A COMPUTER-ASSISTED STUDY OF A TEXTUAL FAMILY IN THE BOOK OF RUTH

John R. Abercrombie

This presentation reflects two closely related concerns, one focusing on the results of text critical investigation, the other on the means of obtaining and evaluating such results. With regards to the latter, this paper demonstrates how a new generation of manuscript studies can be conducted with the assistance of the computer. Such research is essential for working effectively with the Greek and Hebrew material currently becoming available in computer form through the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies Project (CATSS).\(^1\) The Book of Ruth was chosen because the data including Greek variants from the critical apparatus in Brooke-McLean already existed in electronic form.\(^2\)

This study focuses on the MSS designated by Brooke-McLean \(\text{gnlptvwwe}_2\), or the so-called Lucianic group in Ruth.\(^3\) In his detailed 1922 examination, A. Rahlfs grouped the MSS into the following families: \(\text{gnloww}_2\) = "L(ucianic)", \(\text{MNhlrmuy}_2\) = "R(ecension of Unknown Origin)", \(\text{dej}\) = "C(atena)", and \(\text{abcx}\) = "O(igenic)".\(^4\) MSS \(ptv\) (designated \(1\)) were classified as a mixed type with material from groups \(R\) and \(L\). MSS \(\text{gnlwe}_2\), however, were considered to

---


\(^2\)B. Wright and R. Kraft prepared the data files containing the critical apparatus to Ruth during a pilot project (1981) supported by the Research Tools Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Subsequently the author wrote a computer program for merging this text with the Hebrew MT into line of formal equivalency, see "Aligning the Greek and Hebrew Texts," *Textus* 12 (1984) 125-139. That corrected file is the basis for this research.

\(^3\)Alfred Rahlfs, *Studie über den Text des Buches Ruth*, NGW Gött (1922) 74-78.

be the representives of the Lucianic tradition in Ruth, and I was taken as a later
derivative.\textsuperscript{5} Rahlfs further divided the L group into subgroups gn, o\oe_2, bw, and
1.\textsuperscript{6} He also presented considerable evidence on other matters including the
underlying text of the L group and uncial B, the curious and perplexing relation of
Theodoret to MSS ptv, and the close connection between L and the Old Latin (OL)
and Peshitta.\textsuperscript{7}

My own research was done independent of Rahlfs so as not to prejudice the
results. I used various of my own computer programs to create lists of the material
from each of the MSS gInotvwe_2 according to the type of variants, pluses,
minuses, substitutions, and differences in word order. Each list was sorted into
alphabetic order, and studies of frequent patterns were then conducted both on the
IBYCUS system (with the LEX program) and on an IBM AT (with various of my
own searching programs, e. g. PROBE).\textsuperscript{8} In addition, I created a running text of
various MS families collated against each other and compared with MT. The
results were later compared to Rahlfs' conclusions. Except for a few instances
mostly regarding the mixed classified MSS, my observations agreed with his.
Indeed, I had largely duplicated his organization of manuscripts labelled L and 1
into groups as well as even subgroups. Nevertheless, there were a few differences
in conclusions as well as some new observations. What follows thus does not
reproduce Rahlfs' points, but merely adds additional observations on material
either missed by Rahlfs or wrongly interpreted.

1. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ptv

Rahlfs presented many of the now well-known characteristics of ptv and for that
matter of the L group as a whole: Attic constructions, use of particles,
characteristic renderings of proper nouns, used of καί and τάο, verbal forms, etc.\textsuperscript{9}
Though he correctly identified individual types of variants, his list aids solely
in classification of known and probably newly discovered MSS within his two
major groupings, 1 and L. Rahlfs rarely deduces from the variants themselves

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., 78.
\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., 91-96.
\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., 90-91, 100-103.
\textsuperscript{8}John R. Abercrombie, Computer Programs for Literary Analysis (Philadelphia 1984).
\textsuperscript{9}Rahlfs (above, n. 2) 79-90.
readactors' motives in the way they preserved the text. An observation, however, can be made in this regard based upon the evidence, and could help in the long term explaining how and why new traditions and text types arose.

A longer text: the text of ptv is significantly longer than that of any other MS, and seldom contains the shorter text of a given passage. Almost all of these "pluses" in ptv are also found in L with most deriving from L and to a lesser extent in R.

