Restoring the GreekTobit

Stuart Weeks

Department of Theology & Religion, Durham University,

Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham DH1 4DE, UK

s.d.weeks@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

The modern consensus that the "Long" text of Tobit is earlier than the "Short" has brought about a paralysis in attempts to restore the Greek, with the very unsatisfactory text in Sinaiticus coming to serve as our *de facto* best effort. It is important to appreciate that the Long witnesses do not constitute a specific and coherent recension, capable of reconstruction in its own right, but are potentially miscellaneous texts, that happened individually to elude the two major revisions of the tradition. Original readings are preserved in both the revised and unrevised witnesses, and if we are to progress then we need to employ and evaluate all those witnesses. The paper ends with an attempt to reconstruct the original form of 4:7-19, which is lacking in Sinaiticus, as an illustration of the scope for such progress.

Restoring the Greek Tobit

The old rivalry between "Long" and "Short" texts of Tobit has given way to a general acceptance in recent decades that the Long text contains the earlier form of the book. Such consensus has not, however, opened the way for any real attempt to establish the original form of the Greek, and, indeed, seems almost to have had the opposite effect. Since the Long text is earlier, and Codex Sinaiticus is our only full witness to that text, scholarship seems largely to have been content to offer presentations and translations of Sinaiticus alongside or instead of the Short text. Indeed, in an important article published in the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* some years ago, Tobias Nicklas and Christian Wagner suggested that, in effect, we could not go further than this, and that any original text of Tobit was beyond our grasp.[1] Most scholarly reluctance to pursue the original text has been, perhaps, less considered, but the consequence has been that the text of Tobit offered for reading and study is now deeply unsatisfactory: it may be the only Long Greek text for the book as a whole, but Sinaiticus is one witness to a text-type, not the embodiment of that type,[2] and its text of Tobit is riddled with errors and omissions.[3] I want to suggest here that we can, in fact, do much better, and

---

[1] "Thesen zur textlichen Vielfalt im Tobitbuch", *JSS* 34 (2003), 141-59.

[2] The seeds for a common confusion between S itself and the Long or "G^{II}" type were sown in the standard edition, R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Vol. VIII, 5 Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983). Hanhart followed the usual Göttingen practice of presenting an eclectic text for G^{I}, the dominant text-type, and this text occupies the upper half of each page. What he places beneath it is labelled "G^{II}", but the text offered there is not an eclectic edition of the non- G^{I} text, so much as a diplomatic edition of the text in Sinaiticus. This may not be a bad thing in itself – and it is an implication of what I shall argue below that an eclectic edition of the "G^{II} texts" would actually be meaningless – but the presentation and label encourage an identification of the text-type G^{II} with the single manuscript S.

[3] The best known and longest omissions are in 4:7-19 and 13:6-10, but comparison with the other witnesses suggests many shorter losses too: in 13:5, for instance, καὶ συνάξει ὑμᾶς or similar has apparently been lost before ἐκ, creating incoherence, while at the start of the list in 13:12, a copyist has probably skipped from one πάντες οἱ to another, later occurrence: "Cursed are all those who <reject you, and all who blaspheme you; cursed are all who hate you and all

that, even if we can never hope to re-create Tobit *verbatim*, we can at least go a long way toward filling some of the gaps and restoring the original form of the Greek. In order to do so, however, we need to move beyond paradigms derived from earlier debates: if it is used as anything more than a shorthand, the very idea of a "Long text" is, in fact, deeply problematic, while the displacement of the "Short text" has robbed us of a key witness.

There are, in fact, three Greek text-types of Tobit. In the familiar nomenclature of Hanhart's edition, "G^I" (the Short text) is the most common, and is represented by almost all manuscripts. "G^{II}" (the Long) is represented in Codex Sinaiticus and, for verses 3:6-6:16 only, the eleventh-century Βατοπαιδιος 513 from Mount Athos (ms 319 in the standard system). Finally, the third Greek type, "G^{III}", is preserved only for the second part of the book: it is to be found between about 6:8 and 13:2 in several late Greek manuscripts, which are closely related to each other, and also underlies the majority Syriac text after 7:11. In addition, we have an unusually high number of Old Latin witnesses.[4] The Latin tradition is extremely complicated, but insofar as there is a majority text, it is clearly based on a Greek text of the G^{II} type. One Latin text, Codex Reginensis 7 (L^{143}) displays in the first six chapters, however, a text with so many differences from that main OL text-type that it must represent either a profound revision or a fresh translation; there are some reasons to associate

---

who> speak". Not all the errors are of omission, however, and so in 11:4, for example, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς has apparently been replicated from the end of the next verse (and καὶ then added), while in the same verse κύων has famously become the abbreviation κ(υριο)ς: "the Lord" now follows, not "the dog". Such errors (and there are many, many more) are probably not attributable to the copyist of Tobit in Sinaiticus itself, and there are signs that the text has been altered to mitigate the most obvious incoherencies arising from them (although this introduces, of course, further new readings). As well as errors, there are other probable changes in the text, many stylistic, and some quite mysterious – like the introduction of Raphael and Ragouel into Tobit's list of ancestors in 1:1.

