed edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg</td>
<td>Reading in the margin of a Bible manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txt</td>
<td>Reading in the text of a Bible manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm</td>
<td>Reading of a Bible text from the commentary section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨l⟩</td>
<td>Indicates a problem due to the end or beginning of a line in the manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>A dot under a letter indicates that it is uncertain in the manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>Letters cannot be read in the manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[εΠει]</td>
<td>Letters in brackets are reconstructed by conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Separates words and/or phrases of a verse under discussion in the apparatus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1994, the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla was held in Oxford, UK, and was organized around the theme of creating a new edition of all hexaplaric fragments. The last comprehensive collection was published by Frederick Field in 1875, but since then, new hexaplaric materials have steadily been accumulating, and scholars have long desired an update to Field’s work. More recent developments such as critical editions of the Septuagint (LXX) and the discovery of new Syro-Hexapla manuscripts have made the Rich Seminar’s goal of a “Field for the Twenty-First Century” a more realistic possibility.

Statement of Project

The aim of this project is to produce a new, critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments for the second half of the book of Numbers (chaps. 19-36). The work will build upon Field and upon the critical edition of J. W. Wevers of the Septuagint of Numbers. In addition, it will incorporate hexaplaric materials made available since

---


3 Within about twenty-five years of Field’s work, Henry Swete noted that materials were already accumulating. Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; reprint, Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 76.


Wevers’ edition. My purpose is that this edition (1) will contribute to the study of the Greek versions of Numbers, (2) will help clarify the text history of the Greek Old Testament (OT), and (3) will contribute to the Rich Seminar’s goal of an updated Field for the entire OT.

**Background**

**History of the Hexapla and Hexaplaric Research**

Although the data is sometimes limited, many facts about the Hexapla are at least reasonably certain. According to Jellicoe, the Hexapla was completed in Caesarea and took most of the fifteen years between AD 230 and 245 to complete. For most of the OT books, the Hexapla (as can be discerned from the name) contained six columns. The first column contained an unpointed Hebrew text of Origen’s day. The second column was a transliteration into Greek of the Hebrew text. The third, fourth, and sixth columns contained, respectively, the translations of Aquila (α), Symmachus (σ), and Theodotion (θ), also known as “the Three.” The fifth column contained an edited version of the LXX from Origen’s day, although the degree of editing is debated. For

---


9 Emerton argues that the purpose of the second column was to provide a vocalization system, similar in purpose to the later Masoretic pointing. For his position and a summary of the various views, see J. A. Emerton, “The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1956): 79-87.

10 The majority view is that the fifth column contained an LXX that was corrected by Origen towards the Hebrew. For example, Marcos argues that the all the Hexaplaric “corrections” were from Origen, even when not marked with asterisks or obeli; see Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000),
some OT books Origen included as many as nine columns, adding up to three Greek translations by unknown translators. The extra three columns are known as Quinta, Sexta, and Septima.\textsuperscript{11}

The purpose behind Origen’s creation of the Hexapla has long been debated. First, Origen had some kind of text-critical emphasis behind his work. According to Origen’s testimony in his \textit{Commentary on Matthew}, he had found discrepancies among the various manuscripts, which he attributed to various causes including laziness or perversity on the part of scribes, or simply the whims of correctors. As a result, he endeavored to correct (“heal”) the discrepancies in the copies of the Old Testament using the Hebrew text and other Greek translations (mainly Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) as criteria.\textsuperscript{12} However, the nature and scope of his corrections are debated, for example whether he had a desire to restore the “true text” of the LXX.\textsuperscript{13} Second, Origen had an apologetic purpose for creating the Hexapla. In his \textit{Letter to Africanus}, Origen states that he has tried to be aware of what is missing from the LXX that is in the accepted Jewish versions, and conversely, what is in the LXX that is not in their versions. The purpose for making this knowledge available was so that Christians could be

\textsuperscript{11}See Frederick Field, \textit{Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta}, trans. G. J. Norton with C. Hardin, Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 62 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), 83-90. None of these translations is extant for the book of Numbers.

\textsuperscript{12}Origen describes this in his commentary on Matthew: πολλὴ γέγονεν ἢ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ βαθμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τάξεως τινῶν μοχθηρῶς <ἐκτε ἀπὸ ἀμελούστων> τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦστα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει <ὑπερ-> προσποδημένων ἢ ἀφαιρομένων. Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς παλαιός διαθήκης διαφωμίας θεοῦ διδάσκοντος εὐρομένη ἱστορία, κριτερίῳ χρησάμενοι τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκδόσεις (“Many differences have come about in the copies, whether from the lazziness of some scribes, or from the boldness of some wicked ones, <or from those who are negligent> in restoring the writings, or also from those who think to correct [them], adding or omitting as they see fit. We were able [lit: we found] to heal the disagreements in the Old Testament, God giving [help], using the other versions as criteria.”). Origen, \textit{Commentariorium in Matthaeum}, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 40 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935), XV, 14, 387-88.

\textsuperscript{13}Jellicoe believes that the time and labor involved with the production of the Hexapla indicate that Origen had a primarily text-critical purpose; see Jellicoe, \textit{The Septuagint and Modern Study}, 109.
prepared, and Jews would not deride them for their ignorance of the Jewish readings.\(^\text{14}\)

Third, in a more recent discussion, Law has argued based on weaknesses in assuming text-critical or apologetic concerns alone, and based on the strong exegetical concerns that motivated Origen’s life and work, that Origen had a strong if not overriding exegetical purpose for producing the Hexapla.\(^\text{15}\)

The fifth column was evidently the focus of the Hexapla, based on the amount of effort Origen expended on it. For this column, Origen used a system of symbols called Aristarchian signs to mark the differences between the LXX and the other versions. Where the Hebrew column contained text not reflected in the LXX, Origen added text from one of the Three, usually Theodotion, and placed an asterisk (\(\ast\)) before the addition. If the added text spanned more than one line, an asterisk was placed before each additional line. The end of the inserted text was marked by a metobelus (\(\downarrow\)). When the LXX contained text not included in the other versions, an obelus (\(\div\)) was placed before the text (and before any additional lines) and a metobelus was put after the text. Occasionally Origen would also combine the asterisk and obelus, for example for Proverbs to mark transpositions in the LXX.\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{14}\)Origen wrote, ‘Ἀσκούμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ’ ἐκείνος, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίοις διαλεγόμενοι μὴ προφέροιμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα εἰς τοὺς αὐτογράφους αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρησάμεθα τοῖς φερομένοις παρ’ ἐκείνος εἰ καὶ εἰ τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐ κεῖται βιβλίοις. Τοιαύτης γὰρ ὁσίας ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς αὐτούς ἐν ταῖς ζητήσεις παρασκευῆς, οὐ καταφρονήσουμεν, οὖδ’ ὡς έθαυμάσωμεν, γελάσωμεν τοὺς ἡμῶν εὐθύνουσας, ὡς τ’ ἀληθή παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα ἀγνοούσας (And we also strive not to be ignorant of the things [i.e., readings] belonging to them, so that when we converse with the Jews, we would not bring forward to them what does not lie in their writings, and so that we may avail ourselves of what is contained in them, [even] if also they [lit: it] do not lie in our books. For if we are [lit: our being] prepared for inquiries with them, they will not, as is their custom, despise or laugh at those of the Gentiles who believe for [lit: as] being ignorant of their [i.e., the Jews’] true readings). Origen, *La Lettre à Africanus sur L’Histoire de Suzanne*, trans. with an introduction by N. de Lange, Sources Chrétiennes 302 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983), §9, 534. Brock argues that Origen, rather than desiring to construct the “original text,” was interested only in providing to Christian apologists a text that would be acceptable to Jewish scholars; see Brock, “Origen’s aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament,” in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays with a Prolegomenon by Sidney Jellicoe*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1974), 343-46. Schaper contends that Origen had both text-critical and apologetic purposes; see Joachim Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla,” in Salvesen, *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments*, 3-15.


\(^{16}\)Field, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 100-04, 118. See also Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 208-10.
The history of the Hexapla can be traced through the seventh century. Because the complete work was very large – probably comprising 6,500 or more pages\textsuperscript{17} – it would have been extremely time-consuming and expensive to reproduce in its entirety; however, copies of smaller units were made. In the fourth century, Constantine ordered Eusebius to have 50 copies of the fifth column made to be spread throughout Palestine.\textsuperscript{18} In about 616, Paul of Tella translated the fifth column along with the Aristarchian signs into Syriac (this work is called the Syro-Hexapla or Syro-Hexaplar). In 638, Caesarea fell to the Muslims, and the Hexapla manuscripts may have been destroyed at that time, or they may simply have succumbed to time and neglect.

Until the end of the nineteenth century, what remained of the Hexapla was (1) manuscripts reflecting the Origenic recension of the fifth column, with only a few containing the Aristarchian signs, (2) other LXX manuscripts with marginal notes, (3) manuscripts of the Syro-Hexapla with its marginal notes, (4) catena manuscripts with attributions to one of the Three, and (5) citations from the Church Fathers. In 1578, Peter Morinus was commissioned to produce the Sixtine Edition of the Greek Bible. When this work was published in 1587, Morinus included as notes hexaplaric fragments that he had collected and edited. The following year, these hexaplaric notes were included in the annotations of Flaminius Nobilius to the Latin edition. In 1622, Johannes Drusius produced the \textit{Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta, collecta, versa, et notis illustrate} which included hexaplaric fragments with comments and a preface containing two letters, the first a discussion of the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the second a discussion of Quinta, and Sexta. After this,\textsuperscript{17,18}

\textsuperscript{17}This is Swete’s figure, based on the size of Codex Vaticanus, the OT portion of which he estimates occupied about 650 leaves with each leaf containing two pages. Swete also notes that depending on how Origen laid out the words, this estimate could be low. Swete, \textit{An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek}, 74.

Lambert Bos and Matthew Poole published works that included editions of the hexaplaric fragments.\(^\text{19}\)

The first publication devoted to Hexapla materials came from Bernard de Montfaucon in 1713.\(^\text{20}\) Field characterizes this work as not perfect, but as “extremely useful,” and says that it “held the primacy without rival in this branch of biblical knowledge for a century and a half.”\(^\text{21}\) After Montfaucon, a few other editions were produced, for example by C. F. Bahrdt, but it was left to Field to produce an update that has remained the standard for over 130 years, his *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, published in 1875. Field used Montfaucon as his base while incorporating new material and adding comments. He provided an extended prolegomena that addressed such subjects as the nature and characteristics of the Three and the anonymous editions (Quinta, Sexta, and Septima). In addition, Field advanced the study of the Hexapla by providing retroversions (back translations) into Greek of the Syriac of the Syro-Hexapla.\(^\text{22}\)

After Field’s edition of 1875, several manuscripts containing hexaplaric remains surfaced. In 1896, G. Mercati discovered fragments of the Hexapla from Psalms in the palimpsest 0.39.\(^\text{23}\) In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published a manuscript containing portions of Aquila’s translation of 1 and 2 Kings.\(^\text{24}\) Then in 1900, C. Taylor published

---

\(^{19}\) This summary comes primarily from Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 127-33, and Field, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 19-23).


\(^{21}\) Field, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 20-21.

\(^{22}\) Field had available to him Ceriani’s unpublished version of the Syro-Hexapla: A. M. Ceriani, ed., *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitiographice editus*, Monumenta Sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).


hexaplaric fragments of Psalm 22 (LXX ch. 21) from the Cairo Genizah fragments. These finds allowed scholars to confirm the columnar order suggested by ancient witnesses. By about 1900, Swete was suggesting that Field could be updated with newly discovered materials. And over sixty years later, Jellicoe asserted that a new edition that incorporated all the new materials discovered since Field would be valuable, but he was not optimistic about the work being undertaken in the foreseeable future.

The task of producing a new edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Numbers has been aided in particular by the publication of two works. The first is the Larger Cambridge Edition for Numbers by Brooke and McLean in 1911. The second and most important work for the current project is John Wevers’s Numeri, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis, published in 1982. Wevers attempted as part of his work to assemble all extant hexaplaric readings in his first and second apparatuses. He also published a text history of the Greek Numbers with a separate section covering hexaplaric materials, and another book that provides explanatory comments on the Greek text.

As noted above, in 1994 the Rich Seminar acknowledged the desirability of producing an updated Field. This task has been undertaken by the Hexapla Institute, under the auspices of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.

---

25 C. Taylor, Hebrew-Greek Cairo Geniza Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection including a Fragment of the Twenty-Second Psalm, according to Origen’s Hexapla (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).

26 Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 76.


30 J. W. Wevers, Text History of the Greek Numbers, Philologisch-historische Klasse Dritte Folge, Nr. 125 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1982).

and in conjunction with The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oxford University, and Leiden University. The Hexapla Institute’s stated purpose is “to publish a new critical edition of the fragments of Origen's Hexapla, an endeavor which might be described as, ‘A Field for the Twenty-First Century’ to be available in a print edition and as an online database.” My work for this dissertation will constitute one step towards accomplishing this goal.

**Relevance for Research**

The primary relevance of my project is in its production of a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of the second half of Numbers. Although most of the materials to be assembled are available through Wevers they are not presented in a convenient way nor do they allow for differentiating between sources. For example, Norton has noted that much of the hexaplaric material listed in the first apparatus of the Göttingen edition is not included in the second apparatus. This is because Wevers had as his goal a critical edition of the LXX, not of the Hexapla. Norton goes on to argue that Wevers’s presentation of the hexaplaric material contributes to a “leveling of the authority of the different hexaplaric sources” and this leads to a “blurring of the distinctions that need to be drawn between the various kinds of witnesses, e.g., catenae, manuscripts, marginal notes.” For this project, these limitations are addressed by combining the information from the first and second apparatuses and by making judgments about the types of readings and their reliability.

Second, this project will contribute to clarifying the text history of the LXX. Norton observes that the Hexapla is a witness to the most important Greek texts of the first two centuries A.D., and he argues that this period was significant for the process of

---

32See the Hexapla Institute website: [www.hexapla.org](http://www.hexapla.org).

development and stabilization that occurred for both Hebrew and Greek texts.\textsuperscript{34} Thus, clarifying the Greek translations will aid in the task of determining the amount and nature of that development. In addition, all attempts to recover the original Greek Septuagint translation must reckon with the effects of the Hexapla. Achieving more clarity on the contents of the Origenic recensions and of the Three will assist in those efforts.

Third, the creation of a database will contribute to compiling both an index and a lexicon of the Three.\textsuperscript{35} Although the promise of electronic databases can be overstated and due care needs to be exercised to maintain their longevity, the ability to search quickly and efficiently through the indices using a variety of search criteria will be a benefit to researchers.

Fourth, as Swete suggests, the hexaplaric materials offer promise for aiding New Testament lexicography. Many NT words do not occur in the LXX, and some rare words occur only in the hexaplaric fragments or are best represented in them.\textsuperscript{36}

Fifth, the Hexapla influenced the Church Fathers, as evidenced by their frequent references to hexaplaric readings. Thus, indirectly, the Hexapla may have influenced their theology. A critical edition of hexaplaric fragments can help shed light in this area.\textsuperscript{37}

Finally, clarifying and adding material to the known Greek texts of the Three may help with the study of rabbinic exegesis of the first centuries A.D. This is because


\textsuperscript{35}Currently, we have an index of Aquila for all the OT books (J. Reider, An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew Greek, Latin-Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence, rev. N. Turner, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 12 [Leiden: Brill, 1966]) and an index of Symmachus for the Pentateuch (Alison Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch, Jss Monograph 15 [Manchester: Victoria University of Manchester, 1991]).

\textsuperscript{36}Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 460-61.

the Three, at least in part, were developed as Jewish alternatives to the Septuagint, the latter having been adopted by the Christian church.

**Adequacy and Accessibility of Sources**

The resources required for this project are many and scattered, but most of them that were available in 1982 are included in Field and in the Göttingen critical edition of Numbers, both of which are available in the Boyce Library at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The Boyce Library also has many of the other resources necessary for this project. It has copies of the previous critical edition of the Hexapla by Montfaucon. It also has the English translation of Field’s Prolegomena. The library contains versions of the Syro-Hexapla edited by Lagarde\(^{38}\) and Vööbus,\(^{39}\) and Gottstein’s published edition of fragments.\(^{40}\) It also contains editions of the Church Fathers needed for checking patristic citations, including the recent cumulative index of citations of the Church Fathers,\(^{41}\) a work which was not available to Wevers.

**Methodology**

**The Aim of This Project**

Although the production of a critical edition of the Hexapla itself, with materials arranged in the proper columns, would be very beneficial, Norton points out that accomplishing such a task is not practical. The few fragments that we do possess do not provide enough evidence to reconstruct how the entire Hexapla was organized.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{38}\)Paul de Lagarde, *Bibliothecae syriacae a Paulo de Lagarde collectae quae ad philogiam sacram pertinent* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1892).


\(^{40}\)M. H. Gottstein, “Neue Syrohexaplafragmente,” *Biblica* 37 (1956): 162-83. The library also contains another of Gottstein’s published sets of fragments from Deut 34.


And even if we did know the number of columns and the columnar order for each book, we would not know how the different versions were aligned in the individual lines of the Hexapla.\(^{43}\)

Thus, the goal of this project is more realistic: to create a critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for Numbers 19-36. I will adopt the three categories for hexaplaric fragments outlined by Ter Haar Romeny and Gentry\(^{44}\) and used by the Hexapla Project. The first category includes asterisks and obeloi along with other explicit indications of pluses and minuses relative to the Hebrew. This material is strictly hexaplaric. The second category includes material that may have existed prior to Origen but that he incorporated into the Hexapla. This material has been transmitted to us not only through the Hexapla but also in other ways. The third category is material that is hexaplaric through its association with more strictly hexaplaric materials. It includes readings from ὁ Σύρος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν or ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν. None of these works was used in the Hexapla, but they were cited together with readings from the Three in commentaries and margins, and they have traditionally been included with hexaplaric material.

### Compiling and Presenting Information

The methodology used for this project, and presented in the following sections, mainly follows that laid out by Ter Haar Romeny and Gentry in their article on collecting hexaplaric materials for Genesis, but with some changes adopted by the Hexapla Project since that article was published.\(^{45}\)

**Choices between readings.** In some cases in Wevers’s apparatus, witnesses

---


\(^{44}\)Ibid., 287.

\(^{45}\)Ibid., 289-94.
are in conflict. As with Field, for this project I will indicate a preference for a particular reading, although my choice may differ from Field based on new information or more recent studies.

**References to secondary literature and other remarks.** At times, I will include editorial remarks or references to secondary literature to clarify or defend the choices I have made. As was the practice of Field, these will be included in a separate apparatus.

**Latin and oriental sources.** For non-Greek sources, I will present the original reading and also provide a retroversion to Greek if no equivalent Greek witness is available. In some cases, a non-Greek reading may differ slightly from the available Greek text for reasons such as translation technique and not because of a different Vorlage.46

**Variant readings from editions.** I will provide variant readings from editions of patristic sources, and include instances where an author cites the same passage more than once.

**Readings from earlier collections that can no longer be checked.** Wevers sometimes uses the indication “Field” but I will attempt to replace these with Field’s sources, and when the source can be named, Field’s name will not be mentioned. In some cases, it is not possible to go beyond the indication “Montef,” “Combef,” or “Nobil.” “Montef” refers to readings given by Montfaucon with no other indication; “Combef” indicates readings found by Montfaucon in schedis Combefisianis; and “Nobil” refers to readings given by Nobilius with no further indication.

**Other hexaplaric material.** I will include the pluses and minuses given in

---

46Ibid., 290-91.
Wevers’s first apparatus along with other evidence, for example from commentaries and manuscript margins that were not recorded in either of his apparatuses. In addition, some readings should clearly be regarded as asterisked even though they are not so marked in any manuscripts. These cases will be indicated by an asterisk enclosed in angle brackets. Also, in cases of transpositions of words or phrases that indicate hexaplaric influence, the abbreviation “non tr” will be used. 47

The text tradition of Numbers has many unnamed sources that are likely hexaplaric, for example because they come from the margins of manuscripts that have other marginal hexaplaric readings. In cases where the author can be reasonably determined, the attribution is placed in angle brackets. Where no attribution is possible, a question mark will be placed inside angle brackets, and these entries will be included in an appendix.

The Project Format

Each entry contains the following elements, in line with the prescriptions of the Hexapla editorial board.

**Hebrew and Greek texts.** The Hebrew lemma (consonantal text) is given first followed by the critical text of the LXX from the Göttingen critical edition (this text will be labeled LXX). The Hebrew text is the Masoretic text (MT) of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) 48 and is labeled HT. If Origen’s Hebrew Vorlage appears to be different from the MT, this is indicated in the apparatus. Verse references follow the LXX numbering system, and where the Hebrew numbering is different, the Hebrew reference is given second in square brackets.

47 The phrase “non tr” means not transposed in relation to the Hebrew (they are transposed in relation to the LXX).

Readings with attributions. After the LXX reading, the related hexaplaric readings are given. When conflicts exist within the tradition, a preferred text is given and the choice explained in the apparatus. Any lemma that is pure retroversion (i.e., not supported by any Greek witness) is indicated by a smaller font and is discussed in the final apparatus.

Witness apparatuses. The first apparatus contains the primary hexaplaric witnesses (Wit 1). Primary witnesses come mainly from marginal readings in manuscripts such as those listed in the second apparatus of the Göttingen edition. The second apparatus for this project contains secondary witnesses (Wit 2). These are manuscripts transmitting the text of the LXX that have been corrupted by hexaplaric readings. They are found in the first apparatus of the Göttingen edition. If all witnesses contain the entire lemma, then the witnesses are simply listed. Otherwise, sources that contain the entire lemma will be preceded by the word “lemma” and the others will be preceded with the portion they contain.

The third apparatus gives variants to the attribution (denoted by Attr). Where the attribution is omitted, this is denoted by a greater-than sign (>) followed by the manuscripts that omit the attribution. If a variant attribution is given, this is listed followed by the sources that contain the variant.

The fourth apparatus lists the variants to the readings (Var). The applicable lemmas are given followed by a right bracket (]) and the variants and their sources are listed separated by vertical lines (l). The format follows that of the Göttingen edition. If the same manuscript has a marginal reading listed in the first apparatus and a text reading listed in the second apparatus, variants will be listed using superscripts to differentiate marginal readings (mg) and main text readings (txt). Thus, for example, if manuscript 85 is listed in both the first and second apparatuses, a variant in the marginal reading will be listed as 85mg and a variant in the main text reading will be listed as 85txt.
The fifth apparatus lists all of the non-Greek sources (NonGr). Although the final form of the Hexapla project will include all known non-Greek sources, this project will cover the original texts of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin sources. All non-Greek sources included by Wevers in his critical edition will be listed, but only the texts of the abovementioned languages will be included.

The sixth apparatus contains applicable notes on the entire entry (Notes). Comments may be given about the other five apparatuses, or on matters such as the translation technique or usage of particular translators. Sometimes cross references to secondary literature are given. The goal is to explain the given lemma and its place in the text tradition of Numbers.

The following sample from Numbers 2:17 contains entries for all six apparatuses. The symbol o’ indicates an Origenic attribution, and NUM refers to the Septuagint of Numbers.

**Num 2:17**

**HT** (רשע איש לְדוֹלָיָם וַעֲלָיָם)

**LXX** (ἐξαροῦσιν ἑκαστὸς) ἐχόµενος καθ’ ἡγεµονίαν

ο’ ἐχόµενος αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἡγεµονίαν αὐτοῦ

**Wit 1:** lemma 85’↓344 | καθ’ ἡγεµονίαν M’ ↓58

**Wit 2:** lemma ↓O Syh | ἐχόµενος—ἡγεµονίαν ↓767 | καθ’ ἡγεµονίαν αὐτοῦ ↓F ↓82 ↓28

**Attr:** o’ > M’ 58 130

**Var:** ἐχόµενος αὐτοῦ] ἐχόµενος αὐτοῖς 767 | καθ’] κατὰ 58mg | καθ’ ἡγεµονίαν] κατὰ τάγµα 581st | αὐτῶν 2º] αὐτῶν F O376-82 28-344 Syh

**NonGr:** Syh1st ܦܹܫܲܥ ܘܥܫ ܒܶܥܬܐ ܐܬ݂ ܒܥܬܐ
Notes: The o’ text differs from the NUM only in the addition of the personal pronouns. This is not surprising as it matches the Hebrew and happens in similar situations in 2:5 and 2:20.

Explanation of entry. The parentheses in the HT and LXX lines indicate text that is not being directly considered in the entry; it is included for context.

The first apparatus (Wit 1:) consists of marginal readings. Here it indicates that the margins of manuscripts 85’-344 (meaning manuscripts 85, 130, and 344) contain the entire lemma, while the margins of M’ (M and 416) and 158 contain only a partial reading. A down arrow (↓) before a manuscript number indicates that more information is given about that manuscript below in the apparatus.

The second apparatus (Wit 2:) contains readings from the main texts of manuscripts. The entry indicates that the texts of the entire Origenic group (O-group: manuscripts G, 58, 376, and 426) and the Syro-Hexapla contain the entire lemma, but that 767, F, 82, and 28 have partial readings in their texts.

The third apparatus (Attr:) shows that the marginal readings in manuscripts M, 58, and 130 omit the o’ attribution. Note that manuscript 130 does not appear by name in the first apparatus. The group 85’ contains manuscripts 85 and 130.

The fourth apparatus (Var:) lists the variants that occur in the first two apparatuses. Manuscript 58 has both marginal and textual readings, and variants for the marginal reading are listed with the notation 58mg while variants for the text reading are listed with the notation 58tx.

The fifth apparatus (NonGr:) gives the Syriac reading from the Syro-Hexapla that corresponds to the reading noted above. All Syriac entries are presented in Estrangela font, which matches the British Museum manuscript. Although the Tur Abdin manuscript is written in Serto font, it is transcribed into Estrangela for consistency.

Finally, the sixth apparatus provides comments on this entry. The “o’ text” refers to the Fifth Column of Origen’s Hexapla.
CHAPTER 2
DESCRIPTION OF SOURCES OF HEXPLARIC MATERIALS FOR NUMBERS

This edition of the hexaplaric materials for Numbers is based on the manuscripts used by Wevers in his Göttingen edition for Numbers. Described below are the main sources for the Greek, Syro-hexapla, and church fathers. When possible, the descriptions are limited to close translations of Wevers’ *Einleitung.*

Following these descriptions, the abbreviated version of all of Wevers’ manuscript sources is given. A fuller description of all sources along with all abbreviations can be found in Wevers’ *Einleitung.* Note that when manuscripts are mentioned for works other than Numbers, the reference numbers may not match the groups given below.

**Greek Bible Manuscripts**

**Greek Manuscripts and Uncials of the Origenic Group**

The most important text group for hexaplaric material is the Origenic group (*O*-group). These manuscripts contains hexaplaric footnotes and Aristarchian signs and most closely match the original fifth column of Origen’s hexapla and the Syro-hexapla. Below are the four Greek sources for this group:

**G**  

---

Greek Manuscripts of the s-Group

The s-group is significant for the Hexapla because it contains many hexaplaric marginal notes. Below are its members:


30 Rome, Bibl. Casanat., 1444. 11th-12th Century A.D.

85 Rome, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2058. 10th Century A.D. Notation used by Brooke-McLean: z.

130 Vienna, Nat. Bibl., Theol. gr. 23. 12th-13th Century A.D. Notation used by Holmes-Parsons: 131; by Brooke-McLean: s.

321 Athos, Βατοπαιδίου, 603 (earlier 516). 14th Century A.D.

343 Athos, Λαύρα, 352. 10th Century A.D.

344 Athos, Παντοκράτορος, 24. 10th Century A.D. Notation used by Brooke-McLean: v.

346 Athos, Πρωτάτου, 53. Written 1326.

730 Venice, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 15. 12th Century A.D.

Other Important Greek Sources for Hexaplaric Studies

Below are listed other important Greek Sources for hexaplaric studies. Usually, these contain hexaplaric notes and have texts that agree heavily with hexaplaric tradition.

F Milan, Bibl. Ambr., S. P. 51 (earlier A. 147 inf.) 5th Century A.D. The corrections in F come from two very distinct periods. The Codex was first
corrected by various hands, whose common characteristics were markings in yellow or brown ink and upper case script; this edition is named F^a. The different F^a corrections are distinguished temporally from each other by F^{a1} and F^{a2}. In the Middle Ages, the Codex was retraced throughout by a restorer who also corrected the manuscripts. These and later corrections are designated in the edition with F^b; the different F^b hands will be distinguished as F^{b1} and F^{b2} only when the hands can be separated in time. Where F^b made mistakes in the restoration of the manuscript, the symbol F^s is used. Erasures which cannot be assigned to any corrector are noted with F^c. Most of the marginal notes in the manuscript come from F^b, and often the reading corresponding to the text of F is designated with erasure dots. Edition: A. M. Ceriani, Monumenta sacra et profana 3, Milan 1864. The edition contains only the text of the original scribe without corrections (except for those of the original scribe). Notification used by Holmes-Parsons: VII.

M Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coisl. 1. 7th Century A.D. It is missing 29:23 δω — 31:4 αποστειλατε due to leaf loss. Notification used by Holmes-Parsons: X.


127 Moscow, formerly. Syn. Bibl. Gr. 31. 10th Century A.D.

416 Leipzig, Univ.-Bibl., Gr. 16. 10th Century A.D.

458 Messina, Bibl. Univ., S. Salv. 62. 12th Century A.D.

551 Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 129. 13th Century A.D.

707 Sinai, St. Catherine Monastery, Cod. gr. 1. 10th-11th Century A.D. The manuscript is badly faded, and conclusions e silentio are not allowed.

**Syro-Hexapla Manuscripts**

Two Syro-hexapla manuscripts were used for this project. The editions listed in Wevers critical edition are listed below, as they catalogue the lacunae in the manuscripts. But copies of the original manuscripts of Syh^L and Syh^T were analyzed for this project. Thus, for example, the notation Syh^L will be used according to the Göttingen conventions, but it will refer to the actual British Museum manuscripts.


Patristic Sources

Although many church fathers attest to hexaplaric material for Numbers, only the following five were found to have explicit attributions to hexaplaric material for the book.

The Greek Fathers


Or     Origen I–VI (GCS 2, 3; Ed., P. Koetschau. GCS 10; Ed., E. Preuschen. GCS 29; Ed., W. A. Baerens. GCS 38; Ed., E. Klostermann. GCS 40; Ed., E. Klostermann).

Procop Procopius of Gaza (PG 87).

Tht    Theodoret of Cyrene I–V (PG 80-84).

Nm     Quaestiones in Numeros (TECC 17)

The Syriac Fathers


In addition to these attributions, the church fathers listed below are witnesses to the Hexapla in a secondary manner through their agreement with hexaplaric readings in various places (note that the five witnesses above also provide this secondary type of witness to the Hexapla).

The Greek Fathers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Author/Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas</td>
<td>Basilius Magnus of Caesarea I-IV (PG 29-32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chr</td>
<td>Chrysostom I-XVIII (PG 47-64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyr</td>
<td>Cyril of Alexandria I-X (PG 68-77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CyrHier</td>
<td>Cyril of Jerusalem (PG 33, 331-1180).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did</td>
<td>Didymus of Alexandria, Kommentar2 zu Sacharja (Tura-Papyrus) (SC 83-85; Ms. L. Doutreleau, 1962).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philo Judaeus of Alexandria (Opera; Ms. L. Cohn u. P. Wendland, Berlin 1896ff).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Latin Fathers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Author/Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambr</td>
<td>Ambrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ep</em> Epistulae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sat</em> De escessu fatris Satyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocEvang</td>
<td>Apocrypha Evangelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Inf</em> Evangelium infantiae Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Loc in hept</em> Locutionum in Heptateuchum libri 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Num</em> Quaestiones de Numeris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Serm</em> Sermones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beda</td>
<td>The Venerable Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ep Cath</em> Super epistolae catholicas expositio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Luc</em> In Lucae Evengelium expositio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Marc</em> In Marci Evengelium expositio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sam</em> In primam partem Samuelis libri 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpiphSchol</td>
<td>Epiphanius the Scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Enarr</em> Didymi Alexandrini in epistolae canonica brevis enarratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>C Pel</em> Dialogi contra Pelagianos libri 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Eph</em> Commentarii in epistuam ad Ephesios libri 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Or in ier hom</em> Origenis in Jr Homiliae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Origen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Matth</em> Matthew Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsAmbr</td>
<td>Pseudo-Ambrose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mans
De XLII mansionibus filiorum Israel

Ruf Rufinus

Num Origenes in Nm homiliae 28

The Rest of the Witnesses

Below all of the manuscripts, translations, and printed editions used by Wevers are listed. Most of these are used as primary or secondary witnesses in this project. For more information, see the Einleitung of Wevers’ critical edition.

Uncials and Papyri: A B F K M S V 803 833 933 963

Miniscules:

\[ O \quad G-58-376-426 \]
\[ 376' = 376 + 426 \]
\[ oI \quad 15-64-381-618 \]
\[ 15' = 15 + 64 \]
\[ 381' = 381 + 618 \]

\[ oII \quad 29-72-82-707 \]
\[ 72' = 72 + 707 \]

\[ O'' = O + oI + oII \]
\[ O' = O + oI \]
\[ O' = O + oII \]
\[ oI' = oI + oII \]

\[ C \quad 16-77-131-500-529-616-739 \]
\[ 16' = 16 + 131 \]
\[ 500' = 500 + 739 \]
\[ 529' = 529 + 616 \]
\[ cI \quad 57-73-320-413-528-550-552-761 \]
\[ 57' = 57 + 413 \]
\[ 73' = 73 + 320 \]
\[ 528' = 528 + 761 \]
\[ 550' = 550 + 552 \]

\[ cII \quad 46-52-313-414-417-422-551-615 \]
\[ 46' = 46 + 313 \]
\[ 52' = 52 + 615 \]
\[ 414' = 414 + 551 \]

\[ C'' = C + cI + cII \]
\[ C' = C + cI \]
\[ C' = C + cII \]
\[ cI' = cI + cII \]

\[ b \quad 19-108-118-314-537 \]
\[ 19' = 19 + 108 \]
\[ 118' = 118 + 314 \]

\[ d \quad 44-106-107-125-610 \]
\[ 44' = 44 + 106 \]
\[ 107' = 107 + 610 \]
\[ 125' = 125 + 107 \]

\[ f \quad 53-56-129-246-664 \]
\[ 53' = 53 + 664 \]
\[ 56' = 56 + 246 \]

\[ n \quad 54-75-127-458-767 \]
\[ 54' = 54 + 127 \]
\[ 75' = 75 + 458 \]
\[
\begin{align*}
s &\quad 28-30-85-130-321-343-344-346-730 \\
30' &= 30 + 730 \\
85' &= 85 + 130 \\
321' &= 321 + 346 \\
343' &= 343 + 344 \\
t &\quad 74-76-84-134-370 \\
74' &= 74 + 134 \\
76' &= 76 + 370 \\
x &\quad 71-509-527-619 \\
71' &= 71 + 619 \\
527' &= 527 + 71 \\
y &\quad 121-318-392 \\
121' &= 121 + 392 \\
z &\quad 18-68-120-122-126-407-628-630-669 \\
18' &= 18 + 128 \\
68' &= 68 + 122 \\
120' &= 120 + 407 \\
630' &= 630 + 669 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Mixed Codices:  
\[
55-59-319-416-424-646-799 \\
M' &= M + 416
\]

Translations:  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Aeth} &\quad \text{Arab} &\quad \text{Arm} &\quad \text{Co (Bo Fa Sa)} &\quad \text{La} &\quad \text{Pal} &\quad \text{Pesch} &\quad \text{Sam} &\quad \text{Syh} \\
\text{Syh}^G &\quad \text{Syh}^L &\quad \text{Syh}^T &\quad \text{Tar (Tar}^J\text{ Tar}^O\text{ Tar}^P\text{)} &\quad \text{Vulg}
\end{align*}
\]

Printed Editions:  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ald} &\quad \text{Compl} &\quad \text{Sixt} &\quad \text{Gr} &\quad \text{Ra} &\quad \text{Ra.}
\end{align*}
\]
CHAPTER 3

CRITICAL TEXT OF HEXAPLARIC READINGS
WITH APPARATUS AND NOTES

Numbers 19

Num 19:1

HT אֶל (אַהֲרֹן)

LXX Ἀαρών

〈Sub ※〉 pr πρός

Wit 2: 426 Arm = MT

Attr: ※} > omnes

Notes: Hebrew repeats prepositions in phrases joined by waw conjuctions, as in אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן. The LXX of Numbers (hereafter NUM) is inconsistent in how it renders such repeated prepositions. For example, in the three places where the phrase אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן appears (26:1, 31:12, and 32:2), NUM has πρός before both Μωυσῆν and Ελεαζάρ. But for the phrase אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן, NUM never repeats the preposition before Ἀαρών. O-group manuscript 426 and Arm may reflect evidence of Origen’s work in the present verse by adding πρός before Ἀαρών to match the Hebrew. This may originally have been under the asterisk, as it is in 20:23 for the identical Hebrew.

Origen is inconsistent in his treatment of these repeated prepositions that NUM omits. In some instances he adds a corresponding second Greek preposition under the asterisk, for example, in 13:27[26], 15:33, 16:3, and 20:12. In other places, he does not add the untranslated preposition, as in 2:1, 4:17, 14:26, 16:20, 16:41[17:6], 16:42[17:7], 20:2, and 26:9.

Num 19:3

HT —

LXX εἰς τόπον καθαρόν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G⁵ Syh
Notes: The obelus in G* and Syh indicates that HT has no equivalent to εἰς τόπον καθαρόν in NUM. Here, NUM harmonizes with verse 9, where the same phrase appears, but there it matches the underlying Hebrew (—from Lev 4:12, 6:4). G* has the phrase without the obelus.

Num 19:4

HT

LXX

Sub ※ ὁ ἱερεὺς

Notes: In this verse, NUM has no equivalent for הכהן after Eleazar’s name. In all other cases, NUM matches HT regarding the mention, or lack thereof, of Eleazar’s office with his name. Thus, NUM matches הכהן with ὁ ἱερεὺς after Ἐλεαζάρ in 19:3, 26:3, 63, 27:2, 19, 21, 22, 31:12, 13, 21, 26, 29, 31, 41, 51, 54, 32:2, 28, and 34:17. For the present verse, due to the previous mention of Eleazar’s priesthood (19:3), the translator may have made a stylistic decision to avoid a redundant mention of his office. Origen added ὁ ἱερεὺς under the asterisk.

Sub ※ + τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτοῦ
Notes: NUM has no equivalent for בְּאֶצְבָּעַ in HT, and Origen adds τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτοῦ under the asterisk as witnessed by the O-group. This phrase does not appear elsewhere in NUM, although τῷ δακτύλῳ is a standard way in Leviticus of rendering בְּאֶצְבָּעַ in the same context of a priest transmitting blood with his finger in sacrificial ceremonies. This Origenic addition is reflected in the uncial V and a number of other manuscripts.

Num 19:5

| HT  | בְּשָׂרָהּ |
| LXX | (δέρμα) |

Sub ※ + αὐτῆς

Notes: NUM does not render the pronominal suffix on בְּשָׂרָהּ, and Origen added the equivalent αὐτῆς under the asterisk. A majority of the manuscript tradition has the added αὐτῆς or its equivalent. This is likely an "inner Greek correction" introduced early into the textual tradition and is probably independent of the o′ text. SyhT has the added text but without the asterisk.

Num 19:6

| HT  | αἰλιτήριον σώρεως |
| LXX | εἰς μέσον τοῦ κατακαύματος |

⟨σ′ θ′⟩ εἰς τὴν πυρᾶν
**Notes:** The Hebrew שְׂרֵפַת אֶל־תּוֹכָה is rendered by NUM as εἰς μέσον τοῦ κατακαύματος. An unattributed marginal note in three s-group manuscripts makes two changes to NUM with the alternate reading εἰς τὴν πυράν. First, for שְׂרֵפַת the note substitutes πυρά (“sacrificial/beacon fire”) for κατακαύματος, and second it omits the preposition μέσον.

Aquila renders שְׂרֵפַת with ἐπρησός (“burning”) in Isaiah 9:4 and with a passive participle of κατακαύω in Jeremiah 28[51]:25. He employs πῦρα for ἔσον τοῦ κατακαύω in Leviticus 2:9 and Deuteronomy 18:1. But Aquila almost always renders prepositions, and thus he would be unlikely to drop μέσον in translating שְׂרֵפַת. Thus this reading does not fit Aquila.

Symmachus renders שְׂרֵפַת with καύσις in Isaiah 9:4 and 64:10 and with a passive participle of κατακαύω in Jeremiah 28[51]:25. He uses πῦρα for אִשֶּׁה in Leviticus 2:9. The word שְׂרֵפַת refers to fire or burning in general, whereas אִשֶּׁה refers almost exclusively to the fire of an offering to the Lord (e.g., 42 times in Leviticus and 16 times in Numbers). The word πυρά, however, refers to a fire in the general sense, and so Symmachus could have used it for שְׂרֵפַת. In addition, Symmachus is less tied to quantitative correspondence than Aquila, and may have provided no equivalent for the prepositions שְׂרֵפַת.

No data exists as to how Theodotion renders שְׂרֵפַת. He uses πυρά in Isa 30:33 to render שְׂרֵפַת. Since πῦρα and שְׂרֵפַת can be somewhat synonymous (see e.g., Num 17:2, Isa 9:4, 64:11), this note could be from Theodotion, although the data is scanty.

**Num 19:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἁπανθήσεται</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\langle \text{oī λ́} \rangle \] μιανθήσεται

**Notes:** An unattributed marginal note from s-group manuscripts 130-321’ gives the rendering μιανθήσεται for ἁπανθήσεται rather than ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται from NUM. Since both ἀκάθαρτος and μιαίνω are common in NUM, it is perhaps unlikely that a scholiast would feel compelled to clarify one using the other. In 5:2, a similar unattributed marginal note from 130 and 321’ also renders ἀκάθαρτος using a form of μιαίνω (see HEXNUM1 for the \(\langle \text{oī λ́} \rangle \) entry under 5:2). In 5:20, all of the Three use passive forms of μιαίνω to render the Niphal of ἁπανθήσεται. Elsewhere, the Three render the Piel of ἁπανθήσεται using an active form of μιαίνω (α’: 4 Kgdms 23:13, 16, Ezek 20:26; α’ and θ’: Ezek 36:18; α’,...
σ’, and θ’: Isa 30:22). Also Aquila uses μισίνα to render the related adjective κακή (Job 14:4, Isa 6:5, 52:1, Hos 9:3). Thus, this marginal note could come from any one of the Three.

**Num 19:8**

**HT**

(בקריר) (בקרין)

**LXX**

(τα ίματα αὑτοῦ)

**Sub ※ + ἐν ὕδατι**

*Wit 2:* O$^{(-376)}$ Aeth$^C$ Syh = Compl MT

*Attr:* ※ G Syh$^T$] > rell

*NonGr:* Syh$^L$ ἐν ὕδατι | Syh$^T$ ἐν ὕδατι

Notes: HT states that one who burns the heifer shall wash his clothes “with water” (בקרין) and bathe his body “with water” (בקריר). NUM does not render either instance of בֵּין. In both instances Origen added ἐν ὕδατι under the asterisk (for the second asterisk, see below). Elsewhere, NUM renders without the metobelus in this first instance). Syh$^L$ is missing the metobelus in this first instance. Syh$^T$ reflects the addition of this phrase both times, but only includes the asterisk for the second instance. This is possibly a copying error.

**HT**

(בקריר)

**LXX**

(τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ)

**Sub ※ + ἐν ὕδατι**

*Wit 2:* ἐν ὕδατι O$^{(-376)}$ Syh l om ἐν A M’ V ol$^{–29}$ 82 $C$ f$^{129}$ n s t x$^{(-527)}$ y$^{–392}$  لبنان 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Aeth$^G$ = Compl MT

*Attr:* ※ G Syh] > rell

*Var:* τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ] pr ἴδατι 628

*NonGr:* Syh$^L$ ἐν ὕδατι | Syh$^T$ ἐν ὕδατι
Notes: NUM has no equivalent for בַּמָּיִם in HT, and Origen adds ἐν ὕδατι under the asterisk, as witnessed by the O-group (376 is not a witness either way, as a larger section was omitted in 376 through paraplepsis). This is the second of two identical asterisks in this verse (see above for the first). The majority of Greek manuscripts have added the lexically equivalent ὕδατι, which is the standard NUM rendering of בַּמָּיִם (19:7, 19:19, 31:23). For many manuscripts, this is probably through the influence of the o’ text, but for some, the addition of ὕδατι could represent a harmonization with verse 7 independent of Origen.

Although Syh has the preposition beth, this is not a witness to a Vorlage that included ἐν, since in Numbers Syh always uses beth when translating ὕδατι without ἐν. SyhL has placed the asterisk before the preceding possessive pronoun but this is clearly a mistake, as the pronoun occurs in both in HT and NUM. SyhL has the asterisk placed correctly.

HT  תַּמָּיִם
LXX  ἐν ὕδατι

Sub ※  pr τῆς

Wit 2:  G = MT
Attr:  ※ Gj

Notes: The phrase עַד־הָעָרֶב in HT is rendered by NUM as ἕως ἑσπέρας. Manuscript G indicates that Origen matched the definite article in the Hebrew. However, no other manuscripts witness to this addition. Elsewhere the NUM translator routinely uses ἕως ἑσπέρας (i.e., without the definite article) for עַד־הָעָרֶב (19:7, 10, 21, 22) and in none of these is the noun articulated except in an uncertain reading in manuscript 321 for 19:22. In general, Origen is inconsistent in his treatment of mismatches between HT and the LXX regarding the definite article, so his typical practice cannot be appealed to in this case. Syh is not a solid witness to the G reading because although the state of the noun in the Syriac is emphatic, which in older Aramaic signified definiteness, in Syriac the distinction between definite and indefinite was lost for the emphatic state.

G is an old and generally reliable witness, and so it possibly reflects an Origenic asterisk here. If so, then as mentioned above this is the only place in Numbers where Origen corrected the phrase עַד־הָעָרֶב (the phrase also appears 27 times in Leviticus, where it is uniformly translated ἕως ἑσπέρας with no Origenic addition of τῆς).

Num 19:10

HT  בָּכַס לַאֲשָׁף אֶת־אֶפֶר הַפָּרָה אֶת־בְּגָדָיו
LXX  καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἵματα ὁ συνάγων τὴν σποδιὰν τῆς δαμάλεως
καὶ πλυνεῖ ὁ συνάγων τὴν σποδιὰν τῆς δαμάλεως τὰ ἱάτια αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: lemma $O^{-58}$ Syh = MT | καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια] + αὐτοῦ et post δαμάλεως tr 58 n $Lat$ cod 100 Arm | πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια] + αὐτοῦ et post δαμάλεως tr A F M $oI^{-82}$ C'' 56' s 619 y z 55 59 646 799 $Lat$ Aug Num 33.9 Aeth Bo = Sixt | τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ 82 d t 509

NonGr: $Lat$ cod 100 qui collegerit cinerem uitulae et lauabit uementa sua | $Lat$ Aug Num 33.9 et qui congregat, cinerem iuuencae, lauabit uementa sua | Syh ὁ συνάγων καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱάτια αὐτοῦ

Notes: For the HT passage above, NUM does not render the pronominal suffix on דַּאָלֶאֵו and it changes the word order from HT. The first indicator of Origen’s work is the addition of αὐτοῦ to render the suffix, giving τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. This is witnessed by the $O$-group and may originally have been under the asterisk. The second indicator is a modification to the NUM word order to match the Hebrew. HT places the verb כִּבֶּס first, followed by the compound subject הָאֹסֵף אֶת־אֵפֶר הַפָּרָה (“the one who gathers the ashes of the heifer”), followed by the direct object דַּאָלֶאֵו. Thus its order is <verb> <compound subject> <direct object>. NUM places the direct object τὰ ἱάτια immediately after the verb πλυνεῖ and before the compound subject ὁ συνάγων τὴν σποδιὰν τῆς δαμάλεως. So the NUM order is <verb> <direct object> <compound subject>. The $O$-group (minus 58), $b$-group, and Syh transpose the direct object τὰ ἱμάτια (+αὐτοῦ) so that it comes after the compound subject to match the Hebrew order. Thus, the original fifth column probably reads: καὶ πλυνεῖ ὁ συνάγων τὴν σποδιὰν τῆς δαμάλεως τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ.

These Origenic changes appear to have affected many manuscripts. All of the witnesses listed under Wit 2 above have added αὐτοῦ after τὰ ἱμάτια. Manuscripts 82, d, t, and 509 have τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ but otherwise maintain the NUM word order. The following transpose a larger phrase than τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ after δαμάλεως:

(1) καὶ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ: 58 n $Lat$ cod 100 Arm
(2) πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ: A F M $oI^{-82}$ C'' 56' s 619 y z 55 59 646 799 $Lat$ Aug Num 33.9 Aeth Bo

HT

LXX

〈Sub ※〉 + ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν
Wit 1: ἐν αὐτοῖς 321′

Wit 2: ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν O Eus VI 11 Syh = MT | μέσον ὑμῶν 528 | ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ↓A ↓F Fb oH §82-15 ↓C′-528 f-129 s-321 x-71 (527) ↓z 55 59 424 624 646 799 Cyr II 628 = Compl | ἐν αὐτοῖς 319 Lat cod 100 Arm

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: ἐν] ἐμ A F y-121 | ὑμῶν] υμῶν 52′-313-550

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The phrase ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν shows Origen’s work in that it corresponds to כָּםבְּתוֹ in HT for which NUM has no equivalent. It is witnessed by the O-group and may originally have been under the asterisk. Although כָּםבְּתוֹ is not translated ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν anywhere else in NUM, כָּםבְּתוֹ without the pronominal suffix is translated ἐν μέσῳ in 1:49, 3:12, 5:21, 9:7, 18:20, 23, 24, 26:2 (2x), 27:3, 4, 7, and 35:34. In addition, Theodotion translates כָּםמְרָקֶפֶנ this way in Num 1:47 (Symmachus has ἐν αὐτοῖς), and so Origen may have picked up this rendering from Theodotion.

Wevers argues that for the present verse, the b-group reading that adds ὑμῶν after προσιμῦτος is not a result of the influence of the o’ text, but instead reflects the same phrase in 15:15 (NGTN 316). The variants that do possibly reflect the o’ text are listed under Wit 2 above.

Num 19:12

HT  יִתְחַטָּא
LXX  (ἁγνισθήσεται)

Sub ※ + ἐν αὐτῶν

Wit 2: ↓O-15 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G] > rell

NonGr: Syh

Notes: NUM has no equivalent for the preposition plus suffix (ָ֫ב) in HT. Origen added the equivalent ἐν αὐτῷ under the asterisk, as witnessed by the O-group and Syh.
Num 19:13

**HT** (אֲשֶׁר־יָמוּת)

**LXX** (ἐὰν ἀποθάνῃ)

〈οὶ λ′〉 pr ὅς

**Wit 1:** 130-321'-344

**Wit 2:** 767

**Notes:** Instead of ἐάν, the phrase ὅς ἐάν is indicated by marginal notes in four s-group manuscripts. Other than in this verse, NUM does not render ἀποθάνῃ using ἐάν alone; rather it is used in combination with a relative, such as ὅς or ὅσος (24 times), including three verses later in 19:16. This anomalous use of ἐάν in 19:13 may have led a later scholiast to add ὅς as a suggested addition to harmonize this verse with the rest of NUM. The Three all use ἐάν and ὅς ἐάν (or an equivalent such as ὅστις ἐάν) for various Hebrew words, including וֹ בַּ (וֹ דֵי) and ר and for ἀποθάνῃ (e.g., in Ezek 3:1). Aquila and Symmachus also render a Hebrew participle using ὅς ἐάν plus the subjunctive in Numbers 3:10. Thus, the usage of the Three can be somewhat flexible. This marginal note could conceivably have come from one of the Three, although it is not clear why they would “improve” upon ἐάν by using ὅς ἐάν.

**HT** (זונד טופואה)

**LXX** (ἐτι ἡ ἀκαθαρσία αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστιν)

ο′ οἱ λ′ ἐν αὐτῶ

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** G 529*

**Notes:** NUM employs the copula ἐστιν to render the nominal clause in HT, and virtually all the Greek manuscripts follow NUM. According to s-group manuscript 344, o′ and οἱ λ′ match HT by omitting ἐστιν. That the o′ text lacks ἐστιν is supported by G from the Ο-group which places ἐστιν under the obelus (see below). The attribution to οἱ λ′ is reasonable because this reading conforms to the Hebrew quantitatively.
Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G

>  

Wit 2:  529* = MT

Notes:  NUM uses ἐστὶν to render a Hebrew nominal clause that lacks the copula, and O-group manuscript G marks ἐστὶν with an obelus.  Although no other manuscripts (except 529*) are missing ἐστὶν, the obelus is probably genuine.

Num 19:14

HT  (זֹאת)
LXX  καὶ (οὗτος)

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G<sup>c</sup>  Syh<sup>L</sup>

>  

Wit 2:  Bo = MT Tar

NonGr:  Syh<sup>L</sup>  καὶ  ἄρα  ÷

Notes:  HT has no initial conjunction, but NUM adds καὶ.  G<sup>c</sup> and Syh indicate that Origen placed καὶ under the obelus.  Syh<sup>L</sup> marks both the conjunction and the following word under the obelus, but Syh<sup>L</sup> regularly misplaces Aristarchian signs due to conglutinate formations in Syriac.

HT  (כָּל־)
LXX  (ὅσα)

Sub ※  πρὶν πᾶντα

Wit 2:  O Eus VI 12 = MT
Notes: NUM renders the first לַאֲשֶׁר in HT as πᾶς followed by a participle. In the same sentence, a second לַאֲשֶׁר is rendered ὅσα, which is an acceptable translation, although πᾶς ὅς might have been a better equivalent, as in 19:16 (NGTN 318). Many hexaplaric witnesses indicate Origen’s work by preceding ὅσα with πάντα, and G places πάντα under the asterisk. The omission of an equivalent for לֹכְד is common in NUM, occurring in 4:27, 8:20, 9:3[2x], 5, 12, 11:11, 14, 14:29, 35, 36, 39, 15:23, 18:29, 19:14, 18, 30:15, and 31:9 (see HEXNUM1 under 4:27).

HT
כֹּל־אֲשֶׁרּ בָּאֹהֶל יִטְמָא שִׁבְעַת יָמִים

LXX
καὶ ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ἀκάθαρτα ἔσται ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας

Σʹ
καὶ ὅ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ ἄκαθαρτὸς ἔσται ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας

Wit 1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: This marginal note attributed to Symmachus in Syh is consistent with that translator. NUM uses the neuter plural ὅσα to translate לַאֲשֶׁר and the neuter plural ἀκάθαρτα to refer to those who are unclean. Symmachus modifies the plural ἀκάθαρτα to the singular ἄκαθαρτός which matches the singular Hebrew verb יִטְמָא. Symmachus tends generally (although not universally) to revise the LXX to stricter conformity with Hebrew grammatical forms (see SITP 199ff). From the Syriac one is not able to determine whether Symmachus uses the masculine ἄκαθαρτός or the neuter ἄκαθαρτόν, although it is probably masculine since the subject is a person.

The retroversion above is Field’s. It renders לֹכְד with the Greek σκηνή as this is closer to the Hebrew than οἶκια in NUM, and is also consistent with Symmachus in Numbers (3:7, 4:25) and with the Three in general, who do not render לֹכְד using οἶκια (it is also more consistent with NUM, which uses σκηνή outside of this chapter).

As alluded to above, the NUM translator uncharacteristically uses a neuter (ἄκαθαρτον) in this verse to refer to people who are unclean. Elsewhere, NUM uses the neuter of this word to refer to things that are unclean (18:15, 19:15, 22) and the masculine to refer to people, including in this chapter (5:2, 9:6, 7, 10, 19:7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19 [2x], 21, 22).

Num 19:15

HT
 אשֶר אֲשֶׁרּ אֵין־צָמִיד פָּתִיל
LXX  ὀσα οὖχι δεσμὸν καταδέδεται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ

α’  ὅ ὄυκ ἔστιν πῶμα στρεπτὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ

Wit 1:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh, מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד
SyhT מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד

σ’  ὅ ὄυκ ἔστιν (ὅ ὄυκ ἔχει) πῶμα συνημμένον πρὸς αὐτό

Wit 1:  Syh

NonGr:  SyhL מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד
SyhT מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד

θ’  ὅ ὄυκ ἔστιν (ὅ ὄυκ ἔχει) πῶμα συνδεδεμένον (συνημμένον SyhL) ἐπ’ αὐτῷ

Wit 1:  Syh

NonGr:  SyhL מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד
SyhT מַלְאָם עָלָיו פָּתִיל אֵין צָמִיד

Notes:  The meaning of the Hebrew הַנַּ֣עֲרַ֣מִּים לַעֲרֵ֣י צָרָה is obscure. The usual meaning of הַנַּ֣עֲרַ֣מִּים is “bracelet” (e.g., in Num 31:50). This word is possibly related to the root זָמִ֣יד which has to do with a strap or harness (perhaps זָמִ֣יד is original). הַנַּ֣עֲרַ֣מִּים signifies a thread, and since the subject is open vessels, the verse seems to be referring to how the lack of a tied-down lid makes a vessel unclean. NUM renders it as οὖχι δεσμὸν καταδέδεται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ (“a tie/bond is not bound on it”). The Three interpret the phrase similarly, as indicated by the above retroversions from marginal notes in Syh. The retroversions are adapted from Field and Wevers (NGTN 319, note 19).

All the Three begin with the equivalent of οὖκ ἔστιν πῶμα (“a cover”). Aquila renders the rest of the phrase στρεπτὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ (“turned/bent upon it”). The use of στρεπτῶν for this retroversion is consistent with the Syh verb מַלְאָם and with Aquila’s rendering of מַלְאָם in Genesis 38:18.

For Symmachus, in the phrase συνημμένον πρὸς αὐτό, the word συνημμένον (from συνάπτω) is a retroversion of the Syriac מַלְאָם (from the root מַלְאָם — “to
join/accompany’). This retroversion fits Symmachus, who uses συνάπτω in Job 38:31 for כָстер (“to bind”) and in Psalm 93[94]:20 and 118[119]:63 for רָב (“to ally oneself”).

For Theodotion, Syh\(^L\) and Syh\(^T\) differ in their equivalents for the Greek corresponding to מִשְרָאלוֹ. In Syh\(^L\), θ’ is shown as having the same word as σ’ (.bottomAnchor). In Syh\(^T\), however, the θ’ reading uses passive participle from the root סומ — “bind fast” or “hold tight.” The Syh\(^L\) reading would suggest συνάπτω as for Symmachus.

Based on Syh\(^T\), Wevers suggests the retroversion συνδεδε*ένον (“bound/tied,” from συνδέω — see NGTN 319). Theodotion uses both συνάπτω (in Isa 28:20) and συνδέω (in Am 7:10, Job 17:3, Pr 6:21, 7:3). Thus, both Syh\(^L\) and Syh\(^T\) have renderings that are consistent with a genuine text from Theodotion.

In Syh\(^L\), the text of the θ’ note seems to have either (1) substituted an alaph for a lamadh, changing the word 살 (“there is not”) to살 (“there is”), or (2) dropped 살 from the phrase 살 살 살 살, leaving 살. This change results in the opposite meaning from HT, NUM, α’, σ’, and Syh\(^T\). The correction back to 살, adopted both by Field and Lagarde for his edition, is almost certainly the equivalent of the original.

**Num 19:16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>יִרְבֵּן(בַּחֲלַל)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(τραυματίου)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ + ῥομφαίας**

- **Wit 2:** ↓ O Eus VI 12 Syh = MT
- **Attr:** ※ G Syh\(^L\)] > rell
- **Var:** ῥομφαίας] -φαία G-376'
- **NonGr:** Syh ἀνθρώπου

**Notes:** The O-group, Syh, and Eusebius bear witness to Origen adding ῥομφαίας under the asterisk to render בִּרֵית for which NUM has no equivalent. Perhaps the NUM translator judged that the instrument of killing would be assumed to be a sword.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>בָּיָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἀνθρωπίνου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α’ ἀνθρώπου (

**Wit 1:** 344\(^{344}\)
Wit 2: A oI C’ s y–392 55 646

ρ′ θ′ ἀνθρωπίνου

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: B F M’ V O’ b d f n t x–527) 392 z 59 319 424 624 799

Notes: The adjective ἀνθρωπίνος is used three times in NUM and it always renders אָדָם (5:6, 19:16, 18); it occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch. A note in s-group manuscript 344 indicates that the ρ’ text matches NUM with ἀνθρωπίνου, and this is supported by the O-group. 344 also indicates that Symmachus and Theodotion have ἀνθρωπίνου. Symmachus uses ἀνθρώπινος only in Ezek 24:17 to render יִשָּׁך, and this provides some support for the 344 attribution. We have no evidence of Theodotion using ἀνθρώπινος anywhere else, but he may have followed NUM here.

Aquila always prefers a more literal rendering of ἀνθρώπινος, using either ἀνθρώπος or ἄνήρ, and so the reading ἀνθρώπινου makes sense for him. Some manuscripts, including A, reflect Aquila in this verse. Syh is not a witness to either usage, as it renders ἀνθρώπινος as ἅκαθάρτος (e.g., in 19:9) but it also renders ἀνθρώπινος the same way (e.g., in the present verse).

| HT     | וַיַּטְמָא שִׁבְעַת יָמִים |
| LXX    | ἑπτὰ ἡ*έρας ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται |
| non tr | ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἑπτὰ ημέρας |

Wit 2: O–58 54-75-767 509 392 Eus VI 12 Aeth Arm Bo Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh אֶלִימָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא אָלַמָא

Notes: Origen routinely changed word order to match the Hebrew without noting this with Aristarchian signs. The O-group (minus 58) and several other witnesses depart from the LXX order and correspond exactly to the Hebrew, thus showing evidence of Origen’s work.

Num 19:18

| HT     | כֵּלִים (מִשְׁרָנִים) |
| LXX    | (τὰ σκεύη) |
Sub ※  pr πάντα

Wit 2:  O Syh = MT Tar

Attr:  ※ G Syh^T > rell

NonGr:  Syh^L אָנָוֹס > Syh^T אָנָוֹס

Notes:  NUM routinely omits the equivalent of בַּל (see comments under 19:14 above). Here, NUM is consistent with Sam, which also omits בַּל. Origen added the equivalent πάντα under the asterisk, and this is supported by the O-group. Syh^L has the asterisk but no metobelus.

HT  עָלִי הַנֹּגֵעַ
LXX  ἐπὶ τὸν ἡμιμένου

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh^L = MT

NonGr:  Syh^L אָנָוֹס ÷

Notes:  G and Syh have an obelus that correctly indicates that the τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου in NUM has no equivalent in HT. No other manuscripts witness negatively to the obelus.

Syh^L has mistakenly marked אָנָוֹס (“bones” with preposition) with the obelus. This is an example of Syh^L misplacing Aristarchian signs (for other examples, see under the asterisks for 20:5 and 11, and under the obelus for 20:12). Manuscript 392 has also omitted τοῦ ὀστέου, but this is probably a coincidence and not a negative witness to Syh^L.

HT  עַל־הַנֹּגֵעַ
LXX  ἐπὶ τὸν ἡμιμένου

〈όι λ́〉  ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγγίσαντα

Wit 1:  F^b

Notes:  The corrections in F come from two periods. The first set of corrections are known as F^a. Later, in medieval times a restorer retraced F and made further corrections which are designated F^b. F^a and F^b contain glosses to the LXX text of manuscript F. In some instances, these notes have affinities with earlier traditions,
including hexaplaric ones. An example of clear affinities with Aquila is found in the F\textsuperscript{b} reading in 25:6 (see under that verse), while other F\textsuperscript{b} readings appear to have originated later. Thus, each reading must be evaluated separately.

This section covers a marginal note in F\textsuperscript{b} that replaces τὸν ἡ**ένον with τὸν ἐγγίσαντα to render הַנֹּגֵעַ. NUM uniformly renders נגע using ἅπτο*αι (4:15, 16:26, 19:11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22[2x], 31:19). NUM uses ἐγγίζω only at 24:17, for קָרוֹב, an adjective derived from קרב. The Three use ἐγγίζω to render בֵּן (e.g., α′ θ′: Isa 41:21, Hos 7:6 Piel; α′ σ′: Ps 31[32]:9), but Aquila and Symmachus render the hiphil of נגע with ἐγγίζω (α′: 1 Kgdms 14:9; σ′: Ps 31[32]:6, Zech 14:5). Theodotion does not render נגע using ἐγγίζω elsewhere, but in this instance he could be following NUM. Thus, the note could from any of the Three, although it could also be a gloss from a scholiast.

**Num 19:20**

| HT          | מֵי נִדָּה |
| LXX         | ὅτι (ὕδωρ ῥαντισ*οῦ) |

**Sub ÷**

| Wit 2:  | G Syh\textsuperscript{L} = MT |
| NonGr:  | Syh\textsuperscript{L} מֵי נִדָּה |

**Notes:** G and Syh\textsuperscript{L} correctly obelize the second ὅτι in NUM which has no basis in HT. No other manuscripts delete this word (Syh\textsuperscript{T} has the word without the obelus). Wevers notes that the clause beginning with the second ὅτι is an exact copy of the same phrase in 19:13 (NGTN 321), and this may be the reason for the NUM addition of ὅτι here.

**Numbers 20**

**Num 20:3**

| HT          | ῥαμάμαρ (καίμαρ) |
| LXX         | (λέγοντες) |

**Sub ※ pr καὶ εἶπαν**

| Wit 2:  | ↓ O ↓121 Syh = MT |
Notes: Hebrew often couples finite verb forms of לָמָה with רָלֵאמֹל to mark the onset of quoted speech (e.g., 7:4, 14:7, 20:3, 23). In this verse, the normal pattern is broken because another verb — וַיָּרֶב — comes before וַיֹּאמְרוּ, resulting in: “And the people contended with Moses and they said, saying…” NUM omits the second verb, and reads simply, “And the people contended with Moses, saying…” which is a good equivalent. Origen includes the equivalent καὶ εἶπαν under the asterisk. Manuscript 121 from the υ-group substitutes καὶ ἔλεγον for λέγοντες in NUM, and this may be a witness to καὶ εἶπαν from the ο′ text, although it may be an inner Greek correction. For a discussion of the treatment of לָמָה in NUM see under 27:15.

Num 20:4

HT

וַיֹּאמְרוּ לָמָה לָבֶן וּלָא מִן אַרְבָּא ג אִ פָּרָה לָא מִן אַרְבָּא

LXX

ἵνα τί ἀναμένειν καὶ εἴπῃ τί

ο′ σ′ θ′ ῥνα τί

Wit 1: 344 ↓85′ ↓321′

Wit 2: A B F M′ V O′ 618* b d f n 30-730 t x y ↓z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Attr: ο′ σ′ θ′] > 85′ 321′

Var: ῥνα τί] + τοῦτο 126

α′ εἴς τί

Wit 1: 344

Notes: Manuscript 344 from the s-group indicates that ο′, σ′, and θ′ read the same as NUM, translating מַהְמָלְא as ῥνα τί. This is different than most of the s-group which has διὰ τί. The attribution to the ο′ text is supported by the O-group. The Three routinely use ῥνα τί to render מַהְמָלְא, (e.g., α′: 3 Kgdms 14:6, Ps 2:1, 21[22]:2, Prov 17:16; σ′: Ps 41[42]:10, 43[44]:24, Prov 17:16; θ′: 2 Kgdms 14:13, Ps 67[68]:17, Isa 58:3). Thus, the attributions to Symmachus and Theodotion make sense. The attribution of εἴς
τί to Aquila is also valid, however, since he regularly uses εἰς τί for לָמָה (e.g., in Gen 4:6, 12:18, and 31:27), although nowhere else in Numbers.

HT 
LXX 

Sub ※ + ἐκεῖ

Wit 2: O\(^{-376}\) Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh\(^1\) > rell

NonGr: Syh\(^1\) אֹתָנוּ ※ | Syh\(^\uparrow\) אֹתָנוּ

Notes: Origen added ἐκεῖ under the asterisk to match שָׁם which NUM does not render. The metobelus is missing in Syh\(^1\) but the asterisk is sufficient.

Num 20:5

HT 
LXX 

Sub ↓

Wit 2: G

> 72 71 Lat cod 100 Arm Bo Sa\(^12\) = MT

Notes: Origen placed τοῦτο under the obelus to show it has no counterpart in the Hebrew. Wevers believes that τοῦτο reflects a parent text for NUM different from MT, one which has נִי לָמָה (NGTN 324). Supporting Wevers’ suggestion is that elsewhere in NUM, לָמָה alone is rendered either with ἵνα τί or διὰ τί without τοῦτο. Where לָמָה נִי appears elsewhere in NUM, however, it also is rendered without τοῦτο (11:20 and 14:41). Wevers may be correct, but the amount of data is limited. The differences may also be stylistic.

HT 
LXX
Sub ※ + ἡμᾶς

Wit 2:  O 121 Aeth Arab Syh = MT

Attr:  ※ G Syh† > rell

NonGr:  SyhL | Syh

Notes:  The O-group, 121, and some versions witness to the Origenic addition of ἡμᾶς under the asterisk. This corresponds to אֹתָנוּ in HT which NUM does not render, probably because ἡμᾶς has already been used as the object of ἀνῆγαγετε and it is understood in context as the object of παραγενέσθαι.

Syh† has placed the asterisk around the word קָאָשַׁה ("place") which directly follows the word that is equivalent to ἡμᾶς. This sign is clearly misplaced because the word for "place" is present in both the Hebrew and Greek, and no manuscript evidence indicates otherwise.

Num 20:6

HT  שלֵּמְיָהָה(ם)
LXX  (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον)

Sub ※ + αὐτῶν

Wit 2:  O Arab Arm Co ↓Syh = Compl MT

Attr:  ※ G Syh† > rell

NonGr:  SyhL | Syh

Notes:  Origen has correctly used the asterisked αὐτῶν to reflect the untranslated pronominal suffix on פְּנֵיהֶם. NUM often leaves pronominal suffixes untranslated (see verse 5 above; also see HEXNUM1 on 2:4 for 11 examples from chapter 2). NUM also adds pronouns when not matched in the Hebrew (see HEXNUM1 for the obelus in 2:34). Such omissions and additions can be a result of the NUM tendency to adopt standard patterns (see HEXNUM1 on the obelus in 2:34), or simply because Greek style allows such omissions.

HT  יִפְּלוּ
LXX  ἔπεσον
ο’ σ’ θ’ ἔπεσον

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ Bς Φη Μ’ Υ V G-426-οl64 73’-414-528-761 vid b(–314) d 53’-129 n 85*-321-343-346 y 319 646 799 = Sixt

α’ ἔπεσαν

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ A B F 58 376 64 oll C’–414 57-413-550-552-761* 56’ s–385* 321 343 346 509
121 55 ↓59 424 624 Cyr II 489 = Ra

_Var:_ –σον] -σεν 59*

_Notes:_ NUM uses –αν as a second aorist ending, common in Hellenistic Greek, for a few words and routinely only for ἐπιπτων; otherwise it uses the classical form –ov. For the present verse the Greek manuscript tradition is split between ἔπεσον and ἔπεσαν – and even the hexaplaric witnesses are evenly split. Manuscript 344 from the ο’ group notes that Origen, Symmachus, and Theodotion agree with NUM and use the classical –ov ending for πίπτων, while only Aquila adopts the later Hellenistic inflection (see Gignac 335-36).

Because of the division in the text tradition it is difficult to assign levels of accuracy to the attributions (see HEXNUM1 for 16:22, where the identical attributions occur). As for the 344 ο’ note, the O-group is split, with G-426 agreeing with the ο’ attribution but 58-376 agreeing with α’. The ο’ attribution is possibly accurate, since G is the oldest witness and 58 often diverges from the rest of the O-group. At 16:22, however, where 344 again attributes ἔπεσον to ο’, the entire O-group disagrees and has ἔπεσαν. This casts uncertainty on the attribution at 16:22, and at least raises a question about the present ο’ attribution.

HT

LXX

ο’ ἐπ’ αυτούς

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ V O’–15 d 246 n t 527’ 128 Arm Bo Syh
NonGr: Syh ܐܘܢ
doi λ’ προς αυτούς

Wit 1: 344\textsuperscript{1st}

Wit 2: A B F M' 15 oII C'\textsuperscript{(-314)} f\textsuperscript{(-246)} s x\textsuperscript{(-527)} y ε\textsuperscript{(-128)} 55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Notes: A marginal note in 344 indicates that the o’ text has ἐπ’ αὐτούς for
οἱ λ’ instead of προς αυτούς as in NUM, and the O-group and Syh support this
attribution. The context is the appearance of “the glory of God” (ἡ δόξα κυρίου).
This phrase appears in NUM elsewhere in 14:10, 21, 16:19, and 17:7. In 14:10, ἐπί
is used when the glory of the Lord is said to appear “at/upon” (ἐπί) the tent of witness “among”
(ἐν) the children of Israel (ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς υἱοῖς
Ἰσραήλ). Thus, the use of ἐπί is unusual in the present verse, and it is not clear why
Origen chose it.

Another 344 note says that oi λ’ agrees with NUM. That the Three would follow
NUM and employ προς makes sense as it is used for דא by all of them (e.g., Num
16:24).

Num 20:9

HT (כַּאֲשֶׁרֶם לַּאֲשֶׁר)
LXX (καθὰ συνέταξεν) κύριος

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Var: κύριος| αὐτῷ V 319 = MT

NonGr: Syh ܐܘܢ
doi λ’ προς αυτούς

Notes: At the end of this verse, HT reads כַּאֲשֶׁרֶם לַּאֲשֶׁר (“as he commanded
him”), with an implicit subject and a direct object. NUM has καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος,
with explicit subject and no direct object. Origen places κύριος under the obelus as
witnessed by Syh. Origen does not address the omission of the direct object, although he
frequently includes asterisked equivalents of pronominal suffixes (e.g., 20:11 below). A
number of mainly non-hexaplaric manuscripts do match the direct object by adding αὐτῷ (and thus read καθ’ αὐτῷ συνέταξεν αὐτῷ κύριος), although this is probably an inner Greek correction. Manuscripts V and 319 not only add αὐτῷ but they omit κύριος, and because of the latter omission they are listed as negative witnesses to the obelus.

**Num 20:10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>הַמֹּרִים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>οἱ ἀπειθεῖς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** NUM renders a participial form of מְרִי with the nominal adjective phrase οἱ ἀπειθεῖς. An unattributed marginal note in manuscript 128 reads οἱ φιλόνεικοι (“contentious”). In the LXX, φιλόνεικος is uncommon — it is used only in Ezek 3:7 and there it does not render מְרִי. A note attributed to οἱ ἄλλοι uses φιλόνεικος to render a related Hebrew word רָפָד (“rebellious”) in Ezek 44:6. Symmachus uses the related verb φιλόνεικεῖν to render מְרִי in Ps 77[78]:17. Thus, the note is possibly from Symmachus or another of the Three.

**Num 20:11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>וּ(בְּמַטֵּה)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(τῇ ῥάβδῳ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ**

**Wit 2:** V O Syh = MT

**Attr:** ※ G Syh] > rell

**NonGr:** Syh^L שולא ✗ שולא ✗ ✗ ✗ | Syh^T שולא ✗ ✗ ✗ ✗

**Notes:** Origen adds αὐτοῦ under the asterisk to correspond to the untranslated pronominal suffix in HT. Once again, Syh^L has misplaced the asterisk by one word (e.g., see 20:5 above).

**Num 20:12**
HT אַהֲרֹן (אַהֲרֹן)
LXX (Ἀαρων)

〈Sub ※〉 pr πρός

Wit 2: 426 Arm = MT
Attr: ※] > omnes

Notes: This is the same situation as in 19:1 (see the discussion supra and see HEXNUM1 13:27[26], 15:33, and 16:3). Here 426 and Arm may indicate Origen’s work in including a second preposition to match the standard Hebrew repetition of the preposition, and this addition may originally have been under the asterisk. NUM invariably drops the repeated preposition when HT has אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן.

HT בִּי (הֶאֱמַנְתֶּם)
LXX (ἐπιστεύσατε)

Sub ※ + ἐν ἐμοί

Wit 2: O Bas I 440 Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh ב

Notes: NUM does not render ב in HT following the verb ἐπιστεύσατε. Origen added the equivalent ἐν ἐμοί under the asterisk as witnessed by the O-group and Syh.

A large number of manuscripts add μοί after ἐπιστεύσατε (including M’ V b d and Lat cod 100). The only other occurrence of πιστεύω in NUM occurs in 14:11, and in a similar context, where the Lord speaks of believing “in me” (בִּי), and there NUM renders ב as μοί. So the addition of μοί in many manuscripts for the present verse may reflect 14:11, or as Wevers suggests, it may simply be an ad sensum (inner Greek) gloss (NGTN 327). Thus, the manuscripts attesting μοί likely do not bear witness to Origen’s work.

HT (אַהֲרֹן לָעִי)
LXX (οὐκ εἰσάξετε) ύμεῖς

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh
>  

**Wit 2:** 58 Chr I 506 Bo = MT

**NonGr:** Syh\textsuperscript{L} ꞧ\textsuperscript{חאץא} ꞧ \textsuperscript{אבדא} | Syh\textsuperscript{T} ꞧ\textsuperscript{חאץא} ꞧ \textsuperscript{אבדא} ꞧ

**Notes:** The obelus of G and Syh correctly identifies ὑμεῖς in NUM as having no equivalent in HT. Syh\textsuperscript{L} has the obelus placed around the next word (ܡܬܐܬܐ), but this is incorrect since both HT and NUM have its equivalent. As noted elsewhere, this is not uncommon for Syh\textsuperscript{T}.

**Num 20:13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>fin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>fin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sam\textsuperscript{sec_Syh} + καὶ ἐπιε Μωυσῆς· κύριε κύριε (Syh\textsuperscript{L} ΠΠΠΙ), σὺ ἤρξω δεῖξαι τῷ θεράποντί σου ἵσχυν σου, καὶ τὴν χεῖρά σου κραταίαν· τίς γὰρ θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὃστις ποιήσει καθὰ ἐποίησας σὺ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἵσχυν σου; διαβάς οὖν ὅσοι τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν τὴν οὖσαν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦτο, καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον. καὶ εἶπε κύριε (Syh\textsuperscript{L} ΠΠΠΙ) πρὸς Μωυσῆν· ἱκανούσθω σοι, *ἡ προσθῆσαι πρὸς μὲ ἐτι τὸν λόγον τοῦτοι. αὐτοῖ ἐπι τὴν κορυφήν τοῦ λελαξευεύνου, καὶ ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου κατὰ θάλασσαν, καὶ βορρᾶν, καὶ λίβα, καὶ ἀνατολάς, ἶδε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, ὅτι οὐ διαβάσῃ τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦτον. και ἔντειλαι Ἰησοῦ υἱῷ
Ναυε, καὶ κατίσχυσον αὐτῶν, καὶ παρακάλεσον αὐτῶν· ὅτι αὐτὸς
diαβήσεται πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ
τοῦτο, καὶ οὕτως κατακληρονομήσει
αὐτοὺς τὴν γῆν ἕν ἑώρακας. καὶ ἐλάλησε

κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν, λέγων· ἴκανοῦθω
痫ὶν κυκλοῦν τὸ ὀρος τοῦτο·

ἐπιστράψατε οὖν εἰς βορρᾶν. καὶ τῷ λαῷ
ἐντειλαὶ, λέγων· ύμεῖς παραπορεύεσθε
dιὰ τῶν ὀρίων τῶν ἀδελφῶν ύμῶν ύιῶν
Ἡσαῦ, οἱ κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Σινέρ. καὶ
φοβηθήσονται ύμᾶς, καὶ εὕλαβηθήσονται
σφόδρα. μὴ συνάψετε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· οὐ
gὰρ μὴ δῶ ύμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν εἰς

κληρονομίαν οὐδὲ βῆμα ἵκνους ποδος, ὅτι
ἐν κλῆρῳ τοῖς ύιοῖς Ἡσαῦ δέδωκα τὸ

ὀρος Σινέρ. βρώματα ἀγοράσατε παρ’
αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου, καὶ φάγεσθε· καὶ ὑδῷ
λήψεσθε παρ’ αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου, καὶ
πέσεσθε.

Wit 1: ↓Syh

NonGr: Syh1
Syh

Notes: The reading is a retroversion from Syh provided by Field and derived mainly from the LXX of Deuteronomy 3:24-25, 26b-28, and 2:2-6. After Numbers 20:13 in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam), passages from Deuteronomy 3:24-25, 26b-28 and 2:2-6 in Sam are copied in almost verbatim, with a few explanatory additions and modifications. A number of these additions from Deuteronomy (and two from Numbers) appear in Sam of Numbers. The whole of Sam, including these additions, was translated into Greek in a work known as the Samaritikon. In some Greek manuscripts and in Syh, marginal notes appear associated with the passages in Sam that have these additions. The Greek manuscripts include what presumably is the Samaritikon for these passages and Syh includes a Syriac translation of the Greek. Because these passages from the Samaritikon came to be associated with hexaplaric materials, they are included here.

This section covers one such marginal note associated with 20:13 in Syh, where Syh has a Syriac rendering of the Samaritikon of the added text in Sam between Numbers 20:13 and 14. Syh marks each line except the last with a modified obelus whose right side resembles the tail of an arrow. Syh uses a sign that looks more like a standard obelus. The attribution in Syh comes from the ending of the passage (shown below), which reads (words that are different in Syh follow the corresponding Syh words in parentheses):
“These alone are brought according to an exemplar of the Samaritans. They are reminiscent of Moses in the Second Law (Deuteronomy).”

The two inserted passages from Deuteronomy appear together in the Samaritan Pentateuch after Numbers 20:13 (the text that matches HT is labeled 20:13a and the added text is labeled 20:13b). The first interpolated passage relates to Numbers 20:1-13 and the second to Numbers 20:14-21. Numbers 20:1-13 is the story of Moses and Aaron’s actions that led to their being denied entrance to the promised land. The first inserted passage, containing most of Deut 3:24-28 of Sam, is logically related in that it recounts Moses’ prayer to the Lord to be allowed to enter the land, and the Lord’s negative response. Numbers 20:14-21 is the story of Edom’s refusal to allow Israel to pass through their territory. The second inserted passage, from Deuteronomy 2:2-6 of Sam, relates to Numbers 20:14-21 in that it reviews the Edom episode and mentions God’s promise to give the territory of Edom to Esau’s descendants.

In the marginal note containing this passage, Syh uses the word ܐܘܠܐ to render the tetragrammaton, where Syh uses ܐܠܐ. This alternate name originated from a scribal attempt to represent יהוה using the Greek characters ΠΠΠΙ. For a full discussion, see under 20:16 below.

The text from the Samaritan Pentateuch of Deuteronomy 3:24-25, 26b-28, and 2:2-6 is shown below with differences from Numbers 20:13b noted. Phrases in Deuteronomy that are modified in Numbers 20:13b are noted with asterisks, and the modified phrase from Numbers follows in brackets. Additions to Deuteronomy in the Numbers text are also noted with brackets.

Sam, Deuteronomy 3

[24] 24elyn yeirah ehet hahalah lehoratoh at tahbir okhah at delal rohah

[25] 25* nahr*eh

[26] 26...roirah yeirah "ela*

[27] 27...unlah elo ahem hemafeh ma taevikah roirah hahah at tahbir okhah

[28] 28...rainah at haerdrim rohah roirah tah at tahbir okhah roirah tah "ela*

Sam, Deut 2

[22] 22roirah yeirah "ela*

[23] 23...unlah elo ahem hemafeh ma taevikah roirah hahah at tahbir okhah

LXX, Deut 3

2Kuriē kuriē, su ἐπέδειξα τῷ σῷ θεράποντι τὴν ἰσχύν σου καὶ τὴν δύναμιν σου καὶ τὴν χείρα τὴν κραταίαν καὶ τὸν βραχίονα τὸν υψηλόν· τίς γάρ ἐστιν θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡστες ποιήσει καθὰ σὺ ἐποίησας καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἰσχύν
σου; 25 διαβὰς οὖν ὄψοις τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ταύτην τὴν οὖσαν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, τὸ ὄρος τούτο τὸ ἄγαθον καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον… ἐπὶ κυριότερα μη ὄψοις τὸν ὄρον τούτον. 26 ἀνάβηθι ἐπὶ κορυφήν Λελαξευμένου, καὶ ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ βορρᾶ καὶ λίβα καὶ ἀνατολάς, καὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔδρατος τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦτον. 27 καὶ ἔντειλαι Ἰησοῦς καὶ κατακληρονόμησε τούς τετράδιναν τοῦταν, ὅτι οὐκ ὠνομάζεται πρὸς προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ αὐτὸς κατακληρονομῆσαι αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν, ἢν ἑώρακεν.

LXX, Deut 2
2 καὶ ἔδρατος τοῦτον, ἐπιστράφη ἐπὶ βορρᾶ. 3 Ικανούσθω ὑἱῶν κυκλοῦν τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο, ὑπετάθη αὐτοῖς λέγων Ὑπείς παραπορεύεσθε διὰ τῶν ὀρίων τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑιῶν Ἡσαύ, οἳ κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Σηίρ, καὶ φοβηθήσονται ὑιῶν καὶ εὐλαβηθήσονται σφόδρα. 4 ἔντειλαι Ἰησοῦς καὶ κατακληρονόμησε αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν, ἢν ἑώρακεν. 5 βρώσατε ἀγοράσατε παρὰ αὐτῶν καὶ φάγεσθε καὶ ὕδωρ λήψεσθε παρὰ αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου καὶ πίεσθε.

In the above note, Syh shows clear affinities with the relevant Greek LXX passages from Deuteronomy 2 and 3. In addition, Syh also evidences an awareness of peculiarities of Sam in Numbers 20:13b that are not derived from the Deuteronomy passage from Sam or the LXX (for example, the explanatory “son of Nun” after Joshua’s name is unique to Sam of Numbers 20:13b and is also reflected in this Syh marginal note). This implies that the Samaritikon translation was derived from Numbers 20:13b of the Samaritan Pentateuch, even though the Samaritikon translator almost certainly referred to the LXX of Deuteronomy as well.

The above Syriac text is one of fourteen passages from the Samaritikon or a closely allied work found in the margins of Syh or other Greek manuscripts. Twelve of the fourteen are quotes from Deuteronomy, and two are from Numbers. The following list shows all the locations of the marginal notes and the Sam passages quoted in them in translated form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX verse</th>
<th>Sam verse</th>
<th>Inserted text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>10:10b</td>
<td>Deut 1:6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1</td>
<td>13:33b</td>
<td>Deut 1:27-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40</td>
<td>14:41a</td>
<td>Deut 1:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Deut 1:44b (+ added phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:13</td>
<td>20:13b</td>
<td>Deut 3:24-25, 26b-28; 2:2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:11</td>
<td>21:12a</td>
<td>Deut 2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:13</td>
<td>21:13a</td>
<td>Deut 2:17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:20</td>
<td>21:21a</td>
<td>Deut 2:24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:22</td>
<td>21:22a</td>
<td>Deut 2:27b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:22</td>
<td>21:22b</td>
<td>Deut 2:28-29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:23</td>
<td>21:23b</td>
<td>Deut 2:31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: Little evidence exists for determining the origin of this note, although it could be hexaplaric. The LXX does not use the noun μηνυτής (as a substantive, “one who brings information”), although it uses the related verb μηνύω five times in 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees (2 Macc 3:7, 6:11, 14:37, 3 Macc 3:28, 4 Macc 4:3). Symmachus does not use the noun but he does use the verb once in Job 12:8. Although the note could conceivably reflect Symmachus, the data is scanty.

Notes: HT begins with a third person plural verb (יִרְדוּ = “they went down” referring to “our fathers”), and then the subject shifts to first person plural נֵשֶׁב (from ישב). NUM matches these, using κατέβησαν (third person) followed by παρῳκήσαμεν (first person). Manuscript 344 — part of the s-group which has παρῳκήσαμεν — indicates that the o’ text has παρوهاκησαν which incorrectly continues the third person inflection of the first verb as if the subject were the same. The O-group (minus 58), Aeth,
and Syh bear witness to this change, and so the attribution is probably accurate. Possibly this was an inner Greek corruption in the text received by Origen.

In the LXX, παροικέω is not commonly used to render ישב — it is rendered this way only here in the Pentateuch (although 963 and the uncials A and M also do so in Gen 24:37), and six other times in the OT. Much more frequently παροικέω renders רָדָה which signifies a temporary residence. Perhaps for the present verse the LXX translator was attempting to convey the temporary quality of Israel’s stay in Egypt, even though it lasted several generations.

\[\alpha' \text{ ἐκαθίσα} \text{μεν}\]

*Notes:* This note attributed to \(\alpha'\) is consistent with Aquila who uses several words to render ישב, including καθίζω, κάθη*αι, and κατοικέω. In this verse, ישב is used in the sense of dwelling, and Aquila chooses καθίζω to convey that idea, as he does also in Genesis 13:12, Psalm 67[68]:17, and Isaiah 37:37.

\[\sigma' \text{ διετρίψα} \text{μεν}\]

*Notes:* Symmachus uses διατρίβω (“to spend time, reside”) in 2 Kingdoms 5:9 to render ישב. There the context is David dwelling in Jerusalem. In the present verse, however, Salvesen suggests that Symmachus may have selected διατρίβω to reflect the impermanent nature of the Israelites’ dwelling in Egypt (SITP 127).

\[\theta' \text{ κατῳκήσα} \text{μεν}\]

*Notes:* NUM commonly uses κατοικέω to render ישב (e.g., 13:19, 28, 29, 32, 14:14, 25, 21:1, et passim). This is also characteristic usage for Theodotion who regularly renders ישב as κατοικέω in the sense of “inhabit” (Isa 38:11, Jer 31[48]:19, 32[25]:29, Ezek 26:17). Although 319 is listed as a witness here, it may reflect NUM usage rather than Theodotion, since NUM also uses κατοικέω frequently.

**Num 20:16**
Notes: The margin contains a lemnisk (represented above), which looks similar to an obelus, except that the line between the two dots is wavy like a tilde. For this verse, the lemnisk is unattributed and occurs in the margin with the word ܐfilesize:AUTOFROMTEXT-hom. The same unattributed use of the lemnisk with ܐfilesize:AUTOFROMTEXT-hom occurs over 20 times in Syh and to relate them to marginal notes that contain the word ܐfilesize:AUTOFROMTEXT-hom. This word is the Syriac equivalent of the Greek ΠΠΠΠ, a word introduced by a Greek scribe who saw the tetragrammaton (יהוה) and read it backwards, as if it were the capital Greek letters pi-iota-pi-iota. ΠΠΠΠ also occurs 14 other times in Syh as part of attributed marginal readings.

Notes: The obelus from G correctly indicates that κύριος in NUM has nothing corresponding to it in HT, where the subject is implicit from the indirect object of the previous clause. Several other manuscripts reflect the obelus and omit κύριος.
Sub ˙ επιπι

Wit 1:  Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg}

Wit 2:  Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt} | Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg}

Notes:  The second lemnisk in the text of Syh\textsuperscript{L} occurs with the second instance of אֲנָה in this verse and corresponds to the second lemnisk in the margin with the word הָם (for discussion of the lemnisk, see supra).

\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad הָם \quad (עַדְשֶׁהָן) \\
\text{LXX} & \quad (καὶ εἰσήκουσέν) κύριος τῆς φωνῆς ἡμῶν
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{non tr} & \quad τῆς \phiωνῆς \ ήμῶν \div \ κύριος \\
\text{Wit 2:} & \quad O^{-58} \text{Syh}
\end{align*}

Notes:  The O-group (minus 58) and Syh witness to a possible Origenic transposition of the word κύριος. As shown above, the word κύριος was put under the obelus by Origen. Without κύριος, the Greek phrase would read: καὶ εἰσήκουσέν τῆς φωνῆς ἡμῶν which matches the Hebrew exactly. NUM places κύριος in the middle of that phrase. Origen sometimes changed word order to match the Hebrew, and he appears to have done so with κύριος under the obelus, perhaps for reasons of aligning the text in his columns.

Num 20:17

\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad מֵי בְאֵר \\
\text{LXX} & \quad (ὕδωρ ἐκ λάκκου) σου
\end{align*}

Sub ˙

Wit 2:  Syh\textsuperscript{L}
Notes: The obelus correctly marks that σου in NUM is lacking in HT. Two Catena manuscripts also reflect this minus. Syh has the word but without an obelus.

**Num 20:18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>שָׁלוֹם תַּעֲבֹר בִּי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>οὐ διελεύσῃ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** HT uses the phrase שָׁלוֹם תַּעֲבֹר בִּי, which means literally “you will not pass through me.” NUM renders the Hebrew literally as οὐ διελεύσῃ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ. The intended meaning is clearly “you shall not pass through my territory.” An unattributed marginal note in manuscript 58 expresses this implied meaning by replacing δι᾽ ἐμοῦ with ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις μου (“into my region”). The Three all use διέρχομαι for עָבֹר (e.g., Prov 4:15, Isa 30:9). Aquila is not likely to have departed from the literal Hebrew and added ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις, and Theodotion has no compelling reason to depart from NUM since NUM renders literally. Symmachus might possibly have added ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις, for example to harmonize with the three appearances of ὁρίον in the immediate passage (verses 16, 17, 21; he uses ὁρίον elsewhere, e.g., in Isa 9:1, Hos 5:1). But it is also possible that the note reflects a scribal gloss with the usage in those verses in view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἀναχωρήσαντι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐξελεύσομαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ο’ ἐξελεύσομεθα

**Notes:** The obelus correctly marks that σου in NUM is lacking in HT. Two Catena manuscripts also reflect this minus. Syh has the word but without an obelus.
NonGr: Syh מים

Notes: In HT, the king of Edom uses the singular when referring to himself and his people. NUM matches HT in using the singular εξελεύσομαι. According to 344, the ο’ text changes this to a plural, and since almost the entire O-group follows suit this is likely the ο’ text reading. The reasons for this change are not obvious, however, unless Origen had a different parent text.

α’ ο’ θ’ εξελθω

Wit 1: 344

Notes: A reading attributed to α’, σ’, and θ’ matches the singular of the Hebrew but instead of future in NUM they use an aorist subjunctive. NUM uses εἰ μή to render ἤπειρον (“lest”) that precedes the verb. Perhaps the Three were trying to express a more conditional sense of ἤπειρον as it relates to the Edomites’ actions (see NGTN 331).

Num 20:19

HT י(מִקְנַי) LXX (κτήνη)

〈Sub ※〉 + μου

Wit 2: A F M’ O’ oIT82 C” h(314) f 767 s 619 y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Phil II 87UF Cyr I 572 Lat Aug Loc in hept IV 68 Num 37 ↓ Lat cod 100 ↓ Aeth Syh = Sixt MT Sam Tarα

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: μου] ἡμῶν Lat cod 100 Aeth = Tarα

NonGr: Lat cod 100 nostrα | Lat Aug Loc in hept IV 68 Num 37 meα | Syh מים

Notes: A large number of LXX manuscripts add μου which corresponds to the pronominal suffix on מִקְנַי in HT but which NUM omits. This could be due to Origen, as it is reflected by the O-group, and it may have been under the asterisk. Wevers suggests, however, that this change could have been introduced as an ad sensum gloss (NGTN 331). Three other differences are not addressed by Origen in this verse. First, NUM fails to render another pronominal suffix (מִכְרָם), and Origen does not account for it with an asterisk. Second, to the verb δώσω NUM adds the ad sensum gloss σοι which is not in
the Hebrew, and Origen does not indicate this with an obelus. Third, NUM paraphrases the last part of the verse, rendering בְּרַגְלַי אֶעֱבֹרָה by repeating the phrase from earlier in the verse: παρὰ τὸ ὄρος παρελευσόμεθα. Origen makes no attempt to mark or modify this.

**Num 20:20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לֹא תַעֲבֹר</td>
<td>(οὐ διελεύσῃ) δι’ ἐμοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ÷**

*Wit 2:* G Syh

> 

*Wit 2:* Lat<sup>cod 100</sup> = MT

*NonGr:* Syh לֹא

**Notes:** In 20:18, HT has בּאָה after the verb עבֹר, and NUM matches the Hebrew with δι’ ἐμοῦ. In the present verse, the same speaker repeats essentially the identical message, but HT leaves out בּא. NUM adds δι’ ἐμοῦ here, probably to harmonize with verse 18. Origen correctly places this under the obelus.

**Num 20:23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אַהֲרֹן)אֶל־(וְ</td>
<td>(καὶ Ααρων)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ πρός**

*Wit 2:* Syh = MT

*Attr:* ※ Syh > rell

*NonGr:* Syh<sup>ך</sup> נ♂ו ♂ | Syh<sup>ך</sup> ♂ ♂ ♂<sup>ך</sup> ♂ ♂

**Notes:** For the phrase אַהֲרֹן)אֶל־, NUM never repeats the preposition before Ααρων. Origen adds πρός under the asterisk to account for the repeated
preposition (see the discussion under 19:1 on the treatment of repeated prepositions in NUM).

The asterisk in Syh\(^1\) includes the conjunction, which is probably incorrect since it appears in both Hebrew and Greek. This is consistent with the occasional tendency of Syh to misplace Aristarchian signs due to conglutinate structures. In addition, Syh\(^1\) omits the metobelus here. Unfortunately manuscript G, which is the only Greek manuscript with consistent Aristarchian signs, lacks the rest of chapter 20 and most of chapters 21-29. Thus, for these sections, Syh is the primary and usually the only witness to the signs.

**Num 20:25**

HT \(\text{הֹר הָהָר}\)

LXX \(\text{Ωρ τὸ ὄρος} \equiv \text{πάσης τῆς συναγωγῆς}\)

**Sub \(\div\)**

Wit 2: Syh

> Arab = Compl MT

**NonGr:** Syh\(^1\) + Syh\(^T\) +

*Notes:* The final words of 20:25 in NUM, \(\text{πάσης τῆς συναγωγῆς}\), have no corresponding text in HT. This seems to be a harmonization with verse 27, where the entire end of the verse — \(\text{Ωρ τὸ ὄρος} \equiv \text{πάσης τῆς συναγωγῆς}\) — appears again, only there it has support in the Hebrew. For the present verse, Origen placed the added text under the obelus, as witnessed by Syh. Syh\(^1\) has an extraneous obelus between the correct one and the metobelus, a phenomenon that occurs periodically in both Syh\(^1\) and Syh\(^T\).

**Num 20:26**

HT \(\text{הִלְבַּשָּׁהּ}\)

LXX \(\text{ἔνδυσον} + \text{αὐτήν}\)

**Sub \(\times\)**

Wit 2: \(\phi(G)\) 121 Co Syh = MT
Num 20:28

Sub ※ Μωυσῆς

Notes: HT has the explicit subject “Moses” but NUM has no equivalent, probably because the subject is plain from verse 27. According to the witness of the entire O-group and Syh, Origen added the equivalent Μωυσῆς under the asterisk.

Sub ※ †екеї

Notes: HT includes a plural pronominal suffix on גלְבַּשְׁתָּם (“you shall put them on”) referring to Aaron’s garments, but NUM has nothing corresponding to the suffix. Syh and the O-group witness to Origen adding the direct object αὐτήν under the asterisk to match the Hebrew (the Hebrew is masculine plural, but αὐτήν matches the feminine singular στολήν in NUM). SyhT places the asterisk correctly before the suffix, while Syh has shifted the asterisk one letter to the right.
Notes: HT adds the adverb בָּשָׂם to describe where Aaron died, but NUM omits it, possibly considering it to be redundant since the qualifier “on the top of the mountain” immediately follows. Origen added ἐκεῖ under the asterisk. This addition was copied by a large number of manuscripts and this likely indicates that it was adopted early in the transmission process.

Num 20:29

HT גָוַע
LXX ἀπελύθη

α΄ ἐδαπανήθη

Wit 1: 108 Syh

NonGr: Syh ἀλλᾶσσα

Notes: The word attributed to Aquila to render גוע — δαπανάω — in the passive means “to be consumed,” “destroyed,” or “spent.” It is used by Aquila only in this verse, and this is the only evidence we have for how Aquila renders גוע. δαπανάω is not used in the LXX for any of the Hebrew books. It is used by Theodotion in his version of Bel 3 to describe spending food for an idol, and in Bel 21 to describe devouring food. The Syh note uses the word אֵלֶּה (Ethpe’el of אַלֶּה) which means “to perish” or “be dispersed,” and thus Syh supports the reading in 108. The data is limited, but the attribution to α΄ is possibly correct.

θ΄ ἐξελίπεν

Wit 1: 108 344 ↓Syh

Attr: θ΄ σ΄ SyhL

NonGr: Syh ἀλλᾶσσα

Notes: According to two manuscripts, Theodotion uses ἐκλείπω to render גוע. Theodotion renders גוע using ἐκλείπω in Job 13:19 (in addition, he uses ἐκλείπω to render כלה in Deut 28:32, Job 11:20, 17:5, and 19:27, and מבת in Ezek 24:10). Thus this attribution to Theodotion makes sense.

SyhL attributes this reading to Symmachus, who also uses ἐκλείπω numerous times and in some of the same places as Theodotion (Deut 28:32, Job 17:5), including one time...
to render בְּרֵא (Ps 87[88]:16). Although this marginal note could possibly come from Symmachus, there seems to be no reason to doubt the attributions in 108 and 344 to Theodotion.

Numbers 21

Num 21:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>הַכְּנַעֲנִי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ὁ Χανανίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

οἱ λ’ ὁ Χαναναῖος

Wit 1: 108 Syh

Wit 2: A 72-426 56*(vid)-129-664 n^54 527 Procop 856 Lat cod 100 Arab Arm^up
Bo Sa^10^12 = Compl

NonGr: Lat cod 100 Channaneus | Syh

Notes: NUM renders הַכְּנַעֲנִי with the proper name ὁ Χανανίς. The normal way to render הַכְּנַעֲנִי in the LXX is with the gentilic ὁ Χαναναῖος, including five times in NUM (13:2, 29, 14:25, 43, 45). Only three times in the LXX is the proper name ὁ Χανανίς used, and all three are in NUM (21:1, 3, 33:40). Wevers argues that the translator was aware that the king in question did not live in the territory of Canaan, and so he treated נַעֲנִיכְּ as a proper name (NGTN 337).

As an alternative to NUM, a 108 and Syh note attributed to οἱ λ’ gives the more usual gentilic ὁ Χαναναῖος. In Syh, the complete note reads, “those of οἱ λ’: Canaanite (খাইν)”. At 33:40, for הַכְּנַעֲנִי in HT, NUM has ὁ Χανανίς, and there Syh attributes ὁ Χαναναῖος to Aquila and Theodotion. Elsewhere, Aquila and possibly the other two translators also use Χαναναῖος to render כְּנַעֲנִי (α’ in Job 40:30; ο’ γ’ possibly in Exod 6:15). The present attribution to οἱ λ’ is consistent with these examples, and thus, this reading is reasonable for any of the Three. The manuscript groups that pick up the modified rendering ὁ Χαναναῖος may reflect the influence of one of the Three, but they may also reflect NUM usage elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>יֹשֵׁב הַנֶּגֶב</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ὁ κατοικῶν κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{ἄλλος} ὁ καθήμενος εἰς τὸν νότον
Wit 1: Euseb., Onomasticon

Notes: No other witnesses have this note. Field says that this note is “doubtful” as coming from ἄλλος, but is perhaps from Aquila. Wevers does not include this note in his second apparatus.

HT אֶתָרִים (רַחָא)
LXX (ὁδὸν) Αθαρίμ

α’ σ’ τῶν κατασκόπων

Wit 1: ¶58 Eus III 1.10 ¶Syh
Attr: α’ σ’ ἄλλοι Syh | > 58
NonGr: Syh אֶתָרִים אֶתֶרָא

Notes: NUM transliterates הָאֲתָרִים, rendering it “Atharim.” This place name appears only here in the OT and its actual location is unknown. From the present note, we can infer that the name was also understood as מַעֲרַת (from the root מָר), or “the spies,” perhaps referring to the route that the twelve spies (κατασκεψά*ενοι) traveled in chapter 13 (see NGTN 337-38). Eusebius attributes the reading τῶν κατασκόπων to Aquila and Symmachus. The attribution to ἄλλοι in Syh comes from a note that reads, “Atharim, of spies, others translated it.”

The attribution to Aquila and Symmachus is possibly correct. Translating proper names is consistent with Symmachus (e.g., at 21:11 — see F-Pro 67-68). Aquila also occasionally translates place names (e.g., 21:19 — see REI-Pro 20). Evidence for the use of κατασκόπος, however, is scanty for Aquila and Symmachus. Montfaucon attributes an instance of τῶν κατασκόπων to Aquila and Symmachus at Numbers 14:6, but he provides no other evidence (see HEXNUM1 under 14:6). Aquila uses the related verb κατασκοπέω for תור in Deuteronomy 1:33 (as does Theodotion in Job 39:8). Hatch and Redpath lists οἱ λ’ readings for κατασκοπέω (or κατασκέπτο*αι) at Judges 1:23 and 1 Chronicles 17:17. Thus, the attributions to α’ and σ’ are possibly correct.

HT בֵּית
LXX κατεπρονόμευσαν

⟨ο’⟩ κατεπρονόμευσεν

Wit 1: 344
Notes: HT has singular וַיִּלָּחֶם and follows this with another singular וַיִּשְׁבָּ ("he took captive"). NUM renders the first verb as singular but for the second verb, it shifts to the plural κατεπρονό*ευσαν. An unattributed note from s-group manuscript 344 changes this to third singular κατεπρονό*ευσεν which conforms to the Hebrew, and many manuscripts match this, including the O-group and Syh. This is probably the reading of the o’ text (see NGTN 338).

Num 21:2

HT

אִם־נָתֹן תִּתֵּן אֶת־הָעָם

LXX

ἐάν *οι παραδώς τὸν λαὸν

ο’  

ἐάν παραδιδοὺς παραδῶς τὸν λαόν

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: ↓O(G) Syh

Var: παραδιδούς παραδούς 376

NonGr: Syh כָּכָּלָא יִשְׁלַמֵךְ,ךָכָּלָא יִשְׁלַמֵךְ

Notes: The marginal note attributed to o’ indicates two changes that Origen makes to NUM conform to HT. First, he omits μοι which has no equivalent in HT, and second he adds παραδιδούς, using a participle to match the infinitive absolute that NUM does not render. NUM renders inconsistently when HT has an infinite absolute preceding a cognate finite verb. One way NUM handles this is by using a participle followed by a cognate (or near cognate) finite verb, for example in 12:14, 13:30, 23:25, 30:7, 13, and 16. Another way is to use a dative noun followed by cognate (or near cognate) finite verb, as in 14:18, 15:31, 35, 18:15, 22:30, 23:25, 26:65, 35:16, 17, 18, 21, 26, 31, and 35:26. More rarely, NUM uses a cognate adverb with finite verb as in 22:17, or a periphrastic construction in 22:38. A final option is not to translate the infinitive absolute and to use a single Greek verb, as in 21:2, 37, 24:11, 27:7. For information on Hebrew infinitive absolutes paired with finite verbs, see GKC §113 and JM §123.

The witness of the O-group provides solid evidence for the attribution to o’ in 344. O-group manuscript 376 reflects the o’ text except for having the aorist participle
παραδούς instead of the present participle. Syh translates Origen’s cognate participle using a cognate infinitive absolute, taking its cue from the Peshitta for this verse.

\[\alpha' \quad \epsilon\acute{a}n \ \delta\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \delta\omicron\varsigma \ \sigma\upsilon\nu \ \tau\omicron \ \lambda\alpha\omicron\nu\]

\textit{Wit 1: 344}

\textit{Notes:} This 344 marginal reading attributed to Aquila is typical of him. He normally uses \(\delta\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\) to render \(\gamma\tau\nu\) (over 70 times) as in this verse (he uses \(\pi\tau\rho\alpha\delta\dot{i}d\delta\omicron\mu\) once in Jer 39[32]:4). Here, like Origen, Aquila reflects the Hebrew infinitive absolute and cognate finite verb with a participle before the cognate finite verb. For the Hebrew infinitive absolute and cognate verb construction, Aquila normally renders the infinitive absolute with either a participle (e.g., Num 30:13, 16, Isa 56:3, 61:10, Jer 13:17, 28[51]:58, Jer 39[32]:4, 46[39]:18, Hab 2:3), or a dative noun (e.g., Lev 13:7, Deut 31:29, Isa 59:11, Jer 6:9, 29:13[49:12], 51[44]:29). It is also common for Aquila to use a cognate pair (or close approximation) to represent a Hebrew cognate pair, as in every example given above (also e.g., Gen 28:22, Num 3:7, 16:13, 21:2, Deut 7:23, 11:22 — see SITP 228-29). Finally, characteristic of Aquila’s literal translation technique, and unique to him among the Three, is his use of \(\sigma\upsilon\nu\) to render the direct object marker \(\eta\eta\).

\[\sigma' \quad \epsilon\acute{a}n \ \delta\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron \ \lambda\alpha\omicron\nu\]

\textit{Wit 1: 344}

\textit{Notes:} This note, attributed by 344 to \(\sigma'\), avoids Aquila’s literalistic rendering of the infinitive absolute plus finite verb, but matches his use of \(\delta\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\) to render \(\gamma\tau\nu\) instead of \(\pi\tau\rho\alpha\delta\dot{i}d\delta\omicron\mu\) in NUM. Salvesen speculates that perhaps Symmachus avoided \(\pi\tau\rho\alpha\delta\dot{i}d\delta\omicron\mu\) so as not to ascribe to God the possibly negative connotation of betrayal (see SITP 128).

Unlike Theodotion and Aquila, Symmachus does not have a standard way of translating Hebrew infinitive absolute with cognate finite verbs. When the infinitive absolute precedes the verb, Symmachus may leave the infinitive untranslated, as in this verse and in Exodus 19:13. In other instances, he uses a cognate accusative noun (e.g., Deut 7:23) or a cognate dative noun with finite verb (e.g., Num 30:13, 16).

