

# Scribal Harmonization in Codex Alexandrinus? The Pentateuchal Quotations in the Corpus Paulinum\*

Florenc Mene, University of Edinburgh

**Abstract:** This study examines the phenomenon of scribal harmonization in Codex Alexandrinus. It does so by analyzing all the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum of A(02) to detect the presence of harmonization as a result of the LXX's influence on the New Testament quotations (or vice-versa). It demonstrates that A(02) exhibits few signs of influence of LXX on Corpus Paulinum quotations (or vice-versa). It also reveals some characteristics of A(02)'s scribes. Finally, it shows that the influence of LXX on the New Testament quotations in biblical manuscripts, even as late as the fifth century, may not necessarily be as pervasive as is often assumed.

## 1. Introduction

Fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus (British Library's MS Royal 1. D.V-VIII; von Soden's  $\delta$  4; Gregory-Aland's A, or 02) is an invaluable textual witness.<sup>1</sup> Along with two other codices—Vaticanus (03) and Sinaiticus (01)—it contains the entire Bible in Greek, constituting “a primary witness to the biblical texts.”<sup>2</sup> Alexandrinus (henceforth, A[02]) is deemed to be of a mixed nature in the New Testament. Kurt and Barbara Aland opined that its “text is of uneven value ... inferior in the Gospels, good in the rest of the New Testament.”<sup>3</sup>

Despite its importance, however, many aspects of A(02) remain underexplored. As David Parker comments, “the bibliography on this manuscript is surprisingly sparse.”<sup>4</sup> W. Andrew

---

\* Gratitude is owed to Dirk Jongkind's invaluable guidance as supervisor of my M.Phil. dissertation at the University of Cambridge. Its fruit is presented in this study. Thanks to Elijah Hixson and Jacob W. Peterson for their incisive comments on early drafts of this article. Thanks also to the anonymous reviewer for their invaluable feedback.

<sup>1</sup> See Kurt Aland et al., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 19. For more background information on A(02), see J. K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, 3rd ed., NovTSup 160 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 55–58, which lists all the bibliography on text-critical studies related to A(02). This bibliography is updated regularly to include the latest text-critical studies.

<sup>2</sup> W. A. Smith, *A Study of the Gospels in Codex Alexandrinus: Codicology, Palaeography, and Scribal Hands*, NTTSD 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1. Smith devotes two detailed chapters to A(02)'s history and codicology (7–101).

<sup>3</sup> Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticisms*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 109.

<sup>4</sup> David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 72. For a sample of studies done regarding A(02), see Scot

Smith's work constitutes the most recent, extensive, text-critical, and palaeographical study of A(02). He, too, however, concludes by noting, "So many aspects of [A's] history remain virgin territory that has yet to be discovered by adventurous scholars."<sup>5</sup>

A particular area in New Testament textual criticism that requires fuller exploration is harmonization in those Greek New Testament passages that quote the Old Testament. Ancient scribes were often cognizant of the Greek Old Testament quoted in the New and, at times, (consciously or unconsciously) may have adapted the text of the Old Testament passage to its New Testament quotation, or vice-versa—a process known as harmonization.

Work has been conducted in this area for other witnesses,<sup>6</sup> but to this writer's knowledge no large-scale study has been undertaken regarding A(02). For this reason, an exploration of harmonizations in this manuscript holds great promise; it can test the quality of A(02) as a textual witness regarding the transmission of the initial text of the New Testament. In addition, it would deepen our knowledge of A(02)'s transmission history.

This underexplored area is what this text-critical study seeks to address. Its aim will be to analyze all the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum of A(02) to identify the absence and presence of harmonization in A(02). This will shed further light on the textual character of this manuscript and on the habits of its scribes, at least as far as the Corpus Paulinum is concerned. This would open one more window into the study of the New Testament's transmission history.

### 1.1. Delimitations

To provide depth to its analysis, five delimitations will serve as controls for this study. Firstly, this study will consider only explicit quotations from the LXX Pentateuch in the Corpus Paulinum of A(02).<sup>7</sup> Choosing two self-contained collections of biblical books will provide more cohesion to this study's findings.

McKendrick, "The Codex Alexandrinus: Or the Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript," in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. S. McKendrick and O. A. O'Sullivan (London: The British Library, 2003), 1–16; E. Maunde Thompson, ed., *Genesis–2 Chronicles*, vol. 1 of *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus: Old Testament*, (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1881), 3–12; Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V–VIII) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1909), 1–11; Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan, 1912), 58–62; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 5th ed. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1958), 198–202; Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible*, 3rd ed. (London: Duckworth, 1975), 42–43, 83–88; Guglielmo Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1967), 77–80; H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus: With Seven Illustrations*, 2nd ed. (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955), 30–40; Elijah M. Hixson, "Scribal Tendencies in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus" (MTh diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> Smith, *Study*, 253.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., Ronald Henry van der Bergh, "The Textual Tradition of Explicit Quotations in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis of the Acts of the Apostles" (PhD diss., University of Pretoria, 2013); Cambry Pardee, "Scribal Harmonization in Greek Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels from the Second to the Fifth Century" (PhD diss., Loyola University, 2016).

<sup>7</sup> As such, allusions are not covered. The list of explicit quotations is based on NA<sup>28</sup> 836–45, as well as on Wuppertal's online LXX project, which focuses on LXX quotations in New Testament. Some passages will not be studied for one of the following reasons: (1) a few quotations seem to be allusions (Heb 7:1; 7:4; 13:20); (2) a New Testament verse is not present in A(02) (due to a lacuna; 2 Cor 6:16; 8:15); (3) an Old Testament quotation is not present in Old Testament A(02) (due to a

Secondly, the two base texts utilized are Göttingen's LXX and NA<sup>28</sup>. These eclectic editions do not necessarily represent the initial texts of the LXX or of the New Testament perfectly, but they would provide a feasible starting point from which to trace harmonization tendencies in A(o2).

Thirdly, harmonization will be explored on two levels (ancestral and scribal) and in three directions only. Regarding levels, some harmonizations may have occurred in A(o2)'s ancestors (i.e., during the transmission history of the New Testament text from the first century to the time of A[o2]'s exemplars). Others may be the result of adaptations by the scribes of A(o2).

The three directions of harmonization to be explored are as follows:

- Scribes may have adapted a New Testament quotation to its Pentateuchal source.
- An LXX source may have influenced the text of its New Testament quotation.
- A New Testament quotation may have been adapted to another New Testament quotation of the same Old Testament passage.<sup>8</sup>

Fourthly, this study will be confined to the Greek LXX, rather than to the Hebrew MT or versions in other languages. The same applies to the New Testament. For this reason, the testimony of the church fathers, or Jewish writers, or versions in other languages (whether for the LXX or the New Testament) will not be generally considered.

Finally, while there is a debate on the number of scribes responsible for copying the New Testament of A(o2), Smith's conclusion that two scribes were responsible for the Corpus Paulinum (as opposed to H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat's single scribe) will be assumed as the correct one.<sup>9</sup>

## 1.2. Methodological Remarks

This study will proceed in two major stages. Firstly, it will scrutinize each Pentateuchal quotation in the Corpus Paulinum to identify harmonization in A(o2) and in the wider LXX/New Testament textual tradition. Singular and subsingular readings will draw attention to possible

---

lacuna; Gen 15:5 quoted in Rom 4:18). (4) an Old Testament quotation is too brief to be studied for harmonization (Gal 3:16, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου; Rom 7:7, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). All citations follow Rahlfs' LXX numbering system. The following are the Corpus Paulinum passages that quote the Pentateuch and that will be considered in this study. They have been divided according to the two scribes delineated by Smith:

Scribe 2: Rom 4:3; 4:17; 4:18; 7:7; 9:7; 9:9; 9:12; 9:15; 9:17; 10:5; 10:6; 10:8; 10:19; 11:8; 12:19; 13:9; 15:10; 1 Cor 5:13; 6:16; 9:9; 10:7;

Scribe 1: 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 6:16; 8:15; 13:1; Gal 3:6; 3:8; 3:10; 3:12; 3:13; 3:16; 4:30; 5:14; Eph 5:31; 6:2-3; 1 Tim 5:18; 5:19; 2 Tim 2:19; Heb 1:6; 4:4; 6:14; 7:1; 7:4; 8:5; 9:20; 10:28; 10:30; 11:18; 11:21; 12:15; 12:21; 12:29; 13:5; 13:20. (The eight italicized passages will not be studied.) It may be noticed that Scribe 1 was responsible for copying a larger portion of the Corpus Paulinum. Scribe 1 has copied twenty-seven Pentateuchal quotations, whereas Scribe 2 was responsible for nineteen of them.

<sup>8</sup> An example of a further direction of harmonization is when an LXX passage is adapted to another parallel LXX passage. However, this is outside the scope of this study, which is confined to harmonizations occurring in the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum.

<sup>9</sup> H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), 92–93. Smith (*Study*, 60) divides the scribes of New Testament A(o2) into three. Scribe 1 copied the following: Matthew, Mark, 1 Cor 10:8 to the end; 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Ephesians; Colossians; 1 and 2 Thessalonians; Hebrews; 1 and 2 Timothy; Titus; Philemon. Scribe 2, on the other hand, was responsible for Luke, John, Romans, and 1 Corinthians (up to 10:7). Scribe 3 copied Revelation. As such, only Scribes 1 and 2 were responsible for the Corpus Paulinum. It must be admitted that Smith's categorization of these scribes may not necessarily convince everyone. Our characterization of these scribes is, thus, only tentative.

harmonizations at the hands of A(02)'s scribes, whereas harmonized readings shared with other textual witnesses might reflect adaptations that may have already occurred in A(02)'s exemplars.<sup>10</sup> This two-pronged approach—tracing A(02)'s harmonizations in tandem with those in the LXX and New Testament traditions—will provide a fuller grid through which to evaluate A(02)'s tendency to harmonize on its scribal and ancestral levels.

Scrutiny of A(02)'s text, however, will not be confined to the above-mentioned eclectic editions. Nonetheless, to identify any LXX readings that may be the result of harmonization, only the textual apparatus of Göttingen's LXX will be utilized, since it notes every possible variant reading in LXX witnesses. As regards New Testament readings, the textual apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup> will be our initial, but by no means sole, port of call. Each of the textual apparatuses of the following resources will also be considered for every New Testament quotation: Tischendorf, von Soden, CNTTS (*The Center for New Testament Textual Studies: NT Critical Apparatus*), Swanson, and *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*.<sup>11</sup> This will provide a more complete coverage of Greek New Testament readings that may have occurred due to harmonization.

In addition, two conversation partners will feature regularly in the first stage: Gert J. Steyn and Christopher D. Stanley.<sup>12</sup> In his *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*, Steyn endeavours to identify the LXX text that the Hebrews author used when quoting from the Old Testament. Stanley, on the other hand, in *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, considers Paul's explicit quotations of the Old Testament in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. He establishes Paul's text and determines how the apostle adapted his Greek Old Testament in his quotations. Since Romans, Hebrews, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians contain the vast majority of the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum,<sup>13</sup> interaction with Steyn and Stanley would be particularly beneficial for our purposes.

In its second stage, this study will summarize and assess its findings on harmonization in the LXX/New Testament traditions in general and in A(02) in particular. In so doing, it will

<sup>10</sup> Singular and subsingular readings reveal scribal idiosyncrasies and alert the text-critic to harmonizations whose origin may be the scribe of a particular manuscript. For a succinct summary of this methodology, see Pardee, "Scribal Harmonization," 47–53. Its foundations were laid by the following studies: Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits," in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. B. M. Metzger (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 106–24; James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 65–68; Gordon D. Fee, "On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 62–79.

<sup>11</sup> To avoid possible confusion in distinguishing LXX witnesses from New Testament ones, the former are designated according to Göttingen's textual apparatus. The New Testament witnesses, on the other hand, are denoted by their Gregory-Aland numbers. For instance, majuscules, such as B or C are designated as 03 and 04. For this reason, if B appears in this study, it designates an LXX reading, whereas if 03 appears, it denotes a New Testament reading.

The only exception is A(02), which in this article will be used for codex A in its entirety. However, for clarity purposes, when A(02)'s LXX text is specifically in view, it will be labelled according to the LXX book in question. Similarly, when A(02)'s New Testament text of a particular book is in view, it will be labeled accordingly. Thus, for instance, GenA refers to the Genesis text of A(02), whereas RomA refers to the Romans text of A(02).

<sup>12</sup> Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Gert J. Steyn, *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

<sup>13</sup> Only five explicit Pentateuchal quotations appear in the rest of the Corpus Paulinum: Eph 5:31; 6:2–3; 1 Tim 5:18; 5:19; 2 Tim 2:19.

seek to clarify further whether A(02) can be considered a reliable witness in the Corpus Paulinum and whether its scribes were reliable in their copying of the Pentateuch quotations in this part of the New Testament. Finally, conclusions will be drawn on the quality of A(02)'s text and of its scribes in the Corpus Paulinum. A conclusion will also be drawn on the extent of LXX's influence on the Corpus Paulinum quotations in the New Testament textual tradition in general.

## 2. Examination of the Pentateuchal Quotations in the Corpus Paulinum

To evaluate A(02)'s tendency to harmonize, this section will examine the textual evidence in the LXX Pentateuch and in its corresponding quotations in the Corpus Paulinum. The material will be presented in a twofold manner. Firstly, for each quotation, the LXX text of each Pentateuchal passage and of its New Testament quotation(s) will be provided.<sup>14</sup> The order of the studied passages will follow that of each Pentateuch book.<sup>15</sup> Then an LXX and New Testament textual commentary will identify those cases where harmonization may have occurred.

### 2.1. Genesis<sup>16</sup>

#### 2.1.1. Genesis 2:2 in Heb 4:4<sup>17</sup>

Gen 2:2 (1b:1.46–49): καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.  
(LXX = GenA)

<sup>14</sup> After each LXX or New Testament quotation, a brief note in brackets will note whether A(02)'s text is the same as that of LXX or NA<sup>28</sup> or not. If A(02)'s text differs from that of LXX or NA<sup>28</sup>, it too will be quoted for ease of reference. In addition, the actual text of A(02)'s Old Testament and New Testament may be found in the last section of this study, where a table is presented for this purpose.

<sup>15</sup> The two following resources were used for consulting the images of A(02): for the Old Testament, the first volume (containing Genesis–2 Chronicles) of Thompson's full-scale facsimile of A(02) was used (*Facsimile*). For the New Testament, the digital color images available on-line at the British Library's website (The British Library MS Viewer) were inspected.