[4] Currently, the Latin texts are available most conveniently in S. Weeks, S. Gathercole, L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit. Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions. With Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac*. (Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam Pertinentes 3; Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

it with G^{III}, although there is insufficient overlap between them in chapter 6 to establish that relationship beyond doubt.[5] Another Latin version, found in the Alcalà Bible (L^{109}) may go back to something like the main text-type, but it paraphrases constantly, and seems to have been revised in the light of other texts (probably including Greek texts belonging to G^{I}). It is difficult to assess the extent to which these different OL versions may have exerted any influence on each other in particular places, but they can generally be treated as distinct.

Although older questions about the relative priority of G^{I} and G^{II} have not vanished altogether, the discovery of at least five[6] fragmentary Tobit manuscripts at Qumran has resolved the issue to the satisfaction of most scholars. 4Q196-199 are in Aramaic and 4Q200 in Hebrew, and there are some slight differences between them where they overlap, but all represent what is basically a single version of Tobit, and that version is very similar to the "G^{II}" text of 319, Sinaiticus and the Old Latin. It is possible that other Semitic versions existed, and Jerome claims to have used an Aramaic Tobit for his Vulgate translation of the book, but there is no direct evidence for such versions, and no reason to suppose that, if they did exist, they exerted any influence on the Greek tradition.[7] It is a reasonable and economic supposition, therefore, that the Greek was translated from a text of essentially the same version of Tobit found at Qumran, that the original translation was closest to the G^{II} text-type, and that the distinctive features of the G^{I} and G^{III} types arose as the result of developments

---

[5] See Stuart Weeks, "Some Neglected Texts of Tobit: The Third Greek Version", in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London & New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 12-42, esp. 22-3.

[6] Schøyen Ms. 5234, previously identified as a fragment of 4Q196, actually appears to affirm the existence of an additional Aramaic text; I understand from Eibert Tigchelaar that a further, unpublished fragment exists in another collection.

[7] Jerome's claim is taken seriously by Nicklas and Wagner, "Thesen", 153-4, who adopt the position of Vincent Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses* (SBL Dissertation series 180; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), that Jerome had an Aramaic text very different from those found at Qumran, although in one or two places this led his Vulgate translation to preserve readings also found at Qumran. Those dependencies are questionable, but if Skemp's view is accepted, then the potential relevance of such a text anyway seems correspondingly slight.

within the Greek tradition, uninfluenced by any Semitic prototypes.[8] Hanhart's edition presented G^I and G^{II} in parallel, so as to maintain some neutrality on the question of priority, but if it is indeed true that the original translation was closest to G^{II}, then the two types should not be regarded as parallel recensions, and the very terminology of G^I / G^{II} / G^{III} is potentially misleading. What distinguishes Sinaiticus and 319 is, we might say, their very lack of recension: all three types are witnesses to the original G, but only these manuscripts have escaped the revisions, or processes of revision, that gave rise to the G^I and G^{III} text-types, even if they have incorporated more miscellaneous changes and errors of their own. Along with the lost source-text(s) of the Old Latin, they are the survivors from what may originally have been a very diverse tradition, even before the G^I and G^{III} revisions, and they may have

---

[8] Since the medieval books of Tobit that we possess in Hebrew and Aramaic do not seem to have been derived from the version of the book found at Qumran, and Tobit appears to have had little influence in rabbinic Judaism, it is questionable, indeed, whether Hebrew or Aramaic versions would even have been widely available, *pace* Jerome. There are no places where G^I or G^{III} texts present readings that are clearly based directly on a Semitic text, and from a very careful study of the relationship between the Qumran fragments and the other witnesses, Michaela Hallermayer concludes that "…können die Divergenzen der griechischen Textformen G^I und G^{II} nicht unmittelbar auf unterschiedliche, aber nahe verwandte semitische Texte zurückgeführt werden." See her *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 3; Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 2008), 180. Robert Littman *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008), xx, makes the curious claim that in some places "each consulted a separate translation", and suggests that G^I καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ in 1:5 is a different rendering of "*achim*", where S has πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοί <μ>ου. Of course, any such Hebrew form read by S would presumably have been אחי rather than אהים, which would imply separate *Vorlagen*, not just fresh translations. G^I is clearly re-writing, though, not re-translating, and changes the whole reference from "my brothers" to "the tribes that became apostate together". Littman also refers to J.D. Thomas, "The Greek Text of Tobit", *JBL* 91 (1972), 463-71, for the suggestion that "G^I based its text on G^{II}, and then added and corrected it from a Semitic text" (assuming that his reference to another article, "Thomas [1960]" is an error): this appears to be a misunderstanding of Thomas' position.