In cases where the infinitive absolute is postpositive to the cognate finite verb, Symmachus may construe it as providing emphasis, as in Numbers 16:13. In Deuteronomy 11:22, where the infinitive absolute is prepositive, Symmachus is sensitive to the context and correctly construes the Hebrew as speaking of continuous action. These examples demonstrate that Symmachus did not follow stereotypical formulas for translating these types of cognate verb pairs (see SITP 228-29).
Notes: A note attributed to θ′ employs παραδίδω*ι like NUM, and reflects the infinite absolute, but uses a dative noun rather than a participle. This is acceptable Greek, and a common way among all the translators to render the infinitive absolute when paired with a cognate verb. Theodotion commonly uses cognate pairs (or close approximations) to render cognate pairs (e.g., Num 3:7, 30:13, 16, Deut 7:23, 11:22). Thus, this attribution is probably correct.

NonGr: Lat cod 100 in manu mea | Syh

Notes: The O-group (minus 58), Syh, and Lat cod 100 all bear witness to an unattributed reading in manuscript 344 that renders בְּיָדִי using the expression ὑπὸ χεῖρα μοι instead of ὑποχείριον in NUM. This appears to reflect Origen’s work in two ways. First, although in some contexts ὑποχείριος is close in meaning to ὑπὸ χεῖρα, the latter corresponds more quantitatively to HT. One would expect such a rendering from Aquila or Theodotion, who may have influenced Origen, or Origen may have introduced the change himself. Second, the addition of the pronoun μοι matches the Hebrew pronominal suffix which NUM does not render. The pronoun may originally have been under the asterisk.
> 

Wit 2: Lat codd 91 92 94—96 = MT

NonGr: Syh_L

Notes: HT says, “I will devote their cities to destruction.” NUM adds a direct object and a conjunction — αὐτὸν καὶ — which gives, “I will devote him and his cities to destruction.” One would expect an obelus to mark αὐτὸν καὶ. Syh_L has an obelus, but it is incorrectly placed. Here, the material to be obelized is split between a pronominal suffix on one word and a conjunction on the following word, a situation which Syh incorrectly represents due to conglutinate structures in Syriac. In Syh_L the obelus is placed around αὐτὸν καὶ, thus including the equivalent of καὶ τὰς πόλεις. Since τὰς πόλεις is matched by HT, only καὶ is correct. In addition, Syh_L does not obelize the suffix on the previous word that corresponds to the direct object αὐτὸν. Origen probably originally placed the obelus and metobelus around αὐτὸν καὶ, and the Syriac translator or a later copyist misplaced the signs. Syh_T has the same text but without the obelus.

Num 21:3

HT יְהֹוָה
LXX κύριον

Sub ː ΠΠΠΙ

Wit 1: Syh_L^mg

Wit 2: Syh_L^txt

NonGr: Syh_L^txt Χανανείον | Syh_L^mg Χανανείον

Notes: Syh_L uses a lemnisk with the word מנה to point to a marginal note that reads הָאָמָר, a word which resulted from a scribal misreading of the tetragrammaton. See the discussion under 20:16.

HT כְנַעֲנִי
LXX Χανανείον

⟨o’⟩ χαναναίον
Notes: Many hexaplaric and other manuscripts witness to a modification of the proper name Χανανίν to the gentilic χαναναίον. This change may have originated with Origen who frequently corrects the spelling of proper names without noting the changes with Aristarchian signs (see THGN 59-61). It is witnessed by O-group manuscript 426. This is the same change that a οἱ λί note makes in 21:1 (see the discussion there) and Origen may have been influenced by one of the Three.

HT —
LXX ὑποχείριον αὐτοῦ

Sub ÷

Notes: Syh witnesses to an Origenic obelus which correctly marks ὑποχείριον αὐτοῦ in NUM as having no counterpart in HT. This phrase was probably added through the influence of ὑποχείριον in a similar context in the previous verse. The Boharic lacks the equivalent of ὑποχείριον and can be considered a negative witness to the obelus, although Bo retains the possessive pronoun.

HT θερπ
LXX ἐπεκάλεσαν

〈οἱ λί〉 ἐπεκάλεσε(ν)

Wit 1: 85 321 344
Notes: This is the only time in NUM that אָדּוֹ, when used in the context of naming, is rendered using ἐπικαλέω. Elsewhere when used for naming, אָדּוֹ is rendered by the simplex form καλέω (11:3, 34[2x]) or ἐπονομάζω (13:16, 24, 32:38[3x], 32:41, 42). In the present verse, NUM renders the Hebrew singular with the indefinite plural ἐπεκάλεσαν: "they called the name of the place Hormah" (see NGTN 340). Five s-group manuscripts have an unattributed note that modifies the third person plural to third person singular, which matches HT. No hexaplaric manuscripts bear witness to this change, and so it probably does not represent the ό’ text. But the note could originate from any of the Three. Aquila uses ἐπικαλέω for אָדּוֹ in the context of naming in Psalm 60[61]:3, and 85[86]:7. Symmachus does so in Psalm 55[56]:10, 60[61]:3, 65[66]:17, and Isaiah 63:19, as does Theodotion in Daniel(TH) 9:18, 19 and 10:1. Aquila in particular would be expected to match the Hebrew singular, and Symmachus and Theodotion could do so as well.

Num 21:5

HT (וַיְדַבֵּר הָעָם בֵּאלֹהִים וּבְמֹשֶׁה)
LXX (καὶ κατελάλει ὁ λαὸς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ κατὰ Μωυσῆ)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: SyhL = MT

NonGr: SyhL ἔγοντες

Notes: Syh witnesses to an obelus for λέγοντες which has no counterpart in HT. As discussed under the asterisk for 20:3, Origen is inconsistent in his use of Aristarchian signs in treating the common occurrences of λέγω and their correspondence (or lack thereof) with participles of λέγω in NUM. SyhT has the text but without the obelus.

HT קַצָּה
LXX προσώχθισεν

α’ σικχαίνει

Wit 1: M ↓ C’’ C’’cal ↓85’-↓321’-↓344 ↓18 = Sixt
Var: σικχαίνει] συγχ. 18; συγχ. aut σιγχ. C"; σηκχ 344; εκχε' 130; εκχαίνει 85-321′

α' ἐσικχάνθη

Wit 1: ↓58 54txt-↓458∗ ↓458c
Attr: α'] > 58 458
Var: lemma] ἐσισχ. 458∗; ἐσισχ. 458c

Notes: The attribution of the verb σικχαίνω to Aquila for קָצָה in HT is probably genuine, as Aquila also uses this verb to render קוץ in Genesis 27:46, Exodus 1:12, and Isaiah 7:16. Little support exists for the 85-321′ variant ἐκχαίνει ("grin, scoff at"). This verb (a form of ἐγχάσκω) is not attested for Aquila. It is used once in the LXX at 1 Esdras 4:19.

Two different traditions exist for this Aquila reading, one is the present σικχαίνει and the other is the aorist ἐσικχάνθη. Because קָצָה is perfect tense, Wevers argues that the aorist is a better reading (NGTN 342), presumably because of Aquila’s tendency to use the aorist to render the Hebrew perfect. Reider notes that generally, Aquila renders the Hebrew perfect with the aorist (REI-Pro 42-44), and so Wevers’ conclusion is well founded. Aquila does occasionally use the Greek present for the Hebrew perfect in situations where the context fits (e.g., ἐξέρχονται for וּאצְיָ in Job 24:5). In the context of the present verse, the people say “we loathe this insubstantial food,” which includes the present situation, even if it also represents a settled condition that has continued from the past. So the present tense is also possible here.

σ' ἐνεκάκησεν

Wit 1: ↓M ↓58 C"cat 54txt-↓458 85-↓130-321′-344 18 SyhL = Sixt
Attr: σ'] > 58 458 130
Var: ἐνεκάκησεν] ἐνεκάκισεν M
NonGr: SyhL ἐνεκάκησεν

Notes: Many witnesses attribute the reading ἐνεκάκησεν to σ'). Symmachus is attested as using ἐγκακέω to render קוץ in Genesis 27:46 and Isaiah 7:16. Thus, the attribution is suitable. According to Salvesen, the meaning “grow weary” is late (from the NT and onward), developing from the sense “neglect, omit to do” (SITP 247, 252).
HT  הַקְּלֹקֵל
LXX  τῷ διακένω

οἱ λ′  κούφῳ

Wit 1:  M′ ↓58 707 85′-321′-344 ↓128

Wit 2:  ↓767

Attr:  οἱ λ′ > 58 128

Var:  κούφῳ] pr τῷ 58; pr τῷ διακένω 767; τῷ κοουφατάτῳ 128

Notes:  The Hebrew word הַקְּלֹקֵל is a hapax legomenon whose meaning, though disputed, is clearly negative, in keeping with the people’s attitude toward the manna. NUM translates using διάκενος (“empty, hollow, vain”). A marginal note attributed to οἱ λ′ substitutes the word κούφῳ (“light, unsubstantial, vain”). Since הַקְּלֹקֵל is unique to this verse, obviously no pattern of translation can be determined. Each of the Three is credited with using κούφος for the related word קְל in Jeremiah 2:23, as is οἱ λ′ at Isaiah 18:2. In addition, Nobilius indicates that Theodotion renders the verb ללק using κούφος in Proverbs 14:6, although there are no other witnesses. In conclusion, this rendering could come from any of the Three.

HT  הַקְּלֹקֵל
LXX  τῷ διακένω τούτῳ

Sub ~ ⟨½⟩ τούτῳ

Wit 2:  Syh$L$

>  

Wit 2:  B 29-426-707* 16-46 71-509 68′-120′ Arab Arm Sa (sed hab Ald Sixt) = Ra MT Sam

NonGr:  Syh$L$  ܬ)

Notes:  NUM adds τούτῳ which has no match in the Hebrew. One would expect an obelus here, but Syh$L$ uses a sign resembling a lemnisk (like the sign used for the ΠΠΠΠī readings — see under 20:16), but without the surrounding dots (~). The sign clearly
functions like an obelus in this verse. Many manuscripts witness negatively to the obelus. Syh\(^T\) has the text but no sign.

**Num 21:7**

| HT | לָא כָּאָרְרָה נִשְׁאָרָה כֵּי |
| LXX | ἐλέγων ὅτι ἡμαρτήκαμεν ὅτι |

\(o′ \ σ′ \ θ′\) ἐλέγων ἡμάρτομεν ὅτι

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** V \(O^{−(G)}\) \(n^{−127}\) 30 Lat cod 100 Aeth Arm Syh = MT

**NonGr:** Lat cod 100 dicens. Peccauimus, quod Syh

**Notes:** NUM adds ὅτι as a marker of direct discourse. Although this is standard Greek, it is the only instance in NUM where ὅτι is used in this way, and HT has nothing corresponding to it. A note attributed by 344 to ὅτι, σ′, and θ′ drops the first ὅτι to match the Hebrew. The note also uses the aorist ἡμαρτήκαμεν instead of the perfect (ἡμαρτήκαμεν) in NUM. In order to evaluate the distribution of these two changes — (1) inclusion or omission of the first ὅτι, and (2) perfect or aorist — the manuscript evidence (with minor variants not noted) is presented below.

ἐλέγων ὅτι ἡμαρτήκαμεν ὅτι A F M’ 58 ol\(^{−381}\) 414 b\(^{(−314)}\) f\(^{−53′129}\) s\(^{−30}\) y\(^{−392}\) 59 319 424 624 799

ἐλέγων ὅτι ἡμαρτήκαμεν ὅτι B 381’ C\(^{−414}\) d\(^{−44}\) 53′−129 127 t x\(^{−619}\) 392 55

ἐλέγων ἡμαρτήκαμεν ὅτι 44 619 z 646 = MT

ἐλέγων ἡμάρτομεν ὅτι V \((O^{−(G)}\) \(n^{−127}\) 30 Lat cod 100 Aeth Arm Syh = MT

Irrespective of the tense of the verb, those witnesses that lack the first ὅτι conform to HT which has no equivalent. The o′ note, supported by 2 of three \(O\)-group manuscripts, implies that Origen omitted the first ὅτι to correct the text, perhaps without using an obelus. The more difficult question is the degree of influence of the o′ text on later manuscripts. The \(O\)-group and Syh would be understandably influenced by the o′ text. On the other hand, other manuscripts may have been independently influenced by the more typical NUM pattern.

A second issue regards the tense of ἡμαρτάνω. The o′ text appears to have used the aorist. Wevers considers the perfect ἡμαρτήκαμεν to be original to NUM, first because of its manuscript support (e.g., A, F, M), and second because it is “contextually
more exact” (NGTN 343). His second reason is open to question since NUM uses both the perfect (22:34), the aorist (12:11, 14:40) and the future (32:23) to render the perfect of חָטָא in very similar contexts. If the perfect is original, then Origen may have changed it to aorist. But given the wide manuscript support for the aorist (e.g., B and V), another possibility is that Origen selected it from one of the exemplars available to him.

According to the 344 note, Symmachus and Theodotion match the o’ text by dropping ὅτι and changing the verb to aorist. Dropping ὅτι makes good sense for these translators, as this conforms to the Hebrew. Using the aorist is also reasonable given that aorist is a standard rendering for the Hebrew perfect.

HT

LXX

α’  ήμαρτήκαμεν

Wit 1: 344ṭst

Wit 2: A F M’ ↓58 oP−381’ 414 b(−314) f53’129 s−30 619 y−392 z 59 319 424 624 646 799

Var: ήμαρτήκαμεν 58

Notes: According to 344ṭst, Aquila uses the perfect ήμαρτήκαμεν for חָטָא in HT, in line with NUM. Although Aquila typically renders the Hebrew perfect using the aorist (see REI-Pro 42-44), he does use the Greek perfect occasionally (Gen 1:29, Exod 7:1, Jer 18:12). So although this reading reflects a less common choice, no reason exists to doubt its genuineness.

HT

LXX  πρὸς κύριον 2°

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

>  

Wit 2: Cyr II 637 Arab = Compl MT

NonGr: Syh 637 Arab
Notes: HT contains the people’s request to Moses to pray for them “to the Lord.” The end of the verse reports that Moses prayed, and without Hebrew support, NUM goes on to say that Moses prayed “to the Lord” (πρὸς κύριον), reflecting the earlier request from the people. The obelus indicates this addition.

Sub ־ ΠΠΠΙ

Wit 1: Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg}
Wit 2: Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt}
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt} הָיְמָּר | Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg} הָיְמָּר

Notes: This entry is for the first of three lemnisks in Syh\textsuperscript{1} for 21:7 — each lemnisk is located in the text over an instance of the word הָיְמָּר. The margin of Syh\textsuperscript{1} contains two lemnisks each indicating the word הָיְמָּר (which resulted from a scribal misreading of the tetragrammaton). Normally, one lemnisk in the text corresponds to one lemnisk in the margin, so one marginal occurrence of lemnisk plus הָיְמָּר is missing. Because of the redundancy, one may simply have been omitted by a copyist. For more on the lemnisk and ΠΠΠΙ readings, see the discussion under 20:16.

Sub ־ ΠΠΠΙ

Wit 1: Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg}
Wit 2: Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt}
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{Ltxt} הָיְמָּר | Syh\textsuperscript{Lmg} הָיְמָּר

Notes: This entry is for the second Syh\textsuperscript{1} lemnisk in 21:7 over the second instance of הָיְמָּר. One of the marginal readings has been omitted, but the intent of the lemnisk is clearly to relate this occurrence of הָיְמָּר with הָיְמָּר in the margin. See the discussion above, and for more on the lemnisk and ΠΠΠΙ readings, see 20:16.
LXX κύριον 2ο

Sub ꞌΠΠΠ

Wit 1: Syh:\mg
Wit 2: Syh:\txt
NonGr: Syh:\txt | Syh:\mg

Notes: This entry is for the third Syh\h lemnisk for 21:7 over the third instance of ꞌחמס. One of the marginal ꞌחמס readings has been omitted, but the intent of the lemnisk is clearly to relate this occurrence of ꞌחמס with ꞌחמס in the margin. For more on the lemnisk and ꞌΠΠΠ\ reading, see the discussion under 20:16.

Num 21:8

HT (שָׂרָף)
LXX (ὄφιν)

Sub ꞌ(÷) χαλκοῦν

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: A B F V 426-\textit{oI} \textit{--82} C\textsuperscript{\textit{--46C}} 56* s x\textsuperscript{\textit{--527}} y\textsuperscript{\textit{--318}} z 59 319 424 624 646 = MT

NonGr: Syh ꞌ∈̣ βαβ

Notes: In HT, Moses is instructed to make a ꞌשָׂרָף (a kind of flying snake). The Hebrew root refers to something burning, and could refer to the burning pain or red appearance of the bite of this snake. NUM renders this ꞌόφιν, and many Greek manuscripts have added the word ꞌχαλκοῦν (“bronze”) which was apparently copied from the next verse, where the phrase ꞌόφιν χαλκοῦν occurs (see NGTN 343-44). Origen obelized ꞌχαλκοῦν in the present verse, which although probably not in the original LXX, was present in his text. As in 21:5, Syh uses a lemnisk-like sign (~) rather than the expected obelus, although the sign functions like an obelus.

HT ꞌ(צל)
Notes: For סֵנ in HT, M and Syh have the reading ὕψους (“height”) attributed to Symmachus instead of σημείου in NUM. Syh has the same index in the text as Syh and the marginal note is the same, but Syh is missing the attribution due to manuscript damage.

Symmachus has ὕψος attributed to him as a rendering of סֵנ only in the present verse and in verse 9. He does use ὕψος many other times to render words that indicate height or a high place (the two Hebrew words he primarily renders as ὕψος are (1) מָרוֹם in Ps 70[71]:19, 72[73]:8, 74[75]:6, Eccl 10:6, Is 32:15, Jer 38[31]:12; and (2) קוֹמָה in Jer 52:21). In HT for the present verse, Moses is told to place a bronze serpent on a “standard” (נֵס) which presumably had to be high so that the people could look at it and be cured. While NUM uses a more literal rendering of סֵנ, giving the sense of “sign” or “standard,” the σ note renders it in this verse and the next using ὕψους to give the sense of the relatively high position of the bronze serpent. This type of contextual translation fits Symmachus.

Rather than making a substitution, manuscript 75 has inserted ὕψους before σημείου, but this is possibly a witness to the Symmachus reading.

Notes: O-group manuscript 58 has a second unattributed marginal note in addition to the one that matches the Symmachus reading (covered above). The present note applies to the same text in NUM and reads σημεῖον ὑπὲρ σημείως. The note could possibly be from Theodotion who tends to agree with NUM, and who uses the related word σύσσημον for סֵנ in Isaiah 30:17. If σημεῖον is in the accusative case, then Theodotion could have used ἐπί as the preceding preposition.

The reason for the added note ὑπὲρ σημείως is not clear, particularly because the preposition ὑπὲρ is not a normal equivalent for על. If ὑπὲρ is being used in an instrumental
sense, the note could conceivably be a scribal gloss explaining that the bronze serpent was to be set up “by means of” a standard. This, however, is speculation.

HT

LXX  ἐὰν δάκη ὄφις ἀνθρώπων

Sub ÷  ÷ ἐὰν δάκη ὄφις ἀνθρώπων

Wit 2:  Syh

>  

Wit 2:  426 L=PsaMbr Mans 35 = MT

NonGr:  Syh^L < κέρας ÷ κέρας ἄνθρωπον, κέρας | Syh^T < κέρας ἀνθρώπων

Notes:  HT reads, “And it will be that everyone who is bitten and looks at it (the bronze serpent) shall live.” NUM matches this, but in addition has inserted the phrase ἐὰν δάκη ὄφις ἀνθρώπων before πᾶς ὁ δεδηγημένος (“everyone who is bitten”). NUM may have added this through influence from the next verse, which has the phrase ὅταν ἔδακνεν ὄφις ἀνθρώπων. Syh^L has an obelus and metobelus marking the last word in the phrase, although that word has been copied incorrectly. For κέρας ἀνθρώπων (“man”) in Syh^T, Syh^L has substituted the word κέρας (“bronze”). This is clearly an error — the phrase “if the serpent bites bronze” makes no sense. Three factors are possibly at work. First, both the correct words (κέρας ἀνθρώπων) and the incorrect word (κέρας ἀνθρώπων) are preceded by κέρας (“serpent”). Second, the two-word phrase beginning with κέρας in Syh^L is κέρας κέρας (“serpent of bronze”), and the identical phrase appears in the text two lines directly above. Third, the end of the word κέρας is identical to the end of the correct κέρας. The Syh^L copyist may have seen the similar phrase κέρας κέρας immediately above where he was writing, and mistakenly replicated that phrase instead of the correct κέρας.

If corrected, the obelus in Syh^L comes before the equivalent of ἀνθρώπων. It is not clear why Syh^L obelizes only the last word of the entire added Greek phrase. Although Syh^L occasionally misplaces obeli, usually the obelus is dislocated by one word, while this is a three-word displacement. Syh^T has placed a metobelus in the correct place but it has no obelus at the beginning of the phrase. Manuscript 426 from the O-group and one Latin text bear negative witness to the absence of the entire phrase, and this provides evidence that the original obelus marked ἐὰν δάκη ὄφις ἀνθρώπων. Field agrees with this assessment.

Num 21:9

HT  סֵֽנֶֽסֶן
Notes: Manuscript 54 indicates that Symmachus has rendered נֵס in HT using ὕψους, as he did in the previous verse. As in verse 8, the attribution makes sense for Symmachus (see the discussion there).

Notes: HT uses the Hiphil perfect of נבט to say that everyone who “looked upon” the bronze serpent lived. NUM uses ἐπιβλέπω to render נבט only in this verse, using ὁράω in 12:8, and a circumlocution in 23:21. Here, NUM renders נבכר with the aorist ἐπέβλεψεν and s-group manuscript 344 also attributes this reading to Aquila and Symmachus. These attributions make good sense. Aquila uses ἐπιβλέπω to render נבט elsewhere (e.g., Is 63:15). Also, Aquila’s use of the aorist here is characteristic — he normally translates the Hebrew perfect using the aorist, although on occasion he uses the imperfect (REI-Pro 42-43). Symmachus also renders נבכר using ἐπιβλέπω in Isaiah 63:15, and no reason exists that Symmachus would not use the aorist here.

The s-group text agrees with the aorist in NUM, but 344 attributes the imperfect ἐπέβλεπτεν to the o’ text. The difference in meaning from the aorist is not significant,
imperfect perhaps expressing the ongoing nature of the people looking at the serpent. The hexaplaric witnesses are mixed. Most of the hexaplaric manuscripts, including O-group manuscripts 58 and 426, have the aorist. 376, the other available O-group manuscript, has imperfect, and according to Wevers’ critical apparatus this is reflected by Syh. Presumably this is because Syh uses an active participle, which in Syriac is regularly used to express continuous action. Thus the 344 o’ attribution is possibly correct.

344 also attributes to θ’ the imperfect ἐπεβλέπεν, which agrees with NUM. Theodotion uses ἐπιβλέπω to render נבט elsewhere (Jonah 2:5, Zech 12:10). Thus, the attribution is suitable.

Num 21:11

HT

LXX

εἰς Ἀχελγαί (ἐκ τοῦ πέραν)

ο’ εἰς Ἀχελγαί ἐκ τοῦ πέραν (ὁ ἐστιν εἰς ἐποικίαις Ἐβραίων)

Wit 1: ↓85'-↓321'↓344

Wit 2: A F B M O n-G 82 426 C n-G 52'417 528 ↓56'129 ↓x s -343 ↓392 y z -699 55 59 424 624 646 ↓799 ↓Sa ↓Lat Aug Loc in hept IV 74


NonGr: Lat Aug Loc in hept IV 74 in Acalgai trans in heremo

Notes: A note attributed to Origen in several s-group manuscripts contains two parts — the first gives the actual o’ reading (“in Ἀχελγαί ο’ to the other side”) and the second (shown in parentheses above) is an explanatory note about the town: ὁ ἐστιν εἰς ἐποικίαις Ἐβραίων (“which is among the settlements of the Hebrews”). According to Wevers, contrary to his critical text, the evidence points to an original NUM translation of εἰς Ἀχελ Γαί ἐκ τοῦ πέραν for the somewhat cryptic Hebrew expression בֵּית יְהוּדָה (NGTN 345). His critical text combines Ἀχελ Γαί into one word — Ἀχελγαί, and so he is suggesting an amendment. The name Ἀχελ Γαί occurs in the same Hebrew phrase at 33:44, but there NUM translates the phrase Γαί ἐν τῷ πέραν; that is, it is lacking the initial Ἀχελ. Wevers speculates that the original Hebrew for the present verse began with הָנָּל and this is supported by Syh. Thus Ἀχελ may have been derived from הָנָּל, and if so, the original was two words: Ἀχελ Γαί. In the text families many
variants occur, indicating that the Greek speaking scribes did not know what this word meant.

For בְּעִיֵּי, the s-group texts have a slight variant on NUM with ἐν Ἀκαλγαί τῷ (or τὸ) πέραν. The s-group note attributed to o’ agrees with NUM, having ἐν Ἀχελγαί ἐκ τοῦ πέραν. That this the o’ text reading is likely given that it agrees with most of the hexaplaric witnesses. The one possible exception is indicated by O-group manuscript 426 which for עִיֵּי has Αἱή; this is closer to the Hebrew, and possibly represents the original o’ text version of this name. As for the added phrase ὁ ἐστιν ἐν Ἑβραίοις, it has no equivalent in the Hebrew, and no manuscripts provide any witness to it. Field takes the additional text to be the work of a scholiast, and he is probably correct.

σ’ ἐν τοῖς βουνοῖς

Wit I: Eus III 1.10

Notes: Eusebius attributes to σ’ the translation ἐν τοῖς βουνοῖς for בְּעִיֵּי. Symmachus has a tendency to translate place names, as seen in 21:1, 8, and 19 (see REI-Pro 20, F-Pro 67-68). Although Symmachus uses βουνός to render בְּעִיֵּי (e.g., Deut 12:2, Mic 6:1, Isa 30:17, 40:12, Jer 29:17 [49:16]), and בְּעִיֵּי in Numbers 21:19 (retroverted from Syriac), it is not clear why he would render עִיֵּי with this word. The Hebrew יִּעִ with its plural forms יִעִּ in Ps 79:1 [MT] and יִעִ in Mic 3:12 means “heap of ruins” (also Mic 1:6, Jer 33[26]:18). Although the next word נַעֲרָבְרִים can have several translations (“passing over” in 33:51, 35:10; “transgressing” in 14:41; or “Hebrews” e.g., in Exod 2:13), in 33:47, Symmachus renders the name נַעֲרָבְרִים with τῶν διαβασέων (“passage” or “crossing over” — retroverted from the Syriac). Conceivably, he could have been reading the combined phrase נַעֲרָבְרִים with יִעִ with “hills,” construing the phrase נַעֲרָבְרִים יִעִ to mean “(desolate) hills of crossing over.” This contextual translation fits Symmachus as evidenced by his rendering בְּעִיֵּי with ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς in 33:44.

HT — fin
LXX — fin

Sam sec + καὶ εἶπεν κύριος (ΠΙΠΙ Syh) πρὸς Μωυσῆν· μὴ ἐχθραίνετε τοῖς Μωαβίταις, καὶ μὴ
συνάψητε πρὸς αὐτούς· οὐ γὰρ
μὴ δῶ ύμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν
ἐν κλήρῳ· τοῖς γὰρ υἱοῖς Λὼτ
dέδωκα τὸ ὄρος ἐν κλήρῳ.

Wit 1: 85’ ↓344 ↓SyhL

Var: συνάψητε] -ται 344*

NonGr: SyhL

Notes: The attribution for this marginal note comes from added text placed under the note in manuscripts 130 and 344, and from a similar note in SyhL (the index for SyhL is found before verse 13). The Greek reads: καὶ τούτων μενύηται Μωυσῆς ἐν
Deuteronomio-• ἀ μὲν ἐν τῶν Σαμαρείτων εὑρομέν ("and these are remembered of Moses in Deuteronomy, which we indeed find in the Samaritan[s]"). SyhL has a similar statement with the clauses reversed:

The marginal note in 130 and 344 is a Greek translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam) of Numbers 21:12a which in turn is a copy of Sam of Deuteronomy 2:9 with minor modifications. For example the note begins “And the Lord said to Moses” whereas Deuteronomy 2:9 begins, “And the Lord said to me.” A number of insertions from Sam of Deuteronomy are found throughout Sam of Numbers and they are almost verbatim copies of their Deuteronomy counterparts (for details, see under 20:13). Greek translations of these insertions are sometimes found in Greek manuscripts (and Syh translates the Greek into Syriac), presumably taken from a Greek translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch known as the Samaritikon.

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:9 and Numbers 21:12a is shown below. Phrases in Deuteronomy that are modified in Numbers 21:12a are noted with an asterisk with the modified phrase from Numbers following in brackets.

The very similar corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:9 is:

καὶ ἐκείνῳ κύριος πρὸς με Μὴ ἐκθραίνετε τοῖς Μωσαίταις καὶ μὴ συνάψητε
πρὸς αὐτούς πόλεμον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ δῶ ύμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν ἐν κλήρῳ, τοῖς γὰρ
νιόις Λωτ δέδωκα τὴν Σιμρ κλήρονομεῖν.
At this point in Numbers, Israel has just arrived at the border of Moab. The passage from Deuteronomy 2:9 fits here, as it recounts God’s statement that he will not give any of the land of Moab to the Israelites because it is the inheritance of the sons of Lot.

Num 21:12

HT מִשָּׁם נָסָעוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ

LXX ἐκεῖθεν ἀπῆραν καὶ παρενέβαλον

ο’ οἱ λ’ καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάραντες παρενέβαλον

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: lemma Fb καὶ 1ο] 619 68’-120’ = Sixt ἀπάραντες 376 318

Notes: HT begins a new section in 21:12 and in verses 12-20, the text departs from the typical narrative style to recount (1) details of the encampments of the Israelites and (2) sayings and poems of the people. 21:12, the beginning of this new section, does not begin with the typical wayyiqtol form that characterizes narrative. Instead the clause begins with the preposition and particle combination מִשָּׁם followed by a perfect verb and then a wayyiqtol: מִשָּׁם נָסָעוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ. NUM matches HT closely with ἐκεῖθεν ἀπῆραν καὶ παρενέβαλον.

A 344 marginal note, attributed to ο’ and οἱ λ’, makes two changes to NUM. First, contrary to HT, καὶ is added before the first word. Second, the <finite verb> - καὶ - <finite verb> structure is modified to adverbial participle plus finite verb with no intervening καὶ. Fb is the only other witness to both of these changes. Perhaps the simplest explanation for the marginal note is that it exactly matches the beginning of the next verse (verse 13), which uncharacteristically for NUM has the participle plus aorist structure. A later scholiast may simply have been noting the equivalence of the two verses.

Regarding the prepending of καὶ, the attribution to ο’ may be suspect, first because no hexaplaric witnesses include καὶ. Second, outside of reported speech, it is uncharacteristic of Origen to add a copula at the beginning of sentences where both HT and NUM do not have it (see 1:44, 2:32, 3:3, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 33, 39, 4:37, 41, 45, 7:18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60, 66, 72, 78, 84, 9:16, 18, 9:23, 10:28, 11:33, 35, 13:16, 13:24, 20:13, where the ο’ text matches both HT and NUM with no copula).
As for the change in 21:12 from ἀπῆραν καὶ παρενέβαλον (<finite verb> - καί - <finite verb>) to ἀπάραντες παρενέβαλον (<adverbial participle> - <finite verb>), O-group manuscript 376 alone of the hexaplaric witnesses has this. This change is unusual for Origen. In Numbers overall, Origen does not typically go against the LXX when it follows the verbal pattern in HT of <finite verb> - copula - <finite verb> where the verbs have the same subject (e.g., for other examples of <finite verb> - καί - <finite verb>, see 7:1 [2x], 8:21, 11:24, 25[2x], 27, 31, 13:28[27], 14:22, 45, 15:31, 16:3, 5, 14, 15, 18, 22, 25, 32, 35, 38[17:3], 47[17:12], 17:8[23], 20:1, 22:18, 23:4, 32:39, 41, 42, where no manuscript evidence suggests that Origen altered this form). More to the point, in chapter 33 the exact same verbal structure — ἀπῆραν καὶ παρενέβαλον (with possible modifiers, etc. in between) — occurs 38 times, and except for a few sporadic exceptions, the hexaplaric witnesses uniformly follow NUM. Thus, for the present verse, the agreement of 376 with the 344 o' reading is likely a result of harmonization with verse 13. In conclusion, since both changes to NUM reflected in this 344 marginal note would be very unusual for Origen, the attribution of this note to o' is probably not accurate.

The reading καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάραντες παρενέβαλον is also attributed to οἱ λ'. Although ἀπαίρω is used by each of the Three for נסע (e.g., at Is 37:9), Wevers argues that the additional attribution to οἱ λ' is doubtful. The two changes just noted — adding καὶ and modifying the Hebrew paratactic to the Greek hypotactic structure — are not characteristic of Aquila or Theodotion, although Wevers argues that they could come from Symmachus (NGTN 345), who at times smooths his renderings for better Greek style. In particular, Symmachus sometimes modifies the typical Hebrew paratactic division of verbs by using participles with finite verbs (e.g., Exod 5:7 — see F-Pro 62).

Num 21:13

HT (מִשָּׁם נָסָעוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ)
LXX καὶ (ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάραντες παρενέβαλον)

Sub ÷ καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάραντες

Wit 2: Syh
Hebrew. Arriving at this conclusion would normally be straightforward, as one might expect an obelus to mark the initial καί. But the evidence of the two Syh texts is confused.

The first issue is whether Syh originally had the initial copula or not. Wevers includes initial καί in his critical text, but the textual evidence is mixed (NGTN 346). SyhL has the copula but SyhT does not. Both SyhL and SyhT have obeli at the beginning of the verse, and the only potential mismatch between HT and NUM in the first part of the verse is the copula in NUM. Thus it is likely that Syh originally had the copula, and that it was later lost in SyhT which nonetheless retained the obelus.

Secondly, in both the SyhL and SyhT manuscripts, the next sign after the obelus is not a metobelus but a second obelus which is then followed by a metobelus. The presence of a spurious obelus is not uncommon in Syh, although in this case, the metobelus is incorrectly placed. To add to the confusion, SyhL and SyhT differ in the placement of the second obelus.

To summarize, Origen probably placed an obelus before and a metobelus after καί. Field agrees with this assessment, although he had only SyhL for reference. Wevers is not certain that the initial καί is original (NGTN 346), but in any case, Origen probably had it in his exemplar.

**Sub ※ pr ὅ ἐστιν**

*Wit 2:* O(-G)-15 246 18'-628-630' Syh = MT

*Attr:* ※ Syh] > rell

*NonGr:* SyhL ✓ לְשֹׁנַיְךָ, בָּמִדְבָּר עָלֵי ※ | SyhT ✓ לְשֹׁנַיְךָ, בָּמִדְבָּר עָלֵי ※ עָלֵי

*Notes:* HT uses the word בַּמִּדְבָּר in the phrase, “across Arnon which is in the wilderness.” The Greek does match ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, and so Origen includes the equivalent ὅ ἐστιν under the asterisk.

Two differences exist between the signs in SyhL and SyhT. First, the asterisk is placed before אֲשֶׁר in SyhL but after it in SyhT. Although SyhL misplaces signs more often than SyhT, in this instance SyhL appears to have the asterisk correctly placed, while SyhT has shifted it by one word. Second, both SyhL and SyhT have placed the metobelus after “in the wilderness” which is clearly incorrect, as both the Hebrew and Greek have this phrase. One possibility is that Origen’s Greek exemplar was missing this phrase, and so Origen included ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ under the asterisk. A few Greek manuscripts omit ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (F 707txt 56txt 799). Besides 707txt, however, no other hexaplaric manuscripts reflect this omission and thus it is doubtful that Origen’s Greek exemplar was missing this phrase. It is more likely that the metobelus is simply misplaced in Syh.
καὶ ἐκείθεν ἀπάραντες παρενέβαλον

Sam<sec>

+ καὶ ἐπένεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν, λέγων· σὺ παραπομπῆς σήμερον τὰ ὀρία Μωᾶβ τὴν Ἀροῆρ, καὶ προσάξετε ἐγγὺς ύιῶν Ἄμμαν. μὴ ἐχθραίνετε αὐτοῖς, καὶ μὴ συνάψητε πρὸς αὐτοὺς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ δῶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς υἱῶν Ἄμμαν σοὶ ἐν κληρῷ, ὅτι τοῖς ύιοῖς Λῶτ δέδωκα αὐτὴν ἐν κληρῷ. καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ τῆς φάραγγος Ζαρῆθ, καὶ περενέβαλον.

Wit 1: §85'-§344 Syh

Wit 2: §343

Var: κύριος| Ἐκ 343 | Ἀροῆρ| ὑπὸ ταῖς 344 | ύιῶν| ύμων 85'-343-344 | Ἄμμαν 1ος| αμμῶν Syh|; εμμε 130 | ἐχθραίνετε| θρεν 130 | αὐτοῖς| αὐτόν 130 | ἀπὸ| ἐκ 130 | Ἄμμαν 2ος| αμμῶν Syh| ὅτι| τοῦ 130 | ὅτι — κληρῷ| bis scr 344 | σοὶ ἐν κληρῷ| συγκληρον 343 | Ζαρῆθ| 3rd Syh| καὶ περενέβαλον| > 343

NonGr: Syh|
Syh^T

Notes: This note is a translation of Sam of Numbers 21:13a and the beginning of 13b. The attribution for this marginal note comes from added text placed under the note in manuscripts 85' and 344, and from a similar note in Syh (the index in Syh^T is at the end of verse 11). The Greek reads: καὶ τούτον μεμνήται Μωυσῆς ἐν Δευτερονομίῳ, ζα (ομ 130) ἐν μόνοις τῶν Σαμαρείτων εὑρομέν (“and these are remembered of Moses in Deuteronomy, which we find only in the Samaritan[s]”). Syh^L and Syh^T have similar statements, with the contents arranged in a different order from the s-group notes. Syh^L has:

The very similar corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:17-19 is:

And Syh^T has:

The first parts of the two notes are identical except for a second occurrence of the word “only” in Syh^T. They read: “And these only in those of the Samaritans (+only [Syh^T]) they are placed, remembered of those of Moses in the Second Law (i.e., Deuteronomy).” Syh^L has also added the following phrase: “These are only with those commended of the Samaritans.”

Syh^L begins the first line with an obelus-like symbol with added thickness at the right end followed by a symbol like a rotated asterisk (#). This latter sign also appears before the line that begins 21:13, and this corresponds to the location of the added text in Sam. Each line of the note thereafter includes the obelus-like symbol only.

The marginal note in 85' and 344 is a Greek translation (presumably the Samaritikon) of Sam of Numbers 21:13a which in turn is a copy of Sam of Deuteronomy 2:17-19 with minor modifications (the s-group and Syh notes also continue with a translation of the first several words of Sam Num 21:13b which differ from HT Num 21:13).

A number of insertions from Sam of Deuteronomy and Numbers are found throughout Sam of Numbers and their Samaritikon versions (or Syh translations thereof) are found in many marginal notes (for details, see under 20:13).

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:17-19 and Numbers 21:13a is as follows. Phrases in Deuteronomy that are modified in Numbers 21:13a are noted with asterisks with the modified phrase from Numbers following in brackets.

The very similar corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:17-19 is:
and inserted into Sam at Numbers 21:12a. This is similar to the statement given about Moab in Deuteronomy 2:9 and inserted into Sam at Numbers 21:12a.

At this point in Numbers, Israel has just arrived at the border between Moab and the Amorites. In Deuteronomy 2:17-19, God informs Moses that he will not give any of the land of the Ammonites to Israel, since Ammon is descended from Lot to whom the land was promised. This is similar to the statement given about Moab in Deuteronomy 2:9 and inserted into Sam at Numbers 21:12a.

**Num 21:14-15**

**HT**

τὸ τούτον ἁπάντως ἐν καταλώγῳ τῶν πολεμούντων· κύριος (ΠΠΠ Συγ) πρὸς μὲν Ἀμάβ ἐν λαίλαπτι, τῶν δὲ φαράγγων πρὸς Ἀρνών· ἢ γὰρ ἐκχυσίς τῶν φαράγγων ἐκλινεν μέχρι τῆς κατοικίας Άρ, καὶ ἐπίκειται τῷ ὀρίῳ Μωάβ.

**LXX**

14 διὰ τούτου λέγεται ἐν βιβλίῳ Πόλεμος κυρίου τὴν Ζωδίων ἐφλόγισαν καὶ τοὺς χειμάρρους Ἀρνών, 15 καὶ τοὺς χειμάρρους κατέστησαν κατοικήσαν τοιούτως "Ηρ, καὶ πρόσκειται τοῖς ὀρίοις Μωάβ.

**σ’**

διὰ τούτου εἴρηται ἐν καταλώγῳ τῶν πολεμούντων· κύριος (ΠΠΠ Συγ) πρὸς μὲν Ἀμάβ ἐν λαίλαπτι, τῶν δὲ φαράγγων πρὸς Ἀρνών· ἢ γὰρ ἐκχυσίς τῶν φαράγγων ἐκλινεν μέχρι τῆς κατοικίας Άρ, καὶ ἐπίκειται τῷ ὀρίῳ Μωάβ.

**Wit 1:** Syg

**Wit 2:** ἐκλινεν μέχρι τῆς κατοικίας 58

**Attr:** σ’ Syg > Syg

**NonGr:** Syg
Notes: The retroversion is offered by Wevers (NGTN 347). HT reads, “Therefore it is said in the book of the war(s) of the Lord…” followed by some difficult Hebrew expressions through the end of verse 15. The first problem is deciding how the word הירדּה is being used. The options are (1) הירדּה is part of the phrase “the book of the war(s) of the Lord” — this is the way MT reads it; (2) “the book of the war(s)” ends the sentence and “Lord” begins a new sentence — this is Symmachus’ approach; (3) “the war of the Lord” is the subject of the following sentence — this is the option NUM takes. Next, what seem to be two locations are given: (1) אֵת הַנְּחָלִים אַרְנֹון and (2) “the war of the Lord.” Both are preceded by the word אֵת but they have no verb associated with them. If אֵת is the more usual direct object marker, then the reader has to supply a verb — something like: “Behold Waheb in Sufah and the wadis of Arnon.” If אֵת is being used as a preposition, then the sense is still not clear, but could be something like, “The Lord is with Waheb and with the wadis…” In verse 15, the first word is רָשִׁיא which MT takes as the noun רָשִׁא meaning “slope.” Thus, MT has “The slope of the wadis which stretches to the settlement(s) of ’ar and lies along the border of Moab.”

NUM has attempted to make sense of רָשִׁיא in verse 14 as a direct object marker, and so treats רָשִׁיא as a verb meaning “set on fire” and uses “A war of the Lord” as the subject, giving: “A war of the Lord sets Zóob on fire, and the wadis of Arnon.” Although the Hebrew רָשִׁיא is obscure, the NUM translator may have used the Aramaic root סַפָּה (“to kindle”) for his rendering. Verse 15 is not as problematic, but still caused difficulties for the translator. Thus, NUM ignores ”סַפָּה (“slope”) and רָשִׁיא, and then takes וַאֲשֶׁר to mean “establish” — and so the verse reads: וַאֲשֶׁר הִכְּנָהוּ קָטֵטְסַה נוֹאֶגֶל וְיוָדָא וַאַרְנָו (“And the wadis he established to settle Er [or for Er to inhabit] and it lies beside the border of Moab”).

The reading attributed to Symmachus follows a different approach from NUM. First, according to the punctuation supplied by Syh for the Symmachus note, “Lord” begins the second clause. Next, Symmachus treats רָשִׁיא as a preposition, but renders it with פְרוּס (Syh אָל) rather than the expected meta. Thus verse 14 reads: פְרוּס רָשִׁיא אֵל כּוֹנֶת לְוֹנָו פְּלָמָו לְוֹנָו כּוֹנֶת פְּרָו מַרְבּוּ (“For this reason it is said in the record of the wars, (the) Lord is) to ’Ao’ab in a storm as well as to Arnon of the wadis”). In verse 15, Symmachus construes the Hebrew רָשִׁיא according to its Syriac meaning “pour out,” and he renders רָשִׁיא contextually as “bend downwards” or “descend.” Thus, verse 15 is translated: פוֹרָו עֵקֶר עָבִי מֵרָו פְּלָמָו עֵקֶר מֵרָו מַרְבּוּ (“For the pouring out of the wadis descended as far as the settlement of Ar, and has pressed [or has been pressed] against the border of Moab”).

This Syh reading is suitable for Symmachus. With a retroversion it can be difficult to link vocabulary to a particular author. But the reading fits Symmachus in that it does not
strive for a strictly literal rendering; rather, it attempts to make a smooth translation of a
difficult Hebrew passage while addressing most of the underlying Hebrew.

Num 21:16

HT  (מָיִם)
LXX  (ὕδωρ) πιεῖν

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  Syh

>  

Wit 2:  58 551 = Compl MT

NonGr:  Syh\L  \text{\small \textsuperscript{L}} \triangleright \text{\small \textsuperscript{T}} \triangleright \text{\small \textsuperscript{T}} \triangleright \text{\small \textsuperscript{T}} πιεῖν

Notes:  At the end of 21:16 in HT, God says, “I will give them water.” NUM adds πιεῖν and Origen appropriately placed it under the obelus. As often happens, Syh\L  has misplaced the obelus, putting it before “water,” which is clearly incorrect because NUM matches מָיִם with ὕδωρ. Syh\T  places the obelus correctly.

Num 21:17

HT  (יִם)
LXX  ἐξάρχετε

α’ σ’  καταλέξατε

Wit 1:  M’ ↓58-707 54\sup{ext} ↓85’ ↓321’-344

Attr:  α’ σ’] > 58 85’-321’

Var:  ¬ξατε] -ξετε 130

Notes:  The attribution of καταλέξατε to Aquila and Symmachus is suitable. Both translators use καταλέγω for יִם in Psalm 146[147]:7 in the sense of “recite” or “sing” as in this verse.
Num 21:18

HT  (בִּמְחֹקֵק)

LXX  (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ) αὐτῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  Syh = MT

NonGr:  Syh ܢܹܠܹܣ

Notes:  NUM renders the phrase בִּמְחֹקֵק (בְּמִשְׁעֲנֹתָם) “(with a scepter [and] their staff(s))” in a rather loose lexical sense (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ κυριεύσαι αὐτῶν), but its rendering corresponds quantitatively with HT except for the addition of αὐτῶν after βασιλείᾳ. This was placed under the obelus by Origen.

HT  בְּמִשְׁעֲנֹתָם

LXX  ἐν τῷ κυριεύσαι αὐτῶν

α′  ἐν τῇ βακτηρίᾳ αὐτῶν

Wit 1:  ↓108 ↓Procop 860 Syh

Var:  βακτηρίᾳ -ρι 108 | αὐτῶν | > Procop 860

NonGr:  Syh³ ܢܹܠܹܣ|Syh⁷ ܢܹܠܹܣ

Notes:  NUM apparently construes בְּמִשְׁעֲנֹתָם (“with their staff(s)”) as an infinitive construct, and so renders it using the infinitive of κυριεύω. The attribution of ἐν τῇ βακτηρίᾳ αὐτῶν to Aquila makes sense, as βακτηρία (“staff”) is a more literal rendering of the underlying Hebrew noun. In addition, Aquila uses the word βακτηρία elsewhere for “staff” (1 Kgdms 14:27, Ps 104[105]:16), although in the other verses, he is rendering the more common word מַשְׁעָנָה which overlaps in meaning with מַשְׁעָנָה. The word מַשְׁעָנָה is pointed by MT as plural, but the consonantal text can also be singular, and this is how Aquila read it. Syh³ indicates that the word βακτηρία is plural (using a seyame), but Syh⁷ has singular, which is probably correct.

θ′  ἐν ταῖς ράβδοις αὐτῶν

Wit 1:  Procop 860 Syh³
NonGr: Syh

Notes: This attribution fits Theodotion. Like Aquila, the θ’ note chooses a rendering that is closer than NUM to the underlying Hebrew noun. In addition, the word ράβδος is used by Theodotion to express the idea of a rod or staff, although elsewhere he is translating either מטה (Num 17:7[22]) or שבע (Jer 10:16, Ezek 21:10). The word משענת is pointed by MT as plural, but the consonantal text can also be singular. Aquila construed it as singular (see above), but Theodotion as plural.

Num 21:19

HT נַחֲלִיאֵל

LXX εἰς Νααλιήλ

α’ εἰς χειμάρρους ἱσχυρῶν

Wit 1: ↓58 Syh

Wit 2: Tar

Attr: α’] > 58

Var: lemma] χειμάρροι ἱσχυροί 58

NonGr: Syh הַנַּחֲלִיאֵל | Tar מַחֲלֹלָא הָסָּלָא

Notes: The Greek has been reconstructed from manuscript 58 and Syh. Aquila construes the Hebrew place name לנחליא by splitting it into two words, אל נחליא, meaning “strong/powerful brooks” — his rendering is εἰς χειμάρρους ἱσχυρῶν. At times, Aquila translates proper names, as at 21:1 (see note there for other examples), so the attribution to Aquila makes sense. Uncharacteristically, Aquila adds εἰς without a preposition in the underlying Hebrew, although the context clearly indicates that εἰς is appropriate. Targum Neofiti, which adds the preposition, and Aquila may reflect a common tradition.

That the 58 copyist was confused about the referent for this note is evidenced by his relating it incorrectly (along with its second part covered below under σ’) with the word Ζαρέδ, the name of the valley mentioned in verse 12. A non-Hebrew speaking scribe would have seen no connection between Νααλιήλ in verse 19 and a valley. This confusion may also have led the copyist to list the words χειμάρρους ἱσχυρῶν in their nominative forms. Not seeing a connection between the words and their context, he may have defaulted to the nominative.
In the margin of Syh\(^1\), two pairs of Aquila/Symmachus readings are placed together in close proximity, the first pair referring to ܐܠܘܬܐ (ܐܐܝܐ) and the second pair referring to ܬܓܐܐ (ܐܬܪܝܐ — see below). The index for the first reading is missing, however, and the index symbol associated with the second reading appears before both sets of readings, which is incorrect.

\[\text{σ'} \text{ εἰς φάραγγα (φαλαγγας cod)}\]

\text{Wit 1:} \hspace{1em} \downarrow 58 \hspace{1em} \text{Syh}^1

\text{Wit 2:} \hspace{1em} \text{Tar}^N

\text{Attr:} \hspace{1em} \text{σ'} \rangle 58

\text{NonGr:} \hspace{1em} \text{Syh}^1 \hspace{1em} \text{呤} \hspace{1em} \text{Tar}^N

\text{Notes:} \hspace{1em} \text{Syh attributes the reading εἰς φάραγγα to Symmachus, and manuscript 58 has the reading without attribution. As discussed above, Aquila renders הָנַחַל by dividing it into two words. Symmachus approaches the word similarly, although in keeping with his less literal translation technique, he appears to be satisfied with rendering only the first word (נַחַל), resulting in εἰς φάραγγα. Like Aquila, Symmachus sometimes translates proper names (e.g., later in this verse and 21:1; see F-Pro 67-68 and REI-Pro 20). In addition, Symmachus uses φάραγξ for הָנַחַל in Job 28:4a and Psalm 82[83]:10 (and for the synonym גִּיא, e.g., Isa 22:1, Jer 19:2, Ezek 32:5). Thus this attribution is suitable for him. Wevers associates this Symmachus note in Syh with the word νάπην (“valley”) in verse 20. But the present note is physically grouped in both Syh\(^1\) and manuscript 58 after the Aquila reading associated with נָאָלָא (see above) and before the second Aquila reading for the present verse (covered below). In addition, 344txt has another note attributed to Symmachus for νάπην in verse 20. This indicates that the present note should be associated with נָאָלָא here in verse 19.}

\text{HT} \hspace{1em} \text{בְּמַהְרֵי}

\text{LXX} \hspace{1em} \text{εἰς Βαμώθ}

\text{α'} \hspace{1em} \text{εἰς ὑψώματα}

\text{Wit 1:} \hspace{1em} \downarrow 58 \hspace{1em} \downarrow 108 \hspace{1em} \text{Syh}

\text{Attr:} \hspace{1em} \text{α'} \rangle 58

\text{Var:} \hspace{1em} \text{εἰς} \rangle 108
**Notes:** The word תָּמִימוֹ in HT usually refers to high places, but it is sometimes used in place names, such as תָּמוֹ הֶבּוֹ in Joshua 13:17. Aquila often uses ὑψωμα to render תָּמִימוֹ (e.g., Deut 32:13, Is 14:14, Ezek 6:6, 20:29). Given that Aquila has already translated one place name earlier in this verse, it is not surprising that he does so here as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \sigma' )</th>
<th>εις βουνόν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wit 1:</strong></td>
<td>Syh†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **NonGr:** | Syh† לא |

**Notes:** The Syriac means “hill,” and the retroversion to βουνόν is based on Symmachus’ use of this word elsewhere to render the related Hebrew word גבעה (see under 21:11 above). Since Symmachus, like Aquila, has already shown his tendency to translate place names earlier in this verse, it makes sense that he would do so again here (see F-Pro 67-68, and under 21:1). Note that in Ezekiel 20:29, for “high place,” Theodoret Cyrensis attributes the transliteration βαμα to Symmachus. But Syh clearly indicates that Symmachus translated in the present verse.

### Num 21:20

| HT | תָּמוֹ |
| LXX | (εις) νάπην |

| \( \circ' \) | ἱαννα |

| **Wit 1:** | ↓130-↓321'-344 |

| **Wit 2:** | ↓B ↓F ↓Fb ↓15-↓58-64-↓72-381-426-↓618 ↓54-↓75 ↓458 ↓59 ↓Arm |

| **Attr:** | \( \circ' \theta' \) > 130-321' |

| **Var:** | ἱαννα| σίανα νάπην 458; + νάπην 54-75; ]αινα; 15*; αννα 618; ἱανα 130 -321'; ἱανην B; anaen Arm; νάπην ἱαννα F Fb 58 59; νάπην ἱανα 72 |
Notes: The Hebrew גַּיְא means “valley,” and NUM gives a good equivalent with νάπη. According to manuscript 344 from the s-group, Theodotion and Origen changed this to ἱαννα, which is puzzling. Wevers speculates that it conceivably could have been derived from the Hebrew loan-word γεέννα (NGTN 350).

Many manuscripts reflect Theodotion’s rendering. The hexaplaric manuscripts that have ἱαννα, including 58 and 426 from the Ο-group, indicate that the attribution to ο′ is probably correct. Origen possibly copied Theodotion here.

α′ σ′ νάπην

Wit 1: 344th

Wit 2: A F F^a F^b M' V 58 376 ↓oII C” b d ↓ f n 458 s t ↓ x y z 630 55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Var: νάπην] ιαπην 82; ναγην f^129; ναπαν 527

Notes: According to a 344 (s-group) note, Aquila and Symmachus match NUM by using νάπην for גַּיְא. Aquila is not known to have used this word anywhere else, but the NUM rendering is literal, and Aquila may have been content to copy NUM. Symmachus uses νάπη at 2 Kingdoms 2:24 and Song of Solomon 4:6 for גּבְעָה (“hill”). This is an unusual use of νάπη which normally means “valley” or “glen,” and whose meaning does not appear to have evolved over time. The only other place where νάπη is possibly used in a context of a high place is in the LXX of Jeremiah (Jer 14:6). In any event, for the present verse, νάπη fits the context, and Symmachus may be copying NUM or Aquila.

HT fin
LXX fin

Sam^sec_Syh + καὶ εἶπεν κύριος (SyhL ΠΙΠΙ) πρὸς Μωυσῆν· ἀνάστητε καὶ ἀπάρατε, καὶ παρέλθετε τὴν φάραγγα Ἀρνών· ίδοὺ παραδέδωκα εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου τὸν Σηὼν βασιλέα Ἑσεβὼν τῶν Ἀμορραίων, καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ· ἐνάρχου κληρονομεῖν· σύναπτε πρὸς αὐτὸν πόλεμον· ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη ἐνάρχου δοῦναι τὸν τρόμον
σου καὶ τὸν φόβον σου ἐπὶ προσώπου πάντων τῶν ἔθνων τῶν ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ παντὸς, οἵτινες εἰ ἀκούσανται τὸ ὄνομά σου, παραχθήσονται, καὶ ὄδινας ἔξουσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου σου.

Wit 1: Syh

NonGr: SyhL

SyhT

Notes: The reading is a retroversion taken from Field and is derived mainly from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:24-25. The attribution for the reading comes from added text placed under the marginal note in Syh: "And these are only in the Samaritan[s]".

Apart from a few minor differences SyhL and SyhT are identical, except SyhT has omitted a section (shaded above in the SyhT text) probably due to parablepsis between successive occurrences of the Syriac phrase מָתְאִי חָלְמוּת מֶסְעַדָּה ("And these are only in the Samaritan[s]").

In Sam of Numbers 21:21a, a copy of Sam of Deuteronomy 2:24-25 with minor modifications has been inserted. The present Syh note is a Syriac translation of a Greek version of Sam, presumably the Samaritikon, for Numbers 21:21a. A number of insertions from Sam of Deuteronomy and Numbers are found throughout Sam of Numbers and Greek versions (or Syh translations thereof) are found in many marginal notes (for details, see under 20:13).

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:24-25 and Numbers 21:21a is as follows. Additions to Deuteronomy in the Numbers text are noted with brackets.

[1] יָדַר מִתְיָהוּ בָּלָשׁ הָּלָּשׁ בָּלָשׁ אֲרָבֶּה יָדַר הָּלָּשׁ אֲרָבֶּה יָדַר

את סְרִיָּה מִלְּךָ הַשָּׁבָּה הֶמָּרֶה רָאָס אַלָּשׁ אֲרָבֶּה יָדַר

וְיָדַר מִתְיָהוּ בָּלָשׁ הָּלָּשׁ בָּלָשׁ אֲרָבֶּה יָדַר הָּלָּשׁ אֲרָבֶּה יָדַר
The corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:24-25 is:

24 νῦν οὖν ἀνάστητε καὶ ἀπάρατε καὶ παρέλθατε ὑμεῖς τὴν φάραγγα Αρνων-ιδού παραδέδωκα εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου τὸν Σηων βασιλέα Εσεβων τὸν Αμορραῖον καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ· ἐνάρχου κληρονομεῖν, σύναπτε πρὸς αὐτὸν πόλεμον. 25 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταυτῇ ἐνάρχου δοῦναι τὸν τρόον σου καὶ τὴν φόβον σου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οἵτινες ἀκούσαντες τὸ ὄνομά σου ταραχθήσονται καὶ ὠδῖνας ἕξουσιν ἀπὸ προσώπου σου.

In Numbers 21:21, Israel sends messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites, to ask for permission to pass through the land. The quote from Deuteronomy that Sam has inserted before the beginning of this verse is God’s promise to Moses to give the land of Sihon into the hands of Israel, and to put the fear of Israel into all the nations.

**Num 21:21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵּל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Μωϋσῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**o’ oi l’ ʾΙσραήλ (1ηλ)**

*Wit 1:* ↓M ↓85’-↓321’-344

*Wit 2:* F 58-72-707th(c pr m) 131♂ f<sup>129</sup> 392 59 624 799 Aeth Arab Syh = Compl

*Attr:* o’ oi l’] > M 85’-321’

*NonGr:* Syh ↓אֵל

Notes: In HT, Israel sends messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites, but NUM has Moses sending the messengers. Wevers argues that this is a conscious alignment with 21:14, where Moses sends messengers to the king of Edom (NGTN 351). The s-group texts match NUM with Μωϋσῆς, and s-group manuscript 344 has a note attributed to o’ and oi l’ that reflects the Hebrew by substituting ʾΙσραήλ for Μωϋσῆς. The change toward the Hebrew makes sense for Origen, although it is supported by only 58 from the O-group and two other hexaplaric witnesses. Thus the o’ attribution is possibly correct. As for the oi l’ attribution, the change to ʾΙσραήλ makes sense for any of the Three. Many manuscripts have incorporated this change, giving evidence of the possible influence of the Three or of the o’ text.

HT —
NUM 21:22

**HT**

| LXX                       | τῇ ὁδῷ πορευσό*εθα
|---------------------------|----------------------

**Sub -divider**

**Wit 2:** Syh

>  

**Wit 2:** 58 319 Lat PsAmbr Mans 41 Arab = Compl MT

**NonGr:** Syh^T ܕܝܓܐܢܕܪܡܐ ܕܝܓܐܢܕܪܡܐ

**Notes:** NUM adds the phrase τῇ ὁδῷ πορευσό*εθα which has no basis in HT. It may be based on Sam, which has דֶֽרֶֽךְ רָאָשׁ, although NUM has no equivalent for דֶֽרֶֽךְ, and דֶֽרֶֽךְ is first person singular, whereas NUM has first person plural. Origen placed this phrase under the obelus. The form דֶֽרֶֽךְ in Syh is not first person plural as in NUM. It may be a first person singular participle as in Sam. Syh^T has the phrase without the obelus.
HT

LXX

τῇ ὁδῷ πορευομέθα, οὐκ ἐκκλινοῦμεν

Sam

Sam sec_Syh

+ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ βασιλικῇ πορευομέθα, οὐκ ἐπιστρέψομεν εἰς δεξιὰν οὐδὲ εἰς ἀριστεράν. οὐκ ἐκκλινοῦμεν

Wit 1: Syh
d

NonGr: Syh
d

Notes: The reading is a retroversion supplied by Field and derived from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:27. The attribution for this note comes from additional text after the marginal note that reads: "placed only in the Samaritan[s]" ("placed only in the Samaritan[s]"). The note in Syh appears in the left margin and spans the lower half of verse 20, all of verse 21, and the beginning of verse 22. Each line of the note except the last is preceded by the obelus-like sign with the widened right side that also precedes most of the other Samaritikon readings in Syh:

Deuteronomy 2:27 of Sam reads: אֲשֶׁר בַּאֵרֵךְ בַּדָּרֶךְ אֶלָּא אֲפֹרָה יָמִין וְשָמֶאל (this is identical to HT except that Sam doubles בַּדָּרֶךְ). This text is inserted into Sam of Numbers 21:22a with the phrase בַּדָּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר בַּאֵרֵךְ בַּדָּרֶךְ אֶלָּא אֲפֹרָה יָמִין וְשָמֶאל ("in the King’s Highway I will walk; I will not turn aside to the right or to the left"). Numbers 21:22a in Sam also contains some text from HT of Numbers 21:22: لا أتني ("I will not turn aside in field of vineyard"). A Greek translation of Sam, presumably the Samaritikon, has rendered into Greek the middle portion of Numbers 21:22a of Sam: εἰς τῇ ὁδῷ πορευομέθα (see the obelus above). Sam has inserted additional text from Deuteronomy 2:28-29 later in the same verse, and this is covered below.

The LXX for the corresponding portion of Deuteronomy 2:27b is: εν τῇ ὁδῷ παρελεύσομαι, οὐκ ἐκκλινῶ δεξιὰ οὐδὲ ἀριστερά.

HT (בָּאֵר)

LXX (φρέατός) σου

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh
d
Sam 18 sec + ὑπηρέτου *μοι, καὶ φάγομαι· καὶ ὕδωρ ἄργυριον μεταδώσεις μοι, καὶ πίομαι· πλὴν παρελεύσομαι τοῖς ποσίν μου, καθὼς πεποιήκαν μοι οἱ νεκροὶ Ἡσαῦ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σηεὶρ, καὶ οἱ Μωαβίται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ Ἀρωμῷ.

Wit 1: Syh¹
Wit 2: ↓15
Var: καθὼς οἱ νεκροὶ 151 Σηεὶρ] Γαβαλά 151 Ἀρωμῷ] Ὄρινή 15
NonGr: Syh¹

Notes: The attribution for this note comes from additional text in Syh¹ after the marginal note that reads: "(these are only in the Samaritan[s])."
Manuscript 15 from the ol-group has the above text inserted after the end of 21:22 with the exception of three changes derived from Syh (with their retroversions in smaller font than the rest of the text): (1) the adverb καθώς rather than ὅν τρόπον (2) the name Σηείρ instead of Γαβσάλα; and (3) the name Ἀροήρ instead of Ἄρινή. The text is a Greek translation of Sam of Numbers 21:22b, where Sam has inserted a copy of Sam of Deuteronomy 2:28-29a. The Greek translation is presumably from the Samaritikon.

The first difference between manuscript 15 and the Syh note is lexical. For καθώς in Sam, Syh1 has ἄροήρ which has been retroverted to καθώς, based on how Syh renders καθώς at Numbers 8:22, 21:34, and 26:54. Manuscript 15 has ὅν τρόπον which is similar in meaning, but Syh for Numbers, with the exception, always translates ὅν τρόπον with ἄροήρ (for the exception, the similar ἄροη is used). Thus, the Syh translator was probably not looking at ὅν τρόπον when he gave the rendering ἄροήρ, and manuscript 15 represents a variant. For the retroversion above, καθώς has been chosen as the most likely Samaritikon original.

The second and third of the abovementioned differences between Syh and manuscript 15 involve variants in place names. For the name שטיר, manuscript 15 has Γαβσάλα but Syh has ἄροήρ (‘adr’y) and this is retroverted as Σηείρ above. Regarding proper names, when the LXX follows Sam closely, the Samaritikon normally agrees with both (see e.g., 21:13 above, and the names Μωαβῖται and Ἄμμιάν). The reading Γαβσάλα in manuscript 15 is unknown anywhere in the LXX, whereas in Deuteronomy 2:29 (part of the inserted passage) the LXX follows Sam with Σηείρ for שטיר. Thus, the Samaritikon reading here is most likely Σηείρ. Γαβσάλα may be a transliteration of בובל which appears at the end of verse 22 in HT, although the reasons for this word being taken as a place name and transliterated are not clear.

The other name in Sam for which there are different renderings is רה — manuscript 15 has Ἄρινή while Syh has ἀροήρ (‘ado’y). For two reasons, the latter probably corresponds to an original Ἀροήρ in the Samaritikon, with Syh (or a later copyist) substituting dalath (s) for the similar resh (s) due to a copying error. First, in 21:13 another Samaritikon note renders רה using Ἀροήρ. There Syh also substitutes dalath for resh although the Greek witnesses have Ἀροήρ. Second, the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:29 has Ἀροήρ for רה, and there Syh28 matches the Greek with resh instead of dalath (אלוועס — ‘aro’y). Thus, Ἀροήρ is the likely Samaritikon reading for the present verse.

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:28-29a (which is identical to Sam of Numbers 21:22b) is as follows.

The similar corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:28-29a is:

βρώματα ἀργυρίου ἀποδώσῃ μοι, καὶ φάγομαι, καὶ ὑδώρ ἀργυρίου ἀποδώσῃ μοι, καὶ πίομαι· πλὴν ὦν παρελεύσοιμαι τοῖς ποσίν, καθὼς ἐποίησάν μοι οἱ υἱοὶ Ησαυ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σηείρ καὶ οἱ Μωαβῖται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἀροήρ
In Numbers 21:22, Israel sends messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites, to ask for permission to pass through the land. The quote from Deuteronomy that Sam has inserted at the end of this verse is added information about Israel’s request to King Sihon that is provided in Deuteronomy 2:28-29.

Num 21:23

HT

LXX (τῶν ὁρίων) αὐτοῦ

Samsec_Syh + καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν: Ἥδου ἤργαι παραδοῦναι πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Σηὼν, καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ. ἔναρξαι κληρονομῆσαι τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ.

Wit 1: Syh^L

NonGr: Syh^L

Notes: The retroversion is provided by Field and derived mostly from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:31. The attribution for this note comes from additional text after the note that reads: (“only in the Samaritan[s]”).

Numbers 21:23b of Sam is an insertion from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:31 with a few words modified or omitted. The marginal note in Syh^L is a Syriac translation of a Greek version of Numbers 21:23b, presumably the Samaritikon (for more information on these Samaritikon readings, see under 20:13). Each line of the note is marked in the Syh^L text with an obelus-like sign with a mark like the tail of an arrow on the right side.

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 2:31 is as follows. Phrases in Deuteronomy that are modified in Numbers 21:23b are noted with asterisks, and the modified phrase from Numbers follows in brackets (the second pair of brackets is empty, signifying that the preceding asterisked phrase is omitted in Num 21:23b).

Sam, Deuteronomy 2:31:

The corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 2:31 is:
καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς μὲ Ἰδοὺ ἔργαι παραδοῦναι πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Σηων βασιλέα Εσεβων τὸν Αμορραῖον καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ. ἔναρξαι κληρονομῆσαι τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ.

In Numbers 21:23, Sihon the king of the Amorites refuses to let Israel pass through the land. The quote from Deuteronomy that Sam has inserted in the middle of 21:23 gives (1) God’s promise to Israel that he has begun to give Sihon’s land to Israel, and (2) God’s command to Israel to possess Sihon’s land.

Num 21:24

HT ישׁרָאֵל
LXX Ἰσραήλ

Sam sec_Syh + καὶ τοὺς ὑιοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ

Wit 1: Syh T
NonGr: Syh T מלחשהملוחה planta planta

Notes: The attribution for this marginal note comes from additional text after the note that reads: תְּלָשֶׁה תְּלָשֶׁה (“only in the Samaritan[s]”).

Sam has inserted the text רואת בניו ואת כל תנמר into Numbers 21:24. It is taken from Numbers 21:35 of HT, although interestingly Sam of Numbers 21:35 has only the phrase רואת בניו (a Sam copyist may have dropped רואת כל תנמר through parablepsis on successive occurrences of רואת). The Samaritikon has faithfully translated the entire phrase added into 21:24, and Syh has a Syriac translation of the Samaritikon phrase. The added text provides a little more information about who was slain by the Israelites. For more information on Samaritikon readings, see under 20:13.

HT —
LXX ἐστίν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh L

>
Num 21:25

HT

בְּנֹתֶיהָ

LXX

συγκυρούσαις αὐτῇ

οἱ γ′ θυγατράσιν αὐτῆς

Wit 1: 108 Syh

NonGr: Syh L Syh T

Notes: HT says, “And Israel lived in all the cities of the Amorites, in Heshbon, and in all her daughters.” The meaning of the last phrase is all the daughter villages, and NUM captures this with συγκυρούσαις αὐτῇ (“those who are near to it”). In 21:32 and 32:42, NUM translates the same Hebrew phrase more literally, referring to the villages belonging to Kenath as τὰς κώας αὐτῆς. The difference may be stylistic, as the sense of the Hebrew is similar in all the verses.

A note attributed to the Three reads θυγατράσιν αὐτῆς which is a literal rendering of the Hebrew. This is consistent with any of the Three, as נב is a common word, and θυγάτηρ is the most common rendering for it (Aquila renders נב with θυγάτηρ exclusively).

Syh\textsuperscript{TM} translates in accord with the Hebrew and not NUM (סנה לאטס אטס) using “daughters,” possibly through the influence of the Three, but after “daughters” it also adds “of her domain” perhaps to capture the sense of NUM. Syh does not follow P here (P renders contextually as בנה חכמה אטס [“all her villages”]).

\begin{equation}
\langle \text{σ′ θ′} \rangle \quad \text{ἐγγιζούσαις}
\end{equation}

Wit 1: F\textsuperscript{b}

Notes: For this verse, F\textsuperscript{b} has added a marginal note associated with בנה חכמה אטס that reads ἐγγιζούσαις. This is an alternative to συγκυρούσαις in NUM and both words have some semantic overlap. The Three use the verb ἐγγίζω commonly (e.g., for בק in — α’: Isa 41:5; θ′; Isa 45:21; σ′: Ps 26[27]:2, 31[32]:9, 90[91]:10; and all three translators for בנה in Isa 41:1). However, the literalistic tendencies of Aquila would
make him far more likely to use θυγάτηρ for בת which he does without exception elsewhere. Theoretically, Symmachus or Theodotion could have used ἐγγιζόσαις here, although the data is scanty.

In 19:18, another unattributed Fᵇ note has ἐγγίσαντα for הַנֹּגֵעַ (Hiphil of נגע). This suggests that a scholiast may have used the same gloss in both places.

HT
LXX

ο’ αὐτῆς

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: B F V O⁽⁽G⁾⁾ 58 b d f⁽⁽56⁾⁾ n t x⁽⁽619⁾⁾ z⁽⁽630⁾⁾ 59-424-646-799

Notes: Most manuscripts agree with NUM and end verse 25 with αὐτῆς, which renders the singular pronominal suffix that refers back to Heshbon. Some manuscripts, including A, M, and the s-group, have αὐταῖς which is likely not correct, as it would have to refer back to πόλεσιν (see NGTN 354). A 344 (s-group) marginal note attributed to ο’ indicates Origen’s agreement with NUM. This attribution is supported by the available O-group minus 58, and is probably correct.

οἱ λ’ αὐτῆς

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: 56 Syh
NonGr: Syh ܐܢܛܐ
d

Notes: Manuscript 344, from the s-group, has a note attributed to οἱ λ’ that replaces the dative pronoun at the end of the sentence with a genitive. This note matches the second part of the οἱ γ’ reading covered above which has θυγατράσιν αὐτῆς for בְּנֹתֶיהָ (“her daughters”), and the present note probably is derived from the same tradition as that reading.

Num 21:26

HT
LXX
non tr Ἑσεβὼν γὰρ πόλις Σηὼν τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἀμορραίων ἔστιν

Wit 2: Ὀ(G) 58 ↓129 ↓509 Syh = MT
Var: Ἑσεβὼν γὰρ Ἐσεβὼν ἔστιν γὰρ Ἑσεβὼν B 129 509
NonGr: Syh

Notes: To match the Hebrew word order, Origen has transposed the word ἔστιν from the beginning of the sentence to after Ἀμορραίων, and then reversed the resulting words Ἐσεβὼν at the beginning so that γὰρ maintains its postpositive position. The O-group manuscripts 376 and 426 match this perfectly suggesting that this is Origen’s work. Three other manuscripts — B 129 509 — have ἔστιν at the end of the clause but also retain it at the beginning and thus they may reflect Origen’s influence.

HT מְרַדְּעַ′ אָרְעַד מִיָּדוֹ
LXX (ἀπὸ Ἀροήρ) ἕως Ἀρνών

οἱ γ′ (ο′) ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἕως Ἀρνών

Wit 1: lemma] Syh1 ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ 108
Wit 2: ↓O(G)426 ↓C-↓46 767
Var: ἀπὸ Ἀροήρ] pr ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ O(G)426 ἐκ χειρός] χειρός C-46
NonGr: Syh1

Notes: HT says that King Sihon had taken land from the king of Moab, “from his hand as far as Arnon (ןנֹעַד־אַרְעַד מִיָּדוֹ).” NUM omits the reference to “his hand” and adds that this land began “from Aroer” — thus it reads ἀπὸ Ἀροήρ ἕως Ἀρνών. A note attributed to οἱ γ′ in Syh1 matches HT: ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἕως Ἀρνών. A shorter version in manuscript 108 has the same attribution and reads only ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. The note could be from any of the Three, particularly from Aquila, who would have translated literally. Two O-group manuscripts have inserted ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ before ἀπὸ Ἀροήρ and this could reflect the o’ text.
Num 21:27

**HT**
עליך נאמורו דומ⇋צלום

**LXX**
דיاآ תוזו ἔροσιν οἱ αἰνιγµατισταὶ

**〈α′ σ′〉**
דיاآ תוזו ἔλεγον οἱ παροιµιαζόµενοι

**Wit 1:** Procop 860

**Notes:** This unattributed marginal note substitutes the imperfect of λέγω for the aorist, and for מְשָל replaces αἰνιγµατισταί (“to speak in riddles”) with παροιµιαζόµενοι (“to speak in proverbs”). Aquila and Symmachus use παροιµιάζω to render מְשָל in Ezekiel 24:3. In addition, both of these translators use the noun παροιµία to render מְשָל (e.g., α`: Ezek 18:2; σ`: 1 Kgdms 24:14, Ps 77[78]:2, Prov 25:1, Eccl 12:9). Thus either of these translators could be the source of this note.

**HT**
עיר סיחון

**LXX**
πόλις Σηών

**〈ο′〉** οἱ λ′ πόλις Σιών

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** 29 131° 108-118° d 53'-56*-246° 54-75'-767* 84 71-509* γ'-121 55 (sed hab Compl)

**Notes:** Most witnesses, including the s-group, follow the NUM rendering Σηών for סירוה, the name of the king of Heshbon. A note in s-group manuscript 344 attributes the alternate rendering Σιών to o’ and oi λ’. Σιών normally refers to Zion in Jerusalem, but the change here may not be a confusion between the two locations. Many manuscripts change the spelling of King Sihon’s name to Σιών when the reference is unambiguously to King Sihon (see Wevers’ apparatus under verses 21:21, 23, 29, 34, and 32:33).

For this verse, no O-group manuscripts and only one hexaplaric manuscript (29) reflect Σιών. Of the nine occurrences of סירוה in NUM, only manuscript 29 consistently has Σιών. In four of those verses, the original readings of individual O-group manuscripts have Σιών (58* in 32:33; 376* in 21:21, 23; 426* in 21:26), although they were later modified to Σηών. Thus, the evidence is inconclusive for the o’ text having Σιών in the other verses, and it is virtually non-existent for the present verse. In conclusion, it appears unlikely that the o’ text has Σιών here.
344 also attributes Σιών to οἱ λ’. Aquila often adhered closely to the Hebrew form of proper names (see REI-Pro 19), and Symmachus and Theodotion could likewise be expected to follow HT. Little evidence exists for how the Three render רָעָה, other than an attribution of Σηών to θ’ in Jeremiah 31[48]:45. If the present attribution to οἱ λ’ is correct, it would be the only example of any of the Three using Σιών for רָעָה. Thus, this attribution to οἱ λ’ is possibly correct.

**Num 21:32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>רָעָה (בְּנֹתֶיהָ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(καὶ κατελάβοντο) αὐτήν καὶ (τὰς κώμας αὐτῆς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub ÷  ÷ αὐτήν καὶ _stepped value_

Wit 2:  Syh

>  

Wit 2:  319 Lat cod100 = MT

NonGr:  Syh  _stepped value_

**Notes:** HT has “and they captured her daughters” (רָעָה (בְּנֹתֶיהָ)), referring to the villages surrounding Jazer. NUM tries to be more specific by adding a reference to Jazer itself being captured (using αὐτήν as a direct object of κατελάβοντο). NUM then adds καὶ to link αὐτήν to the second direct object: καὶ κατελάβοντο αὐτήν καὶ τὰς κώμας αὐτῆς. Syh has an obelus around the equivalent of καὶ but it does not include the pronominal suffix on the preceding word which is the equivalent of αὐτήν. Sign confusion occurs frequently in Syh, particularly with conglutinate structures, and Origen likely included the entire phrase not matched in HT — αὐτήν καὶ — under the obelus.

**Num 21:33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἀνή (κλῆροι)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῖς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈Sub ※〉  + αὐτός

Wit 2:  ἐν οivirus (G) 376 d n t 527 Sa 12  Syh = MT
**Attr:** ※] > omnes

**NonGr:** Syh ܣܘܼܪ

**Notes:** HT says, “Og, king of Bashan, came out to meet them, he (ܡܵܐܒܓ) and all his people.” NUM has no equivalent for ܒܓ. Two O-group manuscripts, however, add αὐτός to match the Hebrew and Syh agrees, as do a number of other manuscripts. These are a possible indication of Origen’s work, and αὐτός may originally have been under the asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ܐܹܕܪܵܝܹܐ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Ἐδράιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** For ܐܹܕܪܵܝܹܐ in HT, NUM has added a final nu with Ἐδράιν. Several witnesses, including O-group manuscripts 58 and 426, drop the nu and match the Hebrew. These probably indicate Origen’s work in correcting the spelling of this proper name without using Aristarchian signs, as is his frequent practice (see THGN 59-61).

**Num 21:35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ܫܶܪܵܝܹܐ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ζωγρίαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** NUM has ζωγρίαν for ܫܶܪܵܝܹܐ in HT. A 344 (s-group) note attributes an alternate spelling to the o’ text — ζωγρείαν — and this is the reading of many other manuscripts, including the uncial B. Thackeray argues that the LXX autographs of the earlier translations preserved the classical distinction between ει and ι that was lost in later Hellenistic times, and that manuscript B usually represents the more correct and
earlier orthography for these forms (THACK 85-87). Wevers, however, believes that in this case, the B spelling is secondary (NGTN 359), and that ζωγρίαν is original.

As for the o’ attribution in 344, only one hexaplaric manuscript (72), and none from the O-group, reflects ζωγρείαν. If ζωγρείαν were original to the o’ text, one would expect more hexaplaric witnesses to reflect it (although in some cases later scribes may have changed ει to ι). In addition, a marginal note in SyhT has “ζωΓΡίΑΝ” (written as shown with mixed small and capital Greek letters) linked to the Syh equivalent, indicating that the Syh translator had an o’ text with ζωγρίαν. Thus, the 344 reading ζωγρείαν is possibly correct, but some uncertainty remains.

\[ \alpha’ \quad \lambdaείμμα \]

_Wit 1: 344_

\[ \sigma’ \quad \lambdaείψανον \]

_Wit 1: 344_

\[ \theta’ \quad υπόλειμμα \]

_Wit 1: 344_

**Notes:** According to manuscript 344, the Three provide similar variants to replace the NUM rendering ζωγρίαν for שָׂרִיד. α’ has λείμμα (“remnant/residue”), which he also uses to render שָׂרִיד in Deuteronomy 2:34, 3:3, and Isaiah 1:9. σ’ employs λείψανον (“piece left” or “remnant”) which he uses for שָׂרִיד in Judges 5:13. And θ’ uses υπόλειμμα (“remnant/remainder”) which he uses for שָׂרִיד in in Deuteronomy 2:34. Thus, these attributions make sense.

**Numbers 22**

**Num 22:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>יָּקָץ(וַ</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>(καὶ) προσώχθισεν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\[ \langle \sigma’ \rangle \quad ἠθύ*ησεν \]

_Wit 1: 130-1321' 128_
Var: ἡθύησεν ἡθι. 346; ἤριθ. 321

Notes: NUM renders יָקָץ (root קוץ) as προσώχθισεν. Two different meanings of קוץ appear in Numbers. In 21:5, it is used for the irritation or weariness of the people. The second meaning appears in the present verse, where קוץ is used to refer to the fear the Moabites had of Israel. NUM uses προσόχθιζω in both instances. προσόχθιζω fits the context in 21:5 — where the sense is to feel disgust or repugnance — but it does not normally carry the meaning of fear, and thus is not a good rendering in the present verse. As a result, any of the Three may well have used another rendering to fit the context better.

Three s-group manuscripts have added an unattributed marginal note giving ἡθύησεν ("be disheartened" or "afraid") as an alternate rendering. Of the Three, only Symmachus uses ἄθυεω — in Job 30:28 for קדר ("be in mourning garb"), in Psalm 101[102]:1 for עטף ("be weak"), and in Jonah 4:1 forחרה. Thus, this note could possibly be from Symmachus.

Num 22:4

HT  (וָנָה הַקָּהָל עַתָּה יְלַחֲכוּ)
LXX  νῦν ἐκλείξει (ἠ συναγωγή)

<οἱ λ’> ἀρτί ἐξαλείψει (-λιψει cod)

Wit 1: 127

Notes: The phrase הַקָּהָל עַתָּה יְלַחֲכוּ means “now the contingent will lick up.” HT uses a plural verb with the singular הַקָּהָל, evidently treating the noun in a collective sense. NUM renders the phrase as νῦν ἐκλείξει ἠ συναγωγή, using a singular subject and verb. The verb ἐκλείξω is similar in meaning toלחך. An unattributed note in n-group manuscript 127 gives the alternate rendering ἀρτί ἐξαλείψει ("now it will wipe out"), a future of ἐξαλείφω. All of the Three employ ἐξαλείφω to mean “wipe out” or “destroy” (α’: Jer 18:23; σ’: Isa 25:8; θ’: Ezek 6:6) although not forלחך, nor does any record exist of the Three renderingלחך anywhere else. This note could possibly be from any of the Three, and Symmachus would perhaps be most likely to use a contextual rendering such as ἐξαλείψει. The note is from manuscript 127 which has another unattributed note for the previous verse that may be from a scholiast. Thus, another possibility is that this present note is from a scholiast.

Num 22:5

HT  רָהו פְּת
Notes: The Hebrew רָהוֹ פְּת is a combination of the name רָהוֹ and the directional he. NUM treats the entire lexeme as a proper noun so that the directional marker is not rendered. According to Syh, the o’ text added εἰς under the asterisk to indicate the preposition represented by the directional marker. Aside from Syh, no hexaplaric manuscripts picked up this addition, but a few other manuscripts did. This asterisk is possibly original to the o’ text.

Syh places the lamadh preposition under the asterisk. In both Syh\textsuperscript{L} and Syh\textsuperscript{T}, the asterisk appears before the word, as shown above. Syh\textsuperscript{T} places the metobelus over the lamadh while Syh\textsuperscript{L} has it over the pe. The margin of Syh\textsuperscript{T} has the word φαθούρα (written as shown), indicating that the copy of the o’ text available to the translator agreed with NUM.

〈σ’〉 τὸν ψφηγητήν

Notes: For ψφηγητής (ψφηγητής plus a directional he) an unattributed note from three s-group margins has τὸν ψφηγητήν which means “leader/guide/teacher.” This could be related to the Hebrew verb פּתר which means “to explain/interpret a dream.” Possibly this is an attempt to render the word in a way that describes Balaam’s office as a diviner. Aquila occasionally translates place names (see REI-Pro 20), but in Deuteronomy 23:5 he renders פּתר, referring also to Balaam’s hometown, as Φαθώρ. Thus, he is unlikely to be the source of this note. Symmachus also translates place names (see F-Pro 67-68), and this reading could possibly come him, although he is not known to use ψφηγητής anywhere else.
Notes: NUM uses the verb ἔχω to render מִמֻּל in HT (מִמּוּל means “opposite” and combining it with מִן gives a similar meaning). Although not common, the verb ἔχω can denote “to be in proximity to.” An unattributed marginal note gives the rendering ἀπέναντι which is a more literal rendering. It could theoretically be from any of the Three, but is more likely from Aquila or Symmachus who are known to use ἀπέναντι (α’: Ezek 14:3; σ’: Jer 30:10[49:32]), although not for מִמֻּל.

Num 22:6

HT

עָצוּם הוּא מִמֶּנִּי

LXX

ισχύει οὗτος η ἡμεῖς

Num 22:6

HT

עָצוּם הוּא מִמֶּנִּי

LXX

ισχύει οὗτος η ἡμεῖς

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh
Notes: The last part of Balak’s speech reads: “For I know that who you bless is blessed and who you curse is cursed.” HT does not have explicit second person pronouns as subjects for the two second person verbs, but NUM adds them. Origen places both personal pronouns under the obelus. The first is covered here and the second below.

HT (אֲשֶׁר תָּאֹר)
LXX (οὓς ἐὰν καταράσῃ) σὺ

Sub ÷

HT
LXX

Sub ÷

Num 22:9

HT (ורְמָךְ)
LXX (καὶ εἶπεν) αὐτῷ

Sub ÷

Notes: NUM includes two second person pronouns not found in HT, both of which are placed under the obelus. The first is covered above and the second here.

Notes: HT reads רְמָךְ, and NUM corresponds quantitatively except that it adds αὐτῷ after εἶπεν, the final word of the phrase. Syh
notes an obelus that marks αὐτῷ. Although no other manuscripts witness negatively to this omission, the obelus is probably genuine.

\[\text{\{\text{o'}\}} \quad \text{ἐστι} \quad \text{οἱ} \quad \text{ἄνθρωποι} \quad (\text{ἀνοί})\]

\begin{align*}
\text{Wit 1:} & \quad 344 \\
\text{Wit 2:} & \quad 426 \ 528 \ 509 \downarrow 392 \ Sa^{12} \downarrow \text{Syh}^T \\
\text{Var:} & \quad ὅτι \text{ pr } τί \ 392; \ + \ τί \ \text{Syh}^T \\
\text{NonGr:} & \quad \text{Syh}^T \quad \text{μηθηλη} \ \text{μεταξεται} \ \text{ἡμεραις} \ \\
\end{align*}

**Notes:** NUM reads τί οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὅτι οὗτοι παρὰ σοί and this agrees with HT. A note in 344 attributed to the o’ text substitutes ὅτι for τί at the beginning of God’s statement to Balaam. This would cause the sentence to read as a declarative statement, the ὅτι serving as a marker of direct discourse: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι παρὰ σοί (“And God said that these men are with you.”) The first problem with this rendering is that it clearly goes against the Hebrew, unless Origen’s Vorlage was different, for example having רְכִּי instead of רְכִּי, and this is unlikely since only 426 of all the hexaplaric manuscripts has ὅτι. A second problem is that only once, in 21:7, does NUM use ὅτι as a marker of direct discourse, and there the o’ text probably omitted it (see the discussion under that verse). The substitution of ὅτι for τί here is more likely a scribal error than the reading of the o’ text.

Syh^T bears witness to ὅτι but seems aware of the problem, since in addition to ὅτι it also includes the equivalent of τί.

\[\alpha' \ \theta' \quad \text{τίνες} \quad \text{οἱ} \quad \text{ἀνδρεῖς} \quad (\text{oûto}i)\]

\begin{align*}
\text{Wit 1:} & \quad 344 \\
\end{align*}

**Notes:** Aquila and Theodotion follow HT and NUM, using τίνες rather than τί (although τί is acceptable in the singular as a predicate with a plural subject). They also tend to use ἀνώπρι for ἄνδρεῖς consistently. Thus, this rendering is consistent with these two translators.

\[\sigma' \quad \text{τί} \quad \text{οἱ} \quad \text{ἀνθρωποι} \quad (\text{ἀνοί})\]
Notes: Symmachus matches HT and the straightforward translation of NUM. Symmachus tends to avoid using ἀνήρ for אִישׁ when the latter is used as an indefinite pronoun, choosing instead to use ἄνθρωπος (see 14:22, 25:6, and SITP 126, 241). This is contrary to the practice of Aquila and Theodotion who use ἀνήρ consistently for אִישׁ. Symmachus does use ἀνήρ for אִישׁ when the person is definitely male.

**Num 22:10**

HT  
(πίστης)

LXX  
(ἀπέστειλεν) αὐτούς

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  Syh

>  

Wit 2:  58 767 319 Bo = MT

NonGr:  Syh

Notes: NUM adds a third person plural pronoun that is not present in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen marks it with an obelus. The word appears in Syh but not under the obelus.

**Num 22:11**

HT  
—

LXX  
καὶ οὗτος ἐγκάθηται ἐχόμενός μου

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  Syh
Notes: In this verse, Balaam quotes Balak’s words from verses 5-6 almost verbatim. However, NUM adds a phrase from verse 5 that is not in HT of verse 11: καὶ οὗτος ἐγκάθηται ἐχό*ενός *ου. Syh reflects the entire phrase, but Syh\(^L\) places only the last word under the obelus. Unless Origen had a different Hebrew Vorlage — and no manuscripts support this idea — one would expect the entire phrase to be obelized. In Syh\(^L\) all but the last word is on one line but the final word (ܐܡ) appears on the next line with an obelus in the margin beside it. If an obelus was originally placed before the beginning of the phrase on the first line, another obelus would have been placed in the margin of the second line to indicate the continuation of the obelized phrase. Then, if the original obelus was lost, what would remain is what we see in the existing text, that is, the marginal obelus before the last word of the phrase and the metobelus after. Thus, it is likely that Origen included the entire phrase under the obelus.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} & \text{לְהִלָּחֶם}\noalign{\medskip}
\text{LXX} & \text{πατάξαι (αὐτόν)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\langle θ′\rangle \quad \text{ἐκπολεμήσαι αὐτόν}
\]

Notes: Several \(s\)-group manuscripts have an unattributed note that has ἐκπολεμήσαι instead of πατάξαι in NUM to render לְהִלָּחֶם. Of the Three, only Theodotion uses εκπολεμέω, and he uses it to render לְהִלָּחֶם (Jdg 9:52, 10:9). Thus, this note could come from Theodotion.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} & \quad —
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{απὸ τῆς γῆς}
\end{array}
\]

Sub \(\div\)

Notes:
>  

Wit 2: Arab = Compl MT  
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{L} אַל־נָא  

Notes: The final phrase of verse 12 in NUM does not occur in HT, and Origen marks it with an obelus, as noted in Syh\textsuperscript{L}. Syh\textsuperscript{T} has the phrase but without an obelus.

**Num 22:13**

| HT       | יְהוָה (יְהוָה) נָבַר |  |
| LXX      | με ὁ θεός           |  |

\[\text{⟨οֹי λ′⟩} \text{ με κύριος (κκς)}\]

Wit 1: 85′-321′ 344  
Wit 2: ↓426 b 319 \text{Lat} \text{cod100 Aeth Bo} = \text{MT}  
Var: με κκς tr 426  
NonGr: \text{Lat} \text{cod100 me dominus}

Notes: NUM renders יְהוָה with ὁ θεός. An unattributed marginal note in five s-group manuscripts changes this to the more typical κύριος (out of 396 occurrences of יְהוָה in Numbers, NUM renders with θεός only 23 times, and 18 of those are in chapters 22-24 — see the oi λ′ and τὸ ἔβρον note under 22:22). Of all the hexaplaric witnesses, only manuscript 426 from the O-group has this change (see the discussion in Chapter 5 about manuscript 426 and its relation to the o′ text). All of the Three would be expected to render יְהוָה as κύριος.

**Num 22:16**

| HT       | אַל־נָא (אַל־נָא)  
| LXX      | (ἀξιῶ) σε       |  |

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh\textsuperscript{L}  
>  

Wit 2: 68′-120′ (sed hab Ald) = MT
NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT reads, אַל־נָא תִמָּנַע ("Please, do not be restrained from coming to me"). NUM translates the opening as ἀξιῶ σε, thus adding a second person pronoun. Syh witnesses to an Origenic obelus marking the added σε.

Num 22:17

Sub ※ σφόδρα

Wit 2: O(G) 246 767 18'-126-628-630' Bo Syh = Compl MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT includes the adverb κατά for which NUM has no equivalent. Origen added σφόδρα under the asterisk, as witnessed by Syh and two O-group manuscripts.

(o’) pr πάντα

Wit 2: A F 619 ↓ F ↓ M’ ↓ O(G) ↓ C’ ↓ 56-246 ↓ s 130 321 344

Var: ο’σα] πάντα ᾧ M’ 426-oΓ 56 s y 799; πάντα F 29 C C· 16 417* 392*

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT has which NUM approximates with ο’σα. O-group manuscripts G-376 add πάντα and 426 adds πάντα ᾧ before ο’σα and this is probably evidence of Origen’s work. The witness of G and 376 suggests that Origen added πάντα and that the o’ text had πάντα ο’σα. Many other manuscripts, including the uncials A, F, and M, and
all the other hexaplaric manuscripts, add πάντα, some with variants. These changes probably reflect the ο烃 text (see NGTN 348).

HT  
LXX  

(Sub ※) + μοι

Wit 2:  F ↓ M' V O (G) 15 C’ f 129 767 s 619 392 z 59 424 624 646 799 Syh

Attr:  ※] > omnes

Var:  εἰπθής] pr μοι M'

NonGr:  Syh ﮚ

Notes:  NUM has nothing corresponding to אֵלַי in HT. The O-group and most of the other hexaplaric manuscripts add μοι, and this indicates Origen’s work. This is reflected in many other manuscripts, including the uncials F, M, and V. Origen possibly placed the addition under the asterisk.

HT  
LXX  

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  Syh

>  

Wit 2:  761(l) b = MT

NonGr:  Syh ﮚ

Notes:  Origen added an obelus to indicate the second person pronoun in NUM, which has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew.

Num 22:18

HT  
LXX  

ο烃 ο烃 θεοῦ μοι

ο烃 ο烃 θεοῦ μοι
Notes: HT reads יִלְשָׁןָה קָטַנָּה אֵלֹהָי while NUM omits the possessive pronoun. A note attributed to ο′ and οἱ λ′ in s-group manuscript 344 corrects the Greek toward the Hebrew by adding μου. The agreement of the O-group and Syh witnesses to the genuineness of the attribution to ο′, and this addition may originally have been under the asterisk. The attribution to οἱ λ′ is also sound, although it cannot be made any more specific because this addition is consistent with any of the three translators.

Sub ÷

Notes: In the phrase לָטְשָׁןָה קָטַנָּה אֵלֹהָי HT omits an explicit reference to “anything” (i.e., “to do anything small or great”) since it is understood in context. NUM makes this explicit using αὐτό and Origen puts this under the obelus. Syh^T places the obelus over the last part of the word to indicate the pronominal suffix.
Notes: NUM adds the phrase ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ ο of at the end of verse 18, and this is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew. Origen places the entire phrase under the obelus. As with 22:11, Syh\textsuperscript{L} has the phrase spanning two lines, with a continuation obelus in the margin before the beginning of the second line but with the initial obelus missing. The first obelus has likely been omitted by a copyist. Syh\textsuperscript{T} has its obelus placed correctly.

Num 22:19

**Sub ★ δῆ**

\textit{Wit 2:} \(O\textsuperscript{(G)}\textsuperscript{426} \) Syh = MT

\textit{Attr:} ★ Syh\textsuperscript{L} > rell

\textit{NonGr:} Syh\textsuperscript{T} \却不\不\不 ※ Syh\textsuperscript{L} ※ δη※ δη

Notes: Origen attempted to match the Hebrew particle \(נָא\), which has no equivalent in NUM for this verse, using δῆ under the asterisk. NUM often disregards \(נָא\), although in 22:16 it uses ἀξιῶ σε to render it (see NGTN 368-69). As often happens, Syh\textsuperscript{L} displaces the Aristarchian sign by one word.

**Sub ÷**

\textit{Wit 2:} Syh

> 58 = MT Sam Tar\textsuperscript{O}

\textit{NonGr:} Syh \(א\)

Notes: HT has τὴν νύκτα ταύτην and NUM renders this τὴν νύκτα ταύτην. Origen places the demonstrative under the obelus as it has no equivalent in the Hebrew.
Num 22:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>(הָאֲנָשִׁים)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(οἱ ἄνθρωποι) οὗτοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub ÷

**Wit 2:** Syh

> 58 \text{Lat}\text{Aug} \text{Num 48} = \text{MT}

**NonGr:** Syh Ï sum ÷

Notes: As with the previous verse, NUM adds a demonstrative pronoun that has no equivalent in HT, and Origen includes its equivalent under the obelus. Both Syh and Syh\text{^T} omit the metobelus.

---

Num 22:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>הֹולֵךְ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐπορεύετο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ο′ ἐπορεύθη

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** B V \text{O\textsuperscript{(-G)}} \text{d 53'-129 458 t 71-509} = \text{Compl Ra}

Notes: HT has a participle (הֹולֵךְ) to express concomitant action to the main verb. Wevers argues that the original LXX renders this with an imperfect, and many witnesses support this (see under α′ below). Other witnesses, however, including the O-group use the aorist, and a marginal note in 344 attributes the aorist to the ο′ text. Whether Origen initiated this reading or simply mirrored one of his exemplars is not clear, but the attribution is likely correct.

α′ θ′ πορεύεται

**Wit 1:** 344


Notes: In HT, a Hebrew participle is used to express action accompanying the main verb which is describing a situation in the past. For a Hebrew participle in a circumstantial clause expressing concomitant action, the Three often use participles (e.g., α’ σ’: Exo 2:13, 9:24 in contexts of past action), but they also use imperfect, aorist, perfect, or present tenses. Their usage is based on context or other rhetorical factors (for Aquila, see REI-Pro 50-51). For rendering participles in past tense situations, the imperfect is sometimes used. For example, Aquila and Symmachus use the imperfect for participles expressing ongoing action in the past (α’: Jer 44[37]:4, 3 Kgdms 21[20]:12; σ’: Exo 3:2). Symmachus’ use of ἐπορεύετο in the present verse is consistent with this pattern.

The Three normally use the present or perfect tense to render participles that express present action (present — α’: 1 Kgdms 28:9, Eccl 1:5, Exo 9:2,17; σ’: Jer 50[43]:3; σ’: Job 4:11; perfect — α’ θ’: Job 20:26; α’ σ’ θ’: Dan 9:26 [present or perhaps prophetic future]). Sometimes, however, the aorist renders participles that express special senses of the present (e.g., in gnomic contexts, α’ in Job 4:11, and α’ and σ’ in Ps 32[33]:7).

Since the Three usually employ present or perfect to render participles in present tense contexts, Aquila and Theodotion’s use of the present tense πορεύεται to render a participle expressing ongoing past action is possibly unusual. However, Aquila at times uses the present tense to render past narrative action in keeping with a historical present sense (e.g., he uses the present to render the Hebrew waw-consecutive in Job 7:15 and Isa 57:20). Thus, this attribution to Aquila is probably sound, and since the translators do not seem bound by rigid rules for rendering participles, no reason exists to doubt the attribution to Theodotion.

HT
וַיִּתְיַצֵּב
LXX
καὶ ἀνέστη

Notes: HT has בָיְתֵּנְס (Hithpael of קָבֶּשֶׁנ) for the action of the angel of the Lord. In place of ἀνέστη, a 344 note attributes the alternate reading ἔστη to ω’ and σ’. In this context, the difference between the two words is not great. NUM uses ἔστη to render the Hithpael of בָיְתֵּנְס at 11:16, and for the Niphal of בָיְתֵּנְס (the allomorph of בָיְתֵנְס in the
Niphal and Hiphil stems) at 16:27. This verse would be the only place in NUM where ἀνίστη*ι is used for נָצב or נָצַב, although ἀνίστη*ι is used many times in NUM for קָם. The accuracy of the o’ attribution is attested by the O-group (minus 58). Origen may have been influenced by the normal NUM rendering of נָצב using ἵστη*ι.

Although Symmachus normally uses ἵστη*ι to render עָמד or קָם, he does occasionally use ἵστη*ι for נָצב (Niphal in Isa 3:13 and Hiphil in Ps 73[74]:17). Thus this attribution is suitable.

α’ θ’ καὶ ἐστηλώθη

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Notes:_ According to a 344 note, Aquila and Theodotion use the passive of στηλόω, meaning “take one’s stand.” This attribution makes sense, as Aquila and Theodotion use στηλόω for the Hiphil of נָצב in Psalm 73[74]:17. In addition, Aquila uses στηλόω for the Niphal of נָצב in Isaiah 3:13.

HT יְהוָה

LXX τοῦ θεοῦ

_οἱ λ’ τὸ ἑβρ’ τοῦ κύριου_

_Wit 1:_ Syh

_Wit 2:_ 376 314 d t 527 Aeth Bo

_NonGr:_ Syh^1 πους | Syh^7 υπ’

_Notes:_ A marginal note in Syh reads: אֵלָה יְהוָה הָאָדָם (“those of the Rest and the Hebrew: ‘Lord’”). For “Lord,” Syh^1 has the equivalent ПΙΠИ (see discussion under 20:16). In the Balaam narratives in chapters 22-24, NUM renders记者在 with θεος 18 times, but only 5 times elsewhere. Wevers speculates that the narrator is attempting to distance the events from the Lord (YHWH), the God of Israel (NGTN 372). That the other translators use the more exact rendering κύριος for记者在 makes good sense.

The reading is also attributed to τὸ ἑβρ’. Chapter 22 has five τὸ ἑβρ’ readings, three of which render the tetragrammaton as a form of κύριος (verses 22, 23, 24), and two of which are transliterations of שָׂטָן, perhaps reflecting the second column (verses 22 and 32).

HT קָשָׂן (וֹ)

LXX ἐνδιαβάλλειν (αὐτὸν)
\( \alpha' \ \tauο \ \epsilonβρ' \ \sigmaαταν \)

**Wit 1:** Procop 864

**Wit 2:** Syh

**NonGr:** Syh אֶלֹאָמָו

**Notes:** The consonantal text \( \text{ץטשל} \) can be taken either as a noun or an infinitive construct, the latter being the option that NUM follows. According to a note from Procopius, Aquila chooses the first option, stating that the messenger of the Lord stood up an “adversary” (σαταν). Aquila renders \( \text{ץטש} \) as σαταν also in 22:32 in the sense of an adversary, and in Job 1:6 and Zechariah 3:1 to refer to “the satan,” and so this attribution makes sense for him. The Procopius note also attributes this reading to το \( \epsilonβρ' \). This is one of five το \( \epsilonβρ' \) notes in this chapter and one of two which are transliterations that possibly reflect the second column. Interestingly, Syh is closer to Aquila than to NUM — Syh reads, “that he might be to him an opponent.”

\( \theta' \ \alphaντικεισθαι \)

**Wit 1:** Procop 864

**Notes:** A Procopius note attributes the reading \( \alphaντικεισθαι \) to Theodotion. The same Hebrew appears in 22:32, and many witnesses attribute to Theodotion the use of \( \alphaντικειμαι \) there. In addition, Theodotion uses \( \alphaντικειμαι \) for \( \text{ץטש} \) as “the satan” in Job 1:6. Finally, a reading attributed to \( \text{oι λ'} \) has \( \alphaντικειμαι \) in the sense of an accuser in Psalm 108[109]:20. Thus, this attribution is suitable for Theodotion.

**HT**

(לְשָׂטָן \( \text{לֹו} \)בַּדֶּרֶך)

**LXX**

(ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν)

**Sub ※ ※ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν**

**Wit 1:** ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ 121

**Wit 2:** ἐν (> 407) τῇ ὁδῷ (> 120*) ἐνδιαβάλλειν (-βάλλειν 426; -λλει 527) αὐτόν 376-426 n 527 120*-407 Or IV 409 <cod100 Bo ↓ >Syh = MT | ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν b | ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐνδιαβάλλειν (-λλει*)
αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴς ὀδοῦ 58 | ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ 77 | ἐνδιαβάλλειν (βάλλειν V 82 125 30-343-344 c 18′-126-628-630′)
αὐτῶν (αὐτῷ 72[vid]) ἐπὶ (ἀπὸ 72 73′ 128) τῆς ὀδοῦ Μ' V ol′ 707 C′
d 246 s t 619 121 mg 318 z′ 68 120 122 407 55 59 319 424 624 646

Attr: ※] ÷ Syh | > relL

NonGr: Lat cod 100 in via | Syh  √ κατονκο ÷

Notes: HT has the phrase יְרוּם which has no equivalent in NUM, and Origen adds ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ under the asterisk. The asterisk is reflected in many manuscripts and many variants developed. Syh has used the obelus sign to mark this addition instead of an asterisk, but an asterisk was clearly intended.

The witnesses that match NUM (with minor variants) are: A B F Fb 707 f 246 71-509 121 mg 392 68′-120′ 799 Aeth Sd Procop 864.

A summary of witnesses to the Origenic asterisk is as follows: M′ V O(G) 707 C′ b d 246 n s t 527-619 121 mg 318 z′ 68′ 120′ 55 59 319 424 624 646 Or IV 409 Lat cod 100 Bo Syh. The first set of witnesses under Wit 2 match the Origenic asterisk. The rest of the witnesses show Origenic influence. The variants are placed together with the witnesses because with all the permutations, a separate variant section would be more cumbersome than usual to read.

Num 22:23

HT יְרוּם
LXX τοῦ θεοῦ

οἱ λ′ τὸ ἔβρυ′ τοῦ κύριου

Wit 1: Syh

Wit 2: 551 Aeth Sa

NonGr: Syh  אַף

Notes: A marginal note in Syh reads: אַף אֶלֶךֶן אֶלֶךֶן אֶלֶךֶן אֶלֶךֶן (‘the Hebrew and those of the Rest: ‘Lord’’). As in verse 22, NUM renders וַהֲוִי using θεός, which is very common in chapters 22-24 (see the οἱ λ′ and τὸ ἔβρυ′ note under 22:22). That the Three use the more exact rendering κύριος for וַהֲוִי makes sense. This τὸ ἔβρυ′ note is the second of three in chapter 22 that render the tetragrammaton with κύριος rather than θεός (the three are in verses 22, 23, and 24).

HT יְרוּם
LXX  
(τὴν ῥοφαίαν)

Sub ※  αὐτοῦ

Wit 2:  
$O^{(G)}$\textsuperscript{58} Or IV 409 Co Syh = MT

Attr:  
※ Syh\textsuperscript{1} > rell

NonGr:  
Syh ἀλλά

Notes:  
As he often does when NUM fails to render a possessive pronoun that is in HT, Origen adds the Greek equivalent under the asterisk.

HT  
זֶרִיך
LXX  
ἐπορεύετο

〈ο’〉  
ἐπορεύθη

Wit 2:  
$O^{(G)}$\textsuperscript{426} 392 Aeth Bo

Notes:  
HT describes the donkey’s actions in the main clause with two waw-consecutive verbs in parallel. NUM renders the first with an aorist and the second with an imperfect (ἐπορεύετο), although one would probably expect an aorist (see NGTN 373). The available $O$-group (minus 426) indicates that the $o'$ text possibly had the aorist.

HT  
בִּלְעָם
LXX  
—

Sub ※  βαλαάμ

Wit 2:  
$O^{(G)}$\textsuperscript{58} Or IV 409 Co Syh = MT

Attr:  
※ Syh[ ] > rell

NonGr:  
Syh flamm

Notes:  
HT reads, “Balaam (בִּלְעָם) struck the donkey,” while NUM has, “He struck the donkey with a rod (τῇ ῥάβδῳ).” The first difference noted by Origen is the failure to render בִּלְעָם — the equivalent is placed under the asterisk. The second difference is the addition of τῇ ῥάβδῳ and this is covered below.
Sub ｠

Wit 2:  Syh¹

>  

Wit 2:  58 75 Arab = Compl MT

NonGr:  Syh¹  ﲿ

Notes:  NUM adds τῇ ῥάβδῳ which is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus (see the discussion of the entire phrase under the asterisk above). NUM may have added this under the influence of verse 27, where the underlying Hebrew supports τῇ ῥάβδῳ in NUM in a similar context.