<sup>16</sup> Missing text in GenA (due to mutilation): 14:14–17; 15:1–5, 16–19; 16:6–9. For a better grasp of the different LXX witnesses, their families, groups, and characteristics, see the introduction (Einleitung) to J. W. Wevers, ed., *Genesis*, SVTG 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 9–73. See also Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 9–73 (henceforth, THGG); see also the relevant notes in Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) (henceforth, NGTG). For more information, see Alfred Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914); Detlef Fraenkel, ed., *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); Christian Schäfer, *Benutzerhandbuch zur Göttinger Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> For each LXX passage and its New Testament quotation(s), two features will be provided: their page notation in A(02) and their Greek texts. Firstly, for each Pentateuchal passage and its corresponding New Testament quotation(s), their manuscript page notation will be shown. The reader may thus consult each image of these texts in Thompson's Facsimile (for the LXX) and on the British Library's website (for the New Testament). The page notation for the LXX is somewhat different from the one followed for the New Testament.

For the LXX text, the page notation—always provided within brackets after its respective reference—includes the following elements: (1) the folio number, followed by “a” or “b” (denoting

Heb 4:4 (f.114r:2.11–15): καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ HebA)

Heb 4:4 of A(o2): καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

In Gen 2:2 some younger Greek Old Testament manuscripts—O-recension (except 426), 16–408\*, *b*, *d*, 53–56\*–664\*, *s*, and others—add ὁ θεός after κατέπαυσεν, in line with Heb 4:4.<sup>18</sup> Could this be due to harmonization of these LXX witnesses to Heb 4:4, or did the Hebrews author consult a different Vorlage that already contained this addition?<sup>19</sup> The former option might be more probable for two reasons: (1) the earlier LXX witnesses do not include ὁ θεός; (2) and, on the other hand, the entire New Testament textual tradition contains it.

As to Heb 4:4, its text is uniform across the New Testament textual tradition.<sup>20</sup> A(o2), on the other hand, contains a singular reading in Heb 4:4 by omitting ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. This is its only difference with the other New Testament witnesses. Whatever the origin of this reading, it was not due to harmonization to the LXX, since no LXX witness omits this phrase.

In conclusion, A(o2) displays no signs of harmonization in this quotation. By contrast, harmonization may have occurred in a number of LXX manuscripts, which may have added ὁ θεός to adapt their text to Heb 4:4.

### 2.1.2. Genesis 2:7 in 1 Cor 15:45

Gen 2:7 (1b:2.19–20): καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. (LXX = GenA)

1 Cor 15:45 (f.99r:1.3–5): ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. (NA<sup>28</sup> = 1CorA)

---

right or left page of opening), ending in a column sign; (2) then the column number is given, which ends in a period; (3) this is followed by the number of lines in that particular column. For example:

Gen 12:3 (7a:1.10–14) folio 7, right page of opening: column 1. lines 10–14

Gen 15:6 (8b:1.1–2) folio 8, left page of opening: column 1. lines 1–2

For the New Testament text, the page notation includes the following elements: (1) folio number (as it appears on the British Library's website's numbering of folios), followed by "r" or "v" (denoting right or left page of opening), ending in a column sign; (2) then, the column number is given, which ends in a period; (3) this is followed by the number of lines in that particular column. For example:

Heb 4:4 (f.114r:2.11–15) folio 114, right page of opening: column 2. lines 11–15

Gal 3:8 (f.102v:1.38–39) folio 102, left page of opening: column 1. lines 38–39

<sup>18</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 83.

<sup>19</sup> Paul Ellingworth mentions both alternatives (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 248). Harold W. Attridge (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989], 130n.91) attributes this to the Hebrew author's *Vorlage*, because the same text is also found in Philo (*Post.* 64). Gareth L. Cockerill (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012], 206.n.39) concurs. J. C. McCullough ("Hebrews and the Old Testament: A Comparison of the Use which the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews Makes of the Old Testament, with the Use Made by Other Writers of His Day" [PhD diss., Queen's University, Belfast, 1971], 112) reaches the same conclusion.

For Philo's exact quotation and a detailed study of this issue in Heb 4:4, see Steyn, *Quest*, 197–204. However, *contra* Steyn et al., based on (1) the lateness of LXX manuscripts containing this addition, (2) the unanimity of New Testament witnesses containing it; and (3) the fact that Philo's text has been preserved by Christian copyists, it seems more probable that Philo's Genesis quotation was adjusted to the Hebrews text.

<sup>20</sup> No variants are given in NA<sup>28</sup> 662. ἐν is only missing in missing in minuscule 33 and 1735 (so CNTTS, Heb 4:4).

There are no relevant variants in the LXX tradition for this portion of Gen 2:7.<sup>21</sup> Departing from an otherwise uniform LXX text, Symmachus and Theodotion have added Ἄδάμ between ὁ and ἄνθρωπος.<sup>22</sup> However, this is probably not due to harmonization to 1 Cor 15:45 because, in the 1 Corinthians verse, Ἄδάμ is placed in a different position: between ἄνθρωπος and εἰς. Moreover, Symmachus and Theodotion do not contain 1 Cor 15:45's πρῶτος before ἄνθρωπος.<sup>23</sup> Ἄδάμ was, thus, possibly added as a literal translation of the Hebrew text.<sup>24</sup>

A few New Testament witnesses<sup>25</sup> omit ἄνθρωπος, but all the rest contain it. The text of 1 Cor 15:45 is, thus, secure. As Anthony C. Thiselton suggests, this omission may have occurred because of its seeming redundancy: “[ἄνθρωπος] appears to replicate Ἄδάμ.”<sup>26</sup>

### 2.1.3. Genesis 2:24 in 1 Cor 6:16 and Eph 5:31

Gen 2:24 (2a:1.39–43): ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. (LXX ≠ GenA)

Gen 2:24 of A(02): ... τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναίκε αὐτοῦ ...

1 Cor 6:16 (f.94r:2.48–49): ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ 1CorA)

1 Cor 6:16 of A(02): ἔσονται γάρ οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

Eph 5:31 (f.106r:2.40–43): ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος [τὸν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ A[02])

Eph 5:31 of A(02): ... τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ... προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναίκε αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

While the textual situation of Gen 2:24 is somewhat complex, two LXX variants may be noted.<sup>27</sup> Firstly, P. 911 and the GenA add αὐτοῦ after μητέρα. However, this is not due to harmonization to the New Testament because New Testament/EphA does not contain this article, and neither does the parallel passage of Mark 10:7–8a. Secondly, A(02), along with many other witnesses,<sup>28</sup> has τὴ γυναῖκε in Gen 2:24, instead of LXX's πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα. This is treated below.

As to the New Testament, the text of 1 Cor 6:16 is stable.<sup>29</sup> A(02) does contain a singular reading at this point. It omits φησίν.<sup>30</sup> While this makes its text more similar to LXX, it is probably not due to harmonization. After all, A(02)'s 1 Cor 6:16 still retains γάρ, which does not exist in the LXX tradition.

<sup>21</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 84.

<sup>22</sup> See also NGTG 25n20.

<sup>23</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 159, suggests that it was Paul who added πρῶτος and Ἄδάμ.

<sup>24</sup> MT has וַיִּהְיֶה הָאָדָם וְהַיְוָנָה יֶחְדָּו.

<sup>25</sup> 03, 017, 326, and 365 (NA<sup>28</sup> 551). CNTTS (1 Cor 15:45) adds 1319, 1573, 1962 to the list.

<sup>26</sup> Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1281. It is not probable that 03 and the others are harmonizing their text to a different LXX Vorlage. Such omission does not occur in any extant LXX manuscripts.

<sup>27</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 89.

<sup>28</sup> 77<sup>c</sup> (member of C-group), 344-127 (s-group; hexaplaric reading in margin), 121 and 424 (y-group), 31-122 (z-group, a group closely related to y).

<sup>29</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 528.

<sup>30</sup> Constantine von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior*, vol. 2 (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872), 487. (Henceforth, Tischendorf.) See also Klaus Junack et al., eds., *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus. 2: Die Paulinischen Briefe, 1: Röm., 1. Kor., 2. Kor.*, ANTF 12 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 204; Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: 1 Corinthians* (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2003), 79.

The textual situation in Eph 5:31 is somewhat more complex. Firstly, A(02) and some other witnesses<sup>31</sup> read τὴ γυναῖκι, instead of NA's πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα. As already mentioned, this is in line with GenA (and some other LXX witnesses).<sup>32</sup> Secondly, A(02) and a few others add αὐτοῦ after πατέρα,<sup>33</sup> in line with Gen 2:24 LXX (and GenA). This is indication that, in Eph 5:31, A(02) has a text that stands closer to GenA than to the initial New Testament text.

There are two parallel New Testament passages that might throw further light on the possible presence of harmonization: Matt 19:5 and Mark 10:7–8a. Since there is a lacuna in A(02) for Matt 19:5, it cannot be considered for comparison. Mark 17:7–8a, on the other hand, is extant in A(02). Two variants may be noted. Firstly, 01, 05, 579, and 1241 contain αὐτοῦ after τὴν μητέρα in Mark, just like in GenA (but not like LXX). This could be a sign of harmonization to GenA (or an LXX text similar to it), since Eph 5:31 (including EphA) does not contain αὐτοῦ here.<sup>34</sup> Secondly, even here A(02), along with a few others, has τὴ γυναῖκι instead of τὴν γυναῖκα.<sup>35</sup>

Evidently, this situation is not easily mapped out. It may be noted, however, that A(02) retains τὴ γυναῖκι throughout GenA, EphA, and MarkA. This could be a sign of harmonization in A(02), as this stubborn uniformity of text across the whole codex is otherwise difficult to explain. On the other hand, the direction of this harmonization (LXX to New Testament, or vice-versa, or even from parallel New Testament passages) is impossible to determine.

To conclude, harmonization has occurred in New Testament A(02) to a form of LXX text peculiar to it and to some other LXX witnesses. This harmonization occurred in A(02)'s ancestor(s) rather than at the hand of its scribes. Moreover, the fluid situation in LXX, as well as in Eph 5:31 and Mark 10:7–8a, as noted above, is a sign that other LXX and New Testament manuscripts may have also been involved in a knotty process of harmonization.

#### 2.1.4. Genesis 12:3 in Gal 3:8

Gen 12:3 (7a:1.13–14): ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>36</sup> (LXX ≠ GenA)

Gen 12:3 of A(02): ἐυλογηθήσονται ...

Gal 3:8 (f.102v:1.38–39): ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. (NA<sup>28</sup> = GalA)

Instead of LXX's ἐνευλογηθήσονται, GenA (along with a few witnesses) has ἐυλογηθήσονται.<sup>37</sup> As to the New Testament, the quoted text in Gal 3:8—which A(02) also follows—is secure. It reads ἐνευλογηθήσονται.<sup>38</sup> Since this differs from GenA's text, it is a clear sign that GenA has not harmonized its reading to the Gal 3:8, or vice-versa.

On the other hand, three majuscules—010, 012, and 0142—and several minuscules (including 1739) read ἐυλογηθήσονται in Gal 3:8.<sup>39</sup> This agrees with GenA, but not with LXX. Since

<sup>31</sup> P<sup>46</sup>, 06\*, 010, 012, 0285, 33, 81, 1241 (supplement).

<sup>32</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 600.

<sup>33</sup> 01<sup>2</sup>, 06 (a later copyist), 06, 018, 020, 025. See Tischendorf 696.

<sup>34</sup> Only five minuscules do: 209, 1315, 1505, 1573, 2495.

<sup>35</sup> 04, 019, 022, 037, f<sup>i</sup>, 579. See NA<sup>28</sup> 144.

<sup>36</sup> Genesis 18:18, although listed in NA<sup>28</sup> as another source of quotation for Gal 3:8, will not be treated in this study—it speaks of Abraham in the third person, rather than in the second person as in Gal 3:8.

<sup>37</sup> Papyrus 833, 72+707 (O-recension) 569 (C-group) 343 (s-group) 59 (mixed codex). See Wevers, *Genesis*, 150.

<sup>38</sup> No variants noted in NA<sup>28</sup> 582.

<sup>39</sup> Tischendorf 639. Majuscule 0142 is not mentioned in Tischendorf but in Klaus Wachtel and Klaus Witte, eds., *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus. 2: Die Paulinischen Briefe, 2: Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1 u. 2 Thess, 1 u. 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr*, ANTF 22 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 18. See also Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal*



the New Testament textual tradition is otherwise very stable in reading ἐνευλογηθήσονται, it seems that these three majuscules have harmonized their text to an LXX Vorlage similar to GenA.<sup>40</sup>

There is also a parallel verse in the New Testament to be noted: Acts 3:25 (f.57v:2.34–36).<sup>41</sup> It reads as follows: καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου [ἐν]ευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς. Wuppertal's website on the LXX quotations in the New Testament<sup>42</sup> notes that the first hand of Acts in A(02) wrote ἐυλογηθήσονται then added ἐν in front of it. This shorter form of the verb is also the reading of 02, 044, 323, 945, and 1739.<sup>43</sup>

Since Scribe 2 (responsible for copying Acts) was the one who corrected their own reading to ἐνευλογηθήσονται, (s)he may have had in mind Gen 12:3 in A(02) when (s)he first wrote the short form. Then, realizing that Acts 3:25 had the longer form, (s)he then duly corrected their error. As to 02, 044, 323, 945, and 1739, it seems that they too have been influenced by Gen 12:3's text as it appears in GenA.

There is, thus, no harmonization in A(02). In fact, at this point, A(02)'s scribe seems to have corrected their own subconscious harmonization. Other New Testament witnesses, on the other hand, seem to have harmonized their text to the Old Testament. Some (010, 012, and 0142) may have been influenced by an Old Testament text like GenA.

### 2.1.5. Genesis 15:6 in Rom 4:3 and Gal 3:6

Gen 15:6 (8b:1.1–2): καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (LXX = GenA)

Rom 4:3 (f.86v:1.6–8): ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)<sup>44</sup>

Gal 3:6 (f.102v:1.30–32): Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (NA<sup>28</sup> = GalA)

The *b*-group of LXX minuscules reads ἐπίστευσε δὲ in Gen 15:6,<sup>45</sup> exactly like Rom 4:3 and a parallel New Testament passage, Jas 2:23. This might be an attempt of harmonization to the New Testament.<sup>46</sup>

---

*Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Galatians* (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 1999), 33. See also Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 180.

<sup>40</sup> Jeffrey R. Wisdom (*Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law: Paul's Citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal 3.8–10* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 27–35) explores other Old Testament verses that have a similar text: Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; and 28:14 (the last two promises are made to Isaac). In all of them, the LXX reads ἐνευλογηθήσονται.

<sup>41</sup> While NA<sup>28</sup> (837), lists Rev 1:7 as a quotation of Gen 12:3, its text (κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) is an allusion, rather than a quotation.

<sup>42</sup> The Institut für Septuaginta- und biblische Textforschung at Wuppertal runs a helpful website (LXX EasyView) that documents the uses of LXX in the New Testament. See [https://projekte.isbtf.de/easyview\\_v11/](https://projekte.isbtf.de/easyview_v11/).

<sup>43</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 388.