belonged to quite different branches of that tradition. It is a mistake, therefore, to conceptualize the situation in terms of three separate but similar entities, when what we have is a series of witnesses to the same tradition, two groups of which happen to have passed through particular revisions. The texts that have not gone through those revisions do not constitute a meaningful group in themselves, and although it may be a useful shorthand to talk of "G[II] readings", it would make no sense, where the texts differ, to pick one of the readings from 319, Sinaiticus or, for that matter, the Old Latin, and call it *the* G[II] reading in the way that we might a reading from G[I] or G[III]. Furthermore, the unrevised witnesses cannot be treated as inherently superior in any given passage, at least unless it can be demonstrated that the revised texts have been revised at that point: although we have to be aware that some of our witnesses have been changed deliberately, nothing precludes the possibility that original readings have survived in those witnesses – and, clearly, they often have – whilst the differences between them show that readings in the unrevised texts must frequently be secondary.

It should be emphasized in all this, though, that there is a significant amount of material common to all three text-types where they are all extant in the second half of the book.[9] Since the G[III] revision was probably created independently of the G[I] revision,[10] such material can at the very least be said to have been derived from an unrevised, ancestor shared by all the texts, and where there is no evidence to the contrary, it is a reasonable presumption that it belonged to the original Greek translation. So, for example, in 9:1 (τότε) ἐκάλεσε Τωβίας τὸν Ῥαφαὴλ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, the only difference between the three Greek text-types is the absence of τότε at the beginning of the verse in G[I]. We might argue about the originality of that word, or of the plus

---

[9] Some interesting statistics are offered in Thomas, "Greek Text", 466-7, for the amount of material shared by G[I] and Sinaiticus.

[10] Weeks, "Neglected Texts", 18-19. See also R. Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen MSU 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1984), 44-5: Hanhart takes G[III] to derive from a G[II] text, probably close to the *Vorlage* of the Old Latin, but to have acquired some readings from G[I] secondarily. Where G[I] and G[III] agree against S, however, it is usually with the support of the Old Latin, and they have probably inherited their readings independently.

in the Old Latin which speaks of "the *angel* Raphael", but it would seem perverse to doubt that we have most of the original Greek intact here.

Whilst such identity is unusual across the span of a whole verse, we can frequently see a common basic framework. Here, for instance, is 8:17 marked to show the material shared by all three (in bold), and that shared but re-ordered (underlined):

G^I **εὐλογητὸς εἶ ὅτι ἠλέησας δύο μονογενεῖς ποίησον αὐτοῖς δέσποτα ἔλεος** συντέλεσον τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν ἐν ὑγείᾳ <u>μετὰ εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἐλέους</u>

S καὶ **εὐλογητὸς εἶ ὅτι ἠλέησας δύο μονογενεῖς ποίησον αὐτοῖς δέσποτα ἔλεος** καὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ **συντέλεσον τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν** <u>μετ᾽ εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἐλέου</u>

G^{III} (ms 106) **εὐλογητὸς εἶ** κύριε **ὅτι ἠλέησας δύο μονογενεῖς** καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῶν **ποίησον αὐτοῖς δέσποτα ἔλεος** καὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ **συντέλεσον τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν** <u>μετὰ ἐλέους καὶ εὐφροσύνης</u>

In this case, we would hardly be sticking our necks out to say, on the basis of no more than the Greek versions, that Sinaiticus probably offers the early text more or less unchanged: it has been revised very slightly in G^I, and more extensively in G^{III} (although not all the distinctive readings of 106 occur in every G^{III} ms).[11] Obviously, this early text is not necessarily identical to the text of the original Greek translation, and that *caveat* applies even more when we are looking at text shared only by two of the text-types. The important point that arises from these observations, however, is not that we can readily reconstitute the original Greek from such material in every verse – would that it were always so straightforward – but that we are dealing with multiple texts derived from what is essentially a common core, not with three wholly different and irreconcilable Greek versions of Tobit. If we wish to get at that core, we need to take account of all the witnesses.

In doing so, it is obviously helpful to know what we might expect in the way of revisions to G^I and G^{III}, and comparisons of the texts do permit us to identify, at least in broad terms, some of the interests and habits of the revisers. It is apparent, for example, that G^I makes a lot

---

[11] In particular, κύριε is peculiar to 106, and καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῶν is likewise only to be found in 106, although it is also reflected in the Syriac. Other G^{III} witnesses have an initial καὶ, like S. The reversal of nouns at the end of the verse is also found in some OL texts, which otherwise support S here, but has probably occurred independently in that tradition.

of stylistic changes, substituting close synonyms or re-writing sentences to suit its idea of better Greek, but it tends also to shorten speeches and to reduce the amount of narrative detail offered. Such changes are absent or very limited in the very didactic or theological speeches of 4:5-19 and 12:6-15, and the prayers of 8:5-7, 15-17; 11:14-15; 13. That suggests that the G^I revision may have had a greater interest in such material than in telling the story – which distinguishes it from the G^{III} texts, in which the material is often more drastically shortened or re-written, but where there is also an obvious concern to improve the narrative by adding or changing details. When we try to establish more precisely just how and when the revisions arose, however, we begin to run into some of the problems posed by thinking too much in terms of recensions, and too little in terms of texts.