Many plus readings in ptv are single words. For example, ptv lack καί twice in the text against most MSS (2:2,2:20). (Note that καί is lacking in MSS Akptv in Ruth 1.05). A further identifiable trait of ptv is the inclusion of καί where it is lacking either in MT or Greek witnesses especially in Ruth 3 and 4: 1:08(gnptvw22), 1:12(dgjnoptvw22), 2:9(MNabdefiqkmprstuvb2), 3:3 (MNfhiimnqrtvb2), 3:3 (ptv OA OE OL), 4:12 (bglnoptve2 Thdt), 4:19 (MNabdefiqklmnpqrstuvwxyb2). Note that the insertion of καί is more common in ptv than in the other members of L. καί also is preferred to δέ by ptv, and even more so by other members of L.

Another example of the addition of a single Greek word in accordance with MT is τοῦ. Although most Greek MSS represent ἔ + infinitive as τοῦ + infinitive, there are occasions when they do not. MSS ptv, however, consistently uses τοῦ before an infinitive, as well as before nominal elements. 10

The inclusion in ptv of additional words often appears to be a deliberate attempt to clarify the text. For example, the scribes focused on simple constructions such as "he said to him" or "she said to her" to which proper names and accompanying articles were added. The context of Ruth 3:15 is a good example why such clarification was necessary.

1:7 ἐξ ἡλθεν + ἡ gnowe2 + νοεμέλεν goptvw2 
  : νοεμμὴν ἡ : νοεμλ 125
1:18 αύτῇ ἢ fgnw : ἡ loptve2 
  Pouθ glnoptvw2
2:2 αύτῇ ἢ: αύτὴν ὁ
  + νοεμέλεν goptvw2 : νοεμμὴν ἡ
2:3 ἐπορεύθην + Pouθ glnoptvw2
2:3 μερίδι + Bou8 glnos(w)we2
2:10 ἐπιμεν] + Pouθ glnoptvw2 OL
2:17 συνέλεξεν] + Pouθ glnoptvw2

10 Ibid., 83-84.
As Rahlfs noted, this desire for clarification in the text can also be seen, from the insertion of pronouns: 2:9 (ḡlnptvwx₂), 2:10 (ḡhlnptvw), 2:12 (ḡlnptvwx₂ OA OC OE OS Thdt), 2:14 (ḡlnopqtwvx₂), 3:10 (hptv).¹¹

One last point on the fuller text of ptv is the general lack of shorter readings in almost every passage. Only in a few cases does ptv omit material from a passage. When one of the traditions to which it is related (that is, R or L) favor a shorter reading, ptv includes the longer one from the other tradition.

2. INTERNAL RELATIONS BETWEEN MSS ptv

MSS ptv form a tight group, relating with consistent patterns to both L and R.¹² Although ptv agree relatively more with L, its text also tends to agree with the word order in R and indirectly with MT and contains mostly plus readings found in R but not in L. MSS tv are practically identical with less than a dozen internal differences in Ruth. MS p, on the other hand, varies more frequently from t and v with numerous unique readings and a few readings with scattered supporting attestations (notably MS k). Nevertheless, ptv remain the most cohesive group in the entire corpus with only 41 internal different readings in 2400 words. The following data reports merely the differences amongst members of this group:

UNIQUE READINGS IN p

1:3 : Νοεμνν p Thdt
1:4 : Αρφα
1:9 + άμια (')p-OA(')
1:16 : ζν
1:16 : με
2:2 : δε
2:11 : ειδες
2:14 : ξωμον

¹¹Ibid., 88.
¹²Ibid., 96-98, 114.
3:1 ἔρχεσθαι (R) > ἐς
3:1 + < εἰς
4:5 τῆς > ἐς
4:12 : δῶσοι