<sup>44</sup> This quotation is almost the same as LXX. As Benjamin Schliesser notes, “The particle δε and the change from Ἀβραμ to Ἀβραὰμ are the only differences from the Septuagint” (*Abraham's Faith in Romans 4: Paul's Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*, WUNT 2.224 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], 334n837).

<sup>45</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 168.

<sup>46</sup> Stanley, on the other hand, proposes that the Old Testament reading in Rom 4:3 was not Paul's invention, but that it already appeared in his *Vorlage*. His argument is mainly that δὲ (in Rom 4:3) is awkward but Paul still retains it. Had it been Paul's invention, he would have probably omitted

This Genesis quotation in Rom 4:3 is almost variant-free.<sup>47</sup> Only 06\*, 010, 012, and 209\*<sup>48</sup> (mainly belonging to the D-text) omit δέ. This is probably not due to harmonization to LXX but might be due to the awkwardness of δέ in Paul's wording, which these witnesses may have felt they must omit.<sup>49</sup> As for Gal 3:6, its text too is almost variant-free.<sup>50</sup>

James 2:23 is the third New Testament passage that quotes Gen 15:6.<sup>51</sup> Because its text, even in A(02), is equal to that of Rom 4:3, it is evident that Jas 2:23 has not exerted any influence on the reading of Rom 4:3 or Gal 3:6.

In sum, A(02) reveals no signs of harmonization. By contrast, a few LXX witnesses (the *b*-group) may have harmonized Gen 15:6 to Rom 4:3.

### 2.1.6. Genesis 17:5 in Rom 4:17

Gen 17:5 (9a:1.42–43): ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε.

Rom 4:17 (f.86v:2.10–11): ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε. (LXX/GenA = NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA)

There are almost no LXX variants in this part of Gen 17:5.<sup>52</sup> Its New Testament quotation's text is also extremely uniform.<sup>53</sup>

### 2.1.7. Genesis 18:10, 14 in Rom 9:9

Gen 18:10, 14 (9b:2.26–29 and 2.43–45): Ἐπαναστρέφω ἥξω πρὸς σέ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σαρρα ἢ γυνή σου (v. 10)... εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σαρρα υἱός (v. 14). (LXX = GenA)<sup>54</sup>

it in this quotation (*Paul*, 100). However, two arguments weaken Stanley's case. Firstly, on his own admission, the *b*-group harmonizes its reading to Paul's text in other verses as well. Secondly, as no other LXX manuscripts agree with Rom 4:3 at this point, it is more feasible to accept harmonization as the reason for this variant. It is true that this quotation also appears in this exact form in Philo (*Mut.* 177), but since Philo was transmitted almost exclusively by Christian copyists, it is not too far-fetched to assume that Philo's text too may have been harmonized to Rom 4:3.

<sup>47</sup> There are no variants listed in NA<sup>28</sup> 488.

<sup>48</sup> Junack, *Neue Testament*, 27; Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Romans* (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001), 50. Minuscule 209 is mentioned in CNTTS (Rom 4:3).

<sup>49</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 100.

<sup>50</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> (582) provides no variants.

<sup>51</sup> James 2:23 (f.77r:1.29–31): ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. This uniformity of text to Paul's Rom 4:17 is not necessarily the result of these two writers having the same Old Testament *Vorlage* (Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ICC [New York: Bloomsbury, 2013], 491). Rather, it might well be that the writer of James was already familiar with this quotation in Romans. Again, the uniformity of the LXX text at this point, coupled with the absence of evidence (except for the very isolated *b*-group) to an alternate LXX text similar to that of Rom 4:3 and Jas 2:23, weaken the theory of an already existing *Vorlage* that Paul, James, and Philo each used for their writings. In all of these three cases, Abraham is not called Ἀβράμ but Ἀβραάμ, a name he only acquired in Gen 17:5—implying that caution is required when suggesting such a *Vorlage*.

<sup>52</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 177. Only a minuscule (120) has πηρ (nomen sacrum), instead of πατέρα. Also, 46 omits ἐθνῶν.

<sup>53</sup> No variants are mentioned in NA<sup>28</sup> 489, and only two very minor variants in Tischendorf 382. See also Swanson, *Romans*, 59.

<sup>54</sup> While NA<sup>28</sup> (837) links Rom 9:9 with both Gen 18:10, and 18:14, Göttingen LXX's textual apparatus may be correct in linking it to only Gen 18:14 (Wevers, *Genesis*, 187). Their textual similarities are much greater than with Gen 18:10. As such, only Gen 18:14 will be considered in this study as

Rom 9:9 (f.88v:2.43–45): κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἱός. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

No LXX variants impinge on issues of harmonization, and the New Testament quotation has a very stable textual transmission.<sup>55</sup>

### 2.1.8. Genesis 21:10 in Gal 4:30

Gen 21:10 (11b:2.28–32): Ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς, οὐ γὰρ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης ταύτης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαακ. (LXX ≠ GenA)

Gen 21:10 of A(02): ... ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ ...

Gal 4:30 (f.103r:2.48–49; f.103v:1.1–2): ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ GalA)

Gal 4:30 of A(02): ... τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην ... οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήση ...

Two observations may be made regarding the LXX.<sup>56</sup> Firstly, a number of LXX witnesses omit ταύτην after τὴν παιδίσκην.<sup>57</sup> Secondly, GenA and some other LXX witnesses<sup>58</sup> omit ταύτης after τῆς παιδίσκης. Both these changes are similar to Gal 4:30, but perhaps not due to its influence. Some scribes may have considered one or both of these demonstratives as redundant “and sought to eliminate one or the other of them as a corruption.”<sup>59</sup>

As to Gal 4:30, two variants may be noted. Firstly, instead of τῆς ἐλευθέρας, three New Testament majuscules—06\*, 010, 012 (all D-text)—have μου Ἰσαακ.<sup>60</sup> The clear implication is that they have harmonized this quotation to its LXX form, where this phrase uniformly appears.<sup>61</sup>

Secondly, A(02) contains a singular reading in Gal 4:30: it adds ταύτην after τὴν παιδίσκην.<sup>62</sup> This is most likely a harmonization to LXX/GenA. The scribe who was copying Gal 4:30 was probably very familiar with the GenA text and corrected Paul’s quotation to match it. However, since this scribe left New Testament’s κληρονομήση unchanged and did not conform it to LXX/GenA’s κληρονομήσει, their correction of Paul’s text was probably made from memory and unintentionally. Even if intentionality be granted in this case, this change was not made for theological reasons as it does not contribute in any way to the text theologically.

To conclude, there seem to be two cases of harmonization in this passage. Firstly, a few textually related New Testament witnesses (06\*, 010, 012) harmonize their text to the LXX. Secondly, A(02)’s Scribe 1 has harmonized Gal 4:30 to LXX/GenA.

### 2.1.9. Genesis 21:12 in Rom 9:7 and Heb 11:18

Gen 21:12 (11b:2.42–43): ἐν Ἰσαακ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα.

Rom 9:7 (f.88v:2.38): ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα.

quoted in Rom 9:9 (despite NA<sup>28</sup> 499).

<sup>55</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 184–85. No variants noted in NA<sup>28</sup> and in Tischendorf.

<sup>56</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 207.

<sup>57</sup> 82 (O-recension) C+cI+cII (all the C-group) b f 370, 346 and 424 (y-group), all of z except 122, and 59 (mixed codex).

<sup>58</sup> 17–400 (O-recension), b, 121 (of y-group) 122 (part of z-group).

<sup>59</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 250.

<sup>60</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 586; Swanson, *Galatians*, 62.

<sup>61</sup> Tischendorf 650. Also, F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, reprint (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), 214.

<sup>62</sup> Tischendorf 649. He specifies, “ut LXX.” Also, H. F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Part 2: Text und Apparat* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 757. (Henceforth, von Soden.)

Heb 11:18 (f.117v:1.35–36): ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα. (LXX/GenA = NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA/HebA)

There are almost no variants in the LXX tradition, and the New Testament text is even more uniform.<sup>63</sup>

#### 2.1.10. Genesis 22:17 in Heb 6:14

Gen 22:17 (12b:2.8–10): ἢ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου. (LXX ≠ GenA)

Gen 22:17 of A(02): εἰ μὴν εὐλογῶν ...

Heb 6:14 (f.115r:1.16–18): εἰ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

LXX differs from GenA in that the latter (along with a number of other witnesses) reads εἰ μὴν, instead of ἢ μὴν.<sup>64</sup> As Steyn observes, “this was most probably influenced by the reading of Heb 6:14.”<sup>65</sup>

As to Heb 6:14, A(02) follows Hebrews’ initial reading. On the other hand, a considerable number of later New Testament witnesses read ἢ μὴν instead of εἰ μὴν.<sup>66</sup> This could be due to harmonization to LXX, where the more classical reading (ἢ μὴν) of LXX may have been chosen<sup>67</sup> over the Hebrews author’s rendition.

In addition, it is worth noting that Hebrews’ transmission history has not been influenced by LXX’s τὸ σπέρμα σου. It retains σε throughout, although LXX’s wording here would seem to have invited harmonization, especially as σπέρμα is used in another Old Testament quotation later in Heb 11:18 (quoting Gen 21:12).<sup>68</sup>

Harmonization may have, thus, occurred in two directions. Firstly, A(02) and some other LXX witnesses seem to have harmonized their Genesis text partly to Heb 6:14. Conversely, many New Testament witnesses may have harmonized their readings to the LXX.

#### 2.1.11. Genesis 25:23 in Rom 9:12

Gen 25:23 (15a:2.23–24): ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι.

Rom 9:12 (f.89r:1.2–3): ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. (LXX/GenA = NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA)

This quotation “follows the LXX exactly.”<sup>69</sup> Moreover, A(02) has the same reading in both Genesis and Romans.

#### 2.1.12. Genesis 47:31 in Heb 11:21

Gen 47:31: (32a:2.1–2): καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. (LXX = GenA)

<sup>63</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 208. No variants are mentioned in NA<sup>28</sup>. Tischendorf (823) only notes a minor variant in the spelling of the name Ἰσαὰκ. CNTTS’ apparatus notes that, in Heb 11:18, A(02) has a singular, nonsense reading: σπέρκα instead of σπέρμα. However, the online images of A(02) show that this codex actually reads σπέρμα.

<sup>64</sup> D, L, M, a considerable part of the O-recension, f, n, etc. See Wevers, *Genesis*, 217.

<sup>65</sup> Steyn, *Quest*, 215.

<sup>66</sup> 018, 81, 365, 630, 1175, 1241, 1505, 1739, 1881, and the Majority Text. See NA<sup>28</sup> 664; Tischendorf 796; CNTTS Heb 6:14.

<sup>67</sup> Attridge, *Hebrews*, 178.

<sup>68</sup> Thanks to Peter van Minnen for kindly alerting me to this possibility of harmonization, to which the New Testament textual tradition did not succumb.

<sup>69</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 586n63. There is nothing of note in the LXX apparatus; also, the NT textual tradition is variant-free. Tischendorf (412) only notes a minor variant: 020 reads δουλεύση.

Heb 11:21 (f.117v:1.45–47): καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

No LXX variants relate to issues of harmonization.<sup>70</sup> Moreover, the New Testament text is very secure.<sup>71</sup>

## 2.2. Exodus<sup>72</sup>

### 2.2.1. Exodus 9:16 in Rom 9:17

Exod 9:16 (39a:1.24–28): καὶ ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. (LXX ≠ ExodA)

Exod 9:16 of A(02): ... ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου ...

Rom 9:17 (f.89r:1.13–17): ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)<sup>73</sup>

Two variants may be noted in Exod 9:16.<sup>74</sup> Firstly, instead of ἵνα, the minuscules of *oI* (except 64, marginal reading)<sup>75</sup> read ὅπως, just like Rom 9:17. This could be due either to harmonization to the New Testament or to the preservation of an alternative—albeit poorly attested—LXX reading (e.g., per Stanley),<sup>76</sup> which was also in Paul's *Vorlage* and which he quoted faithfully. In favor of Paul as this reading's originator is the presence of two consecutive ὅπως; this brings forth a stronger parallelism of thought, since ὅπως stresses purpose more than ἵνα does.<sup>77</sup> For this reason, Paul may have decided to change ἵνα into ὅπως. If this is the case, those LXX witnesses that read ὅπως twice may have harmonized their text to Rom 9:17. Stanley, on the other hand, argues that ἵνα is used more often than ὅπως in the New Testament to denote purpose.<sup>78</sup>

Nonetheless, *contra* Stanley, firstly, it is undeniable that two consecutive ὅπως do emphasize parallelism in this quotation.<sup>79</sup> Secondly, the almost complete concurrence of the respective LXX and New Testament texts at this point cannot be taken lightly. Since only a very small, and related, subgroup of the LXX tradition supports the ὅπως reading, it is more probable to conclude that the change of ἵνα into ὅπως originated with Paul than that it was already present in his *Vorlage*. Later, Paul's change must have found its way into an isolated part of the LXX tradition, which harmonized its text to his reading.

<sup>70</sup> Wevers, *Genesis*, 450.

<sup>71</sup> No Greek variants mentioned in NA<sup>28</sup> 678; Tischendorf 824.

<sup>72</sup> For more information on the different LXX witnesses, their families, groups, and characteristics in Exodus, see the Introduction (Einleitung) to J. W. Wevers and U. Quast, eds., *Exodus*, SVTG 2.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 7–63. See also J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992). (Henceforth, THGE.) See also the relevant notes in J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), henceforth, NGTE.

<sup>73</sup> Their only difference is orthographic: RomA has ἐνδίζωμαι, not ἐνδείξωμαι.

<sup>74</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 143.

<sup>75</sup> This is an *O*-recension subgroup, consisting of minuscule 64-381-618-708.

<sup>76</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 108.

<sup>77</sup> Brian J. Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.10–18: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 164–5. See also C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Romans*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 486; Robert Jewett and Roy D. Kotansky, *Romans: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 584.

<sup>78</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 108.

<sup>79</sup> Abasciano, *Paul's Use*, 165.

The second variant constitutes A(02)'s only difference with LXX. Along with majuscule M, and many LXX minuscules, ExodA reads δύναμιν instead of ἰσχύον, in line with Rom 9:17.<sup>80</sup> In view of such divided LXX evidence, however, it is difficult to argue that ExodA has harmonized its text to Romans.<sup>81</sup> It is just as possible that Paul had a *Vorlage* with δύναμιν (just like the alternative LXX text transmitted by ExodA and others), which he duly transmitted. Both options, thus, must be left open.

As to Rom 9:17, the New Testament text is strongly uniform<sup>82</sup> and A(02) follows it faithfully. On balance, there is no harmonization of New Testament A(02) to LXX. However, an isolated recensional subgroup (*oI*) may have been influenced by Rom 9:17.