One of the pieces of evidence adduced for their case by Nicklas and Wagner is the sixth-century P.Oxy. 1076 (ms 910), which has affinities with both G^I texts and Sinaiticus; it was linked to G^{III} by its original editor.[12] Noting that the manuscript agrees more frequently with G^I against G^{II} than *vice versa*, Nicklas and Wagner conclude after an exhaustive examination that "910 eindeutig auf der Linie von GI liegt", although it also seems not infrequently to align itself with G^{II}, and at one point finds a parallel only in the Old Latin.[13] This demonstrates, for them, the thesis that, "Es gibt eine Reihe von griechischen Tobit-Handschriften, deren Texte sich aufgrund von gravierenden Sonderlesarten einer eindeutigen und zweifelsfreien Verortung innerhalb der bekannten Überlieferungsgruppen (GI; GII; GIII) sperren."[14] If that implies in turn that we cannot clearly isolate the revised texts from the unrevised, and that something much more complicated is going on, of which we can only catch glimpses, then it does indeed pose a significant problem. Despite its date, however, it seems likely that ms 910 is a witness to a much earlier situation, and its character, like that of

---

[12] See A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part VIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1911), 6-9.

[13] "Thesen", 149.

[14] "Thesen", 144

the older P.Oxy. 1594 (ms 990) which Nicklas and Wagner also mention,[15] only becomes problematic when we try to impose inappropriate categories upon it.

Ms 910 has affinities with the texts of the revised G^I text-type, but it does not thereby have "G^I readings" that arose specifically as a result of the G^I revision. The simplest explanation for its relationship with G^I is rather that 910 preserves readings from the unrevised Greek tradition that were taken up into the G^I revision from its source text or texts, alongside other readings that were either never contained in those sources, or were eliminated by the revision; of course, some of these may have been earlier "improvements" to the text. At times, 910 also has readings that may have been common in the unrevised Greek, but that have been changed or lost in the particular branch of that tradition which led to Sinaiticus: at least one such reading is not found in either G^I or G^{II}, but survived in the Old Latin.[16] What we see in 910 and sometimes elsewhere, therefore, is not a problematic blurring of distinctions, but a glimpse of the complicated textual tradition out of which our types emerged. Those considerations hold even if we choose to suspect that 910 is a fragmentary G^{III} text: except where they came into being specifically as the result of the G^I or G^{III} revision, we cannot identify readings as the exclusive possession of the later text-types, and there are doubtless many readings found now only in G^I or G^{III} which circulated previously as variants in the unrevised tradition. The problem is not that we have texts which transcend our categories, but that we tend to misunderstand the nature and implications of those categories.

Of course, our ability to deal with the primeval soup of the early Greek tradition is rather limited. It is probably true that there was a great deal of instability, perhaps provoked in part by a dissatisfaction with the original translation, or with the narrative qualities of the underlying version, which led to much re-writing and revision. If we try to approach the history of the Greek text through some detailed reconstruction of relationships and of a family tree, then the task seems foredoomed to founder, and the slight but chaotic evidence for early transmission offers little purchase for such standard text-critical techniques. There are indications, all the same, of certain affinities between our various witnesses: we may note,

---

[15] See B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1919), pp. 1-6, pl. I.

[16] καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχο[ν]τα αὐτοῦ in 2:8.

for example, that the source-text of G^{III} seems frequently to have shared readings with that of the Old Latin against Sinaiticus. In 8:19, to take one of many possible examples, Sinaiticus describes Raguel's preparation of animals for the wedding-feast: καὶ εἶπεν συντελεῖν αὐτούς καὶ ἤρξαντο παρασκευάζειν. Here the Old Latin has just *et iussit praeparari*, and G^{III} similarly καὶ ἔταξεν ἑτοιμάζειν αυτούς: it seems apparent that G^{III} and the Latin are drawing on some common source, even if it is not clear whether that source is ultimately the original Greek translation, or whether their reading is better than that of Sinaiticus. In the next verse, 8:20, Sinaiticus begins with καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Τωβιαν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "and he summoned Tobias and said to him", while G^{III} has καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Τωβιαν καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπεν, "and he summoned Tobias and made an oath to him and said…". G^{III} is once again supported by the Old Latin (and perhaps by a subsequent reference to an oath in G^{I}). Since, later on in 9:3, Tobias talks about Raguel having made such an oath, such agreements may point up changes and developments in Sinaiticus, rather than in some common G^{III}/OL ancestor, so we should not presume that any relationship between G^{III} and the Latin diminishes their value as independent witnesses to the early tradition. All the same, a systematic evaluation of the relationships between our witnesses might allow us to sketch rather more of the history than is currently known.