Num 22:23-24

HT 窕 ῥάβδῳ

LXX τῇ ῥάβδῳ

οʹ ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ τοῦ εὐθυναί αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ἔστη

Wit 1:  ↓85'-↓321'-344

Wit 2:  ἐν 1º A F M' V O⁽¹⁾⁽⁵⁸⁾ C⁽³⁴⁻⁷³⁾ b f s y z 59 424 624 646 799 Or Iv 409 | τοῦ εὐθυναί αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ A B F M' V ↓O⁽¹⁾⁽⁵⁸⁾ C⁽³⁴⁻⁷³⁾ b f n 343 t ↓x ↓y z 55 59 ↓319 424 624 646 799


Notes:  Manuscript 344 from the s-group has a note with the complete text shown above, while other members of the s-group have portions with minor variations. The s-group (except 343) is lacking the last part of verse 23 (τοῦ εὐθυναί αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) and the s-group notes are indicating their awareness that the o’ text includes it.
The difference between the o’ reading and NUM is that the o’ text includes the preposition ἐν before τῇ ῥάβδῳ (see verse 27, where the O-group also adds ἐν before τῇ ῥάβδῳ). The vast majority of Greek manuscripts, including most hexaplaric witnesses, have ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ, so this is probably the reading of the o’ text although the change may predate Origen.

α’ τὴν ὀνάδα αὐτοῦ ἐκκλίναι αὐτὴν τὴν ὀδὸν καὶ ἔστη

Wit 1: 85′-1321′-344
Wit 2: αὐτοῦ 458
Var: ἔστη] absc 321; ἔστιν 346

Notes: This s-group reading attributed to Aquila is appropriate for him. Unlike NUM, he matches the Hebrew and does not add τῇ ῥάβδῳ (this is also true of σ’ and θ’, and one or more of the Three may have influenced 58, 75, or Arab to omit it). He uses a relatively rare word for a female donkey (ὄνας; the masculine is ὄνος) to render the equivalent Hebrew נאָתוֹ. Normally he uses ὄνος for the related word רֹמחֲ (Gen 36:24, 49:14, Num 16:15, Deut 5:14, 3 Kgdms 13:27), and according to Aquila’s system of equivalencies, he would possibly choose the related feminine ὀνάς as a rendering for the feminine נאָתוֹ. Here, Aquila adds the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ after τὴν ὀνάδα, although this is not reflected in the Hebrew. Aquila’s pedantic literalness makes this addition uncharacteristic of him. Theodotion also adds this possessive pronoun (see below), and this raises the possibility that Aquila and Theodotion had access to a Hebrew manuscript that included a pronominal suffix on נאָתוֹ.

The verb ἔστη can mean “turn aside” or “stretch out.” In the present verse, HT uses the Qal of ἔστη to refer to the donkey turning out of the way, and the Hiphil to refer to Balaam’s efforts to turn the donkey back. NUM uses ἐκκλίνω for the Qal, but εὐθύνω for the Hiphil. For the Hiphil of ἔστη, the α’ note uses ἐκκλίνω, which is an uncommon choice for Aquila since he usually uses ἐκκλίνω for the related δραί or the related σφραί (e.g., Jer 6:28, 15:5, Lam 3:11, Hos 4:16). His usual choice for נמַכַּה in its sense of “stretch out” is ἔκτείνω (Qal — Deut 4:34, 7:19, Isa 3:16, 5:25, 9:17[16], 14:26, 40:22, 51:13, Jer 50[43]:10; Hiphil — Isa 54:2). Scant data exists, however, for how Aquila renders נמַכַּה when it means “turn aside.” Field, citing Nobilius, lists two α’ readings for the Hiphil of נמַכַּה in contexts of “turning” — (1) ὀνακλίνω in Prov 2:2, and (2) ὄγχω in Proverbs 7:21 — but no other evidence is provided. Although Aquila sometimes is rigid in his use of equivalents across contexts, this is not an invariant rule, and thus, he possibly uses ἐκκλίνω in the present context.
σ′

τὴν ὄνον μετακλῖναι αὐτὴν εἰς
tὴν ὁδὸν ἀνέστη δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος

Wit 1: 344

Notes: This 344 reading is consistent with Symmachus. First, like α′ and θ′, he does not add τῇ ῥάβδῳ as NUM does. Then he uses μετακλῖναι for ἑτακλῖναι as he does also in Psalm 43[44]:19. Symmachus also substitutes postpositive δὲ for καὶ in NUM as he often does (e.g., 1:45, 11:8—see SITP 220-21). Unlike NUM and Aquila, who render דּוּמְיָיו literally using ἐστη, Symmachus employs ἀνέστη which is a more contextual rendering, having the sense of standing up in opposition (for other examples of common Hebrew words which Symmachus chooses not to render literally, see SITP 249-50).

θ′

τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ ἐκκλῖναι αὐτὴν
eἰς τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ ἔστη

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: αὐτοῦ 458

Notes: Like the other two translators, this θ′ reading does not add τῇ ῥάβδῳ as NUM does. θ′ here renders נבנה with ἐκκλίνω which Theodotion does elsewhere in Jeremiah 11:8. Thus this reading makes sense for him. As with Aquila, Theodotion adds the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ after τὴν ὄνον, which may indicate that they had a different Hebrew Vorlage that included a pronominal suffix on נבנה.

Num 22:24

HT יְהוָה
LXX τοῦ θεοῦ

θ′

toῦ κύριοῦ

Wit 1: SyhΤ
Wit 2: Sa
NonGr: SyhΤ אֲדַנָּא
οἱ λ′ τὸ ἑβρ′ τοῦ κύριοῦ

Wit 1:  Syh
Wit 2:  Sa
NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  A note in Syh reads: “those of the Rest and the Hebrew: Lord [=ΠΙΠΙ].” This is very similar to a note for verse 23 in Syh. As in 21:22 and 23, NUM renders יוהו using θεός, which is very common in chapters 22-24 (see the οἱ λ′ and τὸ ἑβρ′ note under 22:22). According to the Syh note, the Three use the more exact rendering κύριος for יוהו, and this make sense because it conforms more closely to the Hebrew. For a complete discussion of the ΠΙΠΙ readings, see under 20:16. Syh also attributes this reading to τὸ ἑβρ′. This is the third of three τὸ ἑβρ′ readings in chapter 22 that render the tetragrammaton with τοῦ κύριοῦ rather than with θεός in NUM (the three are in verses 22, 23, and 24).

Num 22:25

HT אֶל־הַקִּיר (בִּלְעָם)
LXX (Βαλαάμ)

Sub ※ + πρὸς τὸν τοῖχον

Wit 1:  ↓344
Wit 2:  A ↓O(G)(15)·82 C′(−46 73 529) 246 s(343) 619 y(392) ↓(628) Lat Aug Num 50 Arab Syh = Sixt MT
Attr:  ※ Syh] > rell
Var:  πρὸς] εἰς 344mg τὸν τοῖχον] τείχον 376 669c
NonGr:  Lat Aug Num 50 ad parietem | Syh | Syh

Notes:  HT says, “she (the donkey) pressed herself to the wall (אֶל־הַקִּיר) and pressed Balaam’s foot to the wall (אֶל־הַקִּיר).” NUM omits the second mention of the wall, probably because it is understood in context. Origen matches HT by adding a second πρὸς τὸν τοῖχον under the asterisk, and this is reflected in a number of other
manuscripts. As it frequently does, Syh\textsuperscript{T} has misplaced the asterisk, which should be after “Balaam” and not before.

**Num 22:26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יְהוָה</td>
<td>τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{oǐ λ’} τοῦ κύριου

\textit{Notes}: A marginal note in Syh\textsuperscript{T} reads: אֵין־דֶּרֶךְ (אֵין־), which is very common in chapters 22-24 (see the \textit{oǐ λ’} and τὸ ἐβρ’ note under 22:22). That the Three use the more exact rendering κύριος for יְהוָה makes sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>וַיִּלְכָּה</td>
<td>(οὐκ ἦν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Sub ※} + ὅδος

\textit{Notes}: HT reads אֵין־דֶּרֶךְ since it is clear in the context. Two \textit{O} group manuscripts and Syh\textsuperscript{T} include ὅδος or its equivalent, indicating that the fifth column included this text, and this may originally have been under the asterisk. Syh\textsuperscript{T} has a space for the word, but the text is missing.

**Num 22:27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יְרֵא</td>
<td>ἑθυμοῦθη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub ※ + ὀργῆ

Wit 2: O^{(G)} 246 18'-628-630' Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh אֶלֶת

Notes: HT repeats the same expression as in verse 22: ἠμαθήματι. There, NUM accounts for all the words by rendering the phrase καὶ ὀργίσθη θυ*ῷ. Here, the translator is content to render the Hebrew less quantitatively as καὶ ἐθυ*ώθη. Syh, with the support of the O-group, testifies that Origen added ὀργῆ under the asterisk as an equivalent of ἠμαθήματι.

HT 
LXX (τῇ ῥάβδῳ)

〈Sub ※〉 + ἐν

Wit 2: O^{(G)} 53'-129 59*(vid) Syh^T = Compl MT

Attr: ※] > omnes

NonGr: Syh^T אֶלֶת

Notes: HT includes the beth preposition before ἐν but NUM has no matching preposition, since the dative without the preposition is equivalent. As evidenced by the O-group, Origen may have added ἐν to account for the Hebrew preposition, and this was possibly under the asterisk. Syh is not necessarily a witness to ἐν, even though it has a beth preposition, since Syh often includes beth when NUM does not have ἐν (for example, for ὑδάτι in 19:7). Syh^T is missing this text due to manuscript damage.

Num 22:28

HT אָמַר
LXX λέγει

O' λέγει

Wit 1: ↓130-↓1321'-344
**Num 22:29**

**Notes:** Most Greek witnesses have the perfect πεποίηκά although some manuscripts, including the uncial B and the O-group, have the aorist ἐποίησά. Wevers argues that the perfect is original, because it is parallel to the next verb in this speech, which NUM renders as perfect (see THGN 125; cf. 23:11). A 344 marginal note indicates that o’ had aorist, which is reasonable given the support of the O-group (minus 58). Since no textual evidence points to anyone using aorist for the second verb, however, this leaves the question open as to why the o’ text and others, including B, have aorist for the first verb and perfect for the second. 344 also attributes the aorist to oi λ’. The aorist makes sense for any of the Three since aorist is a standard rendering for the Hebrew perfect.
Notes: HT reports Balaam’s words: הִתְעַלַּלְתְּ בִּי. Balaam uses the Hithpael of the verb עלל to express his opinion of how his donkey has treated him. In the Poel and Hithpael, the word can mean “to treat severely,” and in the Hithpael it can also carry the sense of “deal wantonly/abusively.” NUM renders the phrase ἐμπεπαιχάς μοι (ἐμπαιχάς means “deceive/trick”).

Three s-group manuscripts have the unattributed marginal reading ἐδολιεύσω με. The Poel of עלל can mean “to glean” in the context of a vineyard, and Aquila and Theodotion render it according to this sense using ἐπιφυλλίζω in Deuteronomy 24:21. In Jeremiah 6:9, HT uses the Poel to refer to gleaning a vine in a metaphorical sense, with the sense of severe punishment, and σ’ also uses ἐπιφυλλίζω there. Similarly, Isaiah 3:12 uses the Poel of עלל to speak of oppression, and Aquila renders it using κολαμ䎴 vmax (“gather stalks”), whereas Symmachus and Theodotion use ἐπιφυλλίζω. Finally, in Lamentations 1:13, the Poel of עלל is used to speak of the Lord dealing severely with Israel and Symmachus renders it with ἀνακαλέω (“call up”). In Lamentations 3:51, HT uses the Poel poetically for how the eyes afflict the soul, and Symmachus uses καταποντίζω (“drown,” as in tears).

Thus all of the Three render the Hithpael of עלל in ways potentially consistent with the current context, although this verse is the only place where the עלל is applied to an animal and not to a human. They all use the Poel flexibly as well.

As for the current reading (ἔδολιεύσω με), arguing against any of the Three being the source is the fact that none of them seem to construe עלל in the sense of acting deceptively. Aquila uses δολιέωμαι in Genesis 37:18 to render הָנַכ (“act deceptively”). Symmachus employs δολιέωμαι to render הָנַכ (Gen 37:18) and he uses δολιόω to render חָמ (“betray”: Pr 26:19). The reading δολιέωμαι appears to be closer to ἐμπαιχάς in NUM than to any reading for עלל that might be expected from the Three. Nevertheless, although the data is scanty, it is possible that one of the Three uses δολιέωμαι because the subject is a donkey and not a person, and the translator had difficulty applying עלל to a non-human subject.

HT

LXX

α’ σ’ θ’ ἀπέκτεινά σε
Notes: For הרג in HT, NUM uses εκκεντέω (“pierce”). It is used only here in the Pentateuch and 5 times total in the LXX. According to a 344 note, all of the Three use the much more common ἀποκτείνω, and this makes sense as it is used by all of them for הרג elsewhere (e.g., in Is 27:1).

Num 22:30

HT תָּלְכָּהוֹ הַסְכֵּן הִסְכַּנְתִּי לַעֲשֹ(הַ LXX (*ὴ) ὑπεροράσει ὑπεριδοῦσα ἐποίησά σοι οὕτως

Notes: In HT, the donkey says, “Have I ever been accustomed to act thus with you?” NUM renders this somewhat contextually as μὴ ὑπεροράσει ὑπεριδοῦσα ἐποίησά σοι οὕτως (“Disregarding with disregard, I have not acted thus with you, have I?”). An unattributed s-group marginal note reads παραπτώ*ατι παρέπεσον ποιῆσαι σοι οὕτως (“Have I ever fallen away with transgression to do thus to you?”). This is a contextual rendering that is a valid alternative to that of NUM. Aquila and Theodotion would normally render the cognate infinitive absolute and finite verb (from סכן) with a cognate pair or close approximation (see under 21:2). Symmachus on the other hand often attempts to avoid this kind of stereotypical rendering (see SITP 228-29). Although the data is limited, of the Three, only Symmachus uses both παράπτω*α (Exod 23:21, Job 35:15) and παραπίπτω (1 Kgdms 27:1). Thus, this reading is possibly from Symmachus.

HT כֹּה LXX οὕτως

Attr: o' oι λ' οὕτως
Notes: A marginal note in s-group manuscript 344 indicates that ο and οἱ ά agree with NUM and use οὕτως although a number of other witnesses, including A, V, and the s-group read τούτο. The attribution to ο is reasonable, given the support of the O-group. The attribution to οἱ λ also makes sense since all of the Three use οὕτως for כֹּה (e.g., Ezek 33:27).

Num 22:31

HT יְהוָה
LXX ὁ θεός

οἱ λ′ ὁ κύριος

Wit 1: SyhΤ
Wit 2: 426 Aeth

Notes: A marginal note in SyhΤ reads: אד (Those of the Rest: ‘Lord’). As happens many times in chapters 22-24 (including later in this verse) NUM renders יהו using a form of θεός (see the οἱ λ and τὸ τρ β note under 22:22). That the Three use the more exact rendering κύριος for יהו makes sense.

HT יְהוָה
LXX τοῦ θεοῦ

〈ο′〉 κύριου (κυ)

Wit 1: 85'-321'-344
Wit 2: Β Ο’-(G) 82 b f 71' 392 z 59 Aeth Arm Syh = Ra MT

NonGr: Syh אָד

Notes: As with the first occurrence of יְהוָה in the verse, NUM renders the second instance using a form of θεός. In this case, there is evidence that the ο′ text may have corrected towards the Hebrew. First, the O-group has κύριου and second, the text of Syh, which has אָד (“God”) for the first occurrence of יְהוָה, has אָד (“Lord”) here.
Num 22:32

HT  יֹאמֶר
LXX  (καὶ) εἶπεν

ο′ οἱ λʻ εἶπεν

Wit 1:  ↓85′-↓321′-344
Wit 2:  B F V O′-(G) 82 b d f n x 392 z 59 424 646 799 Syh
Attr:  o′ οἱ λʻ > 85′-321′
NonGr:  Syh ܐܘܬ

Notes:  A number of witnesses (including A, M′, and the s-group) have the historical present λέγει rather than εἶπεν in NUM. This matches the λέγει used in 22:28 and 30 for the donkey’s speech, but in the present verse, the angel is speaking. NUM uses λέγει in this section only for the donkey — for other speakers, εἶπεν is used. Manuscript 344 from the s-group indicates that o′ matches NUM with εἶπεν, and this is supported by the O-group and other hexaplaric manuscripts. 344 also attributes εἶπεν to οἱ λʻ, and this is reasonable for any of the Three.

HT  רָאִי
LXX  τοῦ θεοῦ

οʻ λʻ τοῦ κύριου

Wit 1:  SyhΤ
Wit 2:  ↓426 ↓C-↓46 ↓53′ Aeth = MT
Var:  κύριουל רע 426 C-46 53′
NonGr:  SyhΤ ܐܒܢ"

Notes:  A marginal note in SyhΤ reads: ܐܒܢܐ ܐܒܢܐ ܐܒܢܐ ܐܒܢܐ ܐܒܢܐ (“those of the Rest: ‘Lord’”). As in verse 22, NUM renders נְאָּבָד using a form of θεός, which is very common in chapters 22-24 (see the οʻ λʻ and τοῦ ἐβροιν note under 22:22). That the Three use the more exact rendering κύριος for נְאָּבָד makes sense.
α' τὸ ἐβρ' σατάν

Wit 1: Syh

Wit 2: Lat cod 91 92 94-96

NonGr: Lat cod 91 92 94-96 in satana (sathana 94 95) | Syh

Notes: A marginal note in Syh reads: אשת. As in 22:22, the consonantal text נטשל can be taken either as a noun or an infinitive construct. There NUM treats it as an infinitive construct and Aquila as a noun. Here, both NUM and Aquila take it as a noun, with NUM using εἰς διαβολήν σου (“for your slander/enmity”) and Aquila rendering it σατάν (“adversary”). Aquila renders נטש as σαταν also 22:22, in the sense of adversary, and in Job 1:6 and to refer to “the satan.” In the present verse, NUM adds a possessive pronoun (“your adversary”) not reflected in HT, perhaps following the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Chapter 22 has five attributions to τὸ ἑβρ′: three are renderings of the tetragrammaton (verses 22, 23, 24), and two are transliterations of נטש, of which the present is the second (the other is in verse 22).

σ' ἐναντιοῦσθαι

Wit 1: M' ↓58-707 ↓54↓54↓↓458 85'-'321'-'344

Attr: σ' > 58 458

Var: ἐναντιοῦσθαι] -σθε σου 458; + σοι 58 54

Notes: An σ' note takes נטש as an infinitive construct, rendering it using the verb ἐναντιόοσθαι (“oppose”). Symmachus also uses ἐναντιοῦσθαι in Psalm 54[55]:4 for נטש (a by-form of נטש) and in Job 7:20 for מְשָׂטָן (“target”). Thus, this attribution makes sense for Symmachus.

θ' ἀντικεῖσθαι

Wit 1: M' 707 54↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓458 ↓85'-'321'-'344 ↓Syh

Attr: θ' > 458 130
Var: ἀντικεῖσθαι πρ ἀναστήσας Syh\textsuperscript{T}; + σου Syh\textsuperscript{T} \\
NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{T} لحم دمبله

Notes: Like Symmachus, Theodotion construes שלן as an infinitive construct, as he does in 22:22 where he also renders it using ἀντικεῖσθαι. Elsewhere, Theodotion uses ἀντίκεισθαι for שלן in the sense of an accuser in Psalm 108[109]:20 and in Job 1:6 for “the satan,” and thus this attribution is suitable for Theodotion. For the present verse, Syh renders the Theodotion text contextually as “to stand to oppose you.”

HT  לְרַס
LXX  οὐκ ἀστεία

⟨σ’ θ’⟩ οὐκ εὐθεῖα· οὐκ ἀγαθή

Wit 1: οὐκ εὐθεῖα· οὐκ ἀγαθή 58 | εὐθεία 118

Wit 2: εὐθεία 59 Or IV 409 Arm

Notes: The Hebrew word רטי is a hapax legomenon. The by-form רטי is used only in Job 16:11 and means something like “throw down.” In the present context רטי is used for the angel’s negative assessment of Balaam’s “way” (דרך), and perhaps refers to being slippery or precipitate. NUM gives a contextual rendering — οὐκ ἀστεία — meaning not “pretty/refined/clever.” An unattributed marginal note in the O-group manuscript 58 has οὐκ εὐθεία· οὐκ ἀγαθή and a few other manuscripts have εὐθεία (118\textsuperscript{mg} 59 Or IV 409). Symmachus renders רטי using ἐβάλλω in Job 16:11, which fits its meaning there of “throwing,” but which does not seem related to the present reading.

Field takes this double reading as a scribal note, and it may be a gloss for ἀστεῖος in NUM.

⟨τὸ σαμ’⟩
⟨οί λ’⟩ πονηρά

Wit 1: 130-346
Notes: An unattributed note has the rendering πονηρά for the hapax legomenon ירט (see above for a discussion of its meaning). NUM gives a contextual rendering — οὐκ ἀστεία — meaning not “pretty/ refined/clever.” An unattributed marginal note in s-group manuscripts 130-346 has πονηρά. The Samaritan Pentateuch has עער (Hiphil of עער or possibly the noun עער with definite article) instead of ירט and so the reading πονηρά could possibly reflect the Samaritikon.

Symmachus renders הרט using ἐβάλλω in Job 16:11, which fits its meaning there of “throwing,” but which seems unrelated to the present note. Any of the Three, however, could have used πονηρά for the difficult Hebrew, perhaps being influenced by Sam. This could also be a scribal gloss.

Num 22:33

HT (כלה מִפָּנַי)
LXX (ἐξέκλινεν)

〈Sub ※〉 + ἀπ’ ἑµοῦ

Wit 2: A F M’ V ↓ O’(−G) ↓ C’(−414’) b f129 ↓ s(130’ 346) 619 y ↓ z 55 59 416 424 624 646 799 Or IV 409 Procop 864 ↓ Sa3 SyhT

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: ἀπ’ ἑµοῦ] + τρίτον τοῦτο (> 122) 707mg C’(−414’) s(−130’ 346) 120(1º)-122 Sa3

NonGr: SyhT

Notes: HT has the phrase כִּלחַה מִפָּנֵי twice in this verse. The first time, NUM matches כִּלחַה מִפָּנֵי with ἀπ’ ἑµοῦ, but the second time, NUM has no equivalent, probably because it is understood in context. Many manuscripts, including the hexaplaric groups, include a second instance of ἀπ’ ἑµοῦ and this probably reflects Origen’s work, and possibly an asterisk (see NGTN 378). SyhT is missing a block of text, including this verse.

Num 22:34

HT (יְהוָה)
LXX (κύριοῦ)

οἱ λ’ τοῦ κύριοῦ
NonGr: Syh^{†}

Notes: A marginal note in Syh^{T} reads: פִּקְדָם (=those of the Rest: Lord [=ΠΠΠ]). Elsewhere in the phrase מַלְאַךְ — NUM renders מַלְאַךְ as τοῦ θεοῦ. Only in this verse is מַלְאַךְ translated with τοῦ κύριοῦ (see NGTN 379 for possible reasons). A marginal note in Syh^{T} indicates that οἱ λ′ had τοῦ κύριοῦ (Syh^{T}: ΠΠΠ). This makes sense for the Three since this has been their pattern throughout this chapter (verses 22, 23, 24, 26, 31, 32). The word ΠΠΠ resulted from a scribal misreading of the tetragrammaton on the part of a Greek scribe (see the discussion under 20:16).

HT

LXX (οὐ γὰρ ἠπιστάν ὅτι σὺ ἀνθέστηκας ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἰς συνάντησιν

non tr ἀνθέστηκας εἰς συνάντησιν μοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

Wit 2: ↓ A ↓ F ↓ M ↓ O^{−(G)/72} ↓ C^{−} ↓ 156-1246 ↓ s ↓ 619 ↓ y ↓ z ↓ 55 ↓ 424 ↓ 624 ↓ 646 ↓ 799 Or IV 410 ↓ Syh

Var: ἀνθέστηκας] pr μοι A F M′ 58-oI^{−72} C^{+} 56-246 s 619 y^{−392} z 55 59 424 624 646 799; pr με 343 318^c 122* | μοι 376 Syh; > 58 C^{−131^c} s

NonGr: Syh^{T} ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ ΠΠΠ

Notes: HT reads מִלְּכַּהֲנָה נִצָּב לִקְרָאתִי בַּדָּרֶךְ (“you were standing to meet me in the way”). NUM changes the order to read σὺ μοι ἀνθέστηκας ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἰς συνάντησιν (“you, with me, were standing in the way for a meeting”). Apparently, Origen performed two transpositions in order to match the Hebrew. First the pronoun μοι has been moved after συνάντησιν, and second the phrase ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ has been transposed so that it comes after the newly positioned μοι, at the end of the sentence. The complete new sentence reads: σὺ γὰρ ἠπιστάν ὅτι σὺ ἀνθέστηκας εἰς συνάντησιν μοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. This rearrangement influenced a large number of manuscripts including the uncials A, F, and M. Some of these manuscripts do not transpose μοι but they do transpose ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. Many other witnesses that transpose ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ have the pronoun μοι twice, retaining it in its original earlier position and including it again later to match the o’ text.
Notes: HT uses the idiomatic expression אִם־רַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ, and NUM renders it well but not literally, expressing it negatively with εἰ μὴ σοι ἀρέσκει (“if it is not pleasing to you”). An unattributed marginal note gives δοκεῖ instead of ἀρέσκει. The verb δοκέω does include the meaning “to seem good” in its semantic range (e.g., LXX Est 1:19, 3:9, et passim, including in Est 8:8 where it is used with the same Hebrew phrase בְּעֵינֶיךָ as in this verse). Usually, however, it has a more neutral sense of “to seem” with the context indicating the sense of goodness or badness.

Of the Three, only Symmachus uses δοκέω (1 Kgdms 20:19, Ps 35[36]:3, Eccl 9:13) but the Three use εὐδοκέω (αʼ θʼ: Gen 33:10, in a context similar to the present verse; σʼ θʼ: Num 14:8). Thus, the reading is possibly from one of the Three, although the evidence is scanty. Several manuscripts reflect this reading, including the b-group.

Num 22:37

Notes: In most cases, when HT pairs an infinitive absolute with a cognate finite verb, NUM accounts for the infinitive using a finite verb paired with a cognate (or near
cognate) participle or noun (for a discussion of how NUM treats Hebrew infinitive absolutes, see under 21:2). In a few cases, NUM simply employs a single verb, as in this verse (also 21:2, 24:11 and 27:7). As with 21:2 and 24:11, Origen here adds a cognate participle to match the infinitive absolute that NUM omits. The manuscript tradition is mixed between a present and an aorist participle, and even the two O-group witnesses disagree. Also, one cannot reconstruct the tense of the Greek participle from the participle in Syh. Thus, no solid determination can be made of Origen’s original tense under the asterisk. Because more hexaplaric manuscripts preserve the present participle, that is the solution proposed here.

Manuscript damage to Syh\[\] has cut off part of the first Aristarchian sign, but the remaining marks appear to form the top left corner of an asterisk. The metobelus after the word can be seen clearly.

\[\text{HT} \quad (אֻמְנָם לֹא אוּכַל)\]
\[\text{LXX} \quad (ὤντως οὐ δυνήσομαι)\]

\[\langle \text{Sub} \; \ast \rangle \quad \text{pr} \; \eta\]

\[\text{Wit 2:} \quad O^{(G)}{58-15c} \; 68'-120' \; \text{Syh (sed hab Ald) = MT}\]

\[\text{Attr:} \quad \ast > \text{omnes}\]

\[\text{NonGr:} \quad \text{Syh o<}\]

\[\text{Notes:} \quad \text{The interrogative particle ה in HT has no equivalent in NUM, although that Balak is asking a question in his rebuke of Balaam is clear from context. A few hexaplaric manuscripts, including two from the O-group, have added η, the Greek equivalent of Hebrew ה, and Syh supports this by adding an interrogative particle. These witnesses likely reflect Origen’s work, and the addition was possibly originally under the asterisk.}\]

\[\text{Num 22:38}\]

\[\text{HT} \quad (דָּבָר)\]
\[\text{LXX} \quad (τὸ ῥῆμα)\]

\[\langle \text{Sub} \; ÷ \rangle \quad ÷ \piλήν \; τὸ \; ῥῆμα\]

\[\text{Wit 2:} \quad \text{Syh\[\]}\]

\[>\]
Wit 2:  A B F M’ V $O^{\alpha-(G)}$ C” b f s x $s^{527}$ y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Syh$^T$

NonGr:  Syh$^T$ ≠ ΡΛΩ ÷

Notes:  Syh$^T$ has added the word ΡΛΩ under the obelus. This word is not in the underlying Hebrew, as one would expect for an obelized word, but the presence of the equivalent πλήν in the original of NUM is doubtful. That a text tradition including πλήν did exist is evidenced by its presence in a number of manuscripts in one of the following configurations: (1) ῥήμα πλήν τὸ ῥήμα: d t Bo; (2) ῥήμα πλήν: n$^l$-767) 527 Arm. But all of the uncials (A B F M V) and the rest of the Greek manuscripts do not have πλήν, and Wevers does not include it in his critical text. As for the o’ text, it is unlikely that Origen had a version of NUM that included πλήν and that he placed the word under the obelus since not a single hexaplaric manuscript has πλήν. Also, the omission of πλήν by a majority of manuscripts is not a negative witness to an Origenic obelus since they are simply reflecting NUM.

HT אֲדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ

LXX τοῦτο λαλήσω

〈τὸ σαμ’〉 τοῦτο φυλάξω λαλήσαι

Wit 1:  ↓M’ 85’-321’-344 624

Wit 2:  A ↓29-82-707 b f$^{129}$ 121 319 799 Aeth = Sam

Var:  τοῦτο φυλάξω] τὸ φυλάξαι 29 ] φυλάξω] φυλάξο*αι (-ξω*αι M) M’

Notes:  A number of manuscripts, including M and five from the s-group contain notes that match Sam for this verse, and mirror verse 35 in NUM, with the reading τοῦτο φυλάξω λαλήσαι (or a variant) for similar Hebrew (in verse 35 it is second person). None of the translators can be considered a likely candidate for adding φυλάξω simply to mirror the non-literal translation of a similar phrase by NUM earlier in the passage. The Samaritikon, however, is a possible candidate for this reading because it would follow Sam.

Num 22:40

HT בָּקָר וָצֹאן

LXX πρόβατα καὶ ἔσχους

non tr μόσχους καὶ πρόβατα
**Notes**: HT says that Balak sacrificed “bulls and sheep,” using singular nouns in a collective sense. NUM changes the number of the nouns to plural, which is an accurate rendering, but in addition it reverses the order. As witnessed by the O-group (minus 58) and Syh, Origen changed the word order to match the Hebrew. Syh\(^T\) is missing a section that includes this verse.

**Num 22:41**

| HT | תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ |
| LXX | ἐπὶ τὴν στήλην (τοῦ Βαάλ) |

\(\langle \text{oí } λ′\rangle\) ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλά

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.

| HT | — |
| LXX | τι |

**Sub ÷**

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַלבָּמוֹ (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַ labore as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַ labore, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַ labore (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.

| HT | — |
| LXX | τι |

**Sub ÷**

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַ labore (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַ labore as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַ labore, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַ labore (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.

| HT | — |
| LXX | τι |

**Sub ÷**

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַ labore (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַ labore as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַ labore, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַ labore (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.

| HT | — |
| LXX | τι |

**Sub ÷**

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַ labore (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַ labore as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַ labore, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַ labore (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.

| HT | — |
| LXX | τι |

**Sub ÷**

**Notes**: The Hebrew תבָּעַ labore (plural of בָּמָה) can refer to hills, high places, or Canaanite graves. It appears in 21:19, where it is probably a proper name (perhaps derived from its geographical location), and NUM transliterates it there as Βα*ώθ. In 21:28 it means “heights,” and in 33:52 it means “high places” and in both instances NUM renders it as the plural στήλας. Here, NUM renders תבָּעַ labore as the singular στήλη (see Wevers’ discussion on the translation issues in the Pentateuch, NGTL 453-54).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts changes στήλην to ὑψηλά (“high/lofty/raised”). Symmachus tends to translate words that indicate height or high places using ὑψος (see the discussion under 21:8). For example, in 21:19, rather than follow the NUM transliteration of תבָּעַ labore, Symmachus uses ὑψος. In 21:19, Aquila also translates rather than transliterating, but uses υψώμα. In general, each of the Three uses υψηλάς for תבָּעַ labore (e.g., Isa 36:7 and 58:14, and Aquila translates this way elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 16:16). Thus this note could belong to any of the Three.
> 

**Wit 2:** 82 z (sed hab Ald) = MT

**NonGr:** Syh<sup>T</sup> יאמ

**Notes:** NUM adds the word τι which is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen included this under the obelus. Syh<sup>T</sup> is missing a section that includes this verse, and is thus not a counter witness.

### Numbers 23

#### Num 23:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מזבחות</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>βωμούς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α’ σ’ θ’

σαμ’ θυσιαστήρια

**Wit 1:** ↓F<sup>b</sup> 344

**Attr:** α’ σ’ θ’ σαμ’] > F<sup>b</sup>

**Notes:** Although the NUM translator attempted to distinguish between a pagan altar (βωμούς) and an Israelite altar (θυσιαστήρια), the translators do not make this distinction here. The attribution also extends to the Samaritikon, a Greek translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sam). Sam reads the same as HT here, and like the Three, the Samaritikon translator apparently saw no problem using θυσιαστήρια in this context.

#### Num 23:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:** Syh<F>
Wit 2: 58 = MT

NonGr: Syh\(^T\) ø\(\)l

Notes: NUM adds αὐτῷ which is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen indicates this with an obelus. Syh\(^L\) is missing this text through manuscript damage.

HT בָּלָק וּבִלְעָם
LXX —

Sub ※ + βαλὰκ καὶ βαλαάμ

Wit 2: \(\downarrow O^{(G)}\)\(^58\) Arab Syh\(^T\) = MT

Attr: ※ Syh\(^T\)| > rell

Var: βαλαάμ| -λαμ 376*

NonGr: Syh حلم مصلحت

Notes: HT makes explicit mention of Balak and Balaam as offering up the sacrifices, whereas NUM skips the names, assuming them from context. Origen adds the names under the asterisk. Syh\(^L\) is missing a section of text that includes this reading.

Num 23:3

HT (αἰλήν)\(^{\prime}\)
LXX καὶ (πορεύσομαι)

\(\langle o'\rangle\) καί

Wit 1: 321'-344

Wit 2: B F M' O\(^{(G)}\)-29-707 f \(^x\)\(^{527}\) 392 z 59 799 Lat\(_{\text{cod100}}\) Aeth Bo\(^B\) Sa Syh\(^T\) = edd

NonGr: Lat\(_{\text{cod100}}\) et | Syh\(^T\) ḫן 1020
Notes: The uncial A and V have ἐγὼ δὲ πορεύσομαι. Wevers suggests from 4QNum, which has ἐγὼ δὲ πορεύσομαι, that this is the original Greek text (proposing an emendation to his critical text: see NGTN 385). He proposes that καὶ πορεύσομαι is the o’ text reading, and that καὶ may be attributed to Origen. This is supported by the O-group.

HT
LXX
eί μοι φανεῖται

σ’
eί πῶς φανεῖται

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: O(–G) 619 z Syh

NonGr: Syh אֶלֶק

Notes: Although the LXX elsewhere renders ἀνοίξει as εἴ πώς (e.g., 2 Kgdms 14:15, 16:12, 3 Kgdms 21:31, 4 Kgdms 19:4, Jer 28:8), NUM does not do so, using ἐάν (22:6) or εἰ (22:11, 22:33, 23:3, 23:27). Here, an σ’ reading attempts to reflect ἀνοίξει more accurately by using εἴ πῶς. This fits Symmachus, who translates the same way in Genesis 16:2.

Symmachus employs φαίνω for the Hiphil of ἀνοίξει (“shine”) in Exodus 14:20 (and possibly also Exo 13:21). He also uses it as an equivalent of ἴδη in Exodus 4:6 and Amos 7:7. Finally, he uses it with an adjective as the equivalent of a stative verb in Jeremiah 10:8, and similarly as the equivalent of an implied “to be” verb in Job 32:1. His use of φαίνω in the present verse for κάρη may be unusual, but he appears to use φαίνω flexibly in context elsewhere, and he may be matching NUM here.

HT
LXX

〈O’〉 + πῶς

Wit 2: O(–G) 619 z Syh

NonGr: Syh אֶלֶק

Notes: Balaam continues his speech in verse 23 with a conditional clause. HT can be translated (taking account of word order): “perhaps the Lord will happen to meet me.” NUM translates this: εἴ μοι φανεῖται ο θεὸς εν συναντήσει (“if God will appear to me in a meeting”). Origen makes two changes to reflect the Hebrew. First, perhaps
under the influence of Symmachus (see above), Origen tries to render more accurately by adding πῶς after εἴ. Secondly, he reflects the Hebrew word order by moving μοι after συναντήσει, thus giving the following: εἴ πῶς φανεῖται ο θεός ἐν συναντήσει μοι. The first of these changes is covered here and the next below.

non tr μοι post συναντήσει tr

Notes: Origen transposes the first μοι in NUM after συναντήσει to match the Hebrew word order. This is the second of the two changes Origen makes to this sentence (see above for a summary).

The first of these changes is covered here and the next below.

Notes: An obelus is placed in the right margin of Syh that precedes the Syriac (“he will show to me”). Although some manuscripts invert the Greek words, and have δείξῃ μοι (426 59 Arm Syh), HT and NUM match quantitatively (having “show” and “me”), so this obelus serves no purpose and appears to be a mistake. This is corroborated by the absence of a matching metobelus.

A valid obelized phrase (covered below) begins later in the same line in Syh and this phrase spans two lines. Where the new line begins, the typical continuation obelus appears in the right margin. The spurious obelus covered in this section appears in the margin directly above the valid continuation obelus, and the error may be the result of confusion on the part of a scribe.

Sub
86 for the Greek reading and Syh for the attribution — this reading, however, is not included in Ziegler’s critical edition of the Twelve Prophets. In Micah 7:17 (LXX, and $\sigma'$ Field attributes the use of $\sigma'$ possibly from Symmachus. Because $\sigma'$ may use $\sigma'$ elsewhere, although in a different context, this note is possibly from Symmachus.

Notes: NUM adds the phrase καὶ παρεστῆ Βαλὰκ ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ Βαλαὰμ ἐπερωτήσα τὸν θεόν which has no equivalent in HT, and Origen has correctly obelized it. Syh² has added a second obelus in the middle of the phrase over the word ἐπορεύθη but this clearly is spurious. It is possibly the result of copying from another manuscript where ἐπορεύθη was at the beginning of a new line with a continuation obelus appearing before it.

HT εὐθεῖαν
LXX εὐθεῖαν

\(\langle \sigma' \rangle \) συρόμενος

Notes: The meaning of the Hebrew $\tau\varphi\varphi$ is uncertain. HALOT suggests the meanings (1) a bare plain; (2) a mountain track; (3) sand dunes. NUM approximates with εὐθεῖαν, the translator perhaps inferring that a road on a barren area would be straight. A note in $F^b$ has the reading συρόμενος from the verb σύρω, which in the passive could mean “swept away” and thus by implication, barren. In Genesis 49:17, $F^b$ has another unattributed note with συρόμενος for $\tau\varphi\varphi\varphi$, a hapax legomenon that matches $\tau\varphi\varphi\varphi$ in its first three letters. P and the Vulgate understand $\tau\varphi\varphi\varphi$ to refer to a type of snake (NUM renders it with ἐγκαθήμενος meaning one lying in ambush).

Field attributes the use of σύρω to Symmachus in Micah 7:17 (he cites manuscript 86 for the Greek reading and Syh for the attribution — this reading, however, is not included in Ziegler’s critical edition of the Twelve Prophets). In Micah 7:17 (LXX, and σ' in Field), σύρω describes the action of a creeping animal, and this is consistent with the note at Genesis 49:17. Thus, it is possible that the $F^b$ note in Genesis 49:17 is from Symmachus. Because σύρω could possibly fit the context of the present verse, and because Symmachus may use σύρω elsewhere, although in a different context, this note is possibly from Symmachus.
Num 23:4

HT  נַכְרֵר אֵלֹהִים אֵלָּבָּלעָּמ
LXX  καὶ ἐφάνη ὁ θεός τῷ Βαλαάμ

οἱ λ´
〈τὸ σαµ´〉 καὶ ἐφάνη ἄγγελος θεοῦ (θυ) τῷ Βαλαάμ

Wit 1:  lemma 344 | ἄγγελος θεοῦ ↓130-↓321′ = Sam

Attr:  οἱ λ´ > 130-321´

Notes:  HT has אֵלֹהִים and this is rendered by NUM as expected as θεός.
Sam has מלאך אֵלֹהִים in place of מלאך אֵלֹהִים in HT. A note attributed to the οἱ λ´ in s-group manuscript 344 matches Sam with ἄγγελος θεοῦ. This reading has not influenced any other manuscript traditions. An unattributed reading in 130-321′ indicates the same change.

The modification makes this text consistent with chapter 22, where the messenger of the Lord spoke with Balaam. Perhaps to at least some of the Three this might serve to distance the Lord from the false prophet by means of an intermediary. This interpretive translation is unlike Aquila, who aims for quantitative conformance to the Hebrew, nor might it be expected from Theodotion who would have no compelling reason to depart from the adequate NUM rendering. And although Symmachus does add words at times to convey the Hebrew sense better, he does not typically add words with no Hebrew support unless he has a theological reason. Another possibility is that the term οἱ λ´ is referring to a Samaritikon reading (cf., a joint attribution in manuscript 344 to the Three and to τὸ σαµ´ at 23:1), and thus τὸ σαµ´ has been included above as a proposed possible source.

Num 23:5

HT  יְהוָה
LXX  θεός

〈οἱ λ´〉
〈τὸ σαµ´〉 ἄγγελος θεοῦ (θυ)
Wit 1: 130 = Sam

Notes: This unattributed reading indicates that ἄγγελος θεοῦ is substituted for θεός, as it was in verse 4 in a note attributed to οἱ λ’ (see the discussion there). As with verse 4, this matches מלאך אלהים in Sam. The present note may be from the same source as for reading in verse 4.

Num 23:6

HT (יַחֲלָל הַשָׂרֵי מֹאָב)  
LXX (καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες Μωάμε)

Sub ※ pr αὐτός

Wit 2: O\textsuperscript{(G)}\textsuperscript{58} Syh\textsuperscript{T}(mend) = MT

Attr: ※ Syh\textsuperscript{T}] > rell

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{T} ≠ σλέ ※

Notes: Two O-group manuscripts witness to the addition of αὐτός, corresponding to הוּה in HT, which NUM omits. Syh\textsuperscript{T} places an asterisk over the equivalent of αὐτοῦ (preceding καὶ πάντες) and does not have an equivalent for αὐτός. Nevertheless, the asterisk must refer to αὐτός, and probably reflects the o’ text. In the Syh\textsuperscript{T} transmission process, the word to which the asterisk originally referred was lost, but the asterisk may have remained and been repositioned at a different word.

HT —
LXX καὶ ἐγένηθη πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Or IV 410

>  

Wit 2: Arab = Compl MT

Notes: The final phrase in verse 6 of NUM (which is the beginning of verse 7 in Rahlf’s edition) is not found in the underlying Hebrew, and on the evidence of Or IV 410, Origen probably placed it under the obelus.
Num 23:7

**HT**  
---

**LXX**  
\( \lambda \gamma \omega \nu \)

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:**  
\( \text{Syh}^T = \text{MT} \)

**NonGr:**  
\( \text{Syh}^T \)

**Notes:**  
Balaam quotes Balak, and NUM adds the direct discourse marker \( \lambda \gamma \omega \nu \) even though it has no equivalent in HT. Origen places \( \lambda \gamma \omega \nu \) under the obelus. NUM is not consistent in its treatment of the common Hebrew direct discourse marker \( \text{לֵאמֹ} \), and Origen likewise is inconsistent as to his use of Aristarchian signs to indicate the differences (see the discussion under 20:3).

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:**  
\( \text{Syh}^T \)

>  

**Wit 2:**  
\( \text{Co} = \text{MT} \)

**NonGr:**  
\( \text{Syh}^T \) ÷

**Notes:**  
HT reads “come, curse for me Jacob, and come, denounce Israel.” NUM repeats \( \mu \omicron \omicron \) before \( \text{Ἰσραήλ} \), which is not in HT, and Origen includes this under the obelus. \( \text{Syh}^T \) has no metobelus, but the text covered by the obelus is clear.
οἱ γ´ ἐμβριήσαι

Wit 1:  Syh\textsuperscript{T}

NonGr:  Syh\textsuperscript{T}, ἐ

Notes:  Syh\textsuperscript{T} has the following marginal note: "Those of the Three: rebuke." The Greek word which Syh renders as ἐ is speculation. The Pael of the verb ἐ in Syh means “rebuke severely.” This seems to match the second verb ἐπικατάρασαι and its NUM counterpart ἐπικαταράομαι (from ἐπικαταράομαι) more closely than the first verb ἐπικατάραμαι and its NUM equivalent ἐκφάσαι. Wevers speculates that perhaps the index was misplaced in the Syh text and should have been over ἐπικατάρασαι (see NGTN 388, note 16). If Wevers is correct, then an ᵇ\textsuperscript{b} marginal note in verse 8 associated with καταράομαι — there ᵇ\textsuperscript{b} substitutes ἐμβριήσομαι for καταράομαι — suggests a retroversion for the present verse: the aorist imperative of ἐμβριάομαι which is ἐμβριήσατι. This retroversion fits Aquila and Symmachus, who employ ἐμβριάομαι for זעם in Psalm 37[38]:4 (Symmachus also uses ἐμβριάομαι for נא in Isa 17:13).

Num 23:8

HT אַזּוּם
LXX καταράσομαι

〈οἱ γ´〉 ἐμβριήσομαι

Wit 1:  ᵇ\textsuperscript{b}

Notes:  The ᵇ\textsuperscript{b} corrector includes an unattributed marginal note similar to a note in verse 7 that was attributed to οἱ γ´. Both Aquila and Symmachus use ἐμβριάομαι to render נא (see the discussion under verse 7).

Num 23:9

HT אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ
LXX προσνοήσω

〈σ´〉 τηρήσω

Wit 1:  \textsuperscript{F}
Notes: HT has, “From the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I bend to see him (אֲשׁוּרֶנּ),” and NUM has, “From the top of the mountains I see him and from the hills I perceive him (προσνοήσω αὐτόν).” An unattributed note in F substitutes τηρήσω for προσνοήσω. Although רַאֵשׁ is not always easy to translate in context, the parallel with the verb רָאֵשׁ suggests the option “bend to see.” רַאֵשׁ appears again at 24:17 also in parallel with רַאֵשׁ, and there another F note has the similar reading τηρήσω αὐτόν.

The F reading here has the meaning, “from the hills I watch for him,” and this is reasonable for any of the Three, although at 24:17, all of the Three have different readings attributed to them for רָאֵשׁ. Aquila uses προσκοπεῶ in 24:17, and the context is so similar to the present verse that he probably uses προσκοπεῶ here. At 24:17 it is likely that Theodotion uses ὑποκόπω for רָאֵשׁ. The attribution of ὑποκόπω to Symmachus in 24:17 is probably not accurate (see the discussion there), and so the present note could belong to him. Symmachus renders רַאֵשׁ contextually using ἁμαρτάω (“annul” — see Sophocles 111) in Job 33:14, but he possibly uses τηρέω in the present verse since it fits the context. He uses τηρέω elsewhere (e.g., in its sense of “keep” in Lev 13:26 for סֵרֶם). Alternatively, it may be a later scribal gloss.

Num 23:10

| HT | מִי מָנָה עֲפַר יַעֲקֹב |
| LXX | τίς ἐξηκριβάσατο τὸ σπέρ*α Ἰακώβ |

οἱ ἔτεροι τίς ἕρτθμησε τὸν Ἰακώβ

Wit 1: 344

Notes: When translating words from the root פָּקַד, Origen and the Three usually avoid words from the root αριθ— in Numbers. For this verse, however, the verb מָנָה is used — the only time it used in Numbers — and the meaning is more accurately expressed by ἀριθμέω than by εξακριβάζω in NUM. Both Aquila and Symmachus use ἀριθμέω for מָנָה in Isaiah 53:12, and Symmachus does also at Job 39:2 (Symmachus also uses ἀριθμέω for the synonym σπέρ in Isa 22:10 and 33:18). If the present note also represents Theodotion, this would be his only use of ἀριθμέω in the LXX. He does, however, use the related noun ἁριθμός in Job 15:20 for מִסְפַּר. Another note attributed to οἱ ἔτεροι applies only to מָנָה and has ἕρτθμησε (see below), and this strengthens the case for the validity of ἕρτθμησε here.

The other change from NUM is the omission of the word σπέρμα, which for NUM is an interesting translation of רָפָעָ, and may be related to the promise to Abraham to make his “seed” as numerous as the “dust” of the earth in Genesis 13:16 (NGTN 389-90). Although any one of the Three could have rendered רָפָעָ differently than NUM (e.g.,
Aquila with a word closer in meaning to “dust”), perhaps only Symmachus might have omitted it entirely. The omission, however, may also be a copying error.

**HT**

רְבָּע

**LXX**

ἐξηκριβάσατο

**οἱ γ׳ ἡρίθμησε**

*Notes:* The attribution for this note comes from Syh which reads: מנה ("Those of the Three: number"). This reading overlaps the first part of the 344 note attributed to οἱ λ′ covered above. The note could come from any of the Three (see the discussion above).

**ο′ ἐξηκριβάσατο**

*Notes:* For the מנה in HT, NUM uses ἐξηκριβάσατο (from ἐξακριβάζω or ἐξακριβάζομαι which means “to examine/know accurately”). The s-group has ἐξιχνιάσατο, but s-group manuscript 344 indicates that the o′ text matches NUM with ἐξηκριβάσατο. This reading agrees with the O-group and other hexaplaric witnesses, and so the attribution to o′ is probably accurate.
καὶ λογισμὸν ἕνὸς ἐξ τοῦ τετάρτου Ἰσραήλ

NonGr: Syh

Attr: θ’ σ’ Syh

Notes: The first stich in HT reads, “Who has counted the dust of Jacob” and the second reads, “and the number of a fourth of Israel?” NUM has modified the second stich in three ways: (1) it explicitly reiterates the question “who?” (τίς) which is assumed in the Hebrew; (2) it treats the noun μέτρησεν as a verb, since the added interrogative subject τίς now demands a verb; and (3) it generalizes the phrase “fourth of Israel” to “people of Israel.” Thus for the second stich, NUM has καὶ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται δήμους Ἰσραήλ (“…and who has numbered the people of Israel?”). According to Syh, for the second stich Aquila and Theodotion conform more closely to the Hebrew, although they both add “one of” before “a fourth.” Aquila reads καὶ λογισμὸν ἕνὸς ἐξ τοῦ τετάρτου Ἰσραήλ (“…and the calculation of one of a fourth of Israel?”), while Theodotion has καὶ ἀριθμὸν ἕνὸς ἐξ τοῦ τετάρτου Ἰσραήλ (“…and the number of one of a fourth of Israel?”) — both readings based on retroversions by Field and Wevers [NGT 390]). Aquila uses λογισμός frequently (e.g., Isa 65:2, Jer 29:21[49:20], 36[29]:11, Eccl 7:25, although not for μέτρησεν). Field suggests ψηφον as a retroversion which is also possible. Aquila uses τετάρτος for ἐρυθρί (related to ἐρυθρός) in Zechariah 8:19. Wevers suggests the retroversion τεσσάρων but this seems more appropriate for ἐρυθρός. The addition of the equivalent of ἔνος in Syh (ἕν) with no support in the Hebrew is unlike Aquila who usually strives for quantitative correspondence with the Hebrew. Other than this, the reading fits him.

Theodotion employs ἀριθμὸς in Job 15:20 for μέτρησεν, and he uses τετάρτος in Zechariah 8:19 for ἐρυθρός. Thus the above is a reasonable retroversion and fits Theodotion.

Syh† attributes the second reading to Theodotion, but Syh† attributes it to Symmachus, which is possibly correct, since Symmachus uses ἀριθμὸς (e.g., Gen 31:7 for καὶ ἔξι; Job 25:3 and Isa 10:19 for μέτρησεν) and τετάρτος for ἐρυθρός in Zechariah 8:19.
Notes: The last stich of verse 10 in HT reads, “and may my end/issue (אַחֲרִית) be as his.” The word אַחֲרִית can refer to a “result,” or a “following period,” and it is also used figuratively to mean “descendants” (e.g., in Ps 36[37]:37, 108[109]:13, Dan 11:4). NUM follows this last sense in giving its rendering, καὶ γένοιτο τὸ σπέρμα μου ὡς τὸ σπέρμα τούτων, supplying an explicit referent (σπέρμα) at the end and changing the possessive from singular to plural τούτων (referring either to Ἰσραήλ or to δήμους). The above unattributed reading from the Catena groups is a more literal rendering of HT and was almost surely influenced by the Hebrew. It could belong to any of the three revisers, all of whom use ἔσχατος for אַחֲרִית (see under 24:14 for examples). Field speculates that the note could reflect Symmachus, because Jerome, who often follows Symmachus, translates similarly in the Vulgate.

**Num 23:14**

**HT**

יהַפִּסְגָּה

**LXX**

λελαξευμένου

Notes: For נָחַס(NUM has λελαξευμένου (“hewn in stone”) as it does also at 21:20. Here Fb has an unattributed note that gives the Greek transliteration βισγά. When NUM transliterates נָחַס using Φασγά at Deuteronomy 3:17 and 34:1, Aquila translates and has ἡ λαξευτή. But at Deuteronomy 3:27, where NUM translates with λελαξευμένου, Aquila instead transliterates and uses Φασγά. One would not expect Aquila to use a different transliteration for the present verse. Symmachus is more likely to translate proper names than transliterate, although he transliterates on occasion (see SITP 120, F-Pro 67-68). At Deuteronomy 3:17, Syh attributes to Symmachus the translation “valley” (תָּלָה) for נָחַס. But at Joshua 12:3, Syh attributes a transliteration (אִיבָּן) for נָחַס to Symmachus. The latter Syh reading would likely have come from a Symmachus original with first letter Φ or π and not β, and so the present reading βισγά is probably not from Symmachus. Theodotion transliterates more
commonly than the other two translators (REI-Pro 20, 77), and thus this note is possibly from Theodotion. Interestingly, at Deuteronomy 3:27, another P\(^b\) note gives a different equivalent for הֶבֱּשֵׂה, the more generic ὄρους.

**Num 23:15**

| HT | רְפַּאֵתָבּ (חַל) |
| LXX | (παράστηθι) |

**Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ**

- **Wit 2:** V ↓(\(^{O\rightarrow}\))\(^{(G)}\) 58 Syh = MT
- **Attr:** ※ Syh\(^L\) ] > rell
- **Var:** αὐτοῦ] pr μοι 376
- **NonGr:** Syh אָני

**Notes:** HT has הַרְפַּאֵתָבּ (“stand here”) but NUM omits the equivalent of Hebrew חַל, and Origen adds αὐτοῦ under the asterisk to account for it.

**Num 23:17**

| HT | (שַׁדַּךְ מֵאַבֶּךָ אֹהְרָה) |
| LXX | πάντες (οἱ ἀρχόντες Μωάβ μετ´ αὐτοῦ) |

**Sub ÷**

- **Wit 2:** Syh

>  

- **Wit 2:** 58 = Compl MT
- **NonGr:** Syh\(^L\) מֵאַבֶּךָ אֹהְרָה \(\div\) Syh\(^T\) מֵאַבֶּךָ אֹהְרָה \(\div\) Syh\(^L\) מֵאַבֶּךָ אֹהְרָה \(\div\)

**Notes:** HT notes that the elders of Moab were standing beside the altar, and NUM adds a qualifying πάντες before “elders” which Origen places under the obelus. As frequently happens, Syh\(^L\) misplaced the obelus, putting it around the equivalent of Μωάβ μετ´ αὐτοῦ, a phrase found in both HT and NUM.
Num 23:19

HT  אֵל
LXX  ὁ θεός

〈οἱ λ′〉  ἰσχυρός

Wit 1:  Fb

Notes:  The Three occasionally use ἰσχυρός (or the related noun ἰσχύς) for אֵל when it refers to strength in general (e.g., α′ σ′: Job 41:17; α′ θ′: Mic 2:1), but more often when אֵל is referring to God as the strong one (e.g., α′ σ′: Deut 3:24; α′ θ′: Deut 7:9; α′ σ′ θ′: Ps 49[50]:1). Sometimes the translators have a theological motive for this rendering, for example, in Isaiah 9:6[5] where the messianic son to be born is called βαβυλών אֵל and the Three do not wish to use θεός. In other places, however, the difference is probably stylistic. Thus, this reading could come from any of the Three.

HT  וִיכַזֵּב
LXX  διαρτῆναι α′ θ′ καὶ διαψεύσεται

α′ θ′  καὶ διαψεύσεται

Wit 1:  ↓Fb ↓M′ ↓58-↓707 ↓cIIat ↓108 54ixt-↓458 ↓85-130-321′-344 ↓SyhT
Attr:  α′ θ′] > Fb M′ 58 417 458 851 in ad ἀπειληθῆναι 58
NonGr:  SyhT ↓ἀπειληθῆναι

α′  ψεύδεται

Wit 1:  ↓cIIat
Attr:  α′] θ′ 417

Notes:  HT has, “God is not a man so that he will lie (וִיכַזֵּב).” For the Piel of כזב NUM uses διαρτάω, whose main meaning is “to interrupt/suspend” but which sometimes means “to deceive.” NUM also changes the active sense to a passive: “God is not a man to be deceived (διαρτηθῆναι)”
A note attributed to Aquila and Theodotion substitutes καὶ διαψεύσεται for διαρτηθῆναι. First, α′ and θ′ match the Hebrew waw conjunction literally with καὶ, a mechanical rendering which does not convey well the resultative sense of waw. Second, they use a more common equivalent for διαρτάω than διαρτῆναι. These attributions make sense, first because of the use of καὶ for the Hebrew conjunction, which fits Aquila in particular. Second, both Aquila and Theodotion use διαψεύδο*αι to render the Piel of כזב in Ezekiel 13:19, and the Niphal in Job 41:1.

Some Catena manuscripts attribute the simplex form ψεύσεται to Aquila. He uses ψεύδο*αι in 1 Kgdms 15:29 and Psalm 88[89]:34, but for רָשָׁב and not בֵּית. One cII-group manuscript attributes the present reading to Theodotion, but no examples exist of Theodotion using ψεύδο*αι in the LXX. This reading appears to be derived from the α′ and θ′ reading διαψεύςεται.

σ′ ἵνα διαψεύσηται

Wit 1: M′ Syh\textsuperscript{T}

NonGr: Syh\textsuperscript{T} ἵνα

σ′ ἵνα ψεύσηται

Wit 1: ↓58-707 ↓54\textsuperscript{Iσ} ↓85-321′-344

Attr: σ′ > 58 85

Var: ψεύσηται] –σεται 54

Notes: Similar to the Aquila and Theodotion readings for this verse (see above), some manuscripts have σ′ readings that use διαψεύδο*αι or ψεύδο*αι but they use the subjunctive and introduce the verb with ἵνα. This rendering fits Symmachus, first by employing ἵνα to represent the resultative sense of the waw conjunction rather than using the more mechanical rendering καὶ. Second, Symmachus uses διαψεύδο*αι to render the Piel of בֵּית in Habakkuk 2:3 and the Qal in Psalm 115:2[116:11]. He also uses ψεύδο*αι, in Psalm 80[81]:16 and Isaiah 59:13, but not for בֵּית. If ψεύσηται is the correct reading in the current verse, it would represent the only example of this verb being used for בֵּית by any of the translators (except as proposed through retroversions). It is more likely that ψεύσηται was derived from an original διαψεύςεται.

The index for this note is misplaced in manuscript 58, where it is associated with the word ἀπειληθῆναι. This is clearly incorrect, first, because the uniform witness of the other manuscripts associates the note with διαρτηθῆναι. Second, a separate and well-
attested marginal note attributed to σ′ is associated with ἀπειληθῆναι. And finally, manuscript 58 also misplaced another index sign for this verse (see below).

οἱ λ′ ἵνα ψεύσηται

*Wit 1:* Procop 864

_Notes:_ A note in Procopius attributed to οἱ λ′ matches one of two readings attributed to Symmachus for this verse (see above), and it may be derived from the same tradition as that note.

HT σηματε
LXX ἀπειληθῆναι

σ′ ἵνα μετανοήσῃ

*Wit 1:* ↓58-707 ↓cI†at ↓458 ↓85'-↓321'-344

_Arrt:_ σ′ α′ 313-414'-615 | θ′ 417 1 > 58 458 85'-321′ | in ad εἰπας 58

_Var:_ μετανοήσῃ] =σει 458 130

_Notes:_ As with the first stich, for the second stich NUM uses a passive infinitive, rendering the verb נחם with ἀπειληθῆναι, giving: “Or a son of man to be threatened.” This is the only occurrence of נחם in Numbers, and the translator does not render it directly, perhaps wanting to avoid ascribing to God the human attribute of repentance. A note attributed to Symmachus makes two changes. As with the first stich in this section, it uses ἵνα plus the subjunctive for the waw conjunction plus imperfect in HT. This is consistent with Symmachus since it conveys well the resultative sense of the Hebrew conjunction in this context. Second, the reading uses *ετανοέω* for נחם, which is a more exact rendering than that of NUM. Symmachus uses μετανοέω for בֵּית in Jeremiah 18:8. In that verse, נחם also appears and Symmachus renders it using μετστίθημι. But the use of μετανοέω for נחם in the present verse fits the context, and Symmachus may have varied his rendering in Jeremiah 18:8, for example for stylistic reasons. Although in general, Symmachus avoids expressions that would challenge God’s sovereignty or dignity (see F-Pro 66 and SITP 192), here μετανοέω is being used to describe what is not true of God. Thus, this note is consistent with Symmachus.

Four Catena manuscripts attribute this note to Aquila and one to Theodotion. These attributions are suspect first because neither Aquila nor Theodotion use μετανοέω elsewhere and second because the note attributed to Aquila and Theodotion for the first and parallel stich of this poetic couplet does not match the ἵνα plus subjunctive structure of this note.
HT

אַהֲרֹן אֵל אֲשִׁיב ַ הַהוּא אָמַר וְלֹא יַעֲשֶׂה

LXX

αὐτὸς ἐἶπας οὐχὶ ποιήσει;

α'

οὐχὶ οὗτος εἶπεν καὶ ποιήσει;

Notes:
HT has placed the interrogative indicator ה in front of the phrase, and put the negation before the second verb, literally: “Is it the case that he has said and he will not do?” NUM places the negative particle in the same relative place as the Hebrew but leaves out the conjunction: αὐτὸς ἐἶπας οὐχὶ ποιήσει; (“He has spoken, will he not do?”). In the Syh rendering of Aquila, it has matched the Hebrew interrogative particle as well as the conjunction, but it does not seem to account for the negative particle. Perhaps Syh is content with stating the question such that it demands an affirmative answer, which is how the Greek question is phrased. Wevers has offered a retroversion which reintroduces a negative particle: οὐχὶ οὗτος εἶπεν καὶ ποιήσει; (“Is it not the case that he has said and he will do?” — NGTN 394). One cannot make strong conclusions based on a retroversion, but in general, the note is consistent with Aquila.

HT

ירַקִים

LXX

ἐμμενεῖ

Notes:
HT ends verse 19 by asking concerning the Lord: והלך אָשִׁיב (“will he not cause it to stand?”). NUM does not render the direct object and the three available O-group manuscripts add αὐτῷ which matches the Hebrew since ἐμμενεῖ takes its direct object in the dative. This addition is possibly a result of Origen’s work and was also possibly under the asterisk.

Num 23:20

HT

אֵשִׁיב ַ הַהוּא

LXX

ἀποστρέψω
Sub ※ + αὐτήν

Wit 2: O^{(-G)} 767 Lat Ruf Num XVI 2 Syh = MT
Attr: ※ Syh] > rell
NonGr: Lat Ruf Num XVI 2 eam | Syh שָׂאָה

Notes: HT closes verse 20 with, “I will not cause it to turn around.” NUM omits the direct object, using the verb ἀποστρέψω intransitively. Origen adds the direct object under the asterisk to match the Hebrew.
Syh\(^+\) places the asterisk over the alaph in the word שָׂאָה while Syh\(^T\) has placed it over the kaph. The original intent is clear, however.

Num 23:21

HT רְבֵּנה יִשְׂרָאֵל
LXX τὰ ἐνδοξα ἀρχόντων ἐν αὐτῷ

α’ ἀλαλαγμὸς βασιλέως ἐν αὐτῷ

Wit 1: Procop 865 ↓Syh
Var: ἀλαλαγμός] pr καὶ Syh
NonGr: Syh שָׂאָה שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁאָה

σ’ καὶ σημασία βασιλέως ἐν αὐτῷ

Wit 1: lemma Syh\(^+\) | σημασία Procop 865
NonGr: Syh\(^+\) שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל

θ’ καὶ σαλπισμὸς βασιλέως ἐν αὐτῷ

Wit 1: Procop 865 Syh\(^L\) | σαλπισμός Procop 865
NonGr: Syh\(^L\) שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל
Notes: In the lemmas listed above, words that are available only in Syriac and are retroverted are shown in smaller font, but those that are based on Greek witnesses appear in larger font. HT for the last phrase of 23:21 reads, “and the war-cry of a king is in him” (“him” referring to Israel). NUM translates the last phrase: “and the honors of rulers are in him.”

Apparently the Three attempted to conform more closely to the Hebrew than NUM. All three attributed readings render מֶלֶךְ using the singular βασιλέως. For הָרוּעָתְּ, α’ has ἀλαλαγμός a generic approximation meaning “loud noise.” This is Aquila’s usual rendering for הָרוּעָתְּ (in Numbers at 10:5; also Job 8:21, 33:26, Jer 30[49]:2), and so this attribution makes sense for him. σ’ uses σημασία which means “signal” or “mark.” Symmachus also uses σημασία for הָרוּעָתְּ in Job 8:21, Psalm 26[27]:6, and 88[89]:16. Thus, this attribution fits Symmachus. Finally, θ’ renders הָרוּעָתְּ using σαλπισμός, a by-form of σάλπισμα which means “to sound the trumpet.” This is the only attribution to Theodotion for σαλπισμός (an unattributed M’ and s-group note has it for הָרוּעָתְּ in Leviticus 23:24). The evidence is scanty, but the attribution is possibly correct.

Num 23:22

HT כֵּחשֵַׁנְשׁ LXX (ὡς) δόξα

〈oι λ’〉 υψηλωτατα

Wit 1: ↓130-321’
Var: -λωτ.] -λοτ. 130

Notes: An unattributed reading for כֵּחשֵַׁנְשׁ given in three s-group manuscripts is ὑψηλωτατα, a superlative of ὑψηλος (“high/lofty”). The word ὑψηλος is used frequently by all of the Three (e.g., α’: Deut 2:21; α’ σ’: Ps 77[78]:69; α’ σ’ θ’: Isa 58:14), although not for כֵּחשֵַׁנְשׁ. Any of the Three may have desired to give a more accurate rendering than the rather generic δόξα of NUM, but one cannot determine which of the Three is responsible for this note.

HT (יָבָא) (רָא) כֵּחשֵַׁנְשׁ LXX (ὡς δόξα) μυοκέρωτος (αὐτῷ)

〈α’〉 ῥινοκέρωτος

Wit 1: Fb
Notes: An unattributed note in F<sup>b</sup> gives the alternative rendering ῥινοκέρωτος for רְאֵם instead of ονοκέρωτος in NUM (a similar F<sup>b</sup> note occurs at 24:8). Of the Three, only Aquila uses ῥινοκέρως, for מָרִי (a by-form of רְאֵם) in Job 39:9 (Reider also lists an occurrence of ῥινοκέρως in Ps 28[29]:6 for רְאֵם, but gives no other information — see REI 211). Thus Aquila is a possible source for this note.

Num 23:23

HT

(Lְרָאֵם וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל)

LXX

(Ἰακώβ καὶ τῷ Ισραηλ)

Sub ※ pr τῶ

Wit 2:  F<sup>b</sup> ↓ O<sup>(G)</sup> 414 d n<sup>(456)</sup> t 527 Or III 223 Cels II 420 Tht Nm 220 Syh

Attr: ※ Syh<sup>L</sup> > rell

Var: 'Ιακώβ] Ιακακωβ 376

NonGr: Syh<sup>L</sup> καὶ τῷ Ισραηλ

Notes: HT has the lamedh preposition before both “Jacob” and “Israel,” but NUM includes the equivalent τῶ only before Ἰσραηλ. Origen adds a τῶ under the asterisk before 'Ιακωβ to correspond quantitatively with the Hebrew. Syh<sup>L</sup> has a second metobelus after “Israel” which is clearly spurious.

Num 23:24

HT

(Lְרָאֵם)

LXX

ἀναστήσεται

〈οἱ λʼ〉 ἐγερθήσεται

Wit 1:  58

Wit 2:  376

Notes: For לְרָאֵם in HT, a note in O-group manuscript 58 substitutes ἐγερθήσεται for ἀναστήσεται in NUM, and this is reflected in the text of 376 from the O-group. The verb ἐρθήσεται occurs 32 times in Numbers. The most common NUM equivalents are (1) ἀνιστήμη (15 times), or (2) ἱστήμη (11 times). Aquila employs
ἐγείρω for שׁר (e.g., Isa 50:4) which in some context is a synonym of קום. Theodotion uses ἐγείρω for the Hiphil of קרש (“shake”) in Daniel 10:10. The Three also use ἐξεγείρω for שׁר (α': Job 3:8b, Jer 28[51]:11; α’ θ’: Job 41:2; α’ σ’ θ’: Isa 15:5, 51:9). Finally, Symmachus employs διεγείρω for שׁר in Job 3:8b. This indirect evidence suggests the possibility that the reading is from one of the Three.

**Num 23:27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נָפַת (לִי) לִי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(καταρᾶσαί) μοι αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**non tr** αὐτόν μοι

**Notes:** One O-group manuscript (426) reverses the order of μοι αὐτόν in NUM to match the Hebrew, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. Manuscript 426 sometimes matches the Hebrew apart from the rest of the O-group (see the discussion in Chapter 5).

**Numbers 24**

**Num 24:1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐστίν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ÷**

**Notes:** The first part of 24:1 is a nominal sentence in HT, and NUM translates using the explicit ἐστίν. Syh notes an Origenic obelus around the copula, and although no Greek manuscripts omit ἐστίν, the obelus is probably genuine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לַכְּרָאת בְּנֵהֶם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>εἰς συνάντησιν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
σ′

εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς

Wit 1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Syh has a marginal note attributed to Symmachus that is close to the literal rendering of NUM. The use of ἀπάντησιν as a retroversion for לִקְרַאת is suggested by Wevers (NGTN 401). It fits Symmachus, who uses ἀπάντησις for לִקְרַאת in Jeremiah 28[51]:31 (he also uses it in Job 39:22a but not for לִקְרַאת).

HT

LXX
tὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἔρημον

non tr

εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O[G] 58 Lat cod 100 Syh (sed hab Ruf Num XVII 2) = MT

NonGr: Lat cod 100 in heremiam faciem suam | Syh

Notes: HT has “toward the wilderness, his face” and NUM rearranges the order to give, “his face toward the wilderness.” Some O-group manuscripts (376 426) along with Syh and Lat cod 100 match the Hebrew word order, and this is possibly evidence of Origen’s work.

Num 24:2

HT

LXX

(φυλάς)

Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O[G] Syh

Attr: ※ Syh[+] > rell

NonGr: Syh
Notes: The Hebrew says that Balaam saw Israel "dwelling by its tribes (לִשְׁבָּטָיו)." NUM omits the possessive pronoun, and Origen adds it under the asterisk.

HT
עָלָיו רֹוחַ אֱלֹהִים

LXX
πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ

non tr
ἐπὶ αὐτῷ πνεῦμα θεοῦ

Wit 2:
A F O"-(G) 82 C' 56' n'127 s'(-28) 527-619 y z 55 59 799 Lat cod 100 Ruf Num XVII 2 Aeth Arab Syh = Sixt MT

NonGr:
Lat cod 100 in eo spiritus Dei | Syh ܐܘܝܫ ܐܒܢܛ ܐܡܓ ܐܝܣ ܐܥܠܘܢ ܐܢܫ ܐܢܨ

Notes: HT can be translated, taking account of word order: "upon him (was) the Spirit of God." NUM reverses this, with "the Spirit of God (was) upon him." According to the evidence of the O-group and many other hexaplaric witnesses, Origen reversed the NUM order to match the Hebrew. This also affected a large number of other manuscripts.

Num 24:3

HT
הָעָיִן

LXX
ὁρῶν

{Sub ※} ὁρῶν

Wit 2: Syh

Attr:
※ Syh > rell

NonGr:
Syh ܐܢܨ ※

Notes: The asterisk tradition for verses 3 and 4 is confused. Syh begins with an extraneous asterisk applied to the last word in verse 3 with no matching metobelus. Since the NUM rendering, although not literal, aligns well with the Hebrew, this asterisk is apparently due to a faulty tradition and not original (see THGN 48 under 24:8).

HT
וַיֹּאמַר (בָּלְעָם בְּנֹו בְעֹר וּנְאֻם)

LXX
φησίν 1ο

〈οἱ λ́〉 λέγε
Notes: An unattributed marginal note in Fb gives the alternate rendering λέγε for both instances of נְאֻם in verse 3 in place of φησίν in NUM. Two similar Fb notes occur at 24:15, and a longer Fb note in 24:4 also uses λέγε for נְאֻם. The normal NUM rendering for נְאֻם is a form of φήμι (24:3, 4, 15, 16), the one exception being 14:28 where λέγει is used. In the LXX in general, however, λέγει is used far more frequently for נְאֻם than φήμι (259 vs. 33 times).

In contrast, the Three normally render נְאֻם using φής, particularly in the common expression יְהוָה נְאֻם (e.g., Jer 3:10, 5:11, 7:13, 8:17). Exceptions do occur, however, and λέγει is sometimes used even when נְאֻם is in the phrase יְהוָה נְאֻם (α': Jer 8:3; σ': Isa 3:15, 52:5, 59:20; Jer 3:16; θ': Isa 52:5), indicating that the variations may be stylistic choices. Thus, this note is possibly from any one of the Three, although it is not clear why any of them would substitute for φησίν in NUM. A longer Fb note in verse 4 includes λέγει for נְאֻם and that note is likely not from the Three, and this potentially weakens the case that the present note is from the Three.

Notes: An unattributed marginal note in Fb gives the alternate rendering λέγε for both instances of נְאֻם in verse 3 in place of φησίν in NUM. The first instance is covered above (for details, see the discussion there).
Sub ※ φησὶν ἀκούων λόγια θεοῦ

Wit 2: A B M’ V O’–(G) 29 58 72 707 Tkt C’ d f 56 s’–(28) t x’–527 y’–392 z’–68’ 120’ 126 55 59 424 624 646

Attr: ※ M 344 Syh ] > rell

NonGr: Syh¹ | 616 624 646 ※ Worship Chaldean ※ ※
| Syh¹ | 616 624 646 ※ Worship Chaldean ※ ※

Notes: The asterisk tradition for the end of verse 3 and the beginning of verse 4 is confused, and if reference is made only to HT and to the critical text of NUM, it is not clear to what the signs are referring, since NUM, although not a literal translation, matches the Hebrew quantitatively (see THGN 48 under 24:8). Many manuscripts, however, have omitted φησὶν ἀκούων λόγια θεοῦ (F 29-58-707 Tkt b 56 n 527 392 68’-120’ 319 799 LaT cod 100 Aeth Arm Co) and three manuscripts (M 344 Syh) have this text placed under the asterisk. The Samaritan Pentateuch is missing this phrase, and Origen may have had Greek manuscripts available to him that were also missing it. This possibly led him to conclude that the original Greek was missing this phrase, and to place it under the asterisk.

The placement of the asterisks in Syh¹ and Syh¹ is shown above. Syh¹ has an asterisk before the last word of verse 3 which is one word earlier than the placement in M and 344. As noted elsewhere, Syh¹ often misplaces signs. The phrase continues into a second line, and a second asterisk, which functions as a continuation indicator, appears in the right margin of the second line before the last word in the phrase. The metobelus is then placed correctly. For Syh¹ the phrase under the asterisk is all in one line, and like Syh¹ it has an asterisk one word too soon, but then it places a second asterisk, one word later, in the proper place. A metobelus correctly marks the end of the phrase.

HT ־יוסיון
LXX θεοῦ 1°

〈ο’〉 ἰσχυροῦ

Wit 2: ↓A M’ O’–(G) 58 ᾱ72-707 ↓C’ 44 246 s’–(28) ↓619 y’–392 18’-126-628-630’ 55 ↓59 Eus VI 408 LaT Ruf Num XVII 3 Syh = Sixt

Var: ἰσχυροῦ| -ρως 616; ἰσχυρά 72; 619 59 = Ald | θεοῦ| + ἰσχυρά 72*; + ἰσχυροῦ A

NonGr: LaT Ruf Num XVII 3 fortis | Syh ※ ※※
Notes: The Hebrew word אֵל can refer either to “God” or to “strength” or “power.” It is possible that Origen, perhaps under the influence of exemplars available to him, chose ἵσχυροῦ to denote the latter meaning. This is witnessed by several hexaplaric manuscripts, including 376 and 426 from the O-group, and it is also in many other manuscripts. An unattributed note in 23:19, possibly from the Three, has a similar rendering for אֵל. Another unattributed note for the present verse uses ἵσχυροῦ for אֵל as part of a larger reading, but as discussed below the entire note does not appear to be from Origen or the Three.

HT יִם וּגְלוּי עֵינַ  נֹפֵל
LXX ἀποκεκαλυμμένοι (οἱ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτοῦ)

α′ θ′ ἐμπεφραγμένου ὀφθαλμοῦ αὐτοῦ

Wit 1: Syh
NonGr: Syh

σ′ ἐμπεφραγμένων ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ

Wit 1: Syh Barh
NonGr: Syh, Barh

οἱ λ′ ἐμπεφραγμένοι

Wit 1: Procop 868

Notes: HT for 24:4 has: “The one who hears the words of God declares, who sees a vision of the Almighty, falling down (נֹפֵל), and whose eyes are uncovered.” NUM renders the second part as: “…who sees a vision of God in sleep, his eyes are uncovered.” NUM has apparently interpreted נֹפֵל as an action accompanying sleep. Notes attributed to the Three individually, and one collectively to οἱ λ′, have rendered the passive participle לִגְּ הֵמַע with passive participles of ἐφράσσω (“to block up”), giving the exact opposite sense from the Hebrew. They may be following the NUM idea of “falling down” as being in sleep, perhaps with the idea that Balaam’s physical eyes are closed, he is receiving a prophetic vision (NGTN 403, note 6). The retroversions from Syh and Barhebraeus for α′, σ′, and θ′ are supported by Procopius, who attributes the passive participle of ἐφράσσω to οἱ λ′. The expression פִּלֵגֶר וְנֹפֵל in HT uses a singular verb with a dual subject. Aquila and Theodotion employ a singular verb and subject. Symmachus instead chooses plural for verb and subject.
Elsewhere, Aquila uses ἐφράσσω for סכר (Niph., “be obstructed”) in Genesis 8:2. Symmachus uses it for the Niphal of הושׁר ("stop up" or "block") in Zechariah 14:5 (Jerome attributes it to οἱ ο̣ι̣). Not surprisingly, ἐφράσσω is not attributed to any of the Three for גלה outside of the present verse.

Salvesen believes that this note may belong to the previous verse, first because the singular יִןעַ from verse 3 matches ὀφθαλ*οῦ from the present α′ and θ′ note and is thus consistent with their more literalistic tendencies, and second because ἐφράσσω could theoretically be a closer match with the rare Hebrew verb שׁתם from verse 3 (SITP 133). Regarding the first argument, while Aquila and Theodotion do match the singular יִןעַ from the previous verse, their use of the singular in the present verse was forced by the combination of singular verb with dual subject in HT (יִם גְלוּי עֵינַ). To make their translation consistent they had to make both words singular or both plural. Their choice of singular may have been influenced by the singular יִןעַ from the previous verse, but they were not necessarily rendering that word. The second argument — that ἐφράσσω was applied to שתם from the previous verse — gains strength if one considers that one of the translators may have linked שתם with סתם, which as noted above is rendered with ἐφράσσω (α′ ο̣ι̣: Zech 14:5). On the other hand, Barhebraeus is clear that in his tradition the σ′ reading is associated with verse 4 because he has the equivalent of the LXX from verse 4 — “in sleep, his eyes being uncovered” (ܗܝ̈ܐ̈ܐ̈ܬܨ(ܠ̈ܐ̈ܐ̈ܠ̈22)ܠ̈ܐ̈ܬ̈fdne) — before he lists the Symmachus reading.

Num 24:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>אֹהָלֶיךָ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>σου οἱ οἶκοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

non tr ο̣ι̣ οἶκοι σου

Wit 2: A F M′ O′ (G) 82 381 618 ↓ C′—552 761 (−28) 619 y′—318 z′—126 55 319 424 624 646 799 Eus VI 18 408 Syh = Sixt MT

Var: ο̣ι̣] > A 73′-413-550

NonGr: Syh تملا مسال

Notes: For the NUM phrase σου οἱ οἶκοι, the uncial A, F, and M and most hexaplaric witnesses have the possessive pronoun transposed after οἶκοι to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix. This likely reflects Origen’s work (see Wevers, NGTN 403), although for some witnesses it may reflect an independent harmonization with the second part of the verse where in a parallel phrase, σου appears after σκηναί. Wevers does not include Syh as a witness in his critical apparatus, presumably because the Syriac possessive normally appears after a noun.
Num 24:7

HT

LXX

α': ἀπορρεύσει ὑδατα ἐκ τῶν λεβήτων αὐτοῦ· καὶ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑδασιν πολλοῖς· καὶ ψωθήσεται ὑπὲρ Ἀγὰγ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ.

Σ': ἐποχετεύσει ἐπὶ τοῖς παραφυάσιν ἐκάστης· τῶ δὲ σπέρματε ἐκάστης ἐντός ὑδάτων πολλῶν. καὶ ψωθήσεται ὑπὲρ Ἀγὰγ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ.

Θ': ἔξαντληθήσεται ὑδώρ ἐκ τῶν λεβήτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα (Syh¹ τοῦ σπέρματος) αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑδασιν πολλοῖς· καὶ ψωθήσεται ὑπὲρ Γὼγ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ.
Wit 1: Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The retroversions are derived mainly from Field with a few emendations suggested by Wevers (NGTN 406). Numbers 24:7 contains four stichs, the first three of which are covered by notes in Syh for Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. The first two stichs of HT read: “Water will flow from his buckets, and his seed will be on (lit: in) many waters.” NUM departs rather radically from the Hebrew, and has, “A man will come from his seed, and he will rule over many nations.” The third stich in HT reads “And his king will be exalted above Agag,” and NUM renders this literally.

The three revisers give alternate translations that match HT more closely. For לזר, the retroversion ἀπορρέω is suggested for Aquila. Little Greek data exists for how the Three render לזר. Aquila employs ἀπορρέω in Isaiah 1:30 and 34:4 for δεῖ 
(“decay/perish” — this sense is within the semantic range of ἀπορρέω). The Hebrew בצל (‘bucket’) is rare (appearing only here and in Isa 40:15), but Aquila uses λεβής for the synonym מזר (Ps 59[60]:10, 107[108]:10) and for מזר (“basin”: Jer 52:19). Finally, Aquila uses υψόω for בזר (e.g., Gen 41:44, Deut 8:14, Ezek 21:31[Eng 26], 31:10). Overall, this translation is quite literal, which fits Aquila.

Symmachus’ translation is less literal and carries an agricultural theme through both stichs: “He will draw out water upon each one’s branches, and to each one’s seed, being within from many waters.” Symmachus renders לזר with a transitive verb, as if it were the Hiphil rather than the Qal, and the retroversion chosen is ἐποχετεύσει (limited data exists on how Symmachus renders לזר — he renders it intransitively using ἐρέω in Job 36:28a). For the Syriac מזר (“shoots”), the retroversion παραπλασίαν is used. Symmachus employs παραπλασίας in Job 40:22b as an alternate for ἐπέρω in LXX Job. And he uses υψόω elsewhere for בזר (Deut 8:14).

Like Aquila, Theodotion translates the Hebrew literally. As with the other translators, little information exists for how Theodotion renders לזר. For the Syriac מזר (an Ethpael meaning “be drawn out”), the retroversion ἐξαναθησαίον is chosen. For the rare word לזר, the same Syriac is used for θ’ as for α’ (ἅπασά) and so λεβής is chosen as for Aquila. Although Theodotion has no other known uses of this word, it is relatively common in the LXX. Finally, Theodotion uses υψόω for בזר (e.g., Deut 8:14, Ezek 21:31[Eng 26], 31:10).

Syh and Syh have only minor differences. For Aquila’s note, the word σκοτῶ (“bucket”) has a σεγάμι indicating plural in Syh that is not present in Syh. For Theodotion, the word σκοτ has a daleth before it in Syh which is missing in Syh. This could potentially change τοι σπέρμα to τοι σπέρματος, but the overall meaning is not changed significantly.
HT  מַלְכּוֹ וְיָרֹם מֵאֲגַג
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ

σ’  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ὑπὲρ ’Ωγ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.

HT  מַלְכּο וְיָרֹם
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ

α’ σ’ ὑπὲρ Γώγ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.

HT  מַלְכּוֹ וְיָרֹם
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ

α’ σ’ ὑπὲρ Γώγ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.

HT  מַלְכּוֹ וְיָרֹם מֵאֲגַג
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ

σ’  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ὑπὲρ ’Ωγ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.

HT  מַלְכּוֹ וְיָרֹם
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ

α’ σ’ ὑπὲρ Γώγ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.

HT  מַלְכּוֹ וְיָרֹם
LXX  καὶ ὑψωθῆσαι ἢ Γώγ

α’ σ’ ὑπὲρ Γώγ

Notes: In HT, the name of the king in the third stich is אֲגַג. The identity of this personage has long been a puzzle, as the only אֲגַג in the OT is the king of Amalek during the time of King Saul. Sam renders this as גוג — the name of a nation mentioned in Ezekiel — and this may have influenced the NUM translation.

The text of Syh follows NUM with Γώγ. In Syh marginal notes, both Aquila and Symmachus read Ἀγαγ while Theodotion matches NUM with Γώγ. A note in manuscript 319 and in Theodoretus Cyrensis attributed to Symmachus has the alternative rendering ’Ωγ who was one of the kings defeated by Israel earlier in the Numbers account (21:33ff). Historically this reading makes sense, but it seems unlikely to be genuine because it implies a different underlying Hebrew text (געו vs. אֲגַג) and because alternate and better attested readings for Symmachus exist. Other versions of this name and their attributions are discussed below.
Notes: For אֲגַג in HT, M' and some s-group manuscripts have notes that attribute the reading Γώγ to Aquila and Symmachus. O-group manuscript 58 has a note attributed to οἱ γ' that gives the reading Αγάγ.

Summarizing the evidence, the alternative renderings for אֲגַג are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Witnesses with attributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Γώγ</td>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>M' 85'-321-344-346 Syh^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγάγ</td>
<td>α' σ'</td>
<td>Syh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γώγ</td>
<td>α' σ'</td>
<td>M' 85'-321-344-346 Syh^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ωγ</td>
<td>σ'</td>
<td>Cv^comm Tht Nm 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγάγ</td>
<td>οἱ λ'</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one reading attributed to Theodotion is in Syh and has him matching Γώγ from NUM. The only possible counter-evidence is the reading Αγάγ attributed to οἱ λ'. The evidence of Syh makes sense as a working assumption for Theodotion.

For Aquila, two traditions exist. Syh has Αγάγ, while a number of Greek witnesses (M' 85'-321-344-346), and a second note in Syh^1, have Γώγ. One would expect Aquila to follow the Hebrew, so if his Hebrew text had אֲגַג Aquila likely matched this with Αγάγ (no examples exist for how Aquila renders אֲגַג elsewhere).

For Symmachus, the evidence is more difficult to assess. Three possibilities exist: (1) Syh has Αγάγ; (2) a set of Greek witnesses (M' 85'-321-344-346) and a second note in Syh^1 have Γώγ; (3) the Catena commentaries and Theodoretus Cyrensis have "Ωγ. Symmachus does translate place names (as in 21:11; see F-Pro 67-68), but he is not prone to substitute one name for another. Here he seems to have no overriding reason not to follow the Hebrew, unless for exegetical reasons he used the name "Ωγ to eliminate the reference to a later king and to match a name contemporary to the events in Numbers (this option is discussed above under the σ' reading that contains "Ωγ).

One other factor to consider in using Syh for evidence is the tendency of Paul of Tella to be influenced by the Peshitta (hereafter P) in reproducing proper names in the text of Syh (see THGN 59 and SITP 133-35). For this verse, P has which matches the text of Syh, as well as the Syh notes for α' and σ'. But for the θ' note, Syh has , and Syh^1 has an alternate (shorter) α' σ' reading that also has . Thus, P may have influenced the text of Syh but does not seem to have affected the marginal notes for this verse.

Regarding the quality of the witnesses, many normally reliable Greek manuscripts (M' 85'-321-344-346) have the reading Γώγ. These carry comparable weight to Syh, although they may have been influenced by NUM and Greek variants. Although a final determination is difficult to make, unless there is evidence for a different Hebrew Vorlage, one would reasonably expect Symmachus to conform to the Hebrew and use
Ἀγάγ as in the longer note in Syh (covered above). For further discussion, see SITP 133-35 and NGTN 405-406.

**Num 24:8**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>(ὡς δόξα) μονοκέρωτος (αὐτῷ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(ὡς δόξα) ονοκέρωτος (αὐτῷ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈α′〉 ρινοκέρωτος

**Wit 1:**  F<sup>b</sup>

**Notes:** HT and NUM for this verse are identical to 23:11. As with that verse, an unattributed note in F<sup>b</sup> gives the alternate rendering ρινοκέρωτος for בָּרָא instead of μονοκέρωτος in NUM. Of the Three, Aquila uses ρινοκέρως for בָּרָא in Job 39:9 (by-form בָּרָא) and Reider lists an occurrence at Psalm 28[29]:6 for בָּרָא (REI 211) although he lists no source. Thus Aquila is a possible source for this note.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>(ὡς δόξα) μονοκέρωτος (αὐτῷ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ε'χροῦν (αὐτοῦ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**{Sub ※} ἐκ τῶν ※ ἔχροῦν**

**Wit 2:**  C′′ s<sup>-(28)30′</sup> Syh<sup>L</sup>

**NonGr:** Syh<sup>L</sup>※ ἡμᾶς ἱλάσατο ἑαυτῷ.

**Notes:** Field believes that the original fifth column had an asterisk as follows: ※ἐκ τῶν Ί ἔχροῦν. The addition of ἔκ τῶν is witnessed by the Catena manuscripts, the s-group (minus 30′), and Syh. Syh has added the preposition Ι and Syh<sup>L</sup> has an asterisk placed after it which may originally have been before it. No metobelus follows in the text, although two words later, an unusual six-pointed sign (※) appears that is not an index. The added Ι and the asterisk are the basis of Field’s conjectured asterisk.

Arguing against an Origenic asterisk are: (1) no corresponding ה in HT and (2) no hexaplaric witnesses to ἐκ τῶν. Unless a different Hebrew Vorlage was available to Origen that included ה, for which there is no evidence, one must conclude that the Syh asterisk is not original to the o’ text.

Another possibility is that Syh meant to indicate that Ι was to be placed under the obelus, since it does not reflect HT. But the absence of ἐκ τῶν in any hexaplaric manuscripts suggests that this addition was not in the o’ text.
The end of verse 8 describes what God will do to the enemies of Israel. One of God’s actions is: וְעַצְמֹתֵיהֶם יְגָרֵם ("their bones he will gnaw/break"). The verb גָרֵם is used three times in the OT (elsewhere: Ezek 23:34, Zeph 3:3) and it seems to denote “gnawing/breaking bones.” The LXX does not render it directly in its other occurrences, while in the present verse, NUM uses ἐκολείζω, a verb occurring only here in the LXX (and uncommon elsewhere) that refers to depriving someone/something of strength.

An unattributed reading in manuscript Fb has the alternate rendering ἐξοστεΐσει (from ἐξοστείζω) which means “take out the bone(s).” In Ezekiel 23:34, HT has the phrase καὶ τὰ ὀστρακά αὐτοῦ κατατρώξεις, with Symmachus (according to Syh) adding ὡς ὀστέα. Thus, for that verse Symmachus associates the verb גָרֵם with bones. A synonym of גָרֵם is the Piel of עצים, a rare form that appears to mean “gnaw/break bones.” In Jeremiah 27[50]:17, the only place in the OT where עצים occurs in the Piel, Aquila uses καταθυνοστέει (apparently reading καταθνεῖ as the more common Qal which means “be powerful”). Symmachus, however, uses ἐξοστείζω (the Greek manuscript has ἐξοπτησεν from ἐξέστη but Ziegler indicates that this is read as ἐξοστέωσεν). Thus, although the data is limited, Symmachus is possibly the source of the present note. It is also possible, however, since the verb ἐξοστείζω was used at least into the fourth century (see Sophocles 486), that this note is a scribal gloss.

The end of 24:8 is ambiguous in the Hebrew, the last section of which reads literally, “He (God) will devour the nations of his adversaries, and will break their bones, and crush his arrows.” Because in the first clause, the singular pronominal suffix...
refers to God, and in the second the plural suffix refers to the enemies, translators have generally associated the singular suffix on “arrows” in the third clause to God again and not the enemies; that is, “he will crush with his arrows.” This is how the NUM translator construed the phrase, rendering it ταῖς βολίσιν αὐτοῦ κατατοξεύσει ἔχθρόν. Thus instead of “arrows” being crushed, they become the instrument that God uses to crush, and in addition ἔχθρόν is added as a new direct object, even though this has no equivalent in HT. Syh indicates that the added word was placed under the obelus by Origen. Syh makes “enemy” plural and adds a pronominal suffix, but most of the Greek hexaplaric witnesses, including the Ο-group, indicate that the o’ text has the singular with no possessive. Syh also has no metobelus.

Num 24:10

HT

LXX

Sub ※ ὀργῇ

Wit 2: O(G)58 767 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh ] > rell

NonGr: Syh άλ οτ

Notes: In 11:1 and 11:10, NUM matches the Hebrew יִחַרְו with ἔθυμοθη ὀργῇ. In this verse, NUM omits ὀργῇ for the identical Hebrew, and Origen adds it under the asterisk, as witnessed by O-group manuscripts 376 and 426 and by Syh.

HT

LXX εὐλογών εὐλόγησας

Notes: HT has an infinitive absolute following a finite verb. NUM often translates the infinitive using a participle (for a discussion of the treatment of infinitive absolutes in Numbers, see under 21:2). Unlike for the present verse, HT of Numbers
more often has the infinitive before a finite verb, and here, perhaps under the influence of typical usage, NUM translates with a participle before the finite verb. Two of three available O-group manuscripts and Syh reflect a probable Origenic transposition of the words to match the Hebrew order.

| HT        | זֶה שָׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים |
| LXX       | τρίτον τοῦτο      |

**non tr**  
τοῦτο τρίτον

**Wit 2:**  
A F M′ O(G)76−707 C′−52 313 761 19 d 53′−56 s(−28) 527 y+z−68 120 59
799 ↓Cyr I 441 Arm Bo Syh (sed hab Compl) = MT

**Var:**  
τοῦτο| τοῦτῳ Cyr I 441

**NonGr:**  
Syh בָּהָדֶלֶת אֵלָי

**Notes:** At the end of the verse, HT has זֶה שָׁלֹשֶׁ פְּעָמִים (“this three times”). NUM has no equivalent for פְּעָמִים, probably assuming it from context, but it reverses the order of זֶה שָׁלֹשֶׁ and renders the phrase as τρίτον τοῦτο. Origen transposed the NUM order to match the Hebrew, as evidenced by two O-group manuscripts and a number of other hexaplaric manuscripts. This change is reflected in a large number of witnesses.

Syh has an equivalent for פְּעָמִים which is not reflected in any Greek witnesses. Its reading is תַּחְתֵּים (“times/seasons”) which is also in P, and so the Syh translator may have picked up the word from P.

**Num 24:11**

| HT        | כָּבֵדךָ (אֲכַבֶּדְךָ) |
| LXX       | (Τιμήσω σε) |

**Sub ※ pr τιμῶν**

**Wit 2:**  
O(G) 58 Syh = MT

**Attr:**  
※ Syh[*] > rell

**NonGr:**  
Syh בָּהָדֶלֶת אֵלָי

**Notes:** In 22:17, HT has the identical infinitive absolute plus finite verb combination as for the present verse. There HT reads כָּבֵדךָ אֲכַבֶּדְךָ (with added
particle) and NUM renders this quantitatively as ἐντίς γὰρ τιήσω. Here, HT has ἐκβάλλεις, but NUM has the finite verb only. Origen adds the participle τιμῶν under the asterisk to match HT.

**Num 24:13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>יתֶן־לִי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>μοι δῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non tr</td>
<td>δῶν μοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* HT has יתֶן־לִי and NUM reverses the order with μοι δ痿. Origen transposed the order to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58) and other hexaplaric witnesses.

**Sub ÷**

*Notes:* In HT, Balaam says, “I am not able to transgress the mouth of the Lord, to do good or evil.” In the last clause, NUM adds αὐτό (‘…to do it’). The added word has been placed under the obelus by Origen.

Both SyhЛ and SyhТ have placed the obelus over the middle of the word, to indicate that only the pronominal suffix is to be included. However, although SyhТ has correctly placed the metobelus after the end of the same word, SyhЛ has misplaced the metobelus to the end of the line. This is clearly a mistake, as the intervening text (“good or evil”) is in both HT and NUM.
non tr  καλὸν ἢ πονηρὸν

Wit 2:    A F M\textsuperscript{mxt} \diamondsuit\textsuperscript{G} 82 381' \diamondsuit\textsuperscript{Cn} 417 b 56-246 s\textsuperscript{(–28)} 527-619 y z 55 59 424 624 \diamondsuit\textsuperscript{b} 646 799 Cyr I 441 Syh = Sixt MT

Var: καλὸν ἢ πονηρὸν] pr μικρὸν ἢ μέγα [μέγα ἢ μικρὸν καλὸν [. πονηρὸν 376 l αὐτὸ πονηρὸν ἢ καλὸν] καλὸν αὐτῷ (αὐτό 52-414-616\textsuperscript{(–761)} ἢ (και 528) πονηρὸν C\textsuperscript{–57 417 500} 646

NonGr:   Syh ܢܐܬܒ

Notes: For reasons that are not clear, NUM chose to reverse the order of the phrase רָעָה בָהּ אָטוֹ and render it πονηρὸν ἢ καλὸν. The ο′ text transposed this to match the Hebrew, and a large number of manuscripts reflect this change with many variants.

Num 24:14

HT  בְּאַחֲרִית (הַיָּמִים)
LXX  ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου (τῶν ἡμερῶν)

ο′  σ′  θ′  ἐπὶ ἐσχάτω

Wit 1:  344
Wit 2:  29-426 527

α′  ἐν ἐσχάτη

Wit 1:  344
Wit 2:  Syh
NonGr:  Syh ܢܐܬܒ

Notes: For בְּאַחֲרִית in HT, NUM translates using ἐπί and the genitive ἐσχάτου. The Hebrew preposition beth is often used temporally to describe the time at
which or during which an event occurs. Similarly, the Greek preposition ἐπί plus the genitive is used with the temporal sense “during.” Thus the NUM rendering is accurate.

Aquila translates הַיָּמִים as ἐν ἐσχάτῃ, in keeping with his almost universal tendency to render the preposition beth with ἐν. In the context of expressing the time during which an event occurs, some overlap exists between ἐπί and ἐν, so the meaning is not substantially different. Aquila also uses the feminine ἐσχάτῃ which matches its Hebrew counterpart, the feminine noun, הַיָּמִים as well as the feminine ἡμέρα. Aquila varies his rendering of הַיָּמִים, using the feminine at times (e.g., Deut 32:29), but the neuter in other places (Jer 12:4, Ezek 23:25). Syh text, which normally renders ἐπί using the preposition בְּאַחֲרִית uses בְּאַחֲרִית, in keeping with his almost universal tendency to render the preposition beth with בְּאַחֲרִית. In the context of expressing the time during which an event occurs, some overlap exists between ἐπί and ἐν, so the meaning is not substantially different. Aquila also uses the feminine ἐσχάτῃ which matches its Hebrew counterpart, the feminine noun, אַחֲרִית as well as the feminine ἡ*έρα. Aquila varies his rendering of אַחֲרִית, sometimes using masculine as in the present verse (e.g., at Ezek 23:25), sometimes feminine (Jer 12:4), and sometimes neuter (Ezek 23:25).

Symmachus often varies his rendering of the Hebrew preposition beth (see F-Pro 64). And like Aquila, he varies his renderings of הַיָּמִים, sometimes using masculine as in the present verse (e.g., at Ezek 23:25), sometimes feminine (Jer 12:4), and sometimes neuter (Ezek 23:25).

Theodotion elsewhere renders the expression הַיָּמִים as ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν (Jer 31:47, Dan [TH] 10:14, and 2:28 for Aramaic הַיָּמִים). This is different than the current attribution of ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων but like the other translators, Theodotion could vary his renderings.

The s-group texts match NUM with ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων, and 344 attributes ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων to o’. Here the witness of the O-group is mixed. Manuscript 426 agrees with the o’ reading and this also agrees with 0′, whom Origen often copies. 376 matches NUM, while several s-group manuscripts (130-321′-344) have the unattributed alternate reading ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων, and O-group manuscript 58 agrees with this. In summary, the 344 o’ attribution is possibly correct.

**Num 24:15**

| HT | לְאַשְׁמ (כְּלֵי) |
| LXX | φησίν (Βαλαάμ) |

| o’ λ’ | λέγε |

Wit 1:  Fb

Notes: An unattributed marginal note in Fb gives the alternate rendering λέγε for both instances of φησίν in verse 15 (in the second instance, the note reads καὶ λέγε — this is covered below). Fb has a similar note at 24:3 for both instances of φησίν in that
verse, and a longer F\textsuperscript{b} note in 24:4 also uses λέγε for נְאֻם. The present note is possibly from any of the Three (see the discussion under the first (οἱ λ′) reading for λέγε in 24:3).

\[ \text{HT} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{LXX} & \quad \phiησίν (ο̣ αληθινῶς ὁρῶν)
\end{align*} \]

\[ \langle \text{οἱ λ′} \rangle \quad \text{καὶ λέγε} \]

\[ \text{Wit 1:} \quad \text{F}\textsuperscript{b} \]

Notes: An unattributed marginal note in F\textsuperscript{b} gives the alternate rendering λέγε for both instances of φησίν in verse 15. For this second instance, HT also includes the copula, and this is reflected by the added καί. This note is possibly from any one of the Three (see the discussion under the first (οἱ λ′) reading for λέγε in 24:3).

**Num 24:16**

\[ \text{HT} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{LXX} & \quad —
\end{align*} \]

Sub ※ φησίν

\[ \text{Wit 2:} \quad O^{(G)}\textsuperscript{58} - 15 106\textsuperscript{c} \text{ Arab Syh = MT} \]

Attr: ※ Syh | > rel\ll

NonGr: Syh ܕܳܡ

Notes: In HT, verse 16 begins with נְאֻם and this is omitted in NUM. Origen includes the equivalent φησίν under the asterisk as witnessed by two O-group manuscripts and Syh.

**Num 24:17**

\[ \text{HT} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{LXX} & \quad δείξω αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐχὶ νῦν
\end{align*} \]

α′ όψομαι αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ νῦν

\[ \text{Wit 1:} \quad \text{lemma} | \text{Eus VI 407} \downarrow \text{Syh} | \text{ὀψομαι} \text{ Procop 872} \]
Notes: The Masoretic pointing indicates that אֶרְאֶנּוּ is a Qal imperfect, meaning “I see (or will see) him.” NUM construed this as a Hiphil imperfect, and translated using the future δείξω αὐτῷ. A note attributed to Aquila treats the Hebrew verb as a Qal, and uses ὁψόμαι, thus matching MT. This is consistent with Aquila who regularly uses ὁράω for ראה (e.g., in the Pentateuch in Exod 7:1, 24:10, 32:25) and he usually renders the Hebrew imperfect with the future when it is not in special contexts, such as waw-consecutive (see REI-Pro 44-47).

Syh attributes this note to Symmachus as well as to Aquila, but a note in Procopius has an alternate reading for Symmachus that uses the present tense (see below).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
HT & \text{אֶרְאֶנּוּ} \\
LXX & \text{Δείξω} \\
\sigma' & \text{ὁρῶ}
\end{array}
\]

Wit 1: Procop 872

Notes: A one-word note in Procopius attributed to Aquila has ὁψόμαι, and this is covered above. A second note from Procopius attributes the present tense ὁρῶ to Symmachus. Symmachus commonly uses ὁράω for ראה (e.g., Exod 7:1, 24:10, 32:25). Apparently Symmachus considered the opening words of Balaam’s speech to be referring to a current vision, and thus gave a contextual, but valid rendering of the Hebrew imperfect.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
HT & \text{אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּּּוּ וְלֹא קָרֹוב} \\
LXX & \text{μακαρίζω, καὶ οὐκ ἐγγίζει}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\alpha' & \text{προσκοπᾷ αὐτὸν αλλ' οὐκ ἐγγύς}
\end{array}
\]

Wit 1: Eus VI 407 ↓Syh ↓Barh

Attr: \(\alpha'\ \sigma'\ \text{Barh; } > \text{Syh} \uparrow\)

NonGr: Syh Barh אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא קָרֹוב אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא קָרֹוב
Notes: HT for the second stich in verse 17 reads: אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ רָאִיתִי מֵאֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא קָר. The form אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ is from the root שׁוּר whose meaning is not well-established. Because of its parallel position with אֶרְאֶנּוּ (from the root רָאִיתִי) in the first stich, the second stich may be translated something like “I behold him, but not near.” In 23:9, NUM translates אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ along these lines using προσνοέω. In the present verse, however, even though the context is almost identical to 23:9 — e.g., Balaam is speaking, and the identical verb forms (ראה and שׁוּר) are used in parallel — the NUM translator apparently took the verb שׁוּר to be a form of rather than שׁוּר. Thus he translates using ακαρίζω, meaning “I call (him) happy.” This may be an example of a type of contextual shortsightedness that sometimes appears in NUM (see Voitila, 109-121). Or it may be, as Wevers suggests, an intentional device to differentiate the two passages (NGTN 412-13).

A note attributed to α′ has rendered אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ as προσκοπῶ αὐτόν (“I watch him”) apparently reading the verb as שׁוּר. We have little data about how Aquila renders שׁוּר. In Job 7:8, he uses something akin to διακρίνω (retroverted from Syriac איה) for Aquila’s προσκοπῶ αὐτόν. This is puzzling, as the verb שׁוּר means (1) “to weigh/compare/test/pay,” or (2) “to stumble” or “strike against.” The latter meaning is closer to the Greek προσκόπτω (“strike against”), which looks very similar to προσκοπῶ (differing in only one letter). Thus, it is possible that the Syriac translator read προσκόπτω for προσκοπῶ.

{σ′}{θ′} ὁρῶ αὐτὸν ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγγύς

Wit 1: Eus VI 407

Attr: {θ′} σ′ Eus VI 407

Notes: A note attributed to Symmachus by Eusebius renders רָאִיתִי using ὁρῶ, the present tense of ὁράω. This is puzzling, as Procopius has Symmachus translating רָאִיתִי, the first verb in the parallel sequence, using ὁρῶ (see above). Wevers argues that something is wrong with this tradition, since Symmachus, being a careful translator, would not likely use ὁράω for two different verbs in parallel stichs, and this is probably correct (NGTN 412, n. 25). As noted above, Symmachus commonly uses ὁράω for רָאִיתִי as in the first stich. In addition, Symmachus has a possibly different reading for רָאִיתִי (see below). In summary, the evidence suggests that the present note is not from Symmachus. Aquila has another reading attributed to him here, so this leaves Theodotion as a candidate for this reading. That Theodotion found the NUM rendering inadequate is likely (see above under α′). He employs προνοέω for רָאִיתִי in Job 17:15b, but he possibly uses ὁράω here since it fits the context.
LXX  
μακαρίζω

〈σ′〉  
τηρήσω αὐτόν

Wit 1:  
F

Notes:  
This unattributed note from F has τηρήσω αὐτόν for ἀκυρώσει. It matches another unattributed note at 23:9 which has τηρήσω for ἀκυρώσει in a similar context (see the discussion there). The present note is probably not from Aquila, who has been credited with a different rendering (see above). τηρήσω could belong either to Symmachus or Theodotion. However, for this verse, Theodotion possibly uses ὁραῶ for ἀκυρώσει (discussed above). Symmachus renders ἀκυρώσει contextually as οὐκ ἀκυρώσει (“he does not annul” — see Sophocles 111) in Job 33:14b, but he possibly uses τηρέω in the present verse since it fits the context. The note could also be a later scribal gloss.

HT  
καὶ τῆς χερσάς

LXX  
καὶ ἀναστήσει ἄνθρωπος

σ′  
καὶ ἀναστήσεται σκῆπτρον

Wit 1:  
C^\text{cat} = Sixt

Notes:  
HT reads: “A star will travel from Jacob, and a staff will rise from Israel.” NUM translates, “A star will rise from Jacob and a person will rise up from Israel.” A note attributed to σ′ in the Catena group renders שֵׁבֶט more literally as σκῆπτρον (a word that covers both of the meanings of שֵׁבֶט as “staff” or “tribe”). Symmachus uses σκῆπτρον for שֵׁבֶט elsewhere in 1 Kingdoms 10:20, Psalm 73[74]:2, and Isaiah 28:27 and thus this attribution makes sense for him.