### 2.2.2. Exodus 24:8 in Heb 9:20<sup>83</sup>

Exod 24:8 (48b:2.35–37): Ἴδον τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς. (LXX = ExodA)

Heb 9:20: (f.116r:2.37–38): τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

Two variants may be mentioned regarding the LXX text of Exod 24:8.<sup>84</sup> Firstly, the *x*-group reads ἐνετείλατο, rather than διέθετο. This is like Heb 9:20. Due to this variant's isolated appearance in a small, related, and very late group of manuscripts, it seems that *x* has harmonized its reading to Heb 9:20.<sup>85</sup>

Secondly, the same suspect, *x*, also reads πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός (exactly like Heb 9:20), instead of κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς. It has, thus, aligned its reading almost completely to Heb 9:20.

As to Heb 9:20, two variants may be noted. Firstly, *o4* has a singular reading: it replaces ἐνετείλατο with διέθετο. Its scribe has, thus, apparently adapted its text to the LXX.<sup>86</sup> Secondly, minuscule 1751, too, contains a singular reading. It adds καινῆς before διαθήκης. Its scribe was most probably influenced by Matt 26:28, where A(02) (as well as *o4*, *o6*, and others) have the same word and in the same case.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>80</sup> M<sup>txt</sup> (seventh century majuscule with hexaplaric notes), *oI*-29-135 (subgroups of *O*-recension), the Catena group, *d*-group.

<sup>81</sup> As Stanley (*Paul*, 109) notes, “The New Testament manuscripts are agreed in reading δύναμιν here, but the LXX is strongly divided between δύναμιν and ἰσχύον.” Abasciano's argument that it was Paul who changed LXX's ἰσχύον to δύναμιν is that ἰσχύς is rare in Paul and does not otherwise appear in Romans (*Paul's Use*, 166). Nonetheless, the highly divided textual evidence of LXX would make it less likely that Romans 9:17 would have affected such a great part of the LXX tradition. As Wevers (NGTE 132) points out, ExodA's reading is “a popular ... variant.”

<sup>82</sup> See NA<sup>28</sup> 499; Tischendorf 412; Swanson, *Romans*, 142.

<sup>83</sup> While NA<sup>28</sup> (840) also lists Heb 13:20 as a quotation, a comparison of its text with that of Exod 24:8 and Heb 9:20 gives the distinct impression that Heb 13:20 is more of an allusion. Wuppertal's site, too, does not mention it as a quotation.

<sup>84</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 278. Text witnesses are listed in detail in NGTE xix–xx.

<sup>85</sup> Steyn, *Quest*, 276. McCullough, too, argues on stylistic grounds that the Hebrews author was responsible for replacing διέθετο with ἐνετείλατο (“Hebrews,” 118). Thus, any LXX manuscripts that have the latter reading were influenced by the New Testament form of this quotation.

<sup>86</sup> Tischendorf 811.

<sup>87</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 89. Bruce M. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. [Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994], 54) opines that καινῆς was added at some stage from the influence of Luke 22:20: “it if had been present originally, there is no good reason why anyone would have deleted it.” However, due to the genitive form of this phrase, it seems that 1751 was probably influenced by Matt 26:28 reading, as it appeared in a number of New Testament manuscripts, including A(02).

In conclusion, there has been no harmonization in A(02). However, such a phenomenon seems visible in other witnesses in three cases. Firstly, a small group of LXX witnesses (*x*) harmonizes its reading to the New Testament. Secondly, a New Testament witness (04) harmonizes its reading to the LXX. Finally, 1751 harmonizes its reading to a parallel New Testament passage, where the term *καινης* occurs before *διαθήκης*.

### 2.2.3. Exodus 25:40 in Heb 8:5<sup>88</sup>

Exod 25:40 (49b:2.17–19): ὄρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει. (LXX = ExodA)<sup>89</sup>

Heb 8:5 (f.115v): 2.15–17: ὄρα γὰρ φησιν, ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

A(02) follows LXX and Heb 8:5 exactly, precluding any possibility of harmonization. On the other hand, two variants in Exod 25:40 may betray harmonization in other witnesses. Firstly, F, b, 129–246, 127, s, 126, and 509 add *πάντα* before *κατὰ* in Exod 25:40, exactly like Heb 8:5.<sup>90</sup> Since this reading appears also in Philo, it could be argued that this alternative LXX reading predates the writing of Hebrews.<sup>91</sup> As such, this variant reading might not be due to harmonization to Heb 8:5.

However, Philo's text differs from Hebrews somewhat. For example, it adds *πάντα* before *ποιήσεις* (rather than after it, as in Heb 8:5).<sup>92</sup> If Philo and Hebrews were following the same Vorlage, why would their texts agree on the addition of *πάντα*, but not on its order? It is probable, then, that Philo added *πάντα* to clarify the context of God's commandment: everything must be built according to the divine model. Further, since Philo's text has been transmitted by Christian copyists, his text was possibly later harmonized to Hebrews.<sup>93</sup> It would thus seem more probable that the above LXX witnesses have also harmonized their text to Heb 8:5.<sup>94</sup>

The second Exod 25:40 variant concerns the O-recension (except 767), f, s, 126–128, 426, and 799. Just like Heb 8:5, they have *δειχθέντα* instead of *δεδειγμένον*. Whether this is a harmonization to the New Testament or not depends on whether *δειχθέντα* was the Hebrews author's intrusion or whether it was already in his Vorlage. J. C. McCullough takes the latter view. He argues that, while the above-mentioned witnesses belong to the Hexaplaric recension, readings from this recension are sometimes present in the Hebrews' author's Pentateuch Vorlage.<sup>95</sup> Steyn, however, persuasively suggests that *δειχθέντα* was the Hebrews' author's invention because of "the available textual evidence (including the occurrence in Philo)" and of "the author's hermeneutics."<sup>96</sup> While a hexaplaric recension may sometimes predate the Hebrews' letter, in this case the balance tips towards a harmonization of the above witnesses to the New Testament.<sup>97</sup> In other words, the Hebrews' writer seems to have originated this change, and some LXX witnesses later harmonized their reading to his form of quotation.

<sup>88</sup> For a detailed review of the variants in this quotation, as well as the LXX's textual comparison with Heb 8:5, see Steyn, *Quest*, 241–45.

<sup>89</sup> ExodA differs only orthographically in reading *δεδιγμένον* (instead of *δεδειγμένον*).

<sup>90</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 293.

<sup>91</sup> Intimated by McCullough, "Hebrews," 120. Steyn, too, says that "the inclusion of *παντα* and its parallel in Philo's *Leg.* seems to be too coincidental" (*Quest*, 245).

<sup>92</sup> See Steyn (*Quest*, 242) for a textual comparison between the two.

<sup>93</sup> For Philo, refer to our previous example (Gen 15:6 in Rom 4:3) in footnote 51.

<sup>94</sup> So NGTE 410.

<sup>95</sup> McCullough, "Hebrews," 121.

<sup>96</sup> Steyn, *Quest*, 245.

<sup>97</sup> See NGTE 410.

As to the New Testament quotation, its text is very uniform.<sup>98</sup> CNTTS mentions minuscule 131 (eleventh century) as omitting πάντα, possibly to harmonize its reading to the LXX, since πάντα is otherwise uniformly present in the New Testament tradition.

In sum, while A(02) avoids harmonization, other witnesses do not. In two different variants certain LXX witnesses harmonize their text to Heb 8:5. There is also one case when a New Testament minuscule harmonizes its text to the LXX.

#### 2.2.4. Exodus 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7

Exod 32:6 (54a:1.21–23): ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. (LXX = ExodA)<sup>99</sup>

1 Cor 10:7 (f.95v:2.48–49): ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πρῖν καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. (NA<sup>28</sup> = 1CorA)

There are no notable variants in the LXX witnesses.<sup>100</sup> As to 1 Cor 10:7, Gordon D. Fee concludes that it is “an exact quotation of the LXX.”<sup>101</sup> In addition, its text is uniform across the New Testament textual tradition.<sup>102</sup>

#### 2.2.5. Exodus 33:19 in Rom 9:15

Exod 33:19 (55a:1.45–47): ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω. (LXX = ExodA)<sup>103</sup>

Rom 9:15 (f.89r:1.8–9): ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)<sup>104</sup>

As Stanley observes, “The Pauline text agrees precisely with a nearly unanimous LXX tradition.”<sup>105</sup> The LXX and New Testament texts are also very stable.<sup>106</sup> A(02) agrees completely with them. No harmonization has occurred.

On the other hand, there could be a possible case of harmonization in 69 (a New Testament minuscule). Instead of the established οἰκτίρω, it has the singular reading οἰκτειρήσω.<sup>107</sup> This variant appears in only two cases in LXX quotations: in LXX minuscule 426 and in the sixth-century *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*.<sup>108</sup> Since 69 is much later than either of these two witnesses—and since the New Testament tradition is otherwise very uniform—it could be

<sup>98</sup> No variants mentioned in NA<sup>28</sup> (669); Tischendorf (805) has no notable variants either.

<sup>99</sup> There is only an orthographic peculiarity in A(02), both in Exodus and in its Romans quotation: ἐκάθεισεν.

<sup>100</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 356.

<sup>101</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 454. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, ed., *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 385; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 734; Stanley, *Paul*, 197.

<sup>102</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 536; Tischendorf 514; Junack, *Neue Testament*, 243; von Soden 710; Swanson, *Romans*, 143–4.

<sup>103</sup> Except for orthography: A(02) has ελαυήσω ... οικτειρήσω (which the Wuppertal site fails to mention)... οικτείρω.

<sup>104</sup> Except for orthography: A(02) has οικτειρήσω ... οικτείρω.

<sup>105</sup> Stanley points out that “the Pauline text agrees precisely with a nearly unanimous LXX tradition” (*Paul*, 106). See also Moo, *Romans*, 592n18; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, WBC 38B (Waco: Word Books, 1988), 552; Abasciano, *Paul’s Use*, 155.

<sup>106</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 373; NA<sup>28</sup> 499; Tischendorf 412.

<sup>107</sup> Swanson, *Romans*, 141. Minuscule 69 (fifteenth century) is category III in Paul (Aland and Aland, *Text*, 129).

<sup>108</sup> Eleventh century CE. After Exod 20:1, it contains a mixed text (Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 12, 40). F.C. Conybeare, ed., *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894), 84. See William C. Varner, ed., *Ancient Jewish-Christian Dialogues: Athanasius and Zacchaeus, Simon and Theophilus, Timothy and Aquila: Introductions, Texts, and*



that 69 has harmonized its text to a very poorly attested LXX *Vorlage* that is reflected in 426. Moreover, since this variant is also quoted in the *Dialogue*, this reading possibly predated 69 or its ancestor(s). As such, the direction of the harmonization would be from the New Testament to the LXX. There is, however, another possible explanation. The scribe of 69 may have inadvertently written οἰκτειρήσω, instead of οἰκτίρω, because the former form appears in the same verse already. Such a change may also account for the same phenomenon in 426 and in the *Dialogue*. As such, this may be a coincidental change in both manuscripts, rather than a result of harmonization.

To conclude, while A(02) does not display any signs of harmonization, a New Testament minuscule may have adapted its text to an alternative LXX text of Exod 33:19, although this is not too likely.

## 2.3. Leviticus<sup>109</sup>

### 2.3.1. Leviticus 18:5 in Rom 10:5 and Gal 3:12

Lev 18:5 (7ob:2.9–10): ἄ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. (LXX = LevA)

Rom 10:5 (f.89r:2.33–34): ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ RomA)

Rom 10:5 of A(02): ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ...

Gal 3:12 (f.102v:2.2–3): ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. (NA<sup>28</sup> = GalA)

Three variants are of interest in the LXX text of Lev 18:5. In the first variant, the first hand of majuscule F and some other LXX witnesses have the masculine singular ὁ instead of the neuter plural ἄ.<sup>110</sup> This is in line with Gal 3:12 and Rom 10:5. These LXX witnesses seem to have harmonized their text to Gal 3:12 and/or to Rom 10:5 for three reasons. Firstly, ὁ makes the LXX text awkward, so it would be difficult to imagine how this variant could have arisen unless it happened due to harmonization to an authoritative parallel passage. Secondly, the external evidence is otherwise heavily in favour of ἄ as original in the LXX. Thirdly, the New Testament text at this point is unanimous about the presence of ὁ. Paul had to change ἄ to ὁ because it “would have found no referent whatsoever in Rom 10:5.”<sup>111</sup> At some point, then, the above-mentioned LXX witnesses must have made the change from ἄ to ὁ, harmonizing their reading to Paul.

A second variant is the presence or absence of αὐτὰ after ποιήσας.<sup>112</sup> A(02), B, V, and 381-618, *y*-group (except 392), 55, omit it (which is also the original reading), while other witnesses have it.<sup>113</sup> The same divided evidence is also present in the text of Rom 10:5.<sup>114</sup> A possible scenario could be that the LXX text was at some point conformed to the Hebrew Old Testament by adding αὐτὰ, which translates אָתָּא. It would have then found its way into the LXX copy that Paul used when he wrote Rom 10:5 and Gal 3:12. As a result, omissions of αὐτὰ in New

*Translations* (Lewiston: Mellen, 2004), 137, about the date. For this quotation (*DialTA*, 29.7), see Varner, *Dialogues*, 206.

<sup>109</sup> For more information on the different LXX witnesses, their families, groups, and characteristics in Leviticus, see the introduction (Einleitung) to J. W. Wevers and U. Quast, eds., *Leviticus*, SVTGT 2.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 7–41; J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); and the relevant notes in J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) (henceforth, NGTL).

<sup>110</sup> O-15-72+707, 16<sup>c</sup>-46-413-417-529<sup>c</sup>-550<sup>c</sup>-552-739<sup>c</sup>, etc. See Wevers and Quast, *Leviticus*, 203.

<sup>111</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 126.

<sup>112</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Leviticus*, 203.

<sup>113</sup> See Stanley, *Paul*, 127.

<sup>114</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 501.

Testament manuscripts may rightly be seen as attempts to harmonize Rom 10:5 to the earlier LXX text.<sup>115</sup> A(02) is one of those manuscripts that omit αὐτά in both the LXX (in line with the original), and in Rom 10:5 (where αὐτά was originally present). As such, it too seems to exhibit signs of harmonization to LXX.<sup>116</sup>

The third variant is the omission of ἄνθρωπος by two minuscules of the *f*-group (53-664) and by Philo.<sup>117</sup> This, too, seems to have occurred due to harmonization to the New Testament, but this time to the text of Gal 3:12, whose entire textual tradition also lacks ἄνθρωπος.