READINGS IN MS p NOT SUPPORTED BY tv

0:0 : + βεβαιοῦν b'dgkp
0:0 : + ὅ γένοντο dp
1:10 : ἐπιστρέψομεν AMilkmpr(α)suy OA OC OL
2:9 : διωνήσῃς ekpr
2:9 καὶ ἀκρόπ OA OC OE OL
2:11 : εἰς dop OA
2:12 +< ὁ ὀρωμεν
2:16 : συλλέγειν απ
3:1 ἤ > ἀκρ-ΟΕ(c)(>3)
3:1 πενθερᾶς ἀκρ-ΟΕ(c)(>3)
3:1 αὐτὴς > ἀκρ-ΟΕ(c)(>3)
3:11 : εἴδεν b'op
3:18 : ἔστιν Ip
4:3 + αὐτῆς απ
4:8 : ἀπελύσατο fp
4:11 : πόλει gnpα

UNIQUE READINGS IN t

1.19 : ἡξίου t*
2.17 : σύνεις t*
4.4 : τούς t*

UNIQUE READINGS IN v

1:5 : Μασσαλλων
2:15 : μεσᾶν
3:13 : σοι

COMMON READINGS IN pt NOT SUPPORTED BY v

2:15 : παρά tv
2:16 : βαστάζετε tv

COMMON READINGS IN pt NOT SUPPORTED BY v

1:5 : Μασσαλλων MNefgjklmptwyb2e2 OL
1:16 +< ἄπο MNdefhikmpstuyb2 OA OE OS
3:11 : μέν Nbdegjlmnopsuwe2 Thdt
4:19: Αραμ MNabcdefgijklmn(e)opqrstuvwxyz2 0A 0C 0E Anon

COMMON READINGS IN ptv

2:9: ση cpv

Rahlfs' classification of MSS 74, 76 and 125 with ptv as part of group l is questionable.13 These three MSS cannot be included with ptv unless this grouping simply meant to Rahlfs that these MSS do not belong to L. There are just too few readings of 74 and 76 to classify them with any group though in one or two instances they do read with ptv as well as others included in R. MSS 125 clearly does not belong to this group at all. Most of the 20 unique readings of 125 are minuses, and such omission of material is inconsistent with a noted trait of ptv. Only one reading in Ruth 1:7 can be used for linking 125 with L. Agreements of MS 125 in Ruth 1:8 with ptv occur also in other MSS classified as R. In fact, 125 reads more with h including a long omission reading than any other MS including ptv.

3. RELATIONSHIP OF ptv TO L

Most of the traits listed by Rahlfs apply equally to ptv and glnowe2. If one looks where all extant L representatives differ from ptv, there is little significant variation between L and ptv except that ptv include plus readings from R.

For example, L lacks seven more words in its text than ptv: 1:1 (glnowe2 125 0A 0E 0L), 2:21 (glnowe2 Thtdt), 3:9 (B*cglnoswe2), 3:10 (Aabcglmnoswe2 0C 0E 0S), 4:10 (MNghjklmnopee2 0A 0L Thdtl), 4:13 (bglnowe2), and 4:14 (Nbgkl mnowe2 0A 0C Thdtl). No pattern is apparent in these minuses.

Although Rahlfs attempted to stress the differences between ptv and L (he counted 24 instances14), numerous phrases are common to ptv and L. Members of L have six additional plus readings not attested in ptv, while ptv have numerous pluses most of which are attested in R.

PLUS READINGS IN L NOT ATTESTED IN ptv

1:5 γνυν ἡ + μόνῃ glnowe2 0A
1:7 ἐξ [ἰλαθε]ν + ἂ (gnowe2) Nοεμμεν (goptmwe2): Νοεμμήν (η) Nοεμμ
125
2:3 μεριέδι + Boo[έν glnor(n)we2

13Ibid., 78.
14Ibid., 96.
Both groups also share the same substitution readings. There are but twelve substitution readings in L not found in ptv. Many of these readings, however, appear to be insignificant differences; thus, there is little if any difference between these two groups in this type of variant.

SUBSTITUTION READINGS IN L NOT ATTESTED IN ptv

1.6 ἔπεσκεπτα|: ἔπεσκεψατο gnowe2
1.21 ἔπεστρεψεν |: ἔπεστρεψεν gn : ἔπεστρεψε lowe2
2.3 τοῦ ἄγροῦ |: τό ἄγρον glno(Θ)we2
2.9 τὰ παιδάρια |: οἱ παιδίς gnowe2
2.14 φαγεσα|: φαγή gnowe2
2.16 καὶ γε παραβάλοντες παραβαλείτε |: καὶ σωρεύσατε gnowe2
2.22 οὐκ ἀναπνεύσατα |: οὐ συναντήσασαν gnowe2
3.1 εἰ ἐπελέξε |: καὶ εἰσεβέν gnowe2
3.9 ἀχίλλευς |: ἀχίλλευς gnowe2
3.14 τὸν |: τὴν Bglnoe2
4.13 αὐτῷ |: εἱπτί gnowe2
4.17 αὐτοῦ |: αὐτῷ B*owe2