If we are to go back still further, and attempt to assess not just the early date but also the originality of particular readings, then it is the Qumran texts that offer our most valuable resource. It is likely, to be sure, that the Greek translation was sometimes based on readings different from any of those preserved for us at Qumran, and so when a reading found there has no counterpart in any of our witnesses to the Greek, we should not presuppose that our witnesses must all be at fault. However, when a Qumran reading does match a reading in the Greek or Latin sources, then there is a high probability that it has been transmitted *via* the original translation. A simple example is offered by 13:13, where the first verb in the text of Sinaiticus is πορεύθητι, "go!", but G^{I} has χάρηθι, "rejoice!", supported by Old Latin *gaude*. In the Hebrew 4Q200 we read שמחי, and in the Aramaic 4Q196 חדי, which both also mean "rejoice!" Since it is unlikely that this occurred coincidentally as a change in G^{I}, we may suppose that it must have reached that version from the original Greek translation, and that the reading of Sinaiticus here is more probably the secondary one. Such instances represent a phenomenon that again makes Nicklas and Wagner uncomfortable: if the Qumran texts sometimes support readings that are not to be found among the "G^{II}" texts, or which support either Sinaiticus or the Old Latin against the other, this leads them to suspect that distinctions

within G^{II} might be attributed to existing variation within the Semitic tradition.[17] That, however, introduces a very complicated notion of multiple texts and translations for no very good reason, except to sustain a particular way of thinking about G^{II}.

Obviously, helpful though they are, the value of the Qumran materials cannot extend directly beyond those passages for which they are actually extant. There are more general lessons to be learned from those passages, however, and they offer important insights about the nature and inter-relationships of our witnesses. For example, in 3:6 we find the words καὶ γένωμαι γῆ in Sinaiticus but not in ms 319 or in the principal Old Latin texts. If we were trying to reconstruct a "G^{II}" recension in isolation, it is very possible that we would assume S to be at fault here, and perhaps to be offering a corrupt doublet of the preceding clause. S is supported by 4Q200 עָׁפׁר, however, and its text is repeated by G^{I}: there is no "G^{II}" reading, as such, and this is simply a case where an early omission has passed into some of the "unrevised" witnesses, but the original reading been preserved both by Sinaiticus and the revised G^{I}. Interestingly, that reading has also survived in the idiosyncratic L^{143}, where we find *ut fiar terra*, so this case also tends to affirm the significance of that text as an independent witness. The Qumran texts of Tobit may confirm beyond reasonable doubt that the revisions in G^{I} and G^{III} occurred secondarily in the Greek tradition, but they also teach us to recognize the importance of those text-types as witnesses to the original translation, and warn us not to treat the unrevised witnesses as a distinct and coherent G^{II} recension, with some presumed monopoly on the best readings. Especially where we do not have Qumran readings, and where the extant witnesses diverge, it is important for us to evaluate all the available readings in every case, and not to rely on generalizations.

Although Nicklas and Wagner themselves observe some of the many difficulties involved in the rigid delineation of recensions, it is this very way of looking at the tradition that underpins their pessimism, and that seems more generally to stand in the way of any progress beyond presentations of Sinaiticus, warts and all, as the best Greek text available. If we are to move forward, we need to stop setting Tobit out in parallel columns, and to start treating G^{I} and G^{III} as members of a single text tradition, alongside 319, Sinaiticus and the Old Latin. To do that effectively, we shall need to explore the relationships between the witnesses in more detail than has usually been attempted, and, although Hanhart has already provided us with a

---

[17] "Thesen", 152-3.

valuable reconstruction of the G^I text, it would obviously be helpful to have better critical editions both of the Latin and of the G^{III} texts than are currently available. We can go a long way, however, simply on the basis of what we know already, and I want to close by offering an attempt to restore the original Greek for the text of 4:7-19, which is famously lacking in Sinaiticus. Space forbids a full discussion of all the readings adopted, but I hope that this will both illustrate the points that I have made above, and offer some justification for my optimism that we can do much better, and get much closer to the original Greek of Tobit.

4:7-19:

4:7 καὶ τὰ (or κατὰ τὰ) ὑπάρχοντά σου[18] παιδίον[19] ποίει ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ παντὸς πτωχοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σοῦ οὐ μὴ ἀποστραφῇ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ.