Regarding the state of text at Rom 10:5 and Gal 3:12, the main variants pertaining to harmonization in Rom 10:5 were already mentioned above.<sup>118</sup> As to Gal 3:12, a noteworthy variant is that a later hand of 06, as well as many Byzantine witnesses, add ἄνθρωπος after αὐτά.<sup>119</sup> Since the majority of LXX witnesses contain ἄνθρωπος, Paul himself seems to have been responsible for omitting it in Gal 3:12, although he was cognizant of its presence (he retains it in Rom 10:5). It is, thus, very probable that, at some point, some New Testament witnesses harmonized Gal 3:12 to LXX<sup>120</sup> or to Rom 10:5 (which also has ἄνθρωπος).

In summary, all three directions of harmonization may be present. Firstly, some LXX manuscripts (F, two *f*-group minuscules, etc.) may have harmonized their text to Rom 10:5 and/or Gal 3:12. Conversely, some New Testament witnesses, including A(02) in Rom 10:5, harmonize their text to the LXX. Finally, some New Testament witnesses (e.g., 062) seem to harmonize Gal 3:12 to LXX, or to its parallel text, Rom 10:5.

### 2.3.2. Leviticus 19:18 in Rom 13:9 and Gal 5:14

Lev 19:18 (71b:1.16–17): ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Rom 13:9 (f.90v:2.7–8): ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Gal 5:14 (f.103v:1.43–44): ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. (LXX/LevA = NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA/GalA)

A considerable number of LXX minuscules have ἐαυτόν instead of σεαυτόν in the text of Lev 19:18, although the latter is the original reading.<sup>121</sup> The same variant (ἐαυτόν replacing σεαυτόν) also appears in some New Testament witnesses at Rom 13:9 and at Gal 5:14.<sup>122</sup> Despite this fluctuation, the evidence favours σεαυτόν as Paul's reading.<sup>123</sup> This variant also appears in five parallel passages that appear in the Gospels: Matt 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27; James 2:8.<sup>124</sup>

<sup>115</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 127. Wevers, too, (NGTL 275) also seems inclined to a recensional (i.e., Hebraizing) origin for αὐτά in LXX.

<sup>116</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 1993], 589) would concur to such harmonization to LXX, although he only mentions 01\* as omitting αὐτή.

<sup>117</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Leviticus*, 203.

<sup>118</sup> While RomA (and some other manuscripts) read αὐτή instead of Paul's αὐτοῖς, this is not due to harmonization to LXX, where such a variant never appears.

<sup>119</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 582.

<sup>120</sup> Tischendorf (640) possibly intimates this.

<sup>121</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Leviticus*, 214; Stanley, *Paul*, 179.

<sup>122</sup> Rom 13:9: E.g., 010, 012, 020, etc. See NA<sup>28</sup> 508; Tischendorf 435–36; Swanson, *Romans*, 206–7. Gal 5:14: E.g., P<sup>46</sup>, 010, 012, etc. See Tischendorf 654; Swanson, *Romans*, 71–72.

<sup>123</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 251.

<sup>124</sup> See Tischendorf 145, 353, 554, 254–55. Matt 19:19 contains no such variant in any of its Greek New Testament witnesses. (Matt 5:43 is not considered here as it contains a shortened form of this commandment.)

Since the same fluctuation appears in both the LXX and the New Testament tradition, it is difficult to decide whether harmonization has occurred in the direction of the LXX, of the New Testament, or, possibly, within the New Testament (where parallel passages may have influenced each-other's text). However, while such fluctuation in both traditions could be a sign of harmonization, there is another feasible explanation for it. In scriptio continua (the form in which LXX and Greek New Testament manuscripts were most possibly written) the phrase ὡς σεαυτὸν would have been written as ὡσσεαυτόν. Since ὡς is not accented and its form is thus protected, it is quite possible that scribes (from both LXX and New Testament traditions) may have accidentally dropped the second sigma (i.e., the sigma that was part of σεαυτόν). As such, this varied tradition in both LXX and New Testament may be due to simple haplography, rather than to harmonization.

In conclusion, A(02) shows no signs of harmonization. The possibility of harmonization, on the other hand, may exist in a number of LXX and New Testament witnesses.

## 2.4. Numbers<sup>125</sup>

### 2.4.1. Numbers 16:5 in 2 Tim 2:19

Num 16:5: (89a:2.36): ἔγνω ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ. (LXX = NumA)

2 Tim 2:19 (f.121v:2.33–34): ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ. (NA<sup>28</sup>= 2TimA)

One variant may be mentioned.<sup>126</sup> Instead of ὁ θεός, 458\* (twelfth century; hexaplaric notes) has ὁ κύριος in Num 16:5. Similar to this, 426 (part of O-recension), 71-619 (x-group) have κύριος without ὁ.<sup>127</sup> The latter is exactly the same as 2 Tim 2:19. Could this be a case of harmonization of these isolated LXX witnesses to 2 Tim 2:19?

Philip H. Towner deems that, due to his knowledge of the Hebrew text of Num 16:5, the writer of 2 Timothy was responsible for making the change from ὁ θεός to κύριος (since the Hebrew word used is יהוה).<sup>128</sup> However, there is also another possibility: such a Hebraizing change may be expected in later LXX recensions, which often tried to bring the LXX nearer to the Hebrew text. In that case, the variant form in LXX (i.e., κύριος) would not have necessarily been influenced by 2 Timothy. It, thus, may have probably arisen in isolated manuscript groups independently from the New Testament and possibly prior to it. If so, the writer of 2 Timothy may simply be quoting a “variant form of the text.”<sup>129</sup>

In sum, there is no harmonization in A(02). It is perhaps possible, on the other hand, that a few LXX witnesses might have harmonized their text to 2 Tim 2:19; this, however, is not very likely.

<sup>125</sup> For more information on the different LXX witnesses, their families, groups, and characteristics in Numbers, see the introduction (Einleitung) to J. W. Wevers and U. Quast, eds., *Numeri*, SVTG 3.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 7–45; J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); and the relevant notes in J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

<sup>126</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Numeri*, 210.

<sup>127</sup> So Wevers in his *Notes*, xxxviii. In *Text History*, 16, Wevers explains that “the x-group is closer to the Byzantine text represented by *d*, *n* and *t* than to any other tradition.”

<sup>128</sup> Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 532n.88. So also Geroge W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 415.

<sup>129</sup> Ian H. Marshall and Philip H. Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 757.

## 2.5. Deuteronomy<sup>130</sup>

### 2.5.1. Deuteronomy 4:24 in Heb 12:29

Deut 4:24 (106a:1.32–33): ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν. (LXX = DeutA)

Heb 12:29 (f.118v:1.23): γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

LXX minuscule 55 has a singular reading: instead of ὅτι, it has ὁ γὰρ.<sup>131</sup> It is, thus, possible that its scribe harmonized its text to the Hebrews' quotation.

New Testament minuscule 1962 contains a singular reading:<sup>132</sup> it adds ἔστιν after καταναλίσκον. Its scribe, thus, has adapted its reading to that of LXX (which uniformly contains ἔστιν). Another singular reading is that of the original hand of ο6 (ο6\*). It wrote κύριος γὰρ,<sup>133</sup> which resembles the LXX text. A different hand later replaced κύριος (κς) with καί. It seems, then, that both 1962 and, to a certain extent, ο6\* have been influenced by LXX.

To conclude, A(ο2) shows no signs of harmonization. On the other hand, an LXX minuscule may have harmonized its reading to the New Testament, while two New Testament witnesses may have been influenced by LXX.

### 2.5.2. Deuteronomy 5:16 in Eph 6:2, 3<sup>134</sup>

Deut 5:16 (106b:2.15–107a:1.3): τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου ... ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (LXX = DeutA)

Eph 6:2, 3 (f.106v:1.4–8): τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα...ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (NA<sup>28</sup> = EphA)

Exodus 20:12 constitutes a parallel passage:

LXX: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ... ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

ExodA: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ... ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (the underlined phrase is missing in A[ο2]).

There is nothing of note regarding possible harmonization in the text of Deut 5:16.<sup>135</sup> In its parallel passage, Exod 20:12, a phrase (ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται) is missing in A(ο2). This is possibly a

<sup>130</sup> For more information on the different LXX witnesses, their families, groups, and characteristics in Deuteronomy, see the Introduction (Einleitung) to J. W. Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium*, SVTG 3.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 7–52; J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), henceforth, THGD. See also the relevant notes in J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), henceforth, NGTD.

<sup>131</sup> See Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 100.

<sup>132</sup> Eleventh/twelfth century CE, a manuscript of Pauline Epistles with commentary, located in the Austrian National Library, Aland category II text. See Aland and Aland, *Text*, 136. (Consult page 335 for an explanation of Aland's text categories.) See also CNTTS Heb 12:29.

<sup>133</sup> “καὶ γὰρ et. Or<sup>2.572</sup> etc ... D\* d κυριος γαρ.” So Tischendorf 834.

<sup>134</sup> Stephen E. Fowl (*Ephesians: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012], 193) mentions only Exod 20:12 as the citation behind Eph 6:2, 3. Andrew T. Lincoln (*Ephesians* [Dallas: Word, 1990], 397) agrees that Eph 6:2–3 is closer to LXX Exod 20:12 than to LXX Deut 5:16. So also Thorsten Moritz, *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 154–55. However, since Deut 5:16 is also very much present in this text, this study will treat it as the main quotation in Eph 6:2–3.

<sup>135</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 113.

case of haplography, with the scribe's eye jumping from the first ἵνα to the second. Since there is a line change in the manuscript at this point, this further suggests a case of parablepsis.<sup>136</sup>

Parallel New Testament passages are as follows: (1) Matt 15:4; 19:19, which are not extant in A(02) due to a lacuna; (2) Mark 7:10 = MarkA; (3) Mark 10:19 = MarkA; (4) Luke 18:20 = LukeA. Their texts are as follows:

Matt 15:4: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς εἶπεν· τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα  
 Matt 19:19: τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα  
 Mark 7:10: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου  
 Mark 10:19: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα  
 Luke 18:20: τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα

It is clear that EphA has not harmonized its text to these three parallel passages. EphA does not add σου after μητέρα (unlike, e.g., the text of Mark 7:10). Moreover, it has the same text as Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:20, so there seems to have been no harmonization due to parallel New Testament passages in New Testament A(02).

### 2.5.3. Deuteronomy 5:17–21 in Rom 13:9

Deut 5:17–21 (107a:1.4–8): οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις... οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (LXX ≠ DeutA).  
 Deut 5:17–21 of A(02): οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις ...  
 Rom 13:9 (f.90v:2.2-4): οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA).<sup>137</sup>

As regards LXX, there is nothing of note regarding harmonization in Deut 5:17–21.<sup>138</sup> There is, on the other hand, a parallel Old Testament passage to be considered:

Exod 20:13–17: οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ φονεύσεις ... οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.  
 ExodA: οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις ... οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. (Notice the different order in A[02]).

A(02) displays the same order in DeutA and ExodA. Both of these, however, differ from RomA (which in turn is the same as Deut LXX). There can, thus, be no influence of Old Testament A(02)'s text on NT A(02), or vice-versa.

Regarding the textual situation in the New Testament, there are three parallel New Testament passages:

Mat 19:18 is absent due to a lacuna in A(02), so it cannot be used for comparison.  
 Mark 10:19 reads μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης ... MarkA, on the other hand, has μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, just like LukeA and Rom 13:9.<sup>139</sup>

Luke 18:20: μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης ... This is the same as LukeA. Majuscule ο6 has a singular reading here: εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τὸ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις.<sup>140</sup> This is similar to Mat 19:18 (except for the order of commandments) and the same as LXX Deut. In this case, it is very probable that ο6 has harmonized its text to LXX Deut, whose order of commandments it also shares.

<sup>136</sup> Wevers and Quast, *Exodus*, 243.

<sup>137</sup> Part of the text is illegible due to a creased margin; A's text, however, is easily reconstructed due to the presence of most of the letters.

<sup>138</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 113–14.

<sup>139</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 145. Mark A(02) shares this reading with: 018, 022, 032, 038, f13, and others.

<sup>140</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 260.

As to A's text, it may be noted that LukeA = MarkA = RomA (not in the verb tenses, but in the verb order). There could, thus, be some influence from these parallel New Testament passages on one-another, although their different tense forms (indicative in Romans but subjunctive in Luke and Mark) seems to militate against it.

RomA (like the rest of the New Testament tradition) follows LXX Deuteronomy's order of these actions, even though it differs from the MT and DeutA.<sup>141</sup> DeutA, thus, follows the Hebraizing order, whereas RomA follows the Deut LXX order. As such, there has been no inner-manuscript harmonization here. It is interesting, on the other hand, that a few New Testament witnesses (01, 024, 048, 81, 104, etc.) add οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις after οὐ κλέψεις.<sup>142</sup> This is "undoubtedly a copyist's addition, harmonizing the Pauline text with the OT Decalogue."<sup>143</sup> Or as Stanley put it, this insertion was done "to fill a perceived gap in the Pauline text."<sup>144</sup>

To conclude, DeutA (= ExodA) and RomA are different enough to exclude a harmonizing tendency. On the other hand, 06's order is just like LXX Deut, a possible sign of harmonization to LXX. There are also a few other New Testament manuscripts, including 01, that may have harmonized their text to LXX Deut.

#### 2.5.4. Deuteronomy 9:3 in Heb 12:29

Deut 9:3 (109a:1.11): κύριος ὁ θεός σου, οὗτος προπορεύεται πρὸ προσώπου σου, πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν.

Heb 12:29 (f.118v:1.23): γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον.

Refer to Deut 4:24 in Heb 12:29 above. While NA<sup>28</sup> also links Deut 9:3 with Heb 12:29, some commentators only connect Heb 12:29 to Deut 4:24.<sup>145</sup> They are probably right, because Deut 4:24 offers a more direct source of quotation to Hebrews. For example, Deut 4:24 lacks the intervening words of Deut 9:3 (οὗτος προπορεύεται πρὸ προσώπου σου), which would slice the Heb 12:29 quotation mentioned into two. As a result, this parallel was not considered in this study.

#### 2.5.5. Deuteronomy 9:4 in Rom 10:6

Deut 9:4 (109a:1.17): μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.

Rom 10:6 (f.89r:2.36–37): μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. (LXX/DeutA= NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA)

Both the LXX and the New Testament textual traditions are uniform at this point.<sup>146</sup>

#### 2.5.6. Deuteronomy 9:19 in Heb 12:21

Deut 9:19 (109a:2.46): ἔκφοβός εἰμι. (LXX = DeutA)

Heb 12:21 (f.118r:2.45): ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

<sup>141</sup> For a helpful article on why there is a difference between the Hebrew/MT textual tradition and the LXX on the order of these prohibitions, see Richard A. Freund, "Murder, Adultery and Theft?" *SJOT* 2 (1989): 72–80.

<sup>142</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 508; Tischendorf 435; Swanson, *Romans*, 206.

<sup>143</sup> Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 679.

<sup>144</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 173n313.

<sup>145</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 844. See Gottlieb Lünemann, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882), 470; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 691; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 383.