HT  
מָחַץ פַּאֲתֵי מֹואָב

LXX  
καὶ θραύσει τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς Μωάβ

σ′  
καὶ παίσει (πέσει codd) κλίματα Μωάβ

Wit 1:  
C^\text{cat} = Sixt

Notes:  
The second to last stich in 24:17 of HT reads: מָחַץ פַּאֲתֵי מֹואָב (“And he will crush the sides of Moab”). NUM renders the phrase with καὶ θραύσει τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς Μωάβ (“he will shatter the leaders of Moab”). An σ′ note in the catena
portion of the Catena group renders the Hebrew as καὶ παίσει κλί*ατα Μωάβ (“and he will smite the slopes of Moab.” Symmachus may have been thinking of פֵאָה in the sense of a “side” of a country, and thus referring to the “slopes” of the western border of Moab that descend down to the Dead Sea.

Salvesen (SITP 135-36) points out that in Jeremiah 31[48]:45, Aquila renders פֵאָה using κλίμα and that Symmachus renders פֵאָה with πρόσωπον (both retroverted from Syh). Similarly, in Leviticus 19:27, Aquila renders פֵאָה as κλίμα where Symmachus uses πρόσωπιν, a term that overlaps πρόσωπον in meaning. As a result, Salvesen suggests the possibility that the present reading is from Aquila rather than Symmachus.

HT קַרְקַר
LXX προνομεύσις

σ’ ἐξερευνήσεις(ς)

Wit 1: C\cat = Sixt

Notes: The last two stichs of verse 17 in HT read: וּמָחַץ פַּאֲתֵי מֹואָב וְקַרְקַר כָּל־בְּנֵי־שֵׁת (“And he will smash the sides of Moab and destroy (?) all the sons of Sheth”). The meaning of the Hebrew קַרְקַר in the last stich is uncertain. Num renders קַרְקַר with προνομεύσις which means either “to forage” or “to plunder.”

An σ’ note in the catena portion of the Catena group renders קַרְקַר using ἐξερευνήσει (“search out” or “examine”). Field cites Symmachus as using ἐξερευνάω in Psalm 43[44]:22 and Proverbs 25:27 for קַרְקַר (“explore/search out”), but Field’s only source in both instances is Nobilius. If the attribution is accurate, Symmachus may be relating קַרְקַר to חָקַר (see SITP 135-36 for a discussion of the Symmachus readings for this verse). Coupling this reading for the final stich with the previous Symmachus reading for the second-to-last stich, and supplying conjectured words in brackets gives: και παίσει κλίματα Μωάβ [και] ἐξερευνήσεις [πάντας υἱοὺς Σήθ] (“and he will smite the slopes of Moab and search out the sons of Sheth”). The present reading fits in context with the Symmachus note for the previous stich, and thus the attribution to Symmachus is possibly correct.

Num 24:22

HT כִּי אִם־יִהְיֶה לְבָעֵר קָיִן עַד־מַחֲרַשׁ תִּשְׁבֶּךָּ׃
LXX καὶ ἐὰν γένηται τῷ Βεώρ νοσσιὰ πανουργίας, Ἀσσύριοί σε αἰχ*αλωτεύσουσιν.

α’ ὅτι ἐὰν γένηται εἰς τὸ ἐπιλέξαι Καὶν ἕως τινὸς Ἀσσοῦρ αἰχμαλωτεύσει σε
The above retroversions from the Syriac are mainly from Field and Wevers (NGTN 416). The Hebrew is difficult to translate. It reads something like: “But Kain will be for burning/grazing/removing; until what (i.e., what time = how long) will Assur take you captive?” For the first stich, apparently NUM has read בָעֵר as בָעֵר, giving the opening as גֵלֵא. Second, it has read שָׁנָה as שָׁנָה as a preposition plus proper name (“to Beor”) rather than as an infinitive construct. Beor was the name of Balaam’s father, and so the reference seems to be indirectly to Balaam. Third, it renders יָנָה as יָנָה (“nest”), presumably from מַי. And finally, it treats מַיִם as part of the first stich, and apparently has read it as מַיִם (“cunning”) as seen by its rendering of מַיִם (“villainy”). The remainder of the second stich follows the Hebrew with the exception of rendering the singular בְּשֵׁה with the plural אִיקְמהַלֶּותְעָסָוֶסִי. Thus NUM reads, “And if there is a nest of villainy for Beor, Asshur will take you captive.”

For the opening בָעֵר of the verse, the α’ reading in Syh has בָעֵר which retroverted is גֵלֵא. Syh renders Aquila’s equivalent of יָנָה as יָנָה (“choose”). This is retroverted as ἐπιλέξαι (from ἐπιλέγο - “select”), which follows Aquila’s pattern of rendering יָנָה with ἐπιλέγο in contexts where יָנָה is being used in the sense of removing something (e.g., Deut 26:14, 4 Kgdms 23:24). Aquila may have associated יָנָה with רָטֵב, since he renders רָטֵב with ἐπιλέγο in 3 Kingdoms 18:25. The second stich follows the Hebrew literally, including using singular אִיקְמהַלֶּותְעָסֶס for בְּשֵׁה. Aquila uses אִיקְמהַלֶּותְעָסֶס for בְּשֵׁה elsewhere in Jeremiah 48(41):10. The whole reads,
“Since if it is with the result of choosing Kain, how long will Asshur take you prisoner?”
The retroversion and the reading is suitable for Aquila.

Symmachus construes בְּנֵי in its sense of grazing or devouring. Thus, כַּרְכְּבּבּוֹ (for Syh’s is) is appropriate, since Symmachus renders the synonym יִדְּרָה this way in Psalm 79[80]:14. Second, he sees כּוֹ as referring to the people called the Kenites. Third, he treats שַׁבְּךָ as a noun, perhaps related to תִּשְׁבֶּךָ. The retroversion אֵילָלָתְוּסָי (for Syh’s אֵילָלָתְוָסָי) is a word used by Symmachus for רַע (e.g., in Isa 49:24; he also uses it for the synonym נָלַמִּים in Isa 20:4). Thus, his translation reads: “And if the Kenites are devoured, how long will your captives belong to Asshur?”

The final reading has no attribution, although it follows attributed readings for α’ and σ’ and thus occupies the Theodotion “slot” (Field also proposes Theodotion as the source). This reading renders τισ οικείου as an equivalent of the Syriac סְיַלְּהֶה (‘‘robbery’’) leading to אֵילָלָתְוָסָי as a retroversion. It does not translate כּוֹ, and the remainder matches Aquila, giving: ὅτι έαν γένηται εἰς ἁρπαγήν ἕως τινὸς Άσσουρ αἰχαλωτεύσει σε (“Since if it is for robbery, how long will Asshur take you captive?”). Regarding ἁρπαγή. Field cites Theodotion as the source of the related word ἄπαργα in Psalm 61[62]:11, although he cites only Noblius as a source, and it is for τόξον and not for לִבּו. Since בְּנֵי can have the meaning “devastate” or “remove,” it is more generic than ἁρπαγή but has some potential overlap in meaning. This retroversion of בְּנֵי is admittedly based on scanty data, but it or a synonym is possibly from Theodotion. For this note, Syh uses שְׁבִי for קָבְרָךְ as it does also in the note attributed to Aquila. Thus, the same (אֵילָלָתְוָסָי) makes sense, having also the singular to align with HT rather than the plural in NUM. Elsewhere, Theodotion employs the related אֵילָלָתְוָς in Isaiah 14:2 for לִבְרָךְ and in Isaiah 49:24 for שַׁבְּךָ. Thus the reading possibly reflects Theodotion. In conclusion, with these renderings the translators are trying to make sense of a difficult Hebrew couplet and to conform more closely to the Hebrew than NUM does.

| HT | לִבְרָךְ |
| LXX | σε αἰχαλωτεύσουσιν |

non tr αἰχαλωτεύσουσιν σε

Wit 2: A F O(G)426 Ol-82 C’ b 56-246 s(-28) y z Ruf Num XIX 3 Syh

NonGr: Syh שְׁבִי

Notes: HT has a pronominal suffix on the verb לִבְרָךְ but NUM places the pronoun before the verb. A number of hexaplaric manuscripts have reversed the order, including two from the O-group, and this possibly reflects Origen’s work. A number of other manuscripts reflect this change. Although Syh has the pronoun after the verb, Wevers does not list Syh as a witness, presumably because it uses an inseparable suffix which must come after the pronoun.
Num 24:23

HT —
LXX καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ὥγ

(Sub ÷)

>

Wit 2: F V 376'-707 C* 129 n s(28) 527 y121 319 646 Lat cod 100 Ruf Num XIX 4 Arab Arm Co Syh = Compl MT

Notes: NUM adds the phrase καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ὥγ which is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew, and some hexaplaric and many other manuscripts omit this phrase. This may be due to hexaplaric influence, and the phrase was possibly originally under the obelus.

Num 24:24

HT כִּתִּים
LXX Κιτιαίων

(oι λ') Χεττιείμ

Wit 1: 54xt

Wit 2: 761xt δ610 127c-458xt ↓ t 319 Tht Num 221ap

Var: Χεττιείμ| Χεττιήμ 84

Notes: HT has כִּתִּים, a name used originally in Genesis 10:4 for a descendant of Japheth, one of a group of his descendants who settled the coastlands of the nations. Later it came to refer to Cyprus (Isa 23:1) or more generally to the islands of Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean (e.g., Dan 11:30). Two unattributed notes give alternate renderings from Κιτιαίων in NUM. The first is from n-group manuscript 54, and provides the spelling Χεττιείμ which is closer to HT than NUM. Symmachus renders כִּתִּים using Κεττάν or Χεττάν in Genesis 10:4. Theodotion uses Κίτιοι in Daniel 11:30, which matches NUM at Genesis 10:4. Finally, a note attributed to oι λ' has Χεττιείμ for כִּתִּים at Isaiah 23:1. This note is possibly attributable to oι λ', and is
perhaps more likely to be from Aquila, whose Tendenz when he does transliterate is to match Hebrew names exactly (REI-Pro 19).

A second note is in F\(^b\) and gives the reading Κυπρίων. It is probably a scribal gloss (see Chapter 4 for a discussion).

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} & \text{עֵבֶר} \\
\text{LXX} & \text{Ἐβραίους}
\end{array}
\]

\[<\text{oī λ'}> ΨΕβερ\]

\text{Wit 1: F}^b
\text{Wit 2: Lat cod 91 92 94--96}
\text{NonGr: La heber}

Notes: Here NUM translates עֵבֶר the way it normally translates עִבְרִי (“Hebrew”). However, as a proper name עֵבֶר refers to an ancestor of Abraham in Genesis 10:21, and the LXX usually renders it ΨΕβερ. This transliteration could come from any of the Three, and perhaps more likely from Theodotion or Aquila who transliterate more commonly than Symmachus, particularly proper names. It could also be a scholiast’s explanatory note.

\textbf{Numbers 25}

\textbf{Num 25:2}

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HT} & \text{(רַעֲשִׁלָהּ נָיבוֹ)} \\
\text{LXX} & \text{(ἐφαγεν ὁ λαὸς) τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν}
\end{array}
\]

\text{Sub ÷}

\text{Wit 2: G Syh}

\text{>}

\text{Wit 2: 58 Arab = MT}

\text{NonGr: Syh}}^1 \text{Syh}^1 \text{Syh}^1
Notes: HT says that the Moabite women invited the people of Israel to the "sacrifices of their gods" and that "the people ate," with the implication that what they ate was the previously mentioned sacrifices. NUM makes this explicit by adding τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν after ἔφαγεν, and Origen places this phrase under the obelus.

Manuscript G has an obelus only around the final αὐτῶν but this is a mistake, as the original obelus apparently indicated the entire phrase. G occasionally has sign errors in NUM. Syh often misplaces Aristarchian signs. Syh\(^{L}\) includes the obelus around "their sacrifices" but leaves out αὐτῶν, but this is also incorrect. The confusion in placing the initial obelus in Syh may be from a mismatch in prepositions between Greek and Syriac. In the Greek, the genitive is being employed in a partitive manner without a preposition, but the Syh translator rendered the same idea by including the preposition αὐτῶν.

**Num 25:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha'\ \theta')</td>
<td>ἔζευγίσθη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* HT says, "the people were joined (יִצָּמֶד) with Baal-peor." The verb is the Niphal of צָמֵד, and NUM renders this contextually as ἐτελέσθη which can mean in the passive "be initiated" (e.g., into cult mysteries — see Liddell-Scott). A note ascribed to Aquila and Theodotion appears in M and several s-group manuscripts and reads ἔζευγίσθη (from ζευγίζω — the passive meaning "be joined/bound"); this is closer in meaning to the Hebrew. No other examples exist of any of the Three using ζευγίζω or its by-form ζεύγνυ*ι, although all of the Three use the related noun ζεύγος for the related Hebrew צֶמֶד (σ': Isa 21:7, Jer 28[51]:23; α' σ' θ': Isa 5:10). The rendering matches the Hebrew well and is thus consistent with Aquila and Theodotion.

\(\langle\alpha'\ \theta'\rangle\) ἔζευχθη

*Notes:* HT says, "the people were joined (יִצָּמֶד) with Baal-peor." The verb is the Niphal of צָמֵד, and NUM renders this contextually as ἐτελέσθη which can mean in the passive "be initiated" (e.g., into cult mysteries — see Liddell-Scott). A note ascribed to Aquila and Theodotion appears in M and several s-group manuscripts and reads ἔζευγίσθη (from ζευγίζω — the passive meaning "be joined/bound"); this is closer in meaning to the Hebrew. No other examples exist of any of the Three using ζευγίζω or its by-form ζεύγνυ*ι, although all of the Three use the related noun ζεύγος for the related Hebrew צֶמֶד (σ': Isa 21:7, Jer 28[51]:23; α' σ' θ': Isa 5:10). The rendering matches the Hebrew well and is thus consistent with Aquila and Theodotion.

\(\langle\alpha'\ \theta'\rangle\) ἔζευχθη
Notes: This F note uses ἐζεύχθη (from ζεύγνυμι) rather than ἐζευγίσθη (from ζευγίζω) which appears in the note attributed to α' and θ' (covered above). This note may be derived from the reading attributed to α' and θ'.

Num 25:4

HT

LXX

εἴηται (παντὶ)

(λαβέ) τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς (τοῦ λαοῦ)

ο' θ' pr πάντας

\[\text{Wit 1: } \downarrow 130-344- \downarrow 346\]

\[\text{Wit 2: } B F^a \downarrow O-82 d 53' n t 71-509 \downarrow 319 799 \text{ Phil III 223} \text{ Cyr I 908 IV 300} \]

\[\text{Lat cod 91 92 94—96 100 Co Syh (sed hab Aug} \text{ Loc in hept IV 79 Num 52} \]

\[\text{Ruf} \text{ Num XX 4) = Compl Ra}\]

Attr: \[\text{ο' θ'] > 130-346}\]

Var: λαβέ pr πάντας 58 | τοῦ λαοῦ} + πάντας 346; + πάντος 319

NonGr: La omnes | Syh لحلاصم

Notes: According to HT, the Lord orders Moses to take “all” (כל) the elders of the people and execute them. Many Greek manuscripts include the equivalent πάντας and Rahlfs included it in his edition. Manuscript 344 from the s-group has indicated that πάντας is an o' reading, which in the s-group usually refers to a reading from the o' text that differs from the s-group text. Based on this and further text-critical evidence, Wevers has excluded πάντας from his critical edition (see his discussion in THGN 135). Wevers proposes that Origen derived this reading from Theodotion to whom 344 also attributes the reading (NGTN 421), and this is reasonable since Origen is often influenced by Theodotion.

HT

LXX

(ה bâtiment)

(יוغضופ)

Sub ※ τῶν

\[\text{Wit 2: } A F M' O'' C'' b 56-246 s^{(-28)} 527-619 y z 55 59 424 624 646 799 \text{ Phil III 223 Syh}\]

Attr: ※ G | > rel
Notes: Apparently Origen added τῷ under the asterisk to match the preposition in the common expression Ἰακώβ, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts and many others. Why he did so for this verse is not easy to explain. The phrase Ἰακώβ appears 62 times in Numbers. In 60 places, NUM translates with the dative κυρίῳ and does not include the definite article. In two instances (18:12 and 28:11), in contexts similar to the other 60, NUM translates Ἰακώβ with the definite article as τῷ κυρίῳ. Of those places where NUM does not have the article, Origen only rarely sees fit to add an article under the asterisk (e.g., 6:6, 6:12, 28:26, 29:13, 31:38: see NGTN 96 and HEXNUM1 under 6:6).

HT
LXX
παραδειγμάτισον (αὐτοὺς)

α’ ἀνάπηξον

Wit 1: M’ ↓58 C’↓54cal-458 85’↓321-344-346 ↓128 Lat Aug Num 52 SyhT = Sixt

Attr: α’] nom absc 321

Var: ἀνάπηξον] σπαγξον 128 c var l + αὐτοὺς 58

NonGr: Lat Aug Num 52 confige | SyhT ἀνάπηξον

Notes: Hebrew Ῥάπαθ is a Hiphil from the root Ῥά theta. The Qal is used in Genesis 32:26 to refer to what happened to Jacob’s thigh after the angel touched it, but the meaning of the Hiphil is not certain. It refers to displaying a dead body publicly in 1 Kingdoms 31:10, and to executing men by hanging in 2 Kingdoms 21:6. Salvesen notes the resemblance to the Arabic waqa’ā which means “fall down” (SITP 139 note 43). Thus the meaning in the present verse seems to refer to public execution. NUM chooses the neutral rendering παραδειγμάτισον (“to make an example”). Aquila, however, renders closer to the Hebrew using ἀνάπηξον (from ἀναπηγόμενον) which means “impale.” He uses this also for the Hiphil of Ῥά in 2 Kingdoms 21:6 and 9.

A variant in manuscript 128 has the simplex form σπαγξον (from σπαγχω) which means “to choke,” with the middle meaning “to hang oneself” and the passive “to be hanged.” Thus, the meaning is similar, but this probably represents a later scribal modification.

σ’ κρέμασον
Wit 1: \( M' \downarrow 58 \) \( C^{\text{cat}} \downarrow 108 \) \( 54^{\text{ext}} \downarrow 75' \) \( 85' \downarrow 321-344 \) \( 346 \) \( 128 \) \( \text{Lat Aug Num 52} = \text{Sixt} \)

Attr: \( \sigma' + \alpha' \) \( 108 \mid > 75' \mid \text{nom absc 321} \)

Var: \( \text{κρέμασον} + \alpha' \) \( \alpha' \) \( 58 \)

NonGr: \( \text{Lat Aug Num 52} \) \( \text{suspende} \)

Notes: In place of \( \piαραδειγμάτισον \) in NUM, an \( \sigma' \) note gives a rendering closer to the meaning of \( \text{ἀναπηχόν} \) by using \( \text{κρέμασον} \) (from \( \text{κρεμάννυμι} \) or \( \text{κρεμάζω} \)) meaning “to hang.” Symmachus also uses \( \text{κρεμάννυμι} \) for \( \text{ Yapı } \) in 2 Kings 25:6 and so this attribution is reasonable.

Manuscript 108 attributes this reading also to Aquila, who does use the verb \( \text{κρεμάννυμι} \) but not for \( \text{ Yapı } \). Aquila has the reading \( \text{ἀνάπηχόν} \) attributed to him here (see above) which is better attested and fits Aquila’s usage more closely, and so this added attribution of \( \text{κρέμασον} \) to \( \alpha' \) is probably not correct.

Num 25:5

HT

\( \text{שֹׁפְטֵי ישֶׁרֶל} \)

LXX

ταῖς φυλαῖς (Ἰσραήλ)

\( \langle \text{oī λ'} \rangle \) \( \text{τοῖς κριταῖς} \)

Wit 1: \( 130-321' \)

Notes: The Hebrew \( \text{שֹׁפְטֵי} \) is rendered as \( \text{ταῖς φυλαῖς} \) by the NUM translator, who possibly read it as \( \text{טֵיבְשִׁ} \). Or, as Wevers suggests, it is possible that the translator was thinking of the leaders of tribes who were appointed as judges as at Exodus 18:25-26 (NGTN 422). In Deuteronomy 1:15, \( \text{שֹׁפֵט} \) is translated by the LXX using \( \text{τοῖς κριταῖς} \), and thus the distinction between the two words may have been blurred at times. An unattributed \( s \)-group reading has \( \text{τοῖς κριταῖς} \) which matches the Hebrew. The Three routinely use \( \text{κριτής} \) for \( \text{שֹׁפֵט} \) (e.g., \( \alpha' \): Isa 40:23; \( \alpha' \sigma' \) \( \theta' \): Mic 5:1[4:14], Isa 3:2). Thus any of them could have been the source of this reading.

HT

\( \text{נַפְשִׁים פְּרָצִים} \)

LXX

τὸν τετελεσμένον

\( \sigma' \) \( \text{τοῦς μυθέντας} \)

Wit 1: \( M' \downarrow 58 \downarrow 85' \downarrow 321' \downarrow 344 \)
**Num 25:6**

| **HT** | שִׁישׁ‎ |
| **LXX** | ἄνθρωπος|

*Notes:* An unattributed note in F⁶ gives the alternate reading ἄνήρ instead of ἄνθρωπος to render שִׁישׁ. This note could be from Aquila or Theodotion who tend to use ἄνήρ routinely for שִׁישׁ. And it could be from Symmachus, who generally avoids the use of ἄνηρ for שִׁישׁ when the latter is used as an indefinite pronoun but does employ ἄνηρ when the individual is definitely male, which is the case in the present verse (SITP
126, 241). The note could also be a scribal gloss intended to highlight that the person who violated the covenant was a male.

**Notes:** HT says that a man from the sons of Israel “brought to his brothers (אֶחָיו) a Midianite woman.” MT points אֶחָיו as plural, but NUM reads it as singular which is also consistent with the consonantal text. Second, NUM translates as if the words אֶל (preposition) and אֶת (direct object marker) have been transposed. Thus NUM has: “he brought his brother to the Midianite woman.” An unattributed note gives an alternate rendering, using προσήγγισεν for קָרַב, treating אֶחָיו as plural, and matching the Hebrew by keeping the preposition and particle in their proper order. The reading is likely from Aquila. First, the use of προσέγγίζω is consistent with Aquila’s rendering of קָרַב at Isaiah 8:3. Second, and more significantly, the reading replaces the direct object marker with σὲν which is characteristic of Aquila but not of the other two translators.

**Num 25:7**

**HT**

רֹמַח

**LXX**

σιρομάστην

**α’**

ΚΟΝΤΟΝ

**Wit 1:**  
\[F^b\ M' \downarrow 58 \ C^{cat} 54^{\text{ext}} \downarrow 458 85’-321’ \downarrow 343-344 18 = \text{Sixt} \]

**Wit 2:**  
\[\downarrow 376 \downarrow 767 \]

**Attr.:**  
α’ > F^b 58 458 343

**Var.:**  
σιρομάστην] pr κοντόν 767; pr κοντόν δόρυ 376
Notes: Hebrew רֹמַח means “lance” and NUM renders it using σιρομάστην which has a similar meaning. A note attributed to α’, witnessed in many manuscripts, renders רֹמַח as κοντόν which means “a pole.” The other example of Aquila rendering רֹמַח is in Jeremiah 26[46]:4. The only witness there is Syh which has ܐ时空, meaning “pole” or “javelin,” and this is consistent with κοντός. The data is scanty, but no reason exists to doubt this attribution.

σ’ δόρυ

Wit 1: ↓M’ ↓58 C’t 54xt 85’-321’-344 18 = Sixt
Wit 2: ↓376
Attr: σ’] > M’ 58
Var: σιρομάστην] pr κοντόν δόρυ 376

Notes: The rendering δόρυ is attributed to σ’ in many manuscripts. This is the only example from the Three that renders רֹמַח this way, although the LXX of Chronicles uses δόρυ for רֹמַח regularly. Symmachus uses δόρυ to render חֲנִית in 4 Kingdoms 11:10. Because the meaning of רֹמַח has some overlap with חֲנִית, and because the attribution is attested by a number of normally reliable sources, the attribution is probably accurate.

HT
LXX
Sub ※ αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O-72-82 C” b 85’-321’ 59 646 Arm Co Syh (sed hab Compl) = MT
Attr: ※ G | > rell
NonGr: Syh סָיָּה שָׂמִים

Notes: HT includes a pronominal suffix that is not translated by NUM. Origen added the equivalent αὐτοῦ under the asterisk.

Num 25:8

HT
LXX
〈οἳ λ′〉 ἀνδρός

Wit 1: F^b

Notes: Similar to 25:6 (and later in this verse), an unattributed note in F^b substitutes ἀνδρός for ἀνθρώπου in NUM to render ἁνήρ. As with 25:6, the note could be from Aquila or Theodotion who tend to use ἀνήρ routinely for ἁνήρ and it could possibly be from Symmachus who uses ἀνήρ for ἁνήρ when it refers to a male individual as in the present context (see SITP 126, 241).

HT  הַקֻּבָּה(אֶל
LXX  (εἰς τὴν) κάμινον

α′  τὸ τέγος

Wit 1: M' ↓707 C'^cat ↓54'^txt ↓85'-↓321'-↓344 ↓18 Procop 873 Syh^T

Attr: α'] > 18; nom absc 321

Var: τό| pr εἰς Syh^T; > 707 54'^txt 85'-321'-344

NonGr: Syh^T אֲחַזְמָה אֲחַז

σ′  εἰς τὸ πορνεῖον

Wit 1: ↓58 108 ↓343 Syh^T

Wit 2: ↓767

Attr: σ'] > 58 343 767

Var: πορνεῖον] -νιον 58 343

NonGr: Syh^T אֲחַזְמָה אֲחַז

σ′  τὸ πορνεῖον

Wit 1: M' ↓707 ↓C'^cat ↓54'^txt 85'-↓321'-↓344 ↓18 Procop 873 = Sixt
Notes: The word הָבּוּ in HT — the place to which the Israelite took the Midianite woman — is a hapax legomenon. Many believe that it is related to the Arabic qubbat which means “dome” (cf. Latin cupola = domed structure). Also, in Syriac مَصْرَع refers to a vault or dome. NUM renders the word using κάμινον which means “furnace” and this is puzzling, unless some furnaces had a domed structure (see Wevers’ discussion in NGTN 424-25).

A note attributed to α’ renders הָבּוּ as תֶגָו, which could refer to a roof or covered chamber, but in Hellenistic and later times came also to refer to a brothel (see Liddell-Scott). Similarly an σ’ note renders the Hebrew using πορνεῖον meaning “brothel.” The attributions are probably correct. Symmachus, and perhaps Aquila, infused a value judgment into their translations, and Wevers argues that their renderings should not be used as linguistic evidence for the meaning of the Hebrew (NGTN 424, note 20). The C’ and manuscript 18 variants (πυρινίον and πύρινον) although similar phonetically to πορνεῖον, actually are closer in meaning to κάμινον in NUM. The alternate spelling may be a scribal error, possibly influenced by NUM.

HT
LXX

\( \text{אִישׁ} \)
\( \text{ἄνθρωπον} \)

\( \langle \text{oí } \lambda' \rangle \)
\( \text{ἄνδρα} \)

Wit 1: F\(^b\)

Notes: Similar to 25:6 and earlier in this verse, an unattributed note in F\(^b\) substitutes ἄνδρα instead of ἄνθρωπον in NUM to render אִישׁ. As with the earlier cases, the note could be any of the Three (see the discussion for the \( \langle \text{oí } \lambda' \rangle \) entry earlier in this verse).

HT
LXX

(הֶבַת)
(חְוָטָא)

\( \langle \text{oí } \lambda' \rangle \)
\( \text{διὰ τοῦ [κοιλι]δ{ε̣}ίου} \)

Wit 1: F\(^b\)

HT
LXX

(π)כֶּנֶב
μήτρας
οἱ λ′ κοιλίας

Notes: HT says that the spear pierced through the κεβά (stomach) of the woman. NUM gives the rendering μήτρας meaning “womb.” Two Fb notes give the alternate readings (1) κοιλίδιου, the genitive of a diminutive of κοιλία, a word which refers to the belly or abdomen, and (2) κοιλίας the genitive of κοιλία. Like κ喹 in Deuteronomy 18:3. All of the Three use κοιλία but not for κ喹 (α' for מעש in Jer 38[31]:20; σ' for מעש in Isa 16:11 and for בֶּטֶן in Isa 44:1, 48:8; θ for Aramaic מעש [corresponding to Hebrew מעש in Dan 2:32). Thus, any of the Three could have used κοιλία as an alternative to NUM.

Num 25:11

HT (בֶּטֶן (אֶת־קִנְאָתִי)) וֹ (בְּקַנְא לXX (ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαί *ου τὸν ζῆλον)

Sub ※ αὐτόν

Notes: The HT phrase אֶת־קִנְאָתִי בְּקַנְאו uses an infinitive construct followed by a cognate noun. NUM translates literally with an infinitive and a cognate noun, but of the two Hebrew possessives, it renders only the second. For the second possessive, NUM also changes the Hebrew order and places *ου before τὸν ζῆλον. Origen makes two changes to HT. First he adds the possessive αὐτόν under the asterisk. Second he transposes *ου after ζῆλον to match the Hebrew order (see below). Manuscript G has an obelus where the asterisk should be, but this is clearly a mistake.

non tr τὸν ζῆλον *ου
NonGr:  La zelum meum | Syh ليلته دل

Notes:  As noted above, HT reads, “in his being jealous with my jealousy.” NUM omits the third person possessive and puts the first person possessive before ζῆλον. Origen placed the third person possessive αὐτόν under the asterisk (see above), and also moved μου after ζῆλον to match the Hebrew order, as witnessed by the O-group and reflected in other manuscripts.

Num 25:12

Sub ☆ τὴν διαθήκην ☆ μου εἰρήνης

Wit 1:  ↓707

Wit 2:  ↓A ↓M' ↓O'↓82↓707 ↓C'' ↓d ↓f(129) ↓n ↓s(28) ↑τ ↓527↓619 ↓121↓318 ↓392 ↓18'↓68'↓120↓122↓126↓628↓630' ↓55 ↓59 ↓424 ↓624 ↓646 ↓799 Syh

Attr:  ※ G Syh[T] > rell

Var:  τὴν διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης| διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης 58-707ثال 527-619 392 68'-120 59; διαθήκην μου διαθήκην εἰρήνης 343' 18'-126-628-630; τὴν διαθήκην εἰρήνης μου G; τὴν διαθήκην διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης 318; τὴν διαθήκην μου διαθήκην εἰρήνης A M' 376 ol 82-707𝗺ง C'' d f(129) n s(28)343' t 121 122 55 424 624 646 799

NonGr:  Syh[T] لَٰ اَلُّ دَلَّ مَعَهُ | Syh[T]

Notes:  The Hebrew is unusual in that it leaves סלָחָה in an ambiguous position. It reads literally, “I give you my covenant, peace (בריתちゃん).” One could take “peace” in apposition to “my covenant” and read, “I give you my covenant, even peace.” If instead the intent is to say “my covenant of peace” one would expect the pronominal suffix to be on סלָחָה and not בְּרִית and not as seen for example in Isaiah 54:10 (cf. also Malachi 2:5 which constructs a similar phrase using a copula). NUM avoids the issue by ignoring the suffix and rendering the remaining phrase as a bound form: διαθήκην εἰρήνης.

The Hexapla clearly has attempted to address the mismatch with the Hebrew by reintroducing the possessive pronoun, and it probably also adds a definite article before
Two lines of evidence help to uncover Origen’s work. First the Aristarchian signs in the text, and second, marginal notes attributed to ο’. The asterisk is covered in this section, and the marginal notes below.

Manuscript G has placed an asterisk and metobelus around τήν and SyhL may have attempted to do the same (see the NonGr entry above). But Hexaplaric witnesses (58 426 707 Syh) and many other manuscripts influenced by them indicate that the μου was also a result of Origen’s work. Thus the hypothesis advanced here is that although τήν was in the ο’ text (possibly Origen’s attempt to render the direct object marker תָּאֵ), the original asterisk was used to indicate *ου, and later the asterisk incorrectly became associated with τήν.

The exact hexaplaric changes are difficult to unravel due to the varied impact of the ο’ text on later manuscripts. The manuscript evidence is summarized below. Group 1 contains those manuscripts that agree with the critical text of NUM and thus display no influence from the ο’ text, while groups 2-7 show its influence.

1. διαθήκην εἰρήνης: B F V 29-72 b 71-509 407 319 1Lat cod 100 Ambr Ps 118 XVIII 10 Hi Mal 2 Aeth Arm Co
2. διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης: 58-707txt 527-619 392 68' -120 59
3. τήν διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης: 426 Syh
4. τήν διαθήκην εἰρήνης μου: G
5. διαθήκην μου διαθήκην εἰρήνης: 343' 18' -126-628-630'
6. τήν διαθήκην διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης: 318
7. τήν διαθήκην μου διαθήκην εἰρήνης: A M' 376 ol 82-707mgr C' d f'-129) n s'(28) 343' ι 121 122 55 424 624 646 799

According to the witness of the O-group, the Hexapla adds τήν and μου, and the original hexaplaric order seems to have been τήν διαθήκην μου εἰρήνης. G and SyhL have placed τήν under the asterisk, but Wevers suggests that μου was originally under the asterisk rather than τήν (THGN 48). Later he also proposed the idea that the phrase τήν μου was originally before διαθήκην and under the asterisk (NGTN 426).

Wevers is probably correct in his assessment that the asterisk originally indicated μου. This implies that the asterisk was later mistakenly associated with τήν, and this is reasonable as such confusion of Aristarchian signs is not uncommon, particularly where Origen’s activity is seen in two separate places.

As for Wevers’ reconstruction that places τήν μου before διαθήκην, this would be the more difficult reading, but the evidence does not support it. First, Origen’s normal tendency is to place possessive pronouns after the nouns they modify to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix, even modifying the NUM word order to do so (e.g., see under
24:5, 22). Second, no witnesses, hexaplaric or otherwise, have the phrase τὴν μοῦ before διαθήκην. Third, in addition to the O-group, the ο’ reading from 344 (covered below) also places μοῦ after διαθήκην. In conclusion, it is likely that the ο’ text reads τὴν διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης, and that μοῦ was originally under the asterisk.

HT          διαθήκην εἰρήνης
LXX         διαθήκην εἰρήνης

ο’ θ’      διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης

Wit 1:  ↓707 344

Wit 2:  ↓A ↓M’ ↓O’ ↓82-707 ↓C’ ↓d ↓f→(129) ↓n ↓s→(28) ↓t 527-619 ↓121- ↓318-392 ↓18’-68’-120- ↓122- ↓126-527-619-392’ ↓55 59 ↓424 ↓624 ↓646 ↓799 ↓Syh

Var:      διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης] διαθήκην μοῦ διαθήκην εἰρήνης 343’ 18’-126-628-630’; τὴν διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης 426 Syh; τὴν διαθήκην εἰρήνης μοῦ G; τὴν διαθήκην διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης 318; τὴν διαθήκην μοῦ διαθήκην εἰρήνης; A M’ 76 ol 82-707mg C’ d f→(129) n s→(28) 343’ i 121 122 55 424 624 646 799

NonGr:  Syh^L | Syh^T |

Notes: NUM ignores the pronominal suffix on רָצוֹ נ and translates as if the phrase is רָצוֹ נ רָצוֹ נ, giving διαθήκην εἰρήνης. A 344 note attributed to ο’ and θ’ has the reading διαθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης. Regarding the ο’ attribution, the pronoun μοῦ is added under an Origenic asterisk and so this attribution is probably correct (see the discussion of the translation issues and textual variants under the asterisk above). The reading is also attributed to Theodotion, and it makes sense for him, as it conforms to the Hebrew pronominal suffix. Many manuscripts were affected by this addition, some through the ο’ text but some possibly through θ’.

α’       τὴν συνθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης

Wit 1:  344

Notes: A 344 note attributes the reading τὴν συνθήκην μοῦ εἰρήνης to Aquila in place of διαθήκην εἰρήνης in NUM. Although Aquila often renders the direct object marker ἔστιν using συν, he may have been approximating it here with τὴν (according to his Tendenz to correspond quantitatively with the Hebrew). He accounts for the first person pronominal suffix with μοῦ and then matches NUM with the genitive εἰρήνης. Aquila
regularly uses συνθήκη for בְּרִית (e.g., Gen 6:18, Deut 9:15, Isa 55:3, 61:8, Hos 12:1[2], Mal 2:4). Thus this attribution fits Aquila.

HT שָׁלֹום
LXX εἰρήνης

ο’ εἰρήνην

Wit 1: 344

Notes: This 344 note indicates that Symmachus employs the accusative εἰρήνην rather than the genitive that NUM and Aquila use. This likely means that he took שָׁלֹום to be in apposition to בְּרִית so that he translates: “my covenant, even peace.” This rendering is certainly possible for Symmachus.

Num 25:13

HT ﷣ ﷥
LXX καὶ ἔσται αὐτῶ

ο’ οἱ λ’ καὶ ἔσται αὐτῶ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: A B F M’ V O58 72 b d f129 n 730 t x y392 z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Notes: A 344 note indicates that ο´ and οἱ λ´ agree with NUM with καὶ ἔσται αὐτῶ. Most of the s-group, including 344, have οὔτως or αὐτός instead of αὐτῶ and this note indicates the difference in the o´ text. The reading is supported by virtually all the hexaplaric witnesses. The attribution also makes sense for the Three as it conforms well to the Hebrew.

Num 25:15

HT ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ ﷥ 

non tr τῇ Μαδιανίτιδι τῇ πεπληγυίᾳ

Wit 2: O58 = MT
Notes: Origen reversed the NUM order τῇ Μαδιανίτιδι τῇ πεπληγυίᾳ to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58), although interestingly not by Syh.

HT: τὴν Ἀμαὴν
LXX: (ἀρχοντος Ἐθνους) Ὀμμὼθ

Sub ÷

Wit 2: ↓G Syh

>  

Wit 2: Arab = MT

Var: Ὄμμῳθ] σομμῳθ G

NonGr: Syh 🍂 אטסאג + אטסאג

Notes: HT says that Tsur, the father of the Midianite woman, was “head of a family” (הָאָמָן שָׁנַר). NUM has given both a translation and a transliteration of תאהם, as if it were also a family name: Ἐθνους Ὀμμὼθ. Origen placed the transcription Ὄμμῳθ under the obelus, although whether Ἐθνους or Ὄμμῳθ is properly under the obelus could be debated (NGTN 429). Many variations exist for the name Ὄμμῳθ and O-group manuscript G has σομμῳθ under the obelus. Interestingly, the Syh rendering of Ὄμμῳθ is אטסאג which also means “of the people.”

HT: תאהם
LXX: (Ἐθνους) Ὅμμῳθ

†(θ′) φυλῶν

Wit 1: Ἔβ

Notes: Manuscript Ἔβ has the reading φυλῶν in place of Ὅμμῳθ in NUM. In this verse, NUM both translates and transliterates תאהם, giving Ἐθνους Ὅμμῳθ. Origen recognized the redundancy and obelized Ὅμμῳθ (see above). The Three all use φυλή for λαатегор (α′: Ps 64[65]:8; Isa 49:1; α′ σ′: Isa 51:4; α′ θ′: Isa 34:1, 51[51]:58), although they all have other equivalents as well. The word λαатег may be related to תאהם (see HALOT). If the index indicated that φυλῶν was intended to replace the entire phrase Ἐθνους Ὅμμῳθ, then one could posit that any of the Three was possibly the source of the reading. But the index indicates that only Ὅμμῳθ is replaced with φυλῶν; this
leaves the reading ἔθνους φυλῶν which still is a double rendering of רַבּוֹת. Aquila would be unlikely to use two roughly equivalent words for one Hebrew word. Symmachus sometimes uses two words for one Hebrew word in the interests of clarity, but it is not obvious in this case how the two words ἔθνους φυλῶν make better sense than either one of the words alone. Finally Theodotion, in order to conform to the LXX word flow, conceivably substituted φυλῶν for Ὄμμωθ but left ἔθνους in place even though it is redundant. The evidence is weak, however. Of course, if the index is incorrect, and the entire phrase ἔθνους Ὄμμωθ was intended, then any of the Three could be the source of the note.

HT אֵשְׁתָּר הָדָן
LXX ἐστιν τῶν Μαδιαν

non tr τῶν Μαδιάν ἐστιν

Wit 2: O\(^{58}\) Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh, המדינה י־כ

Notes: For ἐστιν τῶν Μαδιάν in NUM, Origen transposed ἐστιν to the end of the phrase to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group and Syh.

HT בְּמִדְיָן הוּא בֵּית־אָב
LXX (ὠίκου πατριᾶς) ἐστιν τῶν Μαδιαν

⟨σ′⟩ Όικου τῶν

Wit 1: 130(vid)-321′

Notes: In HT, the end of verse 15 reads: בְּמִדְיָן הוּא בֵּית־אָב. NUM translates this fairly literally as οἶκου πατριᾶς ἐστιν τῶν Μαδιαν. An unattributed note in some s-group manuscripts substitutes οἶκου for ἐστιν which would result in the phrase: οἶκου πατριᾶς οἶκου τῶν Μαδιαν. This can be seen as creating a phrase in apposition to οἶκου πατριᾶς: “a father’s house, a house of Midian.” Aquila would be unlikely to depart from an exact quantitative rendering in this way, and Theodotion would probably be satisfied with the NUM rendering apart from perhaps making minor adjustments. Symmachus is possibly the source of this contextual rendering, although the evidence is scanty.

Num 25:16

HT —
Sub 𝄆

| Notes | NUM adds the phrase, “Speak to the sons of Israel, saying...” which is not in the underlying Hebrew. Similar phrases are common elsewhere in HT of Numbers (e.g., in 5:6, 12, 6:2, 9:10, 15:2, 18). Both Syh and Syh have misplaced the obelus, which should enclose the entire phrase. |
| HT | Num 25:18 |
| LXX | (ἐν δολιότητι) |

Sub  ※  αὐτῶν

| Notes | HT says the Midianites “have been hostile to Israel with their tricks (בובכליהם).” NUM omits the possessive pronoun, and the o’text includes it under the asterisk. |
| Num 26 | Numbers 26 |
| Num 26:1 | |
ο’ οἱ λ’ καὶ πρὸς Ἐλεαζὰρ υἱῶν (ὑν) Ἄαρὼν ἱερέα λέγων

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** O Arab Syh

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** HT states that Eleazar is “the son of Aaron” (בֶּן־אַהֲרֹן) but NUM omits this phrase. The s-group matches NUM, and according to a 344 (s-group) note the ο’ text includes the equivalent υἱῶν Ἀαρὼν. This is supported by the O-group and the phrase may originally have been under the asterisk. 344 also attributes the reading to οἱ λ’ and this makes sense since the added phrase conforms to the Hebrew.

**Num 26:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>μὴ ἄνων</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>μετ’ άνων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**o’ θ’ μετ’ άνων**

**Wit 1:** ↓M ↓85’-↓321’-344

**Wit 2:** A F V ↓O→(G) 58-82 b ↓f→(129) 619 ↓y→392 68’-120 59 ↓416 424 624 799 ↓Aeth → Syh

**Attr:** o’ θ’] > M 85’-321’

**Var:** μετ’ αύτων] pr αὐτοῖς 246 416 l αὐτῶν] αὐτοῦ 72 318 Aeth→

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** The Hebrew reads, “And Moses and Eleazar the priest spoke with them (דָּנָא).” NUM follows this fairly closely: καὶ ἐλάλησεν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἐλεαζάρ ὁ ἱερεὺς μετ’ αύτῶν. Wevers (NGTN 431-32) notes that μετ’ αύτῶν is ambiguous, since one cannot determine if it modifies Ἐλεαζάρ (i.e., “Moses and Eleazar, the priest who was with them, spoke…”) or the verb ἐλάλησεν (as the indirect object designating with whom they spoke). Several manuscripts (B 58-82 71-509 Aeth→ Arm Sa) omit μετ’ αύτῶν, as does Rahlf’s edition. The s-group texts have the alternate reading αὐτοῖς, which Wevers says indicates an understanding that the original μετ’ αύτῶν modifies the
verb. Manuscript 344 from the s-group indicates that μετ’ αὐτῶν is the reading of o’ and θ’, and this is attested by unattributed notes in manuscript M and four other s-group manuscripts. The o’ reading is supported by two of three available O-group manuscripts. That Origen and Theodotion match NUM and render הָרָה using μετ’ αὐτῶν makes sense as it corresponds quantitatively with the Hebrew.

HT
Lev
LXX
(ἐν) Ἀραβώθ

α’
ἐν τῇ ὁ*αλότῃ

Wit 1: Syh

NonGr: Syhσ’    \(\text{α’}\) > 130 343

σ’
ἐν τῇ πεδιάδι

Wit 1: ↓130 ↓343 Syh

Attr: σ’ > 130 343

Var: ἐν τῇ πεδιάδι] πεδίῳ 130

NonGr: Syhσ’

Notes: The Hebrew נְרָה (pointed in MT as the plural of נְרָה) is transliterated by NUM using Αραβώθ in this verse as well as in 26:63 and 31:12. It is translated using δυσ*ή (“west”) in 22:1, 33:48, 49, 50, 35:1, and 36:13. Why the translator treated נְרָה as a proper name in some instances and as a direction in others is not clear, as the contexts of all the verses are similar.

An α’ note has translated נְרָה as ἐν τῇ ὁ*αλότῃ (adapted from a retroversion of Syh by Field) meaning “in the level ground” or “plain.” This retroversion is derived from the Greek α’ note in 31:12, where Aquila uses the similar ὁ*αλός (“even/level”) to translate נְרָה in a similar context. Why he uses a noun in 26:3 and an adjective in 31:12 is not clear. The reading here is consistent with Aquila, however, who uses ὁ*αλός for נְרָה elsewhere in Deuteronomy 1:1, 7, Isaiah 35:6, 40:3, 41:19, 51:3, and Amos 6:14. For the Syh readings, Syhσ has the singular and Syhσ has plural, although the difference in meaning is not significant. The MT pointing נְרָה indicates plural, although the consonantal text for the singular construct form is the same. The retroversion given above (ὁ*αλότῃ) is singular because in 31:12, Aquila renders נְרָה using the singular ὁ*αλά.
A note attributed to Symmachus has the rendering ἐν τῇ πεδιάδι (a form of πεδιάς) also meaning “in the flat” or “in/on/of the plain.” Symmachus uses πεδιάς for עֲרָבָה regularly (e.g., 31:12, Deut 1:7, 4:49, Jer 46[39]:5, Amos 6:14). Thus, this note makes sense for him. As with Aquila, Symmachus construed נַרְבָּה as singular.

**Num 26:4**

| HT  | Init |
| LXX | Init |

\{Sub ~\} \pr ἀριθμησάτε αὐτούς

**Notes:** The Hebrew at the beginning of verse 4 is: מִבֶּן עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה וָמָעְלָה (“from the age of twenty years old and upward). This is a somewhat abrupt transition as it begins Moses and Eleazar’s command to the people, and seems to imply some kind of command before it, such as “take a census.” NUM follows the Hebrew very closely, although it avoids the Hebrew idiom “a son of” before the number of years, and the vast majority of manuscripts follow NUM. Some manuscripts and translations have added text before the beginning of the verse. F, 68', and 120 begin the verse, “Every male of the sons of Israel, give (as) the first-fruits...” AethC begins with “count/enumerate” and similarly, Syh begins with “count them.” SyhL uses a sign that looks like a lemnisk without dots (~) together with a matching metobelus to mark the word מְאֹם (“count”). At 21:5, a similar lemnisk-like sign with metobelus is used where an obelus is clearly warranted, but here, no obvious minus exists — both the Hebrew and NUM agree closely. It is possible that over time scribes made various attempts, in the form of notes, to make sense of the text (e.g., by adding a missing command), and that some of these notes subsequently were copied into the main text. In any case, this SyhL sign does not appear to represent an original mark in the o’text.

| HT  |  יִשְׂרָאֵל |
| LXX | Ἰσραήλ |

\{Sub ÷\}
**Notes:** Syh$^1$ has an obelus in the right margin before the word “Israel” with no matching metobelus. There appears to be no reason for this sign, as both יִשְׂרָאֵל and Ἰσραήλ are well-attested; although 376 has omitted the word “Israel,” no other witnesses do so. This Aristarchian obelus may be associated with another obelus on the following line, which is addressed below. In any event, the obelus for Ἰσραήλ is a probably a mistake and not original to the o’ text.

HT

LXX

\{Sub \div\}

**Notes:** HT reads הלך וגר למארו ממצרים ("The ones coming out of the land of Egypt"). NUM omits the word “land” and reads οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. One might expect Origen to have added an asterisked word to match אֶרֶץ, but no hexaplaric witnesses indicate that he did (although V and Arab have supplied the word γῆς or its equivalent). Syh has no equivalent for אֶרֶץ but it has an unexpected obelus and metobelus that mark the word “Egypt.” Since that word is included in both HT and NUM, the obelus is probably not original to the o’ text. The reason for the sign confusion is not clear.

**Num 26:7**

HT

LXX

ο’ οἱ λ’ τριάκοντα

**Notes:**

Wit 1: B F M’ V O$^{(G)}$ 707$^{mg}$ \(d f^{(-129)} n t x^{(-527)}\) z 59 319 424 624 799 Lat cod 100
Notes: The last number in 26:7 in HT is thirty, and this is matched by NUM. Uncial manuscript A, the Catena group, and others, including the texts of the s-group, have πεντήκοντα. A marginal note in s-group manuscript 344 indicates that the o' text and οἱ λ’ match NUM with τριάκοντα. The o' reading is supported by the O-group, and οἱ λ’ would be expected to agree with HT.

Num 26:9

HT

LXX

Sub ※  + Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβιρών

Wit 2: ↓O-(G) 58 Lat cod 100 ↓Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh[T] > rell

Var: Αβιρών] αβειρ. 376; 'abyrm Syh

NonGr: Lat cod 100 Dathan et Abiron | Syh\ | Syh[T] ✓

Notes: HT lists the sons of Eliab as Nemuel, Dathan, and Abiram. It goes on: קְרוּאֵי הוּא־דָתָן ( הָעֵדָה "this [was] Dathan and Abiram, called of [by] the assembly"). NUM does not repeat the names of Dathan and Abiram; it has οὗτοι ἐπικλητοι τῆς συναγωγῆς. Origen adds the names Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβιρών under the asterisk to match the Hebrew.

Syh[T] has one asterisk before “Dathan” and a second before “and Abiram” followed by a metobelus placed correctly after “Abiram.” The second asterisk is spurious, but the original placement of the signs is clear.

ht

LXX

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh
Notes: Verse 9 lists the three sons of Eliab: Nemuel, Dathan, and Abiram. HT then goes on and provides two facts about Dathan and Abiram in particular: דָתָן אֲשֶׁר הִצּוּ עַל מֹשֶׁה וַאֲבִירָם קְרוּאוּיִם היאָר ("this is the Dathan and Abiram called by the congregation who fought against Moses"). As discussed above, NUM renders the sentence-initial הוּא as οὗτοι but then has no equivalent for דָתָן וַאֲבִירָם and Origen adds ∆αθὰν καὶ Ἀβιρών under the asterisk. HT first describes the men using the phrase קְרוּאוּיִם היאָר where refers back to Dathan and Abiram who appear earlier in the sentence. Since NUM does not include their names in the sentence, it does not use a relative pronoun (e.g., οἱ) but instead repeats the demonstrative pronoun as the subject of a new sentence that begins: οὗτοί εἰσίν οἱ ἐπισυστάνες ἐπὶ Μωυσῆν. The active verb εἰσίν is expressed by NUM using εἰσίν and a participle. Origen places οὗτοί εἰσίν under the obelus. Together with the asterisk, this gives the reading: οὗτοί Δαθὰν καὶ Αβιρών ἐπικλῆται τῆς συναγωγῆς οἱ ἐπισυστάνες ἐπὶ Μωυσῆν, which conforms more closely to HT. Syh⁰ has mislabeled the obelus after the equivalent of οὗτοι instead of before, but Syh⁷ places the signs correctly.

Sub ※ ἐπισυστάσει ※αὐτῶν κατά κυρίου

Notes: HT has a third plural suffix on the infinitive construct of נצחה and this is followed by the preposition עַל. NUM does not render the suffix, and it subsumes the preposition under κυρίου, which functions as an objective genitive (see NGTN 434).
Origen adds both the possessive pronoun and the preposition under the asterisk. Syh⁹ has the asterisk placed correctly, but it has no matching metobelus.

**Num 26:10**

**Sub ‡**

\[\text{Wit 2: Syh}^L\]

\[>\]

\[\text{Wit 2: Sa} = \text{MT}\]

\[\text{NonGr: Syh}^L \text{ ἀνδρός}\]

**Notes:** NUM adds a possessive pronoun with συναγωγῆς which is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus.

**Sub ※ + ἀνδρός**

\[\text{Wit 2: F V O}^{(-G)}-1\text{Lat} \text{cod 100 Bo Syh} = \text{MT}\]

\[\text{Attr: ※ Syh}^L ] > \text{rell}\]

\[\text{NonGr: Lat} \text{cod 100 uiros } | \text{Syh}^L \text{ ἀνδρός } | \text{Syh}^T \text{ αὐτοῦ}\]

**Notes:** The Hebrew explicitly adds the word וַיֵּלָּח after the number of people killed, which NUM omits. Origen includes the equivalent ἀνδρός under the asterisk, as witnessed by the O-group. Syh⁹ mistakenly places the asterisk around the equivalent of καὶ διακοσίους.

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{בֵּית} \]

\[\text{LXX} \quad \text{ἐν σημείῳ}\]

(οἱ λ`) \text{ εἰς φυγήν}
Notes: In HT, Moses declares that when the Lord opened the earth and it swallowed up Korah and his allies, they became “a sign” (לְנֵס). In chapter 21, נֵס is used in the sense of “standard” to refer to the bronze serpent that was placed on top of a pole. NUM translates נֵס in 21:8-9 using σημεῖον which can have the meaning “standard” or “flag.” In the present context, נֵס seems to have the meaning “warning sign,” and NUM renders נֵס using ἐν σημεῖῳ which fits, since the semantic range of σημεῖον also includes the idea of a sign. An unattributed note in two s-group manuscripts and a z-group manuscript has the alternate reading εἰς φυγήν. Elsewhere, the Three normally render נֵס the way MT has it pointed here (נֵס — α’: σύσση*ον in Ps 59[60]:6, Isa 11:10, 13:2, 30:17; θ’: σύσση*ον in Isa 11:10, 30:17 and possibly σημεῖον in Num 21:8; σ’: ὑψος in Num 21:8, 9, σημεῖον in Ps 59[60]:6, σύσση*ον in Isa 11:10, ἵστιον in Isa 30:17). The present reading εἰς φυγήν suggests that נֵס may have been construed as a participle of the verb נוּס (”to flee”), and this would fit in context. In Isaiah 31:9, HT has נֵס and the Masoretes pointed this as the noun נֵס as for the present verse; but there all of the Three employ φυγή, apparently reading נֵס as being derived from נוּס. Thus, any one of the Three could also have been the source of the present note.

Num 26:15

HT
LXX

post (27) fin tr

Wit 2:  O^58 Arab Syh = Compl MT

Notes: The Hebrew presents the next four families counted in the census in the order: Gad, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun. NUM has transposed Gad to verses 24-27, at the end of that sequence so that the order of verses 15-27 is Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Gad. The fifth column has transposed its text to match the Hebrew. According to its normal practice, this apparatus will follow the NUM verse order and list the corresponding verse numbers from the Hebrew in brackets.

Num 26:17[21]

HT
LXX

⟨o’⟩  Ἄμουυλ
Wit 2: 426 = Compl MT

Notes: This change in spelling may possibly originate with Origen, who often changed the spelling of proper names to conform more closely to the Hebrew. Syh has (Syh) which is closer to NUM than to HT. As sometimes happens, O-group manuscript 426 is the only witness that agrees with HT.

HT _acquire_LXX (all) 'Iqomouhli

Wit 2: 426 = Compl MT

Notes: As with the change to the family name (covered above) this change to the related Gentilic may possibly originate with Origen since it conforms more closely to the Hebrew.

Num 26:18[22]

HT יְהוּדָה (מִשְׁפְּחֹת
LXX (ο) τῶν Ἰουδᾶ

o' τῶν 'Ιουδᾶ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: 29-72-426

Notes: The summary phrase plus family name occurs twelve times in Numbers of HT (all in chapter 26), once for each tribe. In each case, NUM begins with the stock phrase οὗτοι δῆμοι. For ten families, the unarticulated family name follows. For Levi, the unarticulated phrase υἱῶν Λευί is used. For Judah, NUM uses a dative article: τῷ Ἰουδᾶ. Dative articles are used for family names outside of the οὗτοι δῆμοι construct in this chapter, but in those instances the Hebrew typically has the lamedh preposition before the family name, and so one would expect the dative.

Origen possibly considered the article on τῷ 'Ιουδᾶ to be a problem, since no lamedh corresponds to it in the underlying Hebrew. 344 indicates that the o’ text has changed the dative singular article to the genitive plural, and this is witnessed by three Greek hexaplaric manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group. At least two possible reasons can be suggested for the change. First, a genitive conforms more closely to the
bound construct phrase מִשְׁפְּחֹת יְהוּדָה (see NGTN 438). Second, the one time in the twelve family summaries when a declinable word is used — in verse 58, NUM has οὗτοι δῆοι υἱῶν Λευί — the word υἱῶν would take a genitive article. Thus τῶν ἱουδα is possibly Origenic. A number of other manuscripts have the genitive singular article (A 85 x 71(527) 121 68'-120) but this could be the result of an inner Greek correction, and independent of Origen.

HT

LXX

οʹ ἐπισκοπήν

Notes: For פְּקוּד in HT, NUM has ἐπισκοπήν. A 344 marginal note (supported by four other s-group manuscripts) attributes the NUM reading to o'. Many manuscripts, including A, M, and V as well as the s-group texts, have the alternate reading ἐπίσκεψιν, which is the most common word in chapter 26 for the “numbered” of a family (26:7, 14, 21[25], 23[27], 27[18], 31[47], 38[34], 41[37], 45[41], 50, 51, 62, 63). By contrast, ἐπισκοπή is only used twice (26:18[22], 47[43]). The o' reading is supported by two O-group manuscripts and other hexaplaric witnesses and is probably accurate.

Num 26:20[24]

HT

LXX

οʹ αʹ θʹ τῶν Σαμράμ

Notes: Syh אֲמִרְעַל
Notes:  Copyists had trouble with the name Σαράμ (Hebrew שִׁמְרֹן) probably because of confusion between final nasals. According to Wevers’ critical text, the original is Σαμράμ (see the discussion in NGTN 438). The s-group texts have Ἄμβράμ and an s-group (344) note indicates that ω’, α’, and θ’ all agree with Σαμράμ in NUM. This reading matches the uncials B and F.

The attribution of Σαμράμ to Origen is supported by few hexaplaric witnesses. The three available O-group manuscripts all have different readings. 58 has Ἄμράμ while 376 has the similar Ἄμβραμ. 426 (along with 82 from the oll-group) agrees with the Hebrew and has Σαμράμ and this could reflect the original o’ text reading. Syh text supports the 344 o’ reading with שִׁמְרֹן (šmrm) and this is a solid witness because Syh, which can be influenced by P in regards to proper names, differs from P here (P has שִׁמְרֹן). In conclusion, the attribution of τῷ Σαμράμ to o’ is possibly correct.

Given Aquila’s tendency to follow the Hebrew form of proper names (see REI-Pro 19), one might expect him to use a final nu, unless his Hebrew text had mem. He is satisfied with the quantitative correspondence between the lamedh preposition and the dative article in NUM. Although questions remain, the attribution is possibly correct. As for Theodotion, he may have been content to follow the LXX, and no strong reasons exist to doubt this attribution to him.

The attribution of τοῦ Σεμρώμ to Symmachus is reasonable, although as with Aquila and Theodotion, the final nun of the Hebrew has been rendered using mu, perhaps under the influence of NUM or the other translators. Symmachus uses omega as the final vowel, perhaps vocalizing in the same way as the Masoretes. He also uses a genitive article rather than the dative of NUM and the other translators. Although this does not strictly follow the Hebrew, it is an acceptable contextual rendering.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad \text{שִׁמְרֹן} \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{ὁ Σαμραμί} \\
\text{o’ α’ θ’} & \quad \text{ὁ Σαμραμεί}
\end{align*}
\]

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: Βε 426*-707* 509 407 Syh = Sixt

NonGr: Syh שִׁמְרֹן

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{σ’} & \quad \text{ὁ Σεμρωνίτης}
\end{align*}
\]

Wit 1: 344
Notes: This entry covers the gentilic form of the family name used earlier in the verse (see above). The s-group texts are mixed (with ἀβραή, ἀβραεί, and ἀβραεί̃). A 344 (s-group) note attributes the reading ὁ Σαραεί to ο′, α′, and θ′ for ἡσαραή in HT. This is quite close to ὁ Σαμραή in NUM. The O-group witness is mixed, with 58 having ἀμφρά, and 376 having ἀμβραεί. 426c has Σαμραή, which is closer to the Hebrew and could reflect the original o′ text. Syh supports the 344 reading, and can be considered a strong witness because it differs from P (which has ܐܘܢ̃). As with the attribution to o′ earlier in the verse, this 344 note possibly reflects Origen’s work.

The 344 reading is possibly accurate for Aquila and Theodotion, with the same questions about μν as the final consonant as for Σαμρά earlier in the verse. As for the σ′ note, Σερωνίτης is a gentilic form common in the LXX (e.g., Gen 38:12 and Exod 4:14) and is close to the Hebrew, and so the attribution is probably correct.

Num 26:21[25]

| HT | ἀρκετὴν ῥοῆς θέσεως ἀνήλικα (τὸς θεόν) |
| LXX | τίτοσσαρες καὶ ἡξήκοντα χιλιάδες καὶ τριακόσιοι |

o′ οἱ λ′ τριακόσιοι

Wit 1: ↓85-344

Wit 2: B M' V O'-(G) 29 707 mg d f 53 129 n t x-(527) 619 128-407-630-669 319 424 624 799 Lat cod 100 Syh

Attr: o′ οἱ λ′ > 85

NonGr: Lat cod 100 CCC1 Syh ܐܢ̇ܘܡ̇ܕ̇l

Notes: HT and NUM have the final count for Issachar as 64,300. A number of manuscripts, including A, F, and s-group texts have 400 for the final part of the number. Marginal notes from s-group manuscripts 85 and 344 indicate that o′ and οἱ λ′ have τριακόσιοι. The attribution to o′ is probably correct as it agrees with the O-group and other hexaplaric witnesses. The attribution to οἱ λ′ also makes sense, as all of the Three would be expected to match the Hebrew.

Num 26:22[26]

| HT | ἡγιασμένη τῆς θείας ἀυλᾶς |
| LXX | τῷ ἅλλῃ δῆμῳ ὁ ἅλληλί

Notes:
ο’ οἱ λ’ τῷ Ἰαλιλ δῆμος ὁ Ἰαλιλεί

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: ↓376-↓426 ↓767 ↓Syh

Var: 'Ἰαλιλ] ἱαλλή 376; ἱαλιήλ 426; ἱαλλῆλ 767 | Ἰαλιλεί] ἱαλειλί 376; ἱαληλί 426; ἱαλῆλ 767; Syh yhyl

NonGr: Syh ܠܡܠܐ ܢܡܠܐ

Notes: The Hebrew name יַחְלְאֵל is rendered by NUM as Ἀλλήλ and the similar gentilic ἡγίαστα Ἁλλεῖλι as ὁ Ἀλλήλ. The s-group texts have variants that begin with Α for both names, and a 344 (s-group) note indicates that the o’ text modified these names to Ἰαλιλ and Ἰαλιλεί respectively, thus reflecting the initial yodh in the Hebrew. To this, with slight variations, two of three available O-group manuscripts agree. In addition, such a correction towards the Hebrew fits Origen’s practice. Thus, the o’ attribution is probably correct. The attribution to οἱ λ’ is suitable, as any of the Three could have conformed more closely to the Hebrew.

Num 26:26[17]

HT  דָּרוֹ (לְ) _packets
LXX (τῷ) Ἀρωδί

{o’} Ἀρωδ

Wit 2: 426 = MT

Notes: O-group manuscript 426 indicates a possible o’ text change of Ἀρωδί in NUM toward the Hebrew. NUM may have been influenced by Sam, which has יָרָד. As periodically happens, O-group manuscript 426 is the only witness that agrees with HT. Syh (with אָרוֹד) is not a witness since it agrees with NUM (and P) against HT and 426.

HT  יָרָד (ן)
LXX (ὁ) Ἀρωδί

{o’} Ἀρωδεί

Wit 2: ↓B* 426 ↓71 ↓59(ε) ↓Bo Syh
Var: Ἀρωδεῖ] Ἀρωδεὶ B* 71; Ἀροδὶ 59(c) Bo

NonGr: Syh ܣܘܚ

Notes: The gentilic version of the family name from earlier in the verse shows possible evidence of Origen’s work. Although Syh technically agrees with O-group manuscript 426 and HT, it also agrees with P, and the Syh translator sometimes was influenced by P for proper names.

Num 26:27[18]

HT בְּנֵי (גָּד)
LXX υἱῶν (Γαδ)

ο’ οἱ λ’ υἱῶν

Wit 1: ↓85’-↓321’-344
Wit 2: B O(G) 29-82 b-19 d 129 n t 71-509 318 407 424 624 799 Syh
Attr: ο’ οἱ λ’] > 85’-321’
NonGr: Syh ܣܘܚ

Notes: Manuscript 344 from the s-group has a note indicating that ο’ and οἱ λ’ match NUM and have υἱῶν to match the Hebrew בְּנֵי. Many witnesses (including the uncials A F M V) and all of the s-group texts are missing υἱῶν. The ο’ text probably had υἱῶν both because this reading is supported by the O-group and because it matches the Hebrew. That the Three have υἱῶν in line with the Hebrew also makes good sense.

Num 26:28

HT —
LXX init — (31) fin

post (47) fin tr

Wit 2: O(G)58 Arab Syh = Compl MT

Notes: As at verse 15, NUM has reordered the tribes compared with HT. The tribe of Asher is dealt with at this point rather than Dan. The ο’ text has transposed
verses 28-31 after verse 47 to match the Hebrew order. According to its normal practice, this apparatus will follow the NUM verse order and list the corresponding verse numbers from the Hebrew in brackets.

**Num 26:29[45]**

**HT**

לְכֶבֶר בְּרִיעָה (לְחֶבֶר)

**LXX**

(τῷ Χόβερ)

**Sub ※ τῶν υἱῶν Βαρία**

**Wit 2:** ↓ $O^{(-G)}$ Syh$^T$

**Attr:** ※ Syh$^T$ > rell

**Var:** Βαρία] -ρεια 376

**NonGr:** Syh$^T$

**Notes:** HT begins the verse with the phrase לְכֶבֶר בְּרִיעָה and NUM has nothing corresponding to it. Origen added its equivalent under the asterisk.

**Num 26:31[47]**

**HT**

מִשְׁפְּחֹת בְּנֵי־אָשֵׁר

**LXX**

δῆ*οι Ἀσήρ

ο′ σ′ δῆ*οι υἱῶν Ἀσήρ

**o′ σ′ δῆμοι υἱῶν ’Ασήρ**

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** $O^{(-G)}$ Syh$^T$

**NonGr:** Syh$^T$

**Notes:** The text attributed to σ′ has noted the addition of the word υἱῶν which corresponds to בְּנֵי but which has no equivalent in NUM. The Origenic addition of υἱῶν is supported by the $O$-group, and may originally have been under the asterisk. As for the σ′ attribution, it is reasonable that Symmachus matched the Hebrew. Symmachus employs δῆμος for מִשְׁפְּחָה in Numbers 36:12.

**HT**

הַמֵּשֶׁר אֲלֵךְ וְאֵרֵבַע מֵאֹות
LXX ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑ ΧΙΛΙΑΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΤΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ

ο’ οἱ λ’ ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑ (なのです) ΧΙΛΙΑΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΤΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ (のです)

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: O(–G) 128-630' Aeth C Arab Syh

NonGr: Syh T

Notes: In HT, the census total for the tribe of Asher is 53,400. A 344 (s-group) note indicates that ο’ and οἱ λ’ match the Hebrew (ν’ = πεντήκοντα and υ’ = τετρακόσιοι). The first census counts for Asher at 1:41 and 2:28 had a total of 41,500. Many manuscripts (e.g., A B F M’ V and the s-group from which the note comes) reflect the τεσσαράκοντα from those previous totals, and in addition have used ἑξακόσιοι instead of τετρακόσιοι, giving 43,600.

The manuscript agreement with each of the Hebrew numbers is as follows:

πεντήκοντα] O(–G) 128-630' Aeth C Arab Syh = Compl
τετρακόσιοι] O(–G) 619 68'-120-128-630' Aeth C Arab Syh = edd

The witnesses that match the Hebrew for both numbers are the O-group, 128, 630', Aeth C, Arab, and Syh. The witness of the O-group and Syh indicates that the 344 ο’ attribution is correct. Wevers argues that only in this verse in NUM is the Origenic reading the original (NGTN 442).

344 also attributes this reading to οἱ λ’, and this is probably correct since it matches the Hebrew

Num 26:36[32]

HT קִנְאָמִיתּ לְפָעְמֵהוֹתָה
LXX τῷ Συμμαέρ δήμος ὧ Συμμαερί

ο’ τῷ Συμμαέρ δήμος ὧ Συμμαερεί

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: Συμμαέρ A B F M’ ↓O (–G) 82* ↓b d f ↓n t x (527) 619* y z 55 59 319 424
Num 26:37[33]

HT  
LXX  ταῦτα (tà ónóματα)

(Sub ÷)

Wit 2:  B² F O¹(G) 58 707 129 x⁽527⁾ 619 59 Arm Sa Syh (sed hab Sixt) = MT

Notes: NUM has ταῦτα tà ónóματα tòν θυγατέρων Σαλπαάδ to introduce the list of the daughters of Zelophehad, but ταῦτα is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew, and many hexaplaric witnesses (and others) omit it. This was possibly originally under the obelus.
Num 26:38[34]

HT  חֲמִשִּׁים
LXX  πεντήκοντα

ο’ οἱ λ’ πεντήκοντα

Wit 1:  85-344
Wit 2:  B F M’ V O-(G) 82 707 b d 129 n t x-527 z 59 319 424 624 799 Syh
NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  Both HT and NUM report that the tribe of Manasseh numbered 52,700. Some witnesses, including A and the s-group, have changed 52,000 to 62,000. A 344 (s-group) marginal note indicates that ο’ and οἱ λ’ match the Hebrew with πεντήκοντα. The attribution to ο’ is supported by the O-group and many other hexaplaric witnesses, and the attribution to οἱ λ’ is reasonable given its adherence to the underlying Hebrew.

Num 26:39[35]

HT  אפֵרֵי (לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם)
LXX  (Εφραίμ)

Sub ※  κατὰ δῆμους αὐτῶν

Wit 2:  O-15 Arab Syh = Compl MT
Attr:  ※ Syh1] > rell
NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  HT includes the phrase לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם (for their families”) after the name Ephraim, and NUM has nothing corresponding to it. Origen added its equivalent under the asterisk.
placed one word too soon, but Syh
reflect this with many variants on the spelling of the names. Syh
under the asterisk, as witnessed by
family of the Becherites” — but NUM omits this phrase. Origen added the equivalent

ο′
LXX
HT
Num 26:41[37]

οὗτοι υἱοι
A number of
probably correct, and this addition was possibly originally under the asterisk. The group has a note attributing the addition of
the Hebrew
more likely derived from the frequently occurring phrase in chapter 26 that uses οὐτοι followed by an individual’s name — for example, in verse 39 where the section on Ephraim begins with the same phrase: οὗτοι υἱοι Ἐφράιμ.

ο′ δῆμοι υἱῶν Ἐφραίμ

HT
Masoretic Text with variant reading
LXX
dῆμοι Ἐφράιμ

Notes: HT includes the standard formula for Becher’s family — “of Becher, the family of the Becherites” — but NUM omits this phrase. Origen added the equivalent under the asterisk, as witnessed by O-group manuscript 426 and Syh, and other witnesses reflect this with many variants on the spelling of the names. Syh has the metobelus placed one word too soon, but Syh has it placed correctly.

Num 26:41[37]

ο′ δῆμοι υἱῶν Ἐφράιμ

Wit 2: Λ’ 58-426 ↓ C’ 246 ↓ s(-28) ↓ 392 18-126-↓ 628 646 Arab ↓ Syh = Compl
MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

Var: βαχαρ] χαβαρ M’ 528 343 ↓ δῆμος] > 528 ↓ ό↓ ] > 529 ↓ βαχαρ(e)i] –ραι
M 52-550’ 321; βαχαρ 414; –ραι 426 57-73‘-77‘-131-313-417-500‘-
528’-529-551-615 85-343‘-730; φαχαραδ 16-46 346; βαχραδ 130*;
βαραι 130‘; βαχαι 413-422; βαραι 616; αβαχ. 628; χαβαραδ 416; χαβαιραδ 392; βαραι 77* | Ταναχ| + τω βαχαρ δῆμος ό
βαχαραι 58

NonGr: Syh↑ ᾽ λέξι, ἐπιμελημένος ※ | Syh↓ ενότητα καθορισμένη

Notes: The O-group and Syh witness to an Origenic addition of υἱῶν to match the Hebrew υἱῶν which NUM omits. The s-group matches NUM, and 344 from the s-group has a note attributing the addition of υἱῶν to the o’ text. The attribution is probably correct, and this addition was possibly originally under the asterisk.

A number of z-group witnesses substitute υἱοι for δῆμοι so that the verse begins οὕτωι υἱοι Ἐφράιμ. This might possibly be a result of the influence the o’ text, but it is more likely derived from the frequently occurring phrase in chapter 26 that uses οὕτωι followed by an individual’s name — for example, in verse 39 where the section on Ephraim begins with the same phrase: οὕτωι υἱοι Ἐφράιμ.
HT

בְּנֵי יֹוסֵף

LXX

δῆμοι υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ

〈ο′〉υἱοί

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: 426 Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT reads אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי יֹוסֵף but NUM adds the extra word δῆμοι and makes the phrase οὗτοι δῆμοι υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ. Two hexaplaric witnesses (426 and Syh) change δῆμοι υἱῶν to υἱοί to match the Hebrew, and this is possibly the original reading of the o’ text.

Num 26:42[38]

HT

אַשְׁבֵּל

LXX

Ἄσυβήρ

〈ο′〉’Ασβήλ

Wit 2: 426 ↓Lat cod 100 ↓Syh

Var: ’Ασβήλ | ‘šbol SyhL; ‘šobl SyhT; asybel Lat cod 100

NonGr: Lat cod 100 asybel | SyhL ▼اسبئل ▼SyhT

Notes: The Hebrew אַשְׁבֵּל is rendered by NUM as Ασβήρ. Two hexaplaric witnesses — 426 and Syh — show corrections toward the Hebrew, and these possibly reflect Origen’s work. Wevers notes that confusion of the liquids /r/ and /l/ is an issue in other languages (see NGTN 446-47).

O-group manuscript 426 sometimes agrees with HT independently from the rest of the O-group (see the detailed discussion in Chapter 5). As for Syh, it is not always a reliable witness for proper names because of Paul of Tella’s tendency to follow P in reproducing names. For example, for the present verse Syh matches P with the same final consonant (P has אַשְׁבֵּל). Such agreement, however, is not universal. For example, in 26:46[42], HT and P agree (עֲשָׂבָּם and עֲשָׂבָּל) against Syh (אַשְׁבֵּל).
LXX (ὁ) Ἀσυβηρί

⟨οʼ⟩ Ἀσβηλεί

Wit 2: 426 ↓Lat cod 100 ↓Syh

Var: Ἀσβηλεί] dʼšbol Syh¹; dʼšobl Syh⁷; asybel Lat cod 100

NonGr: Lat cod 100 asybel | Syh⁷ ḏšbol | Syh⁷ ḏšbol

Notes: In HT, the gentilic Ἀσβηλεί is rendered by NUM as Ἀσυβηρί. Two witnesses — 426 and Syh — indicate a possible o’ text correction toward the Hebrew. Syh matches P for this name, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

HT אָשְׁבֵּלִי
LXX Ἀσβηλεί

⟨οʼ⟩ Ἀχιράμ

Wit 2: 58-↓426-707 ↓53-↓56-246 54-75 ↓318 Syh⁷

Var: Ἀχιράμ] Ἀχειράμ 426 53 318; Ἀχιράμ 56

NonGr: Syh⁷ ḏḥyrm

Notes: The Hebrew אֵחיירָם is rendered by NUM as Ἀχιράμ. This is an example of confusion between final nasals (see, e.g., under 26:20). Several hexaplaric witnesses and others correct the final consonant to match the Hebrew, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. Syh and P agree for this name, and so Syh may reflect P rather than the o’ text.

HT אֵחיירָם
LXX Ἀχιράμ

⟨οʼ⟩ Ἀχιραμί

Wit 2: Ἀχιραμί 58 56 ↓Ἀχιραμεί 707 ↓Ἀχιραμεί 53 ↓Ἀχιραμεί 426 ↓Ἀχιράμ 54-75 ↓dʼhyrm Syh

NonGr: Syh ḏšbol
Notes: The gentilic אֲחִירָמִי is related to the family name אֲחִירָם earlier in the verse, and it is rendered by NUM as Ἀχιράνι. This is an example of confusion between final nasals (see, e.g., under 26:20). Several hexaplaric and other witnesses correct the final consonant to match the Hebrew, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. Syh and P agree for this name, and so Syh possibly reflects P rather than the o’ text.

Num 26:43[39]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>שְׁפוּפָם</td>
<td>Σωφάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o’)</td>
<td>Σωφάμι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wit 2: 58 426 Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Hebrew שְׁפוּפָם is rendered by NUM as Σωφάν. Two O-group witnesses (and Syh) correct the final consonant toward HT, although they do not add in the extra pe of the Hebrew. This may be evidence of Origen’s work. Syh and P agree for this name, and so Syh may reflect P rather than the o’ text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מִשְׁפַּחַת הַחוּפָמִים</td>
<td>(ὁ) Σωφανί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o’)</td>
<td>Σωφαμί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wit 2: 58 ↓Syh

Var: Σωφαμί] šofam Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Hebrew gentilic שׁוּפָמִי is rendered by NUM as Σωφανί. O-group manuscript 58 and Syh correct the final consonant toward the Hebrew, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. Syh is possibly influenced by P with which it agrees rather than the o’ text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לְהוֹפָם מַשָּׁחַת חֹוֵפָם</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub ※ τῷ Οὐφάμ δῆμος ὁ Οὐφαμί

Wit 2: \(\downarrow O^{(G)} \downarrow 767\) Arab \(\downarrow Syh^T =\) Compl MT

Attr: ※ Syh^T] > rell

Var: Οὐφάμ] ᾿Ιουβαν 376; –μει 767; ἡwpym Syh^T | Οὐφαμί] Οὐφαμεί 426 767; ᾿Ιεβουμή 376; dhwpym pro ὁ οὐφ. Syh^T

NonGr: Syh^T

Notes: At the end of 26:43[39], HT has the typical combination of the name of an individual family head followed by the family gentilic, and NUM does not translate the phrase. Origen added the equivalent Greek under the asterisk, as evidenced by the O-group. As often happened, subsequent copyists introduced variants to the proper names.

Num 26:44[40]

HT

LXX

Sub ※ + τῷ ᾿Αδὲρ δῆμος ὁ ᾿Αδερί

Wit 1: \(\downarrow 618\)

Wit 2: \(\downarrow M' \downarrow O^{(G)} 376\) \(\downarrow 618\) \(\downarrow 56' 619\) 18-126-628-630' \(\downarrow Bo^B \downarrow Sa \downarrow Syh =\) edd Ra MT Tar

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

Var: τῷ ᾿Αδὲρ] > MT Tar | τῷ του 58-426 | ᾿Αδέρ] ᾿Αδάρ 56' Bo^B Sa = Compl Sixt Ra; ᾿Αράδ 426; ’rwd Syh | ᾿Αδερί] ᾿Αδαρί 246 = Compl Sixt Ra; ᾿Ασαρί 56; ᾿Αραδεί 426; d’rwd pro ὁ ᾿Αδ. Syh; ᾿Ανάρ Bo^B; ᾿Αδαρεί Sa

NonGr: Syh αὐτάξαν ἀρατοῦ ἀκάτω

Notes: HT for the family of Ard reads מִשְׁפַּחַת אָרְדִּי, but this phrase is omitted by NUM. The usual HT formula in this chapter for describing families consists of the family name preceded by a lamedh preposition then מִשְׁפַּחַת and then the gentilic of the family name. For example, later in this verse for the family of Naaman (נַעֲמָן, HT has לְנַעֲמָן מִשְׁפַּחַת הַנַּעֲמִי). For the family of Ard, HT departs from its usual pattern; it has מִשְׁפַּחַת, but one would expect this to be preceded by לְאַרְדְּ. Origen adds
the phrase τῷ Ἀδὲρ δῆος ὁ Ἀδερί under the asterisk. This not only accounts for מִשְׁפַּחַת הָאַרְדִּי from HT, using δῆος ὁ Ἀδερί, but also precedes this with τῷ Ἀδὲρ, the equivalent of the expected but lacking לְאַרְדְּ. Unlike HT, Sam includes the entire phrase לְאַרְדְּ מִשְׁפַּחַת הָאַרְדִּי, so Origen may have been influenced by Sam. Alternatively, Wevers suggests that MT is defective here and that Origen’s Hebrew text had the full phrase upon which his asterisk is based (THGN 135).

The text tradition indicates that some confusion existed between resh and daleth for the names Ἀδὲρ and Ἀδερί. As sometimes happens, manuscript 426 is the only Greek witness that matches the Hebrew form of the names and it may reflect the original o’ text (see the discussion in Chapter 5).

**Num 26:46[42]**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HT</strong></td>
<td>שׁוּחָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LXX</strong></td>
<td>Σαφί</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The Hebrew individual name שׁוּחָם is rendered by NUM as Σαφί. O-group witness 426 has Σουάμ which follows the Hebrew more closely, and this is possibly evidence of Origen’s work. Here, 426 reflects the Hebrew independently from the rest of the O-group (see the discussion in Chapter 5). For this verse, Syh renders the Hebrew שׁוּחָם as ܐُơ,u and so it is not a witness.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HT</strong></td>
<td>שׁוּחָמִי(הַ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LXX</strong></td>
<td>Σαμί</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The gentilic form of the name שׁוּחָם is שׁוּחָמִי and this is rendered by NUM as Σαμί. O-group witness 426 has Σουαμεί which follows the Hebrew more closely, and this is possibly evidence of Origen’s work. As with the family name covered above, 426 reflects the Hebrew independently from the rest of the O-group.

**Num 26:47[43]**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HT</strong></td>
<td>שׁוּחָמָי(הַ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: The Hebrew gentilic שְׁוּחָמִי is repeated from the previous verse, and is again rendered by NUM as Σαμί. The corrected version of manuscript 426 of the Ο- group has Σοαυμεί which follows the Hebrew more closely, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work.

Notes: HT and NUM list the number for the clan of the Shuhamites (the only clan listed in the tribe of Dan) to be 64,400. Many manuscripts (including the uncial A B F M V) read ἕξακόσιοι instead of τετρακόσιοι. This does not match the Hebrew of this verse, nor does it match the previous census number given for the tribe of Dan of 62,700 (1:39 and 2:26). Wevers calls the number “inexplicable” (see NGTN 448-49).

The s-group is among the manuscripts that have ἕξακόσιοι, but some s-group manuscripts have marginal notes attributing τετρακόσιοι to ο’ and οἱ λ’ (the symbol υ’ = τετρακόσιοι). The attribution to ο’ is sound, as it matches the Ο-group and other hexaplaric witnesses as well as the Hebrew. The attribution to οἱ λ’ also makes sense, as all of the Three would match the Hebrew.
Notes: The Hebrew יַחְצְאֵל is rendered by NUM as Ἀσιήλ. Two O-group witnesses add the initial yodh which matches the Hebrew. This may be evidence of Origen’s work.

HT (וּפְקֻדֵיָהוֹ) לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם
LXX (ἐξ ἐπισκέψεως αὐτῶν)

{o’} Ἰασιηλί

Notes: The Hebrew gentilic יַחְצְאֵלِי is rendered by NUM as Ἀσιηλί. As with the family name earlier in the verse, two O-group witnesses add the initial yodh which matches the Hebrew. This may be evidence of Origen’s work.

Num 26:50

HT (לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם קָטָמִים) (סַכְרָנִיר)
LXX (ἐξ ἐπισκέψεως αὐτῶν)

{Sub ※} πρὸ κατὰ δῆμους αὐτῶν

Notes: In verse 45[41], the same phrase occurs as for the present verse — לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם קָטָמִים — but there, NUM translates using κατὰ δῆμους αὐτῶν ἐξ ἑπισκέψεως αὐτῶν whereas in the present verse it uses ἐξ ἑπισκέψεως αὐτῶν alone and thus has no equivalent for בָּלִית לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם. The O-group and Syh have added κατὰ δῆμους αὐτῶν, which indicates Origen’s work, and this may originally have been under the asterisk.

HT אַרְבַּע מֵאֹות
LXX τετρακόσιοι
ο’ οἱ λ’ τετρακόσιοι

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: O\(^{(G)}\) 30’ 619 68’-120’-128-630 59 319 Arab Bo Syh = Compl

NonGr: Syh ܐܢܘܕܡܐ ܐܠܢܐ ܠܒܢܐ ܠܢܝܐ ܠܢܝܐ ܠܒܢܐ

Notes: The final census count for the tribe of Naphtali is 45,400 in HT, and this is echoed in the O-group and others. But the uncials (A B F M V), most of the s-group, and many others have τριακόσιοι for the hundreds. Wevers argues that τετρακόσιοι, which matches the Hebrew, is original because it adds up correctly with the other tribal sub-totals to equal the grand total in the next verse (NGTN 450). Manuscript 344 from the s-group has a marginal note that attributes the reading τετρακόσιοι to the o’ text. This agrees with the O-group and is probably accurate. 344 also attributes the reading to οἱ λ’ and this is suitable, as the Three would conform to the Hebrew.

Num 26:51

HT שֵׁשׁ־מֵאֹות אֶלֶף וָאָלֶף שְׁבַע מֵאֹות וּשְׁלֹשִׁים

LXX ἑξακόσιαι χιλιάδες καὶ χίλιοι καὶ ἑπτακόσιοι καὶ τριάκοντα

άλλοι χιλιάδες ἕξακόσιαι (χ) , ἕν ἑπτακόσιαι τριάκοντα (αψλ)

Wit 1: M’

Wit 2: χιλιάδες χα καὶ ψλ 72 | χιλιάδες χα 319 | χιλιάδες ἕξακόσιαι 106 126 | stm’ ’lpy’ Syh

NonGr: Syh ܐܢܘܕܡܐ ܐܠܢܐ ܠܒܢܐ ܠܢܝܐ ܠܢܝܐ ܠܒܢܐ

Notes: The total census count for the nation is 601,730. Most of the witnesses, including hexaplalic, agree with this, although variations (e.g., number order) exist that do not affect the total. A smaller group of manuscripts has substantive changes in one or more of the numbers (M’ 58 19’ d\(^{106}\) 129 71-509 Bo). M’ has a modified total of 591,050, and it has a marginal note attributed to άλλοι that equals the NUM total, although the order of the numbers is different than NUM. This attribution matches the Hebrew and thus makes sense for any of the Three. The abbreviations are as follows: χ’ = ἕξακόσιαι; α’ = ἕν; ψ’ = ἑπτακόσιαι; λ’ = τριάκοντα. The witnesses listed under Wit
2 above are those that have the NUM total and who match the order of the ἄλλοι number in whole or in part.

**Num 26:54**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>ἠλλοι (τὸν θυρσόν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(κληρονομίαν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 ⟨Sub ※⟩ + αυτῶν

**Wit 2:** ↓O(G) 58 126 Cyr I 349 (sed hab 348) Co Syh = Tar

**Attr:** ※] > omnes

**Var:** αυτῶν] αυτοῦ 426 = MT Sam Tar

**NonGr:** Syh ο̂σ̂μεν

**Notes:** HT includes singular pronominal suffixes each of two times ἠλλοι is used in this verse. The referent of the pronoun is the nation as a whole, and the singular is used collectively. NUM matches the second pronoun using the plural αυτῶν to express the collective nuance (as in 26:56; cf. 33:54 in a similar statement where κατάσχεσιν is used). NUM does not render the possessive after the first instance of κληρονομίαν, however, and hexaplaric and other witnesses have added αυτῶν, which was likely originally under the asterisk. 426 has the singular αυτοῦ, which technically matches the Hebrew singular exactly, but is probably not original, as Origen likely matched αυτῶν in NUM after the second instance of κληρονομίαν. As already noted, 426 sometimes matches HT independently from other O-group manuscripts (see the discussion in Chapter 5).

**Num 26:57**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Αλλοι Λευι (καὶ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(Καὶ νιοὶ Λευὶ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub ※ καὶ ※οῦτοι ἐπεσκεμμένοι νιοὶ Λευί

**Wit 1:** ↓85′↓130↓321′
Wit 2: \( O^{(-G)} \) \( 246 \) 18'-126-628-630 \( \downarrow \) Syh = MT

Attr: ※ 85\textsuperscript{mg} Syh] > rell

Var: οὐτοὶ] οἱ 58; + οὐ τοι ἐπεσκεμένοι] οἱ ※ ἐπεσκεμένων + 85\textsuperscript{mg} οὐ τοι ἐπεσκεμένοι 376; ἐπεσκεμένοι 246 | οὐ τοι] pr καὶ 246*; pr καὶ οἱ 376; + ἐπεσκεμένων (ἐπισκεμένων 321) 130\textsuperscript{mg}-321\textsuperscript{mg}; + ※ ἐπεσκεμένοι < Syh; > 426 = MT

NonGr: Syh ܐܝܘ(ܐ)ܬܨ(ܠ)ieοt ܐ(ܠ)Phys

Notes: HT begins verse 57 with אֵלֶּּה פְקוּדֵי הַלֵּוִי (“And these are the accounted ones of the Levites”). NUM does not render Ɽקְרִו and instead substitutes υἱοὶ according to the pattern established throughout this chapter (verses 19, 22, 24, 28, 32, 42). As discussed below, Origen placed the equivalent of אֵלֶּּה פְקוּדֵי (οὐτοὶ ἐπεσκεμένοι) under the asterisk, but he did not remove the superfluous υἱοὶ in NUM (although 426 does remove it, in accordance with its occasional tendency to conform more closely to the Hebrew than the rest of the O-group — see the discussion in Chapter 5).

The asterisk tradition is confused, with 85\textsuperscript{mg} having καὶ οἱ ※ἐπεσκεμένων καὶ οἱ Λευί, and Syh having the equivalent of καὶ οἱ Λευί (thus transposing υἱοὶ). The available O-group manuscripts add either οὐτοὶ ἐπεσκεμένοι (376-426) or οἱ ἐπεσκεμένοι (58). Since 58 regularly varies from the rest of the O-group, and because οὐτοὶ matches הָרָשָׁ, the original o’ text is probably οὐτοὶ ἐπεσκεμένοι, and this phrase was likely under the asterisk. This addition affected a number of manuscripts, including most of the z-group.

HT יִרְשָׁו LXX Γεδσῶν

\langle o’ \rangle Γηρσῶν

Wit 2: 426 767 Syh

NonGr: Syh אֵלֶּּה

Notes: The Hebrew יִרְשָׁו is rendered by NUM as Γεδσῶν. This is an example of confusion between daleth and resh. Two Greek witnesses including 426 from the O-group change the daleth to match the resh of the Hebrew. This may provide evidence of Origen’s work. Syh and P agree for this name, and Syh is sometimes influence by P rather than the o’ text.
At Numbers 3:17, HT has גֵּרְשׁוֹנִי and NUM renders it Γεδσών just as here. There a 58 note reads: τὸ Γεδσών ὄνομα Γηρσών εὑρέθη ἐν παντὶ. This implies that in all places where Γεδσών appears, other witnesses have Γηρσών (see HEXNUM1 at 3:17).

**HT**

ןגְּרְשׁוֹנִי

**LXX**

(ὁ) Γεδσωνί

<o’> Γηρσώνει

**Wit 2:** 426 ↓ 767 ↓ 120’ Syh

**Var:** Γηρσώνει Γερσών 120; Γηρσών 767

**NonGr:** Syh 

**Notes:** The Hebrew gentilic גֵּרְשׁוֹנִי is rendered by NUM as Γεδσωνί. Four Greek witnesses including 426 from the O-group change the daleth to match the resh of the Hebrew. This is possibly evidence of Origen’s work. Syh and P agree for this name, and so Syh may reflect P rather than the o’ text.

**Num 26:58**

**HT**

מִשְׁפְּחֹת לֵוִי

**LXX**

(δῆοι) υἱῶν (Λευι)

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:** Syh = MT Tar⁰

**NonGr:** Syh סנה

**Notes:** At the beginning of 26:58, the Hebrew phrase מִשְׁפְּחֹת לֵוִי is rendered by NUM with the addition of υἱῶν which has no counterpart in the Hebrew. Syh has an obelus marking this word, and although no other manuscripts witness negatively by deleting the word, the Syh sign tradition corresponds to a plus in the Greek and is probably genuine.

**HT**

משפחת חֶבְרוֹנִי מִשְׁפַּחַת חֶבְרֹנִי

**LXX**

(δῆοις ὁ Χεβρωνι) μεσάθα Χεβρωνι

**Sub ※ + καὶ δῆμος ὁ Μουλί**
Notes: In the list of the families of the Levites, HT includes the family of Mahli, but NUM omits it, likely due to parablepsis on the repetition of מִשְׁפַּחַת (see NGTN 452-53). The o’ text includes the equivalent phrase under the asterisk. Syh has an initial asterisk and a matching metobelus two words later both placed correctly. Another asterisk appears in between the correct asterisk and metobelus. This may have resulted from copying confusion where the exemplar had the asterisked phrase spanning two lines, with an added asterisk in the right margin as a continuation marker. In any case, the purpose and correct placement of the signs is clear.

HT מִשְׁפַּחַת הַמּוּשִׁי מִשְׁפַּחַת הַקָּרְחִי

LXX δῆ*ος ὁ Κόρε καὶ δῆ*ος ὁ Μουσί

non tr καὶ δῆµος ὁ Μουσί καὶ δῆµος ὁ Κόρε

Notes: The last two clans of the Levites are: מִשְׁפַּחַת הַמּוּשִׁי מִשְׁפַּחַת הַקָּרְחִי “The family of the Mushites, the family of the Korahites.” NUM has reversed the order of these clans, as witnessed by such old manuscripts as B and 963 (see NGTN 453). Many other witnesses, including the hexaplaric groups, agree with the Hebrew order, and so although this transposition may not have originated with Origen, it was reflected in the o’ text. HT has no conjunctions between the family names, and NUM follows this pattern except for adding καὶ between the final two names. Most of the manuscripts that have transposed the two clans to match the Hebrew have retained the καὶ from the final NUM phrase καὶ δῆµος ὁ Μουσί, but since this is no longer the last family in the list, they have also added καὶ before δῆµος ὁ Κόρε which is the new last member. Thus the o’
text probably has καὶ δῆμος ὁ Μουσί καὶ δῆμος ὁ Κόρε. A few manuscripts, including 58 from the O-group, have gone further and removed καὶ from before the now second-to-last δῆμος ὁ Μουσί.

**Num 26:59**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>אַֽמְרֵיָם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Μωυσήν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**〈Sub ※〉 pr τόν**

*Wit 2:*  ↓426 ↓77 ↓d ↓127-↓767 t 619 z 319 Syh = MT

*Attr:*  ※] > omnes

*Var:*  Μωυσήν] Μωσήν 426 77 127-767; Μωυσή 44-610

*NonGr:*  Syh אַֽמְרֵיָם

*Notes:* Although NUM is lacking articles before the names Μωυσήν and Μαριάμ some manuscripts include them. The article before Μαριάμ is under the asterisk in Syh (see below). The article before Μωυσήν is witnessed by several manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group, and thus it is possibly the o’ text reading and it may also have been under the asterisk. Wevers suggests that the definite article was Origen’s approximation for the Hebrew direct object marker (NGTN 454). Syh precedes the name with lamadh as a Syriac direct object marker. It is listed as a witness to the added τόν, first because it corresponds quantitatively, and second because the lamadh before the next name is marked with an asterisk by Syh and it corresponds to the article there (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>אַֽמְרֵיָם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Μαριάμ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ pr τήν**

*Wit 2:*  426 76 Syh = MT

*Attr:*  ※ Syh] > rell

*NonGr:*  Syh אַֽמְרֵיָם
Notes: Similar to the second-to-last name in the verse (see above), Origen added an article under the asterisk before the last name, Μαριάμ. Wevers suggests that the definite article was Origen’s approximation for the Hebrew direct object marker (NGTN 454). In Syh the name is preceded by *lamadh*, which functions as a direct object marker and which corresponds quantitatively to the Greek article. The *lamadh* is marked with an asterisk by Syh, and this indicates that τήν is under the asterisk in the o’ text.

**Num 26:60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>אֲבִיהוּא</td>
<td>Ἀβιούδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>אֲבִיהוּא</td>
<td>Ἀβιούδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o’)</td>
<td>Ἄβιού</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wit 2: 426 Syh

NonGr: Syh אֶ评比

Notes: The Hebrew name אֲבִיהוּא is rendered by NUM as Ἀβιούδ. From the O-group, 426 has dropped the final delta to match the Hebrew, as has Syh, and this possibly indicates Origen’s work. 426 sometimes agrees with the Hebrew independent of the other hexaplaric witnesses (see the discussion in Chapter 5). For this verse Syh matches P, and thus Syh may have been influenced by P rather than the o’ text.

**Num 26:61**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>אֲבִיהוּא</td>
<td>Ἀβιούδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>אֲבִיהוּא</td>
<td>Ἀβιούδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o’)</td>
<td>Ἄβιού</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wit 2: 426 Syh

NonGr: Syh אֶ评比

Notes: This is the identical situation as in the previous verse (see the discussion there). The Hebrew name אֲבִיהוּא is rendered by NUM as Ἀβιούδ. From the O-group, 426 has dropped the final delta to match the Hebrew, as has Syh, and this possibly indicates Origen’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Σινά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: 26:61 speaks about the death of Nadab and Abihu. NUM ends the verse with the phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρή*ῳ Σινά and this has no equivalent in the Hebrew. The o’ text places this under the obelus. The added phrase may be a harmonization with 3:4, where a similar statement about Nadab and Abihu’s death includes ἐν τῇ ἐρή*ῳ Σινά. Syh^T does not include a metobelus.

Num 26:62

HT  
تجنب  בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

LXX  ἐν μέσῳ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ 1º

ο’ α’ θ’  ἐν μέσῳ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ (ηλ)

Notes: The Hebrew בְּנֵי יִשָּׂרָאֵל is rendered literally by NUM as ἐν μέσῳ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, and many witnesses agree with this reading. The s-group reads ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, which matches Symmachus and many other witnesses (see below). An s-group marginal note attributes the NUM reading to o’ and this is supported by many hexaplaric witnesses including the O-group. The s-group also attributes this reading to Aquila and Theodotion. Both Aquila and Theodotion regularly render בְּנֵי using ἐν
έσῳ (e.g., α’ θ’: Gen 1:6, Josh 4:10, Ezek 1:16, 28:23). Thus the vocabulary and the quantitatively exact rendering make sense for Aquila and Theodotion.

As just mentioned, Symmachus has rendered the Hebrew as ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, and this may have affected some manuscripts. Interestingly, O-group manuscript 58 has retained ἐν μέσῳ in agreement with the o’ text, but has substituted τοῖς υἱοῖς for υἱῶν. The combination of ἐν μέσῳ with the dative does not occur in NUM — in fact it is very unusual for the LXX, which uses the genitive with ἐν μέσῳ 295 out of 299 times (not counting Theodotion’s versions of Daniel and Susanna), and the dative only 4 times (at Gen 2:9, 37:7, Ezek 5:2, and Dan 3:25). Manuscript 58 could represent influence from Symmachus, perhaps mediated through some of the many manuscripts that have ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, but it may also be a scribal error.

σ’ ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ (ἡλ)

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: A M’ ol-707 C’ f’ 28-30’-85’-321’-343’ 619 y z 55 ↓ 319 624 646 Cyr I 348 Aeth

Var: ἐν] > 319

Notes: Symmachus has rendered the Hebrew בְּתֹוךְ with ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ which is a less quantitative equivalent than NUM, Aquila, and Theodotion (see above), although it is a good contextual translation. Like Aquila and Theodotion, Symmachus elsewhere renders בְּתֹוךְ using ἐν μέσῳ (Gen 1:6, Isa 6:5, 66:17, Ezek 28:23). He does render differently elsewhere, however (e.g., at Ezek 1:16, α’ and θ’ have ἐν μέσῳ while σ’ has ἐντός). Thus although Symmachus normally followed the Hebrew sense closely, he was not bound to rigid translation patterns, and so this rendering is reasonable for him.

Symmachus may have had an influence on the text tradition, as seen in the many witnesses that reflect his reading, including the uncials A and M. Interestingly, of all the texts that agree with Symmachus with ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ for this first instance of בְּתֹוךְ, only 318 is consistent and likewise renders the second instance as ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ. For the second occurrence, the others follow NUM with ἐν μέσῳ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

Num 26:64

HT אָהֲרֹן (אַהֲרֹן)
LXX (Ααρων)
Sub ※ τοῦ ἱερέως

Wit 2:  O\(^{(G)}\)\(^{58}\) Syh = MT

Attr:  ※ Syh] > rel

NonGr:  Syh אָּטֹא

Notes:  HT adds Aaron’s title “the priest” ( Sonsות) after his name, and this is omitted by NUM. Origen includes the equivalent τοῦ ἱερέως under the asterisk.

HT
LXX

\(\langle o'\rangle\) Σιναΐ́

Wit 2:  54'-75'-458 Syh

Var:  Σιναΐ́] Σηναΐ́ 458

NonGr:  Syh אָטֹא

Notes:  Instead of Σιναΐ́ in NUM, some manuscripts have Σιναΐ́ which matches the Hebrew סִינַי, and this may reflect Origen’s work. Although in the present instance Σιναΐ́ does not have any O-group witnesses, this same spelling variation occurs elsewhere in Numbers at 3:4, 14, 9:1, 5, 10:12, 28:6, 33:15 and 16, and for many of the other instances, O-group witnesses do support the variant. Syh is listed as a witness because it matches the final iota in Σιναΐ́, although Syh matches P here, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P rather than the o' text.

Num 26:65

HT
LXX

ο’ ὁ τοῦ Ναυή

Wit 1:  344

Wit 2:  B M’ V O\(^{(G)}\)\(^{58}\) 29-82 b d\(^{-125}\) 129 n t x\(^{-527}\) \(^{619}\) Cyr I 348 352 Syh = Ra
NonGr: Syh ܢܐܢ ܣܐ

οἱ λ’  ὑιὸς Ναυή

Wit 1: 344\textsuperscript{txt}

Wit 2: A F 963 58-ol-72-707 C\textsuperscript{r} f\textsuperscript{129} s 619 y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799
Lat cod 100

NonGr: Lat cod 100 filius Naue

Notes: Two readings exist for ḫוּן נַעַנְ: ὑιὸς Ναυή and ὁ τοῦ Ναυή and both are well-attested for this verse. Both renderings are also seen in NUM: ὑιὸς Ναυή at 13:9[8] and 14:38, and ὁ τοῦ Ναυή at 11:28, 14:6, 30, 26:65, 32:12, and 34:17. For this verse, Wevers has chosen ὑιὸς Ναυή for his critical edition because it is the reading of 963, the oldest manuscript. The s-group has ὑιὸς Ναυή and a marginal note in 344 indicates that the o’ text had ὁ τοῦ Ναυή. This is the reading of the majority of the O-group and Syh, and so the attribution is probably accurate. The reading may have been available in one of Origen’s exemplars since it is widespread.

A 344\textsuperscript{txt} note lists ὑιὸς Ναυή as the reading of οἱ λ’. Both Aquila and Symmachus use Ναυή for נון (Josh 1:1) and Theodotion possibly follows NUM here. Since the phrase ὑιὸς Ναυή matches the Hebrew quantitatively, the attribution to the Three makes good sense.

Numbers 27

Num 27:1

HT ךָרָמַכְשׁעָה
LXX —

Sub ※  ὑioũ Μανασσή

Wit 2: O\textsuperscript{(G)} 58-15 767 Arab Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ܢܐܢ ܣܐ ※ ܣܐ ※

Notes: At the end of the list of the forefathers of Zelophehad’s daughters, HT includes ךָרָמַכְשׁעָה ("the son of Manasseh"). NUM omits this, and Origen adds it under
the asterisk. As it does occasionally (e.g., 26:58), Syh\(^T\) has two asterisks, an initial one in the correct place and a spurious one between the first asterisk and the metobelus.

**Num 27:2**

**HT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num 27:2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LXX**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐναντὶ 4°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:** Syh

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wit 2:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-618(^c) 44-125 71 126 319 Arab Sa(^5) = MT Sam Tar(^O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NonGr:** Syh ܡݭݲܐ

**Notes:** HT explains that the daughters of Zelophehad appeared before four separate groups, using the phrase לִפְנֵי for the first three but omitting it before the last. NUM includes the equivalent ἐναντὶ all four times, and Origen places the fourth occurrence under the obelus.

**HT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>פֶּתַח</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LXX**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O’** ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν

**Wit 1:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wit 2:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(O^{(G)})(^{58}) d(^{-619}) n(^{-767}) (t) Syh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NonGr:** Syh ܒܥܬܐ

**Notes:** In Numbers, the phrase פֶּתַח אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד is bound to אֶל or has no preposition. The phrase לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד (always with אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד) is rendered as (1) ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας in 6:10; (2) ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν in 10:3, 17:15, 20:6; (3) παρὰ τὰς θύρας in 6:13; (4) παρὰ τὴν θύραν in 16:19. In places where there is no explicit preposition but the context implies a preposition, NUM renders פֶּתַח אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד (either in the phrase פֶּתַח אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד or לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל־מֹועֵד) as follows: (1) ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας: 12:5, 27:2; (2) παρὰ τὰς θύρας: 6:18, 16:18; (3) παρὰ τὴν θύραν: 25:6. In very similar contexts and sometimes in close
proximity (e.g., 6:10, 13) the NUM translator felt free to vary the translation of the phrase, probably for stylistic reasons. For the present verse, the majority of witnesses, including the s-group, match NUM with ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας. 344 from the s-group attributes the reading ἐπὶ τῆν θύραν to the o’ text. This is witnessed by two members of the O-group and is probably accurate. This reading is not without precedent in NUM, but it is not clear what led Origen to adopt it here.

\[\theta' \quad \pi ρα\acute{a} \ τη\acute{n} \ \thetaυραν\]

\[Wit 1: \quad 344\]

\[Wit 2: \quad \text{Theodotion employs } \thetaυρα for \pi\breve{t}αχ in Numbers at 4:25-26 (also e.g., Gen 4:7, 6:16) and the use of } \pi ρα\acute{a} plus accusative singular in this verse matches NUM in a similar context at 25:6. Thus, this attribution is reasonable.\]

\[\sigma' \quad \pi ρο\acute{c} \ τη\acute{n} \ \thetaυραν\]

\[Wit 1: \quad 344\]

\[Notes: \quad \text{Symmachus uses } \thetaυρα for \pi\breve{t}αχ in Numbers 4:25-26 (elsewhere e.g., in Gen 4:7, 6:16, Isa 13:2). Also, his use of } \pi ρο\acute{c} provides a good contextual translation. Thus, this attribution is suitable for Symmachus.\]

**Num 27:9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לְבָּנָה</td>
<td>θυγάτηρ αὐτῷ</td>
<td>αὐτῷ θυγάτηρ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Wit 2: \quad V 963(vid) O^{(G)}58-82 414 b d 129 n t x^{(527)} \textbf{619} 55 624 \text{Lat Ruf Num XXII 1 Syh = MT} \]

\[NonGr: \quad \text{Lat Ruf Num XXII 1 ei filia | Syh אנתא סא} \]

\[Notes: \quad \text{HT uses the idiom “There is not to him a daughter” and NUM follows this literally except that it reverses the order of “to him” and “daughter.” The o’ text transposes the words to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by O-group manuscripts 376 and 426, and this change is reflected in many other manuscripts.}\]
LXX (κληρονομίαν)

〈Sub ※〉 + αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: V 963 O (G) 58-82 C b d 129 1246 n s \(^{-30}\) t 392 z 319 624 646 Arm Co Syh (sed hab Ald) = MT

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: αὐτοῦ] αὐτῷ 246

NonGr: Syh אֶתָה

Notes: HT has נַחֲלָתוֹ in verses 9, 10, and 11 but NUM does not render the pronominal suffix in any of these verses. For each instance of נַחֲלָתוֹ, Origen probably added the equivalent αὐτοῦ, but only in verse 10 does any witness indicate that an asterisk marked the addition. Although no sign tradition is preserved here in verse 9, the addition was possibly originally under the asterisk. Manuscript 246 has the variant αὐτῷ which possibly reflects the o‘ text.

Num 27:10

HT הַֽנְלִיֵּלַז

LXX (κληρονομίαν)

Sub ※ αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O (G) 58 417-616 b 44-106 (mg) 107 127-767 t \(^{-89}\) 120 (126) 799 Arm Bo Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh אֶת

Notes: As with verses 9 and 11, the pronominal suffix on נַחֲלָתוֹ is not rendered by NUM, and Origen here included it under the asterisk. For verses 9 and 11, although Origen probably added αὐτοῦ, no sign tradition has been preserved.