4:8 καθώς σοι ὑπάρχει παιδίον οὕτως ποίει[20] ἐὰν ᾖ σοι πλῆθος ἐξ αὐτοῦ ποίει ἐλεημοσύνην ἐὰν ὀλίγον σοι ὑπάρχει (or καὶ εἰ ᾖ σοι ὀλίγον)[21] κατὰ τὸ ὀλίγον (+ ... ?)[22] καὶ μὴ φοβηθῇς παιδίον ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν σε ἐλεημοσύνην[23]

4:9 θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης

---

[18] L^{143} has read *in substantia tua* with the preceding sentence, probably to deal with the awkward καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά σου attested in 319. OL and G^I "out of your possessions" are a different attempt to make sense of the same. και τα is most likely early, then, but may be an error for κατὰ τά, equivalent to כ in the idiomatic 4Q200 כארך ידכה.

[19] OL, L^{143} *fili*; cf. 4Q200 בני and 4Q196 ברי.

[20] 319, cf. OL, but the Latin texts then try to supply an object for the verb, which is here intransitive in the Greek. There is no equivalent in 4Q200 for the verse up to this point, and the source-text of the Greek may have been different.

[21] G^I, cf. OL. A case could be made for 319 καὶ εἰ ᾖ σοι ὀλίγον as potentially closer in form to an underlying Semitic text.

[22] Cf. G^I. OL and 319 both offer further specification here, but are different and may simply be trying to clarify what was originally an elliptical expression.

[23] 319, cf. 4Q200 [בעש]וֹתך צדקה.

4:10 διότι ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται καὶ οὐκ ἐᾷ ἐλθεῖν²⁴ εἰς τὸ σκότος

4:11 δῶρον ἀγαθόν ἐστιν ἐλεημοσύνη πᾶσιν τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτὴν ἐνώπιον (or ἐναντίον) τοῦ ὑψίστου

4:12 πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ παιδίον ἀπὸ πάσης πορνείας γυναῖκα πρῶτον λαβὲ ἐκ (or ἀπὸ) τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν πατέρων σου καὶ μὴ λάβῃς γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν ἢ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ (or ἐκ) τῆς φυλῆς τῶν πατέρων σου²⁵ διότι υἱοὶ προφητῶν ἐσμεν καὶ κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν υἱοὶ προφητῶν²⁶ ὁ δὲ (or Νωε)²⁷ προφήτης ἦν πρῶτος Αβρααμ καὶ Ισαακ καὶ Ιακωβ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος μνήσθητι παιδίον ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες ἔλαβον γυναῖκας ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν καὶ εὐλογήθησαν ἐν τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν κληρονομήσει γῆν

4:13 καὶ νῦν παιδίον ἀγάπα τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου καὶ μὴ ὑπερηφανεύου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ λαοῦ σου²⁸ μὴ λαβεῖν σε μίαν ἐξ αὐτῶν διότι ἐν τῇ ὑπερηφανίᾳ ἀπώλεια καὶ ἀκαταστασία πολλή καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀχρειότητι ἐλάττωσις καὶ ἔνδεια μεγάλη μήτηρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀχρειότης τοῦ λιμοῦ (or ἡ ἀχρειότης μήτηρ ἐστὶν τοῦ λιμοῦ)²⁹

---

²⁴ 319 has ἀπελθεῖν at the end of the verse, but see Gᴵ and OL *ire in tenebras* for the order. Gᴵ mss have ἐλθεῖν rather than εἰσελθεῖν; and that may have been the original Gᴵ reading (cf. OL).

²⁵ A case could be made for the singular, as Gᴵ, on the grounds that the reading may have been influenced by the previous τῶν πατέρων σου. 319 is supported by OL here, however, and Gᴵ is probably trying to make the reference more precise.

²⁶ 319 καὶ κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν υἱοὶ προφητῶν is probably supported by the interpretative *qui in ueritate prophetauerunt priores* (OL mss), and L¹⁴³ *et secundum ueritatem ambulamus*.

²⁷ The improbable inclusion of Noah in the list may have arisen as an error involving the preceding ν of προφητῶν. It is absent from 319 and L¹⁴³, but attested in Gᴵ, OL.

²⁸ 319 is supported by OL *filiabus filiorum populi tui*, but Gᴵ ἀδελφῶν σου καὶ τῶν υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων τοῦ λαοῦ σου finds partial matches in L¹⁴³ *filiis et filiabus populi tui*, and possibly in the one manuscript of OL which has *fratrum tuorum*. The Gᴵ reading seems secondary, with ἀδελφῶν σου arising from the preceding ἀδελφούς σου, but the change from "daughters of sons" to the more familiar "sons and daughters", shared with L¹⁴³, may pre-date Gᴵ in the Greek tradition. This gives rise to the subsequent clarificatory specifications σεαυτῷ and γυναῖκα in Gᴵ.