<sup>146</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 145; NA<sup>28</sup> 501; Tischendorf 417. Swanson (*Romans*, 156) notes a few examples of different orthography in some manuscripts regarding the forms of εἴπῃς, τῇ (a few times written as τηι), and καρδίᾳ (written as καρδιαι).

The LXX text is very stable.<sup>147</sup> The same may be said about Heb 12:2. NA<sup>28</sup> and Tischendorf only note that ο1 and ο6\* have ἔκτρομος instead of ἔντρομος, which could not be due to harmonization to LXX (which does not have καὶ ἔντρομος).<sup>148</sup>

### 2.5.7. Deuteronomy 17:6 in Heb 10:28

Deut 17:6 (113b:2.25–26): ἐπὶ δυσὶν μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθανεῖται. (LXX = DeutA)  
 Heb 10:28 (f.117r:1.18–19): ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

Some LXX witnesses—71, 619, 318 (γ-group, of the A-text tradition),<sup>149</sup> 319 (mixed codex)—have the same reading as Heb 10:28 (NA<sup>28</sup> and HebA). They omit the first μάρτυσιν.<sup>150</sup> This may be a sign of harmonization to Heb 10:28. Moreover, codex W<sup>1</sup> has a singular reading, ἀποθνήσκει, instead of ἀποθανεῖται, just like Heb 10:28.<sup>151</sup> Might it be that it too was influenced by Heb 10:28?<sup>152</sup> The New Testament text, on the other hand, is very secure.<sup>153</sup>

To conclude, there is no harmonization in A(ο2). However, some LXX manuscripts may have harmonized their text to Heb 10:28.

### 2.5.8. Deuteronomy 17:7 in 1 Cor 5:13

Deut 17:7 (113b:2.31–32): ἐξαρεῖς τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. (LXX ≠ DeutA)  
 Deut 17:7 of A(ο2): ἐξαρεῖτε ...  
 1 Cor 5:13 (f.94r:2.5–6): ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. (NA<sup>28</sup> = 1CorA)

DeutA has ἐξαρεῖτε (future plural) instead of LXX's ἐξαρεῖς<sup>154</sup> (future singular) but not due to harmonization to 1 Cor 5:13, because the latter has ἐξάρατε (aorist imperative).

As for the text of 1 Cor 5:13, One variant may be noted:<sup>155</sup> ο62 ο19 630 1241 1505 and the Majority Text read καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε (future plural). This is in line with DeutA: καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε.<sup>156</sup>

It, thus, seems that, while 1CorA does not harmonize its text to DeutA (compare their texts above), a considerable number of other New Testament witnesses do.

### 2.5.9. Deuteronomy 19:15 in 2 Cor 13:1 and 1 Tim 5:19

Deut 19:15 (115a:1.19–21): ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα. (LXX = DeutA)  
 2 Cor 13:1 (f.101r:2.20–22): ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα. (NA<sup>28</sup> = 2CorA)  
 1 Tim 5:19 (f.120v:1.21–22): ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων. (NA<sup>28</sup> = 1TimA)

In Deut 19:15 three LXX witnesses—381, 618, and 767—have a similar text to 2 Cor 13:1 in that they omit ἐπὶ στόματος after καί. In another variant, two other LXX minuscules—799 and

<sup>147</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 151.

<sup>148</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 681; Tischendorf 832. Ellingworth (*Hebrews*, 676) misreads this variant as ἔκτροπος.

<sup>149</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 39.

<sup>150</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 215.

<sup>151</sup> Sidney Jellicoe (*The Septuagint and Modern Study* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 211–12) notes that its text is very near to that of A(ο2).

<sup>152</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 215.

<sup>153</sup> No variants are noted at this point in NA<sup>28</sup>, Tischendorf, or von Soden.

<sup>154</sup> NGTD 230–31, 282.

<sup>155</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 526; Tischendorf 483; Swanson, *1 Corinthians*, 68.

<sup>156</sup> NA's text is supported by: ο1, ο2, ο3, ο4, ο6\*, ο10, ο12, ο24, etc.

319—omit the second μαρτύρων, just like 2 Cor 13:1 (and Matt 18:16).<sup>157</sup> While it is possible that these witnesses may preserve an alternative LXX text that is similar to Paul's Vorlage, their late dates and small number suggests that it is more probable that they have harmonized their text to 2 Cor 13:1.

As to the New Testament situation, there is a parallel passage: Matt 18:16. Regrettably, due to a lacuna in A(02) at this point, it cannot be studied for harmonization purposes.

As to 2 Cor 13:1, its text is very stable. On the other hand, A(02) has a singular reading: it reads ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω ἐλθεῖν instead of Paul's ἔρχομαι.<sup>158</sup> A(02)'s reading is clearly secondary, possibly influenced by 2 Cor 12:14, where ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω ἐλθεῖν is also used by Paul.<sup>159</sup> As to 1 Tim 5:19, its text reveals no variants.

In conclusion, some LXX manuscripts may have been influenced by 2 Cor 13:1's text. On the other hand, A(02)'s Scribe 1 has harmonized its text to 2 Cor 12:14, but this is unrelated to the Old Testament quotation.

### 2.5.10. Deuteronomy 21:23 in Gal 3:13

Deut 21:23 (116a:2.4–6): κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. (LXX = DeutA)

Gal 3:13 (f.102v:2.7–9): ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. (NA<sup>28</sup> = GalA)

Only one LXX variant in Deut 21:23 seems to impinge on harmonization.<sup>160</sup> One LXX majuscule and many minuscules place ὁ in front of κρεμᾶμενος.<sup>161</sup> This is similar to Gal 3:13, and might be seen as influenced by it. However, according to Stanley, this is not very likely. He points out that, in such a case, the changed text influenced by Gal 3:13 would be extremely small, "especially when not one of the texts involved follows Paul in inserting ἐπικατάρατος or omitting ὑπὸ θεοῦ."<sup>162</sup> Nonetheless, he concedes that "such an extensive penetration of a Pauline reading into the LXX tradition would not be unprecedented."<sup>163</sup> Also, Stanley fails to point out how this reading may have arisen if not due to harmonization. As such, harmonization to Gal 3:13 cannot be ruled out.

Regarding the text of Gal 3:13, as Richard N. Longenecker observed, "Paul's quotation of Deut 21:23 differs from all extant LXX readings."<sup>164</sup> Moreover, its text is very solid.<sup>165</sup> Harmonization is in-existent.

In sum, there is no harmonization in A(02). It is conceivable, on the other hand, that a considerable part of the LXX tradition may have been influenced by Gal 3:13.

### 2.5.11. Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18

Deut 25:4 (117b:2.38): Οὐ φιμώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα. (LXX = DeutA)

1 Cor 9:9 (f.95v:1.9): οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ 1CorA; but 1CorA = LXX/DeutA)

<sup>157</sup> See Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 233. Also, see THGD 27.

<sup>158</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 576; Tischendorf 623. Reuben J. Swanson (*New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: 2 Corinthians* [Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2005], 176) attests to the same uniform tradition.

<sup>159</sup> Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 905.

<sup>160</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 249.

<sup>161</sup> V, 15-72-82-376, d, 246, n, t, 30-730-343-344, etc.

<sup>162</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 249n229.

<sup>163</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 249n229.

<sup>164</sup> Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas: Word, 1990), 122.

<sup>165</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 582; Tischendorf 640; Swanson, *Galatians*, 35.



1 Cor 9:9 of A(02): οὐ φημώσεις ...

1 Tim 5:18 (f.120v:1.17): βούν ἀλοώντα οὐ φημώσεις. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ 1TimA; but 1TimA = LXX/DeutA)

1 Tim 5:18 of A(02): οὐ φημώσεις....

The LXX text is very uniform.<sup>166</sup> Regarding 1 Cor 9:9, a variant—φημώσεις (also A[02]’s text)—has stronger external support than Paul’s κημώσεις.<sup>167</sup> It is also in line with LXX.<sup>168</sup>

However, as Bruce M. Metzger explains, “a majority of the Committee preferred κημώσεις ... on transcriptional grounds, for copyists were more likely to alter the less literary word (κημώσεις) to φημώσεις, which is also the reading of the Septuagint (Dt 25:4), than vice versa.”<sup>169</sup> He, thus, hints that LXX’s text may have influenced 1 Cor 9:9 in a number of New Testament witnesses. Nonetheless, while Metzger fails to mention it, this harmonization could have also occurred due to influence from 1 Tim 5:18, where φημώσεις is the uniform choice for almost all New Testament manuscripts.<sup>170</sup> Either alternative is possible.

As to 1 Tim 5:18, a number of manuscripts exhibit the LXX order: A(02), 04, 016, 024, 044, 048, and a number of minuscules.<sup>171</sup> This could have arisen out of harmonization to 1 Cor 9:9 (A[02] and 04 have φημώσεις in 1 Cor), or to LXX.

In conclusion, harmonization to LXX, or to a parallel New Testament text, seems the reason behind the change of words or of word order in a considerable number of New Testament manuscripts. What about A(02) in 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18? In both 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18, it has the same text as LXX/DeutA, but it departs from NA<sup>28</sup> both in words and in word order. This uniformity in all these three Old Testament and New Testament passages seems to have been the result of harmonization in A(02), although the direction is impossible to determine. This harmonization, however, occurred in A(02)’s exemplars, not at the hand of its scribes, because A(02)’s reading is also found in other early witnesses, including P<sup>46</sup>, which predates A(02) by about two centuries.

### 2.5.12. Deuteronomy 27:26 in Gal 3:10

Deut 27:26 (119a:1.29): Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις οὐκ ἐμμενεῖ ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου ποιῆσαι αὐτούς. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Deut 27:26 of A(02): ... πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ... τοῦ ποιῆσαι ...

Gal 3:10 (f.102v:1.43–47): ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ GalA)

Gal 3:10 of A(02): ... ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν ...

DeutA, along with “F, M, the majority of the Hexaplaric manuscripts, and the bulk of the texts from the minuscule families b d f n s γ,” adds τοῦ before ποιῆσαι.<sup>172</sup> This is not necessarily due to the influence of Gal 3:10, however, since none of the other (and more substantial) differences between these texts are eliminated.

<sup>166</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 274.

<sup>167</sup> See NA<sup>28</sup> 534; see also Tischendorf 504–7, and Swanson, *1 Corinthians*, 127. See also David Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 131. n38.

<sup>168</sup> So Tischendorf: “item LXX, apud quos φημώσεις non fluctat” (500).

<sup>169</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 492. Also, Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 361–62. Note that Family 1739 is divided here (1881 as opposed to 1739).

<sup>170</sup> With the exception of the original hand of 06, which has κημώσεις as a singular reading. Thus, 06\* had κημώσεις in both 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18, possibly as a result of 1 Cor 9:9’s influence on 1 Tim 5:18.

<sup>171</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 640. Tischendorf 855.

<sup>172</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 242; Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 293.

Regarding the text of Gal 3:10, while not original, the preposition ἐν is added after ἐμμένει in many New Testament witnesses: 012, A(02), 04, 010, 012, 018, 019, 024, and the Majority text.<sup>173</sup> The New Testament textual tradition is otherwise quite stable.<sup>174</sup> This could be due to harmonization to LXX (especially in A[02], which contains ἐν in both Testaments). Nonetheless, this question must be left undecided, since it is inconceivable that these witnesses adapted only such a small preposition to LXX, but left all the other differences untouched.

To conclude, while harmonization cannot be ruled out, it seems that A(02), as well as the other above-mentioned witnesses, have not harmonized their text to LXX.

### 2.5.13. Deuteronomy 29:3 in Rom 11:8

Deut 29:3 (12ob:1.36–39): καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Deut 29:3 of A(02): ... ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ βλέπειν ...

Rom 11:8 (f.89v:2.12–16): ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

DeutA differs from LXX in two ways. Firstly, it has a subsingular reading only shared with 761 (a minuscule belonging to the Catena): it adds τοῦ before βλέπειν.<sup>175</sup> Secondly, DeutA has a singular reading: it adds τά before ὦτα.<sup>176</sup>

The New Testament textual tradition, on the other hand, is very uniform. As such, no variants are worthy of note.<sup>177</sup> RomA, too, has the same text as the rest of the New Testament tradition.

In conclusion, DeutA's singular and subsingular readings are not the result of harmonization to New Testament. While the addition of τοῦ before βλέπειν is similar to Rom 11:8 (but DeutA does not also add μὴ), its second addition (τά before ὦτα) is not found anywhere in the New Testament textual tradition. Also, in all other respects DeutA follows LXX, which differs in many aspects from Rom 11:8 (which RomA duly follows). As such, no attempt is seen on the part of DeutA to harmonize its reading to RomA. There are no signs of harmonization in the rest of the LXX and New Testament traditions either.

### 2.5.14. Deuteronomy 29:17 in Heb 12:15

Deut 29:17 (12ob: 2.42–44): μὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Deut 29:17 of A(02): ... ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ ...

Heb 12:15 (f.118r:2.23–24): μὴ τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

DeutA differs in two ways from LXX.<sup>178</sup> Firstly, along with majuscule F, it adds πικρίας after ῥίζα. This was probably a result of harmonization to Heb 12:15.<sup>179</sup>

<sup>173</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 582. Guy Waters (*The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006], 80–85) provides a detailed discussion on the textual form of Gal 3:10.

<sup>174</sup> See Tischendorf 640. He mentions γεγραμμένος too as a minor variant.

<sup>175</sup> Wevers observes that 761 only adds τοῦ over an erasure. Apparently, A's reading too is done over an erasure. In A's case, 10 letters are written in this way (i.e., τοῦ βλέπειν). See Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 316.

<sup>176</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 316.

<sup>177</sup> See NA<sup>28</sup> 503; Swanson, *Romans*, 171; Tischendorf 422.

<sup>178</sup> Tischendorf 829–31.

<sup>179</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 321.

Secondly, DeutA has ἐνοχλή instead of ἐν χολή. It is also joined by B\*, F\*, and a number of LXX minuscules.<sup>180</sup> According to Wevers, this, too, is due to the influence of Heb 12:15.<sup>181</sup> However, the matter is not so straightforward. Before attempting a conclusion, the New Testament textual tradition must also be taken into consideration.