Num 27:11

HT הַֽנְלִיֵּלַז

LXX (κληρονομίαν)
\langle \text{Sub }\ast\rangle \alphaυτο\u03b5

\text{Wit 2: } O^{(G)} b\,d^\text{610}\,129\,54'\,-\text{767} i\,318\,126 \text{ Bo Syh } = \text{ MT}

\text{Attr: } \ast] > \text{ omnes}

\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh }\alpha\mu\nu\lambda\alpha

\text{Notes: } \text{The phrase } \text{יֵרְבִּיתוֹ} \text{ appears in verses 9, 10, and 11, and in each case, the suffix is not rendered by NUM. For each instance of } \text{יֵרְבִּיתוֹ}, \text{Origen probably added the equivalent } \alphaυτο\u03b5, \text{ but only in verse 10 does any witness indicate that an asterisk marked the addition. As with verse 9, } \alphaυτο\u03b5 \text{ was possibly originally under the asterisk here.}

\text{HT} \quad \text{יֵרְבִּיתוֹ (ךְ)}
\text{LXX} \quad (\tau\nu\iota \text{ oikei}^{\omega})

\langle \text{Sub }\ast\rangle + \alphaυτο\u03b5

\text{Wit 2: } O^{(G)}58\,-\text{15} \text{ Bo Syh } = \text{ MT}

\text{Attr: } \ast \text{ Syh}] > \text{ rell}

\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh }\alpha\mu\nu\lambda\alpha

\text{Notes: } \text{In HT, two suffixes are found in the phrase } \text{לַחֲלוֹתוֹ (ךְ) אֵלָיו} \text{ (literally: “to his flesh, the closest to him”). NUM renders this with } \tau\nu\iota \text{ oikei}^{\omega} \tau\nu\iota \text{ eγγιστα} \alphaυτο\u03b5, \text{ which ignores the first suffix. Origen added } \alphaυτο\u03b5 \text{ under the asterisk to account for the omission, as witnessed by } O\text{-group manuscripts 376 and 426 and by Syh. Thus, the o\' text has the phrase: } \tau\nu\iota \text{ oikei}^{\omega} \alphaυτο\u03b5 \tau\nu\iota \text{ eγγιστα} \alphaυτο\u03b5. \text{ A retroversion of Syh gives: } \tau\nu\iota \text{ oikei}^{\omega} \alphaυτο\u03b5 \tau\nu\iota \text{ eγγιστα}. \text{ So although containing the asterisked word, Syh omits the final possessive. } O\text{-group manuscript 58 follows NUM but 58 sometimes deviates from the rest of the } O\text{-group.}

\text{Num 27:12}

\text{HT} \quad —
\text{LXX} \quad \text{όρος Ναβαυ̇}

\langle \text{Sub }\div\rangle

\text{Wit 2: } \text{Syh}
Notes: NUM adds the phrase ὄρος Ναβαύ, apparently trying to identify the mountain to which Moses was told to go. This phrase is not in the underlying Hebrew and Origen placed it under the obelus.

HT  הָעֲבָרִים הַזֶּה
LXX  τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν τούτῳ ὄρος Ναβαύ

⟨α’ θ’⟩ τῶν ἐβραίων τούτων

Notes: NUM renders the Hebrew הָעֲבָרִים הַזֶּה with τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν τούτῳ ὄρος Ναβαύ. The phrase ὄρος Ναβαύ is not supported in the Hebrew and Origen placed it under the obelus (see above). A marginal note renders the Hebrew as τῶν ἐβραίων τούτων, thus transliterating הָעֲבָרִים and omitting the added NUM phrase.

Aquila often transliterates proper names, as he does for example in Numbers 3:23 (Γηρσοννεί for גֵּרְשֻׁנִּי) and 26:20 (ὁ Σα*ρα*εί for הַשִּׁמְרֹנִי). Symmachus transliterates occasionally (e.g., Num 6:18) but this is not his tendency, particularly for place names (SITP 120). In addition, at 33:47, Symmachus translates הָעֲבָרִים as τῶν διαβασέων (retroverted from Syh). Theodotion transliterates even more frequently than Aquila (REI-Pro 20), and thus this note is possibly from Aquila or Theodotion.

HT  —
LXX  ἐν κατασχέσει

Sub  ÷

Notes: NUM renders the Hebrew הָעֲבָרִים הַזֶּה with τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν τούτῳ ὄρος Ναβαύ. The phrase ὄρος Ναβαύ is not supported in the Hebrew and Origen placed it under the obelus (see above). A marginal note renders the Hebrew as τῶν ἐβραίων τούτων, thus transliterating הָעֲבָרִים and omitting the added NUM phrase.

Aquila often transliterates proper names, as he does for example in Numbers 3:23 (Γηρσοννεί for גֵּרְשֻׁנִּי) and 26:20 (ὁ Σα*ρα*εί for הַשִּׁמְרֹנִי). Symmachus transliterates occasionally (e.g., Num 6:18) but this is not his tendency, particularly for place names (SITP 120). In addition, at 33:47, Symmachus translates הָעֲבָרִים as τῶν διαβασέων (retroverted from Syh). Theodotion transliterates even more frequently than Aquila (REI-Pro 20), and thus this note is possibly from Aquila or Theodotion.

HT  —
LXX  ἐν κατασχέσει

Sub  ÷

WT 2: 58 = MT
**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** At the end of verse 12, NUM adds the phrase ἐν κατασχέσει, providing the information that Israel was to receive the land “as a possession.” This phrase is not in HT and Origen placed it under the obelus.

### Num 27:13

**HT**

עַמֶּיךָ גַּם־אָתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר (אֶל־

**LXX**

(πρὸς τὸν) λαόν σου καὶ σὺ καθά

**ο’** λαόν σου καὶ σὺ καθά

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:**

A B ↓F M' V ↓O^(x(G)) b ↓d ↓f ↓n ↓t x(-527) y(-392) ↓z(-407) 55 ↓59 319 424 623

**Var.** προς τὸν λαόν σου] post σὺ tr d t | καὶ] > 126; καθά] καθάπερ 376 d f n t = Compl; καθὼς F 29-58-72 59

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** In HT, God tells Moses, “You will be gathered to your people, even you, as (גַּם־אָתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר) Aaron your brother was gathered.” NUM renders גַּם־אָתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר literally as καὶ σὺ καθά. A number of witnesses, including the s-group, omit καὶ σὺ, and a marginal note from s-group manuscript 344 indicates that ο’ included it. This matches the Hebrew and is supported by Syh and by the O-group — 58, 376, and 426 all have καὶ σὺ, although instead of καθά, 58 has καθός and 376 has καθάπερ. Since Origen had no compelling reason to modify καθά in NUM, the ο’ text probably has καθά. The majority of manuscripts have καὶ σὺ and since this is original with NUM, many likely have this reading independently from the ο’ text.

**σ’** καὶ σὺ οὖν τρόπτον

**Wit 1:** 344

**Notes:** This 344 note indicates that Symmachus followed καὶ σὺ in NUM but employed οὖν τρόπτον as an alternate rendering for ῥήσιμον. Symmachus uses οὖν τρόπτον for ῥήσιμον at Exodus 2:14 and Psalm 32[33]:22, so this attribution makes sense.
Notes: Manuscript 344 has four notes for the present verse. The first two, from θ' and σ', are covered above. The final note has the form: α' καί γε σὺ καθώς; καί γε σὺ καθά. At first glance, the first reading (καί γε σὺ καθώς) appears to be from Aquila. He frequently employs καί γε for בֵּי and בֵּן. But Aquila is not known to use καθώς; he typically renders רשאכ by καθά (e.g., Gen 27:40, Exod 2:14, 4 Kgdm 23:27, Ps 32[33]:22) and the preposition kaph by ὡς (e.g., Job 42:8g, Isa 59:18). Theodotion on the other hand regularly uses καθώς, both for רשאכ and kaph (for רשאכ at Dan 9:12; for ב at 3 Kgdm 18:28, Job 42:8g, Isa 59:18, Jer 26[46]:26, Ezek 35:15). In addition, Theodotion also uses καί γε for and (e.g., for in Exod 7:11 and for in Dan 11:8), including in cases similar to the present context where the Hebrew has the conjunction followed by a pronoun (e.g., καί γε ἐγώ in Ezek 5:8, 20:23 for רשאכ). Thus, this reading is more suitable for Theodotion. It is possible that the attributions for the two readings (καί γε σὺ καθώς; καί γε σὺ καθά) became corrupted, or that an attribution to θ' was lost. The second reading — καί γε σὺ καθά — is more likely from Aquila (this is discussed below).
Notes: NUM ends verse 13 with ἐν Ὥρ τῷ ὄρει, the name of the place where Aaron died, and this is not in the underlying Hebrew. It may be derived from Numbers 33:38, where HT reports that Aaron went up “to Mount Hor” and died there. Origen included the phrase under the obelus.

**Num 27:14**

HT

LXX

Sub ∨

Notes: HT reads: “As you rebelled (against) my mouth (i.e., word) in the wilderness of Sin, when the congregation rebelled, to sanctify me (לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי).” To clarify that the infinitive is referring to the action of Moses, NUM adds the following that has no equivalent in HT: οὐχ ἡγιάσατέ με. Origen placed the added phrase under the obelus. For a discussion of the translation issues, see NGTN 464-65. Syh is the only witness to the obelus, but since its sign tradition marks a plus in the Greek, it is probably genuine.

Syh, along with several witnesses, precedes οὐχ ἡγιάσατέ με with a conjunction. The obelus should be after the conjunction, but Syh places it before (Syh sometimes misplaces Aristarchian signs due to conglutinate structures in Syriac).

**Num 27:15**

HT

LXX

Sub ※  λέγων
Wit 2: $O^{(G)}$ Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh > rell

NonGr: Syh $\not\in$ ♠ $\not\in$

Notes: HT uses the common marker for direct discourse לֵאמֹר and NUM has no equivalent. Origen added the equivalent λέγων under the asterisk.

HT of Numbers often couples finite verb forms of אמר or דבר with לֵאמֹר (e.g., 1:1, 48, 2:1, 7:4, 14:7, 19:1, 20:3, 23) using the form “and X said/spoke (to Y) saying…” NUM is usually consistent in rendering לֵאמֹר with λέγων or λέγοντες. The two places where NUM does not match לֵאמֹר (16:36[17:1] and here at 27:15), Origen adds the equivalent under the asterisk. In some instances, however, NUM supplies λέγων or λέγοντες without the underlying לֵאמֹר, and here Origen is less consistent. He obelizes such cases in 3:40, 5:6, 11:27, 15:35, 18:1, and 27:18, but he does not do so in 20:14 and 21:10. Reminiscent of 26:58 and 27:1, Syh places a redundant asterisk between the correct asterisk and the metobelus.

Num 27:16

HT

LXX

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: 58 = MT

NonGr: Syh ܙܡ

Notes: Moses asks the Lord to appoint a man “over the congregation” (?) and NUM adds the demonstrative ταύτης which is not in HT. Origen placed this under the obelus.

Num 27:17

HT
Moses asks that the people not be left as sheep without a shepherd. The Hebrew reads: כַּצֹּאן אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לָהֶם רֹעֶה (literally, “as sheep whom there is not to them a shepherd.” NUM approximates the Hebrew with: ὡσεὶ πρόβατα, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιήν. NUM renders the relative particle ἃ δὲ together with λέγων with the dative relative pronoun οἷς. Of all the hexaplaric witnesses, 426 adds αὐτοῖς to match the resumptive pronoun λάετε. This may represent Origen’s work, and possibly an original asterisk (for the occasional tendency of 426 to follow HT independently of the rest of the O-group see Chapter 5).

**Num 27:18**

| HT | — |
| LXX | λέγων |

Sub ÷

| Wit 2: | Syh |

>  

| Wit 2: | 58 Arab = MT |
| NonGr: | Syh ἀνάμελα |

**Notes:** Although HT often prefaces quoted speech with ἀνάμελα, it does not do so in this verse. But NUM prefaces the speech with λέγων, the normal equivalent for ἀνάμελα, and Origen places this under the obelus. See under 27:15 for a discussion of how NUM handles ἀνάμελα and its absence.

**Num 27:19**

| HT | — |
| LXX | (καὶ) ἐντελῆ ἀυτῶν |
Notes: HT for verse 19 reads: וְצִוִּיתָה אֹתֹ ("And you shall make him [Joshua] stand before Eleazar the priest and before all the assembly, and you shall command him in their sight"). NUM renders literally throughエンテルイαυτῷ, and then it rendersエンテルイαυτῷ twice, giving: καὶ ἐντελῇ αὐτῷ ἐναντίο ταύτης συνάγωγῆς καὶ ἐντελῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον αὐτῶν ("and command him before all the assembly and command concerning him before them."

Origen apparently made three changes to conform the text to the Hebrew. First, he removed ἐντελῇ αὐτῷ. This is reflected in the available O-group (minus 58) and in several other manuscripts, and this omission may originally have been under the obelus. O-group manuscript 376 and Syh omitted the preceding καὶ which is puzzling, as this accurately reflects the Hebrew. Second, Origen placed the phrase περὶ αὐτοῦ under the obelus. Third, he substituted αὐτῷ for περὶ αὐτοῦ. These latter two changes are covered below.

<Sub ÷>

Wit 2: V ↓O-(G) 58 b 246 18'-126-628-630' Arab ↓Syh = MT

Var: καὶ] > 376 Syh

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT reads: וֹ צִוִּיתָה אֹת ("You will command him"). NUM modifies this to, "You will (give) command concerning him (περὶ αὐτοῦ)". Origen places περὶ αὐτοῦ under the obelus and replaces it with αὐτῷ (the latter is covered below).
Notes: Origen modifies ἐντελῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ from NUM in two ways. First, it places περὶ αὐτοῦ under the obelus (see above). Second, it substitutes αὐτῷ for περὶ αὐτοῦ to match the direct object Ἰνα of HT. The addition of αὐτῷ, although likely not under the asterisk because of the obelus marking περὶ αὐτοῦ, gives evidence of being Origen’s work since it is witnessed by the entire available O-group.

Num 27:21

HT אֵיתָרְם
LXX δήλων

θ’ ἀλλοι φωτισμῶν

Wit 1: ↓C°comm ↓Syh = Sixt
Attr: θ’| Syh | ἀλλοι | C°comm
NonGr: Syh ἀκολούθησα

Notes: Joshua was instructed to stand before the priest, who would inquire for him “with the judgment of אֵיתָרְם (the Urim).” The word appears only here in NUM, and only here in the OT is it alone — everywhere else it is paired with הַתֻּמיִם (“the Thummim”). NUM translates אֵיתָרְם using δήλος, which means “visible/manifest (it is rendered the same way elsewhere in Deut 33:8 and 1 Kgdms 28:6, and also rendered using the related noun δήλωσις in Exod 28:30 and Lev 8:8). The LXX also translates אֵיתָרְם using participles of the verb φωτίζω in Ezra 2:63 and Nehemiah 7:65.

A note, attributed to θ’ by Syh and to ἀλλοι by the Catena group commentary, uses φωτισμῶν — a noun related to φωτίζω — to render אֵיתָרְם. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion use φωτισμός for אֵיתָרְם in Exodus 28:30 (the α’ σ’ θ’ attributions are in Syh; the s-group and Catena commentary have οἱ λ’), and Aquila and Theodotion use φωτισμός in Leviticus 8:8. Thus the reading makes sense either for Theodotion or for the other two translators. The attribution of the Catena group to ἀλλοι appears to be equivalent to οἱ λ’.

ἀλλοι φωτισμῶν· τελειοτήτων

Wit 1: C°comm
Notes: In addition to the \textit{C''}\textsuperscript{comm} note with \textit{φωτισμῶν} (covered above), \textit{C''}\textsuperscript{comm} has an additional note attributed to \textit{ἄλλοι} that gives the double reading: \textit{φωτισμῶν--τελειοτήτων}. As discussed earlier in this verse, \textit{φωτισμῶν} makes sense as coming from any of the Three to render \textit{אָרוּם}. The second reading, \textit{τελειοτήτων}, is used by \textit{οἱ λ'} (Exod 28:30) for the “Thummim” (בּתֻּמִים), a word that everywhere else in the OT besides the present verse appears together with “Urim” (אָרוּם) in the context of a priest inquiring of the Lord. In addition, Symmachus uses \textit{τελειοτήτων} for בּתֻּמִים in connection with a priest’s “Urim and Thummim” in Deuteronomy 33:8. In the present verse, it is unlikely that Aquila would depart from the Hebrew to add an extra word, even if it is typical elsewhere in the LXX. It is possible that Symmachus, or conceivably Theodotion, added \textit{τελειοτήτων} to accompany \textit{φωτισμῶν} according to typical OT usage. But it is more likely that a scribe, aware of the uncharacteristic lack of the second word, added \textit{τελειοτήτων} as a gloss.

HT: \textit{כָּל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל)}
LXX: \textit{οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ (οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ)}

Sub ※ \textit{πάντες}

Wit 2: Syh
NonGr: Syh

Notes: According to HT, those commanded by Joshua are “all the sons of Israel” (כָּל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). NUM leaves out the equivalent of \textit{כָּל} and according to Syh, Origen has included it under the asterisk. This addition and related asterisk are possibly original to the o’ text, although they are not reflected in any Greek witnesses.

Num 27:22

HT: \textit{יְהוָה אֹתוֹ}
LXX: \textit{αὐτῷ κύριος}

non tr \textit{κύριος αὐτῶ}

Wit 2: 426 16 44 126 Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT has the subject followed by the direct object (יְהוָה אֹתוֹ) and NUM reverses the order with αὐτῶ κύριος. Origen transposes the NUM order to match the Hebrew as witnessed by \textit{O}-group manuscript 426 and Syh. This is reflected in a few other manuscripts.
Num 27:23

Sam\textsuperscript{sec}  + καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ σου ἓδοσαν ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ τοῖς δυσὶ βασιλεύσιν οὕτως ποιήσει καὶ πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις εἰς ἃς σὺ παρελεύσῃ ἐκεῖ ὡς φοβηθῆσῃ ὅτι καὶ ὁ θεὸς σου αὐτῶς πολεμήσει αὐτοὺς μεθ’ υμῶν

\textit{Wit 1}: ↓85-↓321-↓343\textsuperscript{Th}-↓344 ↓Syh

\textit{Var}: ἓδοσαν | εἰδ. 343’ | καὶ > 85’-321’ | παρελεύσῃ | -σει 343 | φοβηθῆσῃ | -σῃ 130 | ὅτι | > 130 | υμῶν | σου Syh

\textit{NonGr}: Syh

\textit{Notes}: The attribution for this marginal note comes from text placed after the note in Syh\textsuperscript{T}:

It reads: “These are only in those brought by the Samaritans, and Moses recalled them in the Second Law (i.e., Deuteronomy).”

The added text in the x-group margins and 343\textsuperscript{Th} is a Greek translation of Sam of Numbers 27:23b which in turn is a copy of Sam of Deuteronomy 3:21-22 with minor
modifications. A number of insertions from Sam of Deuteronomy and Numbers are found throughout Sam of Numbers and their Greek renderings (or Syriac versions thereof in Syh) are found in many marginal notes (see under 20:12). These Greek insertions are presumably from a Greek translation of Sam known as the Samaritikon.

The reading from Sam of Deuteronomy 3:21-22 and Numbers 27:23b is as follows. Phrases in Deuteronomy that are modified in Numbers 27:23b are noted with asterisks, with the modified phrase from Numbers (if it exists) following in parentheses.

Samaritan Pentateuch, Deuteronomy 3:21-22:

*S* כל*עיניך הראות את ( וויאמר אלי* )ואת יהושע צויתי בעת ההיא לאמר
אשר עשה יהוה לשני המלכים האלה כן יעשה יהוה לכל المמלכות אשר אתה
עבר שם לא חרוא אל חלך וז הליך לבם:

The corresponding reading from the LXX of Deuteronomy 3:21-22 is:

Kαί τῷ Ἰησοῖ ἐνετειλά*ην ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ λέγων Οἱ ὀφθαλ*οί ὑ*ῶν
eωράκασιν πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡ*ῶν τοῖς δυσὶ βασιλεύσι τούτοις:
oύτως ποιήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡ*ῶν πάσας τὰς βασιλείας, ἐφ’ ἄς σὺ διαβαίνεις ἐκεί:

At this point in Numbers, Moses is giving instructions regarding the commissioning of Joshua. Here Sam inserts the text from Deuteronomy where Moses recounts (1) his encouragement to Joshua that the Lord would deal with all the nations as he did with the two kings Israel had already defeated, and (2) his command to Joshua not to fear for the Lord would fight for Israel.

**Numbers 28**

**Num 28:2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>λέγων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub ✕

Wit 2: Syh

> 125 509 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Sa 12 = MT
Notes: Although HT often marks the onset of direct speech with רלֵאמֹ, it does not do so in this verse. But NUM begins the speech with λέγων, the normal equivalent for רלֵאמֹ, and Origen placed this under the obelus. See under 27:15 for a discussion of how NUM handles רלֵאמֹ and its absence. Syh⁷ places the obelus one word too soon and does not have a metobelus.

HT (לְאִשַּׁי רֵיחַ נִיחֹחִי)
LXX (καρπώματα μου εἰς ὀσμῆν εὐωδίας)

<Sub ※> μου

Wit 2: O^−(G)⁵⁸ Syh = MT
Attr: ※] > omnes
NonGr: Syh μου κατὰ καιρὸν αὐτοῦ έορτάτης μου

Notes: The phrase בְּמֹעֲדוֹ is translated four different ways by NUM. The first is literally: κατὰ (τὸν) καιρὸν αὐτοῦ, at 9:7 and 13. Another fairly literal rendering is found at 9:2: καθ’ ὥραν αὐτοῦ. A third rendering at 9:3 uses a plural and omits the possessive: κατὰ καιροῦς. Verses 2, 3, and 7 from the same passage in chapter 9 represent each of the three choices, and all are in the context of the proper time to observe the Passover. Thus, the variants appear to be stylistic alternatives. In the present verse NUM has a fourth and more contextual rendering for עֲדוֹ בְּמוֹ: ταῖς ἑορταῖς μου, which
substitutes ἑορταῖς for the more generic καιρός and changes the third person possessive to first person. NUM uses ἑορτή to translate חָג later in this chapter (28:17) as well as in 29:12. Thus, the NUM translator may possibly have accommodated verse 2 to verse 17.

An unattributed note changes the NUM phrase ταῖς ἑορταῖς μου to τοῖς καιροῖς μου, which apart from the use of μου is closer to the Hebrew. Aquila and Symmachus employ καιρός for דֵּמוֹ in Jeremiah 26:17. Theodotion renders in the same way in Daniel 11:29, and 12:7. Thus, the use of καιροῖς in the present note could come from any of the Three. One would not, however, expect Aquila to render the third person pronominal suffix by μου. Because מַעֲדַנֶּה is preceded in HT by five references to God in the first person — “my offering,” “my food,” “my offerings by fire,” “an aroma of my appeasement,” and “you shall bring to me” — and because Leviticus 23:2 uses the phrase מִעֲדַנֶּה in the context of appointed feasts, it is possible that Symmachus used τοῖς καιροῖς μου as a contextual translation. Also Theodotion, after rendering מַעֲדַנֶּה according to his usual pattern (and that of NUM elsewhere), may have been content to copy μου from NUM since it makes sense in context.

This could also be the work of a scholiast who perhaps noticed that elsewhere in NUM (e.g., 9:7 and 13), the “gift/offering” (δωρόν) of the Lord is offered at the appointed “time” (καιρός). He thus added τοῖς καιροῖς as a harmonization, but not having the Hebrew he retained the first person possessive from NUM.

Num 28:3

HT אֲשֶׁר תַּקְרִיבוּ LXX ὅσα προσάξετε

ο’ ὅσα προσάξετε

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: A B Fα ↓ K ↓ V ↓ O−(G) 72 ↓ n−(767) d ↓ t−(527) 619 ↓ 319 624 799

Var: προσάξετε] -ξαται 458; -ξειται 75; -ται K V 82-376-707 319; προσετάξατε 71

Notes: In HT, Moses was instructed to say: זֶה הָאִשֶּׁה אֲשֶׁר תַּקְרִיבוּ לַיהוָה (“This is the offering by fire which you shall offer to the Lord”). The NUM translator rendered the singular זֶה הָאִשֶּׁה using the plural ταῦτα τὰ καρπῶ*ατα, probably construing נַפְשִׁים in its collective sense. For נַפְשִׁים NUM is consistent and uses the neuter plural adjective ὅσα. A number of manuscripts, including M and the s-group have the neuter plural pronoun ἀ instead. The meaning is not significantly different, but 344 from the s-group has a marginal note indicating that the ο’ text has ὅσα, and this is supported by the O-group.
In the list of variants above, all but one have the same verb as the o’ reading (i.e., προσάγω). Manuscript 71 employs προσετάξετε (aorist from προστάσσω) but it is listed as a witness because it has ὅσα.

α’ θ’ ὃ προσάξετε

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Notes:_ A note attributed to α’ and θ’ uses the singular pronoun ὃ, a singular referent which implies that the translators rendered the singular נָשָׁה by a singular in Greek. That Aquila would have matched the Hebrew in this way is very likely, and Theodotion could also have done so. Other than the present verse, Aquila uses προσάγω for בַּיְמֵּן in Jeremiah 37[30]:21 and Theodotion does so in Numbers 29:8 and Isaiah 57:3. Thus, these attributions are suitable.

σ’ ἃ προσάξετε

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ Μ’ ol ↓ C’ ↓ b 246 s 619 ↓ y 121 ↓ ε 407 55 ↓ 424 ↓ 646

_Var:_ προσάξετε] -ξατε M 57-131-313-422-500-529-615 108 18-126; -ται 19 646; προσάγετε 46 318; προσετάξε 424;

_Notes:_ A reading attributed σ’ uses the neuter plural pronoun ἃ which would be consistent with a plural rendering of נָשָׁה, as in NUM. Symmachus may have been thinking of נָשָׁה in its collective sense. Other than the present verse, Symmachus uses προσάγω for בַּיְמֵּן in Numbers 29:8 and in Jeremiah 37[30]:21. Thus the attribution to Symmachus makes sense. Some manuscripts may have been influenced by Symmachus, including the uncial M.

**Num 28:4**

| HT | בָּשֵׂם מְבֹרָךְ |
| LXX | ποιήσεις τὸ πρωί |

ο’ οἱ λ’ ποιήσεις τὸ πρωί

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ B V 963 ↓ O (G) 58-82 616* ↓ b d ↓ f ↓ n 767 619 319 424 624 799 Syh
Var: ποιήσεις] ∩ 2ο 314 | τό] τό 376 246 54-75′-127*  
NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT has the singular ποιήσεις and NUM renders this with ποιήσεις. Many manuscripts, including A, F, K, M, and the s-group have the plural variant ποιήσετε. A 344 (s-group) note indicates that the o’ text matches the singular in HT and NUM, and this is supported by the available O-group (minus 58). 344 also indicates that οἱ λ’ have the singular, and since this matches the Hebrew the attribution makes sense.

| HT | ποιήσεις τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέραν |
| LXX | ποιήσεις τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέραν |
| o’ οἱ λ’ | ποιήσεις τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέραν |

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: B V 963 O^{(G)}{-58 -82 b d^{(-125}} \{h^{(-767)}} t x^{(-527)} 619] 319 424 624 799 Syh

Var: τὸ πρός] τήν 458 | τό] > 319

NonGr: Syh

Notes: As with the first instance in NUM of ποιήσεις in this verse, for the second many manuscripts, including A, F, K, M, and the s-group have the plural variant ποιήσετε. A 344 (s-group) note indicates that the o’ text matches the singular in HT and NUM, and this is supported by the available O-group (minus 58). 344 also indicates that οἱ λ’ have the singular, and since this matches the Hebrew the attribution is suitable.

Num 28:5

HT (יָשְׂרִית)
LXX (καὶ) ποιήσεις (τὸ δέκατον)

Sub ∩

Wit 2: Syh

>
Notes: HT begins this verse with a continuation of the list of items that are to be sacrificed. NUM repeats the verb ποιήσεις from verse 4, which makes sense in context but has no counterpart in the Hebrew, and so Origen placed it under the obelus.

In Wevers’ apparatus, the entire phrase καὶ ποιήσεις is listed as being under the obelus. But καὶ in NUM is matched by a waw in the Hebrew. In addition, the obelus sign in Syh is ambiguous — it appears over the conjunction and may be marking only the word אוג(ܠ) and not the conjunction. Thus, it is probable that Origen’s obelus applies only to ποιήσεις.

Sub ※ κεκομμένω

Notes: HT says that the oil that is offered will be “pounded/beaten” (כחות), but NUM mentions the oil without any description, perhaps following the Samaritan Pentateuch which omits כחות. Origen added a rough equivalent, κεκομμένω, under the asterisk (from κομμίζω, “to be like gum”) which in context means “thickened.”

Num 28:6

Notes: Instead of סינא in NUM, manuscripts 426, 54’-458, and Syh have סינת which matches the Hebrew סינא, and this may reflect Origen’s work (see THGN 59.
regarding the same reading at 9:1). These witnesses are against the vast majority of the Greek tradition which match Σινα in NUM. This phenomenon occurs at 3:4, 14, 9:1, 5, 10:12, 26:64, 28:6, 33:15, 16. Syh is listed as a witness because it matches the final *iota* in Σινα, although here Syh matches P and so Syh may have been influenced by P rather than reflecting the *o* text.

HT אִשֶּׁה (לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ)
LXX (εἰς ὀσ*ὴν εὐωδίας)

**Sub □ + κάρπωμα**

*Wit 2:*  O(G) Syh = MT

*Attr:*  ※ Syh > rell

*NonGr:*  Syh

**Notes:** Normally in NUM, the Hebrew לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ is translated as ὀσ*ὴν εὐωδίας. When the word אִשֶּׁה accompanies it in context, NUM renders it as a form of κάρπωμα (“fruit offering” or “burnt offering”) as earlier in this passage in 28:2 and later in 28:13 and 24; also 15:5, 10, 14, 18:17, 29:11, 13, 36). For some reason, for the present verse the NUM translator chose not to render אִשֶּׁה and Origen added the normal equivalent under the asterisk.

Syh uses the two word equivalent אִשֶּׁה לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ (“offering of fruit”) for κάρπωμα. Syh placed an asterisk before אִשֶּׁה, which is correct, with a second extraneous asterisk before אִשֶּׁה, followed by a correctly placed metobelus.

**Num 28:7**

HT נִסְכּ וְ LXX καὶ σπονδὴν (αὐτοῦ)

*ο’ α’ καὶ εἰς (σ)πονδῆν*

*Wit 1:*  344

*Wit 2:*  O[G] Syh

*Var:*  εἰς] ει 376

*NonGr:*  Syh
Notes: Here the s-group matches NUM with σπονδήν, and manuscript 344 from the s-group reports that o’ and α’ insert εἰς before σπονδήν. The o’ attribution is supported by O-group manuscripts 376 and 426, and Syh. Wevers argues that Origen and Aquila had a parent text that read תַּנְשֵׁם instead of תַּנְשֵׁם (NGTN 473, note 9), and this is reasonable particularly for Aquila who would not be likely to add εἰς without Hebrew support. Aquila uses σπονδή for נֶסֶך elsewhere (e.g., in Jer 51[44]:18).

σ’ θ’ σπονδήν

Wit 1: 344\textsuperscript{1st}

Wit 2: ↓A B F K M’ V 58-o’ C’ b d f n\textsuperscript{(-767)} s t x\textsuperscript{(-527)} y \textsuperscript{(-407)} ↓55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Var: σπονδήν] -δή \ A 55(l)

Notes: For נֶסֶך in HT, the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts have σπονδήν without a previous εἰς (unlike o’ and α’ — see above). 344 reports that Symmachus and Theodotion match NUM and HT and do not have εἰς, which makes sense for them. If Origen and Aquila were referring to a different parent text, then the difference between the translators can be explained readily. Symmachus and Theodotion use σπονδή for נֶסֶך elsewhere (e.g., in Jer 51[44]:18).

HT (EndElement)
LXX (EndElement)

Sub ~ ⟨÷⟩ + οἶνου

Wit 2: Syh

Sub ~ ⟨÷⟩ + οἶνου

Wit 2: A B F M\textsuperscript{1st} V O"\textsuperscript{-(G) 376} C’ b d\textsuperscript{(-44'-107)} f s\textsuperscript{(-85mg 344mg)} x\textsuperscript{(-527)} y \textsuperscript{(-407)} 55 59

NonGr: Syh ↙

Notes: Syh\textsuperscript{1} has inserted a sign like a lemnisk without dots (~) which appears to be functioning as an obelus. At 21:5 a similar sign with accompanying metobelus is used where an obelus is clearly warranted, and this appears to be its intended use here. The original LXX likely did not have οἶνου, but the word was introduced after the phrase τὸ τέταρτον τοῦ ʹν at some point and affected many manuscripts (M\textsuperscript{mg 376 44'-107 n\textsuperscript{(-767)}}
85mg - 344mg t Syh). That Origen had an LXX version available to him with οἴνου is possible because O-group manuscript 376, Syh, M, and s-group marginal notes are aware of this reading. Origen also possibly added an obelus because Syh has the word under a symbol functioning like an obelus.

HT שֵׁכָר
LXX σίκερα

α’ μεθύσματος

Wit 1: Syh
NonGr: Syh אֲלַבָּן

Notes: HT speaks of a drink offering “of a strong drink” (שֵׁכָר). This Hebrew word appears here and in 6:3 (2x) in Numbers, and each time it is rendered using a Greek transliteration common in the LXX: σίκερα (also in Lev 10:9, Deut 14:25[26], 29:6[5], Isa 5:11, 22, 24:9, 28:7[2x], 29:9). Apparently, Aquila chose to translate. The retroversion μεθύσματος (“intoxicating drink”) from the Syriac is appropriate for Aquila, who uses this word to translate כָרשֵׁ in Numbers 6:3 (also Deut 14:25[26], 29:6[5], Isa 5:11, 28:7). Note that Syh is missing an index for this reading.

Num 28:8

HT כְּמִנְחַת הַבֹּקֶר וּכְנִסְכּוֹ
LXX κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν σπονδὴν αὐτοῦ

{Sub ÷} σπονδῆν τοῦ αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: Syh
NonGr: Syh אֲלַבָּן

Notes: Syh has an obelus that is clearly incorrect, as נִסְכּוֹ in HT and σπονδῆν αὐτοῦ in NUM both have a possessive pronoun. The mistake possibly resulted from confusion about an earlier mismatch in the verse. HT speaks of offering a lamb at evening “as the sacrifice of the morning” (כְּמִנְחַת הַבֹּקֶר). NUM does not render הַבֹּקֶר and instead uses αὐτοῦ, giving, κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτοῦ. This is followed by κατὰ τὴν σπονδῆν αὐτοῦ which matches the Hebrew exactly. One can speculate that Origen attempted to mark the first αὐτοῦ with an obelus, but that later the sign was misplaced. Another possible explanation is that verse 9 in NUM ends with σπονδῆν, and there
Origen placed a following αὐτοῦ under the asterisk, possibly causing sign confusion with the similar phrase in verse 8. In any case, Syh’s obelus is categorized here as an error.

Sub ※ pr κἀρπωμα

Wit 2: O\textsuperscript{–G} Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh | > rell

NonGr: Syh א watermarked Luke

Notes: This is a similar situation to that found in verse 6, only in this instance, the Hebrew has אישה before ריח ניחוח rather than after. Again, NUM chose not to translate אישה and Origen inserted the equivalent κἀρπωμα under the asterisk before the entire phrase εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.

Num 28:9

non tr εἰς θυσίαν ἀναπεποιημένης ἐν ἐλαιώ

Wit 2: A F M\textsuperscript{–G} 15 82 C\textsuperscript{–407} 55 59 424 624 646 799 Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh א watermarked Luke

Notes: HT states that the flour will be an “offering mixed with oil,” but NUM modifies the order and says the flour will be “mixed with oil for an offering” (ἀναπεποιημένης ἐν ἐλαιώ εἰς θυσίαν). Origen transposes ἀναπεποιημένης ἐν ἐλαιώ after εἰς θυσίαν to match the Hebrew word order, and not only the hexaplaric groups but many other witnesses (including A F K M) reflect this change.
273

Sub ※  + αὐτοῦ

Wit 1:  ↓85′↓321′↓344

Wit 2:  K O(–G) Syh = Compl MT

Attr:  ※ 85-344] > rell

NonGr:  Syh אָלַך

Notes:  In the final part of verse 9, HT has “its drink-offering” (נִסְכּוֹ) and NUM omits the possessive, so Origen adds it under the asterisk. Although for Numbers, Aristarchian signs are normally found in Syh or manuscript G, for this verse the asterisk is indicated in the margins of 85 and 344, two s-group manuscripts.

Num 28:10

HT  (וֹ )שַׁבַּתּ(בְּ)
LXX  σαββάσιν

ο’  σάββασιν αὐτοῦ

Wit 1:  ↓85↓321↓344

Wit 2:  ↓O(–G) ↓30’ ↓x(527)619 ↓68′↓120 Syh

Attr:  ο’ 344] > rell

Var:  αὐτοῦ] > 30′-85mg-321′mg-344′mg x(527)619 68′-120

NonGr:  Syh אָלַך

Notes:  Manuscript 344 from the s-group attributes two modifications to NUM in the ο’ text. First, the ο’ note changes σαββάσιν in NUM to σάββασιν, an alternate form for the dative plural of σάββατον. This is likely an inner Greek correction, and it may have been available to Origen in one of his exemplars. It is witnessed by the O-group and has been incorporated by several other non-hexaplaric manuscripts. The second modification is the addition of the possessive αὐτοῦ to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix (שַׁבַּתּוֹ) for which NUM has no equivalent. That this addition is Origen’s work is supported by the O-group and Syh, and it may originally have been under the asterisk.
Num 28:11

HT  הָזְדָּשֵׁיכֶם
LXX  νεομηνιαῖς

〈Sub ※〉 ὑῶν

Wit 2:  O(-G) Arab Syh = MT
Attr:  ※] > omnes
NonGr:  Syh

Notes: The second person plural pronominal suffix on חָדְשֵׁיכֶם is omitted by NUM. Origen added the equivalent ὑῶν as witnessed by the O-group, Arab, and Syh, and this was possibly originally under the asterisk.

HT  בֵּן(יוֹדֶה)
LXX  (ἐνιαυσίους)

〈Sub ※〉 pr υἱοῦς

Wit 2:  376 Syh = MT
Attr:  ※] > omnes
NonGr:  Syh

Notes: HT uses the idiom בֵּן-יוֹדֶה to indicate that lambs to be sacrificed are to be one year old. NUM uses the functionally equivalent ἐνιαυσίους and 376 from the O-group and Syh indicate that Origen may have attempted to match the Hebrew by preceding ἐνιαυσίους with υἱοῦς. This was possibly originally under the asterisk.

Num 28:12

HT  בָּשָׂלוֹן
LXX  (τρία)

〈Sub ※〉 pr καὶ
Notes: Although Origen does not always account for conjunctions in HT that have no equivalent in NUM, he appears to have done so here, as witnessed by the O-group, Arm, and Syh. The addition may originally have been under the asterisk.

HT: £ššeš šešerim sélá (flour, an offering)
LXX: (τρία δέκατα σεμιδάλεως)

Sub * + εἰς θυσίαν

Notes: Two times in this verse, HT has the phrase סֹלֶת מִנְחָה (flour, an offering”) where מִנְחָה stands as an appositive to the previous phrase. Both times, NUM has no equivalent for מִנְחָה. Origen adds εἰς θυσίαν as an equivalent under the asterisk in both cases. The second instance is covered below.

HT: ššaš šešerim sélá (flour, an offering)
LXX: (καὶ δύο δέκατα σεμιδάλεως)

Sub * + εἰς θυσίαν

Notes: This is the second instance in this verse where HT has סֹלֶת מִנְחָה and NUM has no equivalent for מִנְחָה (the first is covered above). Again, Origen adds the
equivalent εἰς θυσίαν under the asterisk. For this second asterisk, M’ is also a witness to the addition.

**Num 28:13**

HT

εἰς θυσίαν ἀναπεποιη*ένης

LXX

dékaton dékaton semidálews ἀναπεποιημένης (ἐν ἔλαιῳ)

ο′ α′ θ′
dékaton dékaton semidálews  
eis θυσίαν ἀναπεποιημένης

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: εἰς θυσίαν O(–G) ↓b ↓AethC ↓Arab ↓Bo ↓Lat cod 100 Syh

Var: εἰς] > Lat cod 100 Aeth C Bo = MT

NonGr: Lat cod 100 et decimam similaginis sacrificium consparsum oleo

Notes: As in verse 11, NUM has no equivalent for κόσμης. Many manuscripts, including the s-group follow the NUM omission here. Manuscript 344 from the s-group records that ο′, α′, θ′ all use εἰς θυσίαν to render κόσμης. For the two omissions that occur in verse 11, Origen places the equivalents under asterisks (see above). This is consistent with the present note, which is also witnessed by the O-group and Syh. Thus this note probably reflects the ο′ text, and it may originally have been under the asterisk.

Although the data to support the vocabulary in the reading is limited, it is possibly accurate for Aquila and Theodotion. The literal rendering of the doubled phrase τριακόσια as dékaton dékaton is similar to Aquila and Theodotion’s translation of αἴσθησις as άνεμος ἀνήρ in 1:4 (see REI-Pro 24). Although neither Aquila nor Theodotion use κόσμης for κόσμης, they both use it for the related word θυσία in Zechariah 8:19. For σεμιδάλεως, this verse is the only place where it is attributed to any of the Three, but Aquila and Theodotion could simply have followed NUM, which has a literal translation. All of the Three employ θυσία, but normally to render ἱερατία and not κόσμης. Apart from this verse, however, Aquila does use θυσία to render κόσμης in Jeremiah 48[41]:5, and Theodotion could be satisfied with following NUM. Finally, aside from the present verse, Theodotion uses a form of ἀναποιέω to render κόσμης in Exodus 29:2 in the same context of flour “mixed” with oil. In summary, the attributions to Aquila and Theodotion are probably correct.

σ′

καὶ ἀνὰ dékaton semidálews
δῶρον πεφυραμένης ἐν ἐλαίῳ

Notes: Another 344 note attributed to σ' provides an alternate translation to that of α' and θ', and it fits Symmachus for the following reasons. First, Symmachus does not translate τῆς πεφυραμένης αἵρεσις literally, choosing instead the more contextual ἀνὰ δέκατον, and this is consistent with his less literal Tendenz. Second, elsewhere Symmachus does not employ δέκατος for τῆς πεφυραμένης but he does for the related word μεσήμβρα in Deut 12:17. Third, although Symmachus does not use σεμίδαλις other than for this verse, he could have copied NUM, whose rendering is adequate. Fourth, instead of θυσία, Symmachus uses δῶρον for τῆς πεφυραμένης αἵρεσις, which he also does at 16:15 (as well as Jer 48[41]:5, Zeph 3:10, Mal 2:13). Fifth, Symmachus uses φυράω ("mixing flour") elsewhere, although not for βλοθλή but for a related word dealing with kneading flour (לוש) in Jeremiah 7:18. Thus, although the available data does not provide a perfect fit, the attribution to Symmachus makes sense.

HT

LXX θυσίαν

Sub ※ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα

Notes: For this verse, the asterisk is used to indicate a substitution and not an addition. The Hebrew עֹלָה is normally rendered by ὀλοκαύτωμα in NUM, for example in this chapter in verses 3, 6, 10(2x), 11, 14, 15, 19, 23(2x), 24, 27, and 31. Other than for the present verse NUM uses θυσία for עֹלָה in 23:3 and 15, perhaps because in the context of chapter 23, the sacrifices were from Balak and idolatrous. Only here do we have any indication that Origen attempted to correct the less characteristic rendering.
Often in Numbers, HT has the expression לְעֹלָה and this is usually rendered by NUM as εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα (e.g., 6:11, 16, 7:15, 21, 27, etc.). Twice, לְעֹלָה without the preposition is rendered εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα (8:12, 15:8), probably for contextual reasons. In the present verse, the o’ text has also rendered לְעֹלָה using εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα and placed the phrase under the asterisk. Because the o’ text also deletes θυσίαν, the net effect is that it has substituted εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα for θυσίαν. This is not the usual function of the asterisk, which normally shows where HT has material that is not translated at all by the LXX. O-group manuscript 58 adds εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα but retains θυσίαν from NUM as well. 426 has ὁλοκαύτωμα without the preceding εἰς which is a more exact rendering of HT, and accords with this manuscript’s occasional tendency to follow the Hebrew more closely than the rest of the O-group (at times possibly providing a better o’ text reading — see the discussion in Chapter 5).

Num 28:14

HT

(וּשְׁלִישִׁת הַהִין לָאַיִל)

LXX

(καὶ τὸ τρίτον τοῦ ἴν) ἔσται (τῷ κριῷ τῷ ἑνί)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: Sa = MT

NonGr: Syh 넥스

Notes: HT uses the explicit copula (πρῖν) only once for the wine measurements for the three different animals in verse 14, but NUM includes ἔσται all three times. The second and third are placed under the obelus by Origen. The second instance of ἔσται (and first obelus) is covered here.

HT

(ורביצה חורי לֶכֶבֶשׁ)

LXX

(καὶ τὸ τέταρτον τοῦ ἴν) ἔσται (τῷ ἀμνῷ τῷ ἑνί)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh
Notes: HT uses the explicit copula (יִהְיֶה) only once for the wine measurements for the three different animals in verse 14, but NUM includes ἔσται all three times. This entry covers the third instance of ἔσται in the verse, and the second that is obelized (see above for the first obelus). Manuscripts 58 and 458 witness negatively to this obelus, whereas only the Sahidic does so for the previous obelus.

HT (ךֶּבֶשׂ)
LXX (τῷ ἀνῷ) τῷ ἑνί ἕνι

Sub ÷

Notes: HT employs הָאֶחָד many times in chapter 28 to indicate “each” of the animals to be sacrificed (in verses 7, 12[2x], 13, 21, 28[2x], and 29), and NUM renders each instance with τῷ ἑνί. In the present verse, however, HT omits הָאֶחָד for all three animals. NUM follows its usual pattern and adds τῷ ἑνί for each of the three. For the third instance, Origen marks the plus in the Greek with the obelus. In verse 20, HT also omits הָאֶחָד twice after animal names, and NUM follows the same pattern with τῷ ἑνί after each, but Origen does not obelize them there. Why he chose to obelize this one instance in verse 14 is not clear.

HT (ךֶּבֶשׂ)
LXX (ἐκ μηνός)

Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ

Notes: O-58 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ܕܐܘ ܬܠ(ל)
Notes: HT includes a possessive suffix after “month” (ינוארְ) which NUM omits, and Origen adds its equivalent under the asterisk.

Num 28:16

HT  וָיֵה לַחֹדֶשׁ פֶּסַח לְיהוָה
LXX  ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνὸς πάσχα κυρίῳ

ο’ οι λ’  ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνὸς πάσχα κυρίῳ

(Kω)

Wit 1: 344 ↓ 121

Wit 2: ↓ B ↓ F M V ↓ O n (−767) B x (−527) z (−407) ↓ 55
↓ 319 646 799 Syh

Attr: ο’ οι λ’] > 121

Var: κυρίῳ] pr τῷ F 707* 54; κυρίου Btxt 82 127 55 319

NonGr: Syh סְמָכַת (דְּסָמְכַת) אֲשֶׁר הוֹקֵם לְמָשָּׁה

Notes: The translation of the end of verse 16 in NUM is fairly literal, apart from rendering the Hebrew idiom יָהְרָדֶשׁ with a genitive: ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνός. Changes were introduced to this part of the verse in various parts of the manuscript tradition, including: (1) omitting ἡμέρα, (2) adding τοῦτου after μηνός (including the s-group), and (3) changing κυρίῳ to the genitive κυρίου. A note from s-group manuscript 344 affirms that unlike the s-group texts, ο’ and οι λ’ match NUM and do not have τοῦτου. That the ο’ text matches NUM (and HT) is supported by most of the hexaplaric witnesses. The witnesses listed above match the entire ο’ text reading.

Regarding οι λ’, Symmachus and Theodotion could have translated in line with NUM which follows the Hebrew reasonably closely. But Aquila would be likely to render יָהְרָדֶשׁ quantitatively as τῷ κυρίῳ rather than simply κυρίῳ (for his quantitative rendering of prepositions, see Burkitt 12-13). This is supported by another 344 note in 30:4 attributed to οι λ’ that renders יָהְרָדֶשׁ as τῷ κυρίῳ. Thus, Aquila is less likely to be reflected in the present attribution to οι λ’ than the other two translators.

Num 28:17

HT  וָיֵה לַחֹדֶשׁ פֶּסַח לְיהוָה
LXX  ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦτου έορτή
Notes: Manuscript 127 from the n-group has the phrase ἡμέρα τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου ἑορτή under the asterisk. This is clearly a mistake since NUM matches HT quantitatively and no Greek manuscripts are missing the phrase.

Num 28:18

HT 

LXX

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: ↓O(-G) ↓Sa = MT

Var: ἔσται υἱίν] ἔσται 58 Sa; υἱίν 376-426

NonGr: Syh ↙ compel ÷ compel

Notes: The NUM phrase ἔσται υἱίν has no counterpart in the Hebrew, and Origen probably placed the phrase under the obelus. The omissions resulting from this obelus are mixed in the O-group — 376 and 426 delete ἔσται and retain υἱίν, and conversely 58 deletes υἱίν and retains ἔσται. Syh has ἔσται υἱίν but places υἱίν alone under the obelus. One would expect ἔσται υἱίν to be under the obelus, and it is likely that Syhᵀ misplaced the obelus by one word and that the o’ text originally obelized ἔσται υἱίν.

Num 28:19

HT

LXX

κρίνων ἕνα
ο’ οἱ λ’ καὶ κριὸν ἕνα

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: O(-G) 46 44 319 624 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh

NonGr: Syh ܢܸܡܒ݂ ܢܹܐ

Notes: HT for verse 19 lists what is to be offered on the first day of the Passover celebration: “Bulls, members of the herd two, and one ram, and seven lambs one year old.” The Hebrew includes two conjunctions to connect the three items, but NUM omits them both. The s-group matches NUM, and a 344 (s-group) note indicates that the ο’ text adds καὶ between the first two items. This is witnessed by the O-group and Syh. The 344 note also indicates that οἱ λ’ include καὶ which makes sense since this matches the Hebrew.

Num 28:22

HT (שׂעִיר)
LXX (καὶ χί*αρον) ἐξ αἰγῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh = MT Tar

NonGr: Syh ܢܹܡܒ݂ ܢܹܐ

Notes: In 28:15 HT has θυσίας άχις (“a male goat of the goats”) and NUM appropriately translates χί*αρον ἐξ αἰγῶν (likewise also in 7:16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82, 15:24, 28:30, 29:5, 11, 16, 19, 25). In the present verse, the Hebrew has only שׂעִיר but NUM translates as in other places with χί*αρον ἐξ αἰγῶν. Origen placed the added ἐξ αἰγῶν under the obelus. The same obelus occurs in 29:28, 31, 34, and 38.

HT (θυσίας άχις)
LXX ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας

non tr περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἕνα

Wit 2: 426 Syh
Notes: The NUM standard equivalent for חַטָּאת (and חַטָּאתלְ) used in the sense of an offering is περὶ ἁμαρτίας. In HT for this verse, the number of male goats (אֶחָד) is placed after the function of the goat (חַטָּאת), while in the Greek, ἕνα is placed before περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Origen has transposed ἕνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order. This same transposition occurs in the o’ text in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38.

Num 28:23

HT
(עֹלַת)
LXX
(τῆς ὁλοκαυτώσεως) τῆς διὰ παντός

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 426 761 75 392 = MT

NonGr: Syh סימנים וסימנים

Notes: In the Hebrew phrase עֹלַת הַתָּמִיד (or עֹלַת תָּמִיד), NUM renders עֹלָה either as a form of ὁλοκαύτωσις or the related ὁλοκαύτωσις. The second word תָּמִיד is usually rendered with an article plus διὰ παντός (28:10, 15, 31, 29:6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38) or occasionally with ἐνδελεχισμόν (“perpetual” — 28:6, 23). In the present verse, עֹלַת appears in two phrases: (1) עֹלַת הַבֹּקֶר and (2) the common עֹלַת הַתָּמִיד. NUM translates the second using τῆς ὁλοκαυτώσεως ἐνδελεχισμού which is “normal.” The first, however, is translated τῆς ὁλοκαυτώσεως τῆς διὰ παντός. This does not render הַבֹּקֶר and substitutes the standard τῆς διὰ παντός which has no equivalent in the Hebrew. Origen placed τῆς διὰ παντός under the obelus.

Sub ※ ποιήσετε

Wit 2: ↓Ο(G) 619 121 mg ↓z120(407) 646 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh > rell
**Var:**  
ποιήσετε] -ται 376 126

**NonGr:**  
Syh

**Notes:**  
HT explicitly repeats the command שמשה אִלֶּה ("you shall do these") regarding the offerings, while NUM assumes it from the context. Origen adds ποιήσετε under the asterisk, although he does not account for שמשה אִלֶּה.

**Num 28:25**

**HT**
(מקראת שבת לֹא מְלֶאכֶת לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ)

**LXX**
(ἐργὸν λατρευτὸν οὐ ποιήσετε) ἐν αὐτῇ

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:**  
Syh

>  

**Wit 2:**  
125  
Lat cod 100 = MT

**NonGr:**  
Syh מְלֶאכֶת

**Notes:**  
HT says that on the Sabbath, "business work you shall not perform" (מקראת שבת לֹא מְלֶאכֶת לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ). NUM adds ἐν αὐτῇ, a pattern it follows also in 29:35, and Origen places the phrase under the obelus here and in 29:35.

**Num 28:26**

**HT**
(לַהְדוֹת)

**LXX**
(κυρίῳ)

**Sub ※ pr τῶν**

**Wit 2:**  
$O^{(G)}$ 58 422 f 407 55  
Syh = Compl

**Attr:**  
※ Syh] > rell

**NonGr:**  
Syh
Notes: NUM normally renders the phrase לַיהוָה using κυρίῳ with no definite article. The two exceptions are 18:12 and 28:11 where NUM adds the article τῷ. Occasionally, as for the present verse, Origen decides to add τῷ under the asterisk for לַיהוָה (for details, see the asterisk at 25:4).

Sub ※ + ὑ*ῶν

Wit 2: O(G)58-15 Arab Syh = MT
Attr: ※ Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh מִים תָּ

Notes: HT has "בְּשָׁבֻעֹתיכֶם ("your feast of weeks") and NUM does not render the possessive suffix, so Origen added its equivalent under the asterisk.

Num 28:27

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 58 Lat cod 100 Arab = MT Tar
NonGr: Syh מִים תָּ

Notes: HT frequently uses the modifier מִים תָּ to describe sacrifices as "unblemished," with NUM rendering this with a form of ἁμώμος (19:2, 28:3, 9, 11, 19, 31, 29:2, 8, 13, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 36). At the end of verse 27, NUM adds the word ἁμώμος to describe seven male lambs, but מִים תָּ does not appear in the underlying Hebrew, and so Origen places this under the obelus. This is the only place in NUM where ἁμώμος is used apart from מִים תָּ in HT.
Num 28:30

HT (עִשָּׂרֹון עִזִּים אֶחָד)
LXX (καὶ χί*αρον ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα) περὶ ἁ*αρτίας

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

Notes: For NUM, this verse is an exact copy of verse 22, but the Hebrew here is different. There, the phrase ἐξ αἰγῶν is not matched in the Hebrew, and is under the obelus. Here, the NUM phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is not matched in the Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. Sam has the equivalent לָחַטאת that HT omits, and NUM may have followed Sam or had a parent text that matched Sam. The initial καὶ is also not matched in the Hebrew, but Origen ignores it.

Num 28:31

HT (תַּעֲשׂוּ)
LXX (ποιήσετέ) μοι

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

Notes: NUM states the recipient of the sacrifices (μοι), but this is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places μοι under the obelus.
Verses 31 in NUM summarizes the preceding section which gives detailed prescriptions about various offerings. The verse begins: πλὴν τοῦ ὁλοκαυτώ*ατος τοῦ
dιὰ παντός· καὶ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτῶν ποιήσετε *οι
This is followed by a prescription
that the offerings “will be without blemish to you” (ἀ*ω*οὶ ἔσονται ὑ*ῖν
Finally, the drink offerings that accompany the offerings are mentioned:
καὶ αἱ σπονδαὶ αὐτῶν.
Here, σπονδαί nominative, and this coordinates with the nominative
ἡ θυσία αὐτῶν in verse 28, as can be seen from the similar relation that the phrase
καὶ αἱ σπονδαὶ αὐτῶν has with θυσία (or θυσίαι) in 29:6, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 38. Many manuscripts,
however, have changed καὶ αἱ σπονδαὶ in verse 30 to the accusative τὰς σπονδάς,
probably because it was seen as a second direct object, along with τὴν θυσίαν, of
ποιήσετέ in the phrase τὴν θυσίαν αὐτῶν ποιήσετέ μοι which is earlier in verse 31.
The change to the accusative was probably an inner Greek correction. Wevers considers
καὶ αἱ σπονδαὶ to be original as the lectio difficilior (NGTN 482). The s-group texts reflect
the original nominative in NUM, but 344 has a note that attributes the accusative to o’
and o’’. The attribution to o’ is supported by the O-group (minus 58). Symmachus uses
σπονδή for סכ in Numbers 28:7 and his use of the accusative is
understandable in the present verse if he treated סכ as an object of the closely
preceding command
.

According to an attribution in 344txt, Aquila and Theodotion followed NUM,
apparently agreeing that καὶ αἱ σπονδαὶ has a coordinate relationship with η θυσία αὐτῶν
in verse 28. That both of these translators made this choice makes sense. First, they both
use σπονδή for סכ in Numbers 28:7. Second, Theodotion often agrees with NUM.
And finally, both he and Aquila could have perceived the larger structure in the same way as the NUM translator.

**Numbers 29**

**Num 29:1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>מִקְרָא</td>
<td>ἐπίκλητος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐπίκλητος</td>
<td>κλητή</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** An unattributed s-group note substitutes κλητή for ἐπίκλητος in the phrase ἐπίκλητος ἁγία in NUM which renders מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ. NUM translates מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ two ways: (1) as ἐπίκλητος ἁγία (28:18, 26, 29:1, 7, and 12); and (2) as κλητή ἁγία in 28:25. The latter is the normal choice in the Pentateuch (e.g., in Lev 23:3, 7, 8, 24, 27, 35, 36). In NUM the choice between the two seems to be stylistic (cf. 28:25 and 26). However, no textual evidence points to Origen (or any other NUM tradition) substituting κλητή for ἐπίκλητος in the present verse, so an attribution to o’ does not seem to fit.

Aquila and Symmachus employ the word κλητός for מִקְרָא in Isaiah 1:13, also in a cultic context (they also use κλητός in Isa 48:12). In Isaiah 1:13 Theodotion uses the phrase κλητήν ἐπικλήτον for מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, so he appears to be familiar with both words being considered in the present context. Aquila and Symmachus do not use ἐπίκλητος anywhere, and thus they are perhaps the most likely to use κλητός here. Any of the Three, however, are possible sources for this reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>ימֶרֶא תַּרְעֹת</td>
<td>ἡ<em>έρα ση</em>ασίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἡ<em>έρα ση</em>ασίας</td>
<td>τὸ σα*′ ἠ*έρα(ν) ἀκουστή(ν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** A note in the catena section of the Catena manuscripts attributes to τὸ σαμ’ the reading ἡ*έρα(ν) ἀκουστή(ν) instead of ἡ*έρα ση*ασίας in NUM for ימֶרֶא תַּרְעֹת (“day of shouting”). If τὸ σαμ’ here refers to the Samaritikon then it should reflect Sam, which is identical to HT here with תְּרוּעָה. The Hebrew תְּרוּעָה means “a signal,” usually in the context of war, and can refer to a war cry or to an alarm for war.
The word ἀκουστός denotes a sound in a more general sense. This is the only place where τὸ σαμ’ is reported to use ἀκουστός. In conclusion, the attribution is possibly accurate.

**Num 29:2**

HT  
בֶּן־בָּקָר אֶחָד

LXX  
ένα ἐκ βοῶν

non tr  
ἐκ βοῶν ἕνα

_Wit 2:_ O^58 (G) Lat cod 100 Sy (sed hab Aug Loc in hept IV 88) = MT

_NonGr:_ Lat cod 100 ex bubus unum | Syh _fmt_ Syh

*Notes:* Describing the offering of a bull, HT says literally, “a member of a herd, one.” NUM places the number ἕνα before ἐκ βοῶν and Origen transposes it to match the Hebrew word order.

**Num 29:3**

HT  
–

LXX  
τῷ ἑνί

Sub ÷

_Wit 2:_ Syh = MT

_NonGr:_ Syh

*Notes:* This verse is very similar to 28:12, except that there, HT includes the explicit number “one” (ΠΡΩΤΩ) for each of the two animals mentioned, while the numbers are lacking for the present verse. NUM is consistent and includes τῷ ἑνί for both 28:12 and here, and Origen places the second instance in this verse under the obelus.

**Num 29:6**

HT  
(ἐν ὑπάρχων ὕπαρξις)

LXX  
(εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας)

Sub ※ + κάρπωμα
Notes: This situation is identical to that in 28:6, where an Origenic asterisk also applies to κάρπωμα. Normally in NUM, the Hebrew רֵיחַ נִיחֹח is translated as ὀσὴν εὐωδίας. When the word ἔποιηκε accompanies רֵיחַ נִיחֹח, NUM renders the former as a form of κάρπωμα (as in 15:5, 10, 14, 18:17, 28:2, 13, 24, 29:11, 13, 36). For some reason, for the present verse the NUM translator has no equivalent for אִשֶּה, and Origen added the normal equivalent under the asterisk. Interestingly, the first instance of καὶ αἱ σπονδαί αὐτῶν in this verse in NUM is not matched in HT, but Origen does not indicate this.

For no apparent reason, Syh renders εἰς ὀσὴν εὐωδίας using the word איהו תַּשָּׁב— it does this also at 29:11 and 36). Earlier in Numbers, at 28:6 and 8, Syh uses the non-redundant rendering איהו תַּשָּׁב.

Num 29:7

HT יָשַׁבְתֶּם (לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי)
LXX προσοίσετε (τοῦ μηνός)

Sub ※ + τοῦ ἐβδομον

Num 29:8

HT יָשְׁבוּ (לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי)
LXX προσοίσετε

σ’ θ’ προσάξετε
Notes: For the Hebrew הִקְרַבְתֶּם, Manuscript 344 from the s-group attributes the reading προσάξετε to σ′ and θ′ in place of προσοίσετε in NUM. Symmachus uses προσάγω for בָּרַפ in Numbers 28:3 and Jeremiah 37[30]:21. Theodotion does so in Numbers 28:3 and Isaiah 57:3. Thus these attributions make sense. A number of LXX manuscripts, including F, reflect this reading and may have been influenced by one of these translators. It is also possible, however, that these manuscripts were influenced by the NUM translation at 29:13 where προσάξετε is used for הִקְרַבְתֶּם in an identical context (προσάξετε is also used by NUM for בָּרַפ at 28:3, 11, 19, 27, 29:13, 36).

HT

LXX

ο′ οι λ′ ὀλοκαυτώμα τῷ κύριῳ (κω)

Notes: HT says that the burnt offering is to be presented “to the Lord” ( DataBase ) but NUM does not include an equivalent. Origen added τῷ κύριῳ, as evidenced by the O-group, Syh, and a 344 attribution to the o′ text, and this may originally have been under the asterisk. NUM also renders the singular πῦξι using the plural ὀλοκαυτώματα. The s-group matches NUM, but s-group manuscript 344 notes that the o′ text matches the Hebrew singular with ὀλοκαυτώμα and this is supported by the O-group. The o′ text may have influenced other manuscripts since many, including the uncials F and M, also have the singular.

The reading ὀλοκαυτώμα τῷ κύριῳ is also attributed to oi λ′ by 344. Aquila and Theodotion employ ὀλοκαυτώμα for הִקְרַבְתֶּם in Numbers 15:8 and elsewhere (e.g., a′: Job 42:8; θ′: Ezek 40:38, 39). At Numbers 15:8 and Job 42:8, Symmachus has the alternate
rendering ἀναφορά, but he does employ ὀλοκαύτωμα for ἔλαλεν at Jeremiah 19:5. Since the vocabulary is suitable for the Three, and as any one of them could be expected (1) not to ignore יְהֹוָה, and (2) to match the singular על, this attribution is suitable.

**Num 29:11**

**HT**

בֶּן־בָּקָר אֶחָד

**LXX**

ἐνα ἐκ βοῶν

**non tr**

ἐκ βοῶν ἕνα

**Wit 2:**  A F O′(G) 82 \(C^*\) \(b f^{53}\) \(129\) s 619 \(z^{126}\) 407 55 59 416 424 646 799 Syh

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** This same transposition occurred at 29:2. Describing the offering of a bull, the Hebrew says literally, “a member of a herd, one.” NUM places the number ἑνά before ἐκ βοῶν and Origen transposes it to match the Hebrew word order. Many other manuscripts also reflect this change.

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:** Syh

> 28-85<sup>th</sup> Arab = MT

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** The first part of 29:11 in HT is the same as verse 5, except that verse 5 adds the phrase לְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיכֶם and this is not in verse 11. NUM has the equivalent ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ υμῶν in both verses, and Origen places the phrase under the obelus here.

**HT**

—

**LXX**

κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν εἰς ὅσμην εὐωδίας κάρπωμα κυρίῳ
Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: 426 Arab = MT

NonGr: Syh אֲשַׁמֵּשׁ אֲשַׁמֵּשׁ + אֲשַׁמֵּשׁ אֲשַׁמֵּשׁ + אֲשַׁמֵּשׁ

Notes: The extended phrase at the end of verse 11 in NUM has no counterpart in HT, and Origen places it under the obelus. The phrase is mostly a reproduction of the end of 29:6, except there it has αὐτῶν after σύγκρισιν and does not include κάρπῳ. Syh PNG includes an extraneous obelus in the midst of the phrase, as it does for example in a similar obelized phrase in 28:6. Also, as in 29:6 and 36, Syh renders a single instance of ὀσμήν in NUM using the word אֵשׁ twice.

Num 29:12

HT (הַשְּׁבִיעִי)
LXX (τοῦ ἑβδόμου) τούτου

Sub ÷

Wit 2: Syh

> 

Wit 2: Arab Co = MT

NonGr: Syh אֵשׁ

Notes: NUM adds τούτου to modify τοῦ ἑβδόμου, but this is not in the underlying Hebrew and Origen places τούτου under the obelus.

HT אֵשׁ
LXX ἐπίκλητος
κλητή

Notes: An unattributed s-group marginal note substitutes κλητή for ἐπίκλητος in the phrase ἐπίκλητος ἁγία. This note is identical to that found in 29:1, and apparently confusion between the notes led to the index for the present note being associated with the word σημασίας near the end of verse 1. Any of the Three could be the source of this reading (for details, see the discussion at 29:1).

Sub ÷

Notes: NUM inserts the direct object αὐτὴν after the verb ἑορτάσετε although it is lacking in the Hebrew. Origen places αὐτὴν under the obelus.

Num 29:13

Notes: NUM normally translates the phrase לַיהוָה using κυρίῳ with no definite article. In two places (18:12 and 28:11) NUM uses the definite article τῷ. Occasionally,
as for the present verse, Origen decides to add τῷ under the asterisk when HT has no definite article (for more details, see the discussion under the asterisk in 25:4).

O-group manuscript G originally had an obelus to mark Origen’s added τῷ, but this is clearly incorrect. G' corrects the sign to an asterisk. Syh has the asterisk placed before the lamadḥ preposition but does not have a matching metobelus, perhaps because of the difficulty of marking conglutinate formations in Syriac, or due to confusion on the part of later copyists.

HT

LXX τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> Arab = MT

NonGr: Syh

Notes: For the second through seventh days, HT uses the introduction ובַיֹּם followed by the number of the day, but for the first day it omits this information. NUM avoids ambiguity on the first day by adding τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ and Origen indicates the plus in the Greek by placing it under the obelus.

Num 29:17

HT (בַיֹּם)

LXX (τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ)

〈Sub ※〉 pr καί

Wit 2: A B F M' V O' C'' d f n (-767) s t x -509 (527) y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Lat. cod 100 104 Syh = Compl Ra MT

Attr: ※ > omnes

NonGr: La et | Syh
Notes: According to Wevers’ critical text, even though only 963, the b-group, and 509 omit the initial καί, they represent the original LXX reading. The addition of καί may have preceded Origen, but the hexaplaric witnesses uniformly indicate that the o’ text had the conjunction, and this may have been under the asterisk.

Sub ※ + ἐκ βοῶν

Wit 2: O-15 b Arab Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh אֶלֶךָ אַלָּא

Notes: HT clarifies, as it often does, that the bulls are בְּנֵי־בָּקָר (members of a herd’) and NUM renders this elsewhere as ἐκ βοῶν in 28:11, 19, 27, and 29:13. Similarly, a single bull is often described as בֶּן־בָּקָר (member of a herd,” e.g., 29:2, 8) and NUM usually translates this as ἐκ βοῶν also. In this verse, however, NUM has no equivalent for בְּנֵי־בָּקָר, and Origen includes its normal rendering under the asterisk.

Num 29:18

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh = MT
NonGr: Syh אָלָא

Notes: NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

Num 29:21
Notes: Origen is not consistent as to how he treats conjunctions that are pluses either in the Greek or the Hebrew. In some cases, this possibly reflects a different parent text. In this verse, HT omits a conjunction and reads, “…for the bulls; for the rams…” but NUM inserts καί and Origen includes it under the obelus.

HT (כַּמִּשְׁפָּט)
LXX (κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν) αὐτῶν

Notes: NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that is not a reflection of the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

Num 29:22

HT פָּרָה אֶחָד
LXX ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας

non tr περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἕνα

Notes: The standard NUM equivalent for חַטָּאת (and חַטָּאתלְ) used in the sense of an offering is περὶ ἁμαρτίας. In HT for this verse, the number of male goats (אֶחָד) is placed after the function of the goat (חַטָּאת), while in the Greek, ἕνα is placed before περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Origen has transposed ἕνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order as witnessed by O-group manuscript 426 and Syh. This same transposition occurs in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38.
Num 29:24

HT (םָסְפָּת)
LXX (κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν) αὐτῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> 

Wit 2: 72 = MT

NonGr: Syh ܣܘܢܐ

Notes: NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that is has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

Num 29:27

HT (טָזִיר)
LXX (κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν) αὐτῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh ܣܘܢܐ

Notes: NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that is has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

Num 29:28

HT (רָשָׁבָר)
LXX (καὶ χίμαρον) ἐξ αἰγῶν
Notes: HT often describes a sacrificial goat as שְׂעִירֵי עִזִּים (in 7:16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82, 15:24, 28:15, 30, 29:5, 11, 16, 19, and 25), and in all these verses NUM renders this phrase as χίμαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν. HT also has שְׂעִיר alone without עִזִּים in similar contexts (28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38) but in these cases NUM also has χίμαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν, and Origen places the added ἐξ αἰγῶν under the obelus in all but 29:22. Thus for the present verse, ἐξ αἰγῶν is under the obelus. Manuscript 72 from the oII-group omits ἐξ αἰγῶν due to a larger omission (72 omits ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα).

Notes: Origen transposed ἐνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order. This same transposition occurs in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38. For details, see under 29:22.
**Notes:** NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that is has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

**Num 29:31**

HT  
(חַטָּאת אֶחָד)

LXX  
(καὶ χίμαρον) ἐξ αἰγῶν

Sub ÷

**Notes:** NUM adds ἐξ αἰγῶν although this is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus (he does this at 28:22, 29:28, 31, 34, and 38). Manuscript 72 from the oII-group omits ἐξ αἰγῶν due to a larger omission (72 omits ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα). For details on how the phrase שְׂעִיר־עִזִּים is handled by Origen in Numbers, see under 29:28.

HT  
שְׂעִיר־עִזִּים

LXX  
ἔνα περὶ ἀμαρτίας

non tr  
περὶ ἀμαρτίας ἕνα

**Notes:** NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that is has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.
Notes: Origen transposed ἕνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order. This same transposition occurs in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38. For details, see under 29:22.

Num 29:34

HT

(וּשְׂעִיר)

LXX

(καὶ χίμαρον) ἐξ αἰγῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G

> 72 126 = MT Tar

Notes: NUM adds ἐξ αἰγῶν although this is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus (he does this at 28:22, 29:28, 31, 34, and 38). Manuscript 72 from the oII-group omits ἐξ αἰγῶν due to a larger omission (72 omits ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα). For details on how the phrase שְׂעִירֵי עִזִּים is handled by Origen in Numbers, see under 29:28.

G has an obelus for this verse, but although Syh has obeli for the other places this phrase is obelized (28:22, 29:28, 31, 38), it does not have an obelus for its equivalent of ἐξ αἰγῶν in the present verse.

HT

חַטָּאת אֶחָד

LXX

ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας

non tr

περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἕνα

Wit 2: G-426 Syh = MT Tar

NonGr: Syh שְׂעִירֵי עִזִּים

Notes: Origen transposed ἕνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order. This same transposition occurs in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38. For details, see under 29:22.

Num 29:35
In verse 17, HT opens with 
but NUM has no corresponding initial καί. There, a majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, add καί. For the present verse, HT lacks initial waw and Wevers’ critical text again lacks initial καί (as witnessed by the following: V 963 46-129 246 121 630 59 Lat codd 100 104). Mirroring verse 17, however, the vast majority of the manuscript tradition includes initial καί. Whether Origen introduced a change so widespread is open to debate, but the o’ text clearly had the conjunction, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts.

Notes:  In verse 17, HT opens with עֲצֶרֶת but NUM has no corresponding initial καί. There, a majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, add καί. For the present verse, HT lacks initial waw and Wevers’ critical text again lacks initial καί (as witnessed by the following: V 963 46-129 246 121 630 59 Lat codd 100 104). Mirroring verse 17, however, the vast majority of the manuscript tradition includes initial καί. Whether Origen introduced a change so widespread is open to debate, but the o’ text clearly had the conjunction, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts.

Notes:  In verse 17, HT opens with עֲצֶרֶת but NUM has no corresponding initial καί. There, a majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, add καί. For the present verse, HT lacks initial waw and Wevers’ critical text again lacks initial καί (as witnessed by the following: V 963 46-129 246 121 630 59 Lat codd 100 104). Mirroring verse 17, however, the vast majority of the manuscript tradition includes initial καί. Whether Origen introduced a change so widespread is open to debate, but the o’ text clearly had the conjunction, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts.

Notes:  In verse 17, HT opens with עֲצֶרֶת but NUM has no corresponding initial καί. There, a majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, add καί. For the present verse, HT lacks initial waw and Wevers’ critical text again lacks initial καί (as witnessed by the following: V 963 46-129 246 121 630 59 Lat codd 100 104). Mirroring verse 17, however, the vast majority of the manuscript tradition includes initial καί. Whether Origen introduced a change so widespread is open to debate, but the o’ text clearly had the conjunction, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts.

Notes:  In verse 17, HT opens with עֲצֶרֶת but NUM has no corresponding initial καί. There, a majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, add καί. For the present verse, HT lacks initial waw and Wevers’ critical text again lacks initial καί (as witnessed by the following: V 963 46-129 246 121 630 59 Lat codd 100 104). Mirroring verse 17, however, the vast majority of the manuscript tradition includes initial καί. Whether Origen introduced a change so widespread is open to debate, but the o’ text clearly had the conjunction, as witnessed by all the hexaplaric manuscripts.
A note attributed to τὸ σαμʿ attempts a contextual translation or perhaps a partial explanation, rendering הַנַעַשׁ with τελείωσις ἐπισχέσεως which means something like “completion of abatement.” This verse is the only place where either τελείωσις or ἐπισχέσις are attributed to τὸ σαμʿ but the former is not a rare word, and for the latter the τὸ σαμʿ translator may have copied Aquila.

Most attributions to τὸ σαμʿ in Numbers are quantitatively exact renderings based on Sam (7:3, 18:7, 23:1, 32:2, 6, 12, 13, 25, 29, 31). Also, in chapter 32, a group of these readings (32:2, 6, 25, 29, 31) is explicitly identified with the Samaritikon in a note in 32:33. Thus in Numbers, Greek renderings of Sam that are attributed to τὸ σαμʿ are very possibly from the Samaritikon. Occasionally, notes attributed to τὸ σαμʿ provide explanation rather than translation (e.g., 13:33 and possibly 4:25). They do not render Sam and thus their link to the Samaritikon is doubtful. For the present verse, one might expect the Samaritikon to render תעֲצֶר with a quantitative manner. The double reading τελείωσις ἐπισχέσεως raises questions about whether both words reflect the Samaritikon. It is possible that one of the words, most likely the second, was added later by a scholiast. In conclusion, the reading is possibly from the Samaritikon with the first word the most likely candidate of the two.

HT (לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ)
LXX (οὐ ποιήσετε) ἐν αὐτῇ

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh אָמ

Notes: HT says that on the Sabbath, “business work you shall not perform” (מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ). NUM has added ἐν αὐτῇ, a pattern it follows also in 28:25, and Origen places it under the obelus here and in 28:25.

Num 29:36

HT אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ ניחֹחַ
LXX εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας κάρπωμα

non tr κάρπωμα εἰς ὀσμῆν εὐωδίας

Wit 2: A O-707 C” 56’ s(-28) y z 407 646 Cyr I 1124 Aeth Arab Syh (non hab Ald) = MT

NonGr: Syh אָמ
Notes: HT places נָשָׁה before רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ. NUM changes the word order, placing קָרְפֹּתָה first, and also adds εἰς (for more on how this Hebrew phrase is rendered see 28:8). Origen transposed κάρπω*α to match the Hebrew order and this is witnessed by the O-group. As in verses 6 and 11, Syh renders ὀσήν redundantly, using οὐκ twice (see under 29:6).

Num 29:37

HT (כַּמִּשְׁפָּט)
LXX (κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν) αὐτῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

>  

Wit 2: Ῥωμ codd 100 104 = MT

NonGr: Syh ὀσήν

Notes: NUM adds a possessive after σύγκρισιν that has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. The same situation occurs at the end of verses 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 37.

Num 29:38

HT (ῥώσειρά)
LXX (καὶ χίμαρον) ἐξ αἰγῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

>  

Wit 2: 72 126 = MT Tar
NonGr: Syh ܣܘܼܼܪܐ

Notes: NUM adds ἐξ αἰγῶν although this is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus (he does this at 28:22, 29:28, 31, 34, and 38). Manuscript 72 from the αΗ-group omits ἐξ αἰγῶν due to a larger omission (72 omits καὶ χίαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας), so it may not be a negative witness to the obelus. For details on how the phrase שׂעִיר-עִזִּים is handled by Origen in Numbers, see under 29:28.

HT ἥνεισιν
LXX ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας

non tr περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἕνα

Wit 2: G-426 Syh = MT Tar

NonGr: Syh ܣܘܼܼܪܐ ܲܡܠܼܐ

Notes: Origen transposed ἕνα after περὶ ἁμαρτίας to match the Hebrew order. This same transposition occurs in 28:22, 29:22, 28, 31, 34, and 38. For details, see under 29:22.

Num 29:39

HT לְבַד מִנִדְרֵיכֶם
LXX πλῆν τῶν εὐχῶν ὑμῶν

Sub ※ πλῆν τῶν εὐχῶν ὑμῶν

Wit 2: G Syh

NonGr: Syh ܣܘܼܼܪܐ ܡܠܼܐ

Notes: O-group manuscript G and Syh both place the phrase πλῆν τῶν εὐχῶν ὑμῶν under the asterisk, even though it is matched well by the Hebrew. Several manuscripts (F 29-58-707txt 53-56txt Aeth) have omitted this phrase, possibly due to homoioteleuton with the first and second instances of ὑμῶν. Thus, it is possible that Origen was working with an exemplar that was missing this text, and so he added the equivalent under the asterisk to account for what he considered a minus in the Greek.
Numbers 30

Num 30:2

HT ְָסִירָא (יִשְׂרָאֵל)
LXX (Ἰσραήλ)

〈Sub ※〉 pr τῶν ὑιῶν

Wit 2: ↓ A ↓ F ↓ O⁻¹⁵ -29 C” ↓ b ↓ d⁻¹⁶⁰ ↓ f⁻⁵³ 664 n⁻⁷⁶⁷ s⁻²⁸ t ↓ z⁻¹²⁶ 4⁰⁷ ↓ 55 ↓ 59 ↓ 319 ↓ 416 424 ↓ 624 646 ↓ 799 Cyr I 1060 Syh

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: τῶν] A F O⁻¹⁵ -29 b 125 f⁻⁵³ 664 z⁻¹²⁶ 4⁰⁷ 55 59 319 416 624 799

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT says that Moses spoke to the heads of “the tribes of the sons of Israel” (ְָסִירָא לִבְנֵי). NUM renders this, without accounting for לִבְנֵי, as τῶν φυλῶν Ἰσραήλ. A large number of texts insert either τῶν ὑιῶν or simply ὑιῶν before Ἰσραήλ. Very probably, the o’ text had a previous ὑιῶν and it may have been under the asterisk, but whether the article is Origenic is less clear since the O-group and other hexaplaric witnesses are mixed. Because לִבְנֵי has a lamedh preposition, one might expect Origen to match the preposition with an article to give a quantitatively exact rendering.

Num 30:3

HT (אִישׁ)
LXX (ἀνθρώπος) ἄνθρωπος

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> 72 126 Cyr I 1060 Or II 306 Lat codd 100 104 Bo (sed hab Aug Loc in hept IV 92 Num 56 Ruf Num XXIV inscr) = MT
NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT has a single instance of שִׁמְאָ which NUM renders ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, as if the Hebrew distributive syntax (שִׁמְאָ שִׁמְאָ) was being replicated. Origen placed the second ἄνθρωπος under the obelus. Wevers speculates that the NUM translator had a Hebrew text with שִׁמְאָ שִׁמְאָ (NGTN 494).

HT לֹא יַחֵל
LXX οὐ βεβηλώσει

〈οὶ λ’〉 οὐ διαλύσει

Wit 1: ↓130-321'

Var: διαλύσει] -λυει 130

Notes: HT for verse 3 says that if a man vows a vow, he will not “profane” (לֹא יַחֵל) his word, but will fulfill it. NUM consistently translates לֹא יַחֵל using βεβηλώσει (18:32, 25:1, and 30:3). An unattributed note — from the same three s-group manuscripts that have another unattributed note earlier in the present verse — gives the alternate rendering διαλύσει (“dissolve/destroy”) instead of βεβηλώσει.

Like NUM, Aquila employs βεβηλώσει (“to profane” or “to pierce”) for לֹא יַחֵל (Exod 20:25, Isa 47:6, 53:5, 56:2, Ezek 20:9) and this seems to be his normal translation pattern (he also uses βεβηλώσει for לֹא יַחֵל in its alternate sense of “begin” in Deut 20:6, demonstrating his periodic inflexibility in rendering). Aquila varies this pattern at Ezekiel 22:16, where לֹא יַחֵל is used in its sense of “profane” but Aquila, perhaps influenced by NUM, renders it by κατακληροδοτέω (“seize and parcel out”). As for the alternate reading, Aquila uses διαλύσει for לֹא יַחֵל (“ruin” or “seize a pledge”) in Ecclesiastes 5:5 in a similar context of making vows. Thus it is possible that the present reading is from Aquila.

Symmachus uses βεβηλώσει for לֹא יַחֵל (Exod 20:25, Isa 47:6). He uses διαλύσει in s-group notes later in chapter 30 (30:13 and 16) to translate ῥῆμα (“break”/“destroy”/“make useless”), in a related but not identical context of “cancelling” a vow. Being a careful and nuanced translator, he might be expected to avoid using the same Greek word (διαλύσει) for two Hebrew words with little semantic overlap (לֹא יַחֵל and ῥῆμα), particularly in the same passage. But he possibly uses διαλύσει for לֹא יַחֵל in the present verse in the sense of “violating” one’s word.

Theodotion uses βεβηλώσει for לֹא יַחֵל in Exodus 20:25, Isaiah 47:6, Ezek 22:16, 26, and 28:7. As for διαλύσει, Theodotion does use it for לֹא יַחֵל in its alternate sense of “pierce/wound” in Isaiah 51:9, although this meaning is not a good fit for the present verse where לֹא יַחֵל is clearly being used in the sense of defilement. The data is scant, but it is possible that this note came from Theodotion. In conclusion, the reading could have come from any of the Three, although the evidence is not strong for any one of them.
Num 30:4

HT

לַיהוָה

LXX

κυρίῳ

ο′ οἱ λ′ τῷ κυρίῳ (κω)

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: G 82

Notes: NUM normally translates the phrase לַיהוָה using κυρίῳ with no definite article. In two places (18:12 and 28:11) NUM uses the definite article τῷ. Occasionally, Origen decides to add τῷ under the asterisk when NUM omits the article (for more details, see the discussion under the asterisk in 25:4). An s-group manuscript (344) reports that for the present verse, Origen added τῷ before κυρίῳ, and if this is the case, it may originally have been under the asterisk.

The present 344 note also attributes to οἱ λ′ the rendering τῷ κυρίῳ for לַיהוָה. This makes sense, although in 28:16, 344 has a note indicating that οἱ λ′ render ליהוה as κυρίῳ without the definite article. Both renderings are possible, but Aquila’s tendency would be to render ליהוה in a quantitatively exact manner with τῷ κυρίῳ as in the present verse (see Burkitt 12-13). Syh is not listed as a witness, because it uses the same phrase — אִים (with lamadh preposition) — for κυρίῳ (e.g., at 28:6) and for τῷ κυρίῳ (e.g., at 28:11).

Num 30:5

HT

(לָהּ שִׁירָרָה)

LXX

καὶ (παρασιωτήτη αὐτῆς)

 sociales εἰ μέν

Wit 1: Fb

Notes: The conditional sentence that begins in 30:4 with εἰ...δὲ continues into verse 5, where the final condition is expressed as “and (if) he is silent to her” ( שִׁירָרָה לָהּ). This is rendered literally by NUM as καὶ παρασιωτήτη αὐτῆς. An unattributed Fb note substitutes εἰ μέν for καὶ before παρασιωτήτη. Symmachus tends to avoid καὶ for the waw conjunction, preferring alternatives such as postpositive δὲ, postpositive οὖν, and in one instance, μέν...δὲ (Exod 14:20 — see SITP 220-22). This note is possibly
from Symmachus, although this would be the only known instance where he replaces καί with εἰ μέν. It may also be a later scholiast’s gloss.

**HT**

הֶחֱרִישׁ לָהּ אָבִיהָ

**LXX**

παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ

ο’ οἱ λ’ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ

\(\overline{\text{πήρ}}\)

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** O\(^{-}G\) 53’ 319 Arm Syh

**NonGr:** Syh ܐܘܩ ܬܠ ܐ٢

**Notes:** HT says that if a father hears his daughter’s vow, and “her father is silent to her” (הָ(אָבִי), then the vow is binding. The Hebrew has two pronouns in this phrase: the first (with לָהּ) serves as the indirect object of the verb שִׁרַּה, and the second (with אָבִיהָ) is a possessive suffix. NUM renders the Hebrew phrase with only one pronoun as παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ. The role αὐτῆς plays is ambiguous. It could be the indirect object of παρασιωπήσῃ (i.e., “he is silent at her”), as παρασιωπάω can take an indirect object in the genitive (e.g., in Ps 38[39]:13) as well as in the dative. It could also be a possessive associated with ὁ πατήρ. In this same chapter, in verses 8, 12, and 15, the dative αὐτῇ is used as the indirect object of παρασιωπήσῃ. Thus, unless the original NUM translator began with αὐτῆς for the indirect object here in verse 5 and then abruptly shifted to αὐτῇ in verses 8 and following, he probably intended αὐτῆς to take the role of a possessive with ὁ πατήρ. Most witnesses, including the s-group, match NUM with παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ.

According to the evidence of the O-group, the o’ text makes two changes. First, according to a 344 (s-group) o’ attribution and as witnessed by the O-group (minus G), the o’ text substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς (for G’s confused asterisk tradition, see below). Second, the o’ text adds αὐτῆς under the asterisk after ὁ πατήρ (see below).

A 344 note indicates that οἱ λ’ matches the o’ text reading παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῇ ὁ πατήρ. This reading makes sense for the Three, first because each of the Three uses παρασιωπάω for the Hiphil of שִׁרַּה (e.g., in Hab 1:13). Second, they render πלָּהו as αὐτῇ, the more usual NUM rendering for the indirect object of παρασιωπήσῃ.

Whether the Three also matched the pronominal suffix on הָ(אָבִי) is not known.

**HT**

(הָ(אָבִי)

**LXX**

(᾽ὁ πατήρ)
Notes: This section covers the second of two changes the o’ text makes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew. HT says that if a father hears his daughter’s vow, and “her father is silent to her” (יהוה,parent to daughter), then the vow is binding. NUM renders the Hebrew phrase as παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ. The o’ text first substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and second it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix (for more details on the translation issues see the o’ oi λ’ entry above).

HT

LXX

καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ

\{Sub ※\} καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ ※αὐτῆς

Notes: As discussed above, the o’ text makes two changes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew: (1) it substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and (2) it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the suffix on אָבִיהָ (these are covered above).

Manuscript G from the O-group differs from the o’ text (as reconstructed above) in two ways. First, it does not reflect the substitution of αὐτῇ, and second, it omits ὁ πατήρ. G matches the o’ text in that it has αὐτῆς under the asterisk, although with ὁ πατήρ omitted, G appears to be placing the original αὐτῆς in NUM under the asterisk. Thus, as it stands, the asterisk in G is incorrect. The omission of ὁ πατήρ, however, may possibly be a scribal error, and thus the asterisk for αὐτῆς may be a corrupted witness to the genuine asterisk.

HT

LXX

Sub ÷

Notes: This section covers the second of two changes the o’ text makes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew. HT says that if a father hears his daughter’s vow, and “her father is silent to her” (יהוה,parent to daughter), then the vow is binding. NUM renders the Hebrew phrase as παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ. The o’ text first substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and second it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix (for more details on the translation issues see the o’ oi λ’ entry above).

HT

LXX

καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ

\{Sub ※\} καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ ※αὐτῆς

Notes: As discussed above, the o’ text makes two changes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew: (1) it substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and (2) it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the suffix on אָבִיהָ (these are covered above).

Manuscript G from the O-group differs from the o’ text (as reconstructed above) in two ways. First, it does not reflect the substitution of αὐτῇ, and second, it omits ὁ πατήρ. G matches the o’ text in that it has αὐτῆς under the asterisk, although with ὁ πατήρ omitted, G appears to be placing the original αὐτῆς in NUM under the asterisk. Thus, as it stands, the asterisk in G is incorrect. The omission of ὁ πατήρ, however, may possibly be a scribal error, and thus the asterisk for αὐτῆς may be a corrupted witness to the genuine asterisk.

HT

LXX

Sub ÷

Notes: This section covers the second of two changes the o’ text makes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew. HT says that if a father hears his daughter’s vow, and “her father is silent to her” (יהוה,parent to daughter), then the vow is binding. NUM renders the Hebrew phrase as παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ. The o’ text first substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and second it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the Hebrew pronominal suffix (for more details on the translation issues see the o’ oi λ’ entry above).

HT

LXX

καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῆς ὁ πατήρ

\{Sub ※\} καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ ※αὐτῆς

Notes: As discussed above, the o’ text makes two changes to NUM to conform to the Hebrew: (1) it substitutes αὐτῇ for αὐτῆς to match לָהּ, and (2) it adds αὐτῆς after πατήρ under the asterisk to match the suffix on אָבִיהָ (these are covered above).

Manuscript G from the O-group differs from the o’ text (as reconstructed above) in two ways. First, it does not reflect the substitution of αὐτῇ, and second, it omits ὁ πατήρ. G matches the o’ text in that it has αὐτῆς under the asterisk, although with ὁ πατήρ omitted, G appears to be placing the original αὐτῆς in NUM under the asterisk. Thus, as it stands, the asterisk in G is incorrect. The omission of ὁ πατήρ, however, may possibly be a scribal error, and thus the asterisk for αὐτῆς may be a corrupted witness to the genuine asterisk.

HT

LXX

καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῇ
Notes: NUM adds the *ad sensum* gloss αὐτῇ at the end of verse 5 (“every obligation by which she has bound her soul shall remain to her”), and this has no equivalent in the Hebrew. Origen marked it with the obelus.

**Num 30:6**

HT (חֵנִיא)
LXX ἀνανεύων (ἀνανεύσῃ)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

>  

Wit 2: 125 767 Arm = MT Tar

NonGr: Syh הֵנִיא

Notes: HT has the Hiphil perfect חֵנִיא, but NUM translates by preceding the finite verb with a participle, as if a Hebrew infinitive is accompanying the finite verb. NUM may have been influenced by Sam which reads שָׁנַה נָא (infinitive absolute followed by imperfect). Origen placed the added participle under the obelus. A similar obelus occurs in 30:9.

HT (ךֵנִיא אֲבֵיהָ)
LXX (ἀνανεύσῃ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῆς)

Sub ※ + αὐτῇ

Wit 2: V O\(^{58}\) Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rel

NonGr: Syh אֲבֵיהָ
Notes: The Hebrew provides the protasis “if her father forbids her (אֹתָהּ),” but NUM has no equivalent for the direct object, and Wevers suggests that this is because the verb ἀνανεύω does not take an accusative of person — it is used either absolutely or with a direct object that is a thing (NGTN 496-97). Origen adds the dative αὐτῆς under the asterisk to approximate רְשֵׁי, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58). Since ἀνανεύω does not normally take its direct object in the dative, Origen’s reason for using the dative is unclear.

HT

רְשֵׁי (אֱסָרֶי)

LXX

(ὁρισμούς)

Sub ※ + αὐτῆς

Wit 2: A O-82-381' b 106
t 134 y-318 Cod 100 Aug Num 57 Co Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Lat cod 100 Aug Num 57 eius | Syh ܐܠܐ

Notes: The Hebrew has two possessives in the phrase נְדָרֶיהָ וֶאֱסָרֶיהָ (“her vows and her obligations”) but NUM omits the second. Origen includes it under the asterisk.

HT

רְשֵׁי אֱסָרֶי (אֱסָרֶי)

LXX

(ἀνένευσεν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῆς)

Sub ※ + αὐτῆς

Wit 2: O-58 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ܐܠ

Notes: This is the same situation as earlier in the verse — NUM has no equivalent for the direct object (feminine pronoun אֹתָה; see under the first asterisk for this verse). Origen added αὐτῆς under the asterisk to match הָ(אֱסָרֶי)

Num 30:7

HT

רְשֵׁי
Verse 7 addresses what happens when a woman marries if she still has a binding vow which is “upon her” (עָלֶיהָ). NUM translates עָלֶיהָ as ἐπ’ αὐτῆς. The manuscript tradition, however, is split about the case of the personal pronoun. While many have the dative (e.g., A B V), a sizable number have the accusative. The translators also are not uniform. A 344 note says that o’ uses the genitive, α’ agrees with NUM and uses the dative, and θ’ uses the accusative. Symmachus uses a different preposition and has καθ’ ἑαυτῆς.

The difference in meaning among the various cases associated with ἐπί is not great, and may simply be stylistic. For example, in a similar context of a woman’s vows being “upon her” in 30:15, NUM translates עָלֶיהָ using the genitive (ἐπ’ αὐτῆς) instead of the dative.

The translators likewise render expressions with על variably. For example, all of the Three use the genitive with ἐπί when translating על (e.g., Gen 1:20, Lev 1:12). Aquila and Theodotion use the dative with ἐπί (ἐπ’ αὐτῶ) for עלי in Numbers 2:5 and 19:15. In Numbers 4:13, Aquila uses the accusative with ἐπί for עלי (ἐπ’ αὐτό) while
Theodotion uses the genitive (ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ). But Aquila and Theodotion use the accusative with ἐπί for יָדוֹ לַע (ἐπὶ χεῖρα αὐτοῦ) in Numbers 2:17. Thus the above attributions are reasonable for Aquila and Theodotion.

The note attributed to Symmachus renders עָלֶיהָ as καθ’ ἑαυτῆς, literally “according as herself.” Thus, it renders more in its sense of “according to” than “upon.” Since καθ’ normally is used adverbially, the related verb seems to be ὡρίσατο (in the middle voice) later in the verse. This is confirmed because Symmachus uses καθ’ ἑαυτῆς a second time at the end of the verse (see below), and there it is clearly associated with ὡρίσατο. Thus, in the first instance of καθ’ ἑαυτῆς (covered here), the sense is that the woman’s vows are on her according as she herself has bound herself with her lips. This is a good contextual rendering and makes sense for Symmachus.

HT

ο’ οὖς ὡρίσατο

LXX

οὖς ὡρίσατο (κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς)

α’ θ’ ὅσα ὡρίσατο

σ’ ὃ ἔδησεν καθ’ ἑαυτῆς

Notes: For ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, NUM has οὖς ὡρίσατο. This raises the problem of finding the antecedent for the relative pronoun οὖς in NUM, an accusative masculine plural, which occurs in the phrase κατὰ τῆς διαστολῆς τῶν χειλέων αὐτῆς, οὖς ὡρίσατο. In the immediate context, it seems to be referring to τῆς διαστολῆς (feminine singular) or possibly to τῶν χειλεων (neuter plural). The phrase οὖς ὡρίσατο is also used in verses 5 and 6 with reference to τοὺς ὡρισμοὺς, and in verse 8 with reference to οἱ ὡρισμοῖ, both of which are masculine plural. The οὖς in the present verse may be a copying error influenced by the earlier phrases. Wevers believes that the original Greek of NUM had ὅσα, a neuter plural relative adjective, and thus suggests a revision to his
critical text (NGTN 497-98). If Wevers is correct, then οὖς is secondary. It was probably available to Origen, however, in one of his exemplars as indicated by s-group manuscript 344 which attributes οὖς to the o’ text, and as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58).

If ὅσα is the original Greek, then α’ and θ’ reflect it along with the majority of Greek manuscripts. In any case, the reading ὅσα makes sense in context for Aquila and Theodotion.

344 attributes the reading ὅ ἔδησεν καθ’ ἑαυτῆς to Symmachus. For ἠστρ σ’ uses the neuter singular ὦ but we do not know what the antecedent is in the σ’ translation. Symmachus uses δέω for ἀστρ, for example in Genesis 42:16 and Jeremiah 47[40]:1. Thus, this attribution is suitable for Symmachus.

**Num 30:8**

| HT | בְּיֹום שָׁמְעֹו וְהֶחֱרִישׁ לָהּ  (וְשָׁמַע אִישָׁהּ) כַּאֲרֵךְ חַשֵׁבָהּ לְהַעֲבוֹדָהּ וְהַכֹּל לָהּ כַּאֲרֵךְ חַשֵׁבָהּ לְהַעֲבוֹדָהּ |
| LXX | καὶ ἀκούσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῇ ἃν ἡμέρα ἀκούσῃ |
| non tr | (καὶ ἀκούσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς) ἃν ἡμέρα ἀκούσῃ καὶ παρασιωπήσῃ αὐτῇ |

*Notes:* The Hebrew reads literally: “and her husband hears in the day he hears and he is silent to her.” NUM has rearranged the phrase, perhaps according to sense, so that it reads, “and her husband hears, and he is silent to her in the day that he hears.” Origen has rearranged the words to match the Hebrew order, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58) and Syh.

| HT | רָכְבָהָה (καὶ) οὕτως (στήσονται) |
| LXX | (καὶ) οὕτως (στήσονται) |

*Sub ÷*

| Wit 2 | G Syh = MT |
| NonGr | Syh √ ρηθοτοῖς |
Notes: Verse 7 contains the protasis of a conditional statement and verse 8 continues the protasis: (“[if] her husband hears and he is silent to her”). Before stating the apodosis — στήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαί αὐτῆς (“all her vows shall stand”) — NUM inserts οὕτως which is not in HT. Origen places οὕτως under the obelus. Both G and Syh have placed the obelus so that it includes the preceding καί as well, but this is incorrect, as both the Hebrew and Greek have the conjunction.

Num 30:9

HT

LXX

\(\text{ἀνανεύων \ ἀνανεύσῃ}\)

Sub \(\div\)

Wit 2: G Syh

> 126 = MT \(\text{ἀνανεύων}\) om 58 \(d 370 \ 407^{(mg)}\) Arm Sa \(\text{ἀνανεύσῃ}\) om 376′ Arab

NonGr: Syh \(\ast\) om \(\text{ἀνανεύων} \ \ast\) + \(\text{ἀνανεύσῃ} \ +\)

Notes: NUM has departed substantially from the Hebrew in verse 9, perhaps under the influence of verses 5 and 6. For example, the entire middle section of verse 9 — from πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαί through μενοῦσιν is almost a verbatim copy of verse 5 (see NGTN 498-99).

In order to bring the o’ text into harmony with the Hebrew, Origen uses (1) an obelus; (2) a transposition; (3) a two word insertion after the transposition with no Aristarchian sign; (4) a second obelus; (5) an asterisk that replaces the text under the second obelus and a part of the third obelus; (6) a single word substitution; and (7) a third obelus.

The present entry covers the first of the seven changes. The o’ text places the entire phrase \(\text{ἀνανεύων \ ἀνανεύσῃ}\) under the obelus; then it introduces \(\text{ἀνανεύσῃ} \ \text{αὐτῆς}\) later to equal the Hebrew πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαί (discussed below). Some manuscripts omit one or the other of the words \(\text{ἀνανεύων \ ἀνανεύσῃ}\). These are listed as witnesses to the obelus, although they demonstrate some confusion in the traditions. As it does sometimes, Syh\(^T\) has an extraneous obelus placed between the correct obelus and the metobelus.

In order to facilitate understanding of all of the changes to this verse, a summary will be provided here. Verse 9 in NUM reads as follows:
A useful way to highlight Origen’s activity is to display what manuscript G looks like with all the Aristarchian signs in place. Additional indicators have also been added for clarity. First, the section that involves a transposition is marked with tilde (~) signs at the ends and a slash (/) between the transposed phrases. Second, the text Origen added without the asterisk is marked with a bracketed asterisk (〈※〉) and a bracketed metobelus (〈↙〉). Following is a representation of G:

First, Origen removes (under the obelus) ἀνανεύσῃ. Second he transposes the order of ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς / ἤ ἡ ἡ*έρᾳ ἀκούσῃ. Third, he adds ἀνανεύσῃ αὐτῇ (with no asterisk) to make up for removing ἀνανεύσῃ earlier and to account for the feminine singular direct object in the Hebrew. Fourth, he obelizes the phrase πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισ*οὶ αὐτῆς, in order to replace it with another phrase under the asterisk. Fifth, Origen adds a lengthy phrase under the asterisk — καὶ διασκεδάση τὴν εὐχὴν αὐτῆς τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν διαστολὴν τῶν χειλέων αὐτῆς — to replace: (1) the previously obelized πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισ*οὶ αὐτῆς and (2) the later obelized οὐ *ενοῦσιν. Sixth, Origen replaces οὗς with ὡσα using no Aristarchian sign. Seventh, Origen obelizes οὐ μενούσιν, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀνένευσεν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ κύριος καθαρεῖ αὐτὴν.

The beginning of this phrase, οὐ μενούσιν, is replaced by the previous asterisk and discussed above. The latter part of the phrase — ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀνένευσεν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς — is explanatory and does not appear in HT. The final form of the o’ text (with obelized phrases removed) matches the Hebrew well. It is shown below with the words that remain from the original LXX shaded. The Hebrew text follows for comparison.
non tr  ἦ ἄν ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

Wit 2:  O^58 Syh = MT

NonGr:  Syh ܐ(uοe)ܐܡܕܡܐܢܐ ואז(ܢܐ)

Notes:  HT reads, “And if, in the day her husband hears, he forbids her…” and NUM has modified and rearranged it to say, “And if her husband surely forbids, in the day he hears…” Origen has transposed the phrases ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς and ἦ ἄν ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούσῃ to match the Hebrew order. This is the second of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

HT  בְּיוֹ שְׁמֹעַ אֹותָהּ ְ(ם)
LXX  (ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ἦ ἄν ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούσῃ)

〈Sub ※〉  + ἀνανεύσῃ αὐτῆ

Wit 2:  ↓V O^58 Arab = MT

Attr:  ※] > omnes

Var:  ἀνανεύσῃ αὐτῆ) ἀνανεύσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς V

Notes:  Origen places the phrase ἀνανεύων ἀνανεύσῃ under the obelus (covered above), and now he matches the Hebrew בְּיוֹ שְׁמֹעַ אֹותָהּ more exactly by inserting the phrase ἀνανεύσῃ αὐτῆ. G has no asterisk to mark this addition, although it may originally have been under the asterisk. Note that Syh is lacking this added text. Manuscript V reflects this Origenic addition, although it does not transpose the previous phrase. V also picks up a large portion of an asterisk later in the verse (see below). This is the third of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

HT  —
LXX  πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισμοὶ αὐτῆς

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh
Origen obelizes the phrase πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισ*οὶ αὐτῆς in order to replace it with another phrase under the asterisk (see below). Syh has misplaced the obelus to the middle of the originally obelized phrase, although G has it placed correctly at the beginning. This obelus is the fourth of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

After removing (through the obelus) the NUM phrase πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισ*οὶ αὐτῆς (covered above) and the phrase οὐ μενοῦσιν (through a separate obelus covered below), Origen proceeds to replace these phrases with a much closer match for the Hebrew, adding the new text under the asterisk. This asterisk is the fifth of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

Notes: The Hebrew says that a woman’s husband can “nullify” (הֵפֵר — Hiphil of הָפַר) the vows and obligations of his wife. NUM expresses this by saying that her vows and obligations “will not remain,” thus making indirect the role of the husband. After removing (through the obelus) the NUM phrase πᾶσαι αἱ εὐχαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ὁρισ*οὶ αὐτῆς (covered above) and the phrase οὐ μενοῦσιν (through a separate obelus covered below), Origen proceeds to replace these phrases with a much closer match for the Hebrew, adding the new text under the asterisk. This asterisk is the fifth of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

All of the O-group manuscripts reflect some version of this added text, although 376 retains the obelized phrase that this asterisk replaces. V and 767 reflect the hexaplaric asterisk in its entirety, with minor variations, but like 376 they both also retain the earlier
obelized phrase. Wevers speculates that Origen borrowed the asterisked text from Theodotion (NGTN 499).

Syh transposes the phrase τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῆς after the final αὐτῆς in the asterisked section. The meaning is not altered significantly, although Syh has departed from the o’ text order in this instance.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad \text{בָּשַׁרָאָּה} \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{oūς (ὁρίσατо)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\langle \text{o’} \rangle \quad \text{όσα}\]

\[\text{Wit 2: } \quad \text{ο’-376}\]

\textbf{Notes:} In 30:7, NUM has the phrase τὴν διαστολὴν τῶν χειλέων αὐτῆς οὖς ὁρίσατο. The relative pronoun οὖς in NUM and the o’ text is awkward, and Aquila and Theodotion have οὐσα instead (see under 30:7). In the present verse, Origen adds a long selection under the asterisk that ends with a phrase that matches part of verse 7: τὴν διαστολὴν τῶν χειλέων αὐτῆς. This would be followed in NUM by the relative pronoun οὖς, but Origen modifies it to οὐσα. Since the asterisked text was possibly borrowed from Theodotion, Origen may have borrowed οὐσα from him as well. This is the sixth of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

Manuscript 376, from the O-group, has omitted the entire phrase οὐσα (οὖς) ὁρίσατο κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς due to parablepsis on successive occurrences of αὐτῆς and so it is not a witness either way to this change.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad - \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{oū μενούσιν, ὅτι ἀνήρ ἀνένευσεν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς}
\end{align*}\]

\textbf{Sub ✕}

\[\text{Wit 2: } \quad \text{G Syh}\]

\[>\]

\[\text{Wit 2: } \quad 58-426 = \text{MT}\]

\textbf{Var:} \quad \text{ἀπ’ G}

\textbf{NonGr:} \quad \text{Syh ὁμολογεῖται τινί υποτιθεμένῳ ἀποκαλύπτειν ἑαυτῷ υποκριτικῶς}
Notes: Origen has obelized the entire phrase οὐ μενοῦσιν, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀνένευσεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς. The first part of the obelized phrase — οὐ μενοῦσιν — is part of an indirect statement that the woman’s vows and obligations “will not remain.” Another asterisk, covered above, follows the Hebrew in saying this more directly and replaces οὐ μενοῦσιν. The rest of the obelized phrase — ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀνένευσεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς — is explanatory and is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew. This is the last of seven Origenic changes for this verse.

Many manuscripts have replaced ἀπ' αὐτῆς in NUM with ἐπ' αὐτῆς including G, which has ἐπ' αὐτῆς as part of its obelized text.

Num 30:10

| HT  | כֹּל (אָשֶׁר) |
| LXX | (וּסָא אָטְנָא) |

Sub ※ pr πάντα

Wit 2: O Syh

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh حَلَصُ

Notes: NUM omits an equivalent to the Hebrew כֹּל and Origen adds the equivalent πάντα under the asterisk.

Num 30:11

| HT  | אָסְרָה אִסָּר |
| LXX | ἢ ό όρισμός |

Sub ※ ἢ ※ ὁν ωρίσατο όρισμον

Wit 2: lemma ↓ O ↓ ἢν ὁρίσατο ἢ ό όρισμός 15

Attr: ※ G] > rell

Var: ωρίσατο] όρίσατο 376

Notes: Verse 11 is the protasis to the first of several conditional statements that summarize the laws about women’s vows. HT uses two finite verbs (נָדָרָה and אָסְרָה), the second of which is in a cognate pair: אָסְרָה אִסָּר (“bind a binding [obligation]”).
The verse reads: “If (in) the house of her husband she vows or binds a binding obligation on her soul with an oath…” NUM treats the feminine singular verbs as if they are nouns with feminine singular pronominal suffixes (these noun/suffix forms appear in verses 5 and 8), and thus to make sense, the verse must be taken as a nominal sentence: “If her vow (is) in her husband’s house, or the oath on her soul (is) with an oath…” By taking אָסְרָה as a noun, the NUM translator was left with the issue of the cognate direct object אִסָּר — that follows, and he solved the problem by simply ignoring the word.