The only obvious and somewhat perplexing difference between ptv and all members of L besides inclusion of material from R is the word order. MSS ptv generally follow the word order of the MT while L does not: 1:9, 1:16, 1:21, 2:7, 2:8, 3:1, 3:9, 3:18, 4:3, 4:9, 4:12. No explanation can be given as yet to account for the unique word order in L.

4. POSSIBLE CONNECTION BETWEEN ptv AND gn

Of the various subgroups defined by Rahlfs and confirmed in my own research, ptv shows a similarity to the subgroup gn. There are only a few instances in which ptv read with b or w against other members of L: 2:3, 2:16, 2:20, 4:16, subscription. MSS oe2 also contain two instances (Ruth 1:18, 3:7) in which they read with ptv as opposed to other members of L. On the other hand, gn read nine times with ptv when members of L diverge in their attestations:

1:9 εὔροτε | εὔρητε bgglmpaswy2
2:16 αὐτῇ (Beptu OC(vid) OL) om. repl
2:16 συλλέξει (repl) : συλλέξῃ η np
2:18 αὐτῆ | τῇ πενθερᾶ | glnptvw
3:3 πειν καὶ φαγεῖν Blwe2 | ~ Abcgntnxe2
3:4 ἀποκαλύψεις | ἀποκαλύψης cgv
4:1 κύρει | ὁ δὲ εἰπεῖν (ptvn2) τίς εἴ συ κρύφει gptve2
4:3 Μωαβ | αὐτῆ πρ φρ
4:11 πολὴ | πολει | gnpb2

5. SPECIAL RELATION OF ptv TO THEODORET

Rahlfs concluded that Theodoret is more closely related to glnowe2 (L) than ptv (I).\(^{15}\) Though this conclusion is correct in general lines since ptv differ from Theodoret especially in word order and certain readings, it can also be misleading if one concludes that ptv are to be dismissed as a late and unreliable witness to the so-called Lucanian tradition.\(^{16}\)

a. TRANSPOSITIONS

Readings in 1L and Thdt

1:16 σὺ post πορευθῆς | glnoptvw OE Thdt

Readings of Thdt in 1 but not in L

[none]

Readings in Thdt in 1 but not in 1

1:16 ἀπαντήσαι | μοι rell: | μερ ἐμοι BLsq | :
  μοι γένοστο | glnowe2 Thdt: γένοστο μοι k(mg)
  : μοι κληρος de: | μοι κληρος 1r
2:8 ἐν ἄχρο συλλέξαι ἐτέρῳ rell | ἐτέρῳ συλλέξαι ἐν ἄχρο Bdefgjklnoswe2
  OC OE Thdt
  : ἐτέρῳ συλλέξουν ἐν ἄχρο 1
4:9 Χελλεων cratyn | Μασαλων eh | ΙσThdt: Μασαλων digne2
  Μασαλων Nptnbg2 | Χελλεων f Thdt: Χελλαλων deh | ΙσThdt
  : Χελλεων gnoeb2: | Χελλεων 1
4:12 κύριος σοι rell | σοι κύριος bglnos2 OL Thdt

One notes that Theodoret's word order is identical with that of glnowe2 (L). This suggests that the base text for Theodoret was the same as that of L. The

\(^{15}\)ibid., 99.