Moving on to the New Testament, the text of Heb 12:15 is very stable, the only exception being a singular reading in P<sup>46</sup>, which has ἐνχ[.]λή.<sup>182</sup> This was, thus, quite possibly due to harmonization to LXX.<sup>183</sup>

To return to the somewhat mixed LXX textual tradition, is it possible to speak of harmonization of the above-mentioned LXX witnesses to Heb 12:15's ἐνοχλή? It must be observed that Heb 12:15 (including A[02]) is much closer to DeutA than to LXX. Hence, Wevers contends that the textual form represented by DeutA and a number of other manuscripts is due to harmonization to Hebrews. Philip E. Hughes, too, deems that, "the probability is that the Alexandrinus reading has been influenced by and 'corrected' from the reading of Hebrews 12:15, rather than *vice versa*."<sup>184</sup> Gareth Lee Cockerill concurs, "The A manuscripts appear to represent a text that has been partially conformed to Hebrews by changing ἐν χολή ('in gall') to ἐνοχλή ('cause trouble') and by adjusting the significance of πικρία."<sup>185</sup>

There is, however, another alternative. It might well be that the text of DeutA (and of the other witnesses) predates the writing of Hebrews. In other words, as Harold W. Attridge puts it, the Hebrews writer may have "relied on a text in which such corruption had [already] occurred."<sup>186</sup> For Attridge, the idea that the LXX text was influenced at some point by Hebrews "does not adequately account for the diverse readings in the LXX. Corruption in the pre-Christian manuscript tradition of the LXX offers the simplest explanation of the overall textual situation" in Heb 12:15.<sup>187</sup>

The situation is, thus, complicated, although it seems to lean toward harmonization. *Contra* Attridge, the LXX tradition is not so diverse as to make Hebrews' influence improbable. The LXX manuscripts that have DeutA's reading are not so numerous and textually diverse as to preclude such a possibility.

In conclusion, a New Testament manuscript (P<sup>46</sup>) has quite probably harmonized its quotation to the LXX. In addition, DeutA and some other LXX manuscripts may have possibly been influenced from Heb 12:15 at two points. Regarding A(02), such harmonization may have occurred in its exemplars, not at the hand of its scribes, because its variants also appear in a number of other LXX witnesses.

### 2.5.15. Deuteronomy 30:12 in Rom 10:6

Deut 30:12 (121a:2.50–51): Τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Deut 30:12 of A(02): ... ἀναβήσεται ἡμῶν ...

Rom 10:6 (f.89r:2.37–38): τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

<sup>180</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 321.

<sup>181</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 321; NGTD 471.

<sup>182</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 681. Tischendorf (829) mentions ἐνοχλεί as a variant in majuscules 018 and 025.

<sup>183</sup> A parallel verse (but not quotation) is Acts 8:23: εἰς γὰρ χολὴν πικρίας. The text of this phrase is also solid (NA<sup>28</sup> 405; Tischendorf 609) and is too different to have influenced Heb 12:15's transmission history.

<sup>184</sup> Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 539n143.

<sup>185</sup> Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 636n20.

<sup>186</sup> Attridge, *Hebrews*, 368.

<sup>187</sup> Attridge, *Hebrews*, 368.

Two observations are in order regarding the text of Deut 30:12. Firstly, instead of LXX's ἡμίῃν, A(o2) and many other witnesses have ἡμῶν.<sup>188</sup> Secondly, three LXX minuscules—246 (*f*-group), 767 (*n*-group), and 55 (mixed text)—omit ἡμίῃν.<sup>189</sup> This is in line with Rom 10:6, and may well be the result of harmonization incurred by Christian scribes.<sup>190</sup>

On the other hand, the text of Rom 10:6 (including A[o2]) omits the pronoun uniformly across its New Testament textual tradition.<sup>191</sup>

To conclude, since Rom 10:6 (including RomA) has a very stable text, and since DeutA differs from it (see mentioned variant in the LXX commentary), harmonization in A(o2) to the New Testament is non-existent. On the other hand, a few LXX manuscripts do seem to harmonize their text to Rom 10:6.

### 2.5.16. Deuteronomy 30:14 in Rom 10:8

Deut 30:14 (121b:1.6–9): ἐγγύς σου ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. (LXX = DeutA)

Rom 10:8 (f.89r:2.42–44): ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

Regarding the LXX situation, three variants may be mentioned. Firstly, a few manuscripts (B, 707, 18-120, 509), have ἔστιν σου ἐγγύς, a transposed form of ἐγγύς σου ἔστιν.<sup>192</sup> However, this is not due to harmonization to Rom 10:8, which has a different order. Secondly, three manuscripts (F, 53-664) omit σφόδρα.<sup>193</sup> This is probably due to harmonization to Rom 10:8, which also omits σφόδρα.<sup>194</sup> Thirdly, four LXX minuscules (29, 320-552, and 55) transpose ἔστιν after ῥῆμα, just like Rom 10:8. While this could simply be a variant LXX reading that existed before Romans was written, the very small number of these manuscripts makes harmonization more probable.

The New Testament textual situation (Rom 10:8) is stable,<sup>195</sup> but two variants may be mentioned. Firstly, Tischendorf notes that, in 06, 0319, 010, 012 (all of which belong to the D-text), ἔστιν precedes τὸ ῥῆμα (like LXX).<sup>196</sup> This is, quite possibly, harmonization to LXX. Secondly, three New Testament minuscules (1739 and 1881 of Family 1739, and 1962<sup>197</sup>) add σφόδρα after τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, which (but for the transposed order of τὸ ῥῆμα and ἔστιν) is most probably influenced by LXX.

To conclude, A(o2) exhibits no signs of harmonization. However, harmonization does seem present in other individual (or groups of) manuscripts. Some LXX manuscripts harmonize their reading to Rom 10:8. The reverse influence is seen in some New Testament manuscripts (e.g., the four D-text majuscules, or Family 1739).

<sup>188</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 328. This is the only difference between LXX and DeutA.

<sup>189</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 328.

<sup>190</sup> Stanley, *Paul*, 131.

<sup>191</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 501; Tischendorf 417; Swanson, *Romans*, 156.

<sup>192</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 329.

<sup>193</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 329.

<sup>194</sup> However, see Georg Walser, *Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews: Studies in Their Textual and Contextual Background* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 167; see also Stanley's cautious approach (*Paul*, 133).

<sup>195</sup> No variants noted in NA<sup>28</sup> 508.

<sup>196</sup> Tischendorf 417-9. See Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 73–76. There, these manuscripts are very closely related: 0139 was copied from 06, whereas 010 and 012 quite possibly go back to the same archetype.

<sup>197</sup> Minuscule 1962 is no stranger to harmonization to LXX. See above, Deut 4:24 in Heb 12:29.

**2.5.17. Deuteronomy 31:6, 8 in Heb 13:5**

Deut 31:6 (121b:2.19–20): οὐ μή σε ἀνή οὔτε μή σε ἐγκαταλίπη. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Deut 31:6 of A(02): ... οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπη.

Deut 31:8 (121b:2.29): οὐκ ἀνήσει σε οὐδὲ μή ἐγκαταλίπη σε. (LXX ≠ DeutA)

Heb 13:5 (f.118v:1.37–38): οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

While NA<sup>28</sup> lists both these verses as possible sources of quotation in Heb 13:5, “Heb 13:5 is identical to Deut 31:6 except for the substitution of οὐδ' οὐ for οὔτε μή between the clauses and for the first/third person variation.”<sup>198</sup> For this reason, only Deut 31:6 will be studied for harmonization purposes.

DeutA's differences with LXX are not due to harmonization to the New Testament.<sup>199</sup> Firstly, DeutA—along with some other manuscripts—reads οὐδ' οὐ μή instead of LXX's οὔτε μή.<sup>200</sup> Even though this is in line with Hebrews' reading, its author may have had a Vorlage to DeutA. No harmonization seems to have occurred. The second difference is a different orthographical form of ἐγκαταλίπη,<sup>201</sup> again not as a result of harmonization.

As regards the New Testament textual situation in Heb 13:5, it is very stable, and HebA has the same text as NA<sup>28</sup>. Again, the only minor variant in the New Testament manuscripts is the different orthography of ἐγκαταλίπω.<sup>202</sup>

**2.5.18. Deuteronomy 32:21 in Rom 10:19**

Deut 32:21 (112b:2.26–27): κἀγὼ παραζηλώσω αὐτοὺς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω παροργιῶ αὐτούς. (LXX = DeutA)

Rom 10:19 (f.89v:1.28–30): ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

There is nothing of note that would impinge on issues of harmonization in Deut 32:21.<sup>203</sup> As to DeutA, it has the same text as LXX.

Regarding the text of Rom 10:19, its transmission is very uniform and A(02) follows it.<sup>204</sup> However, harmonization seems to have occurred in a few isolated witnesses: 01<sup>c</sup> and 04 (along with minuscules 1315, 1900) have αὐτούς instead of the first ὑμᾶς. Moreover, two of these same manuscripts, 01<sup>c</sup> and 1315 (along with 1505 and 2495), have αὐτούς in place of the second ὑμᾶς.<sup>205</sup> This is a clear move towards LXX and becomes particularly interesting in the case of 01, where

<sup>198</sup> Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 687n47.

<sup>199</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 334.

<sup>200</sup> Wevers demonstrates that this cannot be the original form of the LXX text, but that it appeared in the first few centuries CE, possibly due to the popularity of Heb 13:5, which also attests this form (NGTD 493–94). However, this does not seem to be due to harmonization to Hebrews. For example, it is also strongly supported by LXX witnesses in Deut 28:65, which is never quoted in the New Testament, and as such cannot have been influenced by Hebrews.

<sup>201</sup> See also NGTD 494. While Attridge notes that LXX minuscule f(53) uses the first person for the verbs in this citation, which would be a possible harmonization to Hebrews (*Hebrews*, 389n72)—an opinion which he has seemingly borrowed from Peter Katz (“Οὐ Μὴ Σε Ἀνῶ, Οὐδ' Οὐ Μὴ Σε Ἐγκαταλίπω Hebr. Xiii 5: The Biblical Source of the Quotation,” *Bib* 33.4 (1952): 523–5)—no such variant actually exists (see Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 334–35).

<sup>202</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 682.

<sup>203</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 351.

<sup>204</sup> No variants mentioned in NA<sup>28</sup> 502.

<sup>205</sup> Tischendorf 421; Swanson, *Romans*, 161–62; and CNTTS Rom 10:19. Tischendorf notes that even 04\* may have read αὐτούς in place of the second ὑμᾶς.

a later scribe corrected both original occurrences of ὑμᾶς to αὐτούς in an apparent attempt to adapt Rom 10:19 to its LXX source.

In conclusion, there is in this quotation evidence that certain New Testament manuscripts may have harmonized their text to the LXX. On the other hand, A(02) is free from such tendency.

### 2.5.19. Deuteronomy 32:35 in Rom 12:19 and Heb 10:30

Deut 32:35 (123a:1.16): ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως ἀνταποδώσω. (LXX = DeutA)

Rom 12:19 (f.90v:1.14–15): ἔμοι ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω λέγει κύριος. (NA<sup>28</sup> = RomA)

Heb 10:30 (f.117r:1.26–27): ἔμοι ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω. (NA<sup>28</sup> ≠ HebA)<sup>206</sup>

Heb 10:30 of A(02): ... ἀνταποδώσω λέγει κύριος.

No LXX manuscripts attest the New Testament form of this text.<sup>207</sup> Similarly, in Rom 12:19, the quoted text of Deut 32:35 is stable and A(02) duly follows it.<sup>208</sup> As to Heb 10:30, there is a variant in the New Testament manuscripts: HebA(02) and some other witnesses add λέγει κύριος after ἀνταποδώσω.<sup>209</sup> Since the LXX manuscripts do not have this phrase, and since it appears uniformly in the solid textual tradition of Rom 12:19, A(02) and the others have obviously harmonized Heb 10:30 to Rom 12:19.<sup>210</sup>

In sum, harmonization has occurred within parallel New Testament passages. A(02) and others have adapted their Hebrews quotation to a parallel quotation in Romans. This harmonization, however, predates A(02)'s scribes, since such a reading also occurs in many other New Testament witnesses.

### 2.5.20. Deuteronomy 32:36 in Heb 10:30

Deut 32:36 (123a:1.20): ὅτι κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. (LXX = DeutA)<sup>211</sup>

Heb 10:30 (f.117r:1.28): κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

There are no notable variants in LXX.<sup>212</sup> The New Testament text, too, is generally stable. There is, however, a small but revealing variant. Some manuscripts—06 and minuscules 81, 104, 629,

<sup>206</sup> In the New Testament, Heb 10:30 and Rom 12:19 display exactly the same Greek form of Deut 32:35, even though it differs from the text of all extant LXX witnesses (see Steyn, *Quest*, 302–8). In the absence of an underlying common LXX *Vorlage* which is not extant, it is an enigma that the writer of Hebrews quotes Deut 32:35 exactly as Paul did in Romans. Could it be that Hebrews, possibly composed in Italy, used Romans for this quotation? And might this piece of evidence perhaps be taken into account in the debate about the authorship of Hebrews if the same writer were responsible for both quotations?

<sup>207</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 356. Possibly, Paul and the Hebrews author may have cited a variant *Vorlage*, no longer extant (see Peter Katz, “The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews,” *ZNW* 49 [1958], 219–20). So also F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 264; Jewett and Kotansky, *Romans*, 776.

<sup>208</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> (507) reports no variants. Tischendorf (433) notes certain orthographic differences in witnesses. So also Swanson, *Romans*, 198–9.

<sup>209</sup> 012, 062, 017, 019, some minuscules, and the Majority Text. See NA<sup>28</sup> 675; Tischendorf 818.

<sup>210</sup> Paul seems to have been its originator: see Lincicum, *Paul*, 136; Stanley, *Paul*, 174. See also Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 266.

<sup>211</sup> As Ellingworth (*Hebrews*, 542–53) observes, even though Ps 135:14 has the same text, “since Dt. 32:35 has just been quoted, it is overwhelmingly probable that this quotation is from the following verse.”

<sup>212</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 356.

1505, 1739, 1881, 2495—add ὅτι before κρινεῖ κύριος, just like the LXX/DeutA text.<sup>213</sup> Since its addition makes for an awkward beginning of the quotation after καὶ πάλιν, it seems to have been done simply to conform it as closely as possible to LXX.

In sum, there are no signs of harmonization in A(o2). On the other hand, o6 and some minuscules may betray a tendency toward harmonization to LXX.

### 2.5.21. Deuteronomy 32:43a in Rom 15:10

Deut 32:43a (123a:2.1): εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Rom 15:10 (f.91r:2.48–49): εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. (LXX/DeutA= NA<sup>28</sup>/RomA)

The LXX text is very secure.<sup>214</sup> The New Testament text, too, is very stable.<sup>215</sup>

### 2.5.22. Deuteronomy 32:43b in Heb 1:6

Deut 32:43b (123a:1.50–51 and 2.2–3): καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ (LXX = DeutA)<sup>216</sup>

Heb 1:6 (f.113r:2.26–27): καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (NA<sup>28</sup> = HebA)

There are no LXX variants in Deut 32:43b related to possible harmonization to the New Testament.<sup>217</sup> DeutA has the same text as LXX in this portion. Similarly, its quoted text in Heb 1:6 is secure across the entire New Testament textual tradition.<sup>218</sup>

## 3. Assessment of Harmonization in A(o2) and in the Wider Textual Tradition

The Alands have remarked that “in the Pauline letters ... the authority of codex Alexandrinus (A) becomes enhanced.”<sup>219</sup> On the basis of the examination of all the Pentateuchal quotations in the Pauline Corpus of this codex, we may now assess the Alands’ claim by means of two steps. Firstly, the harmonization evidenced in A(o2) will be assessed to form a clearer idea about its tendency to harmonize. Additionally, harmonization in other textual witnesses will be briefly evaluated to form a fuller picture of the harmonization tendency in the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum.