Origen does not address the NUM rendering of the first verb נָדָרָה as a noun. But he has attempted to accommodate the ω’ text to the verb/noun pair אָסְרָה אִסָּר probably because the noun אִסָּר is omitted by NUM. He modifies ὁ ὁρισ*ός to read ὁν ὦρίσατο ὦρισμόν, thus (1) adding the relative pronoun ὅν, (2) using the verb ὦρίσατο, and thus treating אָסְרָה as a verb; and (3) using ὦρισμόν to account for the direct object אִסָּר which NUM overlooked. The entire phrase ὁν ὦρίσατο ὦρισμόν is placed under the asterisk (the G asterisk also includes the preceding ἦ, which is probably incorrect). This Origenic modification is witnessed by the entire O-group, and manuscript 15, from the oI-group, has been partially affected.

Origen’s added phrase ὁν ὦρίσατο ὦρισμόν has an accusative relative particle ὅν which has no equivalent אֲשֶׁר in the Hebrew and which seems unnecessary. The Hebrew is literally, “she binds a binding” but the Origenic reading is, “a binding which she binds.” It may be that Origen was attempting to accommodate his reading to the existing nominal sentence structure in NUM: “But if her vow (is) in her husband’s house, or the binding which she binds upon her soul (is) with an oath.” It is also possible that even though אֲשֶׁר does not precede אָסְרָה in the present verse, Origen is conscious of the many times in HT of this passage where אֲשֶׁר does precede אָסְרָה and where NUM accounts for the antecedent(s) using the accusative relative pronoun ὡς (verses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12). In any case, this asterisk is well-attested and probably reflects the ω’ text.

### Num 30:12

**HT**

(אָסְרָה)

**LXX**

(οἱ ὁρισμοὶ) αὕτης

### Sub

Wit 2: G

> W 2:

A F 15'-58-618*(c pr m)-707 C* 125 53'-56 s (28) (85txt) y -392 z -407 55 59

416 624 646 Lat Aug Num 59. 2⁴ = MT Tar⁰
Notes: NUM adds a feminine possessive after οἱ ὁρισμοί which is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. This omission is reflected in many other manuscripts.

HT
LXX

Sub ☄

Wit 2: G Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh שמה

Notes: NUM states that the woman’s oaths shall stand “against her” (κατ’ αὐτῆς), and this is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew. Origen placed κατ’ αὐτῆς under the obelus.

Num 30:13

HT
LXX

α’
καὶ ἐὰν ἀκυρῶν ἀκυρώσῃ αὐτὰς ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

Wit 1: ↓85’-↓321’-344
Wit 2: ὁ] > 624
Var: καὶ] > 85’-321

σ’ ἐὰν δὲ διαλύσει διαλύσῃ αὐτὰς ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

Wit 1: 344
καὶ ἐὰν διασκεδάζων
diaskeđaṣḥ autá o ἀνήρ αὐτῆς

Notes: HT for verse 13 begins with רֵפֵר הַפֵּר (“if he indeed annuls”). It uses a cognate pair consisting of an infinite absolute and an imperfect in the Hiphil of the root מָר. NUM renders these verbs using the cognate pair περιελὼν περιέλη. The Greek refers to removing or stripping off something, and figuratively it can mean to cancel an account or agreement.

A 344 note attributed to α’ uses the cognate pair ἀκυρῶν ἀκυρώσῃ for רֵפֵר הַפֵּר. Aquila uses ἀκυρῶ to render the Hiphil of מָר (or the related מַר) in Deuteronomy 31:20, Job 5:12a, and Isaiah 24:5. For clause-initial ω in HT, the α’ note substitutes an opening καί for postpositive δέ in NUM, and this is a characteristic of Aquila. The note also renders בְּנֵיה, which NUM omits, using the feminine plural αὐτάς, perhaps referring back to αἱ εὐχαί. Unlike the two readings attributed to σ’ and θ’, this reading does not include a definite article before ἀνήρ αὐτῆς and this matches HT which has no definite article. Aquila tends to follow the Hebrew in including or omitting the definite article (see REI-Pro 25-26; for another example, see HEXNUM1 under the Aquila reading at 1:19). In general, Aquila prefers a quantitative correspondence between Hebrew and Greek words (see Burkitt 12-13). In conclusion, the translation style fits Aquila. Note that the index for this reading is at verse 9 in 85’ and 321’. Manuscript 624 is listed as a witness to the lack of the article in the phrase ἀνήρ αὐτῆς; this differentiates Aquila from NUM and the other translators. For 624, however, this may be an inner-Greek correction and independent of the influence of Aquila.

The note attributed to Symmachus uses the cognate pair διαλύσει διαλύσῃ for רֵפֵר הַפֵּר. Symmachus uses διαλύω for the Hiphil of מָר a few verses later in Numbers 30:16, as well as in Job 5:12 and Jeremiah 11:10. The use of the postpositive δέ matches Symmachus, who frequently (although not universally) avoids καί for clause-initial ω (SITP 220-22). Like Aquila, Symmachus here renders בְּנֵיה using αὐτάς, and accounting for this Hebrew word would be reasonable for him. Thus, this attribution is suitable for Symmachus.

The third note, attributed to Theodotion, uses the cognate pair διασκεδάζων διασκεδάση to render רֵפֵר הַפֵּר. Theodotion uses διασκεδάζω (or διασκεδάνυμι) for the Hiphil of מָר in Deuteronomy 31:20 and Job 5:12. He follows the Hebrew initial καί conjunction of Aquila rather than the postpositive δέ of Symmachus and NUM, but this is not unusual for him. He renders the direct object בְּנֵיה using the neuter αὐτά rather than the feminine αὐτάς of Aquila and Symmachus, perhaps referring not just to αἱ εὐχαί but to the obligations of the woman in general. Overall, the style of translation is consistent with Theodotion. In addition, for the asterisk covered below, Origen echoes
Theodotion and uses αὐτά for בְּרֵאשִׁים. Since Origen often follows Theodotion, this lends support to the Theodotionic source of this reading.

HT  יָפֵר לֹא
LXX  περιελὼν περιέλη

ο’  περιαιρῶν περιέλη

Wit 1:  ↓130-↓321’-344
Wit 2:  F 963 29-72-426-707*(vid)-οř^{-15*} ↓56’ ↓127 509 121 z^{-126} 407 59 416 646
Attr:  o’ > 130-321’
Var:  περιαιρῶν] περιερῶν 246 127

Notes: The s-group agrees with NUM in having περιελὼν περιέλη, and 344 (supported by three other s-group manuscripts) notes that the ο’ text uses the present participle of περιαιρέω rather than the aorist participle in NUM. The ο’ reading is supported by manuscript 426 from the Ο-group, and many manuscripts, including F and 963, reflect this change. It is possible that Origen incorporated a reading that was available to him in one of his exemplars. The difference in meaning is not significant.

HT  יָפֵר (ברק הָפֵר לֹא)
LXX  (περιελὼν περιέλη)

Sub ※  αὐτά

Wit 2:  G-426-οř Syh = Ald
Attr:  ※ Gj > rell
NonGr:  Syh אטס

Notes: NUM has no equivalent for בְּרֵאשִׁים, the direct object of יָפֵר, and Origen adds αὐτά (matching Theodotion) under the asterisk.

HT  לָכֵי (בְּרַק בְּרַק)
LXX  (οὐ μενεῖ) αὐτῇ

Sub ÷
Wit 2: G

> Lat cod 100 (sed hab Aug Loc in hept IV 99 Num LIX 2) = MT

Notes: NUM inserts the *ad sensum* gloss αὐτῇ after οὐ μενεί ("it shall not remain with her") that has no equivalent in the Hebrew, and Origen places it under the obelus. G has placed the obelus around the entire phrase οὐ μενεί αὐτῇ which is clearly incorrect, since οὐ μενεί matches יָקוּם לֹא exactly.

HT  
LXX  

Sub ※ αὐτά

Wit 2: G-426-oI Syh = Ald

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ≠ λεη

Notes: HT includes a plural pronominal suffix as a direct object to פֵּרַה and NUM has no equivalent. Origen adds the neuter plural αὐτά under the asterisk, similar to the other asterisk for this verse (covered above). Syh has a metobelus after the word, but no asterisk before, so the original asterisk was probably lost.

Num 30:14

HT  
LXX  

{Sub ※} ὁρκος δεσμοῦ

Wit 2: Syh

NonGr: Syh ≠ λεη ※ λεη ※

Notes: Syh has marked the equivalent of ὁρκος δεσμοῦ with the asterisk, but this is not original to the o’ text, because the Hebrew and Greek match exactly at this
point, and no textual evidence indicates that any of the Greek manuscripts are missing the text. As sometimes happens, Syh has an extra asterisk placed between the initial asterisk and the metobelus.

HT  
LXX

\( \langle o' \rangle \)  
αὐτήν

*Wit 2:*  
F 72-376 \( C'' (-417) \)
19 \( d^{106} \)
53′-129
30′-130ε
343
134*-370*  
\( \chi^{509} (527) \)
318
126-407
624 (sed hab Compl) = MT

*Notes:* The Hebrew יְקִימֶנּ with pronominal suffix means “he will confirm it.” NUM follows στήσει with the dative αὐτῇ, which gives the sense, “he will confirm (it) for her,” with the direct object implied. Many manuscripts, including 376 from the O-group, change αὐτῇ to the accusative αὐτήν, perhaps referring back to the feminine εὐχή. This corresponds to the Hebrew pronominal suffix. This change may represent Origen’s work, although it may also have been an earlier inner-Greek correction that was available to Origen in an exemplar.

**Num 30:15**

HT  
LXX

Sub ※ + ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

*Wit 2:*  
\( O^{(-58)}-15 \)
t Bo Syh = MT

*Attr:*  
※ G] > rell

*NonGr:*  
Syh שלנה

*Notes:* HT gives the explicit subject ἰσχύς (“her husband”) for the first clause, but NUM has no equivalent, assuming it from context. Origen adds the equivalent ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς under the asterisk.

HT  
LXX

Sub ÷
Wit 2:  \[G^c\]

> 

Wit 2:  72 246 $^{\text{Lat cod}}$ 100 = MT  
Attr:  \[\divimes \] \[G^*\]

Notes: Mirroring the phrase in verse 14, NUM says that the husband \[\text{στήσει αὐτῇ}\] ("confirms to her") his wife’s vows and obligations. HT does not have the equivalent of \[\text{αὐτῇ}\], and Origen places it under the obelus.

\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad \text{(καλείρι)} \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{(τους ὁρισμοὺς)}
\end{align*}

Sub ⋆ pr πάντας

Wit 2:  \(O^{(-58)}\)-15 Bo Syh = MT  
Attr:  \[\divimes G]\ > rell  
NonGr:  Syh  \(\text{אָסֵיר} \)

Notes: In HT, two equivalent items appear in a list, each preceded by \[\text{לכ — נְדָרֶיהָ}\] and \[\text{אֱסָרֶיהָ}\]. In its rendering, NUM uses πάντας before τὰς εὐχὰς but not before τοὺς ὁρισμοὺς, thus using πάντας distributively across the two lexemes. Origen adds the equivalent of the second \[\text{לכ}\] under the asterisk.

\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad \text{(אֱסָרֶיהָ)} \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{(ὁρισμούς)}
\end{align*}

\langle\text{Sub ⋆}\rangle + αὐτῆς

Wit 2:  A 426 d 127-458 730 t Arm\[ap\] Sa = MT  
Attr:  \[\divimes \] > omnes

Notes: NUM adds αὐτῆς after εὐχὰς to match the pronominal suffix on \[\text{אֱסָרֶיהָ}\], but it does not match the pronominal suffix on \[\text{אֱסָרֶיהָ}\]. A number of manuscripts, including the uncial A and 426 from the O-group add αὐτῆς after ὁρισμοῦς, and this
change possibly represents Origen’s work. If the addition reflects the o’ text, then it may originally have been under the asterisk.

**Num 30:16**

**HT**

καὶ ἐὰν ἀκυρῶν ἀκυρώσῃ αὐτὰς ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

**LXX**

ἐὰν δὲ περιέλων περιέλῃ αὐτῆς

**α’**

καὶ ἐὰν ἀκυρῶν ἀκυρώσῃ αὐτὰς ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

*Wit 1: 321’-344-346*

*Attr: α’] nom absc 321*

*Var: καὶ] > 321’| αὐτὰς ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς| > 321’*

**σ’**

ἐὰν δὲ διαλύσει διαλύσῃ αὐτὰς ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

*Wit 1: 344*

*Wit 2: ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς Fʰ 29-58-376-oI 106 t 59 416 Lat Aug Num 59.2 ap Arm = Ald Sixt*

*NonGr: Lat Aug Num 59.2 ap uir*

**θ’**

καὶ ἐὰν διασκεδάζων διασκεδάσῃ αὐτὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς

*Wit 1: 344*

*Wit 2: ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς Fʰ 29-58-376-oI 106 t 59 416 Lat Aug Num 59.2 ap Arm = Ald Sixt*

*NonGr: Lat Aug Num 59.2 ap uir*
Notes: Verse 16 of HT begins very much like verse 13, except that while verse 13 includes הָפֵר, verse 16 omits it since it is understood in context (for a discussion of the full readings, see under verse 13). NUM follows HT in both verses regarding הָפֵר: it includes the equivalent ὁ ἀνήρ αὐτῆς in verse 13 and omits it in verse 16. For verse 13, notes attributed to the Three render the Hebrew using (ὁ) ἀνήρ αὐτῆς. In the present verse, all of the Three retain (ὁ) ἀνήρ αὐτῆς and this has influenced a number of manuscripts. Except for the added (ὁ) ἀνήρ αὐτῆς, the attributions make sense for their respective translators, as they did in verse 13. Aquila is unlikely to have added ἀνήρ αὐτῆς with no Hebrew support, and this suggests the possibility that he had a different parent text which contained הָפֵר. The other two translators may also have had a different parent text, or may have been influenced by verse 13. A number of manuscripts reflect the addition of ὁ ἀνήρ αὐτῆς. Note that the indexes for the Aquila reading are found at verse 6 in manuscripts 321 and 346.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>הָפֵר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>περιέλην περιέλη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ο’ περιαιρῶν περιέλη

Wit 1: ↓130-↓321′-344

Wit 2: A F 963 29-426-oF$^{55}$ 56′ 127 121 z$^{-126}$ 407 416 624 646 (sed hab Compl)

Attr: o’] > 130-321′

Notes: This note is identical to the one found for ο’ in verse 13 and applies to the identical text in NUM. An ο’ note substitutes the present participle for the aorist in NUM, with little difference in meaning. The list of witnesses that agree with the present reading is mostly the same as for verse 13. The reading is probably correct (see the discussion under verse 13).

Num 30:17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>י(ח)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(θυγατρός)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O$^{-55}$-15-72 54-75 Arm Bo$^A$ Syh = MT

Attr: ※ Gj > rell
NonGr: Syh סכל

Notes: HT has four pronominal suffixes in verse 17, and NUM renders the first (γυναῖκος αὐτοῦ for אִשְׁתּוֹ) but it omits the following three. Of these latter three, Origen added at least the first two under the asterisk, and probably the third as well. The first asterisk is for the suffix on בִּתּוֹ — Origen adds the equivalent αὐτοῦ. Syh has the added text but does not have the asterisk.

HT נְעֻרֶי LXX νεότητι

Sub ※ + αὐτῆς

Wit 2: O-82 Co Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G] > rell

NonGr: Syh סכל

Notes: As discussed above, NUM has no equivalents for the final three suffixes in verse 17 in HT. The second suffix is on נְעֻרֶיהָ and Origen adds the equivalent αὐτῆς under the asterisk. Syh has the added text but does not have the asterisk.

HT נְעֻרֶיהָ LXX πατρός

〈Sub ※〉 + αὐτῆς

Wit 2: 426 b 44-107' n^75 t^134 Arm Co Syh = MT
Attr: ※] > omnes

NonGr: Syh סכל

Notes: As noted above, NUM has no equivalents for the final three suffixes in verse 17 in HT. The third suffix is on נְעֻרֶיהָ. Several manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group and Syh (and the n-group which sometimes includes hexaplaric readings), add the equivalent αὐτῆς. This is possibly Origen’s work and may have been under the asterisk.
Num 31:3

HT

לַצָּבָא וְיִהְיוּ עַל־מִדְיָן

LXX

(παρατάξασθαι) ἔναντι κυρίου ἐπὶ Μαδιάν

α’ θ’  ίνα δύνωνται καὶ ἕσονται

(ἔσονται cod) ἐπὶ Μαδιάμ

Wit 1: 108

α’ θ’  καὶ ἕσονται ἐπὶ Μαδιάν

Wit 1: ↓130-↓321’ Syh

Attr: α’ θ’] > 130-321’


NonGr: Syh

σ’  ίνα δύνωνται ἐπὶ Μαδιάν

Wit 1: ↓130-↓321’ Syh

Attr: σ’] > 130

Var: δύνωνται] -νονται 130 Μαδιάν] Μαδιάμ 130-321’

NonGr: Syh

Notes: In HT, Moses directs the people to equip themselves (“for service, that they may be against Midian” (לַצָּבָא וְיִהְיוּ עַל־מִדְיָן). First, the NUM translator read the consonantal text לַצָּבָא as an infinitive construct of the verb לַצָּבָא, as opposed to the Masoretes who pointed it as a preposition and noun. Thus NUM translates with παρατάξασθαι. NUM treats לַצָּבָא as an infinitive also in 31:4, but in verses 6 and 27, it treats it as a noun. Second, the NUM translator seems to have misread היה (from היה) as היו and then inserted ἔναντι (probably to make sense out of the text) giving ἔναντι κυρίου. The confusion is understandable if לַצָּבָא is taken as a verb — this makes
somewhat redundant (see NGTN 505 for a discussion of the translation issues). Thus, NUM reads “to draw up for battle before the Lord against Midian.”

In a note in b-group manuscript 108, α’ and θ’ also treat לצבא as an infinitive, taking the "lamedh" to indicate purpose, and they render it with ἵνα followed by the subjunctive δύνωνται. The meaning is something like, “in order to be capable/sufficient.” They then translate רדיה רדיה accurately as καὶ ἐσονται and finally match ἐπὶ Μαδιάν from NUM. The complete α’ θ’ reading is: ἵνα δύνωνται καὶ ἐσονται ἐπὶ Μαδιάμ. Notes from the s-group and Syh echo 108 by attributing the second part of the phrase (καὶ ἐσονται ἐπὶ Μαδιάν) to α’ and θ’. Aquila translates "lamedh" plus infinitive as a ἵνα clause in Ezekiel 17:6, and the literalness of the rest of the rendering fits him. The literal rendering also fits Theodotion.

A related note attributed to Symmachus is found in three s-group manuscripts and Syh. It uses the same introductory ἵνα clause as Aquila and Symmachus, but avoids the potential redundancy of רדיה רדיה by not rendering it. Thus, Symmachus simplifies the passage to convey the overall meaning, translating as ἵνα δύνωνται ἐπὶ Μαδιάν (“in order to be capable [equipped] against Midian”). This fits Symmachus’ tendency to express the Hebrew accurately but without aiming for pedantic literalness.

HT (נִקְמַת־יְהוָה)
LXX (ἐκδίκησιν) παρὰ (τοῦ κυρίου)

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G

> 52 127 Cyr I 324 = MT

Notes: The NUM translator apparently read the construct phrase נִקְמַת־יְהוָה ("vengeance of the Lord") as a type of subjective genitive (NGTN 505). Thus NUM renders the phrase as ἐκδίκησιν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, signifying vengeance “from” the Lord. Although παρὰ does capture the sense of the Hebrew well, Origen placed it under the obelus since technically it is not matched by a word in the Hebrew.

Num 31:6

HT
LXX χιλίους ἐκ φυλῆς 2ο
Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G

> 

Wit 2:  \(C^\text{(-16')-414'-417 730 68'-120' 319 624}\) Arm Bo = MT

Notes:  For some reason, NUM repeats the phrase χιλίους ἐκ φυλῆς twice in succession even though HT has אֶלֶף לַמַּטֶּה only once. It is likely that the obelus in G is original, even though no other hexaplaric manuscripts witness negatively to this deletion. A number of other manuscripts, however, do omit the phrase.

HT  אֶלְעָזָר  LXX  Ἐλεαζάρ

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G = MT

Notes:  NUM adds the phrase υἱοῦ Ἀαρών after the name Ἐλεαζάρ, and this is not in the underlying Hebrew. Although only manuscript G shows evidence of the obelus, the obelus represents a plus in the Greek and is probably correct.

HT  לַצָּבָא  LXX  τοῦ ἱερέως

Sub ※  + εἰς παράταξιν

Wit 2:  \(V O^{58'}-15\) Syh = MT

Attr:  ※ G\[ > \text{rell}

NonGr:  Syh  לַצָּבָא

Notes:  Phineas the priest is commanded to go “to the war” (לַצָּבָא) with the army. NUM does not render לַצָּבָא and Origen adds the equivalent εἰς παράταξιν under the asterisk (following the NUM rendering of לַצָּבָא as a noun in verse 27 and not as an infinitive in verse 3).
Num 31:8

HT אֶת־אֱוִי
LXX καὶ τὸν Εὐίν

οʾ οἱ λʾ καὶ τὸν Εὐεί

Notes: HT proceeds to give a list of the five Midianite kings who were killed by the Israelites. The first is אֱוִי, which NUM renders Εὐίν. Although the -in ending could be an accusative inflection, Wevers argues that NUM only occasionally adds case endings to proper names, and when it does, it is only for better-known names (NGTN 507-508). Also, none of the other four names have case endings.

The s-group uniformly agrees with NUM, but 344 from the s-group has a note that attributes the alternate spelling Εὐεί to Origen. This spelling matches the Hebrew better, and also agrees with O-group manuscripts G and 426 and with Syh, and thus this attribution is probably correct. The note also attributes Εὐεί to οἱ λʾ, and since it matches the Hebrew, the attribution makes sense. Note that here Syh matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

non tr καὶ τὸν Ροκομ καὶ τὸν Σουρ

Notes: Two of the names in the list of five kings are transposed in NUM compared to the Hebrew. The almost uniform witness of the hexaplaric groups indicates that Origen transposed the NUM order to match the Hebrew. Many other manuscripts, including A and F, match the oʾ text.
ο’ α’ τὸν Ῥόβο

*Wit 1:* 344  
*Wit 2:* 426 Syh  
*NonGr:* Syh

ο’ σ’ θ’ τὸν Ῥόβαι

*Wit 1:* 344  
*Wit 2:* Syh  
*NonGr:* Syh

**Notes:** NUM translates the Hebrew proper name בּוֹר using Ῥόβοκ. The final ‘ayin is represented with kappa, which is unusual, as normally ‘ayin is represented either (1) by zero or a vowel change or (2) by gamma (e.g., Γαί for עִיֵּי at 33:44; see Blau 9-16). A kappa normally represents the Hebrew qoph (see NGTN 508). Wevers believes that NUM may have had a different parent text.

A note in s-group manuscript 344 indicates that Origen and Aquila used the alternate τὸν Ῥόβαι which matches the Hebrew more closely. Regarding ο’, the attribution is possibly correct. The witness of Syh is weakened because it matches P’s καὶ, and Syh sometimes is influenced by P regarding proper names. As for the α’ attribution, that Aquila matched the Hebrew makes sense, and so this attribution is probably correct.

A second 344 note with τὸν Ῥόβαι is attributed to σ’, θ’, and ο’. Why 344 has two different readings for ο’ is not clear. The readings differ only in the final vowel, and Origen could have been the source of either. Syh, with καὶ, supports either reading equally. Origen’s tendency to follow Theodotion might indicate that Ῥόβαι is original, but the corroboration of 426 suggests that the Ῥόβο is the ο’ text reading. In any case, what the witness of 344, 426, and Syh indicates is that the ο’ text dropped the final kappa in Ῥόβοκ. That Symmachus and Theodotion use τὸν Ῥόβαι to approximate the Hebrew better than NUM makes sense.

HT —

LXX σὺν τοῖς τραυματίαις αὐτῶν

Sub ÷
Notes: NUM ends verse 8 with the phrase σὺν τοῖς τραυματίαις αὐτῶν, which is an echo of the phrase τοῖς τραυματίαις αὐτῶν earlier in the verse, but which has no support in the Hebrew. Origen correctly placed it under the obelus.

Num 31:9

Sub ※ + οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ

Notes: HT says that “the sons of Israel” (בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל) captured women and children from Moab, but NUM has no equivalent, and Origen adds the equivalent οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ under the asterisk.

Sub ※ pr πᾶσαν

Notes: HT says that “the sons of Israel” (בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל) captured women and children from Moab, but NUM has no equivalent, and Origen adds the equivalent οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ under the asterisk.
Notes: HT includes the modifier כֹל before each of three items that the Israelites plundered: “all their cattle and all their livestock and all their property.” NUM includes πάντα only after the second item. Origen added the equivalent πᾶσαν under the asterisk before the last item, δύναμίν. Why he did not do so for the first item is not clear.

HT בָּזָז
LXX ἐπρονόμευσαν

〈οἱ λ’〉 διήρπασαν

Wit 1: 130-321’

Notes: HT uses two different verbs for capturing people and property and both are found in 31:9: (1) יִשְׁבּו (from שׁבה) for the deporting of women and children and (2) זוּ בָּזְ for the plundering of livestock and goods. NUM renders both of these using ἐπρονόμευσαν. An unattributed s-group note has the alternate διήρπασαν for בזז. Aquila and Theodotion employ διαρπάζω for בזז (α’: Deut 3:7, Isa 33:23, Jer 20:5; θ’: Jer 20:5). Symmachus uses διαρπάζω for בזא, which he possibly considered a by-form of בזז, in Isaiah 18:7, and for שׁשס, a synonym of בזז in Jeremiah 37[30]:16. Thus, any of the Three might have used διαρπάζω for בזז in the present verse. Note that the index for this reading is mistakenly placed at the first instance of ἐπρονόμευσαν in this verse rather than the second.

Num 31:10

HT כָּל־טִירֹתָם
LXX (τὰς ἐπαύλεις αὐτῶν)

Sub ※ pr πᾶσας

Wit 2: O Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G] > rel
NonGr: ∢لللد

Notes: HT says that the Israelites burned “all their cities where they lived and all their encampments” כָּל־עָרֵיהֶם בְּמֹושְׁבֹתָם. NUM translates literally, but does not render the second instance of כָּל, and Origen adds the equivalent under the asterisk.
Num 31:11

HT (חַרְמַלְקֹוחַ)
LXX (τὰ σκῦλα) αὐτῶν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G

> 29-58 527 18 = MT

Notes: HT says that the Israelites brought “all the plunder and all the spoil (חַרְמַלְקֹוחַ)” and NUM renders this literally except that it adds the possessive αὐτῶν to the second item. Origen placed αὐτῶν under the obelus.

Num 31:12

HT נַחֲלָקַח
LXX τὰ σκῦλα

οἱ γ’ τὴν λῆψις

Wit 1: Syh

NonGr: Syh لعابسأ

Notes: The Hebrew נַחֲלָקַח is used in the OT to refer to the spoils of war (five times in this chapter and twice in Isaiah 49:24-25). NUM always renders נַחֲלָקַח using σκῦλον, except in 31:32 where NUM has no equivalent (there Origen adds τὰ σκῦλα under the asterisk).

A note attributed to the Three in Syh has لعابسأ, a noun which means “taking possession” as well as “receipts/income.” The meaning seems to be related to the root of the Hebrew נַחֲלָקַח, which is נָלַק, and this implies that the original Greek rendering was etymological (i.e., based on or influenced by נָלַק). The retroversion τὴν λῆψις is proposed along these lines (see NGTN 510). The word can refer to “seizing” or “catching” as well as to the more generic “receiving/accepting.” Aquila employs λῆψις to render the Hebrew noun נָלַק, which means “instruction” or “learning” in Isaiah 29:24, but Aquila may have been influenced there by the usual meaning of the root נָלַק. Symmachus uses λῆψις in Isaiah 49:24 and 25 to render נַחֲלָקַח in a context of taking
spoil. Theodotion uses λῆψις to render the Qal passive of לָקַח in Genesis 2:23 where it denotes a non-specific sense of “taking.” Thus, the retroversion λῆψις is speculative, but any of the Three are potential candidates for the reading.

The attribution to οἱ γ′ comes from added text before the note: אֲכַל הָאָמ (“those of the third [three]…”). Note that Syh has notes for two words, σκῦλα and προνο*ήν, but the indices for the two are reversed (see below for a discussion of the indices for this verse).

HT
אֲכַל הָאָמ
LXX
(καὶ τὴν) προνο*ήν

α′
καὶ τὴν λάφυρα

Wit 1: ↓108 Syh
Attr: α′] + σ′ 108
NonGr: Syh

α′ σ′ θ′
λάφυρα

Wit 1: 130-321′

Notes: In verse 12, HT lists three things the army captured: בִּלְבֵי (“captives”), חַמַּלְקוֹ (“things taken” or “spoils”), and לָשְׁלֹן (“booty/plunder”). As it did in verse 11, NUM renders לָשְׁלֹן, using προνο*ήν. Marginal notes from several manuscripts substitute λάφυρα for προνο*ήν and attribute this reading to Aquila or to all of the Three.

The indices for the first two readings in this verse are confused in some manuscripts. Syh has the present α′ reading (καὶ τὴν λάφυρα) associated with σκῦλα in the text, and the οἱ γ′ note (see above) associated with προνο*ήν. Also, manuscript 108 agrees with Syh and has the index for its α′ reading (καὶ τὴν λάφυρα) associated with σκῦλα in its text. By contrast, the s-group manuscripts 130, 321, and 346 have the index for their λάφυρα reading (attributed to α′ σ′ θ′) associated with προνο*ήν.

The issue is whether the reading λάφυρα should be associated with σκῦλα and its underlying חַמַּלְקוֹ (as in Syh and 108) or with προνο*ήν and its underlying לָשְׁלֹן (as in the s-group). To answer this, one needs to examine the translation tendencies of the Three, particularly of Aquila. Aquila never uses λάφυρα to render לָשְׁלֹן (in fact we have no record of how Aquila treats לָשְׁלֹן) but he does use λάφυρα to render לָשְׁלֹן (Gen 49:27, Deut 20:14, Isa 33:23, 53:12). Thus, the s-group association of λάφυρα with לָשְׁלֹן for Aquila appears to be correct. As for Symmachus, he uses λάφυρα for לָשְׁלֹן.
in Psalm 67[68]:13, and this supports the s-group attribution. In conclusion, the s-group indices are probably accurate, and 108 and Syh have misplaced theirs (for a discussion of the consistent agreement of 108 and Syh in Numbers, see the {οἱ γ′} entry under 10:12 in HEXNUM1). For Theodotion this is the only example of his using λάφυρα, but the attribution is possibly accurate.

HT  אל-ערבח מואב
LXX  εἰς Ἀραβῶθ Μωάβ

α’  πρὸς ὁμαλὰ Μωάβ

Wit 1:  Eus III 1.12

σ’  ἐπὶ τὴν πεδιάδα τῆς Μωάβ

Wit 1:  Eus III 1.12

Notes: In HT, the place to which the Midianites’ plunder was taken was “the steppe of Jordan” (ארבח מואב) which NUM renders as εἰς Ἀραβῶθ Μωάβ, treating Ἀραβῶθ as a proper name. NUM characteristically translates עַרְבֹת in two ways. First, as in this verse, as a proper name (26:3, 63, 31:12), and second, more contextually, using δυσ*ή which signifies the west (22:1, 33:48, 49, 50, 35:1, 36:13). The reasons for the variant renderings, which appear in similar contexts, are not clear.

A note attributed to α’ renders אל-ערבח מואב as πρὸς ὁμαλὰ Μωάβ. The word ὁμαλός means “level ground,” and is used elsewhere by Aquila for πεδιάδα in Deuteronomy 1:1, 7, Isaiah 35:6, 40:3, 41:19, 51:3, and Amos 6:14. The Masoretes pointed עַרְבֹת as plural, but Aquila took it to be singular construct, which is also consistent with the unpunctuated text. Thus, this attribution fits Aquila. In a similar α’ note in 26:3, the retroversion from the Syriac has ἐν τοῖς ὁ*αλόταις based on the present verse.

The σ’ note reads ἐπὶ τὴν πεδιάδα (πεδιάδα means “a flat” or “on/of the plain”). Symmachus uses the same word for πεδιάδα in 26:3 (and elsewhere in Deut 1:7, 4:49, Jer 46[39]:5, and Amos 6:14). Symmachus has a tendency to translate place names (REI-Pro 20), as seen in 21:1, 8, 11, 19, and 33:44. Thus the translation technique fits Symmachus. Like Aquila, Symmachus takes πεδιάδα to be singular construct.

HT  יערבח
LXX  Ἁραβῶθ

〈σ’〉  πεδίον
Notes: As discussed above, for יְרוֹמִי in the present verse NUM has ἀραβόθ, and a reading attributed to Symmachus in Eusebius has πεδιάς. An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts has the reading πεδίον for יְרוֹמִי. Like πεδιάς, πεδίον means “plain.” Thus, the present reading is possibly derived from the original Symmachus reading.

Num 31:16

HT

עַרְבֹת

LXX

ἕνεκεν Φογώρ

τὸ σαµ’ διὰ λόγου Φογώρ

Notes: For the Hebrew יְרוֹמִי, NUM approximates by using ἕνεκεν Φογώρ, which captures the sense. A Catena commentary note attributed to τὸ σαµ’ translates the phrase as διὰ λόγου Φογώρ. This is a quantitatively precise rendering of Sam (which matches HT) and it is thus consistent with the Samaritikon.

Num 31:17

HT

בָּקָך

LXX

ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀπαρτίᾳ

α’ σ’ ἐν τοῖς νηπίοις

Notes: Syh ܣ}

NonGr: Syh ܣ}

θ’ ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ

Notes: Syh ܣ}

Attr: θ’ > 130-321’ 128
NonGr: Syh

Notes: Moses orders the people to kill every male “among the children” (בַּטַּפְּ). NUM modifies this slightly and specifies every male “among all the spoil” (ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀπαρτίᾳ). A note attributed to α’ and σ’ gives the alternate reading ἐν τοῖς νηπίοις. First the reading drops the redundant πάσῃ (which is obelized by Origen), and then provides a closer approximation for τῇ. Aquila employs νήπιος for νηπίοις elsewhere (α’: Gen 43:8, Exod 10:10, 12:37, Deut 20:14). Thus, the attribution to Aquila is suitable.

Symmachus possibly uses νήπιος for τῇ in Genesis 43:8. In Numbers 31:18, the same s-group manuscripts attribute the reading ὀχλον for τῇ to Symmachus, and Symmachus usually renders this way (see under 31:18). But it is possible that Symmachus renders both ways, even in successive verses, due to contextual reasons. For example, in verse 17, τῇ is referring to boys and in verse 18 it is referring to girls (cf. also Aquila who may use ὀχλος for τῇ in Gen 47:12 and Jer 48[40]:16).

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G

> 58 Aeth = MT

Notes: NUM renders the phrase τῇ as ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀπαρτίᾳ, and πάσῃ is not matched in the Hebrew. Origen placed it under the obelus.

Sub ※ ἐγνωκεν ※ ἄνδρα εἰς κοίτην

Wit 2: O−58 f−129 Syh = MT
**Attr:**  ※ Syh] > rell

**NonGr:** Syh  *

**Notes:** NUM renders יֹדַעַת אִישׁ לְמִשְׁכַּב with ἔγνωκεν κοίτην, thus having no equivalent for לְאִישׁ (noun plus preposition) in the middle of the phrase. The translator may have been harmonizing with the next verse, which abbreviates with the negative restatement οὐκ οἶδεν κοίτην. For the present verse, Origen adds the equivalent ἄνδρα εἰς under the asterisk. Syh¹ has correctly placed the metobelus over the beth preposition in אִישׁ.

**Num 31:18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>(ך)ה</th>
<th>(τῶν)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(πᾶσαν)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<o'> + δέ

**Wit 2:** O¹³⁷⁶ ↓¹²⁹ Syh

**Var:** πᾶσαν δέ] pr καί f¹²⁹

**NonGr:** Syh ܒ

**Notes:** Wevers argues that the original NUM text for verse 18 was asyndetic, as witnessed by manuscript B (NGTN 512-13). HT has an initial waw conjunction, and many manuscripts include an initial καί. The o’ text apparently added a postpositive δέ, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 376) and Syh. This matches the adversative sense of the beginning of verse 18, “But all the girls…” The f-group has both καί and δέ; it is listed as a witness to the o’ text because of its added δέ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>כל הני</th>
<th>πᾶσαν τὴν ἀπαρτίαν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>πᾶσαν τὴν ἀπαρτίαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α’ πᾶσαν νήπιον

**Wit 1:** ↓¹３０-↓３２¹’

**Attr:** α’] > 130-346

{θ’} νήπιον
Notes: This attribution for Aquila is similar to that for verse 17. The s-group note uses νήπιος for ἡγο in verse 17 and the attributions makes sense (see the discussion under 31:17). A 321 note attributes the reading νήπιος to Theodotion, while the other witnesses have the reading without an attribution. Examining the manuscript evidence first, the readings by manuscript are as follows:

130 (s-group) — πᾶν νήπιον νήπια σθ’ ὄχλον
321 (s-group) — α’ πᾶν νήπιον θ’ νήπια ὄχλον
346 (s-group) — πᾶν νήπιον νήπια σθ’ ὄχλον
128 (z-group) — σαμ’ πᾶν νήπιον νήπια σθ’ ὄχλον

Manuscripts 130 and 346 from the s-group, and manuscript 128 from the z-group attribute the reading ὄχλον to σθ’ and θ’. Only 321 possibly associates νήπια with θ’, but manuscript damage for the double reading νήπια ὄχλον makes the precise attributions uncertain. The preponderance of the manuscript evidence suggests that the readings of 130, 346, and 128, which attribute ὄχλον to Theodotion, are probably accurate.

Regarding translation technique, if νήπιος is the Theodotion reading, this would be the only known instance where Theodotion renders ἡγο using νήπιος (in the preceding verse he uses ὄχλος — see the discussion there). Thus, manuscript evidence and translation technique indicate that Theodotion used ὄχλον for ἡγο here.

σθ’ θ’ ὄχλον

Notes: For Theodotion, this reading is similar to that for verse 17 and the attribution makes sense (see verse 17). For Symmachus, this is a different rendering of ἡγο than for verse 17 where he used νήπιος, perhaps for contextual reasons (also see verse 17). Elsewhere, Symmachus uses ὄχλος for ἡγο (Exod 10:10, 12:37, Jer 48[41]:16). Thus, this attribution is probably accurate.

σαμ’ πᾶν νήπιον νήπια

Notes: For Theodotion, this reading is similar to that for verse 17 and the attribution makes sense (see verse 17). For Symmachus, this is a different rendering of ἡγο than for verse 17 where he used νήπιος, perhaps for contextual reasons (also see verse 17). Elsewhere, Symmachus uses ὄχλος for ἡγο (Exod 10:10, 12:37, Jer 48[41]:16). Thus, this attribution is probably accurate.
Notes: A 128 note attributes the reading πᾶν νήπιον νήπιον to σαμ and it includes the added reading νήπιον. The Hebrew in the Samaritan Pentateuch is identical to HT here (משה), and so the σαμ rendering is reasonable, and may represent the Samaritikon. Field surmises that the second reading belongs to Aquila, although he did not have the α reading πᾶν νήπιον available to him (see above). The second reading could be derived from the πᾶν νήπιον Aquila reading, however.

**Num 31:19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(דֶּרֶךְ)</td>
<td>(ἀνελών)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⟨Sub ※⟩ + ἀσκήν

**Wit 2:** M V O d f⁻¹²⁹ n t 799 ἐκ ev codd 100 104 Arab Bo Syh = Ald Compl MT

**Attr:** ※] > omnes

**NonGr:** La animam | Syh ἀσκήν

Notes: HT reads שֵׂשֶׁת הָרֵג but NUM translates simply as ἀνελών with no equivalent for שֵׂשֶׁת. Many manuscripts, including the entire O-group, other hexaplaric witnesses, and the uncial MS V include the equivalent ἀσκήν. This was probably originally in the o’ text, and may have been under the asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>כֹל (ניַס)</td>
<td>(Ὁ ἁπτόμενος)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⟨Sub ※⟩ pr πάς

**Wit 2:** O f⁻¹²⁹ Syh = Compl MT

**Attr:** ※] > omnes

**NonGr:** Syh ἀσκήν

Notes: HT says that “all” (כֹל) who kill a person and “all” (כֹל) who touch a slain person must purify themselves. NUM has no equivalent for the second כֹל, which is acceptable Greek, but Origen adds the equivalent πάς as witnessed by the O-group and Syh. This addition may originally have been under the asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בְּרֵית הַכַּלֵּיָרֶשֶׁי</td>
<td>(Ὁ ἁπτόμενος)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LXX
(τῇ ἡερᾷ τῇ τρίτῃ)

⟨Sub ※⟩ pr ἐν

Wit 2:  $O^{-376}$ 53'-56 = Compl MT

Attr:  ※] > omnes

Notes:  NUM renders the Hebrew בַּיֹּם two ways: (1) by ἐν τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ, and (2) by τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ. For the phrase ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ in the present verse, NUM has τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ and apparently Origen added ἐν to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the $O$-group (minus 376). Apart from the present verse, NUM renders the expression בַּיֹּם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי as τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ in 7:24, 19:12(2x) and 29:20. But in 19:19, NUM adds ἐν and has ἐν τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ. In the verses where NUM does not employ ἐν, Origen adds ἐν only for the present verse, and he may have included here it under the asterisk.

A few manuscripts also precede the next phrase, τῇ ἡ*έρᾳ τῇ ἑβδό*ῃ, with ἐν, including $O$-group manuscript 58. The other $O$-group manuscripts do not have this, however, and since 58 regularly deviates from the rest of the $O$-group, this second addition of ἐν is probably not Origen’s work (see THGN 55, and cf. THGN 53 for 19:12).

Num 31:20

HT  בֶּגֶד
LXX  περίβλη*α

⟨oι λ’⟩  ἰμάτιον

Wit 1:  128

Notes:  NUM normally uses ἰμάτιον for בֶּגֶד (e.g., four verses later in 31:24), and only here does it use περίβλη*α (in fact this is the only occurrence of this word in the LXX). An unattributed marginal reading in $z$-group manuscript 128 gives the more usual ἰμάτιον (although the index is incorrectly placed with the word δερμάτινον). All of the Three employ ἰμάτιον for בֶּגֶד (α’: Gen 27:15, Job 37:17a, Isa 36:22, 52:1; σ’: 4 Kgdms 9:13, Job 37:17a, Isa 36:22; θ’: Prov 20:16, Isa 36:22). Thus, any of the Three could have been the source of this reading, or it could be a scribal explanatory note.

HT  fin
LXX  fin
καὶ εἶπεν Μωυσῆς πρὸς Ἐλεαζὰρ τὸν ἱερέα, Εἴπον πρὸς τοὺς ἀνδρὰς τῆς δυνάμεως τοὺς ἐρχομένους ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου. Τοῦτο τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου ὁ συνέταξεν κύριος (κς) πλὴν τοῦ χρυσίου καὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ τοῦ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου καὶ κασσιτέρου καὶ μολίβου (−δου*), πᾶν πράγμα ὁ διελεύσεται ἐν πυρί, διάξετε ἐν πυρί καὶ καθαρισθῆσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἡ τῶν ύδατι τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ ἁγνισθῆσαι. καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἄν μὴ διαπορεύηται διὰ πυρὸς διελεύσεται δι’ ύδατος. καὶ πλυνεῖτε τὰ ἱάτια ὑῶν τῇ ἡώρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ, καὶ καθαρισθῆσεσθε, καὶ μετὰ
The readings from the two similar passages in Sam are shown below. Phrases in Numbers 31:21b-24 of Sam that are different from Numbers 31:21a in Sam are noted with asterisks, with modified phrases (if they exist) from 31:21a following in parentheses. Text that is unique to 31:21a is also in parentheses.

Samaritan Pentateuch, Numbers 31:21b-24:

אומר (משה אל) אלהים המלחמה (אמר) אלהים יבשמה והבאים למלחמה זאת  

הוקח הרות אתו וגו' (אמר) יאしだ' וגו' (אמר) (海洋)  

הנהו שא יאשיהם ראה והביו את תועפת  

בכימים בורם ממך יבשכית (בשכית) ויבשות ראה יבשיהם של יבשיהם וגו':
The Syh note follows 31:21a of Sam except for one place where it follows the “official” text of 31:21b-24: the words מֵאָר֚וֹן מֵאָר֚וֹן, in the phrase “the Lord commanded Moses” is omitted from Sam of 31:21a, but Syh includes the equivalent אַרְיָה from 31:21b. Manuscript 344, which has many hexaplaric readings but few Aristarchian signs, has an asterisk preceding the entire reading that does not appear to be functioning as a regular Aristarchian sign.

**Num 31:21**

**HT** 
(להלכַּחַם)

**LXX** 
(ἐκ) τῆς παρατάξεως (τοῦ πολέμου)

Sub ÷

*Wit 2:* ↓G(mend)

> 

*Wit 2:* 58 126 Lat codd 100 104 = MT

*Var:* τῆς παρατάξεως γῆς παρατάξεως G

*Notes:* In HT, Eleazar is addressing all the men who went “to the war/fighting” (להלכַּחַם) but NUM precedes the equivalent τοῦ πολέμου with τῆς παρατάξεως. The latter is not reflected in the Hebrew, and Origen placed it under the obelus. Manuscript G has γῆς παρατάξεως instead of τῆς παρατάξεως, and this is probably a scribal error.

**Num 31:22**

**HT** 
אֵשֶׁת-הַבְּדִיל אֵשֶׁת-הָעֹפָר

**LXX** 
μολύβου καὶ κασσιτέρου

non tr κασσιτέρου και μολίβου

*Wit 2:* G-376 Syh = MT

*NonGr:* Syh אֶשֶּׁת-הַבְּדִיל אֵשֶׁת-הָעֹפָר

*Notes:* The final two metals listed that could withstand fire are “tin” and “lead” in HT, but NUM reverses them. The O’ text, as witnessed by O-group manuscripts G and 376 and by Syh, transposes the two words to match the Hebrew.
Num 31:23

**HT**

כָּבָּרָה בָּאֵשׁ

**LXX**

ἐν πυρί

**Sub ※ + διάξετε ἐν πυρί**

**Wit 1:**

↓106 ↓246

**Wit 2:**

↓O-58-↓15 ↓f-129 Lat Ruf Num XXV 6 Arab Syh = Compl MT

** Attr:**

※ G Syh| > rell

**Var:**

διάξετε ἐν πυρί] ※ καὶ (sup ras) πυρί διέξεται / G; διελεύσετε ἐν πήρυ 106me; pr οὗ 53′; pr οὗ καθαρισθήσεται 246mg | διάξετει -ται 376 246-664; διαδέξεται 53; παρενέγκατε 15

**NonGr:**

Lat Ruf Num XXV 6 traducite per ignem | Syh ✔ 351-354※, 360※

**Notes:**

NUM has no equivalent for the phrase כָּבָּרָה בָּאֵשׁ in HT. It is possible that the translator skipped from the first instance of כָּבָּרָה to the second through parablepsis (see NGTN 515). Origen added the equivalent διάξετε ἐν πυρί under the asterisk. Manuscript G — the only O-group manuscript with Aristarchian signs — rearranges the order to καὶ πυρί διέξεται, dropping the redundant pronoun ἐν and adding καὶ. Because the conjunction is not present in the Hebrew, the reading in G is probably a corruption of the original o’ text. The original is witnessed by other O-group witnesses 376 and 426, by Syh, and by the f-group. Syh adds an extra extraneous asterisk between the correct one and the metobelus.

Manuscript 106 has the marginal reading διελεύσετε ἐν πῆρυ, which perhaps indicates Origenic influence because it reflects the underlying Hebrew, although διάξετε has been changed to διελεύσετε and thus conforms to the earlier διελεύσεται in the verse, and πήρυ is probably a copying error. A 246 note precedes διάξετε ἐν πυρί with οὐ καθαρισθήσεται which is redundant, because καὶ καθαρισθήσεται appears immediately after ἐν πυρί in NUM. The added οὐ καθαρισθήσεται is probably a scribal error, but the rest of the 246 note does reflect the o’ text.

Num 31:24

**HT**

בָּאֵשׁ

**LXX**

(τὰ ἱμάτια)
Sub ※ + ὑ*ῶν

Wit 2:  

\[O^\text{58} f^{129} \text{Cyr I 329 Lat cod 100 Ruf} \text{Num XXV 6 Arab Sa Syh = Compl MT}\]

Attr:  ※ Gj > rell

NonGr:  La vestra | Syh

Notes:  The Hebrew pronominal suffix on \(בִּגְדֵיכֶם\) has no equivalent in NUM, and Origen added ὑ*ῶν under the asterisk.

HT  רכמביה
LXX  καὶ πλυνείσθε

\(ο′ \alpha′ \theta′\)  καὶ πλυνείτε

Wit 1:  344

\(\text{Wit 2: } F \downarrow V \downarrow O-72 b^{19} f^{129} \downarrow 127 730 \downarrow c^{126} 407 59 \text{Cyr I 329 (sed hab Ald)}\)

Var:  \(\piλυνείτε\) -νίτε V G; -ταί 127 18; \(\piλήν\). 68

\{\(\alpha′\)\} 〈\(\sigma′\)〉  καὶ πλυνάμενοι

Wit 1:  \(\downarrow 344\)

Attr: 〈\(\sigma′\)〉 \(\alpha′\) 344

Notes:  The text of \(s\)-group manuscript 344 matches the middle voice \(\piλυνείσθε\) in NUM for the Piel of \(כבס\) in HT. A marginal note in 344 indicates that the \(o′\) text had the active \(\piλυνείτε\) and this is witnessed by the \(O\)-group and reflected in many other manuscripts. NUM normally translates the Piel of \(כבס\) using the active of \(\piλύνω\) (8:7, 19:7, 8, 10, 19, 11) except in 8:21 where \(כבס\) is paired with the Hithpael בָּטָא (“purify oneself”) and the translator uses the middle voice, perhaps to continue the reflexive sense. In the present verse, no obvious reason exists for the middle voice, except perhaps that only in this verse is second person used for \(\piλύνω\) in Numbers. As it is the more difficult reading it is probably original. One of Origen’s exemplars may have had the active voice. He may also have been influenced by NUM usage elsewhere, or he possibly copied Theodotion.
The use of πλύνω is uncommon among the Three. Theodotion employs it for דוח in Ezekiel 40:38. Field cites an instance of οἱ λ′ employing πλύνω for שׁטף in Leviticus 15:12 with some manuscript support, although this reading is not included in Wevers’ critical text. The Three, however, may have been content to copy NUM here.

Aquila and Theodotion apparently saw no reason not to use the active voice, and the attribution of πλυνέιτε to them makes sense. The reading καὶ πλύνα*ενοι suits Symmachus, as he often adapts the normal Hebrew paratactic structure (parallel finite verbs joined by copulae) to Greek hypotactic structure (e.g., participle plus finite verb; see F-Pro 62). The 344 attribution of καὶ πλυνά*ενοι to α′ is a mistake, first because another reading that fits Aquila exists (see above), and second because Aquila typically conforms closely to Hebrew paratactic structure.

**Num 31:26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>שָׂא אֵת רֹאשׁ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>λαβὲ τὸ κεφάλαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ σαμ′</td>
<td>λάβε τὸ τέλος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: In the context of verse 26, the Hebrew שָׂא אֵת רֹאשׁ refers to counting the total value of the spoils that were taken. Moses and Eleazar were told to derive this value so that a tax could be assessed on it. The same Hebrew verbs are used together in 1:2, 49, 4:2, 22, 26:2, and 31:40 in regards to counting people in a census. A reading attributed to τὸ σαμ′ from the catena section of the Catena group has τέλος instead of κεφάλαιον, which is an acceptable alternative translation (in this chapter, NUM uses τέλος to refer to the levy assessed on the people and not the number of people, e.g., in 31:28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41). Because this τὸ σαμ′ rendering is consistent with Sam (and HT), it is probably from the Samaritikon.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מַלְקוֹ</th>
<th>נַפְלֵךְ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν σκύλων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⟨τὸ σαμ′⟩ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἀρσεως

*Notes: An unattributed note begins with τὸ τέλος, which matches the τὸ σαμ′ note covered above, and then goes on to render מַלְקוֹ by ἀρσεως (“raising,” “removal”) instead of σκύλων in NUM. Because of the identical beginning with the previous τὸ σαμ′ note, Field as well as Hatch and Redpath attribute the present note to τὸ*
σαμ’. Although ἄρσις provides a less specific rendering than σκύλον, ἄρσις is consistent with ἀρσὶς in a more generic sense of “thing taken” (related to the root ἄρσῃ). Thus the source of this reading is probably the Samaritikon.

**Num 31:27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἐκδήλῳ(ὁ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(συναγωγῆς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈Sub ※〉 pr τῆς

*Wit 2:* A O°426-381° 414 106°(mg) 129 ↓<sup>n</sup> ″(=370) 527 Cyr I 333bis = Compl MT

*Attr:* ※] > omnes

*Notes:* The article on ἱλαρόν has no equivalent in NUM, and the O-group (minus 426) indicates that the o’ text adds τῆς. Origen only occasionally adds articles under the asterisk when NUM has no equivalent for articles in HT (e.g., see the discussion of τῷ κυρίῳ under 25:4). The addition of τῆς may originally have been under the asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἁξιόν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>παράταξιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈οἱ λ’〉 δύναμιν

*Wit 1:* 130

*Notes:* An unattributed marginal note in s-group manuscript 130 has δύναμιν for ἁξιόν instead of παράταξιν in NUM. All of the Three use δύναμις for ἁξιόν frequently (e.g., α’: Jer 8:2, 3, 10:16, 11:20, 19:3, 15; σ’: Isa 22:14, Jer 10:16, 11:20, 19:3; θ’: Isa 22:14, 34:4, Jer 10:16, 11:20, 19:15). Thus, the note could come from any of the Three. Since δύναμις is also a common rendering for ἁξιόν in NUM, however, this could be a scribal gloss.

**Num 31:28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἁξίζη</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>παράταξιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈οἱ λ’〉 δύναμιν
**Wit 1:** 321′

**Notes:** This note is identical to that for verse 27, except that it is found in s-group manuscripts 321 and 346. The note has δύναμιν for אבב instead of παραταξίν in NUM. All of the Three use δύναμις for צָבָא frequently (see the references under 31:27). Thus, the note could come from any of the Three. Since δύναμις is also a common rendering for צָבָא in NUM, however, this could be a scribal gloss.

HT:

מִן־הַבָּקָר וּמִן־הַחֲמֹרִים וּמִן־הַצֹּאן

LXX:

ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνων

〈ο′〉 ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων

**Wit 2:** O^58 ↓Syh

**Var:** lemma| + καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνων Syh

**NonGr:** Syh άπο τῶν βοῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων

**Notes:** The Hebrew says that a tax of one in five hundred will be taken for the persons, and for each of three classes of animals: מִן־הַבָּקָר וּמִן־הַחֲמֹרִים וּמִן־הַצֹּאן (“from the cattle and from the donkeys and from the flocks/sheep”). NUM modifies this, adding one class at the beginning (κτηνῶν) and reversing the order of donkeys and sheep. Wevers argues that NUM had a different parent text (NGTN 517). The o’ text makes a partial correction towards the Hebrew in that it has three classes of animals and places τῶν βοῶν at the beginning of the list to match the Hebrew. However, it retains κτηνῶν, placing it second, and drops ὄνων. Finally, it correctly places προβάτων at the end to match the Hebrew. If Origen derived his second word (κτηνῶν) from the Hebrew, this would require him to read החמרים as הבהמה. These are so dissimilar that Wevers postulates yet another parent text from which Origen was working. Origen’s final product, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58) is: ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων. Syh retains ὄνων as a fourth item at the end of the list, which matches NUM, although the order of the first three items in Syh matches the o’ text.

**Num 31:29**

HT: מִמַּחֲצִיתָם (מַחֲצָתָם)
Num 31:30

HT  
(מִמַּחֲצִית בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל)

LXX  
(καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμίσους) τοῦ (τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ)

<Sub ÷>

>  

Wit 2:  
F\textsuperscript{58} O\textsuperscript{−58} C\textsuperscript{−52} d 54-75' 28-85-730  t 527 318 55 Aeth Arm Syh = MT

Notes:  
The Hebrew begins verse 30 with, “And from half of the sons of Israel...” NUM adds the relative τοῦ, giving: “And from the half which is of the sons of Israel...” The o’ text omitted τοῦ to match the Hebrew, as witnessed negatively by the O-group (minus 58) and many other manuscripts. This may originally have been under the obelus.
HT  אֶחָד
LXX  ἕνα

Wit 2:  $O^{-58} \, 707^c \, 120^c \, 59$

Notes: For הדָּשֶׁ, NUM has the masculine singular ἕνα, perhaps referring forward in the verse to ἀνθρώπων, although this is not clear. The phrase in the Hebrew is חַזַּרְפָּשִׁים and NUM has no equivalent for חַזַּרְפָּשִׁים. Origen adds the equivalent τὸ κρατοῦμένον under the asterisk (see below), and he also modifies ἕνα to neuter ἕν to match κρατοῦμένον. The change to ἕν is witnessed by the $O$-group (minus 58) and other hexaplaric manuscripts.

HT  חַזַּרְפָּשִׁים (חדָשֶׁ)
LXX  (ἕνα)

Sub ※  ἕν ※τὸ κρατοῦμένον※

Wit 2:  $O^{-58}$ Syh = Compl MT

Attr:  ※ G| > rel

NonGr:  Syh אֵשְּפָּה לַעֲקֹב אָפ

Notes: Along with changing masculine ἕνα to neuter ἕν (see above) Origen also adds the phrase τὸ κρατοῦμένον to match חַזַּרְפָּשִׁים in HT which has no equivalent in NUM. The phrase thus matches the Hebrew: “you shall take one seized out of every fifty.” Manuscript 56 from the $f$-group has the marginal reading κατάσχεσιν which may possibly reflect a later scribe’s equivalent to Origen’s κρατοῦμένον.

HT  מִן־הַחֲמֹרִים וּמִן־הַצֹּאן
LXX  ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνων

non tr  ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων

Wit 2:  $O^{-58}$ Lat codd 100 104(vid) Arab Bo Syh = MT
Notes: NUM joins all of the four items listed in this verse with conjunctions which are not present in HT until the fourth item, but the o’ text does not note these. In HT the last two groups are listed as: מִן־הַחֲמֹרִים וּמِן־הַצֹּאן (“from the donkeys and from the sheep”). NUM reverses their order, and Origen transposes them to match the Hebrew.

Num 31:32

HT

LXX

Sub ※ καὶ ἐγενήθη τὰ σκῦλα τὸ πλεόνασμα

Wit 2: O58 53'-56' Syh = Compl MT

Attr: ※ G] > rel

Var: τὰ] > 53'

NonGr: Syh אמא

Notes: In verse 32, the enumeration of the plunder commences. HT begins, “And it was that the booty (חַהַמַּלְקוֹ), the remainder (יֶתֶר) from the spoil…” but NUM has no equivalent for חַהַמַּלְקוֹ. Instead, it treats יֶתֶר as the subject of the sentence. Origen added τὰ σκῦλα, the normal NUM equivalent for חַהַמַּלְקוֹ, under the asterisk.

HT

LXX

〈τὸ σαμ’〉 + ἤ ἀρσις τὰ σκῦλα

Wit 1: 130-1321'

Var: τὰ σκῦλα] abscc 321; pr τασκυ 130-346

Notes: A marginal note in some s-group manuscripts gives the alternate reading ἤ ἀρσις for חַהַמַּלְקוֹ. This is followed by the normal NUM rendering τὰ σκῦλα (the latter possibly added to indicate the normal NUM pattern). In 31:26, what appears to be a
reading from τὸ σαμ’ renders ἄρσεως as τῆς ἄρσεως instead of τῶν σκυλῶν. Thus, the present reading could also be from τὸ σαμ’.

Manuscripts 130-346 have the notation τασκῦ for τὰ σκῦλα. The symbol κυ is normally used for κυρίου so although τασκῦ may possibly represent shorthand for τὰ σκῦλα, it could also be a scribal error.

HT שָׁבַעַם (שָׁבַעַם)
LXX (ἐβδομήκοντα)

Sub ※ + χιλιάδες

Wit 2: A F pr m M † G-29-426-707-ol C” b-19 246 s y-392 55 624 Syh = Compl MT
Attr: ※ G† > rel
Var: χιλιάδες] χειλ. G; -δων 630
NonGr: Syh άληθές

Notes: The total number HT reports is 675,000. HT repeats the explicit number “thousand” (אֶלֶף) or “thousands” (אֲלָפִים) after each of three numbers (600, 70, and 5), but NUM omits the equivalent after the middle number (70), as it is understood clearly from the context. Origen adds the equivalent χιλιάδες under the asterisk to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by G and 426 from the O-group, and many other manuscripts reflect this addition.

Num 31:35

HT כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ
LXX πᾶσαι ψυχαί

ο’ σ’ πᾶσαι ψυχαί

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: B ↓ V O-82 ↓ 52’ ↓ b f ↓ n ↓ t x-71 126-407 ↓ 319 424 646 ↓ 799
Var: ψυχαί] pr αί V 52’ b n t 319 799 (sed hab Compl)

α’ θ’ πᾶσα ψυχή
Notes: NUM understands the singular ψυχή as being collective, and translates with the plural πᾶσαι ψυχαί. This is a pattern it follows in other places (e.g., βόες for בָקָר in verse 33). The singular πᾶσα ψυχή is attributed to Aquila and Theodotion by s-group manuscript 344, and a number of manuscripts, including the uncials A, F, and M, reflect this reading. That Aquila and Theodotion match the literal singular makes sense. Another 344 note indicates that o′ and σ′ match πᾶσαι ψυχαί in NUM. Because the s-group has the singular, 344 is reporting that the o′ text has the plural, and this attribution is supported by the O-group. That Symmachus understood the Hebrew collectively and followed NUM is reasonable for him.

Num 31:36

HT אֶלֶף (שְׁלֹשָׁה מֵאֹות)
LXX (τριακόσια)

Sub ※ + χιλιάδες

Wit 2: A F M′ ωτ−−82 ↓C−−52′ s y z−126 407 55 59 624
Attr: ※ G | > rell
Var: χιλιάδες χείλ. G; -δαίς 59 1

Notes: HT repeats the specific number אֶלֶף or אֲלָפִים after each of three numbers (300, 30, and 7), but NUM includes the equivalent only after the middle number, as the others are understood from the context. Origen adds the equivalent χιλιάδες under the asterisk to match the first אֶלֶף (although he does not address the untranslated אֲלָפִים after שִׁבְעַת later in the verse). Many manuscripts reflect this addition.

HT שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וְחָמֵשׁ מֵאֹות
LXX ἑπτακισχίλια καὶ πεντακόσια
ο’ οἱ λ’ ἑπτακισχίλιαι καὶ πεντακόσιοι

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: ἑπτακισχίλιαι B x (sed hab Sist) | πεντακόσιοι 376'-618 528' 19' 527 59' 799

Notes: In verse 32, the total number of sheep taken as spoil is given as 675,000. The number that HT expresses in the present verse is the half-portion: שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׂ (337,500). NUM renders this as τριακόσιαι καὶ τριάκοντα χιλιάδες καὶ ἑπτακισχίλια καὶ πεντακόσια, using two neuter plurals for the final two compound numbers. For these final two numbers, a 344 note attributes the reading ἑπτακισχίλιαι καὶ πεντακόσιοι — a feminine plural and masculine plural — to o‘ and oι λ’. One normally expects compound numbers that can be declined to match the substantive they modify in number and gender. Hence in Numbers chapters 2-4, every example is of the form -χίλιαi since every count was of men. For compound words with -κοσι- the same holds in NUM. Thus, throughout chapters 1-4, every occurrence of a compound “hundreds” number matches its antecedent in number and gender (most are masculine plural). This is the general rule throughout Numbers, for example in 16:17, where like the present verse, a compound number agrees with a neuter plural noun: διακόσια πυρεῖα.

In the present verse and in 31:43, the half-portion refers to τῶν προβάτων which is neuter plural, and NUM matches using the neuter plurals ἑπτακισχίλια and πεντακόσια. Here, for the first number some manuscripts (B and the x-group) substitute the feminine plural ἑπτακισχίλια. As for the second number, some manuscripts (376'-618 528' 19' 527 59' 799) have the masculine plural πεντακόσιοι. No manuscripts match the 344 reading for both numbers, however.

Regardless of possible explanations for the alternate forms of the numbers, the first question is whether the 344 reading makes sense for the o‘ text from a text-critical standpoint. The O-group witness is mixed, as follows:

G: ἑπτακισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι (masculine, neuter)
58: ἑπτακισχίλια καὶ πεντακόσια (neuter, neuter → matches NUM)
376: ἑπτά καὶ πεντακόσιοι (indeclinable [wrong number], masculine)
426: ἑπτά καὶ πεντακόσιοι (indeclinable [wrong number], masculine)

It can be seen from the above that no O-group (and indeed no hexaplaric) manuscripts match ἑπτακισχίλιαι, and thus it is doubtful as being the original o‘ text. The second number, πεντακόσιοι, is matched by 376 and 426 (with 618 from the oI-group) and so this form possibly reflects the o‘ text.

344 also attributes ἑπτακισχίλιαι καὶ πεντακόσιοι to oι λ’. Considering ἑπτακισχίλιαι first, several reasons might be adduced as to why one of the Three might have used it. One possibility is influence from the Hebrew. In one rare LXX example, 1 Kingdoms 25:2 uses the feminine form of χίλιαι for a masculine noun: χίλιαι αἵγες (‘a
thousand goats”). The underlying Hebrew word נְבֶעַ is feminine, and the LXX translator may have been influenced by the Hebrew to use a feminine form of the numeral. In the present verse, the Hebrew underlying προβάτων is נְבֶעַ, a word which in the collective is sometimes construed as feminine plural (Gen 30:43, Jer 50:6). Thus, one of the translators may have been influenced by the feminine נְבֶעַ to use the feminine ἑπτακισχίλιαι to refer to προβάτων. A second possibility is that one of the translators was mindful of the entire LXX phrase τὸ ἡ*ίσευ*α ἡ *ερὶς τῶν ἐκπεπορευ*ένων εἰς τὸν πόλε*ον ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθ*οῦ τῶν προβάτων. That is, that “the half, the portion” (הַמֶּחֱצָה חֵלֶק) was to come “out of the number of sheep” (מִסְפַּר הַצֹּאן.). Since the total number of sheep was given in verse 32 as 675,000, the translator may have seen the number in verse 36 as referring to the “half” (feminine מֶחֱצָה) rather than to the sheep. A third possibility is that one of the translators, under the influence of the feminine τριακόσιαι καὶ τριάκοντα χιλιάδες just prior in the verse, may have used the feminine ἑπτακισχίλιαι for a second expression of “thousands.”

Similar conjectures can be put forward for the masculine singular πεντακόσιοι.

Examining each number separately still leads to the issue of why the two numbers have different gender, and perhaps the simplest explanation is scribal error in copying one of the numbers.

In summary, it seems likely that some error has been introduced into the tradition that 344 represents. No manuscripts support the complete 344 reading: ἐπτακισχίλιαι καὶ πεντακόσιοι. The ο’ text likely did not have ἐπτακισχίλιαι, although it might have had πεντακόσιοι. It also seems likely that this 344 reading does not reflect οἱ λ’ for both numbers, although one of the two numbers may be correct.

Num 31:37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נְבֶעַ הָעַבְרִים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐβδομῆκοντα πέντε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non tr</td>
<td>πέντε καὶ ἐβδομῆκοντα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wit 2: 426 Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh

Notes: Two hexaplaric manuscripts, 426 and Syh, transpose the order of ἐβδομῆκοντα πέντε in NUM to match the Hebrew, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. In general, Syh is inconsistent in its ordering of numbers when rendering from NUM. For example, for the same number, ἐβδομῆκοντα πέντε, Syh translates מַכְסִל in Genesis 46:27 and Exodus 39:2 (as part of 1,775). However, in Exodus 39:5 for the same number as three verses before, it reverses the numbers and has מַכְסִל.
Thus, Syh may alter the order of numbers for stylistic purposes, and the reversed order for the present verse may not be a witness to an Origenic transposition.

**Num 31:38**

HT (מִכְסָם לַיהוָה)

LXX (τέλος)

Sub ※ + αὐτῶν

**Wit 1:** 246

**Wit 2:** O⁻⁵⁸-¹⁵ 53⁻⁵⁶ Syh = Compl MT

**Attr:** ※ G | > rel

**NonGr:** Syh אָמַס

**Notes:** HT says that from the cattle, “their levy to the Lord” (מִכְסָם לַיהוָה) equaled 72. NUM translates מִכְסָם לַיהוָה with τέλος κυρίῳ, which (1) omits the pronominal suffix, and (2) accounts for the lamedh preposition using the dative. Origen adds two asterisks. The first inserts αὐτῶν to equal the Hebrew suffix. The second asterisk, covered below, adds τῷ to account for lamedh preposition.

HT (לַ徭)

LXX (κυρίῳ)

Sub ※ pr τῶν

**Wit 1:** 246

**Wit 2:** O⁻¹⁵ 53⁻⁵⁶ Syh = Compl

**Attr:** ※ G Syh | > rel

**NonGr:** Syh אָמַס

**Notes:** Although the dative κυρίῳ in NUM is an acceptable translation of לַיהוָה, Origen attempts to account for the lamedh preposition using the definite article τῶν. Origen is inconsistent in how he treats לַיהוָה, sometimes adding τῶν under the asterisk when NUM omits it and sometimes doing nothing (for details, see under 25:4).
This is the second of two asterisks for this verse (the first is covered above). The overall effect of the two asterisks is to modify τὸ τέλος κυρίῳ to τὸ τέλος αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ.

**Num 31:39**

- **HT** (מִכְסָם)
- **LXX** (τέλος)

**Sub 〈※〉 + αὐτῶν**

- **Wit 2:** 15-376 b 767 = MT

- **Attr:** ※] > omnes

**Notes:** As in verse 38 NUM has no equivalent for the pronominal suffix on מִכְסָם, rendering the phrase by τέλος. One O-group witness (376) indicates that Origen possibly duplicated his action from the previous verse and added αὐτῶν under the asterisk, and this is reflected in a few other manuscripts. The rest of the O-group and Syh do not reflect this addition, which leaves some room for uncertainty about the original o’ text here.

**Num 31:41**

- **HT** (אֶת־מֶכֶס)
- **LXX** (τὸ τέλος) κυρίῳ

〈Sub ÷〉

- **Wit 2:** O Syh = MT

**Notes:** Unlike the previous two verses where מֶכֶס is modified by the phrase לַיהוָה, here HT omits לַיהוָה, but NUM includes the equivalent κυρίῳ. The o’ text omits κυρίῳ to match the Hebrew, as witnessed negatively by the O-group and Syh, and this omission may originally have been under the obelus.

**Num 31:47**

- **HT** (אֶחָד)
- **LXX** (τὸ τέλος) κυρίῳ
ο’  τὸ ἑν

Wit 1:  ↓85-↓321’-344

Wit 2:  ↓B F O’ b d f’246 n 28-30-730 t 59 646

Attr:  o’] > 85-321’

Var:  τό] > Bc

Notes:  The o’ text matches NUM with τὸ ἑν but also inserts κρατουμένον under the asterisk (see below). Many manuscripts, including some s-group texts (85-130-321’-343-344) omit τό. A 344 marginal note attributed to o’ indicates that the o’ text had the article, and this is supported by the O-group. 344 seems to be unaware, however, of the asterisk tradition that inserts κρατουμένον between τό and ἑν.

HT אֶת־הָאָחֻז אֶחָד
LXX τὸ ἑν

Sub ※  + τὸ ※ κρατουμένον < ἑν

Wit 2:  O 56* Syh = MT

Attr:  ※ G] > rel

NonGr:  Syh אֶת־הָאָחֻז אֶחָד

Notes:  In defining the tax, the same principle is used as in verse 30: “one out of fifty.” In verse 30, the first part of this formula is אֶחָד אָחֻז, and NUM renders the phrase as ἑνα (masculine), thus not accounting for τὸ κρατουμένον. There, Origen makes two adjustments: first he changes ἑνα to the neuter ἑν, and second he adds τὸ κρατουμένον under the asterisk to equal τὸ κρατουμένον. This results in the phrase ἑν τὸ κρατουμένον. In the present verse, the corresponding phrase is τὸ κρατοῦμενον ἑν which NUM renders (again omitting τὸ κρατοῦμενον) as a definite article and a neuter: τὸ ἑν. Thus, with the definite article present and ἑν already being neuter, Origen adds κρατουμένον under the asterisk, which yields the phrase τὸ κρατουμένον ἑν. This addition is witnessed by the O-group and Syh.

Num 31:48
**Num 31:50**

**HT**

\begin{itemize}
\item (נוּ)נַפְשֹׁתֵי
\end{itemize}

**LXX**

\begin{itemize}
\item (περὶ ἡ*ῶν)
\end{itemize}

**Sub ※ pr ψυχῶν**

**Wit 1:**

246

**Wit 2:**

\(O^{58}-15 \downarrow 767 128-630' \downarrow 669^c\) Arab Syh = MT

**Attr:**

※ G > rell

**Var:**

ή*ῶν] > 767 \(ψυχῶν\) \(pr τῶν\) 669^c

**NonGr:**

Syh ܐ
eed

**Notes:**

In HT, the officers report all the types of articles that their men brought as an offering, “to make atonement for our souls (נַפְשֹׁתֵינוּ עַל־).” NUM has no equivalent for רַפְּקֻדִים, and Origen adds ψυχῶν under the asterisk.

**Num 31:53**

**HT**

\(םֵבְנָנִים\)

**LXX**

\(ἐπρονόμευσαν\)

\(\langle οί λ' \rangle \) διάρπασαν
Notes: This unattributed s-group marginal note is identical to one found at 31:9. There, HT uses two different verbs for taking people and property: (1) יִשְׁבּוּ (from שׁבה) for the deporting of women and children and (2) זוּ בָּזְ for the plundering of livestock and goods. NUM renders both of these as ἐπρονό*ευσαν. For the present verse, an unattributed s-group note has the alternate διήρπασαν for וּזבָּזְ. Aquila and Theodotion employ διαρπάζω for בזז (α': Deut 3:7, Isa 33:23, Jer 20:5; θ': Jer 20:5). Symmachus uses διαρπάζω for בזא, which he possibly considered a by-form of בזז, in Isaiah 18:7, and for שׁסס, a synonym of בזז, in Jeremiah 37[30]:16. Thus, this reading could come from any of the Three.

Numbers 32

Num 32:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o' oι λ'</td>
<td>πληθος σφοδρα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: HT says, “To the Reubenites and Gadites was a multitude of livestock, very great (מְאֹד נְצֶר).” NUM uses the noun πληθος to render the adjective נצֶר which is unusual (the only other time in the LXX where πληθος is used for נצֶר is Deut 26:5, and there it is textually questionable). The NUM translator may have construed נצֶר as the passive participle of נצר. Also unusual is the pairing of a noun with the adverb σφοδρα. Wevers accounts for this by asserting that the NUM translator was not a good Greek grammarian (NGTN 526). Most Greek manuscripts, including A, F, and M have added the adjective πολυ, giving πληθος πολυ σφοδρα, to normalize the Greek grammar. The s-group also adds πολυ, and 344 from the s-group has a note that indicates that the o' text has the original πληθος σφοδρα, and this is supported by the O-group (minus 58). Origen perhaps accepted the NUM reading because although awkward, it is a quantitative rendering of the Hebrew.

The 344 note also attributes the NUM reading to oι λ'. All of the Three use πληθος (e.g., α': Job 23:6a, Isa 24:22 for בֶּשֶׁם, Jer 29[47]:3, Ezek 23:42 for הָמוֹן; σ': Isa 31:4, Jer 10:13 for הָמוֹן, Isa 40:26, 63:1 for נְצֶר; θ': Isa 31:4, Ezek 7:12, 13, 14 for הָמוֹן, Isa 40:26
for רֹב). None of the Three, however, employ πλῆθος elsewhere for עָצוּם. It is possible that they considered עָצוּם to be a passive participle, but the use of the adverb σφόδρα with the noun πλῆθος is still awkward. One would expect the Three to be more sensitive to grammar, particularly Symmachus. Aquila may have left the NUM rendering in place because it corresponds quantitatively to the Hebrew, and Theodotion may also have followed NUM, but some questions remain about the accuracy of this attribution.

Num 32:2

| HT | בְּנֵי־גָד רְאוּבֵן לֵאָוֹב | oı uiöi 'Pouβηn kai oı uiöi Γάδ |
| LXX | οἱ υἱοὶ Ῥουβήν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ |
| non tr | oı uiöi Γάδ kai oı uiöi ’Pouβηn |

Wit 2: ↓376' ↓Syh = MT

Var: 'Pouβηn] -βιν 426; -βειμ 376; rūbil Syh

NonGr: Syh ܫܝܚ, ܫܡܥ, ܫܡܥܢ

Notes: HT lists the tribes who come to Moses as נֵי־גָד וּבְנֵי רְאוּבֵן. NUM reverses the order, possibly because the tribe of Reuben is often listed first, and Origen transposes the names to match the Hebrew. NUM likewise reverses these names in verses 25, 29, and 31, and in each case the o’ text transposes the names back to the Hebrew order.

| HT | Χαμάρ | Χαλὰμάρ |
| LXX | εἰςταν |

tò σαμ’ pr kai tò ἡμίσιν τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσή

Wit 1: Cctxt

Notes: In 32:33, HT has the phrase לֵאָוֹב בְּנֵי רְאוּבֵן בְּנֵי גָד וַחֲצִי שֵׁבֶט מְנַשֶּׁה (“to the sons of Reuben and to the sons of Gad and to the half-tribe of Manasseh”), and NUM translates the entire phrase. In verses 1, 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31, HT lists the tribes of Reuben and Gad only, and for each of those verses, the Samaritan Pentateuch adds the half-tribe of Manasseh, either as (1) רְאוּבֵן רְאוּבֵן לֵאָוֹב שֵׁבֶט מְנַשֶּׁה if the previous names have lamedh prepositions (verses 1 and 6), or as (2) וַחֲצִי שֵׁבֶט מְנַשֶּׁה if there are no prepositions (verses 2, 25, 29, and 31). For verse 6, tò σαμ’ matches Sam with και το̇
ἡμίσει τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσῆ, and similarly for verses 2, 25, 29, and 31, τὸ σαμ’ matches Sam with καὶ τὸ ἢμισυ τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσῆ (for verse 1, no τὸ σαμ’ reading exists).

The attribution is explained in a Catena note for verse 33: ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις οὐ μνημονεύσομεν, ἐν δὲ τῷ Σαμαρειτικῷ μνημονεύεται (“in the ones formerly spoken [i.e., verses 2, 6, 25, 29, 31] — not mentioned; but in the Samaritikon they are declared”). This attribution indicates an understanding among the Catena tradition that τὸ σαμ’ reflects the Samaritikon.

**Num 32:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נמר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Ἀταρώθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(o’ oi λ’ Ἀταρώθ)

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** B F M ‘O’-58 72 b f n-54 75’ 127 x 318 z-669* 55 59 424 624 646 799 Syh

**NonGr:** Syh 3046א

**Notes:** NUM renders the name נמר using Ἀταρώθ, and as often happens with proper names, some variations were introduced into the Greek manuscripts. The uncial A along with the s-group has Ἀταρών, and s-group manuscript 344 notes that the o’ text and oi λ’ have Ἀταρώθ. The O-group (minus 58) and most of the other hexaplaric witnesses have Ἀταρώθ which supports the attribution to o’. And since the reading agrees with the Hebrew, the attribution to oi λ’ makes sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נמר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Ναμβρά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(o’ oi λ’ Ναμβρά)

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** F 29-72-426 74ε-76 59 Cyr I 404 Syh = Ald Sixt

**Var:** Ναμβρά] Νεμρά 426

**NonGr:** Syh 3046א
Notes: NUM renders the Hebrew נִמְרָה with Ναβρά. A number of manuscripts drop the β so that the rendering conforms more closely to the Hebrew. The s-group matches NUM and s-group manuscript 344 notes that the o’ text and οἱ λ’ omit β and have Ναμρά. The attribution to o’ is possibly correct as it is supported by four hexaplaric witnesses including 426 and Syh. Syh agrees with P here, and so Syh might have been influenced by P rather than the o’ text. This reading is also attributed to οἱ λ’, and since it agrees with the Hebrew, the attribution is suitable.

HT שְׂבָם
LXX Σεβαμά

〈o’〉 Σεβαμά

Wit 2: 426 = MT

Notes: The Hebrew city name שְׂבָם is rendered by NUM as Σεβαμά. O-group manuscript 426 modifies this to Σεβάμ, and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. As sometimes happens, 426 is the only witness to the Hebrew.

Num 32:4

HT —
LXX ὑπάρχει

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G = MT

Notes: While HT employs a nominal sentence, NUM translates using the explicit verb ὑπάρχει. O-group manuscript G has an obelus for ὑπάρχει, but no other manuscripts witness to the obelus nor do any delete this text. This is similar to the obelus in 31:48 where G is the only witness. The evidence is limited, but the obelus correctly marks added text in the Greek, and G is an old and normally reliable witness. Thus, the obelus is probably genuine.

Num 32:5

HT רַמאֲמְרָה
LXX καὶ ἔλεγον
καὶ ἔλεγον

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: B F V O 707 414 422 b d f n t x z 18' 628 630 59 319 424 624 646 799
Var: καὶ > 68

καὶ εἶπον· καὶ εἶπαν

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: Lat codd 100 104
NonGr: La dixerunt

Notes: NUM translates the Hebrew waw-consecutive ְַּיָּמְרְ- using καὶ plus the imperfect ἐλεγον. Many manuscripts, including A, F, and the s-group substitute the aorist ἐλεγοσαν. Manuscript 344, from the s-group, notes that the o’ text has the imperfect, and this is corroborated by the O-group and other hexaplaric witnesses. A second 344 note attributed to σ’ has the aorist εἶπον, using the classical –ον ending, which Symmachus also uses for ἔπεσον in 20:6 and possibly also for παρέπεσον in 22:30, rather than the Hellenistic –αν ending (see Gignac 335-38). Thus this form is reasonable for Symmachus. An added note has καὶ εἶπαν, which may be a scribal gloss that gives the customary Hellenistic form used in NUM.

Num 32:6

האחים
LXX οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμῶν

τὸ σαμ’ pr καὶ τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς φυλῆς
Μανασσῆ

Wit 1: C cat

Notes: Sam adds the phrase רְַּחָּשְרְ- שַׁבִּיט הָגֵי (”and to the half-tribe of Manasseh”) although it is not in HT, and the Samaritikon has the equivalent καὶ τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσῆ. Sam has similar additions in verses 1, 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31 and there are Samaritikon equivalents in all but verse 1. The Sam additions and
Samaritikon equivalents are explained in a Catena note for verse 33 (see under 32:2 for a full discussion).

**Num 32:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָתַן לָהֶם יְהוָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κύριος δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**non tr** δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς κύριος

*Notes:* For the phrase נָתַן לָהֶם יְהוָה in HT, NUM has κύριος δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, thus displacing κύριος from the end to the beginning of the phrase. Origen moves κύριος to the end of the phrase to match the Hebrew order, and this is attested by the O-group (minus 58).

**Num 32:9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>עַד־נַחַל אֶשְׁכֹּל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(καὶ ἀναβαίνων) Φάραγγα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**〈Sub ※〉 pr εἰς**

*Notes:* HT says that the spies went up “to the valley of Eschol” (עַד נַחַל אֶשְׁכֹּל). NUM does not explicitly render נַחַל although the accusative Φάραγγα is a suitable rendering following the verb ἀναβαίνω. Two O-group manuscripts, along with M and some others, add εἰς before Φάραγγα. This may be the o’ text reading and εἰς
may originally have been under the asterisk. The *ol*-group has ἐως instead of εἰς which may also witness to this addition.

Syh has the preposition *lamadh* as part of its equivalent of Φάραγγα (ܐܠܡܐ), and here it most likely matches εἰς rather than being the sign of the accusative because the verb that precedes is ἀνελ ("ascend") which often is followed by *lamadh* functioning as a preposition.

**non tr** 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>αὐτοῖς κύριος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Wit 2:</em></td>
<td>A F M’ O’–82 381’ C’–414 b–19’ ↓ f–129 s y–318 ↓ z–407 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Syh = Compl MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Var:</em></td>
<td>αὐτοῖς κύριος + ὁ θεός 53’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NonGr:</em></td>
<td>lat codd 100 104 illis Dominus (104 DMS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** HT places the indirect object (לָהֶם) after the verb (נָתַן) and before the subject (יְהוָה), but NUM places the indirect object after the subject, giving κύριος αὐτοῖς. The o’ text transposed these words to match the Hebrew order, as witnessed by most of the hexaplaric manuscripts. This is reflected in the majority of Greek manuscripts.

**Num 32:11**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>HT:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>LXX:</em></td>
<td>οὗτοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>⟨ο’⟩</th>
<th>ἐκεῖνοι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Wit 2:</em></td>
<td>↓O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Var:</em></td>
<td>ἐκεῖνοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The o’ text substitutes ἐκεῖνοι for οὗτοι in NUM although neither word has a basis in the Hebrew. Since the reading ἐκεῖνοι exists only in the O-group, Origen may have introduced this change, although his reasons for doing so are not clear, or he may have had it available to him in his received text. In any case, he placed the word under the obelus (see below).
HT | —  
LXX | οὗτοι

Sub ÷  ÷ ἐκεῖνοι ✕

Wit 2:  G

>  

Wit 2:  53' Arm = MT

Notes:  As noted above, the o’ text changes οὗτοι in NUM to ἐκεῖνοι. Then, because neither word has a basis in the Hebrew, it places ἐκεῖνοι under the obelus.

HT | —  
LXX | οἱ ἐπιστά*ενοι τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν

Sub ÷  

Wit 2:  G

>  

Wit 2:  58 AethC Arab = MT

Notes:  HT describes those who came up from Egypt as being “from twenty years old and upward,” and NUM adds to that description οἱ ἐπιστά*ενοι τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν. Origen correctly placed this addition under the obelus.

Num 32:12

HT | ἡκάνη  
LXX | ὁ διακεχωρισμένος

tὸ σαμ’  ὁ Κενεζαῖος

Wit 1:  ↓M’ C’n’cat ↓130-↓321’ ↓128 = Sixt
Attr:  tò σαμ’] σ’ 321; oἱ λ’ M’; > 130-346
Var: \( \delta ] > 130-321' 128 \)

\( \sigma' \theta' \) Ναζιραῖος

Wit 1: ↓130-↓321' 128

Attr: \( \sigma'] > 321 \)

Var: Ναζιραῖος καιζ. 130; Ναζηρ. 321'

Notes: The Hebrew says that Caleb was “the son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite.” The Kenizzites were an Edomite tribe, and apparently it was seen as a problem for Caleb to be associated with a non-Israelite heritage. NUM renders ἡ απαθημένος as ὁ διασκεχωρισμένος (“the separated one”). A note attributed by the Catena group to τὸ σαμ’ renders Κενεζαῖος. The attributions are somewhat mixed for this reading, with M' giving the source of this reading as οἱ λ’ and s-group manuscript 321 attributing it to Symmachus. The evidence, however, points τὸ σαμ’ as the source of the note. First, two s-group manuscripts (130-346) and 128 from the z-group attribute the alternate reading Ναζιραῖος to Symmachus and Theodotion, which casts doubt on the M’ attribution of Κενεζαῖος to οἱ λ’ (unless M’ is using οἱ λ’ to refer simply to “another” tradition that could encompass τὸ σαμ’). This attribution of Ναζιραῖος to σ’ θ’ also raises doubts about the 321 attribution of Κενεζαῖος to σ’, since (1) Ναζιραῖος is more suitable for Symmachus (see the next paragraph); and (2) in addition to Κενεζαῖος, 321 has the reading Ναζιραῖος but attributes it to θ’ only; this indicates that the 321 sign tradition may have become confused. The second reason that τὸ σαμ’ is the more likely source of Κενεζαῖος is that the Samaritikon would likely transliterate קנזי rather than using a circumlocution. For these reasons, τὸ σαμ’ seems the more likely source for Κενεζαῖος.

As just mentioned, the reading Ναζιραῖος is attributed to σ’ and θ’ by two s-group manuscripts and 128 (with a third s-group manuscript, 321, attributing it to θ’ alone). Unless Symmachus and Theodotion were dealing with a different parent text, it seems unlikely that they could read נָצִיר as נָצִיר, particularly since Symmachus renders נָצִיר as Ναζιραῖος in Numbers 6:18 and 19 (see SITP 120; for the ways that Symmachus renders the related word נָצִיר see SITP 114). In general, Symmachus is more likely to translate than to transliterate (REI-Pro 20, 77). The idea behind the rendering Ναζιραῖος might be derived from ὁ διασκεχωρισμένος in NUM — that is, Nazirites were separated to God (for more details and references, see NGTN 533). Thus, the attributions are probably correct.

Num 32:13


**Notes:** HT has the Hiphil of **ניֵם(וַ**), which describes the Lord’s action toward the Israelites in the desert: he “caused them to move around.” NUM renders this verb using **κατερρέ*βευσεν**, a rare word that appears only here in the LXX. It is related to ῥε*βεύω (or ῥέ*βο*αι) which means “roam about” and which occurs in the LXX only in Isaiah 23:16. Normally, the s-group reports o’ readings when their text(s) differs from the o’ text, but here 344 notes that o’ has the same reading as the 344 text, and this is supported by all the hexaplaric witnesses. Wevers speculates that the B and G* variant **κατερό*βευσεν** is the result of a spelling error (NGTN 534).

Theodotion is also credited with **κατερρέ*βευσεν** here. None of the Three use καταρρε*βεύω elsewhere, although Aquila and Symmachus use the simplex ῥε*βεύω (α’: Jer 30[49]:4 and 38[31]:22 for בַּעַו; σ’: Ps 58[59]:16 for וֹנָי, 1 Kgdms 23:13 for the Hithpael of הַלָּל). Here, however, Theodotion could be following NUM, since κατερρέ*βευσεν is an adequate rendering.

---

**Notes:** Several manuscripts attribute the reading ἐσάλευσεν to Aquila for the Hiphil of **יוּנָי**. Aquila uses σαλεύω for וֹנָי (the Qal in Exod 20:18, Isa 6:4, 7:2, Ps 58[59]:16). Therefore, this attribution makes sense for Aquila. Manuscript 321 attributes this reading to Symmachus, which is conceivable, except that 344 and Syh have a credible alternate reading for Symmachus (see below).
σ’ περιήγαγεν

Wit 1: 344 ↓Syh

Var: περιήγαγεν] pr καί Syh

NonGr: Syh אכנ

Notes: Symmachus employs ῥε*βεύω for נוע in Psalm 58[59]:16, but no examples exist of his using περιάγω for נוע. He does use περιάγω for the Polel of בְּרֵשׁ in Psalm 59[60]:3 which has some overlap in meaning with נוע, and for the Hiphil of בֵּרֵך in 2 Kgdms 2:8 in a somewhat related sense to the current verse. Thus, this attribution is possibly correct.

tὸ σαµ’ ἐπέχεεν

Wit 1: ↓130-1321’-344

Attr: τὸ σαµ’] α’ 321; > 130-346

Notes: Manuscript 344 attributes to τὸ σαµ’ the reading ἐπέχεεν for the Hiphil of נוע. The word ἐπιχέω means “pour out/over” or “throw over.” The translation is unusual, since נוע in the Hiphil denotes “cause to move about,” “disturb,” or “shake.” Perhaps the τὸ σαµ’ translator used ἐπιχέω in a figurative way, as in “he poured them out in the wilderness.” Only 344 has the attribution to τὸ σαµ’, but 344 is normally reliable. Thus, this attribution is possibly accurate.

Another s-group manuscript, 321, attributes the reading to Aquila. Aquila does not use ἐπιχέω, although he uses the related noun ἐπίκυσις in Deuteronomy 28:53 for מָצוֹק (“hardship”). But a credible alternative reading for Aquila is given in three other s-group manuscripts (see above), and so this attribution to α’ is probably incorrect.

HT תדו
LXX (יוֹכָה) הָצֵאַנְלוֹתָה

ơ’ ἐξανηλώθη

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: B F M V O”¬G 707 C”¬422(vid) 616* b d f129 n767 30’ t 509 392 18-128-628-630-669 55 59 319 424 624 646
Notes: Normally, when NUM employs ἕως with verbs, the particle ἀν is added and the subjunctive is used (6:5, 11:20, 14:33, 20:17, 32:17, 18, 21, 35:12, 25, 28, 32), although in three cases ἕως without ἀν is followed by the subjunctive (10:21, 21:22, 23:24). Only in two places is an indicative verb used after ἕως (without ἀν) — in 12:15 and the present verse. Here, NUM translates בּ (from בּנַ) with the indicative ἔξαιναλωθῇ. Many manuscripts, including A and 963, have the subjunctive ἔξαιναλωθῇ, possibly through the influence of Symmachus. The ι-group also has the subjunctive, and ι-group manuscript 344 notes that the o’ text has the indicative. The o’ reading is also supported by almost all the Greek hexaplaric witnesses except G.

Manuscript 344 also attributes the subjunctive τελειωθῇ to Aquila. Aquila employs τελειοῶ for בּ (Deut 2:14, 1 Kgdms 16:11). More significantly, Aquila uses the subjunctive of τελειοῶ for בּ in Numbers 14:33 in a context similar to the present verse. Since Aquila is noted for consistency in his translations, the attribution here makes good sense for him.

Theodotion is credited by 344 with the rendering ἔξελιπεν. In Numbers 14:33, where NUM has the subjunctive ἁναλωθῇ for בּ, Theodotion uses the subjunctive ἔξαιναλωθῇ. In the present verse, NUM has the indicative ἔξαιναλωθῇ and the θ’ reading is also indicative, perhaps following NUM. Theodotion uses ἐκλείπω in Ezekiel 24:10 for בּ (also in Num 20:29 for גו). Although Theodotion renders differently than in 14:33, the vocabulary still fits him, and the attribution is probably correct.

A 344 note also attributes the subjunctive ἔξαιναλωθῇ to Symmachus. Although Symmachus does not employ ἔξαιναλισκῶ anywhere else, he does use the simplex ἁναλισκῶ (e.g., for הַל in Job 7:6b, 9a, Isa 10:18, 27:10), including for בּ in Psalm 72[73]:19, Ezekiel 24:10 and 11. For the present verse, he may have been influenced by NUM to use ἔξαιναλισκῶ. In Numbers 14:33, in a similar context, Symmachus uses the συντελέσθῃ (subjunctive of συντελέω) for בּ, but Symmachus is less tied to consistent rendering than the other translators. Both 14:33 and the present verse have the
phrase תֹּםַעַד and Symmachus uses the subjunctive in 14:33, perhaps rendering עַד with ἕως or ἕως ἄν. If he translated similarly here, then the subjunctive makes sense. Thus, both vocabulary and usage are consistent with Symmachus. As noted above, many manuscripts reflect the subjunctive, possibly through the influence of Symmachus, but also possibly because of the subjunctive in NUM for 14:33.

**Num 32:14**

HT תַּרְבּוּת
LXX σύστρεμμα

⟨οἱ λ′⟩ θόρυβον

**Wit 1:** Ἄρχω

**Notes:** The Hebrew תַּרְבּוּת is found only here in the OT. It appears to refer to a group of men. NUM renders it as σύστρεμμα which literally signifies something twisted together, but also can refer to a group of men or a crowd. An unattributed note in Ἄρχω gives the alternate rendering θόρυβον, which refers to noise, particular the noise of a crowd, and can also refer to tumult or confusion. All of the Three use θόρυβον — Aquila in Psalm 64[65]:8 for שׁאֹן ("noise/roar"); Symmachus in Ecclesiastes 2:2 for מהולל (participle of הלל, meaning “senseless/madness”) and in Ecclesiastes 10:13 for the related word הָדוֹלֶלָה ("foolishness/blindness"); Theodotion in Isaiah 52:12 for חִפָּזוֹן ("haste"), and in Jeremiah 30[49]:2 for תְרֹעָה ("war cry," "alarm," "shout"). Symmachus also uses the related verb θορυβέω in Jeremiah 26[46]:9 for הלל (Hithpol. meaning “act madly”), in Job 21:6a for בָּהַל ("be disturbed"), and in Psalm 41[42]:6 and 42[43]:5 for הוֹלֵלוּת ("roar," "be tumultuous"). Thus, any of the Three could have been the source of this reading.

**Num 32:16**

HT לאֵלָה הָנָה
LXX שִׁבְדֵהוּ וֹדֶהָ נֵעֲנֵהוּ קֶהַּנָּה

non tr נֵעֲנֵהוּ קֶהַּנָּה שִׁבְדֵהוּ וֹדֶה

**Wit 2:** Ὀ−58 Syh = MT

**NonGr:** Syh לֹאֵלָה שִׁבְדֵהוּ נֵעֲנֵהוּ
Notes: HT has הָּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּּ
Wit 2: \( G = MT \)

**Notes:** NUM adds τὰ κακά after ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ and this has no equivalent in the underlying Hebrew. Manuscript G places this under the obelus, but no other manuscripts witness to the obelus nor do any delete this text. This is similar to the obelus in 31:48 and 32:4 where G is the only witness. The evidence is limited, but the obelus correctly marks added text in the Greek and G is an old and normally reliable witness. Thus, the obelus is probably genuine.

**Num 32:24**

\[ \text{HT} \] בְּנוּ־לָכֶם
\[ \text{LXX} \] οἰκοδομήσετε ὑ*ῖν

\{ Sub ÷ \}

Wit 2: \( G \)

**Notes:** \( O \)-group manuscript G has an obelus for ὑ*ῖν, but the Hebrew has an exact equivalent with לָכֶם. Therefore, this obelus probably does not represent the o’ text, unless Origen had a different Hebrew text.

**Num 32:25**

\[ \text{HT} \] בְּנֵי־גָד וּבְנֵי־רְאוּבֶן
\[ \text{LXX} \] οἱ Υἱοὶ Ῥουβήν καὶ οἱ Υἱοὶ Γάδ

**non tr** \( \text{οἱ ὑιοὶ Γάδ καὶ οἱ ὑιοὶ Ῥουβήν} \)

Wit 2: \( O^{−58} \) Syh = MT Tar

**Var:** Ῥουβήν\[ -β\]n 426; -βεις 376; rūbil Syh

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** HT lists the tribes who speak to Moses as “the sons of Gad and the sons of Reuben.” NUM reverses the order, possibly because the tribe of Reuben is often listed first, and the o’ text transposes the names to match the Hebrew. NUM likewise reverses these names in verses 2, 29, and 31, and in each case the o’ text transposes the names back to the Hebrew order.
Num 32:26

Sub ※ + καὶ ἀι κτήσεις ἡμῶν

Notes: HT lists four groups/items that the two and a half tribes planned to keep in their fortified cities: מִקְנֵנוּ נָשֵׁינוּ מִקְנֵנוּ וְכָל־בְּהֶמְתֵּנוּ. Only the third and fourth items are connected by a conjunction. NUM has no equivalent for the third item (מִקְנֵנוּ) and connects the other three with conjunctions: ἡ ἀποσκευὴ ἡ*ῶν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ἡ*ῶν καὶ πάντα τὰ κτήνη ἡ*ῶν. Origen inserted αἱ κτήσεις ἡμῶν under the asterisk for the omitted מִקְנֵנוּ. He also added καὶ under the same asterisk, although it is not matched in the Hebrew, to conform to the NUM format.
ο’ οἱ λ’ ἔσονται ἐκεῖ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: Of Syh = Compl MT

NonGr: Syh ἐκεῖ

Notes: HT says that their families and goods, “will be there (שָׁם)” in the cities. NUM has no equivalent for שָׁם and according to a 344 note, the o’ text has the equivalent ἐκεῖ, as witnessed by the O-group and Syh; this was possibly originally under the asterisk. The 344 note also attributes the addition of ἐκεῖ to οἱ λ’, and since it matches the Hebrew, this makes sense.

Num 32:27

HT ἂν μεταγόμεθα
LXX καὶ ἐκτεταμένοι

ο’ καὶ ἐκτεταμένοι

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: G-72-426-618 53-56 x 120

Notes: NUM translates the phrase ἂν μεταγόμεθα as ἑνῳπλισμένοι καὶ ἐκτεταμένοι (“armed and battle-ready”). Manuscript 344 attributes to o’ the reading ἐκτεταμένοι (from ἐκτείνονται) instead of ἐκτεταγμένοι (from ἐκτάζομαι). Although ἐκτείνονται can be used in military connotations, usually it is not. The reading is supported by some hexaplaric witnesses, including G and 426 from the O-group, and may reflect Origen’s work. The modification seems to be the result of a spelling error, considering that the perfect participles of the two verbs differ in only one letter, and the two would have been pronounced similarly. Thus, the o’ text possibly has ἐκτεταμένοι as indicated by 344 but this is not a correction based on the Hebrew text.

HT Ἰ(α)δονι
LXX (κύριος)

〈Sub ※〉 + μου

Wit 2: O^-58 128-630’ = MT
Attr:  ※] > omnes

Notes:  HT has אֲדֹנִי, but NUM omits the pronoun. The O-group (minus 58) includes the equivalent μου and this may have originally been under the asterisk. Manuscript 58 and Syh have the plural ἢμῶν, but μου is probably original, first because μου matches the singular Hebrew suffix, and second because 58 often deviates from the rest of the O-group.

**Num 32:28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>הַמַּטֹּות לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>τῶν φυλῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ο’  οἱ  λ’  τῶν  φυλῶν  υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ  
(τῆλ)

Wit 1:  344

Wit 2:  376'-618-707 ↓ 106 ↓ 799 Arab Bo Syh = Compl MT

Var:  τῶν] > 707 106 127 τ 527

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  HT reads לִבְנֵי but NUM does not translate לִבְנֵי. Manuscript 344 has a note attributed to ο’  and to οἱ  λ’  that adds the equivalent υἱῶν to match the Hebrew. The attribution to ο’  is probably correct since this reading is witnessed by two O-group manuscripts and Syh, and υἱῶν was possibly originally under the asterisk. That the Three also included υἱῶν to match the Hebrew makes sense. The addition is reflected in a number of manuscripts possibly through the influence of Origen or the Three.

**Num 32:29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מֹשֶׁה (רָאָם) כַּפַּר אֶלָה</td>
<td>(καὶ εἰπεν) πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μωϋσῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

non tr  Μωϋσῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς

Wit 2:  G-426 30 Sa 1 Syh = MT
NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT places יְהֹוָהּ before the indirect object מֹשֶׁהְ, but NUM places מְשֻׁלָּחַ after the indirect object πρὸς αὐτούς. Origen transposed the order to match the Hebrew.

HT כִּנְּרָאֶד וְכִנְּרָאֶד
LXX οἱ υἱοὶ Ρουβήν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ

non tr οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ρουβήν

Wit 2: ↓O$^{58}$ ↓Syh = MT Tar

Var: 'Ρουβήν] -βιν 426; -βειμ 376; rūbīl Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT lists the tribes to whom Moses speaks as “the sons of Gad and the sons of Reuben.” NUM reverses the order, possibly because the tribe of Reuben is often listed first, and the o’ text transposes the names to match the Hebrew. NUM likewise reverses these names in verses 2, 25, and 31, and in each case the o’ text transposes the names back to the Hebrew order.

HT אִחֵכֶם
LXX μεθ’ ύμιον

τὸ σαμ’ πρ καὶ τὸ ἡμίσυ τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσῆ

Wit 1: C$^{cat}$

Notes: Sam adds the phrase ἄνερ σήμερον ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ (”and the half-tribe of Manasseh”) although it is not in HT, and the Samaritikon has the equivalent καὶ τὸ ἡμίσυ τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσῆ. Sam has similar additions in verses 1, 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31 and there are Samaritikon equivalents in all but verse 1. The Sam additions and Samaritikon equivalents are explained in a Catena note for verse 33 (see under 32:2 for a full discussion).

Num 32:30
HT
LXX eἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἔναντι κυρίου, καὶ διαβιβάσετε τὴν ἀποσκευὴν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν πρότερα υμὸν εἰς γῆν Χανάαν

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G

> 426 Arab = MT

Notes: Moses concludes his statement by saying that if the two tribes will not cross over to fight, they will have possession with the rest of the tribes in Canaan. After the initial phrase ἐὰν δὲ ἕνωμεν ἐνώπιοι ἑθ᾽ υμῶν, which matches the Hebrew, NUM adds a long explanatory phrase with no equivalent in HT: εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἔναντι κυρίου, καὶ διαβιβάσετε τὴν ἀποσκευὴν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν πρότερα υμῶν εἰς γῆν Χανάαν. This has been placed under the obelus by Origen.

Num 32:31

HT כנֵי גָד בֶּנֶי רוּבֵן
LXX οἱ υἱοὶ Ῥουβήν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ

non tr οἱ υἱοὶ Γάδ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ῥουβήν

Wit 2: ↓O 58 ↓16-46 ↓Syh = MT Tar

Var: Ῥουβήν ] -βιν 426; -βειμ 376; -βιμ 16-46; rūbil Syh

NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT lists the tribes who answer Moses as “the sons of Gad and the sons of Reuben.” NUM reverses the order, possibly because the tribe of Reuben is often listed first, and the o’ text transposes the names to match the Hebrew. NUM likewise reverses these names in verses 2, 25, and 29, and in each case the o’ text transposes the names back to the Hebrew order.
LXX λέγοντες

tò σαμ’ πρ καὶ τò ήμισυ τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσή

Wit 1:  C' cat

Notes: Sam adds the phrase ῥθηρίς θεραπούσιν Μανασσή (“and the half-tribe of Manasseh”) although it is not in HT, and the Samaritikon has the equivalent καὶ τὸ Ἦμισυ τῆς φυλῆς Μανασσή. Sam has similar additions in verses 1, 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31 and there are Samaritikon equivalents in all but verse 1. The Sam additions and Samaritikon equivalents are explained in a Catena note for verse 33 (see under 32:2 for a full discussion).

HT דִּבֶּר יְהוָה

LXX ὁ κύριος λέγει

non tr λέγει ὁ κύριος

Wit 2:  O-58 Lat cod 100 Arm Syh = MT

NonGr:  Lat cod 100 dicit Dominus | Syh

Notes: HT places subject יְהוָה after the verb דִּבֶּר, but NUM puts the subject (ὁ κύριος) first. Origen transposed the words to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58).

HT יְהוָה

LXX (θεράπουσιν) αὐτοῦ

ο’ οἱ λ’ σου

Wit 1:  344

Wit 2:  O-58 343 Bo^B Syh

NonGr:  Syh

Notes: In HT, the two tribes say, “What the Lord has spoken to your servants, so we will do.” NUM translates יְבִנֵי as θεράπουσιν αὐτοῦ, changing the possessive
from second to third person. Three s-group texts (30-344-730) delete αὐτοῦ, and another (343) has σου. A 344 note indicates that ο’ and οἱ λ’ have σου to match the Hebrew. The ο’ attribution is supported by the O-group (minus 58) plus Syh. The οἱ λ’ attribution makes sense since the reading matches HT.

**Num 32:32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>αἰχμαὴν τῆς κατάσχεσιν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(καὶ δώσετε) τὴν κατάσχεσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ + τῆς κληρονομίας**

**Wit 2:** O^-58 Syh = MT  
**Attr:** ※ G Syh] > rell  
**NonGr:** Syh ≠ MT

**Notes:** For the HT phrase ἀποκλήρωσιν τῆς κατάσχεσιν ("and with us [will be] the possession of our inheritance"), NUM has καὶ δώσετε τὴν κατάσχεσιν ἢμῖν, which (1) replaces the nominal structure "with us (will be)…" with the future δώσετε, (2) does not render ἀποκλήρωσις, and (3) uses the dative ἢμῖν with δώσετε to replace the suffix on ἢμῖν. Origen addressed the second of these differences by adding τῆς κληρονομίας under the asterisk to match the missing ἢμῖν.

**Num 32:33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לַאֲמֶר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>λέγοντες</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

τὸ σαμʾ ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις οὗ μνημονεύσας, ἐν δὲ τῷ Σαμαρειτικῷ μνημονεύεται

**Wit 1:** C"^*cat^*

**Notes:** This marginal note in C"^*cat^* explains the additions noted by τὸ σαμʾ in verses 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31. In the present verse, HT has the phrase לַאֲמֶר and Sam matches it except for reversing the order of Reuben and Gad. In verses 1, 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31, HT lists the tribes of Reuben and Gad only,
and for each of those verses, Sam adds the half-tribe of Manasseh. In verses 2, 6, 25, 29, and 31 the Samaritikon includes Greek equivalents (see under 32:2 for a full discussion).

For the present verse, the marginal note explains these previous “half-tribe of Manasseh” readings as coming from the Samaritikon and based on text in Sam from the present verse. The note reads: ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις οὐ μνημονεύσας, ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἐβραϊκῷ μνημονεύεται (“in the ones formerly spoken [i.e., verses 2, 6, 25, 29, 31] — not mentioned; but in the Samaritikon they are declared”). The note explicitly identifies the τὸ σαμῖ attribution in those verses with the Samaritikon.

\[
\text{HT} \quad \text{♭άντρον} \, \text{βασιλείᾳ}
\]

\[
\text{LXX} \quad (\text{πόλεις}) \, \text{σὺν τοῖς ὁρίοις} / \text{αὐτῆς}
\]

\textit{non tr} \quad \text{αὐτῆς σὺν τοῖς ὁρίοις}

\textit{Wit 2:} 376' 52' Syh = MT

\textit{NonGr:} Syh συνεθώς σὺν τοῖς ὁρίοις / αὐτῆς

\textit{Notes:} HT is somewhat obscure, stating that from the kingdoms of Sihon and Og, Moses gave to the two and a half tribes “the land for its cities with the borders of the cities of the land surrounding” (הָאָרֶץ לְעָרֶיהָ בִּגְבֻלֹת עָרֵי הָאָרֶץ סָבִיב). NUM has attempted to make sense of this by rendering it τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς πόλεις σὺν τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς, πόλεις τῆς γῆς κύκλῳ. NUM associates the possessive αὐτῆς with ὁρίοις (“its [the land’s] borders”) where the Hebrew has the possessive with “cities” (עָרֶיהָ). To match the Hebrew, Origin transposed αὐτῆς from after ὁρίοις to after πόλεις.