\(^{16}\)ibid.
basic word order of MSS ptv, however, agrees with R to which the material from a precursor of the later L was added.

b. SUBSTITUTIONS

Reading in L1 and Thdt

1:16 ὤνοι] ὡ ῥ MNθghikIMnopqrtywzyaz2b2θ2 Thdt
1:17 καὶ Βαθρχικ 1 καί θέκε MN reel Thdt
2:21 ὧν ὑπάρχει reel ὧν ὑπάρχειa glnopotwe2 Thdt

Readings of Thdt in L but not L

2:8 οὐκάτερ AMN reel Thdt] οὐκάτηρ Bdklowe2 *
2:20 ἡμῖν MN* D 10bedfjhkmqrstuvwzyaz2b2 Thdt] ἡμῖν reel ἡμῖν 1
2:21 παράκατων reel] κοράκατων MN D 10(uld)abehjkimpartuwvxb2 OA OE
3:4 ἀπαγγελεὶ reel Thdt] ἀπαγγέλη bgh: ἀπαγγελῇ w
: ἀναγγέλει me2 : ἀναγγέλη o *

Idem, limited evidence :

1:3 Νοεμν p Thdt
1:12 διότι ὡ τι ν Thdt
1:17 ἐὰν reel ἐὰν MNpurh2 Thdt-ed
1:17 ταφήσωμαι reel Thdt ] > 1 : ταφήσωμαι n *
1:17 ποιήσαι reel Thdt] ἑποιήσε n : προσθεῖνα2 *
3:4 ἀποκαλύψεις reel Thdt] ἀποκαλύψῃς cgv : ἀποκαλύψῃ 1 *

Readings of Thdt in L but not L

1:16 ἀπαντήσαι μοι reel : με p e motion BAmu ] : μοι χένοιται glnowe2 Thdt
: χένοιται μοι k(mg) : μοι σκληρὸς δει : μοι σκληρὸς 1r
1:17 κύριος reel ] ὁ Θεός hptve2 OL
1:17 διαστέλει reel ] διαστέλλει chve2 *
3:4 ἀποκαλύψεις reel Thdt] ἀποκαλύψῃς cgv : ἀποκαλύψῃ 1 *
4:12 δῶσοι p δῶσει h δῶσεi reel i δωσ bglobe2 Thdt : δωσι n
4:14 σου δεξπτουν ] σοι reel Thdt


Substitution variants occur at the same relative frequency between Theodoret and ptv and glnowe2. MSS ptv, however, agree slightly more with Theodoret especially when the majority of MSS including those in R read with ptv. No examples of exclusive agreement between Theodoret and ptv occur in this variant type.
c. PLUSES:

Readings in groups L1 and Thdt

1:16 ιτος MNghilmnoprtuvwbyb₂ Thdt
1:16 έκει glnoptwve₂ OS (sub *) Thdt
1:16 οξ Thdt
glnoptwve₂ Thdt
2:11 τῆς MNdvhjkmprstuvwb₂ Thdt
2:12 σο δ glnoptwve₂ OA OE OL Thdt-ed

Readings of Thdt in L but not in L

[none]

Readings of Thdt in L but not in 1

[none]

Almost all the plus readings of Theodoret lacking in R are supported by both pTv and glnowe₂. This underscores the tendency of pTv noted elsewhere towards a fuller type of text.

d. MINUSES:

Readings of Thdt in L but not in L

1:11 δῆ ᾿η ᾿π ᾿τ ᾿π OA OC OE OL Thdt
1:16 ου lowe₂ Thdt
4:12 δ ᾿ρ ᾿ε ᾿λ ᾿η ᾿π OA OC OE OL Thdt
4:14 δ θες gnowe₂ SOU OE OL Thdt

Readings of Thdt in L but not in 1

2:11 οπ MNedef(uid)hjkmprstuvwb₂ OS > Bbcglnowoqie₂ Thdt
2:21 πρές με rell > glnowe₂ Thdt
4:10 λαο MNghjklnob₂ OA OE Thdt α’ α’
4:11 ως rell > bdefjglnowel₂ Thdt
4:14 καὶ rell > Nbgklnouwie₂ OA OC Thdt

Minus readings are evenly supported between the two groups. Theodoret reads with pTv against R and L four times. These readings are unique when one considers that a trait of pTv is to avoid shorter readings and thus to favor a longer text. Ruth 1:11 is probably the most significant reading here for text criticism.

Though only a few verses of the text of Ruth used by Theodoret are known, the evidence indicates that pTv should not be dismissed so readily in any discussion
of the Lucianic tradition. In some ways, they preserve a credible copy of that
tradition if Theodoret is considered a reliable witness to the Lucianic texts.