²⁹ The end of the verse may been corrupted early in the transmission of OL, which is chaotic here, but some mss have *mater* = Gᴵ μήτηρ, affirming that the awkward ολετηρ of 319 is an

4:14 μισθὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ὃς ἂν ἐργάσηται μετὰ σου (or παρὰ σοὶ)[30] ἀπόδος αὐτῷ αὐθήμερον[31] καὶ μὴ αὐλισθήτω μισθὸς ἀνθρώπου παρὰ σοὶ (or παρὰ σοὶ μισθὸς ἀνθρώπου) καὶ ὁ μισθός σου οὐ μὴ αὐλισθῇ ἐὰν δουλεύσῃς τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ παιδίον (or πρόσεχε παιδίον σεαυτῷ)[32] ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου καὶ ἴσθι πεπαιδευμένος[33] ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ σου

4:15 καὶ ὃ μισεῖς μηθενὶ ποιήσῃς[34] καὶ μὴ πορευθήτω μετὰ σου πονηρὸν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ὁδῷ σου[35]

---

error for that word. They preserve it directly after *magna*, though, and G[I] may have the right word, but 319 the right order; note, however, L[143] *et iugalitas mater est inopiae*.

[30] 319 μετὰ σοῦ; G[I] παρὰ σοὶ. Since παρὰ σοὶ is used with a slightly different sense just afterwards in 319, μετὰ σοῦ is likely to be the earlier reading here, but OL *penes* could support either one.

[31] 319 + a redundant τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ, which is probably a clumsy clarification, and is absent from OL. G[I] has recast the whole verse, making it more compact, but giving a different sense.

[32] OL perhaps slightly favours the order of G[I], but 319 πρόσεχε παιδίον σεαυτῷ cannot be excluded.

[33] 319 ισθη παις πεδευμενος is an obvious error for the ἴσθι πεπαιδευμένος of G[I].

[34] After ποιήσῃς, G[I] starts talking about alcohol, rather unexpectedly in this context: "do not drink wine to the point of drunkenness, and do not let drunkenness go with you on your way." 319 has nothing to say on this subject, but appears to say "may evil not go with you, wickedness on all your way." It is helpful to break the text of G[I] down into three parts:

1. καὶ ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς: this is uncontroversial, and essentially supported by all versions.
2. οἶνον εἰς μέθην μὴ πίῃς: this is supported by most OL texts, but absent from two. One OL ms, and L[143] paraphrase. 319 has κακον instead of οινον, uniquely, and no equivalent to the rest.
3. καὶ μὴ πορευθήτω μετὰ σοῦ μέθη ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ σου: there is no support for μέθη here among the other witnesses, and OL favours 319 πονηρόν.

It seems probable that the reading of the third part with μέθη has arisen as a result of the second part. If we read it with πονηρὸν instead, however, then the reference to alcohol in the

4:16 ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου σου δίδου πεινῶντι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἱματίων σου τοῖς γυμνοῖς πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν περισσεύσῃ σοι ποίει ἐλεημοσύνην παιδίον[36] καὶ(?) μὴ[37] φθονεσάτω σου ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι[38] ἐλεημοσύνην

4:17 ἔκχεον τὸν ἄρτον σου καὶ τὸν οἶνον σου[39] ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον τῶν δικαίων καὶ μὴ δῷς αὐτὸ τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς

---

second part becomes very isolated, as it is in those OL texts which contain it, and it sits awkwardly between the two other parts of the verse. The OL witnesses, furthermore, suggest a different order: μὴ πίῃς οἶνον εἰς μέθην. Although the reference to alcohol in G[I] apparently pre-dates the G[I] revision of the text, then, it has probably been extended into the third part of verse in the course of that revision – perhaps to make it less isolated, or as an interpretative reading of πονηρον – and it may also have been re-expressed in the second part. If the earlier text contained only something like μὴ πίῃς οἶνον εἰς μέθην, then the appearance of the early form μηθενὶ for μηδενὶ in 319 may suggest that the admonition arose as a result of confusion between that form and μέθην. It is tempting to speculate, indeed, that ΜΗΠΙΗϹΕΙϹΜΕΘΗΝ is a corrupt doublet of ΜΗϹΕΙϹΜΗΘΕΝΙ, with οἶνον added as a secondary specification (unless it is related somehow to the κακὸν found in 319, which is probably a gloss or, as Hanhart suggests, an error for καὶ). In any case, its intrusiveness in the verse makes the authenticity of the admonition very questionable. The inconsistency of its appearance in the OL manuscripts does not suggest the influence of variants from the Greek tradition on transmission of the Latin. The reference probably appeared originally in OL, inherited from a source-text like that of G[I], but its intrusiveness, its absence from the Vulgate, or perhaps just its unpopularity, may have led to its omission in some texts.

[35] OL *vita* probably originated as *via*.

[36] 319 παιδίον is absent from G[I], but cf. OL, L[143].

[37] OL *et non* probably supports G[I] καὶ μὴ against 319 μὴ, but it is possible that the conjunction is facilitatory in both.