\textbf{Num 32:35}

\textit{HT} \quad (ֶשֶׁתְּרֹת)

\textit{LXX} \quad (Σωφάρ)

\textit{Sub} * + 'Αταρώθ

\textit{Wit 2:} \quad O^{58} \text{ Arab Syh = MT Tar}

\textit{Attr:} * Gj > rell

\textit{NonGr:} Syh συνεθώς σὺν τοῖς ὁρίοις / αὐτῆς

\textit{Notes:} For the Hebrew name פָּנָשֹׁת, NUM renders only the second part: Σωφάρ. Origen added the equivalent of the first part, 'Αταρώθ, under the asterisk.
NonGr: Syh ܐܘܠܡܐ ܠܡܐ

Notes: Manuscript 426 from the O-group and Syh match the Hebrew name פָןשׁוֹ with Σωφάν rather than Σωφάρ in NUM. Syh matches the o’ text, but it also matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names. Many other manuscripts reflect Σωφάν as well, some with variations. In conclusion, Σωφάν is probably the reading of the o’ text.
and so unless the translators had a different parent text, copyists may have corrupted the spelling from an original (this is Wevers’ opinion, NGTN 545, note 34). This is plausible, first because errors could easily be introduced by scribes who did not have the original Hebrew and to whom the Greek transcriptions would have been meaningless. Second, P confirms exactly this type of confusion because it has variants in its tradition between (this is Wevers’ opinion, NGTN 545, note 34). This is plausible, first because errors could easily be introduced by scribes who did not have the original Hebrew and to whom the Greek transcriptions would have been meaningless. Second, P confirms exactly this type of confusion because it has variants in its tradition between . Transposing the letters to match the Hebrew would yield a retroversion something like . Similarly, Symmachus is credited by Syh with the reading . Assuming a similar copyist transposition between (one transposition could have influenced the other), this could be retroverted into something like .

Num 32:36

HT  
LXX  

〈o’〉  

\[\text{βηθνάμρα}\]

\textit{Wit 2:}  lemma 426 Arab Syh = MT | βηθιαμάρμ 58 | βηθιαμάρμ 56 | βηθιαμάρμ 53’

\textit{NonGr:}  Syh

\textbf{Notes:}  The name of the second to last city built by the sons of Gad is but NUM renders only the second part, giving . Origen corrected the name to βηθνάμρα, as witnessed by 426, Arab, and Syh. For this name, Syh is identical to P and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names. The reading has affected a few other manuscripts.

Num 32:37

HT  
LXX  

\textit{Sub}:  + τῆν

\textit{Wit 2:}  \(O^{426} 422 b f^{129} n 799\) Syh = MT

\textit{Attr:}  * G Syh] > rell

\textit{NonGr:}  Syh
Notes: As with the sons of Gad, the cities built by the sons of Reuben are listed in HT, and each city name is preceded by the direct object marker רָּאָ. In verse 37, NUM precedes the first city with a definite article but omits it for the second and third cities, Ἐλεαλή and Καριαθάι. Origen adds την under the asterisk for both of these cities (the second asterisk is covered below). As noted under 26:59, Origen sometimes approximated the direct object marker with a definite article.

The Syh translator rendered την using the preposition λαμαθ as a direct object marker. The placement of the asterisk is ambiguous, and appears to be above the waw before the λαμαθ preposition, even though it properly belongs above the λαμαθ. The height of the λαμαθ, however, might make it difficult to place the symbol directly over that letter. The metobelus is situated correctly.

HT (רְאָתִים) אֶת־
LXX (Καριαθάι)

Sub ※ + την

Wit 2: O^326 53^c-56'164 343 18 799 Syh = Compl MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh ךָּנָן Δο ※

Notes: In verse 37, NUM precedes the first city with a definite article but omits it for the second and third cities, Ἐλεαλή and Καριαθάι. Origen adds την under the asterisk for the second and third cities (the first of these asterisks is covered above and the second here).

As noted under 26:59, Origen sometimes approximated the direct object marker with a definite article. The Syh translator seems to have construed the asterisked article this way, because for an equivalent, Syh has a λαμαθ functioning as a direct object marker that appears to be marked with an asterisk. The asterisk appears in the margin before the waw, even though the following λαμαθ is the correct location. The metobelus is placed correctly.

Num 32:38

HT (אֱכָתִיבשַׁל) אֶת הָאֲבָב
LXX καὶ (τὴν Ἐεελμεύον)

(ο{) pr καὶ την Ναβω

Wit 2: ↓A F M′ ↓V ↓O’s 707* ↓C′′ ↓d ↓f 129 ↓s ↓t ↓y ↓z 55 ↓59 424 624 646 Syh
Var: καὶ τὴν Ναβώ καὶ] > καὶ 2ο 707ε | καὶ τὴν Ναβώ] Ναβαύ 106 | τήν] τῇ 618 | Ναβώ] -βωθ O-426 f-129 59; -βαυ V 107 t 18'-126-628-669; -βαβ 630; -βαω 44-125; Ναβ[... 422; Ναβδώ 121; Βαμώ A; Αβώ 30 392; Ἀβώθ 72;

NonGr: Syh

Notes: According to Wevers’ critical edition, NUM has no equivalent for the initial family name in verse 38 in HT (אֶת־נְבוֹ), and several manuscripts agree with this omission, including B. The ο’ text includes the equivalent καὶ τὴν Ναβώ, as witnessed by most of the hexaplaric manuscripts. The addition is also matched in the majority of Greek manuscripts.

Wevers later argued that the original NUM included the phrase καὶ τὴν Ναβώ and that it was later dropped due to parablepsis between successive instances of καὶ τήν (NGTN 546-47). If this is true, the ο’ text has the same reading as the original LXX and the reading predates Origen. As happens frequently with names, many variants occurred in copies.

HT מָסָבֹת (שֵׁם)
LXX περικεκυκλωμένας

σ’ περιτετειχισμένας

Wit 1: Μ’ ↓85’-321’-344 Syh Barh

Wit 2: περικεκυκλωμένας καὶ τετειχισμένας 54-75’

Attr: σ’] > 85’-321

NonGr: Syh Barh

Notes: The Hebrew מָסָבֹת is obscure. If מָסָבֹת is a Hophal feminine plural participle of מָסַב (so HALOT), it likely refers to the two previous city names, and מָסָבֹת may mean something like “to be changed regarding name.” NUM has no equivalent for מָסָב and renders מָסָב as περικεκυκλωμένας (“surrounded”), which is consistent with the more common meaning of מָסַב as “surround,” although it is not clear what is surrounding the cities. Several manuscripts attribute the alternate reading περιτετειχισμένας (“walled all around”) to Symmachus. According to Salvesen (SITP 140-41), the versions are divided between construing the Hebrew as referring to a feature of the cities (e.g., NUM “surrounded”; Symmachus “walled about”), or to a change of name (e.g., P with מָסָב). Symmachus uses περιτείχιζω in Psalm 47[48]:13 for the Hiphil of מָסַב whose meaning (“to surround”) overlaps with the more common meaning
He may have been influenced by Tar נ ("surrounded by high walls"). Thus the attribution to Symmachus makes sense. Three manuscripts (54 75 458) have καὶ τετειχισμένας (the simplex form of περιτειχίζω) after περικεκυκλωμένας. Wevers calls this a gloss (NGTN 547), but it was possibly influenced by Symmachus.

**Sub ※ + ὀνομάτι**

**Wit 2:** O Syh = MT

**Attr:** ※ G Syh] > rell

**NonGr:** Syh ססבב

**Notes:** As discussed above, the phrase מָסַבְּת שֵׁם is hard to decipher in the context of verse 38. NUM and Symmachus seem to ignore שֵׁם, or perhaps read it (in accord with תמן in SamJ) as שָׁם ("there") rather than שֵׁם. Origen added ὀνομάτι under the asterisk to match שֵׁם, although what περικεκυκλωμένας ὀνομάτι means is unclear.

**Num 32:39**

**Sub ※} εἰς

**Wit 2:** A FM’ V O’’’-707 C’’’ b d f n s t y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Syh

**Attr:** ※ G J > rell

**NonGr:** Lat cod 100 104 in Galaad (Galad 104) | Syh לִכְלָבָה

**Notes:** HT reads נָמַשְׂרָה, with directional נ, and this is perfectly matched in NUM with εἰς Γαλαάδ. The vast majority of Greek manuscripts have εἰς (it is omitted in B and the x-group). Manuscript G from the Ο-group has εἰς marked with the asterisk. This probably does not reflect the original o’ text, unless Origen had an exemplar missing εἰς which for some reason he took to be the original LXX.
HT  אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ (נֵסָר)
LXX  κατοικοῦντα (ἐν αὐτῇ)

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh = MT Sam TarΟ
NonGr:  Syh ܣܘܡܝܘ + ܩܘܣܡ +

Notes:  HT says of the land of Gilead, “you shall dispossess the Amorite who is in it.” NUM adds the word κατοικοῦντα, which is implied by the Hebrew but not explicitly stated. The obelus is indicated by G and Syh, and although no other texts witness negatively to this omission, the obelus is probably genuine.

Syhత uses a participle and an explicit copula to render the participle κατοικοῦντα. This may have led to confusion about the placement of the obelus, with the result that two obeli appear, one before the participle and an extra one before the copula. The metobelus is in the correct place.

Numbers 33

Num 33:2

HT  אֶחְיֵרָתִים(רָב)
LXX  (τὰς) ἀπάρσεις
α’ σ’ θ’  τὰς ἐξόδους

Wit 1:  ↓108 130-↓321’-↓344 ↓Syh
Attr:  α’ σ’ θ’] oi λ’ 108 344 Syh; nom absc 321
Var:  τάς] > 108 344
NonGr:  Syh ܣܘܡܝܘ

Notes:  Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion employ ἐξόδους elsewhere for מָצַב in Isaiah 58:11. Thus the attributions to α’, σ’, and θ’ here are suitable.

ο’  ἀπάρσεις

Wit 1:  344ΙΧΙ


**Num 33:3**

HT: 

LXX: 

Wit 1: 344
Num 33:4

HT  

LXX  

non tr  

\[ \text{οὔς ἐπάταξεν κύριος ἕξ αὐτῶν ÷ τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας} \]

Wit 2:  \( \downarrow O^ {58} \) Syh = MT

Var:  τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας] > 426

NonGr:  Syh 交接, καὶ οὔς ἐπάταξεν κύριος ἕξ αὐτῶν ÷ τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας

Notes:  NUM begins the account of the journeys without a conjunction, but HT has the standard \textit{wayyiqtol} form. For the name \textit{αἱρέω}, NUM has \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆ}\. The \textit{s-group} follows NUM both in its lack of an initial conjunction and in the spelling of \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆ} (some \textit{s-group} manuscripts have \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆ}). Manuscript 344 from the \textit{s-group} notes that the \textit{o’} text makes two changes: (1) it adds \textit{καὶ} to match the Hebrew conjunction, and (2) it changes the spelling of \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆ} to \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆς} which conforms more closely to the Hebrew. The entire \textit{O-group} and many other manuscripts witness to the addition of \textit{καὶ}, and this may originally have been under the asterisk. As for the name change from \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆ} to \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆς}, \textit{O-group} manuscript 426, hexaplaric manuscript 82, and Syh are witnesses. Here, Syh matches P, and for proper names Syh can be influenced by P rather than the \textit{o’} text. In verse 5, \textit{O-group} manuscripts G and 426 have the identical name change, which lends support to the present reading being Origen’s work. Syh has \textit{αἱρέω} which corresponds to the \textit{o’} text if one accounts for the final vowel (\textit{yod}) being an itacistic equivalent.

344 also attributes the same reading — \textit{καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ Ῥαμεσσῆς — to οἱ λ’}. The use of \textit{ἀπαιρέω} for \textit{ἀφεν} fits any of the Three, who mainly use \textit{αἱρέω} and its complex forms for \textit{Ἀφέν} (\textit{αἱρέω} — \textit{α’: Gen 11:2, Jer 38[31]:24; σ’: Ps 77[78]:26; ἀπαιρέω — α’: Gen 33:12, Num 2:17; σ’: Gen 11:2, Num 2:17; οἱ λ’: Num 21:12, 33:3, Deut 1:40; ἐπαιρέω — α’ σ’: Deut 1:40; ἕξαιρέω — θ’: Num 2:17; συνεξαιρέω — σ’: Job 4:21a). Thus the use of \textit{ἀπαιρέω} here fits any of the Three, and since both the added conjunction and the spelling change to \textit{Ῥαμεσσῆς} match the Hebrew, this attribution makes sense.
Notes: Verse 33:4a in HT reads: יְהוָה בָּהֶם מְקַבְּרִים אֲשֶׁר הִכָּה וְרָדָה כָּלֵַיֵַבְרֶם. NUM translates this as καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἔθαπτον ἐξ αὐτῶν τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας, οὓς ἔπάταξεν κύριος, πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.

NUM departs from HT in three ways. First, HT uses בָּהֶם to describe the people the Lord struck “among them” (i.e., the Egyptians). NUM has the equivalent ἐξ αὑτῶν but associates it with the ones the Egyptians buried. This is a logical translation, since they buried those whom the Lord killed, but Origen transposes ἐξ αὑτῶν (plus τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας under the obelus) after οὓς ἔπαταξεν κύριος to match the Hebrew order. Second, Origen places the phrase τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας under the obelus since it has nothing corresponding to it in the underlying Hebrew. Third, Origen obelizes the phrase ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, as it also has no equivalent in HT. The two obeli are covered below.

The changes can be visualized by reproducing manuscript G with its Aristarchian obeli and the transposition in place. The section with the transposition is marked with tildes at the ends and with a slash between the transposed portions.

καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἔθαπτον, ~οὓς ἔπαταξεν κύριος / ἐξ αὑτῶν ÷τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας~ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ Div.

With all the Origenic changes accounted for, the reading indicated by the o’ text is καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἔθαπτον, οὓς ἔπαταξεν κύριος ἐξ αὐτῶν πᾶν πρωτότοκον, which corresponds precisely to the Hebrew.

HT —
LXX τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> 426 = MT

NonGr: Syh ำ ำ ำ ำ ÷

Notes: The NUM phrase τοὺς τεθνηκότας πάντας is obelized since it has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew. This is the second of three Origenic changes for this verse (see above under the “non tr” entry for a summary). As sometimes happens, Syh places a second spurious obelus between the correct one and the metobelus.
HT
—
LXX  ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh

>  

Wit 2:  Arab = MT

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  The NUM phrase ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ is obelized since it has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew.  This is the third of three Origenic changes for this verse (see above under the “non tr” entry for a summary).

Num 33:5

HT  רַעְמְסֵס
LXX  Ἄρμεσσή

{o‘}  Ἄρμεσσής

Wit 2:  Bc G-426 509 ↓Syh (sed hab Sixt)

Var:  Ἄρμεσσής] r’mys Syh

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  Origen appears to have changed the name Ἄρμεσσή to Ἄρμεσσής to conform more closely to the Hebrew רַעְמְסֵס as indicated (1) by O-group manuscripts G and 426; (2) by the identical change in verse 3 that is witnessed by 426 and is also attributed to the o’ text in a 344 note.  Syh has אאלאאאאאאאאא which corresponds to the o’ text if one accounts for the final vowel (yod) being an itacistic equivalent.  Syh matches P here, and Syh may sometimes be influenced by P for proper names.

Num 33:6

HT  אֵתָם(בְ
LXX  (εἰς) Βουθάν
Notes: The Hebrew name אֵתָם has a *beth* preposition prepended, and the NUM translator (1) included the preposition as part of his transliteration, and (2) changed the final nasal *m* to *n*. This resulted in Βουθάν. Several manuscripts, including 426 from the *O*-group, change the name to Οὐθαµ (or a similar variant), and this may be evidence of Origen's work. Syh matches P for this proper name, and Syh may sometimes be influenced by P for proper names.

HT

LXX τι (τῆς ἐρήµου)

Notes: NUM translates the Hebrew phrase אֲשֶׁר בִּקְצֵה הַמִּדְבָּר relatively straightforwardly as ὅ ἐστιν *έρος τι τῆς ἐρήµου*. The word *τι* has no exact counterpart in the Hebrew, and many manuscripts, including the *O*-group (minus 58) and Syh omit it. This may reflect an original Origenic obelus.

Num 33:7

HT מֵאָם

LXX ἐκ Βουθάν

Notes: NUM translates the Hebrew phrase אֲשֶׁר בִּקְצֵה הַמִּדְבָּר relatively straightforwardly as ὅ ἐστιν *έρος τι τῆς ἐρήµου*. The word *τι* has no exact counterpart in the Hebrew, and many manuscripts, including the *O*-group (minus 58) and Syh omit it. This may reflect an original Origenic obelus.
Notes: In verse 6, the Hebrew name אֵתָם has a beth preposition prepended and NUM translates the preposition as part of the name, giving Βουθάν. In this verse, the preposition is מִן but NUM is consistent with verse 6, and still renders אֵתָם as Βουθάν. Almost all of the same manuscripts as for verse 6, including 426 from the O-group, change the name to Οὐθα* (or a similar variant), and this may be evidence of Origen’s work. Interestingly, Syh matches the o’ text (and P) in verse 6 with אֵתָם, but here in verse 7 it matches NUM with אֵתָם (contra P which again has אֵתָם).

Num 33:9

HT —
LXX παρὰ τὸ ὕδωρ

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> 

Wit 2: Arab = MT

NonGr: Syh א[ו]ר [א]

Notes: NUM adds the phrase παρὰ τὸ ὕδωρ which has no equivalent in HT. Here, NUM is echoing the account in Exodus 15:27, where the LXX says the people camped παρὰ τὸ ὕδατα. Origen placed the phrase under the obelus.

Num 33:14

HT רְפִידִים
LXX 'Ραφιδίν

⟨ο’⟩ 'Ραφιδίμ

Wit 2: 426 ↓761 d t Syh = MT
Var: 'Ραφιδίμ -δειμ 761

NonGr: Syh א[ו]ר
Notes: The Hebrew רְפִידִים is transliterated by NUM but given a Greek final consonant, resulting in Ῥαφιδίν. O-group manuscript 426 (which sometimes matches the Hebrew independently from the rest of the O-group) and Syh both have Ῥαφιδίμ which matches the final consonant in the Hebrew. Here Syh does not match P, and so it is a solid witness to the o’ text. The d-group and t-group agreement with Ῥαφιδίμ may be recensional (so Wevers, NGTN 555), but these manuscripts may have been influenced by the o’ text.

HT  תָּשָׁם מַיִם לָעָם לִשְׁתּוֹ
LXX  ὕδωρ τῷ λαῷ πιεῖν ἐκεῖ

non tr  ἐκεῖ ὕδωρ τῷ λαῷ πιεῖν

Wit 2: lemma A F O’ C’’ b f129 246 s-30 y-318 18-68-122 55 59 424 624 646 Syh = MT | ὕδωρ τῷ λαῷ πιεῖν oI15 n 30 527 318 120 319 799

NonGr: Syh מַיִם לָעָם לִשְׁתּוֹ

Notes: HT places מַיִם at the beginning of the phrase תָּשָׁם מַיִם לָעָם לִשְׁתּוֹ, but in the NUM rendering, ἐκεῖ is at the end of the equivalent phrase. Many manuscripts, including the uncials A and F, as well as the O-group and other hexaplaric manuscripts, transpose ἐκεῖ from the end to the beginning of the phrase to match the Hebrew order. This transposition is probably the o’ text reading. Another group of manuscripts, including 381-618 from the oI-group and the n-group, deletes the final ἐκεῖ, but does not include it earlier. This is possibly due to the influence of the o’ text.

Num 33:15

HT  רְפִידִים
LXX  Ῥαφιδίν

〈o’〉 Ῥαφιδίμ

Wit 2: 426 ↓ 761 d t Arm<sup>c</sup> Syh = MT

Var: Ῥαφιδίμ  deleteUser 761

NonGr: Syh מַיִים לָעָם לִשְׁתּוֹ
Notes: This is a repeat of the name from verse 14 with most of the same witnesses (see the discussion there). The change from Ῥᾳφῖν in NUM to Ῥᾳφῖμ may indicate Origen’s work.

HT סין
LXX Σινά

〈ο’〉 Σιναΐ

Wit 1: M
Wit 2: 426 54', 75-458 416 Syh = MT
Var: Σιναΐ Σιναΐν 75
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Hebrew סין is rendered by NUM as Σινά, and this is reflected in the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts. A few manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group, have Σιναΐ, and this is possibly a result of Origen’s work. This alternate spelling occurs at 3:4, 14, 9:1, 5, 10:12, 26:64, 28:6, 33:15, 16. For this name, Syh matches P and so Syh may have been influenced by P rather than by the o’ text.

Num 33:16

HT סין
LXX Σινά

〈ο’〉 Σιναΐ

Wit 1: M
Wit 2: 426 n767 416 Syh = MT
NonGr: Syh

Notes: The Hebrew סין is rendered by NUM as Σινά. A few manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group, have Σιναΐ, and this is possibly a result of Origen’s work (see the discussion under 33:15). For this name, Syh matches P and so Syh may be influenced by P rather than the o’ text.
Num 33:21

HT  רִסָּה
LXX  ∆εσσά

〈ο′〉  'Ρεσσά

_Wit 2:_ A F ↓ O′-29-707 ↓ C↓' f^129 s^344y^121 68′-120  Lat Ruf Num XXVII 12 Syh

_Var:_ 'Ρεσσά|'Ρεσά 77-414-417*-528; 'Ρασσά 376 313-615*; 'Ρεσσάν oI^15
= Ald Sixt

_NonGr:_ Lat Ruf Num XXVII 12 Ressa | Syh אשת

_Notes:_ The Hebrew רִסָּה is rendered as ∆εσσά by NUM, but many manuscripts have corrected the first letter towards the Hebrew, including the ᪶-group. The reading 'Ρεσσά is witnessed by the entire ᪶-group and was probably in the o′ text. The reading is also reflected in many other manuscripts. Here Syh matches P and Syh is sometimes influenced by P rather than the o′ text.

Num 33:22

HT  רִסָּה
LXX  ∆εσσά

〈ο′〉  'Ρεσσά

_Wit 2:_ A F ↓ O′-29 ↓ C↓' f^129 s^344y^121 68′-120 Syh

_Var:_ 'Ρεσσά|'Ρεσά 77-414-528; 'Ρασσά G-376 664; 'Ρεσσάν oI = Ald Sixt

_NonGr:_ Syh אשת

_Notes:_ This is the same name as for verse 21 (see the discussion there). The change from ∆εσσά in NUM to 'Ρεσσά is probably evidence of Origen’s work.

Num 33:23

HT  (שָׁפֶר)
LXX  (Σάφαρ)
Sub ※ ὄρος

Wit 2: O 767 Arab Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G| > rell
NonGr: Syh ὄρος

Notes: The phrase ἡρ ὄρος in HT is rendered by NUM as Σάφαρ, without accounting for ἡρ. Origen added the equivalent ὄρος under the asterisk. Manuscript 58 has Ἄφαρ instead of Σάφαρ, but it does bear witness to ὄρος.

HT ἡρ ὄρος
LXX εἰς Σάφαρ

{o′} ἐν ὄρει Σάφαρ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: ἐν A F ol′ f-129 s-28 85 y-407 59 = Compl

Notes: An Origenic asterisk adds ὄρος to account for ἡρ in the phrase ἡρ ὄρος (see the asterisk above). The entire Greek phrase would then be: εἰς ὄρος Σάφαρ. The s-group either matches NUM with εἰς Σάφαρ or has the variant ἐν Σάφαρ. A note from s-group manuscript 344 has an o′ text reading of ἐν ὄρει Σάφαρ. Technically, the preposition ἐν is a more exact match for the Hebrew ב, and the reading is consistent with Origen, but four reasons make it difficult to attribute this reading to Origen. First, manuscript support for this 344 reading is weak: no text actually has ἐν ὄρει Σάφαρ. Second, the entire O-group supports the alternate reading implied by the asterisk, εἰς ὄρος Σάφαρ, which casts doubt on the 344 reading. Third, the “literalness” of ἐν for ב is not a strong argument for this reading, as the semantic range of εἰς intersects that of ב. This is demonstrated by the NUM translator’s use of both ἐν and εἰς throughout chapter 33 in identical contexts. Thus, in this chapter, HT prepends ב to place names 34 times after the verb נָהַר (as in the present context) and NUM uses εἰς 24 times and ἐν 10 times. This implies that the witnesses for ἐν listed above, including the hexaplaric groups ol and oll, do not necessarily support the 344 reading, as the use of ἐν could be an inner-Greek correction or stylistic, and not a result of the influence of the o′ text. Syh has ἐν but the beth preposition is not a unique witness to ἐν because Syh uses beth for both εἰς and ἐν in all the “camping” verses in this chapter. Fourth, manuscript M and several s-group manuscripts attribute the reading ὄρος Σάφαρ to οἱ λ′ (see below) which implies that the Three likely have εἰς ὄρος Σάφαρ (the Three
Occasionally employ εἰς for the *beth* preposition, e.g., α′ σ′: Jer 21:7; α′ θ′: Gen 2:7.). Origen would have been more likely to follow the Three, particularly Theodotion, than to depart from them arbitrarily, especially since their reading conforms acceptably to the Hebrew. Thus, the reading indicated by the *O*-group — εἰς ὄρος Σάφαρ — is more likely to be the original o′ text than the present 344 reading.

\[\text{HT} \quad \text{מַּהְרָן} \]

\[\text{LXX} \quad \Sigma 
\]

\[\begin{align*}
oi \lambda' & \quad ὄρος \Sigma \\
\text{Wit 1:} & \quad \downarrow M \downarrow 85'-321'
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Wit 2:} & \quad \downarrow O 767 \text{ Arab Syh} = \text{MT}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Var:} & \quad \Sigma \alpha ϕαρ] \text{Εαφαρ M;} \text{Αφαρ 58 130}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{NonGr:} & \quad \text{Syh }"^\prime\text{ם"}
\end{align*}\]

**Notes:** Manuscript M and four s-group manuscripts have the reading ὄρος Σάφαρ attributed to oι λ/. The accusative ὄρος is consistent with the rendering εἰς for the *beth* preposition before הַר. All of the Three use εἰς for the *beth* preposition elsewhere (e.g., α′ σ′: Jer 21:7; α′ θ′: Gen 2:7). Since this reading matches the Hebrew הַר for which NUM has no equivalent, it makes good sense for all of the Three.

**Num 33:24**

\[\begin{align*}
\text{HT} & \quad \text{מ(מַּהְרָן)} \\
\text{LXX} & \quad \text{ἐκ (Σάφαρ)} \\
\langle o' \rangle & \quad \varepsilon \\
\text{Wit 2:} & \quad O'-29 \ C' \ 44 \ 56-129 \ 54 \ s \ y^{121} \ z^{-407} 669^* \ 55 \ 319 \ 424 \ 624 \ 646 \ 799
\end{align*}\]

**Notes:** For מַּהְרָן in HT, NUM has no equivalent for הַר and renders the phrase ἐκ Σάφαρ. The o′ text renders the Hebrew quantitatively as εξ ὄρους Σάφαρ. Origen placed ὄρους under the asterisk (see below), but since ὄρους begins with a vowel, he also changed ἐκ to εξ. Besides the O-group and 68'-120, many other manuscripts also have εξ, not because they include ὄρους, but mainly because they have variants of Σάφαρ that begin with a vowel.
Sub ※ ὄρους

Wit 2: ↓ O 68'-120 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G] > rell

Var: ὄρους] ὄρος 426

NonGr: Syh ἄρσαφάρ

Notes: In verse 23, הַר־שָׁפֶر is rendered by NUM as εἰς Σάφαρ, with no equivalent for הַר, and Origen adds ὄρος under the asterisk. Similarly, in the present verse, HT has מֵהַר־שָׁפֶר and NUM renders this as ἐκ Σαφαρ. Here, Origen adds the equivalent ὄρους under the asterisk. Manuscripts 58 and 68-120 have ὄρους but variants on Σάφαρ (58 has ὄρους Ἀφάρ and 68-120 have ὄρους Ἄρσαφάρ).

οἱ λ′ ὄρος Σάφαρ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: 426 Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh ἀράδαθ

Notes: The phrase ἐκ Σάφαρ (with the preposition ἐκ) is rendered by NUM as ἐκ Σάφαρ. Origen added the genitive ὄρους under the asterisk (see above) and rendered ἐκ ὄρους Σάφαρ.

A 344 note attributes the reading ὄρος Σάφαρ to οἱ λ′. The accusative ὄρος would imply that the translators used a different preposition than ἐκ to render the preposition ἐκ, perhaps ἀπό which in later Greek sometimes took the accusative. This reading makes sense for any of the Three.
Notes: NUM renders חֲרָדָה in HT with Χαραδάθ. A number of manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group and Syh, drop the final consonant to conform more closely to the Hebrew and this may indicate Origen’s work. Syh is a solid witness to the o’ text for this name since it differs from P (which has אד).
Hebrew. This probably indicates Origen’s work. Syh is listed as a witness although it matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

### Num 33:27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>תָחַת</td>
<td>κατάαθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\langle o' \rangle \quad \Thetaάαθ \]

- **Wit 2:** 58-426 767 ↓ Syh
- **Var:** Θάαθ | tht Syh = MT
- **NonGr:** Syh ܣܘܢ

**Notes:** This is the same name as in verse 26 and the witnesses are identical (see the discussion there). The change from Κατάαθ in NUM to Θάαθ probably represents Origen’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>תָרַח</td>
<td>Τάραθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\langle o' \rangle \quad \Thetaάρα \]

- **Wit 2:** ↓ 82-426 344 ↓ Syh
- **Var:** Θάρα | Τάρα 82; trh Syh = MT
- **NonGr:** Syh ܣܘܢ

**Notes:** NUM renders תָרַח in HT as Τάραθ, and a number of manuscripts, including 426 from the O-group, translate with Θάρα which conforms more closely to the Hebrew. This may indicate Origen’s work. Syh matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

### Num 33:28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>תָרַח</td>
<td>Τάραθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
〈ο’〉 Θάρα

Wit 2: ↓82-426 344° ↓Syh

Var: Θάρα| Θάρα 82; trh Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh ארח

Notes: This is the same name as in verse 27 and the witnesses are identical (see the discussion there). The change from Θάρα in NUM to Θάρα may indicate Origen’s work.

Num 33:29

HT ḡeshen

LXX Ἀσελωνά

〈ο’〉 Ἀσεμωνά

Wit 2: O^376-↓707 ↓53'-↓56 68'-120 Syh

Var: Ἀσεμωνά| Ἀσεμ. 707 56 = Compl; Ἀσεμονά 53'

NonGr: Syh איסנה

Notes: NUM renders ḡeshen in HT as Ἀσεμωνά, and a number of manuscripts, including the O-group (minus 376), translate with Ἀσεμωνά (or variants thereof) which conforms more closely to the Hebrew. This probably indicates Origen’s work. Syh matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

Num 33:30

HT ḡeshen

LXX Ἀσελωνά

〈ο’〉 Ἀσεμωνά

Wit 2: O-↓707 ↓53-56 68' Syh

Var: Ἀσεμωνά| Ἀσεμ. 707; Ἀσεμονά 53
NonGr: Syh

Notes: This is the same name as in verse 29 with many of the same witnesses (see the discussion there). The change from Ἀσελ*ωνά in NUM to Ἀσε*ωνά is probably evidence of Origen’s work.

Num 33:31

HT בִּבְנֵי יַעֲקָן
LXX εἰς Βαναιακάν

σʔ ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰακάν

Wit 1: ↓M ↓85’-↓321’-344
Wit 2: Syh
Attr: σʔ > M 85’-321’
Var: υἱοῖς υοκ 321’
NonGr: Syh

Notes: HT has בִּבְנֵי יַעֲקָן and the two nouns are transliterated by NUM into a proper name, giving εἰς Βαναιακάν, although in LXX Deuteronomy 10:6, where the same phrase appears without the preposition, the translator provides a transliteration of only υιων Ἰακί*, resulting in υιων Ἰακίμ. In the present verse, an s-group note attributes the rendering ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰακάν to Symmachus, which is similar to LXX Deuteronomy. Symmachus often attempts to translate proper names (see e.g., the σʔ reading in 21:11, and F-Pro 67-68), but not always, and so this attribution is probably correct. The 321’ variant υοκ appears to be a shorthand notation or it is possibly a scribal error.

Num 33:33

HT יטבתה
LXX Ἐτεβάθα

〈ο’〉 Ἐτεβάθα

Wit 2: Ἐτεβάθα ↓M ↓318 Syh ↓Ἐτεβάθαν A ol C’’ b 118’537 s y 318 ↓68’ 120 55 424 624 646

NonGr: Syh تلائلما

Notes: NUM renders Ἡτεβάθα in HT with Ἱετεβάθα, and the o’ text probably added an iota to conform to the Hebrew yodh, giving Ἱετεβάθα. This is evidenced by the entire O-group and Syh and it has influenced a large number of manuscripts most of which have Ἱετεβάθαν. Syh is a solid witness to the o’ text because it differs from P here.

Num 33:34

HT Ἡτεβάθα
LXX 'Ἑτεβάθα

〈o’〉 Ἑτεβάθα

Wit 2: Ἑτεβάθα M O 318 Syh Ἑτεβάθαν A oI C b 537 s y 318 z 68 120 55 319 424 624 646 799


NonGr: Syh تلائلما

Notes: This is the same name as in verse 33 with most of the same witnesses and variants (see the discussion there). The change from Ἑτεβάθα in NUM to Ἑτεβάθα probably indicates Origen’s work.

Num 33:36

HT —
LXX καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ τῆς ἐρήµου Σίν καὶ παρενέβαλον εἰς τὴν ἐρήµον Φαράν (αὕτη ἐστὶν Καδής)

Sub ⅵ

Wit 2: G

>
Notes: In HT, verse 36 has one stage: the people journey from “Etsion-geber” (תְּגַרְגֵּרִיָּה) and camp at “the wilderness of Sin, that is Kadesh” (מִדְבַּר צִין הִוא קָדֵשׁ). Apparently, the NUM translator compared this account with 13:26 and perceived disharmony. In 13:26, NUM, following HT, describes Kadesh as being eἰς τὴν ἔρημον Φαράν (ἐρήμιον Φαράν) which clearly differs from “Sin” (צִין) here. To harmonize these accounts in the present verse, NUM adds an intermediate stage: καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ τῆς ἔρημος Σὶν καὶ παρενέβαλον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον Φαράν. This is followed by the equivalent of αὕτη ἐστὶν Καδής — αὕτη ἐστὶν Καδής. This added stage, from Sin to Paran, allows Paran to be identified with Kadesh instead of Sin, in harmony with chapter 13. Origen placed the entire addition under the obelus.

Num 33:37

HT  עִירָן
LXX  γῆς

{Sub ~}

Wit 2:  Syh

NonGr:  Syh  (~)

Notes:  Syh has a lemnisk-like sign (a lemnisk without the dots) and a metobelus to mark the word γῆς. At 21:5, a similar sign with corresponding metobelus is used where an obelus is clearly warranted, but here, no obvious minus exists — עיר in HT is matched by γῆς in NUM. These marks in Syh do not appear to represent any original Aristarchian signs in the o’ text.

Num 33:38

HT  ὁ ἱερεύς
LXX  (ὁ ἱερεύς)

Sub ※  εἰς Ὁ ὁ ὄρος

Wit 2:  εἰς (ἐπὶ 799) Ὁ ὁ ὄρος O58 767 799 Lat cod 104 Arab Syh = MT | εἰς τὸ ὄρος 56'-664 84 Arm = Compl | ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος (τοῦ ὄρους πρὸ τοῦ ὄρους 458) 29-82 d n767 t84 Bo = Ald
**Attr:** ※ G Syh > rell

**NonGr:** Lat cod 104 in or montem | Syh ꞌ104, ꞌ105

**Notes:** HT says that Aaron went up “to Hor, the mountain” (אֶל־הֹר הָהָר). NUM omits the destination, saying simply that he went up, and Origen adds the equivalent text — εἰς Ὡρ τὸ ὄρος — under the asterisk. Many manuscripts reflect this addition, some with variations.

HT ܒܫܢܐ ܢܗܪܐܢܒܝܐ

LXX ܫܫܡܬܐ ܬܘܡܬܘܡܬܐ ܐܬܐܠܐ ܐܬܐܠܐ

non tr ܠܒܫܢܐ ܠܢܗܪܐܢܒܝܐ

**Notes:** HT dates the death of Aaron as ܒܫܢܐ ܢܗܪܐܢܒܝܐ. NUM renders this accurately but reverses the words “year” and “fortieth,” giving ܐܬܐܠܐ ܬܘܡܬܘܡܬܐ ܐܬܐܠܐ. O-group manuscript 426 transposes these words and adds an obligatory ܬܘ to yield the phrase: ܐܬܐܠܐ ܐܬܐܠܐ ܬܘܡܬܘܡܬܐ. This possibly indicates Origen’s work. As sometimes happens, 426 reflects the Hebrew apart from the rest of the O-group.

Syh is not listed as a witness, even though the order in Syh — ܕܡܠܐ ܕܒܡܠܐ — matches 426 (and HT). This is because the normal Syh form in Numbers for dates with cardinal numbers has the time increment (i.e., “day/month/year”) before the number (except when expressing the number of a day followed by the word “month,” when the order is reversed). For example in 1:18, NUM gives the date ܬܘ ܕܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܐܠܐ ܢܓܒܢܡ and Syh renders this ܬܘ ܕܢܘܡܐ ܢܓܒܢܡ (“year”/“two”). Thus, the order in Syh is probably determined by Syriac translation technique independent of the order in the underlying Greek.

**Num 33:40**

HT ܡܪܒܚܡܕܐ ܕܗܡܢܘܢܗܒܐ

LXX καὶ ἄκουσας ὁ Χανανίς

α’ θ’ καὶ ἠκουσεὶ ὁ Χαναναῖος

**Notes:**
- HT ܘܹܘܥܲܲܬܳܐ ܒܳܚܒܳܪܳܢܳܐ
- LXX καὶ ἄκουσας ὁ Χανανίς
- α’ θ’ καὶ ἠκουσεὶ ὁ Χαναναῖος

**Wit 1:** Syh

**Wit 2:** ἠκουσεὶ 381°-426-618 Aeth Arm Syh | Χαναναῖος 82 d 129 ↓ n t | Aeth Syh
Var: Χαναναίος] -νεος 458

NonGr: Syh<sup>mg</sup> μέτοχος | Syh<sup>kt</sup> μέτοχος

Notes: HT uses a wayyiqtol (וַיִּשְׁמַע) followed by the subject (הַכְּנַעֲנִי: “the Canaanite”). NUM renders יִשְׁמַע as a participle, which makes this verse somewhat fragmentary (see NGTN 563) — in effect a participial phrase. Syh has a note attributed to Aquila and Theodotion that renders the verb with the aorist (retroverted from the Syriac perfect). The note also uses the gentilic ὁ Χαναναίος rather than the proper name ὁ Χανανίς. This is consistent with a note from οἱ λ′ at 21:1, where for הַכְּנַעֲנִי, NUM has ὁ Χανανίς while οἱ λ′ has ὁ Χαναναίος. None of the Three employs Χανανίς or its variant Χανανείς anywhere, but Aquila does use Χαναναίος to translate כְּנַעֲנִי in Job 40:30 (for a discussion of the use of Χανανίς and Χαναναίος, see under 21:1). The literal rendering of the wayyiqtol, which makes the sentence less awkward, fits both Aquila and Theodotion. Only Aquila has a known use of Χαναναίος, but no reason exists to doubt the attribution to Theodotion.

A few hexaplaric manuscripts follow Aquila and Theodotion and have aorist here, including 426 from the O-group (Syh matches this with the perfect). 426 often conforms to the Hebrew independent of the rest of the O-group (see the discussion in Chapter 5).

HT

LXX κατῴκει ἐν γῇ Χανάαν

Sub ※ κατῴκει ※ ἐν τῷ νότῳ < ἐν γῇ Χανάαν

Wit 2: ↓<sup>o<sup>58</sup>-15</sup> 1767 Lat Hi Ep LXXVIII 36 Arab Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh| > rell

Var: ἐν τῷ νότῳ] post Χανάαν 767; om ἐν 376 | τῷ νότῳ] τῷ νότῳ 376*

NonGr: Lat Hi Ep LXXVIII 36 ad Austrum | Syh

Notes: HT says that the Canaanites lived “in the Negev” (בַּנֶּגֶב) in the land of Canaan. NUM has no equivalent for בַּנֶּגֶב and Origen adds ἐν τῷ νότῳ under the asterisk to account for it. Manuscript 767, from the n-group, has also added ἐν τῷ νότῳ a few words later, after ἐν γῇ Χανάαν, probably through the influence of the o′ text.

Num 33:42

HT סְהֹנֵן
LXX  Φινώ

⟨ο’⟩  Φινών

Wit 2:  F ↓ O-29 ↓ 72 ↓ C” ↓ n ↓ s ↓ 392 126-128-630’ 59 ↓ 799 Syh

Var:  Φινών | Φινόν 75; Φινάν 72; Φεινών  G C”52 414 529 127-767 s 392; Φηνών 414 799

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  NUM renders ננֹו פּ in HT as Φινώ, and the ο’ text probably adds a nu to conform to the Hebrew, giving Φινών. Origen did not address the use in the first syllable of an iota for an o/u class vowel in ננֹו פּ. The final nu is witnessed by the O-group and reflected in many other manuscripts (with variants). Syh is listed as a witness although it matches P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names.

Num 33:43

HT  ננֹו פּ
LXX  Φινώ

⟨ο’⟩  Φινών

Wit 2:  F ↓ O-29 ↓ 72 ↓ C” 53’ ↓ n ↓ s ↓ 392 126-128-630’ 59 ↓ 799 Syh

Var:  Φινών | Φινόν 75; Φινάν 72; Φεινών  G C”46 52 414 529 127-767 s 321 392 799*; Φηνών 46-414 799c

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  This is the same name as in verse 42 with most of the same witnesses and variants (see the discussion there). The change from Φινώ in NUM to Φινών probably indicates Origen’s work.

Num 33:44

HT  ננֹו פּ (עֲבָרִים)
LXX  ἐν Γαί (ἐν τῷ πέραν)

σ’  ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς
Notes: In 21:11, HT has the same phrase: עִיֵּי אֵבְרְרֵים. There NUM renders the name, with beth preposition, as ἐν Αχελγαί ἐκ τού πέραν. For the present verse, NUM drops the partial name Αχελ and uses Γαί (for a discussion of the rendering Αχελγαί see under 21:11).

Also at 21:11, according to a note from Eusebius, Symmachus renders ἐν τοῖς βουνοῖς as ἐν τοῖς βουνοῖς. For the present verse, M' and the s-group attribute the reading ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς to Symmachus. As discussed under 21:11, The Hebrew יר (with its plural forms יר and ירי) means “heap of ruins” (Ps 78[79]:1; Mi 1:6, 3:12; Jer 33[26]:18). In 33:47, Symmachus renders τῶν ἀντιπαραστάσεων with τῶν διαφασον (“passage” or “crossing over” — retroverted from the Syriac). Thus, Symmachus could have read the combined phrase עִי יפְּר as “ruins/desolation of passage.” As just mentioned, Symmachus’ approximation for בְּעִי in 21:11 was ἐν τοῖς βουνοῖς, which would give the sense of “in the hills of passage” for the combined phrase בְּעִי אֵבְרְרֵים in that verse. For the present verse, the rendering ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς for עִי would give the sense “in the heights of passage” for בְּעִי אֵבְרְרֵים. This contextual translation fits Symmachus and is consistent with 21:11.

Num 33:47

HT (ברר) אֵבְרְרֵים
LXX (τὰ ὄρη) τὰ Ἀβαρίμ

σ' τῶν διαβασέων

Notes: In 21:11 NUM translates אֵבְרְרֵים as ἐκ τοῦ πέραν and in 33:44 similarly as ἐν τῷ πέραν. Here HT has the phrase בְּעִי אֵבְרְרֵים, and NUM renders this as ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ Ἀβαρίμ, thus transliterating rather than translating עִי אֵבְרְרֵים.
In a note attributed to σ', הָעֲבָרִים is translated as τῶν διαβασέων (“passage” or “crossing over” — retroverted from the Syriac). In 21:11 and 33:44, Symmachus translates הָעֲבָרִים in the phrase רֵעֵי הָעֲבָרִים, and so it makes sense that he would also translate הָעֲבָרִים (see the discussion under those verses). Symmachus employs διάβασις in Deuteronomy 32:49 to render הָעֲבָרִים in a similar phrase describing the same location: אֵל הָעֲבָרִים. Thus, the present retroversion is reasonable for him. O-group manuscript 58 inserts the phrase τῶν διαβασέων between τὰ ὄρη and τὰ Ἀβαρί possibly under the influence of Symmachus.

**Num 33:49**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>בֵּיתָ הַיְשִׁמֹת</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(ἀνὰ μέσον) Αἰσιμόθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**σ’**  
τῆς ἀοικήτου

*Wit 1:* 85′-321′-344

**Notes:** The Hebrew name בֵּיתָ הַיְשִׁמֹת is rendered by the LXX as Βαιθασιμόθ in Joshua 13:20 (although Joshua 12:3 has κατὰ Ασιμόθ). Apparently, for the present verse, NUM read בֵּית as בֵּין and rendered the phrase as ἀνὰ μέσον Αἰσιμόθ. An ε-group note attributed to Symmachus has the alternate rendering τῆς ἀοικήτου, which means “not inhabited.” The Hebrew תֶּהוֹשֵׁם may be related to the root ישמש (“desert,” e.g., Deut 32:10) and תורה ישמש (“devastation,” Ps 54[55]:16) are derived. Thus, Symmachus may have read the phrase תֶּהוֹשֵׁם בֵּין as “house of the desert” or “house of devastation” and given the contextual rendering “uninhabited.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>אָבֵל הַשִּׁטִּים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Βελσαττί*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**〈ο’〉**  
’Ἀβελσαττίμ

*Wit 2:* ↓58-↓182-426-↓707 ↓d ↓f-↓129 ↓n-↓75 t ↓68′-↓120 Syh = MT

**Var:** ’Ἀβελσαττίμ | Ἀβελσαττίμ 707 b 54 68′-120; Ἀβελσατείμ (Ἀβεσσ. 56) 106 56 458; Ἀβελσαττίμ d-106 = Compl; Ἀβελσαττείμ 767; Ἀβελσατθή* 58; Ἀβελσατείν 82; Ἀβελσαττείμ (-λασαττ 53) 53; Ἀβερσαττείμ 127

**NonGr:** Syh Ἀβελσαττίμ
Notes: The Hebrew name אָבֵל הַשִּׁטִּים is rendered by NUM as Βελσαττί. Ο-group manuscripts 58 and 426, and Syh correct the name to Αβελσαττί or a close variant. This probably represents Origen’s work, and many other manuscripts may have been influenced by it. Syh differs slightly from P here (P has חַגָּלֵם) and this strengthens the witness of Syh to the ο’ text.

Num 33:50
HT שֵׁלֵל (רְדָר)  
LXX παρὰ (τὸν Ἰορδάνην)

ο’ παρά

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: B F M’ V O’ –376 b d f n –767 t x y z 55 59 319 624 646

Notes: The vast majority of the Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric groups (minus 376), read παρὰ τὸν Ἰορδάνην for עַל־יַרְדֵּן in HT. A few manuscripts, including A and the s-group read either ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου or ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, perhaps from the example of verse 48. Manuscript 344, from the s-group, notes that the ο’ text has παρά, and this is probably correct.

Num 33:51
HT רֵי (רְבָּנִים)  
LXX (ὑμεῖς)

Sub ※ pr ὅτι

Wit 2: O Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh | > rell
NonGr: Syh שֵׁלֵל כִּי ※

Notes: The Lord commands Moses to speak to the sons of Israel and HT uses רֵי as a marker of direct discourse. The equivalent recitative ὅτι is not required in Greek, and NUM omits it, but Origen adds ὅτι under the asterisk to represent רֵי.

Num 33:52


\{\text{Sub} \sim\}\n
\text{Wit 2:} \quad \text{Syh}

\text{NonGr:} \quad \text{Syh} \sim

\text{Notes:} \quad \text{Syh has a sign like a lemnisk without dots (\sim) together with a metobelus indicating the Syriac word \text{š}}} . \text{ At 21:5, a similar lemnisk-like sign with metobelus is used for an obelus. For the present verse, it appears to be intended as an asterisk or perhaps as a substitution. The Hebrew \text{מִפְּנֵי} is rendered by NUM only in this verse as \text{πρὸ προσώπου} — elsewhere in NUM \text{πρὸ προσώπου} is used for \text{פְנֵילִי} (14:42 and 27:12[2x]). The expression \text{מִפְּנֵי} is perhaps more exactly rendered by \text{ἀπό προσώπου}, as in 20:6 and 22:3, but in the present verse’s context of “destroying the inhabitants of the land \text{before you},” \text{πρὸ προσώπου} is an apt translation. \text{Syh translates \text{πρὸ προσώπου} using three words: \text{ܐܘܢ ܡܡܡ} ("from before the face") and then it places the modified lemnisk and metobelus around \text{ܫ}. It is unlikely, however, that Origen added the equivalent of the Hebrew \text{מִנ} under the asterisk because no other textual evidence indicates that Origen added a word, such as \text{ἀπό}, or substituted a word for \text{πρό}. In addition, \text{πρὸ προσώπου} renders the Hebrew \text{מִפְּנֵי} quantitatively, and so Origen had no reason to add a word under the asterisk (see 32:1 for an example of Origen not altering even an awkward NUM translation that is word-for-word). Thus, the modified lemnisk and metobelus appear to be artifacts of the unusual Syriac translation, and probably do not reflect any Aristarchian signs from the fifth column.}

\text{HT} \quad \text{כֶּם (מַשְׂכִּיֹּתָם)}

\text{LXX} \quad \text{πρὸ προσώπου (읍וֹן)}

\text{Sub} \star \quad \text{pr πάσας}

\text{Wit 2:} \quad \downarrow 0-15 \text{Syh = MT}

\text{Attr:} \quad \star \text{ G Syh} > \text{rell}

\text{Var:} \quad \text{πάσας} \sim \text{πάντας} 376

\text{NonGr:} \quad \text{Syh ܐܘܢ}

\text{Notes:} \quad \text{In this verse, HT uses the word \text{כֹל} four times as God lists all the people and things that the people of Israel are to drive out or destroy. NUM matches three of}
these but leaves out one before τὰς σκοπιάς, and Origen adds the equivalent πάσας under the asterisk. O-group manuscript 376 has mistakenly copied the masculine πάντας rather than the feminine πάσας to modify σκοπιάς possibly because the preceding and succeeding nouns are masculine and are modified by πάντας.

HT  
LXX

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh

>  

Wit 2:  72-381’ d 664 55 799 Latt cod 104 Spec 44 Aeth Arm = MT

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  HT places the direct object before the verb when speaking of destroying the molten images: וְאֵת כָּל־צַלְמֵי מַסֵּכֹתָם תְּאַבֵּדוּ. NUM follows this order, but then adds αὐτά at the end (“you shall destroy them”) which is a good translation. Origen, however, placed this addition under the obelus as technically it has no equivalent in the Hebrew.

Num 33:53

HT  
LXX

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G Syh

>  

Wit 2:  664 = MT Sam

NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  HT says, “you will dispossess (רַשְׁתֶּם) the land.” NUM renders רַשְׁתֶּם with ἀπολεῖτε, and since one does not “destroy” a land but its people, it adds
τοὺς κατοικοῦντας before τὴν γῆν, perhaps through the influence of verse 52. Origen correctly placed τοὺς κατοικοῦντας under the obelus.

Manuscript 664 is listed as a witness to the obelus, although it deletes the entire phrase τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν rather than just the obelized τοὺς κατοικοῦντας and so its omission may not be due to Origenic influence. Syh has placed the metobelus incorrectly, after “in the land.”

**HT**

ָתרשׁ לָרֶשֶׁת

**LXX**

(τὴν γῆν) αὐτῶν ἐν κλήρῳ

**non tr**

ἐν κλήρῳ αὐτῶν

**Wit 2:**  G-426

**Notes:**  HT has לָכֶם נָתַתִי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ לָרֶשֶׁת אֹתָהּ. NUM modifies this in two ways. First it renders the infinitive לָרֶשֶׁת as the prepositional phrase ἐν κλήρῳ. Second, it omits the direct object אֹתָהּ, since the verb is gone, and adds αὐτῶν before ἐν κλήρῳ. Origen matches the Hebrew order by transposing αὐτῶν after ἐν κλήρῳ but he makes no other corrections. The association of a genitive pronoun with ἐν κλήρῳ is quite unusual for the LXX, occurring only one other time, in Judges 1:3 (see NGTN 568).

**Num 33:54**

**HT**

(תרשׁ)

**LXX**

(τὴν γῆν) αὐτῶν

**Sub ÷**

**Wit 2:**  G Syh

**>**

**Wit 2:**  A B F oII C’’’ b 53-56s y 55 59 424 624 646 = MT

**NonGr:**  Syh רָטָלָר

**Notes:**  NUM adds the possessive αὐτῶν after τὴν γῆν, perhaps through the influence of verse 53, and this is not matched in the Hebrew. Origen placed this under the obelus, and many manuscripts witness negatively to this.

**HT**

רָטָלָר

**LXX**

τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν ἐν κλήρῳ
ο’ οἱ λ’ τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν ἐν κλήρῳ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν B (mg) M’ V 963 (vid) O’ 56 (mg) 129-664 n t (84) 509-527 z

NonGr: Lat cod 100 terram illorum

Notes: The NUM phrase τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν ἐν κλήρῳ is shared by many Greek manuscripts, including all of the O-group (although G has placed αὐτῶν under the obelus — see above). Many s-group manuscripts read κληρωτί, and s-group manuscript 344 notes that the o’ text has ἐν κλήρῳ. This is witnessed by the O-group and is probably correct. The 344 note also attributes this reading to οἱ λ’. Aquila is unlikely to have matched αὐτῶν in NUM since it is not reflected in the underlying Hebrew. Symmachus or Theodotion may have followed NUM with αὐτῶν, since it makes sense in context. All of the Three employ κλῆρος, although only Aquila and Symmachus for ḥו (α’: Josh 21:20; σ’: Lev 16:8, Josh 21:20). Theodotion uses κλῆρος, for example, for a form of ירָשׁ in Deuteronomy 19:14. Thus the attribution to οἱ λ’ is probably correct, with some doubt about the inclusion of αὐτῶν by Aquila.

ο’ εἰς ὁ ἄν

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: A B F M’ O’ 72 b d f 129 75 2 y 392 z 55 319 424 624 646 799

σ’ ὁποῦ ἄν

Wit 1: 344

θ’ ὦ ἐάν

Wit 1: 344
Notes: HT reads (אֲשֶׁר־יֵצֵא לֹו שָׁמָּה הַגֹּורָל לֹו יִהְיֶה "(to whom goes out to him thither (i.e., the lot), to him the allotment shall be.” NUM renders the beginning somewhat literally as εἰς ὃ ἐὰν. The s-group has εἰς ὃν ἐὰν and 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text matches NUM. This is supported by virtually all the hexaplaric witnesses.

344 also attributes the rendering οὗ ἐὰν to Symmachus, and the similar rendering οὗ ἐὰν to Theodotion. Both of these readings mean “wherever” and are appropriate in the context of apportioning land. Thus, they make sense for both of these translators.

HT

LXX

{Sub _DIV 

ο κλῆρος

Notes: In the context of describing inheritance by families, HT reads (אֲבֹתֵי תַלְמַטּו (קָטָּא פּוּלָּאָּס) πατρίδων (יוֹמָּא) ) (985-321')344.

HT

LXX

Notes: In the context of describing inheritance by families, HT reads אֲלַא אָשֶׁר־יֵצֵא לֹו שָׁמָּה הַגֹּורָל לֹו יִהְיֶה ("to whom the lot goes out there, it will be his"). NUM translates this as εἰς ὃ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ τὸ ὄνο*α αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ, αὐτοῦ ἔσται ("to what his name goes out there, it will be his"). NUM gives a fairly quantitative rendering although it substitutes τὸ ὄνο*α αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ for the normal equivalent for גָּורָל which is κλῆρος (Wevers speculates that τὸ ὄνο*α αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ comes from a double translation of שָׁמָּה, first as a form of שֵׁם and then as the adverb שָׁמָּה — NGTN 569). One tradition, reflected in some non-hexaplaric groups and in an unattributed s-group note, has added о κλῆρος, which technically matches the word NUM bypassed (הַגָּורָל). Whether this addition is influenced by the Hebrew (e.g., through one of the Three) or is instead an ad sensum gloss is not clear. No hexaplaric witnesses have this addition in any form, except that Syh regards it as an addition and has placed it under the obelus. Most Greek manuscripts do not have this reading, but they cannot be considered negative witnesses to the obelus, as they simply match NUM. It is not likely that the obelus in Syh represents an original obelus in the o’ text.
ο’ οἱ λ’ πατριῶν

Wit 1: ↓130-344-↓346
Wit 2: A B F⁢ V O’⁢↑-⁢707 414-422-550* b d n 321 tx y⁢318 z⁢68’⁢120 59 319 424 624 646 799
Attr: o’ οἱ λ’ > 130-346

Notes: NUM renders לְמַטּו in HT literally with κατὰ φυλὰς πατριῶν ὑ*ῶν. Most of the s-group has the singular πατριᾶς for πατριῶν in NUM. A marginal note in s-group manuscript 344 indicates that the o’ text matches NUM and this is confirmed by virtually all the hexaplaric witnesses. The 344 note also attributes πατριῶν to οἱ λ’. Because πατριῶν matches the plural רֵבָּם, the attribution is suitable for the Three.

Num 33:55

HT
LXX

〈ο’〉 τὴν γῆν

Wit 1: ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ↓344
Wit 2: τὴν γῆν G-72-82-376 414 19 76 55 Arab (sed hab Compl) = MT | ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν 58 30’ 509 799 |

Notes: HT says that if the people do not drive out “the inhabitants of the land” (יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ) then the remaining Canaanites would become a problem. For יֹשְׁבֵי NUM has κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, thus adding the word ἐπὶ. A few manuscripts, including G and 376 from the O-group, have τὴν γῆν instead of ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which is possibly an Origenic change to conform more closely to HT. Some other manuscripts (58 30’ 509 799) have ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν and thus possibly show hexaplaric influence. In addition, an unattributed note in 344 has ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν which possibly was a 344 o’ attribution.

HT
LXX

〈Sub ※〉 + ὑμῖν
Notes: HT says that the peoples who remain will “trouble you” (ץָרֲרוּ אֶתְכֶם). NUM has no equivalent for אֶתְכֶם. The vast majority of Greek manuscripts, including all the hexaplaric witnesses, match the Hebrew by adding יָמִינָה (ץχθρεύוטסουσίν) after יָמִינָה after יָמִינָה (ץχθρεύוטσουσίν). This addition was in the o’ text and possibly under the asterisk. The insertion is widespread, and may have been introduced as an ad sensum gloss earlier than Origen.

**Notes:** HT reads ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐφ’ ἤν, which translated literally is: “upon the land which you are living in.” NUM renders this adequately with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐφ’ ἤν, and a note from 344 of the s-group indicates that the o’ text has ἤν instead. This attribution is probably correct since it is supported by the O-group (minus 58). The difference in meaning in this context between ἐπὶ with the accusative and with the genitive is not significant.

**Num 33:56**

**Notes:** HT reads (ץקָשֹו), which translated literally is: “lakshov.” NUM reads (ποιήσατι), which translated literally is: “to perform.” The s-group matches NUM with ἤν, and a note from 344 of the s-group indicates that the o’ text has ἤν instead. This attribution is probably correct since it is supported by the O-group (minus 58). The difference in meaning in this context between ἤν with the accusative and with the genitive is not significant.

**Sub ※ pr τοῦ**

**Notes:** Wit 2: G-376 = MT

**Attr:** ※ G] > rell
Notes: HT uses a standard lamedh preposition before the infinitive, and NUM renders this reasonably with ποιήσατι. Two O-group witnesses indicate that Origen added τοῦ under the asterisk to match the preposition.

Numbers 34

Num 34:2

HT (אמָרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם)
LXX (καὶ ἔρεις πρὸς αὐτούς)

〈ο′〉 + λέγων

Wit 2: $O^{58}$ Syh
NonGr: Syh א"ב
d

Notes: In HT, the Lord says to Moses: וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם צַו אֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. NUM corresponds to this quantitatively, but Origen’s exemplar apparently had an added λέγων, as all of the O-group (minus 58) and Syh include it. Since it is not present in the Hebrew, G and Syh place it under the obelus (see below).

HT (אמָרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם)
LXX (καὶ ἔρεις πρὸς αὐτούς)

Sub ÷ καὶ ἔρεις πρὸς αὐτούς ÷ λέγων

Wit 2: G Syh

>  

Wit 2: A B F M V 963 58-ol C* b d f n(-767) s t x y z126 55 59 424 624 646 799 = MT
NonGr: Syh א"ב יבבא תבבא ÷
Notes: As discussed above, Origen’s LXX exemplar had an added λέγων not contained in the original text of NUM. Because it is not matched in the underlying Hebrew, Origen placed it under the obelus. The vast majority of Greek manuscripts do not have this text, but this minus does not mean that they are negative witnesses to the obelus since NUM originally did not have λέγων. That is, they are simply reflecting NUM and not the obelus. Syh has the asterisk correctly placed, but the metobelus appears one word after its proper location.

HT 
LXX 

Sub ※ pr ὅτι

Wit 2: O58 Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ※

Notes: This is similar to the situation in 33:51. The Lord commands Moses to speak to the sons of Israel and HT uses כִּי as a marker of direct discourse. The equivalent recitative ὅτι is not required in Greek, and NUM omits it, but Origen adds ὅτι under the asterisk to represent כִּי.

HT 
LXX 

Sub ※ ※ ἡ γῆ ἥτις ↗

Wit 1: ↓85
Wit 2: ↓M’ ↓O-82 d n75 (767) 30’-130-321’-343’ t 392 ↓799 Lat cod 100 Arab ↓Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G 85-344] > rell
Var: ἥτις] ἥ G; > M’ 58-426 799 Syh

NonGr: Lat cod 100 terra quae ↓Syh ↗

Notes: HT reads, “This is the land which (הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר) will fall to you for an inheritance.” NUM has no equivalent for הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר and Origen adds the equivalent ἡ
γῆ ἥτις under the asterisk. The asterisk tradition is somewhat confused. G has ※ἡ γῆ  miştir. 344 has ἡ γῆ ※ἡ ἥτις, but 85 has the entire phrase under the asterisk, which is probably correct.

**Num 34:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oι λ'</td>
<td>προς νότον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wit 1:** ↓85′-↓321′ 344

**Var:** προς > 85′-321'

**Notes:** NUM renders the word בּּבּ three ways: (1) ἐρημος: 13:17, 22, 21:1; (2) νότος: 13:29; (3) λίβα: 34:3(2x), 4(2x), 5. For the present verse, several s-group manuscripts indicate that rather than λίβα in NUM, oι λ' render בּּבּ using νότον, a word that normally means “south” or “southwest,” although it can also be used for other directions (e.g., in 34:15, it translates בְּּּרֵּפַּּמֶּ and means “eastward”; see the discussion under 2:3 in HEXNUM1).

The Three all use νότος (or the related νότονδε) for נֶגֶב (e.g., α': Jer 13:19, 17:26, Ezek 20:46; σ': Gen 13:3; α' σ': Gen 12:9, 13:1, Jer 39[32]44; θ': Dan 8:4, 9). Thus this attribution is suitable for any of the Three. Another similar oι λ' reading occurs for the second instance of נֶגֶב in this verse, and this is covered below.

**Num 34:4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תָּקְרַבִּים</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Ακραβίν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wit 2:** 'Ακραββίμ ↓29*-↓381-426 ↓16-↓46-↓528 ↓54 Syh = MT 'Ακραβείμ 29*-381 16-46-528 54

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** For the place name תָּקְרַבִּים in HT, NUM transliterates but also conforms to Greek usage by ending the word with nun rather than μυ, giving 'Ακραβίν. A few hexaplaric manuscripts, including 426 and Syh, correct the final consonant to μυ which is closer to the Hebrew. This change is reflected in some other manuscripts as well, and
is possibly the o’ text reading. Syh is a solid witness to Άκραββίμ since it differs from P (which has ἄκραββιμ).

HT  ἄκραββιμ
LXX  Σέννα

\[\text{o’ οἱ λ’ Σέννα}\]

\[\text{Wit 1: 344}\]
\[\text{Wit 2: } \downarrow O^{58}-82 \downarrow Bo^{A} \downarrow Bo^{B} \text{ Syh}\]
\[\text{Var: Σέννα} \mid \Sigmaίννα 376; sena Bo^{A}; sina Bo^{B}\]
\[\text{NonGr: Syh Σέννα}\]

Notes: The Hebrew צִנָה (“Tsin” plus directional he) is rendered as Σέννα by NUM. The majority of manuscripts have variants, including the s-group which has variants of Σένακ (Σένακ, Σεένακ, Σεέννακ, Σεένναακ). 344 from the s-group reports that the o’ text has Σέννα, and this is supported by the O-group (minus 58) and Syh. Syh is a solid witness to the o’ text for this name since it differs from P (which has Σένακ).

344 also indicates that Σέννα is the reading of the Three. In verses 4, 8, and 10, HT has names that end with he where the he could be seen as directional, but in each case, οἱ λ’ (and NUM) construe the he as part of the name. Thus, this attribution is probably correct.

**Num 34:5**

HT  יָצָתוֹ לָהַמָּה
LXX  (διέξοδος)

\[\text{〈Sub \*〉 + αὐτοῦ}\]

\[\text{Wit 2: } O d 129-246 n^{(-767)} t 628 \text{ Arm Sa}^{1} \text{ Syh} = \text{MT}\]

\[\text{Attr: } \ast] > \text{omnes}\]

\[\text{NonGr: Syh Σύνεστα}\]

Notes: NUM aptly renders יָצָתוֹ as διέξοδος but omits the pronominal suffix. The o’ text probably added the equivalent αὐτοῦ, possibly originally under the asterisk,
as witnessed by the O-group. This is also reflected by other manuscript traditions, including n, t, and the Byzantine d-group.

**Num 34:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לָכֶם גְּבוּל</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>tà ὅρια ὑ*ῖν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**non tr**  υ*ῖν τὰ ὅρια

*Wit 2:*  A F M’ V ↓ O’’ C’’ b f n(-767) s-53’ 84 71-619  y z-126-407 55 59 424 624 646 ↓799

*Var:* τὰ] > 82 799

*Notes:* NUM translates לָכֶם גְּבוּל in HT accurately, but reverses the word order, giving tà ὅρια ὑ*ῖν. The o’ text transposes υ*ῖν, and the majority of the Greek manuscripts also reflect this change.

**Num 34:8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>תְּתָאוּ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>κατα*ετρήσετε αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub ÷ ÷ αὐτάς ↙*

*Wit 2:*  G = MT

*Notes:* HT has רָמַת and NUM supplies the object (αὐτοῖς) unexpressed in HT, probably referring to the people. Manuscript G from the O-group has αὐτάς, a unique reading whose feminine plural referent is unclear, and G places it under the obelus. This may indicate an original Origenic obelus, probably with αὐτοῖς and not αὐτάς, as the other Greek witnesses uniformly support either αὐτοῖς or ἐσαυτοῖς.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נַרְדָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Σαραδά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ο’ οἱ λ’ Σαδαδά*

*Wit 1:*  344
Notes: The Hebrew שְׁפָמָה is rendered as Σαραδά by NUM, perhaps through the influence of Sam, which has שְׁפָרָה. The s-group has the readings Σαρδακ, Σαδδακ, and Σαδακ, and manuscript 344, from the s-group, indicates that the o’ text has Σαδαδά, which matches the Hebrew. The O-group evidence is mixed, however, with G and 426 — which are often aligned with the Hebrew — matching NUM and reading Σαραδά. The rest of the O-group matches the Hebrew better, but not exactly: 376 has Σαδαδά, and 58 reads Σαδαδακ. Syh reads ṣdd, but this matches P and Syh is sometimes influenced by proper names in P. In conclusion, the attribution of Σαδαδά to the o’ text is possibly correct.

344 also attributes Σαδαδά to οἱ λ’. The replacement of ρ by δ makes sense for any of the Three since it aligns with HT. As discussed under verse 4, verses 4, 8, and 10 have names whose he endings could be perceived as directional markers, but in each case, οἱ λ’ (and NUM) construe the he as part of the name. Thus, this attribution is probably correct.

Num 34:10

HT  שְׁפָמָה
LXX  Σεφά*α

ο’ οἱ λ’  Σεφά*α

Notes: The Hebrew שְׁפָמָה includes the name שְׁפָם and the directional he. That the he is directional is made clear by the repeat of the name שְׁפָם in the next verse with a preposition: מִשְּׁפָם. Here NUM construed the final he to be part of the name as indicated by its rendering Σεφά*α. The s-group has Σεπφά*α and s-group manuscript 344 attributes the reading Σεφά*α, which better approximates the Hebrew, to ο’ and οἱ λ’. The attribution to the o’ text is supported by O-group manuscripts G and 426. It is also supported by Syh, which differs here from שְׁפָמָה in P. As with verses 4 and 8, οἱ λ’ renders the name as if the final he is part of the name. In this case in particular, the he is unambiguously a directional marker, both because of the repetition of the name without he in verse 11, and because of the semantics of the phrase מִשְּׁפָם ("from
Hatsar-enan to Shapham’). Unlike NUM, the Three may have included a preposition (e.g., εἰς) before Σεφάμας. In any case, the οἱ λ’ attribution is probably correct.

**Num 34:11**

**HT**

(חַבְרְכֹל) מָמַּה

**LXX**

(τὰ ὅρια) Βηλά

**Sub ‡**

**Wit 2:** G

> 58-82

**Notes:** HT reads, “the border will go down and meet (יחנְרַנִי) at the shoulder of the Sea of Chinnereth, eastward.” Rather than seeing מָמַּה as a verb, NUM renders it and the preceding conjunction as the proper name Βηλά. The ο’ text makes two changes to this verse. First, it places Βηλά under the obelus. Second, it adds καὶ συγκρούσει under the asterisk to equal מָמַּה (see below).

**HT**

(זָמַּה)

**LXX**

Βηλά

**Sub ※ + καὶ συγκρούσει**

**Wit 2:** ↓O-58-82tx -15-707 b ↓f-129 68′-120 Arab Syh = MT

**Attr:** ※ G Syh > rell

**Var:** καὶ συγκρούσει + Βηλά 426 Συγκρούσει συγκρούει 376; συγκρούση 56′-664

**NonGr:** Syh _aspect

**Notes:** NUM construes the verb מָמַּה in HT as a proper name and renders it and the preceding conjunction as Βηλά. The ο’ text replaces Βηλά with a translation of מָמַּה, first by obelizing Βηλά (covered above) and then by adding καὶ συγκρούσει (“and strike together”) under the asterisk.
Num 34:12

HT  צְאֹתָיווֹ תּ  
LXX  ἡ διέξοδος θάλασσα

ο’ οἱ λ’  ἡ διέξοδος αὐτοῦ θάλασσα

Wit 1:  344

Wit 2:  O ↓75 Arm Syh

Var:  αὐτοῦ] αὐτῶν 75

NonGr:  Syh ἰς αὐτῶν ἰς

Notes:  For רְצוּן in HT, NUM has no equivalent for the pronominal suffix, and ο’-group manuscript 344 indicates that the ο’ text has an added αὐτοῦ. This is supported by the O-group and Syh and the addition may originally have been under the asterisk. 344 also indicates that οἱ λ’ match the Hebrew suffix with αὐτοῦ and this makes sense. Each of the Three employ διέξοδος for צְאֹתָיו in Ezekiel 48:30. Thus, this attribution is suitable for any of the translators.

Num 34:13

HT  לָתֵת  
LXX  δοῦναι αὐτήν

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  G<

> 57(l) 129 Aeth = MT

Notes:  The Hebrew uses two רְצוּנ clauses to describe the land, and the second says that it is the land “which the Lord commanded to give” (אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה לָתֵת). NUM renders the second רְצוּנ clause using an ὃν τρόπον clause (Wevers suggests that the parent text of NUM may have had כַאֲשֶׁר — NGTN 577). The use of ὃν τρόπον makes natural the addition of the direct object αὐτήν after δοῦναι to refer to ἡ γῆ (“as the Lord commanded to give it”), but αὐτήν has no basis in the Hebrew. Origen placed αὐτήν under the obelus.
Sub ÷

\[\text{Wit 2: } \text{G Syh} \]

\[>\]

\[\text{Wit 2: } 82 = \text{MT} \]

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{Syh} \]

Notes: The Hebrew says that the Lord is giving the land to “the nine-and-a-half tribes.” NUM makes this explicit by, “the nine tribes and the half-tribe of Manasseh,” Origen places the added word Μανασσή under the obelus.

\textbf{Num 34:14}

Sub ※ κατ’ οίκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν

\[\text{Wit 1: } \downarrow 85′-\downarrow 321′ \]

\[\text{Wit 2: } O^{58-82} b^{314} \downarrow 246 54′ r^{84} 799 \text{ Lat codd 100 104(vid) Arab Syh} = \text{MT} \]

Attr: ※ G\rangle > \text{rell}

Var: κατ’ οίκους [κατὰ κλήρους 85′-321′] αὐτῶν] > 246

\[\text{NonGr: } \text{La per domos pagorum suorum} | \text{Syh} \]

Notes: After each of the names of Reuben and Gad, HT appends the phrase לְבֵית אֲבֹתָם, but NUM has the equivalent only after Gad. Origen added the equivalent κατ’ οίκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν under the asterisk after Ρουβήν. Some unattributed s-group marginal notes substitute κλήρους for οίκους, but οίκους is probably the original ο’ text reading since it is supported by the O-group (minus 58).
Num 34:18

HT  נָשִׂיא אֶחָד (καὶ ἄρχοντα ἕνα)
LXX  (καὶ ἄρχοντα ἕνα)

Sub ※  + ἄρχοντα ἕνα

Wit 1:  130-321'
Wit 2:  ↓G-426 Syh = MT
Attr:  ※ G] > rell
Var:  ἄρχοντα] ἄρχων G
NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  HT repeats the phrase נָשִׂיא אֶחָד to express the distributive sense (see GKC §134q; WOC 7.2.3), but NUM renders the phrase only once. Origen adds the equivalent of the repeated phrase, ἄρχοντα ἕνα, under the asterisk. O-group manuscript G has ἄρχων (from ἄρχος) which is a synonym of ἄρχων, but this is probably a scribal error.

HT  (פָּשַׁלְתִּי)
LXX  (κατακληρονομήσαι) ύμῖν

Sub ÷

Wit 2:  ↓G Syh

> 

Wit 2:  V(l) 552 = MT
Attr:  ÷] ※ G*
NonGr:  Syh

Notes:  In verse 17, HT identifies the men who will “apportion to you the land” (יִנְחֲלוּ לָכֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ). NUM renders יִנְחֲלוּ לָכֶם as κληρονομήσουσιν ύμῖν. In verse 18, HT has לִנְחֹל without the pronoun as indirect object, but NUM echoes the
pronoun from verse 17 with κατακληρονομήσαι υἱῶν. Origen placed υἱῶν under the obelus.

**Num 34:20**

| HT | בְּנֵי שִׁמְעֹון |
| LXX | Συμεών |

ο’ οἱ λ’ pr υἱῶν

**Notes:** For the Hebrew בְּנֵי שִׁמְעֹון, NUM has no equivalent for בְּנֵי, and the s-group follows NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group has a note that indicates that the ο’ text adds υἱῶν to account for the Hebrew, and this is supported by the O-group (minus 58) and Syh. This addition may originally have been under the asterisk. 344 also attributes υἱῶν to οἱ λ’, and this makes sense for any of the Three since it conforms to the Hebrew.

| HT | שְׁמוּאֵל |
| LXX | Σαλαμίηλ |

α’ σ’ Σαμουήλ

**Notes:** The Simeonite name given by HT as שְׁמוּאֵל is rendered Σαλαμίηλ by NUM, perhaps through the influence of the name Σαλαμίηλ, the leader from the Simeonites mentioned in 1:6 (NGTN 580). Aquila and Symmachus have the reading Σαμουήλ attributed to them, and since this conforms more closely to the Hebrew the attribution is suitable for them.
Num 34:22

**Notes:** For the Hebrew name עַמִּיהוּד, NUM has Ἐιούδ as does the s-group. A 344 (s-group) note attributes the alternate rendering Αμιουδ to o’ and oi λ’. The attribution to o’ has no support from the O-group. Manuscripts 376 and 426 differ from 344 (and HT) — 376 with Σειούδ and 426 with Ειούδ. Manuscript 58 agrees with NUM (Ἐιούδ), while G has Ιειούδ. Syh agrees with the 344 reading and also matches the Hebrew, but Syh also agrees with P, and Syh is sometimes influenced by P for proper names. Thus, it is uncertain whether the o’ text has the reading Αμιουδ. 344 also attributes the reading Αμιουδ to oi λ’, and this is probably correct.

HT
LXX

**Num 34:22**

HT
LXX

**Notes:** Similar to verse 20, for בְּנֵי־דָן in HT, NUM has no equivalent for בְּנֵי in HT, NUM has no equivalent for בְּנֵי in HT, and the s-group follows NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group has a note that indicates that the o’ text adds υἱῶν to account for the Hebrew. Since this is supported by O-group manuscript 426 and Syh it probably reflects Origen’s work, and the addition may originally have been under the asterisk. 344 also attributes υἱῶν to oi λ’, and this makes sense as it matches the Hebrew.

HT
LXX
ο’    Ἰογλή (cod Ἰογαή)

Wit 1:  344

Wit 2:  Ἰεγλί 18'-126-628-630’ | Ἰαγλή 106 | Ἰεγλή 376 407 | Ἰογαή 426 | ygly
Syh = MT | Ἰοηλί 53’ | Ἰεκλεῖ M4 G b 318 | Ἰοκλί 707 56 = Compl
’Ἰοκλί 68'-120’ | Ἰεκάι F 59 | Ἰεκλί oI’ | Ἰαγλή 343 | Ἰαιγλή 106 | Ἰεγλή 376 407 | Ἰογαῖ 426 | ygly

NonGr:  Syh ܐܢ ܠ2 ܬieοet ܐuοe)

Notes:  The Hebrew name יָגְלִי is rendered Ἐγλί by NUM. The s-group has either Ἰεκλί or ἐκλί. A 344 (s-group) note attributes the alternate spelling Ἰογλή to ο’. No Greek hexaplaric witnesses have this exact spelling, but three of four O-group manuscripts have the initial iota (G has Ἰεκλεῖ, 376 has Ἰεγλή, and 426 has Ἰογαῖ). Syh matches the Hebrew well, although it also matches P, and Syh sometimes is influenced by P for proper names. The evidence indicates that the o’ reading in 344 is correct as to the initial iota, but the original Origenic spelling of the rest of the name is not clear. Since Origen’s goal was to approximate the Hebrew, perhaps Ἰεγλή in 376 is the original o’ text reading. Many other manuscripts may have been affected by the addition of initial iota.

Num 34:24

HT  שִׁפְטָן
LXX  Σαβαθά

〈o’〉  Σαφτάν

Wit 2:  Σαφτάν M’ G-15'-426-707* $f^{129}$ 121 z$^{-407}$ = Compl | ἱβtn Syh

NonGr:  Syh ܐܢ ܠ2 ܬieοet ܐuοe)

Notes:  NUM renders the Hebrew name יָפֶת as Σαφθά. Many manuscripts are closer to the Hebrew, including O-group manuscripts G and 426 which have Σαφτά, and Syh with ܐܢ ܠ2 ܬieοet ܐuοe). Σαφτά is probably the o’ text reading, and it is reflected in other manuscripts, including the f-group and z-group.

Num 34:25
As in 34:20 and 22, HT here precedes a name with בְּנֵי and NUM has no equivalent. In verses 20 and 22, notes attributed to o’ match the Hebrew with וּיהוּנ and these additions may have been marked with asterisks in the o’ text. For the present verse, the O-group and Syh indicate that the o’ text added וּיהוּנ before Ζαβουλών to match the Hebrew, and this may have been under the asterisk.

**Num 34:28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>בְּנֵי (בְּנֵי)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(Νεφθαλί)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** As in 34:20, 22, and 25, HT precedes a name with בְּנֵי and NUM has no equivalent. In verses 20 and 22, notes attributed to o’ match the Hebrew with וּיהוּנ and these additions may have been under asterisks. For the present verse, the O-group and Syh indicate that the o’ text added וּיהוּנ before Νεφθαλί and this may have been under the asterisk. This influenced some other manuscripts, including the catena groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>בְּנֵי (בְּנֵי)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>(וּיהוּנ) Beαμιούδη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: HT ends verse 28 with "בֶּן־עַמִּיהוּד". NUM apparently double-rendered 'ב resulting in "υἱὸς Βενα*ιούδ". The majority of Greek manuscripts have been corrected toward the Hebrew in various ways, including the uncials A, F, M, and V as well as most of the hexaplaric witnesses. The α′ text probably had 'Αμιουδ (the O-group minus 376 has this reading), although this shift toward the Hebrew may been introduced prior to Origen through the influence of other instances in NUM that have "υἱὸς" (or "υἱοῦ") 'Εμιουδ (1:10, 2:18, 7:48, 53, 10:22, 34:20). For this name, Syh agrees with P which sometimes influences Syh for proper names.

Num 34:29

HT: לֹא (לֹא מְלֹא יְהוָה)
LXX: οἷς (ἐνετείλατο κύριος)

ο′ α′ θ′  οίς

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: A F M′ V O′ 57-528 72 376* 57-528 f n(−767) t−74*(vid) 370 128-407-628 959

ο׳  ούς

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: 29-72-376* C−57 528 b d s 74*(vid)-370 121 18-68′-120-630′ 55 319 (sed hab Ald Compl)

Notes: HT summarizes the previous list in chapter 34 as the leaders "whom the Lord commanded" (οίς ἐνετείλατο κύριος). In NUM, the verb ἐντέλλομαι routinely takes its direct object in the dative for persons (e.g., 34:2, 13), although twice it takes a neuter accusative direct object (in 9:8 and 36:13). A 344 (s-group) note has οίς attributed to o′, α′, and θ′. The s-group (along with some other manuscripts) has ούς, and the 344
attribution to ο’ indicates that the ο’ text differs with οῖς; this is supported by most of the hexaplaric witnesses. That α’ and θ’ also have οῖς is reasonable given the way ἐντέλλομαι is commonly used. 344txt indicates that Symmachus has οῖς which is allowable for ἐντέλλομαι, although we do not know what verb Symmachus used here. No reason exists to doubt this attribution. Symmachus’ reading is reflected by a number of Greek witnesses, and he may have influenced some of them, particularly if he did use ἐντέλλομαι.

**Numbers 35**

**Num 35:3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לֶעָרִים</th>
<th>αὐτοῖς αἱ πόλεις</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>αὐτοῖς αἱ πόλεις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**non tr**

αἱ πόλεις αὐτοῖς

Wit 2: A F M ᾱ’ O” C’’’-(57) 529 ᾱ’<sup>129</sup> s ᾱ’<sup>120</sup> 55 59 424 624 646 799

Var: αὐτοῖς] αὐταῖς 29; αὐτῶν 72 53’ 121 68’-128-669

**Notes:** NUM renders לֶעָרִים straightforwardly, but it places the equivalent of לֶעָרִים (αὐτοῖς) at the beginning. All of the hexaplaric groups transpose αὐτοῖς to the end to match the Hebrew order, and this is likely due to Origen’s work. The transposition is also reflected in a number of other manuscripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>וּמִגְרְשֵׁיהֶם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>καὶ τὰ ἀφορίσματα αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{θ’} καὶ τὰ ἀποβλήματα αὐτῶν

Wit 1: lemma 108 Syh | ἀποβλήματα 130-131’

Attr: θ’] nom absc 321

Var: ἀποβλήματα] προβλήματα 346; [...]βλήματα 321

NonGr: Syh λεπτά ἀποβλήματα

**Notes:** A note attributed to Theodotion by 108, 130-321’, and Syh has the alternate rendering ἀποβλήματα (or προβλήματα) for שִׁרְקָה rather than ἀφορίσματα
in NUM. The word שְׁפֵרָה is used to denote the land surrounding a city. Theodotion renders מִגְרָשׁ using ἀφορίσμα (retroverted from Syh in Ezek 48:17 and from Jerome in Ezek 45:2), matching the NUM rendering in the present verse. By contrast, ἀποβλήμα refers to something cast away. The word is not used elsewhere by the Three, although the related word ἀποβλήτος is used by Aquila for מָנָךְ ("unclean meat") in Leviticus 7:8 and 19:7, and for מָדֶמֶשׁ ("Damascus") in Song of Solomon 7:4. Symmachus employs ἀποβλήτος for מָנָךְ (referring to unclean food) in Hosea 9:3. Theodotion does not use ἀποβλήτος. Conceivably, Theodotion intended ἀποβλήτος in the sense of “areas cast away” to be a substitute for ἀφορίσμα, but this would be an unusual use of ἀποβλήτος. His use of ἀφορίσμα (or a close synonym) elsewhere for מִגְרָשׁ, however, and the likelihood that he would be satisfied with ἀφορίσμα in NUM here, make it unlikely that this attribution to Theodotion is correct.

**HT**

וְלִרְכֻשָם

**LXX**

—

**Sub ※**

καὶ τῇ ὑπάρξει αὐτῶν

**Wit 2:** O Syh

**Attr:** ※ Gj > rell

**NonGr:** Syh

**Notes:** HT says that the pasturelands will be for three things: “for their cattle and for their possessions (팡ָּלָה) and for all their animals.” NUM has no equivalent for the second item, and Origen matches מִגְרָשׁ with καὶ τῇ ὑπάρξει αὐτῶν under the asterisk.

**Num 35:4**

**HT**

וָחוּצָה אֶלֶף אַמָּה

**LXX**

καὶ ἔξω δισχιλίους πῆχες

**o` o`i l`**

καὶ ἔξω χιλίους πῆχες

**Wit 1:** 344

**Wit 2:** ↓ O-58 500 Syh

**Var:** χιλίους] χειλ. G
NonGr: Syh

Notes: In HT, verse 4 gives a measurement of 1,000 cubits from the wall for the Levites’ pasturage lands, but verse 5 mentions 2,000 cubits from each side of the city. NUM attempts to harmonize these verses by rendering אֶלֶף in verse 4 with δισχιλίους. The s-group text matches NUM, and manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that ο′ has χιλίους which matches HT. This attribution is supported by the O-group (minus 58) and Syh. 344 also attributes χιλίους to οἱ λ′ which makes good sense since it conforms to the Hebrew.

Num 35:5

HT (אַמָּה)בָּ (פְּאַת־קֵדְמָה אַלְפַּיִם)
LXX (τὸ κλίτος τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς δισχιλίους πήχεις)

Sub ※ τὸ κλίτος τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολάς ※ ἐπί < δισχιλίους πήχεις

Wit 2: G-376 Syh

Attr: ※ G| > rell

NonGr: Syh

Notes: In HT, God commands the Israelites to measure outside the city, “the side to the eastward a thousand cubits” (אַמָּה אַלְפַּיִם). NUM renders this as τὸ κλίτος τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολάς δισχιλίους πήχεις. This is a quantitative rendering (the directional he in קֵדְמָה is rendered by πρός) except for the beth preposition on בָּאַמָּה. According to O-group manuscript G, Origen included ἐπί under the asterisk before δισχιλίους, possibly to represent the beth, although this is not clear, first because בָּאַמָּה is used three other times with numbers in this verse and Origen does nothing in those instances. Second, ἐπί is fairly standard when expressing numbers of cubits (e.g., Exo 26:2, 8, 27:9, 18, in passim), and in no place where ἐπί is preceded by a number in Exodus or Numbers does Origen add anything to compensate for beth. Third, the O-group witness is mixed — G and 376 have ἐπί while 58 and 426 do not. In summary, the asterisk in G is possibly correct.

Num 35:6

HT (אַמָּה דְּעַרְיֹים אֵשֶׁר)
LXX (καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἔς)
**Num 35:8**

**Sub ※ + ἃς**

*Notes:* The beginning of verse 6 presents an ambiguity in HT. It has a direct object marked by אֵת (וְאֵת הֶעָרִים) but the verb is not evident. HT reads וְאֵת הֶעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לַלְוִיִּם אֵת שֵׁשׁ־עָרֵי הַמִּקְלָט אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לָנֻס שָׁמָּה הָרֹצֵח ("And the cities which you shall give to the Levites, six cities of refuge which you shall give the manslayer to flee to there"). NUM renders both instances of אֲשֶׁר literally using ἃς, but some early manuscripts dropped the instance of ἃς in the phrase τὰς πόλεις ἃς δώσετε (including B V 963), and this allowed the sentence to read more coherently (with τὰς πόλεις as the direct object of δώσετε). Apparently Origen had a version of NUM that omitted the first ἃς, and so he added it under the asterisk to match אֲשֶׁר. Although the asterisk is in the o’ text, and Origen was correct to add the asterisk based on his parent text, because NUM originally had ἃς, the asterisked addition does not represent a minus in NUM.

The asterisk tradition is somewhat confused for this verse. G* has the asterisk around καὶ τὰς in the phrase καὶ τὰς πόλεις which precedes ἃς, and Syh has the asterisk around καὶ τὰς πόλεις. Gc, however, has the asterisk placed correctly.

**Wit 2:** A F M’ O’82 C’62 d n(–57) s t z 407 55 59 424 624 646 799 Syh

**Attr:** ※ G Syh] > rell

**NonGr:** Syh ἃς

**Notes:**

**Num 35:8**

**Sub ※ pr δώσετε**

*Notes:* HT repeats the verb תִּתְּנוּ three times in verse 6, the third time in the phrase תִּתְּנוּ אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁתַּיִם עִיר. NUM has no equivalent for the third instance of the verb, omitting it through an ellipsis. Origen added a third δώσετε under the asterisk to match the Hebrew.
HT  עָרָיו
LXX  πόλεων

Sub ※ + αὐτοῦ

Wit 2:  $O^{−58} \downarrow Co = MT$
Attr:  ※ Gj > rell
Var:  αὐτοῦ| eorum Co

Notes: HT adds a pronominal suffix to the final instance of “cities” (עָרָיו) in verse 8. NUM omits this, and Origen adds the equivalent αὐτοῦ under the asterisk.

Num 35:10
HT  כִּי (אַתֶּם
LXX  ὑ*εῖς

Sub ※ pr ὅτι

Wit 2:  $O^{−58}−15 b d n^{−767} t \downarrow Syh = MT$
Attr:  ※ Gj ∨ Syh; > rell
NonGr:  Syh ❌

Notes: This is similar to the situation in 33:51 and 34:2. The Lord commands Moses to speak to the sons of Israel and HT introduces what Moses is to say using כִּי as a marker of direct discourse. The equivalent recitative ὅτι is not required in Greek, and NUM omits it, but Origen adds ὅτι under the asterisk to represent כִּי. Syh has used an obelus sign instead of an asterisk, but this is clearly incorrect. In 33:51 and 34:2, Syh has the identical phrase and sign placement except that asterisks are used.

Num 35:11
HT  ἦκρίςατε
LXX  διαστέλειτε

(οἱ λ’) ἀφορίσατε
Notes: HT begins verse 11 with the Hiphil of קרא which in the Qal means “encounter/meet.” The hiphil is used elsewhere only in Genesis 24:12 and 27:20 in contexts where it means “cause to happen” or “succeed.” In the present verse, the idea is clearly of selecting (i.e., cities of refuge) and NUM translates contextually with διαστελεῖτε (“divide/set apart”). An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts gives the alternate rendering ἀφορίσατε (“mark off,” “separate,” or “set apart”).

We have little data to indicate how the Three might render the Hiphil of קרא. For the Qal, Symmachus and Theodotion employ ἀπαντάω (‘meet/encounter’, σ’: Eccl 2:14; θ’: Dan 10:14). For the Niphal, Symmachus uses φαίνω in Numbers 23:11 where the sense is God making something to happen. As for the verb ἀφορίζω from the present reading, all of the Three use it, although not for קרא. Aquila uses a participial form in Numbers 6:18 to refer to the Nazirite (נזר) who has been separated to God, as do both Aquila and Symmachus in Judges 13:5. Aquila employs ἀφορίζω (retroverted from Syriac) for נזר in its sense of separating oneself or abstaining in Zechariah 7:3. Symmachus uses the verb for נדה in the sense of “separating” in Amos 6:3, and Theodotion does similarly for בדל in Isaiah 56:3. Thus, the ways that the Three use ἀφορίζω are possibly consistent with the use of קרא in the present verse in the sense of selecting. It is possible that any of the Three is the source of this reading, but the data is scanty.

HT (צְרוּר)  צְרוּר
LXX (πόλεις)  πόλεις

Sub ※ + πόλεις

Notes: In HT, God commands the people through Moses to select “cities as cities of refuge (עָרֵי מִקְלָט). NUM translates this aptly with πόλεις φυγαδευτήρια, where φυγαδευτήρια renders עָרִים עָרֵי מִקְלָט. Origen added a second πόλεις under the asterisk in a somewhat mechanical attempt to keep a quantitative correspondence with the Hebrew, although he does not change φυγαδευτήρια to the genitive which its relationship with the added πόλεις would seem to demand (NGTN 589).

HT (πᾶς)  πᾶς (ὁ πατάξας)
LXX πᾶς (ὁ πατάξας)
Notes: NUM says of the cities: “places of refuge they will be to you (for) the manslayer to flee there, everyone (πᾶς) who has killed a soul unintentionally.” HT does not have an equivalent for πᾶς and Origen placed it under the obelus. Syh has the obelus correctly placed but is missing a metobelus.

Num 35:12

HT
Luke 35:12

LXX αἱ πόλεις ὑ*ῖν

non tr ὑ*ῖν αἱ πόλεις

Notes: This is the opposite of the situation in verse 3. The phrase in HT is לָכֶם הֶעָרִים, and NUM transposes αὐτοῖς before αἱ πόλεις. For the present verse, HT has reversed the order with לָכֶם הֶעָרִים, but NUM transposes these by placing ὑ*ῖν after αἱ πόλεις. The O-group and Syh transpose ὑ*ῖν to before αἱ πόλεις to match the Hebrew order, and this is likely due to Origen’s work. It is reflected in several other manuscripts.

HT Luke 35:12

LXX τὸ αἷς (ἀγχιστεύοντος)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh
Num 35:15[14]

HT  יִנְהֵר (מִקְלָט עָרֵי)
LXX  (φυγάδιον)

Sub ※  pr πόλεις

Wit 2:  ↓O−58 Arab Syh = MT

Attr:  ※ G] > rell

Var:  πόλεις] πόλις G

NonGr:  Syh אֶסְפִּיטָא

Notes:  The last three words in verse 14 in HT (יִנְהֵר (מִקְלָט עָרֵי)) appear in NUM as the first two words of verse 15. Similar to verses 6, 11, 12, and 13, NUM renders the phrase יִנְהֵר (מִקְלָט עָרֵי) with a single word — here φυγάδιον (in the other verses it is φυγάδευτήρια; Wevers thinks the variation is intentional, see NGTN 590-91). Similar to verse 11, Origen (1) adds πόλεις under the asterisk to maintain quantitative correspondence with the Hebrew, and (2) does not change φυγάδιον to genitive, which its new position after πόλεις would dictate.
Notes: The last three words in verse 14 in HT correspond to the first two words of verse 15 in NUM. For NUM has φυγάδιον ἔσται ("it will be a refuge"), and most Greek manuscripts, including the s-group, agree with the singular ἔσται in NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text has the plural ἔσονται which agrees with the plural תִּהְיֶינָה, and this is confirmed by the O-group (minus 58). 344 also attributes ἔσονται to oi λ’, and this makes sense since it agrees with the Hebrew.

Num 35:15

HT

LXX

Notes: HT says that these six (שֵׁשׁ) cities are for refuge. NUM does not render שֵׁשׁ and Origen added the equivalent ἕξ, perhaps under the asterisk. This is witnessed by the O-group and Syh and is reflected in several other manuscripts.

Num 35:18

HT

LXX

Notes: The last three words in verse 14 in HT correspond to the first two words of verse 15 in NUM. For NUM has φυγάδιον ἔσται ("it will be a refuge"), and most Greek manuscripts, including the s-group, agree with the singular ἔσται in NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text has the plural ἔσονται which agrees with the plural תִּהְיֶינָה, and this is confirmed by the O-group (minus 58). 344 also attributes ἔσονται to oi λ’, and this makes sense since it agrees with the Hebrew.

Notes: The last three words in verse 14 in HT (תִּהְיֶינָה מִקְלָט עָרֵי) correspond to the first two words of verse 15 in NUM. For NUM has φυγάδιον ἔσται ("it will be a refuge"), and most Greek manuscripts, including the s-group, agree with the singular ἔσται in NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text has the plural ἔσονται which agrees with the plural תִּהְיֶינָה, and this is confirmed by the O-group (minus 58). 344 also attributes ἔσονται to oi λ’, and this makes sense since it agrees with the Hebrew.

Num 35:15

HT

LXX

Notes: HT says that these six (שֵׁשׁ) cities are for refuge. NUM does not render שֵׁשׁ and Origen added the equivalent ἕξ, perhaps under the asterisk. This is witnessed by the O-group and Syh and is reflected in several other manuscripts.

Num 35:18

HT

LXX

Notes: The last three words in verse 14 in HT (תִּהְיֶינָה מִקְלָט עָרֵי) correspond to the first two words of verse 15 in NUM. For NUM has φυγάδιον ἔσται ("it will be a refuge"), and most Greek manuscripts, including the s-group, agree with the singular ἔσται in NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text has the plural ἔσονται which agrees with the plural תִּהְיֶינָה, and this is confirmed by the O-group (minus 58). 344 also attributes ἔσονται to oi λ’, and this makes sense since it agrees with the Hebrew.

Notes: The last three words in verse 14 in HT (תִּהְיֶינָה מִקְלָט עָרֵי) correspond to the first two words of verse 15 in NUM. For NUM has φυγάδιον ἔσται ("it will be a refuge"), and most Greek manuscripts, including the s-group, agree with the singular ἔσται in NUM. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the o’ text has the plural ἔσονται which agrees with the plural תִּהְיֶינָה, and this is confirmed by the O-group (minus 58). 344 also attributes ἔσονται to oi λ’, and this makes sense since it agrees with the Hebrew.
Although NUM matches the Hebrew בּו with ἐν αὐτῷ in the phrase ἀποθανεῖται ἐν αὐτῷ πατάξῃ, a majority of the Greek manuscripts, including M and the s-group, omit it. A 344 (s-group) note indicates that the ο′ text included ἐν αὐτῷ and this is supported by the O-group and Syh, and is reflected in a number of other manuscripts. 344 also attributes ἀποθανεῖται ἐν αὐτῷ πατάξῃ to α′ and θ′. Aquila and Symmachus use ἄποθνήσκω for מות (e.g., Isa 65:20) and they both render the Hiphil of נכה using forms of πατάσσω (e.g., α′: Gen 36:35, Ezek 32:15; θ′: Jer 48[41]:16). Since ἐν αὐτῷ matches the Hebrew, the attributions make good sense.

HT

LXX

ο′ οἱ λ′ θανατούσθω

Notes: NUM renders יומת (Hophal of מות) in HT as a form of θανατούσθω, which is the common NUM rendering in chapter 35 (e.g., verses 16, 17, 21, 31; also 15:35). Elsewhere, however, NUM uses a form of ἀποθνήσκω for יומת (1:51, 3:10, 38, 18:7). For the present verse, a large number of manuscripts have the alternate ἀποθανεῖται, including M and the s-group. Manuscript 344 (s-group) indicates that the ο′ text matches NUM with θανατούσθω and this is supported by the O-group (minus 58) and other hexaplaric manuscripts. 344 also attributes the reading to οἱ λ′. This makes sense, since Aquila and Symmachus use θανατόω for the Hophal of מות in Numbers 3:38 and all three translators use it for the Hiphil (e.g., α′: Num 16:41[17:6], 3 Kgdms 13:26; σ′: Jer 48[41]:8; θ′: Num 16:41[17:6], 1 Kgdms 17:50, 3 Kgdms 13:26).

As with NUM, Aquila and Symmachus vary their renderings of the Hophal of מות, using both θανατόω and ἄποθνήσκω. For example, in Numbers 3:10, they render יומת as ἀποθανέτω, but in 3:38 they render it as θανατούσθησται. This may be a stylistic choice.

Num 35:20

HT

LXX πᾶν σκεῦος

(Sub ÷)
Num 35:21

**HT**

וֹ (בְיָד)

**LXX**

(τῇ χειρί)

⟨Sub ※⟩ + αὐτοῦ

**Notes:** The Hebrew בְיָדוֹ is rendered by NUM as τῇ χειρί, with nothing corresponding to the pronominal suffix. The O-group (minus 58) adds the equivalent αὐτοῦ and this is also witnessed by Syh. This addition is probably Origen’s work, and it may originally have been under the asterisk.
finite verb pair literally: θανάτῳ θανατούσθω ὁ πατάξας. HT and NUM then both say that the man is a murderer, but NUM adds the phrase θανάτῳ θανατουσθῳ ὁ φονεύων, which is a copy of the previous phrase except that the subject is ὁ φονεύων. This addition is not in the underlying Hebrew, and Origen correctly places it under the obelus. Several manuscripts witness negatively to the obelus, including the uncial V.

**Num 35:22**

HT  ἐξάπινα
LXX  ἐξάπινα

ο’ α’ θ’  ἐξάπινα

_Wit 1:_ 344

_Wit 2:_ ἐξάπινα B M’ V O^{58-82} d 129 n^{127} t ↓x 319 Cyr VII 625 ἐξαπίνης (c var) A F K 58-οφ^{82} C^{58-57} b f^{129} s y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799 Cyr I 581

_Var:_ ἐξάπινα –πεινα 527;

σ’ ἀνεπιτηδεύτως

_Wit 1:_ 344

**Notes:** In verse 22, HT begins a list of conditions regarding accidental deaths, and the first concerns a man who pushes another “suddenly” (בְּפֶתַע). NUM renders this ἐξάπινα, and every Greek manuscript (with minor variants) agrees with this or with its variant ἐξαπίνης. The O-group (minus 58) and many other manuscripts (including the uncials B M V) have ἐξάπινα. The s-group has ἐξαπίνης, and s-group manuscript 344 indicates that the o’ text has ἐξάπινα, which is supported by the O-group. 344 also attributes ἐξάπινα to Aquila and Theodotion. Other than this verse, neither Aquila nor Theodotion are known to use ἐξάπινα (or ἐξαπίνης or another by-form, ἐξαπίνης). But they may be copying NUM, and no other reason exists to doubt this attribution. 344 also has the reading ἀνεπιτηδεύτως (“without care/design”) attributed to Symmachus. Symmachus employs ἐξαπίνης for the related word פִּתְאֹם (e.g., Job 22:10, Isa 29:5) and might be expected to use ἐξαπίνης or a synonym here for פִּתְאֹם. Possibly, however, Symmachus is rendering contextually with the sense of “unintentionally” rather than suddenly. Such a contextual rendering is consistent with Symmachus, but this is the only place where ἀνεπιτηδεύτως is attributed to Symmachus (it is also not used by the LXX or by either of the other translators). Although the evidence is scanty, the attribution to Symmachus is possibly correct.
Num 35:23

HT אֵשׁ בְכָל־אֶבֶן
LXX ἢ παντὶ λίθῳ

ο’ οἱ λ’ ἢ ἐν παντὶ λίθῳ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: O\(^{-58}\) b 407-630 Cyr VII 625 (sed hab I 581 Compl)

Notes: The phrase בְכָל־אֶבֶן in HT is rendered by NUM using the instrumental dative παντὶ λίθῳ, which adequately represents the beth preposition. The O-group (minus 58) indicates that Origen added ἐν to correspond to the beth preposition. The s-group agrees with NUM, and manuscript 344 from the s-group attributes the addition of ἐν to the ο’ text which is probably correct. The 344 note also attributes the added ἐν to οἱ λ’. This makes sense for Aquila and Theodotion, and although Symmachus is not as bound to quantitative renderings as Aquila, nothing would prevent him from using ἐν here.

HT אֵשׁ בְכָל־אֶבֶן
LXX κακοποιῆσαι

ο’ κακοποιῆσαι

Wit 1: ↓85′-↓321′-344

Wit 2: A B F M’ V O\(^{14}\) b d f n t x y z 55 59 319 424 624 646 799

Attr: ο’] > 85′-321′

Notes: A number of witnesses, including the s-group, have the variant κακῶσαι instead of κακοποιῆσαι in NUM. A marginal note in three s-group manuscripts indicates that the ο’ text matches NUM with κακοποιῆσαι, and this is supported by all of the hexaplaric witnesses.

Num 35:25

HT רִ י נֶאֶל מֶה (נֶאֶל לֶהַמֶּר)
LXX (τοῦ ἀγχιστεύοντος τὸ αἷμα)
Sub ※ pr χειρός

Wit 2: O⁻⁵⁸ 767 Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh ας

Notes: HT says that the congregation will deliver the manslayer from “the hand of the avenger of blood” (יַד גֹּאֵל הַדָּם) and NUM renders the phrase as τοῦ ἀγχιστεύοντος τὸ αἷμα, thus ignoring יַד. Origen adds the equivalent χειρός under the asterisk as witnessed by the O-group (minus 58).

HT שָׁמָּה (בֵּן)
LXX (κατέφυγεν)

Sub ※ + ἐκεῖ

Wit 2: O⁻⁵⁸ Syh = MT
Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell
NonGr: Syh ας

Notes: HT says that the manslayer will be restored to the city “which he fled to there,” or “to which he fled” (אֲשֶׁר־נָס שָׁמָּה). NUM does not render שָׁמָּה and Origen adds ἐκεῖ under the asterisk. In verse 26, HT has a similar phrase and there NUM renders שָׁמָּה with ἐκεῖ.

The asterisk sign in Syh is mostly obliterated, but the remaining marks are consistent with an asterisk and it appears in the right place. Also, a metobelus follows in the correct place.

Num 35:26

HT מִקְלָטוֹ (עִיר)
LXX (πόλεως)

Sub ※ + φυγαδευτήριον αὐτοῦ

Wit 2: O⁻⁵⁸-15 Aeth M Arab Syh = MT
Notes: HT describes the city to which the manslayer has fled as יִירָה מִקְלָטוֹ. NUM has no equivalent for מִקְלָטוֹ, perhaps assuming that since the man has fled there, it is understood to be a city of refuge. Origen added the equivalent φυγαδευτήριου αὐτοῦ under the asterisk.

**Num 35:27**

| HT | יָרֵא לְלַ ת(א) | (אֵין) לְלַ ת | (οὐκ) ἐνοχός ἐστίν |
| LXX | (οὐκ) ἐνοχός ἐστίν |

**non tr** ἐστίν ἐνοχός

**Wit 2:** O⁵⁸ Syh

**NonGr:** Syh σημεῖα, στασίαν ἐστὶ

Notes: At the end of verse 27, HT has יָרֵא לְלַ ת (literally “there is not to him blood [guilt]”). NUM renders this aptly with οὐκ ἐνοχός ἐστίν. Origen attempted to match the Hebrew order by transposing ἐνοχός to the end of the phrase.

**Num 35:28**

| HT | מִקְלָט(א) |
| LXX | (καταφυγῆς) |

(Sub ※) + αὐτοῦ

**Wit 2:** A F K M' O⁴⁸-⁸² C⁴-⁶⁷⁷ b d¹⁰⁶ f¹²⁹ 75 s y z⁴⁰⁷ ⁶³⁰ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁹ ⁴²⁴ ⁶²⁴ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁷⁹⁹ Syh = MT

**Attr:** ※] > omnes

**NonGr:** Syh σημεῖα

Notes: HT says that the manslayer should have stayed in the city of “his refuge” מִקְלָט(א). NUM fails to render the pronominal suffix, and the o’ text adds αὐτοῦ, perhaps originally under the asterisk. A majority of Greek manuscripts also have αὐτοῦ, which may have been added prior to Origen under the influence of verse 27 (NGTN 596-
Thus it is not clear if Origen introduced this change or if it was already available to him in one of his exemplars. This same situation occurs again in verse 32.

**Num 35:30**

**HT**

כּ (ערְשָׂו)

**LXX**

(μαρτύρων)

**Sub ※ pr στόματος**

**Wit 1:**

130-321′

**Wit 2:**

O\(^58\)-15 Arab Syh = MT

**Attr:**

※ G Syh] > rell

**NonGr:**

Syh ܐophys ܠPhys ※

**Notes:**

HT has לְפִי עֵדִים to describe a prerequisite for putting a man to death. NUM renders this phrase as διὰ μαρτύρων and Origen inserts στόματος under the asterisk to match the Hebrew that NUM omits. This is witnessed by the \(O\)-group (minus 58) and Syh. Syh\(\text{T}\) places the lemnisk over the *dalath* particle that begins the next word (“witnesses”). This may be because μαρτύρων, although technically still genitive, is now functioning as a possessive in its new position after στόματος, and the *dalath* particle expresses this newly added possessive sense.