Rahlfs correctly reported that other MSS follow readings common to L and I.
MSS h k more consistently agree with ptv than with group L.17 These two MSS
tend also to agree with Theodoret. MS k, classified as a mixed type by Rahlfs,18
is a particularly interesting example of a witness preserving readings found in O
and L and also in the Peshitta and Coptic texts.

6. RELATION OF ptv TO MT AND R

MSS ptv should be classified separately from glnowe2, because they sometimes
align with R, the "recension of unknown origin," and C(atenia). The R and the C
recensions are characterized by revision towards the MT, inclusion of readings
from the "Three" (particularly Aquila), and characteristic and common
variants.19

Members of R and C are often in agreement with MT. Interestingly, members
of groups R and C agree more often with the MT than any other group including O,
the designated Origenic group. Members of O in Ruth 1-3 often align with the
kinds of readings present in B and glnqwe2. MSS ptv align with the readings in
group R or L when they result in a longer text: 1:1, 1:6, 1:8, 1:16, 1:19, 2:23, 3:3, 3:4,
3:9, 4:6. The inclusion of material in the text certainly reflects a noted trait of ptv
to include plus readings from the traditions reflected in the later MSS classified
as members of L or R.

AGREEMENTS WITH THE MT ACCORDING TO VARIANT TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Ibid., 90-91, 107.
18 Ibid., 90-92, 107.
19P. Katz, Philo's Bible (Cambridge 1950) 99-101. See also R. Thornhill, "The Greek Text of
the Book of Ruth: a Grouping of Manuscripts according to Origen's Hexapla", VT 3 (1953)
247.
In Ruth 1:1-3:7 L rarely reads with MT against other Greek witnesses. From Ruth 3:7 on, L includes ρήσις and τῆς δὲ in the text at a number of places, which more closely approximates the Hebrew MT. These pluses are somewhat mechanical in nature, and curiously common also among members of R throughout the book. The marginal citations of the "Three" more often appear in members of R than of other groups. As expected given the relation of this group to R, πτυς show a slightly higher agreement with readings of the "Three" than L. Group L reads only once with Symmachus and Aquila in Ruth 4:10. Thus it appears that the tradition reflected by both L and I may have less reliance on the "Three" than other text types such as R and C.

AQUILA CITATIONS

M 6/11* R group
ku 4/11 R group
A Computer-Assisted Study in Ruth

\[ \begin{align*}
    N & \, hmx_b & 3/11 & \text{R group} \\
    A & abcdefiprstuv_v & 2/11 & \text{ROC1 groups} \\
    glnowe & 1/11 & \text{L group} \\
\end{align*} \]

*3/6 citations are located in the margin

**SYMMACHUS CITATIONS**

\[ \begin{align*}
    M & iq & 4/14 & \text{R group} \\
    N & b & 3/14 & \text{R group} \\
    A & abcdefhikprstuvx & 2/14 & \text{ROC1 groups} \\
    glnowe & 1/14 & \text{L group} \\
\end{align*} \]

Barthélemy, Katz and others have listed additional characteristics of R some of which are presented below to help identify it more precisely as an example of the \( \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \varepsilon \) recension. MSS ptv tend to reflect these traits more so than most MSS classified by Rahlfss as L because most of the additions of one or two words in Greek result in a longer text. Thus it sometimes seems that ptv include material in the Greek with little apparent direct attempt to reflect the underlying Hebrew tradition but rather to be true to the two other Greek traditions designated R and L.

\( \delta \epsilon \) INSTEAD OF \( \kappa \alpha \iota \) IN CONSTRUCTIONS SUCH AS \( \epsilon \tau \pi \varepsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \)

\[ \begin{align*}
    1:19 & \text{AMNabcdefhijklmnopqrstuvwxyz} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L & 0S \\
    2:2 & \text{MNdefhijklmnopqrstuvwxyz} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    2:20 & \text{MN(D)uidedefhijklmnopqrstuvwxyz} & 0A & 0E & 0L \\
    3:1 & \text{rell exc. glnowe} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:7 & \text{rell exc. glnowe} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:9 & \text{rell exc. glnowe} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:14 & \text{rell exc. glnowe} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:15 & \text{MNikmqrstuv} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:16 & \text{rell exc. n} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
    3:18 & \text{rell exc. chm} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
\end{align*} \]