Before doing so, however, two clarifications regarding harmonization in the Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum are in order. Firstly, when harmonization occurs, it may do

<sup>213</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 675; CNTTS Heb 10:30; Tischendorf 818: “item LXX.” Minuscules 2495 and 1505 are part of Family 2138, mainly Byzantine, but often independent in its readings. For further information, on this Family, see Christian-Bernard Amphoux, “La parenté textuelle de Syh et du Gr. 2138 dans l’épître de Jacques,” *Bib* 62.2 (1981): 259–71; Amphoux, “Quelques témoins grecs des formes textuelles les plus anciennes de l’épître de Jacques: le groupe 2138 (OU 614),” *NTS* 28 (1982): 91–115.

<sup>214</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 359.

<sup>215</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> 512; Tischendorf 443.

<sup>216</sup> Because of textual similarities, von Soden (8o2) links Ps 96:7 to Heb 1:6. Ellingworth, however, makes a detailed case that this could not have been the Hebrews writer’s source (*Hebrews*, 118–19). Cockerill (*Hebrews*, 108) agrees. So does Radu Gheorghita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3–4 in Heb 10:37–38* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 40–43. For this reason Ps 96:7 will not be scrutinized as a possible source of harmonization of New Testament manuscripts to LXX.

<sup>217</sup> Wevers, *Deuteronomium*, 359.

<sup>218</sup> See NA<sup>28</sup> 657; Tischendorf 782; Wachtel and Witte, *Neue Testament*, 245.

<sup>219</sup> Aland and Aland, *Text*, 246.

so in more than one word within the same quotation. In other words, the same LXX or New Testament passage may contain one or more words that have been harmonized to an LXX or New Testament form of text. Yet, since it is impossible to decide whether such instances of harmonization have occurred simultaneously or at different periods in a witness' history of transmission, it is more convenient to count A(02)'s harmonizations within the same verse as a single case of harmonization.

Furthermore, there are different levels of certainty regarding harmonization occurrences, ranging from "highly probable" to "probable" to "possible" or "not likely." Such evaluations are often subjective but not necessarily without substance. In the following assessment, only those cases of harmonization that have been deemed more probable are taken into consideration.

### 3.1. Harmonization Extent in A(02)

In its first stage, this study examined all the pertinent Pentateuchal passages (forty-one Pentateuch quotations in forty-nine Corpus Paulinum passages)<sup>220</sup> to identify possible cases of harmonization. To evaluate the significance of harmonization in A(02), both its presence and absence are observed below.

Of all Corpus Paulinum quotations of the Pentateuch, A(02) shows no signs of harmonization in forty of them. In other words, in 82 percent of the Pentateuchal quotations in Paul, A(02) has not harmonized its New Testament text to adapt it to its Old Testament source, or vice-versa. Nor has the codex harmonized its New Testament quotations to other parallel New Testament passages.

On the other hand, A(02) is not completely devoid of harmonization. It does so at two levels and in three directions. Harmonization has occurred at the scribal and at the ancestral level. Put differently, in some cases, the scribes who created this codex may have been responsible for harmonizing the text they were copying to LXX or to parallel New Testament passages with which they were already familiar. However, harmonization has also occurred at an earlier level, that is, during the transmission history of A(02)'s textual ancestors. These harmonized readings later found their way into the Old Testament and New Testament exemplars of the scriptorium that produced codex Alexandrinus.<sup>221</sup> In such cases, A(02)'s scribes were not responsible for such harmonization because they simply (and faithfully) copied their exemplars.

The three directions of harmonization delineated here are (1) LXX harmonized to New Testament; (2) New Testament harmonized to LXX; and (3) New Testament harmonized to a parallel New Testament passage.<sup>222</sup> In the following table, harmonization in A(02) is described in three ways: (1) passages where it is present; (2) level of harmonization (scribal or ancestral); and (3) direction of harmonization.

Table 1: Harmonization Presence in A(02)

<sup>220</sup> Except those cases where a lacuna in A(02) prevents deliberation regarding harmonization. Sometimes the same New Testament passage is counted twice, because it may contain more than one Pentateuchal quotation (e.g., Rom 10:6 quotes a part of Deut 30:12 and Deut 9:4).

<sup>221</sup> It is, often, difficult to decide with certainty whether harmonization has occurred at the hands of A(02)'s scribes or whether it was already present in the exemplar(s) they copied. Thus, as already mentioned in the introduction, only those harmonizations will be considered scribal here which constitute singular or subsingular readings.

<sup>222</sup> There is also another possibility: LXX passages harmonized to other LXX passages. This has not been treated here since this study's focus is on Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum and on harmonizations that arise due to their interaction.



Passage Quoted	Harmonization Level	Direction of Harmonization
Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31	Ancestral	all three directions are possible
Gen 21:10 in Gal 4:30	Scribal (Scribe 1)	NT adapted to LXX
Gen 22:17 in Heb 6:14	Ancestral	LXX adapted to NT
Lev 18:5 in Rom 10:5	Ancestral	NT adapted to LXX
Deut 19:15 in 2 Cor 13:1	Scribal (Scribe 1)	NT adapted to NT
Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18	Ancestral	NT adapted to LXX; and NT adapted to NT
Deut 29:17 in Heb 12:15	Ancestral	LXX adapted to NT
Deut 32:35 in Heb 10:30	Ancestral	NT adapted to NT

To summarize these findings, A(o2) harmonizes its text in nine of forty-nine New Testament passages in Paul (18 percent of the cases). This occurs in three directions, with the LXX-to-New Testament tendency being slightly less frequent.<sup>223</sup> This means that the New Testament text has been influenced by the authoritative Greek Old Testament Scripture much less than might have been expected. As seen in the table above, seven cases of harmonization were already present in A(o2)'s exemplar(s).

On the other hand, in two cases harmonization has occurred at the scribal level (i.e., in about 20 percent of all harmonization occurrences in A[o2] or in 4 percent of all Pentateuchal quotations in its Corpus Paulinum). Interestingly, if Smith's scribal division of the production of A(o2) is correct, only one of the two scribes (i.e., Scribe 1) was responsible for both of these harmonizations. This is evidence that (s)he was slightly less careful compared to Scribe 2 in copying their allotted text. However, in another case—Gen 12:3 in Gal 3:8—this same scribe (Scribe 1) may have corrected their own unconscious harmonization, which probably shows that his/her intent was to faithfully transmit the text of their exemplar, even though (s)he did so less carefully than Scribe 2.

Both of Scribe 1's harmonizations occur in the direction of the LXX. In Gal 4:30, (s)he has brought the New Testament quotation nearer to its LXX source. His/her second case of harmonization (2 Cor 13:1), on the other hand, is not related to the influence of LXX. In this case, Scribe 1 simply replaced Paul's wording (ἔρχομαι) with ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν, most probably under the influence of 2 Cor 12:14, where the same phrase appears. This harmonization takes place outside the Deuteronomy quotation in 2 Cor 13:1.

While two cases are not enough to build a complete profile of this scribe, his/her propensity seems—even if only slightly more than Scribe 1—to be to add (Gal 4:30) and to substitute (2 Cor 13:1), but not to omit. However, in both cases, it appears that these changes were unconscious rather than intentional. In the first case (Gal 4:30) the copyist was unconsciously influenced by a previous knowledge of the LXX, whereas in 2 Cor 13:1 (s)he had a memory slip because of a neighboring New Testament verse. Also, the difference between these two scribes must be tempered by the knowledge that Scribe 1 copied almost 30 percent more Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum than Scribe 2.<sup>224</sup> A higher margin of harmonizations (particularly if inadvertent) on Scribe 1's part is only to be expected.

<sup>223</sup> Since (1) the same Old Testament passage is quoted by more than one New Testament passage; and since (2) a different direction of harmonization may appear within the same quotation, the sum of harmonization is higher than the number of Old Testament passages quoted.

<sup>224</sup> See footnote 7 in the introduction.

### 3.2. Harmonization in Other MSS

All three directions of harmonization are present in the rest of the LXX and New Testament witnesses: LXX to New Testament, New Testament to LXX, New Testament to New Testament. However, in a considerable number of passages no harmonization seems to have occurred. For example, despite the frequent fluidity of LXX or New Testament textual traditions, harmonization seems inexistent in fifteen New Testament passages (out of the forty-nine studied above).<sup>225</sup> This means that, in 31 percent of all Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum, the entire LXX and New Testament tradition refrains from harmonizing its text in any of these three directions (LXX to New Testament, New Testament to LXX, or New Testament to New Testament).<sup>226</sup>

In light of the large number and variety of the LXX and New Testament textual witnesses, such considerable percentage of harmonization absence is impressive. It should serve to temper somewhat the text critics' enthusiasm regarding A(o2)'s trustworthiness as a textual witness solely based on its low percentage of harmonizations. After all, in about one third of the explored passages harmonization is lacking in the entire LXX and New Testament spectrum. Moreover it should be borne in mind that, in thirteen Corpus Paulinum quotations of the Pentateuch, the New Testament text is the same as the LXX.<sup>227</sup> In such cases it is obvious that A(o2) could not have been tempted to harmonize its text, as both its LXX and New Testament exemplars read exactly the same. Since these thirteen quotations constitute about 27 percent of all Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum, A(o2)'s absence of harmonization in such cases is not simply due to its quality as textual witness, but to impossibility of harmonization in such cases.

In addition, this absence of harmonization in 31 percent of the cases of Old Testament quotations in the Corpus Paulinum demonstrates that the influence of LXX on the New Testament text (and vice-versa) is not as pervasive as is often assumed. As Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer aptly put it, "The Septuagint and New Testament scriptures were transmitted independently of each other for a surprisingly long period. Typically, the New Testament quotations did not influence the Septuagint text and vice versa."<sup>228</sup> Even when harmonization is present in the cases covered by this study, it rarely involves more than one or two units of text

<sup>225</sup> These are as follows: Gen 2:7 in 1 Cor 15:45; Gen 17:5 in Rom 4:17; Gen 18:10, 14 in Rom 9:9; Gen 21:12 in Rom 9:7 and Heb 11:18; Gen 25:23 in Rom 9:12; Gen 47:31 in Heb 11:21; Exod 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7; Deut 9:4 in Rom 10:6; Deut 9:19 in Heb 12:21; Deut 27:26 in Gal 3:10; Deut 29:3 in Rom 11:8; Deut 31:6, 8 in Heb 13:5; Deut 32:43 in Rom 15:10 and in Heb 1:6.

<sup>226</sup> In these cases it is difficult to identify harmonization from the extant data in the Göttingen and New Testament critical apparatuses.

<sup>227</sup> Gen 15:6 in Rom 4:3; Gen 17:5 in Rom 4:17; Gen 21:12 in Rom 9:7 and Heb 11:18; Gen 25:23 in Rom 9:12; Exod 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7; Exod 33:19 in Rom 9:15; Lev 19:18 in Rom 13:9 and Gal 5:14; Deut 5:17–21 in Rom 13:9 (A[o2] has a different order in Deuteronomy because of Hebraizing tendencies, but not due to harmonization); Deut 9:4 in Rom 10:6; Deut 32:36 in Heb 10:30; Deut 32:43a in Rom 15:10.

<sup>228</sup> Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer, eds., *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity = Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum*, SCS 60 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 16. This is a collection of essays on research conducted by the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal to understand how the Septuagint and Christian texts interacted in the early centuries of Christianity. Part of this volume focuses on intertextuality issues; in other words, how or whether the Septuagint text has influenced the New Testament text or vice-versa in their transmission history. Their above-mentioned conclusion finds further support in the findings of this article.

in the same Old Testament or New Testament passage. This is evidence that, despite five centuries of transmission history, LXX quotations seem to have influenced the New Testament text much less than might have been expected in this later period of Christianity.

## 4. Conclusion

Much remains to be explored in A(02) as regards harmonization in those New Testament passages that quote the New Testament. This text-critical study sought to address this need. Its findings point to two principal conclusions.

Firstly, it corroborates the Alands' (and most textual critics') description of A(02) as a generally good text in Paul. While it does not tend to harmonize, A(02) shows some presence of harmonization (18 percent of its Pentateuchal quotations in the Corpus Paulinum). Harmonization, however, is almost nonexistent at its scribal level (4 percent). In other words, A(02)'s scribes took great care in copying their exemplar(s). It may be concluded that text critics may trust A(02)'s scribes much more than A(02)'s textual pedigree. In addition, when compared to the rest of the LXX and New Testament textual tradition, A(02) often seems to resist harmonization when many other textual witnesses do not. It is often stubborn in its resistance to such a phenomenon. Where others harmonize, A(02) often resists the temptation. Nonetheless, the complex character of even a good textual witness like A(02) points to the need to treat textual variants case by case.

Secondly, and finally, the entire LXX and New Testament textual landscape also seems devoid of harmonization in approximately 31 percent of these same quotations. In addition, statistics that point to the presence of harmonization must be treated *cum grano salis*. As seen, harmonization often occurs in only a word or two in a given quotation. It is, thus, appropriate to conclude with Karrer and Ulrich Schmid that "early Christian transmission faithfully preserves the forms of the quoted texts (LXX) as well as the quotations (NT). A detailed examination reveals less interdependence of LXX and NT transmission than has often been assumed."<sup>229</sup> In the case of A(02), even up to the fifth century LXX quotations in the New Testament suffer much less from harmonization than probably expected. For this reason, harmonization influence from the LXX or the New Testament should not be assumed *a priori*. It must be weighed in the balance for each case, to see whether such an assumption is found wanting or warranted.<sup>230</sup>

---

<sup>229</sup> Martin Karrer and Ulrich Schmid, "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible—The Wuppertal Research Project," in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, ANTF 43, ed. Martin Karrer, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 185.

<sup>230</sup> Karrer and Schmid point out two contradictory, *a priori* assumptions often held by text-critics (Karrer and Schmid, "Old Testament Quotations," 164). Those whose work has focused more on the text of the Septuagint (e.g., Rahlfs) tend to suspect influence of the New Testament on LXX's text. On the opposite end, New Testament text-critics (e.g., Kurt and Barbara Aland) have often assumed the influence of LXX on the New Testament text (particularly where Old Testament quotations are concerned). Karrer and Schmid do not deny the presence of harmonization as a result of the LXX on the New Testament and vice-versa. Their contention, however, is that such influence must be proven case by case, rather than simply taken for granted or as a rule of thumb.