[38] G[I] ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν σε cannot be excluded, but is probably a specification of the vaguer reading in 319.

[39] The singular ἄρτον and καὶ τὸν οἶνον σου of 319 are supported by OL, L[143]. It is possible that G[I] does not want to refer to libations for the dead, although it seems likely that the original

4:18 συμβουλίαν παρὰ παντὸς[40] φρονίμου ζήτησον καὶ μὴ καταφρονήσῃς ἐπεὶ πᾶσα συμβουλία χρησίμη ἐστίν[41]

4:19 ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ εὐλόγει τὸν θεὸν (and/or κύριον)[42] καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ αἴτησαι (or αἴτησον)[43] ὅπως εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοί σου γένωνται καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ τρίβοι σου καὶ βουλαὶ σου[44] εὐοδωθῶσιν διότι πᾶν ἔθνος οὐκ ἔχει βουλὴν ἀγαθήν ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος δίδωσιν[45] καὶ ὃν ἂν θέλῃ αὐτός ὑψοῖ καὶ ὃν ἂν θέλῃ αὐτός[46] ταπεινοῖ

---

intention here was not to commend offerings to the dead as such, but to suggest that food and wine are better thrown on the graves of the righteous than put in the mouth of sinners.

[40] As Hanhart suggests, OL *homine* may have arisen from *omni* (one ms actually has *omne*), and the παντὸς of G^I is more directly supported by L^{143} *omnibus*.

[41] συμβουλίαν was probably intended to serve originally as the object of both ζήτησον and καταφρονήσῃς, but the writing of ἐπεὶ (cf. OL *quoniam*) as ἐπὶ (so 319, with subsequent πασῃ) has led it to be read as a preposition, and G^I interprets "do not be contemptuous of any useful advice (similarly L^{143}). 319 ἐστίν is supported by OL, affirming the original meaning.

[42] It is difficult to establish whether "God" or "the Lord" is to be blessed – there is support for each in the Latin witnesses, but no support for the reading of both in G^I κύριον τὸν θεὸν (σου).

[43] The middle is preferred when the verb is used in 4:2, marginally favouring the reading of 319 here.

[44] 319 has only πᾶσαι αἱ τρίβοι σου. Both nouns are reflected – not always together – in the Latin witnesses, supporting G^I, but the Latin also suggests that the possessive pronoun of 319 is original.

[45] G^I ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος δίδωσιν πάντα τὰ ἀγαθα, "no nation has counsel, but the Lord himself gives good things". Many of the OL mss are corrupt here, but none support G^I, and it is likely that OL and L^{143} are derived from a text like that of 319. Sinaiticus returns part of the way through this saying, and itself affirms βουλὴν ἀγαθήν. Its readings at this point must be treated with particular caution, however, as they show signs of adaptation to the loss of text: in δώσει κύριος αὐτοῖς βουλὴν ἀγαθήν, αὐτοῖς refers to οἱ ποιοῦντες ἀλήθιαν in 4:6, and the tense of δώσει matches that of εὐοδωθήσονται there. Whatever it read originally, the text of S has been made to serve as a continuation of 4.6.

ἕως ᾅδου κάτω (or κατωτάτω)⁴⁷ καὶ νῦν παιδίον μνημόνευε τὰς ἐντολὰς μου ταύτας⁴⁸ καὶ μὴ ἐξαλειφθήτωσαν ἐκ τῆς καρδίας σου

---

⁴⁶ The repetition of καὶ ὃν ἂν θέλῃ / θέλει in 319 is almost certainly original, and is supported by the Latin witnesses. It has caused problems in S and Gᴵ – perhaps independently – and in both the first clause has dropped out. The specification of the subject for the second clause as κύριος in S, rather than as a pronoun, has no support, and is almost certainly a secondary clarification; there is some Latin support for reading κύριος or θεός in the first clause, but that too may be a clarification, and it is unlikely that either was displaced by αὐτός in 319.

⁴⁷ S uses κατωτάτω and 319 the more common κάτω for "below": both are possible, and the Latin witnesses could support either one. Interestingly, when the expression occurs again in 13.2, S again has κατωτάτω, while Gᴵᴵᴵ has κάτω. In the present verse, Gᴵ unexpectedly has καθὼς βούλεται, which repeats the idea of ὃν ἐὰν θέλῃ, and probably results from an error.

⁴⁸ Gᴵ τῶν ἐντολῶν μου (improving the style by using the genitive after μνημόνευε): OL and L¹⁴³ also have "my", which is present in 319 τὰς ἐντολὰς μου ταύτας, but lacking in S. The status of ταύτας is less clear, but it is more likely to have dropped out of the Latin witnesses and Gᴵ as redundant than to have been introduced unnecessarily into 319 and S; perhaps μου dropped out of S for the same reason.