**HT**

כּ תֵרָם הרַכֵּה אָתַרְהָה

**LXX**

διὰ μαρτύρων φονεύσεις τὸν φονεύσαντα

\(\langle θ' θ'\rangle\) ἐπὶ ρήματι μαρτύρων φονευθῆσεται ὁ φονεύσας

**Wit 1:**

130-321′

**Notes:**

Regarding someone who kills another person, the Hebrew says, “by the mouth of witnesses he shall put him to death.” It is not clear who the singular subject of יִרְצַח is (i.e., the one who will perform the execution). NUM renders יִרְצַח using the second person φονεύσεις which introduces the problem of the identity of the singular “you.” An unattributed note from \(s\)-group manuscripts 130-321′ makes two stylistic changes to the NUM rendering. First, it supplies ρήματι as an equivalent to יֵרַצְח which NUM omits. This is a more contextual rendering than Origen’s literal στόματα added
under the asterisk (see above). Second, it uses indirection to avoid the issue of who actually performs the judicial killing by changing the verb to passive and making the murderer the subject — \( \thetaονευθησεται \ \ο\ \φονευσας \) ("the murderer will be killed").

Aquila is not a likely candidate for this reading for at least three reasons. First, he consistently renders \( \text{umno} \) using \( \sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\alpha \). Thus, one would expect him to render \( \text{umno} \) in this verse as Origen did, with \( \sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\alpha\tau\omicron\alpha \). Secondly, Aquila is consistent in using \( \rho\eta\mu\alpha \) for \( \text{umno} \). Finally, Aquila is not likely to have rendered an active verb with a passive equivalent (Aquila’s normal pattern is active for active, although there are occasional exceptions: see REI-Pro 40-42).

Symmachus and Theodotion are not known in Greek sources to have used \( \phiονευω \), although Symmachus possibly used the related noun \( \phiονευς \) (or \( \phiονευτης \)) in Hosea 5:13 as a translation of the proper name Ιαρί*. Either one of these translators, however, could have copied the NUM use of \( \phiονευω \) here. Symmachus is probably the most likely candidate for this rendering, since it accounts for the Hebrew better than NUM but takes some translation liberties based on the context. But Theodotion is also conceivably the source.

**Num 35:31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>הוהי בושיי</td>
<td>ενοχου ωντος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ενοχου ωντος</td>
<td>ενοχου ωντος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non tr</td>
<td>ωντος ενοχου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The Hebrew phrase \( \text{אשֶׁר-הוּא בושִׁי} \) may be translated, “who is guilty (enough) to die,” and this is how NUM takes it, rendering the phrase \( \tauου ενοχου ωντος \) \( \alpha\nu\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\theta\eta\gamma\alpha \). Origen transposed \( \omegaντος \) before \( \epsilonνοχου \) to match the Hebrew order, as evidenced by the \( O \)-group (minus 58) and Syh.

**Num 35:32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>( \text{ου})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>( \text{ου})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ pr καί**

**Notes:**
Notes: Although Origen does not usually correct mismatches between conjunctions in HT and LXX, occasionally he will use an obelus to mark a καί not matched in HT (e.g., 19:14), or add καί when NUM has no equivalent for a Hebrew waw (e.g., 23:3, 28:12, 33:3). For the present verse, HT opens with a standard we-x-qatal form, but NUM begins the sentence asyndetically. Origen adds καί under the asterisk to match the Hebrew conjunction.

\[
\text{HT} \quad (מִקְלָט)
\]
\[
\text{LXX} \quad (τῶν φυγαδευτηρίων)
\]

\[\langle \text{Sub} \quad ⋆ \rangle \quad + \alpha'τοῦ\]

Notes: This is similar to the situation in verse 28, where the Hebrew מִקָלָטוֹ is rendered by NUM without a possessive. Similarly, NUM uses φυγαδευτηρίων here without a possessive. Here also, as in verse 28, Origen adds the equivalent α'τοῦ to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group. This may originally have been under the asterisk.

\[
\text{HT} \quad (דָּהַן)
\]
\[
\text{LXX} \quad (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ *έγας) \; ὁ μέγας
\]

Sub ÷

Notes: Although Origen does not usually correct mismatches between conjunctions in HT and LXX, occasionally he will use an obelus to mark a καί not matched in HT (e.g., 19:14), or add καί when NUM has no equivalent for a Hebrew waw (e.g., 23:3, 28:12, 33:3). For the present verse, HT opens with a standard we-x-qatal form, but NUM begins the sentence asyndetically. Origen adds καί under the asterisk to match the Hebrew conjunction.

\[
\text{HT} \quad (מִקְלָט)
\]
\[
\text{LXX} \quad (τῶν φυγαδευτηρίων)
\]

\[\langle \text{Sub} \quad ⋆ \rangle \quad + \alpha'τοῦ\]

Notes: This is similar to the situation in verse 28, where the Hebrew מִקָלָטוֹ is rendered by NUM without a possessive. Similarly, NUM uses φυγαδευτηρίων here without a possessive. Here also, as in verse 28, Origen adds the equivalent α'τοῦ to match the Hebrew, as witnessed by the O-group. This may originally have been under the asterisk.

\[
\text{HT} \quad (דָּהַן)
\]
\[
\text{LXX} \quad (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ *έγας) \; ὁ μέγας
\]
Notes: The manslayer who has fled to a city of refuge must live there until the death of “the priest,” who is understood in light of verses 25 and 28 to be “the high priest” (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדֹל). In the present verse, הַכֹּהֵן appears without הַגָּדֹל but NUM renders as it did in verses 25 and 28: ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας. Origen correctly places ὁ μέγας under the obelus since it has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew. Sam has הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדֹל for the present verse, and this may have influenced NUM.

Num 35:33

| HT          | אֶתְכִּם לָאָרֶץ לֹא־יְכֻפַּר |
| LXX         | εἰς ἣν ὑεῖς κατοικεῖτε |

〈Sub ※〉 ἐπ’ αὐτῆς

Wit 2: A F M’ ↓ O’G 381’ 426 C’(−57) b d f 129 n s t y z 407 630 55 59 424 624 646 799

Attr: ※] > omnes

Var: ἐπ’ αὐτῆς] ἐπ’ αὐτή 72; ἐν αὐτή 376

Notes: HT says that the people are not to pollute the land “into which they are entering” (הָאָרֶץ לֹא־יְכֻפַּר). NUM renders here in harmony with verse 34 and 33:55 where HT has יכִּם לָאָרֶץ לֹא־יְכֻפַּר, and thus NUM has εἰς ἣν ὑεῖς κατοικεῖτε. A majority of Greek manuscripts, including 58 and 376 from the O-group, add ἐπ’ αὐτῆς. This may be evidence of an Origenic addition to account for יכִּם (so Wevers, NGTN 599) and if so, it may originally have been under the asterisk. Arguing for this being Origen’s work is first, the witness of O-group manuscripts 58 and 376. Second, ἐπ’ αὐτῆς matches יכִּם quantitatively, which is often a concern for Origen (see e.g., 32:1 and 35:32). Three factors argue against the presence of ἐπ’ αὐτῆς in the o’ text. First, the Hebrew יכִּם is adequately rendered by εἰς ἣν ὑεῖς without the added κατοικεῖτε (an obelus would be more appropriate for κατοικεῖτε). Second, O-group manuscripts G and 426 do not have the addition nor does Syh. Third, this addition could be a result of the influence of verse 34, where NUM has the very similar phrase: ἐφ’ ἣς κατοικεῖτε ἐπ’ αὐτῆς. In conclusion, the witness of 58 and 376 indicates the possibility that ἐπ’ αὐτῆς is original to the o’ text, but some doubt remains.

| HT          | לָאָרֶץ לֹא־יְכֻפַּר |
| LXX         | οὐκ ἐξιλασθῆσεται ἡ γῆ |

non tr ἡ γῆ οὐκ ἐξιλασθῆσεται
Wit 2: \(O^{58}\) Syh = MT

NonGr: Syh אבש ה אבש ג אבש

Notes: HT reads, לָאָרֶץ לֹא־יְכֻפַּר (“the land will not be atoned [for]”) and NUM renders this literally as οὐκ ἐξιλασθῆσεται η γῆ. Origen transposed οὐκ ἐξιλασθῆσεται after η γῆ to match the Hebrew word order, as witnessed by the \(O\)-group (minus 58) and Syh.

HT

LXX ἀπὸ τοῦ σάματος

\(O'\) ὑπό

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: G-426

\(σ'\) περί

Wit 1: ↓130-↓321' 344

Wit 2: \(\mathrm{FF}^b\) 58-376-\(\mathrm{oll}\) \(\mathrm{s}\) 59 \(\mathrm{Lat}\) cod 100

Attr: \(σ'\) > 130-321'

NonGr: \(\mathrm{Lat}\) cod 100 pro

Notes: HT says that expiation cannot be made “for the blood (לָאָרֶץ)" which is shed, and NUM renders ἀπὸ τοῦ σάματος which in conjunction with the verb ἐξιλάσκομαι (“propitiate”) gives the accurate idea of the land being propitiated “from” (ἀπὸ) the blood. In NUM, other than this verse, περί is always used with ἐξιλάσκομαι in the sense of atonement being made “for” a person or group (5:8, 6:11, 8:12, 19, 21, 15:25, 15:28[2x], 17:11, 12, 25:13, 28:22, 30, 29:5, 11, 31:50). But the idea of being propitiated “from” something is found with ἐξιλάσκομαι in Leviticus 16:16, where ἀπὸ is also used (although the default with ἐξιλάσκομαι in Leviticus is also περί).

The \(s\)-group text has ἀπὸ and \(s\)-group manuscript 344 notes that the \(o'\) text has ὑπό. This is witnessed by two \(O\)-group manuscripts, G and 426. This is possibly an indication of Origen’s work, although ὑπό is unusual with ἐξιλάσκομαι. Another \(s\)-group note attributes the reading περί to Symmachus, and since περί is commonly used with ἐξιλάσκομαι this is reasonable.
Notes: In HT, the Lord explains that no atonement can be made for the blood shed on the land “except by the blood of the one who shed it” (כִּי־אִם בְּדַם שֹׁפְכוֹ). NUM renders this as ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ αἵ*ατος τοῦ ἐκχέοντος. The beth preposition in בְּדַם is instrumental, and the NUM rendering as ἐπὶ plus the genitive is unusual for an instrumental sense (e.g., in Lev 14:52, the instrumental use of בְּדַם is rendered ἐν τῷ αἵ*ατι; cf. Lam 4:14, and see NGTN 599), although NUM uses ἐπὶ with the dative for instrumental beth in 13:23. In addition, NUM does not render the pronominal suffix in שֹׁפְכו (Origen adds the equivalent — see below).

An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts has the alternate rendering πλὴν ἐν αἵ*αματι τοῦ ἐκχύσαντος αὐτο which uses the more expected ἐν αἵ*αματι for instrumental בְּדַם and adds αὐτο to account for the pronoun that NUM omits. Aquila would be a likely candidate to make both of these corrections toward the Hebrew, first because he tends to render the beth preposition consistently with ἐν, and because he would translate the final pronominal suffix. Nothing in this reading precludes the other translators, however. All of the Three employ ἐκχέω for שָׁפַך (e.g., all three at Isa 37:33).
Notes: As mentioned above, NUM has no equivalent for the pronominal suffix on שֹׁפְכוּ. Origen added the equivalent αὐτό, as witnessed by the O-group and Syh, and this possibly was originally under the asterisk.

Num 35:34

HT (יֹשְׁבִים) אַתֶּם
LXX (κατοικεῖτε)

⟨Sub ※⟩ pr ὑ*εῖς

Wit 2: O 121 Lat cod 100 Syh = MT

Attr: ※] > omnes

NonGr: Lat cod 100 uos | Syh ❮566❯

Notes: Because HT uses the participle יֹשְׁבִים it also has the explicit pronoun אַתֶּם accompanying it. NUM uses the finite verb κατοικεῖτε and does not have the pronoun, but Origen adds the equivalent ὑ*εῖς to match the Hebrew quantitatively. This change may originally have been under the asterisk.

Numbers 36

Num 36:1

HT (رأَا) רָאָשֵׁי הָאָבוֹ (וּתְוֹנְ) πατְרִיְו
LXX (οἱ ἄρχοντες) (oi ἄρχοντες)

⟨Sub ※⟩ + τῶν πατριῶν

Wit 2: O = MT

Attr: ※] > omnes

Notes: HT reads, “the heads of the fathers (רָאָשֵׁי הָאָבוֹ) for the tribes of the sons of Gilead gathered” which NUM renders without accounting for רָאָשֵׁי הָאָבוֹ (although later in the verse in the same Hebrew phrase, NUM does render רָאָשֵׁי הָאָבוֹ). Origen added the equivalent τῶν πατριῶν, as witnessed by the O-group, and this may originally have been under the asterisk. Interestingly, Syh does not have this addition.
HT
LXX καὶ ἔναντι Ελεαζαρ τοῦ ἱερέως

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> 426 = MT

NonGr: Syh ☐ ☐ ☐

Notes: HT says the heads of fathers’ households came and spoke “before Moses and before the leaders, the heads of the fathers for the sons of Gilead.” Thus, two parties are mentioned. NUM adds a third: καὶ ἔναντι Ελεαζαρ τοῦ ἱερέως. This was probably taken from 27:2, where the daughters of Zelophehad (who are the subject of the present passage) come before Moses, Eleazar, and the leaders of the congregation. Origen placed the added text under the obelus.

As sometimes happens, Syh added an extra obelus symbol. The first obelus is placed correctly; a second obelus is in the margin, which is customary when an obelized phrase continues on another line; and a third spurious obelus appears before the final word in the phrase. The metobelus is correctly placed.

Num 36:2

HT נ(יהו)
LXX (κυρίῳ 2º)

⟨Sub ※⟩ + μου

Wit 2: 6(-376) 246 126-128-669 Syh = MT

Attr: ※] > omnes

NonGr: Syh ☐ ☐ ☐

Notes: The first instance of נ(יהו) in verse 2 is rendered by NUM as κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. For the second, NUM does not include a pronoun, and Origen adds the equivalent μου which may originally have been under the asterisk.
Num 36:3

HT
מִבְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי (שבט)

LXX
(τῶν φυλῶν)

Sub ※ pr τῶν υἱῶν

Wit 2: G 426 = MT

Attr: ※ G| > rell

Notes: HT reads, וְהָיוּ לְאֶחָד מִבְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְנָשִׁים (“And [if] they are to one from the sons of the tribes of the sons of Israel for a wife…” NUM renders בְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי as ένι τῶν φυλῶν, thus omitting the first בְּנֵי in the phrase, probably since “one from the tribe” is clearly understood to be “one from the sons of the tribe.” Origen added τῶν υἱῶν under the asterisk to match the Hebrew. The resulting ο’ text equivalent for קֹlamaֹהַּ מִבְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי is thus ένι τῶν υἱῶν τῶν φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

HT
מִבְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי (שבט)

LXX
(τῶν φυλῶν) υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ

{Sub ※} pr τῶν

Wit 2: 29-82-376 551 44-125'-610' 54' 76* 55 319 799 Syh = Ald

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ܐُ ܬ)

Notes: HT has a four-member construct phrase: מִבְּנֵי שִׁבְטֵי, which NUM renders τῶν φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. As discussed above, Origen added τῶν υἱῶν under the asterisk to account for the first instance of בְּנֵי, which is lacking in NUM. Syh does not have the equivalent of Origen’s added τῶν υἱῶν before τῶν φυλῶν but it does have an asterisk surrounding the particle daleth before υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. Wevers’ first apparatus construes this as meaning that Syh is reflecting an added Origenic τῶν before υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. Together with the asterisked addition of τῶν υἱῶν at the beginning of the phrase, this implies that the ο’ text has: τῶν υἱῶν τῶν φυλῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

This asterisk is probably not original to the ο’ text. First, the asterisk in Syh marks a daleth preposition before the word “sons” (אִשָּׁה). But Syh routinely adds a daleth when translating words in the genitive without the article (see e.g., the ο’ entry under
32:28, where *dalath* is used for *τῶν Ἰσραήλ* with no article, and the *o’* entry at 34:20). So the *daleth* does not necessarily reflect an instance of *τῶν* in the Greek. Second, three of four *O*-group manuscripts — including G and 426 which reflect the asterisk a few words before — do not witness to the added *τῶν* (although some other manuscripts do). The reasons that Syh added an asterisk here and that it is missing the previous Origenic addition are not clear.

**Num 36:4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יַהְבַּל</td>
<td>ἡ ἄφεσις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>o’ θ’</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡ ἄφεσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wit 1</em>:</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>α’</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ παραφέρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wit 1</em>:</td>
<td>108 Syh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>σ’</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ Ἰωβήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wit 1</em>:</td>
<td>108 Syh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NonGr*: Syh ἀφαίρεσις

*Notes*: For יַהְבַּל in HT, NUM has ἡ ἄφεσις. This is the only place where יַהְבַּל appears in Numbers, but here, as for 20 times in Leviticus, the word refers to the jubilee year and is rendered as ἄφεσις. For the present verse, many manuscripts, including the *s*-group, have the alternate ἄφασις (perhaps through the influence of the verb ἄφαιρεσις later in the verse). Manuscript 344 from the *s*-group indicates that the *o’* text agrees with NUM and has ἄφεσις. This is witnessed by the *O*-group (minus 58). The note also attributes ἄφεσις to Theodotion, who uses the word, but not for יַהְבַּל (he uses it for ἀφαίρεσις in Isa 8:7, Ezek 34:13). For יַהְבַּל, Theodotion employs the transliteration
ἰωβήλ in Leviticus 25:13, but Theodotion may have chosen to follow the LXX here, and so the attribution is probably correct.

A note from 108 attributed to Aquila has ὁ παραφέρων for ἡ ὡτήλ in Leviticus 25:10 in an identical context. This makes sense, as Aquila also renders ὡτήλ with the participle of παραφέρω in Leviticus 25:10 in an identical context. Manuscript 108 and Syh indicate that Symmachus has transliterated ὡτήλ to give ὁ Ἰωβήλ (Syh also has a marginal reading in Greek — ΟἰωΒΗλ — that confirms 108). This attribution makes sense, as Symmachus does transliterate names sometimes, although Aquila and Theodotion do so more often (REI-Pro 20, 77). Salvesen speculates that if ὡτήλ was still in use in its Hebrew or Aramaic form in Symmachus’ time, Symmachus would not see a need to translate (SITP 120-21).

**Num 36:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לָסֵתַחַת</td>
<td>(ἐκ τοῦ δῆμου)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub ※ + τῆς φυλῆς**

*Wit 2:* O 246 126-128-669 Syh = MT

*Attr:* ※ G Syh > rell

*NonGr:* Syh ܢܓ͡ܫ tela

**Notes:** HT says that the daughters of Zelophehad must marry within “the family of the tribe (מַטֵּה) of their father.” NUM has no equivalent for מַטֵּה and Origen adds the equivalent τῆς φυλῆς under the asterisk.

**Num 36:8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מַטֵּה</td>
<td>ἐκ (τῶν φυλῶν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ο’ θ’   ἐκ τῶν

*Wit 1:* 344

*Wit 2:* B F V O’ b d f* 53* n t x ʾ18’ 68’ 628 669 59 319 424 799

α’ ἀπὸ ράβδου
Notes: NUM renders רַמְמִטִּי straightforwardly as ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν. A few manuscripts, including the s-group, omit ἐκ τῶν, and s-group manuscript 344 notes that the o’ text and Theodotion match NUM and include it. This is supported by most hexaplaric witnesses including the O-group. The reading makes sense for Theodotion since the preposition ἐκ adequately translates מִן and Theodotion renders מִן this way elsewhere (e.g., Exod 7:24).

344 notes that Aquila and Symmachus use ἀπό instead of ἐκ. Although both Aquila and Symmachus use ἐκ for מִן (e.g., Num 16:13, 18:9), and so this attribution is suitable for both of them. Aquila also has the reading ῥάβδου for מָטֶה attributed to him. Although φυλή is a more appropriate choice for מַטֶּה in this context, Aquila consistently uses ῥάβδος for מָטֶה both when מַטֶּה denotes “staff” (as in 17:2[17]) and when it denotes “tribe” (as in 1:21, 47, 2:5, 18:2). Thus, this reading fits Aquila. This is an example of Aquila’s tendency to use the same Greek word to render a Hebrew word across its range of meaning (see F-Pro 46). One other significant feature is that Aquila uses the singular ῥάβδος for the plural תמִמַּטּו. Wevers suggests that Aquila may have had a Hebrew text with the singular מָטֶה (NGTN 605).

Sub ※  ※ τῆς φυλῆς ∨ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς

Notes: This is almost identical to the asterisk in verse 6. Here HT says a daughter who receives an inheritance must marry a man from “the family of the tribe (phia) of her father.” NUM does not render תַּמָּטֶה and Origen adds the equivalent τῆς φυλῆς under the asterisk.
Both G and Syh have the metobelus placed incorrectly, after τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς and not after φυλῆς. But both HT and NUM are well matched except for the one word τῆς, and so the metobelus clearly belongs after φυλῆς.

Num 36:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HT     | מנה (ברר כהראל) (ויויוויוויוreetings
Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: τῷ Μωσεὶ 72-426 | τῷ Μωυσῇ 58-82-376 b d 53’ r–370 x–527 392 407-630 799 Syh | τῷ Μουσ’ 126 | τῷ Μωσή G n

NonGr: Syh אֶלָא

Notes: For verse 10, NUM renders צוה as συνέταξεν. In general, NUM renders צוה two ways; the first is συντάσσω (e.g., 36:2, 6, 10), and the second is ἐντέλλομαι (e.g., 36:2, 5, 13). The difference seems to be stylistic, as both words are used in the same contexts, and sometimes in consecutive sentences (e.g., in 36:2). For the present verse, the text of manuscript 344 from the s-group matches NUM except for having πρὸς Μωσεὶ instead of Μωυσῇ. 344 has a marginal reading attributed to ο′ and to οἱ λ’ that differs from NUM and the s-group text in two ways. First, rather than συνέταξεν the 344 note has ἐνετείλατο. Second, instead of Μωυσῇ in NUM and πρὸς Μωσεὶ in the text of the s-group, the 344 note has τῷ Μωσεὶ. Regarding the attribution to ο′, the first change — substituting ἐνετείλατο for συνέταξεν — is not witnessed by any Greek manuscripts. Although the use of ἐνετείλατο is not unreasonable for Origen based on NUM usage, it has no additional textual support, and thus this part of the ο′ attribution is suspect. The second change — from Μωσεὶ to τῷ Μουσῇ — is supported by the O-group and may reflect Origen’s work. This would be consistent with Origen’s occasional tendency to render the direct object marker אֵת with a definite article (see under 26:59 for two examples).

The attribution of τρόπον ἐνετείλατο κυρίος τῷ Μωσεὶ to οἱ λ’ is reasonable. First, all of the Three use ἐντέλλομαι for צוה (e.g., Isa 13:3). Second, Aquila in particular would be expected to provide some equivalent (e.g., τῷ) for the direct object marker preceding מֹשֶׁה, and the other two translators could have done so as well. Either Origen or the Three may have influenced the Greek manuscripts that add the article τῷ.

Num 36:11

HT מַחְלָה תִרְצָה וְחָגְלָה וּמִלְכָּה וְנֹעָה

LXX Θερσα καὶ Ἐγλα καὶ Μελχα καὶ Νουα καὶ Μαλα

non tr Μαλα καὶ Θερσα καὶ Ἐγλα καὶ Μελχα καὶ Νουα

Wit 2: ↓A F ↓O′–82 Cν–57) ↓f–129 ↓s x–509 ↓y 68′–120 55 59 424 ↓624 646 Syh

Var: Μαλά | Μαρά 246; Μαλά Α 392 120 624; Μαλά 72* 130*
Notes: In verse 11, HT lists the names of the five daughters of Zelophehad, but in translating these, NUM transposes מַחְלָה, the equivalent of the first name (מַחְלָה), to the end of the list. Origen transposed this to the beginning to match the Hebrew, as evidenced by the O-group, and this is reflected in many other manuscripts. The witnesses listed above match the Hebrew in regards to מַחְלָה appearing first in the list, thus showing possible influence from the o’ text. Some of them, however, have variants elsewhere in the list of names, for example, manuscript 55 matches the Hebrew for the first name, but also transposes Θερσά and Εγλά.

HT
לְנָשִׁים (לִבְנֵי דֹדֵי)

LXX
(ἀνεψιοῖς αὐτῶν)

Sub ※ + εἰς γυναῖκας

Wit 2: V O Arm Syh

Attr: ※ Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh מַחְלָה

Notes: HT says that the five daughters listed “will be to the sons of their uncles for wives (לְנָשִׁים),” but NUM has nothing to correspond with מַחְלָה. Origen added a literal equivalent εἰς γυναῖκας under the asterisk as witnessed by the O-group and an s-group note (see below).

Num 36:11-12

HT
לְנָשִׁים (לִבְנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה בֶּן־יֹוסֵף)

LXX
(αὐτῶν) ἐκ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Μανασσῆ (υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ)

ο’ αὐτῶν εἰς γυναῖκας ἐκ τοῦ δήμου υἱῶν Μανασσῆ υἱοῦ Ἰωσήφ

Wit 1: ↓85-344

Wit 2: εἰς γυναῖκας V O Arm Syh | υἱῶν Μανασσῆ G-426 ↓407-↓630 Aeth Syh | υἱοῦ Ἰωσήφ G-426 767 Arab Bo Syh
Notes: Manuscripts 85 and 344 from the s-group provide an o’ reading that indicates Origen’s work in three places (the s-group text matches NUM in those three places). The first is the addition of εἰς γυναῖκας to match the Hebrew לְנָשִׁים for which NUM has no equivalent. This addition is also noted by an asterisk (covered under verse 11). The second change involves the phrase מִמִּשְׁפְּחֹת בְּנֵי־מְנַשֶּׁה at the beginning of verse 12. NUM renders this as ἐκ τοῦ δῆμου τοῦ Μανασσῆ and thus has nothing corresponding to בְּנֵי. The 85-344 note indicates that Origen substituted υἱῶν for τοῦ to match the Hebrew better, and this is supported by G and 426 from the O-group and by Syh. The third action noted by 85-344 is changing the plural υἱῶν in υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ in NUM to υἱῶν to match the singular in בְּנֵי. This modification fits with Origen’s tendency to correct towards the Hebrew and it is witnessed by O-group manuscripts G and 426 and by Syh. In summary, the 85-344 reading probably represents the o’ text.

α’ αὐτῶν εἰς γυναῖκας εἰς συγγενείας υἱῶν Μανασσῆ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: εἰς γυναῖκας V O Arm Syh | υἱῶν Μανασσῆ G-426 ↓407-↓630 Aeth Syh

Var: υἱῶν| pr των 407-630

NonGr: Syh אֵשֶׁדֶנֶם אֵשֶׁדֶנֶ�

σ’ εἰς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ δήμου υἱῶν

Μανασσῆ

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: εἰς γυναῖκας V O Arm Syh | υἱῶν Μανασσῆ G-426 ↓407-↓630 Aeth Syh
Var: υἱῶν] pr τῶν 407-630

NonGr: Syh

\[ \theta' \]

εἰς γυναῖκας καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας υἱῶν Μανασσή

Wit 1: 344

Wit 2: εἰς γυναῖκας V O Arm Syh | υἱῶν Μανασσή G-426 ↓ 407-630 Aeth Syh

Var: υἱῶν] pr τῶν 407-630

NonGr: Syh

Notes: In addition to the α′ reading, manuscript 344 also has readings attributed to each of the Three. An α′ reading has αὐτῶν εἰς γυναῖκας εἰς συγγενείας υἱῶν Μανασσή. Aquila, like Origen, adds εἰς γυναῖκας to match לְנָשִׁים which NUM omits, and this fits him. Aquila commonly uses συγγένεια to render מִשְׁפָּחָה (e.g., Num 3:23, Deut 29:18, Ezek 20:32). And matching the Hebrew בְּנֵי with υἱῶν would be expected from him. Thus, this reading makes good sense for Aquila.

Symmachus is credited with: εἰς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ δῆ*ου υἱῶν Μανασσή. That Symmachus matches לְנָשִׁים with εἰς γυναῖκας is reasonable. Symmachus sometimes renders מִשְׁפָּחָה as συγγένεια (Ps 21[22]28,106[107]:41, Ezek 20:32), but he uses δῆ*ος in Numbers 3:23 and 26:31[47]. Finally, matching בְּנֵי with υἱῶν makes sense for Symmachus. Thus this attribution is suitable.

Manuscript 344 attributes the reading εἰς γυναῖκας καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας υἱῶν Μανασσή to Theodotion. As with the other two translators, Theodotion would be expected to render בְּנֵי and εἰς γυναῖκας makes sense for him. Theodotion uses συγγένεια for מִשְׁפָּחָה elsewhere (e.g., Num 3:23, 1 Kgdms 20:29). That Theodotion matches the Hebrew בְּנֵי with υἱῶν is reasonable. Theodotion adds καὶ, which has no equivalent in the Hebrew at the beginning of verse 12. He possibly added it for emphasis: “for the sons of their uncles for wives, even from the families of the sons of Manasseh.” The entire reading makes sense for Theodotion.

Num 36:12

HT

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο
ο′ α′ καὶ ἐγένετο

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: B V 963 O b 129 x−509 407 319

σ′ καὶ περιεγένετο

Wit 1: 344

θ′ καὶ ἐγενήθη

Wit 1: 344
Wit 2: A F M′ ol−82 C′·−46′ (57) 417* 528 df−129 n−767 s t y z−407 630 55 59 424 624 646 799

Notes: HT finishes this section on the inheritance regulations for women with the summary statement “And their inheritance was (וַתְּהִי נַחֲלָתָן) with the tribe of the family of their father.” NUM translates רָדָת with καὶ ἐγένετο and this is attested by B and 963 along with the O-group. Many manuscripts, however, have changed ἐγένετο to ἐγενήθη including the s-group. Manuscript 344 from the s-group notes that the ο′ text and Aquila follow NUM with καὶ ἐγένετο. In NUM, when רָדָת is used in the indicative mood (as opposed to the jussive), it is rendered either with καὶ ἐγένετο (24:2, 31:16, 43, 36:12) or with καὶ ἐγενήθη (31:36). The contexts of 31:36 (καὶ ἐγενήθη) and 43 (καὶ ἐγένετο) are almost identical, and so the difference in usage appears to be stylistic. That Origen and Aquila match NUM here is reasonable.

Symmachus is credited by 344 with the reading καὶ περιεγένετο. The main meanings of περιγίνο*αι are “to overcome,” “escape,” or “remain.” He uses περιγίνο*αι in 1 Kings 17:9 for בָּל meaning to prevail over someone, and the sense in the present verse may be of the inheritance remaining under the control of the clan. But perhaps closer to the present verse is the rendering of Symmachus in Ecclesiastes 2:22, where HT has רד for the idiomatic expression, “something is to someone” in the sense of obtaining. There the LXX employs γίνο*αι but Symmachus uses περιγίνο*αι and this seems analogous to the idea in the present verse of possession. Thus, the attribution to Symmachus is probably accurate.

Manuscript 344 also attributes καὶ ἐγενήθη to Theodotion. The reading is standard Greek and is compatible with Theodotion. It is echoed by a majority of the Greek manuscripts and some may reflect Theodotion, but they may also represent an inner Greek correction.
Num 36:13

HT (המִשְׁפָּטִים וְהַמִּצְוֹת)
LXX (αἱ ἐντολαὶ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίατα)

Sub ÷

Wit 2: G Syh

> Sub ※ πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ

Wit 2: O 767 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ※ לֵהוּ מְסַמְּרָה ※

Notes: HT lists two types of utterances of the Lord: “commands and judgments” (המִשְׁפָּטִים וְהַמִּצְוֹת). NUM renders this phrase with three items: αἱ ἐντολαὶ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίατα. Origen considered the second, καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα, to be extra and placed it under the obelus. Which phrase NUM added without Hebrew support, however, is not clear, as both κρίατα and δικαιώματα are possible renderings for Mishpatim. NUM renders מִשְׁפָּטι using κρίατα in 35:24 and 35:29. And although δικαιώματα is usually used to render חֻקָּה (27:11, 30:17, 31:21, 35:29), it is also used for Mishpatim in 15:16. This implies that either καὶ τὰ κρίατα or καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα is a NUM addition. In any event, Origen chose καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα to be under the obelus.

HT אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
LXX —

Sub ※ πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ

Wit 2: O 767 Syh = MT

Attr: ※ G Syh] > rell

NonGr: Syh ※ לֵהוּ מְסַמְּרָה ※

Notes: HT says that the commandments and ordinances were given by the hand of Moses “to the sons of Israel” (אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). NUM does not render אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל and Origen adds the equivalent πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ under the asterisk. As it often does, Syh adds an extraneous asterisk, this time between the correct first one and the metobelus.
CHAPTER 4
READINGS OF DOUBTFUL HEXAPLARIC SIGNIFICANCE

**Num 19:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>עֵץ אֶרֶז וְאֵזוֹב</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>κέδρινον καὶ ὕσσωπον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 κυπαρίσσινον καὶ ὀρίγανον

*Wit 1: ↓130-↓321’ 128*

*Var: κυπαρίσσινον κυπαρίσσινον 130-321’*

*Notes:* NUM renders עֵץ אֶרֶז וְאֵזֹב in HT as κέδρινον καὶ ὕσσωπον (“of cedar and hyssop”). Four s-group manuscripts have the unattributed reading κυπαρίσσινον καὶ ὀρίγανον (“of cypress and a bitter herb”). In the LXX, both κέδρινος and κέδρος normally render Hebrew אֶרֶז (e.g., Num 19:6, 24:6, Lev 14:4, 6, 49, 51, 52). Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion also use the word κέδρινος in 3 Kingdoms 6:20 to render אֶרֶז, and all three use the related word κέδρος in multiple places to render אֶרֶז. None of the Three, however, use κυπαρίσσινος. Thus, we have little reason to ascribe κυπαρίσσινον to any of the Three.

As for the second word, ὀρίγανος, it is not used by either the LXX or the Three. Thus, one cannot determine the source of this note. It is possible that it represents a later scribal clarification for the LXX terms, the second of which (ὕσσωπον) is a transcription that is not common in Greek literature.

**Num 21:5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ἤκλεκτός</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>τῷ διακένῳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 τῶο δοῦμαμίνω

*Wit 1: 58*
Notes: HT has לֹקֵלקְ, whose meaning is disputed, but in context seems to refer to something wretched or worthless. NUM renders לֹקֵלקְ as τῷ διακένῳ (“empty”). An unattributed note in manuscript 58 has the alternate τῷ οὐδαµίνῳ which means “worthless.” The Three do not use οὐδαµίνος, nor does the LXX. In addition, manuscript 58 has two notes for לֹקֵלקְ, and the other is attributed by 58 and other witnesses to οἱ λ’ (see Chapter 3). Thus, the present reading is likely a scholiast’s note.

〈?〉 µαταίῳ⋅ ξηρῷ

Wit 1: M’

Notes: This unattributed note in M’ has two readings associated with לֹקֵלקְ: µαταίῳ (“worthless”) and ξηρῷ (“dry”). Symmachus and Theodotion use µαταίος (e.g., for תֹּהוּ in Isa 59:4, and for שֹׁא in Ezek 12:24), and Aquila uses the related word µαταιότης (for הֶבֶל in Job 7:16b). So the reading could conceivably be from the Three. But this note appears in M’ in addition to a previous M’ note for לֹקֵלקְ attributed to οἱ λ’ (see Chapter 3). Field believes the note came from a scholiast, and he is probably right.

Num 21:8

HT שלַכְיָם
LXX ἐπὶ σηµείου

〈?〉 ἐπὶ σκοπιᾶς

Wit 1: 128

Notes: For שלַכְיָם in HT, NUM has ἐπὶ σηµείου. Manuscript 128 has a note with σκοπιᾶς, which means “height,” “lookout place,” or “hilltop.” σκοπιᾶ is used little by the Three, and none of them uses it to render סנֵ. The only possibly reference to any of the Three using σκοπιᾶ is an unattributed note in 1 Kingdoms 22:3 where it used for מִצְפֶּה (“watchtower”). Montfaucon has an Aquila reading for σκοπιᾶ in Psalm 72[73]:7 to render מַשׂכּיִים (“image” or “imagination”) but according to Field he incorrectly assigns this to Eusebius. Symmachus has another credible attributed reading for סנֵ for the present verse, and Theodotion has a possible alternate reading there as well (see Chapter 3). The note could also be the work of a later scholiast. In conclusion, not enough evidence exists to determine its source.
Num 22:3

HT  יָּקָץ
LXX  (καὶ) προσώχθισεν

(?)  καὶ ἐδειλίασεν (ἐδειλίασεν cod) καὶ ἐµίσασεν (ἐµήσεισεν cod)

Wit 1:  ↓127

Notes: In the current context, HT uses the verb יָּקָץ which refers to the fear the Moabites feel towards Israel. Instead of καὶ προσώχθισεν in NUM for יָּקָץ in HT, a note in n-group manuscript 127 has καὶ ἐδειλίασεν καὶ ἐµίσασεν. The two verbs cover each of the lexical meanings of יָּקָץ: to fear and to detest. None of the Three use δειλιαίνω, although Aquila and Symmachus use the related noun δειλία (“cowardice”; Jer 48[31]:39). The verb µισέω is a common word, used frequently by the Three although not for יָּקָץ.

For יָּקָץ in its sense of disgust, Aquila uses σικχάινω (“loathe/dislike”) and Symmachus uses ἐγκακέω (“lose heart” or “be afraid”) in Numbers 21:5. In contexts where יָּקָץ denotes “fear,” Aquila and Symmachus use the same equivalents (α’ — σικχάινω: Exod 1:12, Isa 7:16; σ’ — ἐγκακέω: Isa 7:16), while Theodotion uses βδελύσσοµαι (“abhor/detest”: Isa 7:16). Thus, Aquila and Symmachus use the same renderings in contexts that cover both meanings of יָּקָץ, and though the data is scant for Theodotion, he appears to construe יָּקָץ as meaning “loathe” even where the context suggests fear. Thus, nothing suggests strongly that any of the Three would use δειλιαίνω in the present context. As for µισέω, each of the Three has alternate renderings for יָּקָץ in its sense of disgust as just noted.

More to the point, the expanded translation (i.e., two words for one) is uncharacteristic of Aquila who adheres to a quantitatively exact translation technique. Nor is it likely from Theodotion, who has a similar tendency. Symmachus is known to add extra words to give a fuller sense to a Hebrew expression (see F-Pro 66), but this is to clarify the meaning in context and not to introduce lexical possibilities from outside the context. In conclusion, the source of the reading cannot be determined. It may be a later scholiast’s note.

Num 22:22

HT  לוֹ לְשָׂטָן
LXX  ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν
κατάγνωστον αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι

Wit 1: 130-321′

**Notes:** For לְשׂמִן in HT, NUM has ἐνδιαβάλλειν αὐτόν. An unattributed s-group note has the alternate reading κατάγνωστον αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι (“to make a judgment [against] him”). Aquila and Theodotion have other, credibly attributed readings for לְשׂמִן in the present verse. And in 22:32, in the sequel to the current passage, Symmachus uses ἐναντιοῦσθαι for לְשׂמִן in an identical context, and so he is not a good candidate for this reading (see Chapter 3 for the α′ σ′ θ′ readings). None of the Three use the noun κατάγνωστον (although Symmachus uses the verb καταγινώσκω in Job 42:6 and Ezek 16:61). In summary, the source of this note cannot be determined; it may be from a scholiast.

Num 22:29

| HT   | הֲרַגְתִּיךְ |
| LXX  | ἐξεκέντησά σε |

Wit 1: 130-321′

**Notes:** For הֲרַגְתִּיךְ in HT, NUM has ἐξεκέντησά σε. An unattributed note in three s-group manuscripts substitutes the common verb φονεύω for εκκεντέω. Of the Three, only Aquila uses φονεύω for הֲרַג (once in Ezek 37:9). But all of the Three already have another credible reading for this verse in which they use ἀποκτείνω for הֲרַג (see Chapter 3). Thus, the source of the present note cannot be determined.

Num 22:35

| HT   | תְדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ |
| LXX  | τοῦτο φυλάξῃ λαλῆσαι |

Wit 1: M′ ↓85′-↓321′-↓344

Wit 2: 319 ↓Lat, cod 100
Var: τοῦτο αὐτό 85'-321'-344 Lat cod 100

NonGr: Lat cod 100 id facies

Notes: In HT, the angel of the Lord says to Balaam: “the word I speak to you, you shall speak it (תְדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ)” NUM embellishes this contextually with, “This you shall be careful to speak.” This follows Sam which has אָתָה תְדַבֵּר לְדַבָּר. An unattributed marginal note, appearing in many of the same manuscripts as the unattributed note for verse 34, substitutes τοῦτο ποιήσεις for τοῦτο φυλάξῃ λαλῆσαι in NUM. This reading is more like the Hebrew in that it does not include φυλάξῃ, but the use of ποιέω is unusual for דבר. Aquila’s normal equivalent is λαλέω. Even Symmachus with his Tendenz toward functional equivalency would probably be unlikely to depart from the plain sense of HT in this way. This note may reflect 22:20, where in a similar context, NUM uses τοῦτο ποιήσεις to render part of God’s command, “The word which I speak to you, you shall do it (תַעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ)” The note may be a gloss influenced by verse 20, but its source cannot be determined.

Num 22:39

HT תְדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ
LXX (πόλεις) ἐπαύλεων

〈?〉 ἐµβολῶν

Wit 1: F

Notes: The city named תְדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ was not familiar to the NUM translator, who attempted to render the words individually as πόλεις ἐπαύλεων (“cities of the folds/dwellings”). The word תְדַבֵּר is problematic. It is the plural of הָלְכָה which means “outside” or “street.” Wevers speculates that the parent text of NUM had חֵצֵר אָרָא, which can mean “settlement” or “unwalled area” (NGTN 382). For חֵצֵר אָרָא, an F marginal note has ἐµβολῶν, a genitive taken from one of two Greek words. The first is ἐµβολή (“a putting/forcing in”) which appears in the LXX only in 3 Maccabees 4:7 with the meaning “attack.” This word is not used by any of the Three, although Aquila uses a related verb ἐµβολεύω, which means “load a ship.” The second possible Greek word is ἐµβολός, one meaning of which is “portico,” but this word is not attested by the Three either. No other manuscripts support this reading, and the evidence is insufficient to determine its origin.

〈?〉 μυστηρίων αὐτοῦ

Wit 1: 344
Notes: This 344 marginal note gives a second unattributed rendering for תַחַזֹּךְ instead of ἐπαύλεων in NUM — the phrase μυστηρίων αὐτοῦ. The connection between this and the Hebrew צֶּרֶךְ or צֶרֶךְ is not clear. With no other evidence, the source of this note cannot be determined.

Num 22:41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>לְמָנָה בָּמֹ</th>
<th>ἐπὶ τὴν στήλην (τοῦ Βαάλ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἔπι τὸ ύψος τοῦ εἰδώλου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For לְמָנָה בָּמֹ in HT, NUM has ἐπὶ τὴν στήλην. An unattributed note offers the alternate reading ἐπὶ τὸ ύψος τοῦ εἰδώλου. Symmachus’ uses ύψος to translate לְמָנָה in 21:19, but none of the Three use εἰδώλον to translate בָּמֹ or the plural בָּמֹ, instead using Βαάλ or Βααλίµ (e.g., α’ σ’: Jer 9:13[Eng 14]; α’ σ’ θ’: 4 Kgdms 23:4). Thus, insufficient evidence exists to propose a source for this note.

Num 23:10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מָנָה</th>
<th>ἐξηκριβάσατο</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>ἐξηκριβάσατο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: An Fb note has the rendering ἐμέτρησεν (“measure”) for מָנָה in place of ἐξηκριβάσατο in NUM. As noted in Chapter 3, ὁ λ’ employ ἀριθµέω for מָנָה in this verse, a rendering that fits the meaning of מנה more closely. In addition, none of the Three are known to use μετρέω or one of its complex forms for מָנָה. Aquila, Symmachus, and possibly Theodotion employ μετρέω (or one of its complex forms) for מידה (α’: Isa 40:12 [καταµετρέω], Jer 38:35 [31:37]; σ’: 2 Kgdms 8:2; α’ σ’ θ’: Isa 40:12 [for implied instance of מידה or מידה]). This note could be a later scribal gloss, but in any case, one cannot determine its source.
Num 23:19

HT 

LXX 

\(\text{καὶ μετανοεῖ}\)

\(\text{καὶ µετανοεῖ}\)

\(\text{καὶ µετανοεῖ}\)

Notes: HT reads \(\text{וְיִתְנֶחָם}\) and NUM renders this as \(\text{ἀπειληθῆναι}\) (“threaten/warn”). An unattributed \(F^b\) note gives the reading \(\text{καὶ µετανοεῖ}\). Only Symmachus of the Three uses \(\text{µετανοέω}\), and another reading more characteristic of Symmachus is attributed to him for \(\text{וְיִתְנֶחָם}\) in this verse (see Chapter 3). The source of this note cannot be determined.

Num 23:22

HT 

LXX (\(\omegaς\) δόξα)

\(\text{πέτασµα}\)

\(\text{πέτασµα}\)

Notes: The Hebrew \(\text{עֲפֹתכְּתוֹ}\) is not easy to translate. In Psalm 94[95]:4 it refers to the highest parts of mountains. In Numbers (23:22 and 24:8) it refers in context to the highest part of an ox (i.e., the horns). Both times in NUM, the translator has rendered this word more generically as \(\text{δόξα}\), presumably inferring that the “glory” of an ox is its horns. An unattributed marginal note in \(F^b\) has the reading \(\text{πέτασµα}\) (“something spread out”). This word occurs rarely in connection with the LXX — (1) a manuscript variant for \(\text{καταπέτασµα}\) in Leviticus 4:6; (2) a manuscript variant for \(\text{πετόµενος}\) (from \(\text{πέτοµαι}\)) in Theodotion Daniel 9:21. It is not used in the LXX or by any of the Three. It could be a later scribal gloss, but its origin cannot be determined.

Num 24:1

HT 

LXX 

\(\text{τὴν ὀψιν αὐτοῦ}\)

\(\text{τὴν ὀψιν αὐτοῦ}\)
Notes: An unattributed note in five s-group manuscripts gives the alternate translation ὀψιν for the Hebrew פָּנֶה in place of πρόσωπον in NUM. This note is probably not from Aquila, who regularly uses πρόσωπον for פָּנֶה (e.g., Gen 1:2[2x], Deut 5:7, Nah 2:2) and would not likely alter his pattern. Symmachus and Theodotion also routinely use πρόσωπον for פָּנֶה (σ′: Zech 7:2, Mal 2:9; θ′: Ezek 10:14[7x]; σ′ θ′: Gen 1:2, Deut 5:7, Job 13:8a).

The Three use ὀψις infrequently. Aquila employs it for the rare רָפִּים (perhaps a loan word meaning “ship”) in Isaiah 2:16. Symmachus uses it for הַרְאֵת in Ezek 23:15, as does Theodotion in Isaiah 11:3. Theodotion has little reason to depart from NUM and his own normal pattern here. As for Symmachus, he uses πρόσωπον elsewhere when it is used for a literal “face” (e.g., Mal 2:9) and this is how פָּנֶה is being used here. Thus, although Symmachus can be more flexible than the other translators, nothing else points to him as the source of this reading. In conclusion, the origin of this note cannot be determined.

Num 24:4

HT נאם שומע אמרים אלה אשר מחזת שדה יחזקיה

LXX φησὶν ἀκούων λόγια θεοῦ, ὃς ὅρασιν θεοῦ εἶδεν

(?) λέγε ἀκούων λόγια ἰσχυροῦ ὃς (ὡς*) ὃρασιν θεωρεῖ

Notes: At the beginning of verse 4, NUM reads: “the one who hears the oracles of God declares, who saw a vision of God.” A note in Fb has an alternate reading: “The one who hears the oracles of the Mighty One says, who beholds a vision.” This note does not likely come from the Three. First, the omission of the second occurrence of θεοῦ, unless it is due to later scribal error, is hard to explain as coming from the Three except possibly Symmachus. Second, θεωρεῖ is not known to be used for רָפִּים by any of the Three in the Hebrew OT, although Theodotion Daniel uses it for Aramaic רָפִּים (Dan 4:7, 7:11).
The note is not likely Origenic either. First, although ἰσχυροῦ does match the likely o' text reading for the first instance of θεοῦ (as discussed in Chapter 3 for this verse), Origen is unlikely to have omitted the second instance of θεοῦ. Second, Origen would have no compelling reason to use θεωρέω for ἐναθέτω, since this is an unusual rendering (occurring in the LXX only in Psalm 26[27]:4). Thus, the source of this note cannot be determined.

Num 24:24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>כִּתִּים</td>
<td>Κιτιαίων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 Κυπρίων

Wit 1: Fₜ

Notes: HT has נָעָר, a name used originally in Genesis 10:4 for a descendant of Japheth, one of a group of descendants who settled the coastlands of the nations. Later it came to refer to Cyprus (Is 23:1) or more generally to the islands of Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean (e.g., Daniel 11:30). Two unattributed notes give alternate renderings from Κιτιαίων in NUM. The first is from n-group manuscript 54, and provides the spelling Χεττιείµ which is closer to HT than NUM. This has been assigned to οἱ λ′ (see Chapter 3).

The second note is in Fₜ and gives the reading Κυπρίων. Κύπρος is the Greek designation for the OT place name כִּתִּים, and the present word Κύπριος means “of Cyprus.” Neither Κύπριος nor Κύπρος is used by the Three. In conclusion, one cannot determine the source of this note, and it is probably a scribal gloss.

Num 25:4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>רֹקֵץ אֲוֹתָם</td>
<td>παραδείγµάτισον (αὐτοὺς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 φούρκισον

Wit 1: Fₜ

Notes: A marginal note in Fₜ gives the alternate rendering φούρκισον for רֹקֵץ (“dislocate” or possibly “grow stiff/numb”) instead of παραδείγµάτισον (“expose publicly” or “disgrace”) in NUM. None of the Three use this verb. The verb φουρκιζω
and the related noun φουρκίσις are used in the 7th century and later (Sophocles 1150), and thus this note is probably a later scholiast’s gloss.

**Num 25:7**

| HT | רֹמַח |
| LXX | σιρομάστην |

〈?〉 ῥοµφαίαν

*Wit 1: M’ 128*

**Notes:** For רֹמַח in HT, NUM has σιρομάστην. An unattributed note in M’ and 128 gives the reading ῥοµφαίαν which means “sword” or “dagger.” This is not a good fit for רֹמַח. Since well-attested notes already exist for Aquila and Symmachus for רֹמַח in this verse (see Chapter 3), only Theodotion, of the Three, remains as a possible source for this note. Theodotion (as well as Aquila and Symmachus) uses ῥοµφαίαν, but normally as an equivalent for חֶרֶב, and none of the Three use it for the relatively dissimilar רֹמַח (although both are weapons, a sword and a spear are substantially different). Thus, the reading cannot be determined to be from Theodotion. It may be a scribal note.

In M’ (manuscripts M and 416) this reading appears as part of a compound note that has the form: ῥοµφαίαν. α’ κοντόν· δόρυ· ῥοµφαίαν· The second word, κοντόν, is attributed to α’ for this verse. The third word is δόρυ, and although unattributed it matches a Symmachus reading in another manuscript for this verse. The first and last word is ῥοµφαίαν; the reason for the repetition is not clear.

**Num 25:8**

| HT | אֶל־הַקֻּבָּה |
| LXX | (εἰς τὴν) κάµινον |

〈?〉 εἰς τὴν τένδην

*Wit 1: Fb*

〈?〉 εἰς τὴν σκηνήν

*Wit 1: Fa*
τένδη· σκηνή

Notes: HT has הַקֻּבָּה for the place an Israelite took a Midianite woman and NUM renders this as κάµινον (“furnace” — see the discussion under the Aquila and Symmachus readings for this verse in Chapter 3). An Fb note contains the alternate rendering τένδην, accusative of τένδα. This is a by-form of the Byzantine Greek word τέντα (“tent”) which may come from the Latin tentorium (see Sophocles 1074). Thus, the word is likely not from α΄, σ΄, or θ΄. That this is referring to a tent is clear from another Fb note which has the form: τένδη· σκηνή. Both words are probably glosses from a scholiast intended to explain the difficult LXX reading κάµινον. Fa has a note that reads εἰς τὴν σκηνήν and this is also probably a gloss for κάµινον.

HT

LXX
dιὰ τῆς μήτρας αὐτῆς

ἐν ἐνύστρῳ (ἐνοίστρῳ cod)

Notes: An unattributed note in 343 translates the Hebrew קֵבָה using ἐνύστρῳ (from ἐνυστρον or ἤνυστρον) which technically means the fourth stomach of a ruminant animal, but is used in Deuteronomy 18:3 to refer more generally to an animal’s stomach and in Malachi 2:3 to refer to the contents of an animal’s stomach. None of the Three use the word, which is an odd rendering in the context of piercing through a human. The source of the note cannot be determined.

Num 25:17

Notes: An unattributed note in 343 translates the Hebrew קֵבָה using ἐνύστρῳ (from ἐνυστρον or ἤνυστρον) which technically means the fourth stomach of a ruminant animal, but is used in Deuteronomy 18:3 to refer more generally to an animal’s stomach and in Malachi 2:3 to refer to the contents of an animal’s stomach. None of the Three use the word, which is an odd rendering in the context of piercing through a human. The source of the note cannot be determined.
Notes: The Hebrew infinitive absolute רָצוֹ is used here as an imperative and means “be hostile.” NUM gives a close approximation with ἐχθραίνετε. A marginal note in F substitutes παρακαθίσατε (from παρακαθίζω) which means “to set/sit beside” (it is used in the LXX only in Job 2:13 for בְּאֶחָד). It is not used by any of the Three, and the meaning does not seem to fit the context well. In later Greek, the word meant “to besiege” (see Sophocles 844) and so this is possibly a later scholiast’s note.

Num 29:1

HT בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ
LXX µιᾷ τοῦ µηνός

τευχηνία (τευχηνία codd)

Wit 1: 130-321′

Notes: The Hebrew phrase בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ is translated in NUM as µιᾷ τοῦ µηνός (or ἐν µιᾷ τοῦ µηνός) in 1:1, 1:18, 29:1, and 33:38. Both HT and NUM are referring to the first day of a month. The word νεοµηνία (or the equivalent νοµηνία) is used in NUM at 10:10, 28:11, and 29:6 to render either χρήµατα (10:10, 28:11) or simply χρήσις (“new moon”: 29:6).

For the present verse, an unattributed s-group note gives the alternate rendering νεοµηνία instead of µιᾷ τοῦ µηνός in NUM for בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ. Of the Three, only Aquila is known to use νεοµηνία (in Jer 2:24 and Hos 5:7 for דְשׁ חֹ) but not where it refers to the first of a month. On the other hand, both Aquila and Theodotion use µήν to translate דְשׁ חֹ in the phrase בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ in Exodus 40:2 (retroverted from Syh). This suggests that they likely would not use νεοµηνία to render דְשׁ חֹ in the same phrase here, Aquila because he normally translates consistently, and Theodotion because he would have no reason to depart either from his own pattern or the literal translation of NUM. In summary, although the note could conceivably be from Symmachus, the data is not sufficient to determine its source.

Num 29:39

HT (כֶם)נִּדְרֵי (כֶם)
LXX (τῶν) εὐχῶν (ὑµῶν)

ταγµάτων

Wit 1: 130-321′
Notes: An unattributed note from the s-group has ταγμάτων (“command” or “rank/order”) for נדֶר rather than εὐχῶν in NUM. The Hebrew נדֶר signifies “a vow,” and is often used in religious contexts (particularly in Numbers chapter 30). The word τάγμα does not seem to match the Hebrew well, although the related verb τάσσω in the middle voice can refer to “taking a payment on oneself,” and in the passive can denote “fulfilling what is prescribed” (e.g., an obligation). Another s-group note in 30:3 uses the combination ταξιται τάγμα for נדֶר, and so conceivably this wider sense of τάσσω is in view here.

Aquila employs εὐχή for נדֶר in Psalm 60[61]:6, and Jeremiah 51[44]:25. At Numbers 15:3, a note that is possibly from Aquila and Theodotion uses ὤρκος for נדֶר. Symmachus renders נדֶר with εὐχή in Jeremiah 51[44]:25. Both εὐχή and ὤρκος are close in meaning to נדֶר in the sense of an oath.

The Three use τάγμα for דֶּגֶל (“division” as in the ordering of the tribes) in Numbers 2:17. These renderings fit the normal use of τάγμα as “rank” or “order.” None of the Three use τάγμα for נדֶר or for anything resembling it in meaning. Thus, one cannot determine the source of this note.

Num 30:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נדֶר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>εὐξηται εὐχήν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉

tάξηται τάγμα· συντάξηται ἄσκησιν

Wit 1: 130-321′

Notes: HT uses a common Hebrew device of following a verb with a cognate noun. In this case, if any man “vows a vow” (נדֶר, רדר) to the Lord, then he is obligated to fulfill it. NUM renders this literally using a cognate pair: εὐξηται εὐχήν (NUM uses the same cognate pair in 6:2, 21, 21:2, 30:3, 4).

In 29:39, an unattributed s-group (130-321′) marginal note gives ταγμάτων for נדֶר instead of εὐχῶν. In that case, the reading did not seem to match any of the Three. For the present verse, 130 and 321′ have a similar note that gives the reading ταξιται τάγμα for נדֶר. The verb τάσσω normally means “to order/appoint.” In the middle voice it can refer to taking a payment on oneself, and in the passive it can refer to fulfilling what is prescribed (e.g., an obligation). As noted under 29:39, the word τάγμα alone does not seem to match נדֶר well, although when coupled with τάσσω as a cognate pair, it could conceivably pick up more of the semantic range of τάσσω. The question is whether any of the Three would have used this phrase for his rendering of נדֶר.
Aquila renders נדר using a form of εὐχομαι (Jer 51:44:25), and he tends to be consistent in his renderings. Aquila also uses εὐχή for נדר (e.g., Ps 60[61]:6, Jer 51[44]:25). In Jeremiah 51[44]:25 he matches the Hebrew cognate pair from the root נדר (in the phrase עת נדרנו אשר נדרנו) with the cognates εὐχομαι and εὐχη (τας ευχάς ήμων ος ηεξάμεθα). Thus, his rendering of נדר in the present verse is likely to be close to NUM (εὔξηται εὐχήν) and not to τάξηται τάγµα. Aquila does use τάσσω in Isaiah 30:33 and 40:18 for ערך in contexts where its normal sense of “ordering” is in view, but never for נדר. In any event, εὐχομαι would be a more suitable choice, and it is Aquila’s normal rendering for נדר. As for τάγµα, Aquila employs it for דֶּגֶל (“division” as in the ordering of the tribes) in Numbers 2:17, which fits its normal denotation. Aquila never uses τάγµα for נדר.

Symmachus employs the cognate pair εὐχομαι and εὐχή to match the cognate pair נדר and נדר in Jeremiah 51[44]:25. Elsewhere, he uses εὐχή to render נדר in Psalm 60[61]:9. As for the words in the present s-group note, Symmachus uses τάσσω frequently, for instance for רשות (Ps 11[12]:6, 61[62]:11); for רשות (Ps 48[49]:15, 72[73]:9); for ברacho (Job 37:15a, Ezek 7:20); for רון (Jer 12:10, 52:32, Ezek 3:17); and for the Hiphil of ברacho (Ps 43[44]:11). He renders all of these Hebrew words appropriately within the normal semantic range of τάσσω as “ordering,” “appointing,” etc. Symmachus never uses τάσσω for נדר. As for τάγµα, Symmachus employs it for דגלה (Num 2:17) but never for נדר. Thus, although Symmachus can be less rigid in his use of Greek equivalents than Aquila, no compelling reason exists to suppose he is the source of the reading τάξηται τάγµα for the present verse.

Theodotion does not employ εὐχομαι for נדר, and regarding the noun נדר, Theodotion does not render it by εὐχή, but he possibly uses the synonym ὥρκος in Numbers 15:3. As for τάσσω, Theodotion uses it to render בחר (Ezek 6:2, Dan 11:17), a Hebrew word that fits the normal meaning of τάσσω as ordering or appointing. Like the other two translators, Theodotion never uses τάσσω for the verb נדר. Theodotion uses τάγµα for קורים in Job 1:17b (in the sense of a “band of men”), and for דגלא in Numbers 2:17, but never for נדר. Thus, we have little to indicate that Theodotion is the originator of this s-group note. In conclusion, one cannot determine the source of this note.

The second part of the note reads συντάξηται ἄσκησιν. The word συντάσσω means “to designate,” “gather together,” or “make an appointment.” ἄσκησις denotes “exercise/training” and was used to refer to religious discipline or asceticism. The word is not used by any of the Three, and is found only once in the LXX (4 Macc 13:22). This added phrase may be some kind of explanatory note, perhaps in the sense that “vowing a vow” is connected with religious service. This second reading does not appear to be connected to the Three or to the LXX of Numbers.

Num 31:11

HT ἰδρυς
τὴν προνομήν

τὴν ὕπαρξιν

Wit 1:  ↓130-↓321’ 128
Var: τὴν} > 130-321’

Notes: NUM translates הַשָּׁלָל ("spoil, booty") in HT with τὴν προνομήν both in this verse and the next. An unattributed note in one b-group and three s-group manuscripts gives the alternate rendering τὴν ὕπαρξιν. None of the Three use ὑπαρξίας to render הַשָּׁלָל, although Symmachus and Theodotion use ὑπαρξίας for some synonyms of הַשָּׁלָל: (σ’ for בָּא in Ps 43[44]13 and Ezek 27:27, for שָׁלָם in Gen 14:21, and for רְמוֹג in Ezek 38:12; θ’ for שָׁלָם in Dan 11:13, 24, 28). But according to attributed readings in a different b-group manuscript and the same three s-group manuscripts, all of the Three render הַשָּׁלָל using λάφυρον in the next verse (31:12). Because the latter rendering makes sense for each of the Three (see the discussion under 31:12 in Chapter 3), the origin of the present note is uncertain.

Num 31:49

Notes: For the phrase ישָׁמֵא אָמְרָה in HT, NUM has εἰλήφασιν τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀνδρῶν. HT uses the expression שָׁמֵא אָמְרָה or variants of it for taking a census in 1:2, 1:49, 4:2, 4:22, 26:2, and 31:49. In all these verses NUM employs λαμβάνοντο for שָׁמֵא, and for שָׁמֵא it uses κεφάλαιον in 1:2, 4:22, and 31:49 (also ἀρχή in 1:2 and 4:22, and ἀριθμός in 1:49). An unattributed s-group marginal note has an alternative rendering: ὑπεδεξαντο τὴν ψῆφον τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

Considering ψῆφος first, all of Three use ψῆφος in the sense of a number or value (e.g., for מִסְפָּר — α’: Deut 32:8; α’ α’: Isa 10:19; α’ σ’ θ’: Isa 40:26) although not for שָׁמֵא. Here, Aquila would be expected to render שָׁמֵא literally, as he does frequently elsewhere (e.g., with κεφαλή in Gen 47:31, Lev 19:27, Isa 9:14, 58:5). Also, an unattributed note at Num 4:22 that has κεφάλαιον for שָׁמֵא in the context of a census is
possibly from Aquila. As for Theodotion, he uses the related word κεφαλή often for רֹאשׁ (Lev 19:27, Isa 9:14, 58:5, Jer 14:3, Dan 1:10). So Theodotion might be expected to use κεφαλή here or to follow NUM with κεφάλαιον. The Tendenz of Symmachus to be more flexible raises the possibility that he could use ψήφος here for רֹאשׁ as a contextual rendering.

The present reading uses ὑπεδέξαντο to render רֹאשׁ. The main meaning of the word ὑποδέχομαι deals with receiving, although it can have the related sense of “taking up.” None of the Three uses ὑποδέχομαι, however, and all have alternate renderings for רֹאשׁ in its various meanings. Symmachus in particular, as the only remaining candidate for the present reading, has the following renderings of רֹאשׁ in the sense of “raising”: αἴρω (Jer 30:7[49:29]); ἐπαίρω (Ps 82[83]:3, Jer 52:31); and ἀναλαμβάνω (Ps 80[81]:3). Thus Symmachus is not a likely source of ὑποδέχομαι, which he is not known to employ anywhere else, for רֹאשׁ here. In conclusion, the source of the note cannot be determined.

Num 32:9

| HT   | רֹאשׁ |
| LXX  | ἀπέστησαν |

(?): ὀκνήρευσαν

Wit 1: 130-321′

Notes: HT has the Hiphil of the verb רֹאשׁ which means “discourage” or “frustrate.” In verse 7, NUM translates the verb (the Ketiv is a Qal, but the Qere is Hiphil) using διαστρέφω. In the present verse, NUM uses ἀπέστησαν (from ἀφίστηµι). An unattributed s-group note gives the alternate rendering ὀκνήρευσαν (from ὀκνηρεύω), which means “fill with reluctance.” This verb is not used anywhere in the LXX or by any of the Three. The related noun ὀκνηρία can mean “fear/shrinking,” and Symmachus uses it to render the word עֲצַלְתַּים (“laziness”) in Ecclesiastes 10:18. This usage does not match the context of the current verse, and thus not enough data exists to attribute this reading to any of the Three.

Num 32:13

| HT   | יָנִיאוּ |
| LXX  | κατερρέµβευσεν |

(?): κατεπλάνησεν
Notes: An unattributed $F^b$ note has κατεπλάνησεν instead of καταρρέµβευσεν in NUM for the Hebrew verb בור. Neither the LXX nor any of the Three ever use καταπλανάω. Although the Three use the simplex πλανάω, none use it for בור. In addition, other more credible readings exist for each of the Three for בור in the present verse (see Chapter 3), and so the reading is unlikely from any of them. It may be a later scholiast’s gloss.

Num 32:28

| HT | רֵעָה |
| LXX | 'Ελεαζάρ |
| (?) | 'Ελεάζαρον |

Notes: An unattributed $s$-group note replaces 'Ελεαζάρ in NUM with 'Ελεάζαρον to render the Hebrew proper name רֵעָה. The LXX of the Hebrew OT always uses 'Ελεαζάρ to translate רֵעָה — that is, without case endings. The Three are not known to have used any rendering besides 'Ελεαζάρ for רֵעָה, and not enough evidence exists to attribute this reading to any of them.

The full sentence in NUM is: καὶ συνέστησεν αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς Ἐλεαζάρ τὸν ιερέα καὶ Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυη καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας πατριῶν τῶν φυλῶν Ισραηλ. Because the subject Μωϋσῆς is adjacent to the direct object 'Ελεαζάρ, it is possible that a copyist or later scholiast added the accusative case ending to insure that readers would understand 'Ελεαζάρ to be a direct object.

Num 33:1

| HT | מַסְעֵי |
| LXX | σταθµοὶ |
| (?) | ἐπαύλεις· τόποι |

Notes: Numbers 33:1-2 gives an introduction to the account of the journeys of the children of Israel. In these verses, NUM renders the Hebrew מַסְעֵי as σταθµοὶ ("lodgings/stations") which is a contextual rendering that seems to relate more to the stopping points of the people than the journeys themselves. Since chapter 33 covers both journeys and camping places, the use of σταθµοὶ, although not an exact rendering, may
have been deemed adequate by the NUM translator for a summary. In any case, NUM renders מַסְעֵי this way only in these two verses. Elsewhere, NUM renders מַסְעֵי using ἐξαίρω (10:2), ἐξαρσις (10:6), ἀπαρτία (10:12), and στρατία (10:28), all of which pertain more to journeying. For the present verse, an unattributed Fb note gives the alternate rendering ἐπαύλεις (accusative of ἔπαυλις) which means “a dwelling.” The accusative case is puzzling, since any of the Three and Origen would have been conscious of the required nominative case for the predicate nominative construction. The change to accusative is possibly the result of a scribal error or confusion about the purpose of the note. If a scribe has no idea about the case of a word, however, one would expect him to use the nominative (e.g., for the α’ note in 21:19) rather than the accusative.

Since σταθµός in NUM is not an exact rendering of מַסְעֵי, any of the Three may have perceived a need to provide an alternative. For מַסְעֵי, Aquila and Theodotion use ἀπαρτίας and Symmachus a form of ἀπαίρω in Deuteronomy 10:11. The Three mainly use αἰρω and its complex forms for the related verb מַסְעֵי (αἰρω — α’: Gen 11:2, Jer 38[31]:24; σ’: Ps 77[78]:26; ἀπαρτία — α’: Gen 33:12, Num 2:17; σ’: Gen 11:2, Num 2:17; οἱ α’: Num 21:12, 33:3, Deut 1:40; ἐπασμί α’ σ’: Deut 1:40; ἔξαρσις — α’ σ’: Num 4:21a). More rarely the Three depart from their usual pattern: Symmachus employs ἐλαύνω (“drive,” “carry off”) in Jeremiah 38[31]:24, and for the Hiphil of מַסְעֵי, Aquila uses μετατίθηµι and Symmachus µετεωρέω (“raise/rise up”) in Ecclesiastes 10:9, but these are also verbs of motion. One might expect the Three to use αἰρω or one of its derivatives, or a similar word for מַסְעֵי. As for the word in the present Fb note, ἐπασμί, the Three use it for Hebrew words that mean a dwelling of some kind, whether permanent or temporary (α’ for חַוָּה [“tent camp”] in Deut 3:14; α’ θ’ for טִירָה [“encampment”] in Ezek 25:4; for σ’, Busto-Saiz lists an occurrence in Ps 77[78]:70 for מִכְלָא [“paddock”], but he gives no source).

To summarize the evidence: (1) any of the Three might use a different rendering for מַסְעֵי than σταθµός; (2) the Three use words for מַסְעֵי whose semantic domains relate to journeying or movement (as does NUM outside of 33:1-2); (3) the Three use ἐπασμί for words that relate to dwellings. Aquila, who strove for accuracy, is not a likely source for ἐπασµί, particularly given his use of ἀπαρτίας elsewhere. And the Three seem content to use words related to αἰρω or its derivatives for מַסְעֵי. It is conceivable that Symmachus or Theodotion understood the introductory and summary nature of 35:1-2 and so followed the lead of NUM in using a “station” word rather than a “journey” word. But the word “journeys” seems to convey a summary of the chapter’s contents just as well as “stations,” particularly since throughout the rest of this chapter, HT mentions journeying (using מַסְעֵי) just as often as it mentions camping.

In conclusion, ἐπασµί is closer to σταθµοί in NUM than to anything resembling the expected usage of the Three. It may be a scribal gloss to help clarify the meaning of NUM. The second word in the note, the common word τόποι, is more generic than ἐπασµί and may also be some kind of explanatory note.

Num 33:7-8
HT

καὶ παρενέβαλον ἀπέναντι Μαγδώλου. καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπέναντι Ἐϊρωθ καὶ διέβησαν μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης

LXX

tινὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὕτως ἔκει· καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπὸ στόματος ἐπὶ Ἐϊρωθ καὶ παρενέβαλον ἀπέναντι Μαγδώλου καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ Μαγδώλου καὶ διέβησαν μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης

〈?〉

Var:

Notes: A marginal note in M and C<sup>catt</sup> attempts to "correct" a perceived problem in the text of NUM. NUM translates two different Hebrew verbs in this verse with the same Greek verb, which caused confusion among later copyists. Overall, however, the NUM translation of verses 7-8a corresponds to HT, and Origen appears to have had no interest in changing or marking it. Thus, the present note has little value for the study of the Hexapla itself. The following paragraphs explain in detail why this is so.

HT for verse 7 reads, "And they journeyed from Etham and they turned back (וַיָּשָׁב) towards Pi-Haṭiḥiroth (הַחִירֹת פִּי) which is before Baal-zephon, and they camped (וַיַּחֲנוּ) before Migdol." Thus, in the Hebrew only one camping stop is mentioned in verse 7 —
Migdol — and the בֵּיתוֹ הַמִּסְגֶּל clause describes a facet of the journey to Migdol. The three place names, Pi-Haḥiroth, Baal-zephon, and Migdol are all describing the same general area, and together delineate only one Israelite camp. Verse 8a then reads: “And they journeyed from before Haḥiroth and passed through the midst of the sea.”

NUM made a translation decision in verse 7 that created confusion in the textual tradition. NUM normally uses παρεµβάλλω to render רנה. In verse 7, NUM uses παρεµβάλλω not only for רנה but also for בִּשָּׁב (the latter rendering being unique not only in NUM but also in the LXX). Specifically, the translator rendered בִּשָּׁב using καὶ παρενέβαλον (it is not clear why בִּשָּׁב is in the singular in HT; Sam and Tar have the plural). At the end of the verse, NUM also renders יחנו (as usual) with παρενέβαλον — its second instance for this verse — and thus, where HT describes one camping stop in verse 7, NUM appears to have two: (1) at Pi-Haḥiroth whose location is before Baal-zephon (ἀπέναντι Βεελσεπφών); and (2) before Migdol (ἀπέναντι Μαγδώλου).

Verse 8 in HT begins with the nation journeying “from before Haḥiroth” מִפְּנֵי הַחִירֹת. This is logical since Haḥiroth (Pi-Haḥiroth in verse 7) is part of the place description of the one camping site from verse 7. But for readers of NUM this created confusion, because it seems as if the logical starting point for the next journey is Migdol, the last named camping place, and not Haḥiroth, the perceived second-to-last camp.

Various attempts were made to reestablish the normal pattern. The M and C’ cat marginal note covered in this section begins with the superscription τινὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὕτως ἔκει (“One of the copyists thus here …”) before the text that attempts to place the perceived extra camping place within the normal pattern of “journeying” and “camping”: καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπὸ στόµατος ἐπὶ Ἑϊρὼθ καὶ παρενέβαλον ἀπέναντι Μαγδώλου καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ Μαγδώλου καὶ διέβησαν µέσον τῆς θαλάσσης (“and they departed from the mouth of Ἑϊρὼθ and camped before Μαγδώλου, and they journeyed from Μαγδώλου and passed through the midst of the sea”).

To summarize the modifications, first the phrase καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπὸ στόµατος ἐπὶ Ἑϊρὼθ is added to verse 7 prior to καὶ παρενέβαλον ἀπέναντι Μαγδώλου, in order to establish a previous departure from Ἑϊρὼθ. Second, at the beginning of verse 8, the phrase καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπέναντι Ἑϊρὼθ is replaced with the perceived new starting point: καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ Μαγδώλου.

As mentioned above, the original NUM translation corresponds to HT straightforwardly, except for the translation of both בַּשָּׁב and יחנו by παρενέβαλον. The only hexaplaric witnesses that reflect any of the abovementioned changes are 58, which often departs from the rest of the O-group, and Syh, which adds the phrase καὶ ἀπῆραν ἀπέναντι Ἑϊρὼθ to verse 7. The rest of the O-group and the other hexaplaric groups show no influence, and the probability is that Origen did not correct these verses at all. Note that Hatch and Redpath mark the first instance of παρεµβάλλω in verse 7 as a “textual variant in the Hexapla,” but the evidence indicates that no other word besides παρεµβάλλω was ever used in any text tradition either prior to or subsequent to the Hexapla. Thus, it is not clear how παρεµβάλλω is a variant, hexaplaric or otherwise.
Num 33:54

HT רלבָּגוֹ
LXX ἐν κλήρῳ

〈?〉 κληρωτί

Wit 1: M

Wit 2: A F oΓ 15–29-707 C” b 56 lx t 343 344 345 c y 18-628 (sed hab Compl) = Ald

Notes: For רלבָּגוֹ in HT, NUM has ἐν κλήρῳ, and manuscript M includes a note that substitutes the adverb κληρωτί for ἐν κλήρῳ. This alternate reading is shared by many manuscripts, including the uncial A and F. Although κληρωτί is similar in meaning to ἐν κλήρῳ, its use is rare in the LXX, occurring only in Joshua 21:4, 5, 7, and 8. None of the Three use κληρωτί. According to a 344 note, ο’ and οἱ λ’ read ἐν κλήρῳ here for רלבָּגוֹ, and as the οἱ λ’ reading fits the normal usage of the Three it is probably correct (see the ο’ οἱ λ’ entry for this verse in Chapter 3). The present note is possibly from a scholiast who is listing (in the margin of M) another reading in the text tradition besides ἐν κλήρῳ, the reading that appears in the text of M. Note that in M, the index has been incorrectly placed at verse 53.

HT (לַל) יִהְיֶה לוֹ
LXX (αὐτοῦ ἔσται)

〈?〉 + ὁ κλῆρος

Wit 1: 85‘-321‘-344

Wit 2: M’ ↓ d n 54 ↓ t ↓ 799 Syh

Var: ὁ | > d t; κλῆρος] + αὐτοῦ 799

NonGr: Syh Α’ ἡμέραν

Notes: Both HT and NUM have similar expressions for how the land will be allocated when the lot falls on a name: HT has יִהְיֶה לוֹ and NUM has αὐτοῦ ἔσται. An unattributed s-group note adds ὁ κλῆρος after αὐτοῦ ἔσται and this is supported by a number of manuscript texts, including M and Syh (which places it under the obelus), but not by any Greek hexaplaric manuscripts. Wevers argues that this addition pre-dates the Hexapla (NGTN 569). That it was contained in the ο’ text is doubtful, given that other than Syh, no Ο-group or other hexaplaric witnesses have it. Of the Three, Symmachus
might conceivably have added ὁ κλῆρος as a contextual addition for clarification, but the evidence is insufficient to make an attribution.

Num 35:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>נחלות</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>κλήρων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 μερίδων· κτήσεων

Wit 1: 130-321′

Notes: For נחלות in HT, an unattributed s-group note gives the alternate reading μερίδων (from μερίς, "part/portion"), which is more generic than κλῆρος in NUM. NUM employs κλῆρος for נחלות to describe an inheritance of land in 16:14, 18:21, 24, 26, 26:62, 27:7, 32:19, 34:14, 15, 35:2, 36:3, 36:9. NUM also uses κλῆρος for לָגוֹ to refer to a lot that was cast to make a decision (e.g., 26:55, 56, 33:54, 34:13, 36:2, 3 for dividing the land).

Aquila and Symmachus use κλῆρος for גורל (α': Josh 21:20; σ': Lev 16:8, Josh 21:20), and Theodotion for a form of שִׁרְי in Deuteronomy 19:14. All of the Three use κληρονομία for נחלות (α' θ': Jer 10:16; σ' θ': Job 27:13b; θ': Ezek 35:15), and Aquila uses κληροδοσία for נחלות (e.g., Deut 4:20). Regarding μερίς, all of the Three use the word, but either for חֵלֶק ("portion," e.g., α': Jer 28[51]:19; σ': Ps 16[17]:14, Ecc 5:18; θ': Isa 57:6; α' σ' θ': Isa 61:7) or for עֵבֶר ("side/edge," α': Jer 31[48]:28). Thus, the evidence does not indicate that any of the Three would use μερίς for נחלות in the current context.

The additional reading κτήσεων accompanies μερίς. The word κτήσεων refers more specifically to "possessions," although not necessarily associated with an inheritance. In the book of Leviticus, κτήσεως is used to refer to a "possession of land" (e.g., Lev 20:24, 25:10, 13, 16) whereas κλῆρος is used for a "lot" that is cast (Lev 16:9,10). As discussed above, NUM uses κλῆρος to refer either to a "lot" or an "inheritance." All of the Three employ κτήσεως, but for words that fit the semantic domain of "property" or "possession as property" (e.g., מִקְנֶה — α' σ' θ': Isa 30:23). The 130-321′ note may be a scholiast’s gloss that attempts to clarify the sense that κλῆρος has in the present verse (i.e., as a possession of land). Field classifies this note as from a scholiast, and he is probably correct. A similar unattributed note from the same manuscripts appears in 36:3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT</th>
<th>מִגְרָשׁ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>προάστια</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

〈?〉 πλάτη
Notes: A marginal note from 130-321′ for this verse gives πλάτη as an alternate rendering for מִגְרָשׁ ("pasture lands" or "outskirts") rather than προάστια in NUM. All of the Three employ the word πλάτος but almost exclusively for words related to the root רָחָב, and none use πλάτος for the more specialized term מִגְרָשׁ. By contrast, all of the Three use other more exact equivalents for מִגְרָשׁ (see the discussion under the unattributed reading εὐρύχωρα for מִגְרָשׁ in 35:3). Not enough evidence exists to assign a possible source to this reading; it is possibly from a scholiast.

Wit 1: 130-321’

Num 35:3

HT מִגְרְשֵׁי
LXX καὶ τὰ ἀφορίσµατα αὐτῶν

(?) εὐρύχωρα

Wit 1: 130-321’

Notes: Along with the reading ἀποβλήµατα attributed to Theodotion (see Chapter 3), another unattributed reading has εὐρύχωρα ("wide") as an alternate rendering for מִגְרָשׁ. Aquila renders מִגְרָשׁ as περισπόριον in Joshua 21:15. Since Aquila is generally consistent in his translation patterns, and because εὐρύχωρος is more generic than the term that Aquila uses elsewhere for מִגְרָשׁ, he is not a likely candidate for this reading.

Symmachus uses προάστειον for מִגְרָשׁ in Joshua 21:15. By contrast, he uses εὐρύχωρος for בְּרָחָב in Isaiah 33:21. Thus, although Symmachus does vary his Greek renderings, there seems to be no reason for him to use a generic term meaning "wide/roomy" for the more specialized term מִגְרָשׁ, particularly when he uses the more precise προάστειον for מִגְרָשׁ elsewhere. So although the reading might be perceived as from Symmachus because it appears with another reading attributed to Theodotion (although incorrectly — see Chapter 3), no other evidence supports Symmachus as the source.

Theodotion employs εὐρύχωρος for בְּרָחָב in Judges 18:10. For מִגְרָשׁ, Theodotion uses ἀφορίσµα (retroverted from Syh in Ezek 48:17 and from Jerome in Ezek 45:2). Thus, as with Symmachus, nothing points to Theodotion using εὐρύχωρος here for מִגְרָשׁ. In conclusion, the source of the note cannot be determined.

Num 35:4

HT מִגְרְשֵׁי
LXX καὶ τὰ συγκυροῦντα
καὶ τὰ διαφέροντα· συνεγγύζοντα

Wit 1:  \(F^b\)

Notes: For συγκυροῦντα (“ones contiguous to”) in NUM, an unattributed \(F^b\) note gives the alternate rendering διαφέροντα for מִגְרָשׁ in HT. διαφέροντα (a participle from διαφέρω) normally refers to “things carried across” or “things that differ,” but it can denote “things appertaining to.” Of the Three, Theodotion uses the verb in the same participial form in Daniel 7:3 for Aramaic שָׁה (“be different/changed”). The other two translators do not use διαφέρω. The related adjective διάφορος is used by Aquila and Theodotion for יִשָּׂ (α’: Exod 25:4, 28:5, 35:23, Is 1:18; θ’: Ex 28:5), and the noun διαφορά is used by Symmachus in Ecclesiastes 6:5 (the Hebrew referent there is not clear). In the present context, it is unlikely that any of the Three would use διαφέροντα to refer to the “pasturelands” (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל) surrounding a village, particularly since they all have alternate words for מִגְרָשׁ (see the discussion under the unattributed reading εὐρύχωρα for מִגְרָשׁ in 35:3).

\(F^b\) also has συνεγγύζοντα as a second note. None of the Three use this word. It overlaps in meaning with the verb NUM uses here (συγκυρέω) and was perhaps a scribal gloss along with the first note. In conclusion, one cannot determine the source of either of the words in this \(F^b\) note. They may be from a later scholiast.

Num 35:20

HT בִּצְדִיָּה
LXX ἐξ ἐνέδρου

Wit 1:  130-321′

Notes: HT uses a rare word to describe someone in hiding: צְדִיָּה. In the OT, this word appears only in this verse and in verse 22. NUM gives a contextual translation, using ἐνέδρον (“ambush”). An unattributed s-group note has the alternate rendering ἐγκρυφίως, an adverbial form that seems to be related to the noun ἐγκρυφός (“hidden”) and the verb ἐγκρυφίαζω (“to keep oneself hidden”). None of the Three use the noun or the verb although Aquila and Theodotion use the related ἐγκρύπτω for הָיָן in Job 20:26. As for the adverb ἐγκρυφίως, it is unattested elsewhere in classical, Hellenistic,
or Byzantine Greek. Thus, the source of the note cannot be determined. It is reminiscent of some of the $F^b$ notes that appear to be from later scholiasts.

**Num 36:3**

| HT | נַחֲלָתָ | הַκְּלָלָה |
| LXX | ὁ κλῆρος |

〈?〉 ἡ μερίς

*Wit 1: 130-321′*

**Notes:** Three s-group manuscripts give the alternate reading ἡ μερίς for נַחֲלָתָ, which is more generic than ὁ κλῆρος in NUM. This is almost identical to a note at 35:2 from the same three manuscripts (there they substitute μερίδων for נַחֲלָתָ). As discussed there, all of the Three use μερίς, but not to render נַחֲלָתָ. In addition, they all have more specific words for נַחֲלָתָ. For example, all of the Three use κληρονομία for נַחֲלָתָ (e.g., α′ θ′: Jer 10:16; σ′ θ′: Job 27:13b; θ′: Ezek 35:15), and Aquila uses κληροδοσία for נַחֲלָתָ (e.g., Deut 4:20). Thus, not enough evidence exists to assign this reading to any of the Three. Field classifies the note at 35:2 as from a scholiast, and this may be true here also.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY

This dissertation provides a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Numbers 18-36 in accordance with the criteria set forth by the board of the Hexapla Project. What follows are some summary observations about the work. The first section provides comments and statistics on the number and nature of readings for the project. The second section contains points of difference with Wevers both in overall focus on the Hexapla and in specific areas where this project has highlighted materials the hexaplaric significance of which Wevers overlooked, mainly because of the different purposes of his work. The third section examines two O-group manuscripts which display interesting features.

Nature of the Readings

Numbers 19-36 contains over 900 readings that are hexaplaric or that have traditionally been associated with the Hexapla. This section will consider the Three, Origen and his relation to the Three, the Aristarchian signs, and other readings.

The Three

Numbers 19-36 contains over 400 attributions to α′, σ′, θ′, οἱ λ′, or οἱ γ′. Of these, four are incorrect (two have unknown origins and two have been reassigned). Among the approximately 130 unattributed readings, 74 have been assigned to one or

1In some cases, Wevers has two or more attributions listed in his second apparatus that have been combined into one for this project because they have been deemed to belong to the same original reading. The following statistics treat these multiply-attributed readings as a single reading.

2In 21:12, an attribution to ο and οἱ λ′ has been reassigned to σ′, and at 24:17, an attribution to σ′ has been reassigned to θ′.
more of the Three. A total of 114 readings are shared by all of the Three – 102 readings from οἱ λ', 7 more from οἱ γ', and five that explicitly mention α', σ', and θ' together. Most of the οἱ λ' readings make sense for any of the Three, although some are more likely from one or two of the translators.

Aquila has 88 readings attributed to him and 6 more that have been assigned to him in this project. Aquila agrees with ο' attributions 10 times. As for the other two translators, apart from the readings common to all of the Three mentioned above, Aquila agrees with Symmachus alone 9 times, and with Theodotion alone 22 times. This means that Aquila stands alone 51 times. His translation technique is generally very quantitative. At times, he renders a word even when Greek usage would allow it to be ignored. In addition, Aquila tends to be consistent with his renderings even when context demands a different choice of word. For example, he uses ῥαβδός ("staff") for מַחְיָב even when the context indicates that the alternate sense, typically rendered by φυλή ("tribe") in the LXX of Numbers, is clearly intended.

Symmachus has 93 readings attributed to him, of which one has been reassigned to Theodotion. In addition, 21 attributions have been assigned to him from among the previously unattributed readings or wrongly attributed readings. He agrees with ο' attributions 9 times. Among the Three, Symmachus agrees with Aquila alone 9 times and with Theodotion alone 16 times. Thus, he stands alone 83 times, a number far higher than either Aquila or Theodotion. This is an indication of Symmachus’ relative

3 The comparative totals for the Three include attributed readings, reassigned readings, and unattributed readings that have been assigned to the one or more of the Three.

4 The level of confidence varies in assigning unattributed readings to particular authors or to the Three. The factors and assessments are discussed in the apparatus for each individual case.

5 For example, in 23:19 where the Hebrew says literally, “God is not a man and he should lie,” NUM substitutes an infinitive, “God is not man to lie.” Aquila renders the second part literally: καὶ διεφεύγεται.

6 See 1:20-21, 47, 2:5, 18:2, 36:8.

7 See the {σ'} entry under 24:17.
independence from the other translators. In general, Symmachus’ translation, although quite true to the original Hebrew, is less rigidly literal than either Aquila or Theodotion. For example, unlike the other two translators, Symmachus does not have a standard way of rendering Hebrew infinitive absolute with cognate finite verbs and he may leave the infinitive untranslated.\(^8\) Another example is Symmachus’ use of the postpositive \(δέ\) instead of the literal \(καί\) for the Hebrew \(waw\).\(^9\) Of the Three, Symmachus is arguably the most sensitive to the demands of the target language.

Theodotion has 69 attributed readings of which two are incorrect.\(^10\) In addition, 14 readings have been assigned to him from unattributed readings. His total of attributed readings, outside of the readings attributed to the Three, is less than for either of the other translators, which may be due to his general agreement with the LXX. This can be seen, for example, in his agreement with the \(ο′\) attributions 21 times – more often than both Aquila and Symmachus combined. He agrees with Aquila alone 22 times and with Symmachus alone 16 times, and he stands alone 38 times. He appears to have had an impact on the LXX tradition, possibly through Origenic readings that follow Theodotion, but also independently.\(^11\)

**The Origenic Readings**

**Origen and the Three.** Numbers has a relatively large number of \(ο′\) readings, which allows comparisons with the readings of the Three. The total of attributed \(ο′\) readings is 118, of which 2 are incorrect.\(^12\) Of the 116 correct attributions to \(ο′\), 47 agree with \(οἱ λ′\), 2 agree with \(α′\) alone, 4 agree with \(σ′\) alone, and 8 agree with \(θ′\)

---

\(^8\) A good example of this is 21:2 (see also 16:13).

\(^9\) For example, see 1:19, 3:32, 22:23, 30:13, 16.

\(^10\) See the \(\{θ′\}\) entries under 31:18 and 35:3.

\(^11\) For example, many Greek manuscripts match \(θ′\) and \(ο′\) at 21:20 and 25:4, but at 36:12, \(θ′\) is different from \(ο′\), and the majority of manuscripts follow \(θ′\).

\(^12\) See the \(\{ο′\}\) entries under 21:27, 22:9, and 33:23.
alone. In addition, \( \omega' \) agrees with \( \alpha' \) and \( \theta' \) 8 times and with \( \sigma' \) and \( \theta' \) 5 times. Thus, \( \omega' \) agrees with \( \alpha' \) a total of 10 times, with \( \sigma' \) 9 times, and with \( \theta' \) 21 times. The Origenic readings agree with \( \theta' \) more than with \( \alpha' \) and \( \sigma' \) combined, confirming the similarity of Origen with Theodotion.

**Origenic readings and the \( s \)-group.** The vast majority of the \( \omega' \) readings occur in the margins of the \( s \)-group manuscripts, and most of those readings occur in 344. In almost every case, the \( s \)-group text differs from the \( \omega' \) reading, indicating an awareness by the \( s \)-group copyist that the Origenic tradition varied from the available \( s \)-group lemma.\(^{13}\) In most cases, the \( \omega' \) reading is validated by the agreement of hexaplaric manuscripts.

**The Aristarchian Signs**

Numbers 19-36 has approximately 300 Aristarchian signs, including 145 asterisks, 146 obeli, 6 lemnisks (\( \sim \)), and 6 lemnisk-like signs without the dots (\( \sim \)). The two main sources of Aristarchian signs are manuscript G from the \( O \)-group and the Syro-Hexapla. Infrequently, a few other manuscripts also have the signs.

**Asterisks.** There are 152 asterisks in Numbers 19-36, 8 of which are probably incorrect. In addition, some 50 or more other instances have been identified where the Hexapla may have originally had an asterisk which was later lost. The vast majority of asterisks are used to indicate where the Hebrew has text that is not rendered by the LXX and simply to add the exact (or close) equivalent in Greek. Occasionally, an asterisk is used for a more complicated textual operation, for example when one word or phrase is substituted for another.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\)For an exception, see 32:13.

\(^{14}\)For example, see 28:13.
As noted above, the vast majority of asterisks are found in \(O\)-group manuscript \(G\) and in Syh. In many instances Syh misplaces its asterisks,\(^{15}\) as does \(G\) occasionally.\(^{16}\) In general, however, it is usually possible to reconstruct the original hexaplaric asterisk tradition using the Hebrew text and the LXX witnesses.

**Obeli.** The second half of Numbers has 143 obeli, 4 of which are incorrect.\(^ {17}\) In addition, in 10 other instances the Hexapla possibly had obeli that later were lost. As mentioned above, Syh incorrectly places some asterisks, but it misplaces many more obeli.\(^ {18}\) In Sy\(h\)\(^1\) in particular, obeli are often found one word away from their proper locations, and in rare instances farther.\(^ {19}\)

**Lemnisks.** Chapters 19-36 contain 6 lemnisks, all of which are used to indicate the so-called \(\Pi\Pi\Pi\) readings.\(^ {20}\) This Greek spelling was used for the Tetragrammaton (\(\text{יהוה}\)), which apparently was read backwards as the capital Greek letters \(\pi i o t a \ pi i o t a\). All of the lemnisks are located in Sy\(h\)\(^1\).

**Lemnisk-like signs.** An apparent Aristarchian marking without an official name has the appearance of a lemnisk but without dots (\(\sim\)). In three places, these signs have a function similar to the obelus,\(^ {21}\) while in three other places they appear to be spurious.

**Other readings**


\(^{16}\)See 25:12, 34:2.

\(^{17}\)This does not count the few obelus signs that were incorrectly substituted for different signs.

\(^{18}\)See, for example, 19:18, 21:8, 25:16.

\(^{19}\)For example, at 20:12.

\(^{20}\)These are located at 20:16 (2x), 21:3, 21:7 (3x).

\(^{21}\)At 21:5, 8, and 28:7.
The Samaritikon and τὸ σαµ′. The Hebrew text of the Samaritan Pentateuch of Numbers has a total of 15 insertions not found in HT, 13 that come from Deuteronomy and 2 from Numbers. These added text sections provide background or explanation for the narrative events in Numbers. Some manuscripts contain marginal notes with Greek translations of these Samaritan Pentateuch insertions, presumably from a Greek version of the Samaritan Pentateuch called the Samaritikon. In addition, Syh has Syriac translations of the Greek versions of all of these insertions. Whether these Greek readings appeared in the original Hexapla is an open question. They have been traditionally associated with the Hexapla, however, and so they are included in this project.

Another group of readings are attributed to τὸ σαµ′ – 4 of them appear in Numbers 1-18 and another 12 in Numbers 19-36. In addition, another 6 unattributed readings have been assigned to τὸ σαµ′ by this project. The relationship of some of these readings with the Samaritikon is unclear. For example, in 4:25, a τὸ σαµ′ note provides added details about the curtain of the tabernacle, but the text is not reflected in the Samaritan Pentateuch. In chapter 32, however, a set of τὸ σαµ′ readings corresponds exactly with Hebrew text in the Samaritan Pentateuch which is not in HT. The final τὸ σαµ′ note in chapter 32 is in verse 33, and it reads: (“in the ones formerly spoken [i.e., the previous verses with τὸ σαµ′ readings] – not mentioned; but in the Samaritikon they are declared”). Thus, these τὸ σαµ′ notes are identified with the Samaritikon. Further work is needed on the nature and purpose of the τὸ σαµ′ readings.

τὸ ἑβρ′. A set of 5 readings attributed to τὸ ἑβρ′ is located in Numbers 22. Elsewhere, in Numbers 1-18, these attributions also have the alternate names ὁ ἑβρ′ or ἑβραϊστί, and among these earlier readings are two that are transliterations of Hebrew

---

22 For details on these insertions, see the discussion in Chapter 3 under 20:13.

23 They are located in 32:1, 2, 6, 25, and 31.
words. In chapter 22, three of the five τὸ ἑβρ′ readings match οἱ λ′ and render the Tetragrammaton more exactly with κύριος rather than θεοῦ in the LXX. The other two readings match α′ and are transliterations. The transliterations could be a witness to Origen’s second column, but the overall purpose of these readings is not clear.

ἄλλοι. In Numbers overall, a total of five attributions to ἄλλοι appear, three of which are in Numbers 19-36.24 For every case in Numbers, these attributions could simply serve as alternate names for οἱ λ′ (e.g., 26:51, and 27:21 where the ἄλλοι reading matches θ′). In one case, a second, explanatory note has been added, but this could be a later explanatory gloss added to the original ἄλλοι note.

Transpositions. Origen often corrected word order to match the Hebrew without using Aristarchian markings to note the changes. When these transpositions occur in isolation they are noted with “non tr” entries, of which 59 are covered in this hexaplaric apparatus. In some cases, transpositions can be part of wider Origenic modifications that are marked with asterisks or o′ attributions.

Names. Origen often changed the LXX spelling of proper names to conform more closely to the Hebrew, and as with transpositions, he usually did this without any Aristarchian notation. In the hexaplaric apparatus for Numbers 19-36 these entries usually appear under the heading ⟨o′⟩ – that is, unattributed readings that are assigned to Origen. A high concentration of these ⟨o′⟩ entries for names appears in chapter 33, which contains a list of the place names for the journeys of Israel.

Unattributed readings. As mentioned above, about 125 unattributed readings appears in Numbers 19-36, 74 of which have been assigned to one or more of the translators. The main criteria for assigning a reading are typical vocabulary and

24The ἄλλοι readings are at 26:51, and 27:21 (2x).
The approximately 50 readings that are not potentially from any of the Three, or from another attributed source such as the Samaritan Pentateuch, are listed in Chapter 4 with (?) entries. Many of these notes appear to be explanatory glosses. Manuscript Fb in particular contains some possibly hexaplaric readings, but it also has many other readings that appear to be later scholiasts’ notes.

**Value of a Critical Edition of the Hexapla**

Although Wevers assembled a critical edition for Numbers almost thirty years ago, and he also compiled many helpful exegetical insights in a companion book, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, establishing a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Numbers provides at least three additional benefits. First, this project focuses on the Hexapla, and only secondarily on the LXX. Second, the database of the Three will provide a valuable research tool. And third, the sources of many unattributed readings have been clarified.

**Focus on the Hexapla.** As valuable as the hexaplaric materials in Wevers’ first and second apparatuses are, Wevers’ focus was reconstructing the Old Greek. Thus, the hexaplaric sources are presented without comment and without an evaluation of their content and probable genuineness. One goal of the Hexapla Project is to evaluate individual readings by assessing their accuracy and provenance. The format of this critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Number 19-36 lends itself to the kinds of data gathering and comparisons needed to make these kinds of evaluations.

**Database of the Three.** The existing works on readings of the Three are useful, but they are well short of complete. Hatch and Redpath, in particular, lists examples of readings of the Three but does not list the Hebrew lemmas to which the readings refer. This is particularly vexing when dealing with poetic literature where many synonyms occur, and where one cannot determine with certainty what Hebrew
word an author was translating. The works of Reider on Aquila, Salvesen on Symmachus in the Pentateuch, and Busto-Saiz on Symmachus in the Psalms are valuable, but limited in their scope. In addition, some of the older reference works are out-of-date and even incorrect in places with regards to attributions to the Three. The task of evaluating the validity of attributed readings and assigning authors for unattributed readings will be greatly aided by a comprehensive database of the Three. As the database grows it will facilitate the task of evaluating existing attributions in an iterative process, and it will allow the sources of previously unclassified readings to be determined more accurately.

**New attributions.** This critical edition of the hexaplaric materials for Number 19-36 has proposed approximately 75 attributions from previously unattributed materials. Some of these attributions have a higher confidence level than others. But in any case, as the Hexapla Project proceeds, these new attributions will contribute to the overall study not only of the Hexapla but of the LXX and the Hebrew OT text as well. In addition, they will help to provide further insight into Judaism during the first three centuries A.D.

**Character of O-group Witnesses**

Due to the nature of Origen’s activity, one often sees the o’ text more closely approximate the Hebrew text than NUM, for example with asterisks and obeli. Origen also regularly modifies word order and the spelling of names to conform to HT without noting these changes with Aristarchian signs. In most of these cases, Origen’s work is reflected in the main Origenic group of manuscripts (the O-group), with manuscripts G-58-376-426. Two O-group manuscripts, however, show regular differences with the rest of the O-group. The first is manuscript 58 which often agrees with NUM against the rest of the O-group (and HT). Conversely, manuscript 426 sometimes conforms more closely to HT than the rest of the O-group.
Of all the $O$-group manuscripts, 58 diverges from the united witness of the other three more often than any of the others. For example, in many instances where the rest of the $O$-group witnesses to an $o'$ text asterisk, 58 matches NUM and does not have the added text. Wevers notes that manuscript 58 omits materials under the obelus more than any other manuscript. Together with its tendency to omit asterisked materials, Wevers wonders if perhaps the copyist omitted material under hexaplaric signs without distinguishing asterisks and obeli.\(^{25}\) As another example, in 50 cases where NUM orders words differently that HT and the $o'$ text modifies the order to match the Hebrew ("non tr" entries in the apparatus), manuscript 58 diverges from the $O$-group (and HT) and agrees with NUM 33 times.

Unlike 58, manuscript 426 sometimes diverges from the rest of the $O$-group towards the Hebrew rather than away from it. In a significant number of instances, 426 is the only witness (or at least the only hexaplaric witness) that corresponds quantitatively to the Hebrew. Since one would hardly suppose that later scribes knew Hebrew or had access to a Hebrew text, what could be the mechanism for this agreement between 426 and HT? One possibility, suggested by Wevers, is that a later scribe had access to one or more of the Three.\(^{26}\) But another plausible explanation is that 426 represents an older and more reliable witness to the $o'$ text.

The degree of independence of 426 can be classified four ways. First, 426 is sometimes the only witness to a particular HT reading. For example, in Numbers 21:11, HT reads בְּעִיֵּי הָעֲבָרִים. NUM translates this ἐν Ἀχελγαί ἐκ τοῦ πέραν. The rendering Ἀχελγαί is not easy to explain, since later, in 33:44, NUM renders עִיֵּי in the same name as Γαί. Here, manuscript 426 alone reads Ἄιή, which is the closest approximation to HT of all the witnesses. The instances where 426 matches HT alone


among all witnesses are: 21:11, 22:13, 26:17[21] (2x), 26:26[17], 26:44[40], 26:46[42] (2x), 26:47[43], 26:54, 26:57, 32:3, and 33:38. Because manuscript G has a large lacuna through most of Numbers 8-11 and 20-29, in some of these cases G may also be a witness along with 426 (this is discussed further below). But the number of instances where 426 appears alone is still significant.

A second degree of independence is demonstrated where 426 and Syh together witness to an alignment with HT apart from all other witnesses. One example is at 28:13, where HT has עֹלָה which is not matched by NUM, and Origen adds εἰς ὅλοκαύτωµα under the asterisk. Although this is an apt contextual rendering, the preposition εἰς does not match HT quantitatively. 426 and Syh alone omit εἰς and thus align more closely to the Hebrew. The cases where 426 and Syh agree alone with HT occur at 23:27, 26:44[40], 41[37], 60, 61, 28:13, 28:22, and 31:37.

A third classification of independence, related to the second, can be seen where 426 agrees with HT along with other non-Greek translations (possibly including Syh), but is still independent of all other Greek witnesses. This occurs at 19:1, 20:12, 22:31, 26:42[38] (2x), 27:17, and 32:36.

A fourth and final degree of independence is shown where 426 agrees and some Greek witnesses agree with HT, but the rest of the O-group does not. An example is 30:15 where HT reads אֱסָרֶיהָ but NUM has no equivalent for the suffix. The rest of the O-group agrees with NUM, but 426 along with a number of other Greek witnesses outside of the O-group add the equivalent αὐτῆς. This type of situation occurs at 21:1, 3, 22:17, 32, 26:18[22], 26[17], 57 (2x), 59 (2x), 27:22, 28:6, 29:22, 30:15,17, 32:3, 35, 33:3, 6, 7, 14, 15 (2x), 16, 24 (2x), 25, 27, 28, 34:4 and 22.

What is the source of this Hebrew influence on manuscript 426? One explanation, mentioned above, is that a copyist had access to one or more of the Three and made corrections based on their translations. But three examples suggest that 426 at
times represents an о’ text that conforms to HT more closely than the Three, thus eliminating copying from the Three as a factor. The first example is in 22:13, where 426 follows oi λ’ in using κύριος for קָרָם instead of ὁ θεός (426 alone of the O-group follows the Three regularly in this practice in chapters 22-24). HT has the phrase מֵאֵן יְהוָה לְתִתִּי לַהֲלֹךְ (“the Lord has refused to allow me to go”). NUM translates adequately as οὐκ ἀφίησίν µε ὁ θεὸς πορεύεσθαι — it simplifies by rendering the three Hebrew verbs with two (“he has not permitted me to go”). In addition, it transposes the first person suffix to before ὁ θεός. A few other Greek manuscripts change ὁ θεός to κύριος, but 426 alone also transposes µε to after κύριος to conform more closely to the Hebrew word order — not even the Three have this transposition. Origen frequently transposed words in the о’ text to correspond to the Hebrew word order, and thus 426 could be representing a better reading of the о’ text here.

The second and third examples are found in 26:20, and in both 426 possibly reflects an о’ text closer to HT than the Three. In 26:20, the family name שִׁמְרֹן and the related gentilic הַשִּׁמְרֹנִי appear. For the family name plus preposition לְשִׁמְרֹן NUM, along with attributed readings for о’, α’, and θ’ have τῷ Σαµράµ while an σ’ attribution has τοῦ Σεµρώµ. Here, 426 alone reads Σαµράν which is closer to the Hebrew and could represent Origen’s original correction of the name. Similarly, later in the verse the gentilic הַשִּׁמְרֹנִי appears. NUM renders this ὁ Σαµραµί; attributed readings for о’, α’, and θ’ have ὁ Σαµραµεί and an σ’ reading has ὁ Σεµρωνίτης. Again, 426 alone matches the Hebrew with ὁ Σαµραµεί, and this could represent the original о’ text. In these two cases, assuming the attributions to the Three are accurate, Origen may have introduced the more correct form of the name through his own knowledge of Hebrew.

Another way that 426 could show the influence of the Three is indirectly, through the о’ text, where Origen himself copied from one of the revisors. An example is 33:40, where HT uses the wayyiqtol expression יִשְׁמַע הַכְּנַעֲנִי. NUM translates this as
καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Χανανίς, using a participle, which leaves an awkward dangling participial phrase, and rendering the gentilic as a proper name. Aquila and Theodotion have the alternate rendering καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ Χαναναῖος. They thus make two changes to conform more closely to the Hebrew: first they render the *wayyiqtol* as a finite verb, and second, they use the gentilic. For the first change, 426 alone among the O-group agrees with α’ and θ’ by having a finite verb. Rather than reflecting the direct influence of one of the Three on 426, this reading may represent the original o’ text, and if it does, Origen may have copied the reading of Aquila or Theodotion.

In a number of cases, 426 and G are the sole witnesses to the o’ text and HT. G is an old and reliable witness, but as mentioned above, G has some lacunae in Numbers (7:85-11:18, 20:22-25:2, and 26:3-29:12). Where G contains the text of Numbers, G and 426 together witness to the o’ text apart from any other Greek witnesses 14 times, and additionally they witness together apart from any other members of the O-group 18 times. Thus, 426 aligns with G regularly in representing the o’ text. In the sections where G is missing text, 426 agrees with the o’ text alone among all Greek witnesses 18 times, and additionally it agrees with the o’ text alone among the O-group 13 times. Thus, it seems likely that in some of these instances, G also would agree with 426. This, however, does not undermine the reliability of 426. First, that it agrees with an old and reliable witness further substantiates the accuracy of 426. Second, even in places where G has text, 426 regularly agrees with HT independent of G and the rest of the O-group.27 Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that its degree of quantitative correspondence with HT indicates that at many points, 426 represents a very early copy of the fifth column. In some cases for the other O-group manuscripts, and particularly for 58, the original o’ text readings were corrupted and increasingly conformed to NUM.

As a point of caution, one cannot make sweeping generalizations about 426 readings in Numbers. An issue is that in Number 19-36, examples occur where 426 diverges from the Hebrew as compared with the rest of the O-group. For example, in 22:19, O-group manuscripts 58 and 376 witness to an asterisk in the o’ text while 426 is missing the added text. Examples of divergence from HT occur in 21:20, 26, 22:9, 19, 24:22, 29:8, 13, 31:27, and 34:22. Thus, 426 also reflects the kinds of negative and corrupting influences that affect all manuscript traditions.
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ABSTRACT

A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEXAPLARIC FRAGMENTS OF NUMBERS 19-36

Andrew Huszagh McClurg, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011
Chair: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

This dissertation provides a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Number 19-36, including (1) Aristarchan signs, (2) attributions to Aquila (α′), Symmachus (σ′), and Theodotion (θ′), and (3) other materials traditionally included among hexaplaric materials. The project includes all witnesses, references, and citations in Greek manuscripts and in such works as the Syro-Hexapla, Latin and other non-Greek sources, and patristic references. The work updates the work of Frederick Field in Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta from 1875. It also updates the hexaplaric apparatus of the Göttingen edition, Numeri, edited by John W. Wevers.

Chapter 1 provides a history of the hexapla and hexaplaric research. The chapter also provides methodological details and an introduction to interpreting the apparatus.

Chapter 2 gives an introduction to the most important hexaplaric sources used for the project. These include the Origenic group which adheres closely to the fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla, the s-group which contains many hexaplaric notes, and the Syro-Hexapla manuscripts.
Chapter 3 is the main body of the critical edition. It provides the relevant texts from the Hebrew and the Greek Septuagint as well as the hexaplaric materials with comments following.

Chapter 4 contains those readings that do not appear to be hexaplaric, but which are found in sources that contain other valid hexaplaric materials. Many of these are included in Wevers’ second apparatus.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the results of the project. Details include aggregate number of types of readings, a comparison with Wevers’ edition, and some remarks on significant Origenic manuscripts.
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