**INSERTION OF THE ARTICLE AND CONJUNCTION TO REFLECT THE MT**

\[ \begin{align*}
    1:6 & \text{to \( \delta \epsilon \)} & \text{MNikmqrstuv} & 0A & 0C & 0E & 0L \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ ^{20} \text{Katz, Philo's Bible (above, n. 19). Note that Katz incorrectly states that the use of \( \delta \epsilon \) is not a trait of the R recension.} \]

\[ ^{21} \text{ibid., 101.} \]
1:16 ἀνὴ MNdefhikmpqrstuyb₂
1:17 ἀ MNkmub₂
2:23 τοῦ MN*D(10)defhijkmpqrstuvb₂
3:3 ἀ τοῦ MN*D(10)defhijklmqrsubah₂

ἐγὼ εἰμι = Ἰησοῦς

2:10 rell
2:13 MNחimrub₂
3:9 rell
3:12 rell except bgne₂
4:4 MNcdedefghijklmpqrstuvb₂e₂
4:4 rell except b

καίγε

1:5 ἐ
1:5 rell except Akptv
1:12 e(5)
2:8 MNhkimrub₂
2:15 rell except k OC OE OL
2:16 rell except gkmnw₂e₂ OA OC
3:12 rell except hkmw
4:10 rell except cdkr OE

OTHER ASPECTS OF καίγε

1:20 ἦκανός rell] ἦκασος hptvb₂
1:21 ἦκανός rell] ἦκανός n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 1</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>3/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 2</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 3:1-9</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:9-17</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>4/6 or 3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23Ibid., 34.
24Ibid., 91, 107.
Finally, a note should be made of an as yet unreported shift in the text type of L from Ruth 3:7 on. Other evidence to support this observation of a subtle change in text-type is L's agreement with B until Ruth 3:9. Rahlfss correctly observed that there is a strong underlying relation between B and his L, for which he cited only the evidence of the spelling of άβεγμελεκ. Additional evidence for this link can be seen primarily in Ruth 1 and 2 where both B and MSS glnwwe2 diverge from the MT, RC and sometimes 0. MS q reads consistently with B and L until Ruth 2:1726 where it shifts text type to R as Rahlfss already noted.27 Thus there appears some evidence to suggest a change in the underlying text of L in Ruth 3:9 away from the text of B and more towards the dominant text-type of R. This shift certainly accounts for the higher frequency of agreement between members of both groups from Ruth 3 to the end of the book, and the appearances of mech-anical insertions of καὶ and τοῦ at the end of Ruth.

7. THE DISSIMILARITY OF MSS ptv AND GROUP 0

A third major group of MSS abczα2, or 0 (ligenic material), bears little relation to ptv. There are only two occurrences in which ptv read exclusively with most members of this group, though there are many places in which ptv agree with 0 and other groups, especially R:

2:2 Νεμμελεν αβ'g(h(β?))optvwe2
2:13 κύρε ίμ ιον Αβhptvχ 05

Members of 0 do agree with L and less with ptv when R revises toward the MT: 1:1, 1:6, 1:15, 1:16, 1:17, 1:18, 1:20, 2:7, 2:9, 2:13, 2:23, 3:3, 3:7, 4:3. Most of this agreement occurs in Ruth 1-3:9 when R usually inserts the articles and conjunctions to reflect each element of MT. From Ruth 3 on, L shows more of a tendency to align with MT in a similar manner and thus the agreement with 0 decreases.

MSS b + b' (=b) should be classified with glnptvwe2 from Ruth 4:12. Prior to this point they (especially b') read only sporadically with L.

---

25Rahlfss (above, n. 2) 100.
26This MS is the only example in the data base so far that aligns with uncial B consistently.
27Rahlfss (above, n. 2) 91, 107.
8. A FINAL NOTE ON MSS ptv IN JUDGES

A recently published study of ptv in Judges reached similar conclusions to the analysis of these MSS in Ruth. 28 J. Targarona de Saenz-Badillos characterized (d)ptv as a conflate tradition of groups 3 (= MN(h)yb2) and 4' (= KZgln (o)w). Much of her well-documented evidence confirms the conflate nature of ptv in Judges, the high occurrence of plus readings, the low occurrence of minus readings, and its general lack of agreement with 0.