Timothy Michael Law

Origenes Orientalis

The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI)

Edited by
Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kristin De Troyer,
Wolfgang Kraus, Emanuel Tov

In Co-operation with
Kai Brodersen (Erfurt, Germany), Cécile Dogniez (Paris, France),
Peter Gentry (Louisville, USA), Anna Kharanauli (Tbilisi, Georgia),
Armin Lange (Wien, Austria), Alison Salvesen (Oxford, UK),
David Andrew Teeter (Cambridge, USA), Julio Trebolle (Madrid,
Spain), Florian Wilk (Göttingen, Germany)

Volume 2

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Timothy Michael Law

Origenes Orientalis

The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

For Katie

τί ἐστι φιλία
μία ψυχὴ δύο σώμασιν ἐνοικοῦσα

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

ISBN 978-3-525-53405-2
ISBN 978-3-647-53405-3 (E-Book)

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Oakville, CT, U.S.A.
www.v-r.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Das Werk und seine Teile sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen bedarf der vorherigen schriftlichen Einwilligung des Verlages.
Printed in Germany.

Druck und Bindung: ⊕ Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 8

Primary Sources 10

Abbreviations and Signs 12

Manuscript Groupings for 3 Kingdoms 14

1 Introduction 15
- 1.1 The Hexapla and the Syrohexapla 16
  - 1.1.1 The Hexapla 16
  - 1.1.2 The Idea of the Syrohexapla 18
  - 1.1.3 The Character of the Translation 22
- 1.2 The Present Study 24
  - 1.2.1 Research in the Modern Period 24
  - 1.2.2 The Scope of the Present Study 29
  - 1.2.3 The Editions of Syh and the Manuscript 31
  - 1.2.3.1 History of Editions of Syh 31
  - 1.2.3.2 Details of the Manuscript 33
  - 1.2.4 Methodology 34
  - 1.2.4.1 Presentation of Textual Data 35
  - 1.2.4.2 Presentation of Chapters 39
  - 1.2.4.3 Numbering 42
- 1.3 Summary 43

2 Hexaplaric Material Marked Correctly: Asterisked Material 44
- 2.1 Material Attested in the Greek Tradition 45
- 2.2 Material Uniquely Preserved in Syh 103
- 2.3 Conclusion 114

3 Hexaplaric Material Marked Correctly: Obelised Material 118
- 3.1 Obelised Material in Syh Omitted or Marked 118

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

3.2 Material Obelised, but Neither Omitted Nor Marked 148
3.3 Conclusion 177

4 Hexaplaric Material Marked Inaccurately 179
4.1 Partially Correct Sub ⁜ Readings 179
4.2 Partially Correct Sub ÷ Readings 199
4.3 Asterisk Missing from Lemma 217
4.4 Obelus Missing from Lemma 224
4.5 Metobelus Missing from Lemma 227
4.6 Unnecessary Signs 244
4.7 Wrong Signs 252
4.8 Conclusion 254

5 Hexaplaric Material Attributed to the Revisers 255
5.1 Hexaplaric Readings in the Main Text of Syh 256
5.2. Hexaplaric Readings in the Margins of Syh 285
5.3 Conclusion 314

6 Hexaplaric Material Outside of Syh 317
6.1 Signed Readings in the Manuscript Tradition 318
6.1.1 Asterisks 318
6.1.2 Obeli 319
6.1.3 Attributed Readings 320
6.2 Unasterisked Approximations to MT 321
6.2.1 Widespread Attestation against B 321
6.2.2 Probable Intentional Approximation 337
6.3 Conclusion 360

7 Conclusion 362
7.1 Correctly Preserved Asterisked Readings 362
7.2 Correctly Preserved Obelised Readings 362
7.3 Inaccurately Preserved Signed Readings 363
7.4 Attributed Readings 364
7.5 Hexaplaric Material Outside of Syh 364
7.6 Limitations of the Present Study 367

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

7.7 Prospects for Future Research 368
7.8 Summary 369

Bibliography 371

Index of Passages Discussed in 3 Kingdoms 379

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the kind assistance of the Clarendon Fund from 2006–2008; three separate grants from the Grinfield Bequest from 2006–2008; and several travel grants provided by the Oriental Institute. During the year of publication, I was supported by the generosity of the British Academy as a Postdoctoral Fellow (2009–2012). To Ken Emond at the Academy, all BAPDFs owe a particular debt of gratitude for his tireless service.

Part of this work was read at the 2006 Société d'Études syriaques conference at the Sorbonne, arranged by Françoise Briquel-Chatonnet and Muriel Debie, and at the 2008 IOSCS section of the SBL. My thanks are due to those who sat listening to this tedious material.

I'm grateful to my students (yes, even you Nikolos Aleksidze!) and colleagues at the Oriental Institute in the University of Oxford, not in the least to Liliane Morton and Allen Miles, who never fail to brighten the cloudiest day with their smiles and warm greetings at the door. The following friends have enriched me personally and professionally: Anneli Aejmelaeus, Marketta Liljeström, Kenneth Liljeström, Christian Seppänen, Tuukka Kauhanen, Elina Perttilä, Jennifer Dines, Jim Aitken, Michael Graves, Adrian Schenker, Julio Trebolle Barrera, Andrés Piquer Otero, Pablo Torijano Morales, Natalio Fernández Marcos, Emanuel Tov, Reinhart Ceulemans, Dries De Crom, Kristin De Troyer, Jan Joosten, Christopher Hays, David Lincicum, Lorenzo Cuppi, David Taylor, Sebastian Brock, Hugh Williamson, Martin Goodman, Daniel Block, Anja Rajaobelina, Jennie Barbour, and Ward Jarvis. I have also experienced both intellectual and spiritual enrichment through my friendship and collaboration with Philippe Hugo (and his lovely family: Caroline, Céline, Elias, and Yonathan). Since 2005, I have gained an enormous amount of knowledge in areas outside of my own field – mainly politics, economics, and global affairs – from my polymathic sparring partner, who often proved me the palooka, Faimon Roberts (and no doubt FCF lost a loyal patron). Before they returned to Glasgow, our best friends during their days in Oxford were John and Ros Goodfellow, and we still remember those years and laugh. I am especially grateful for my friend of more than a decade, Kyle McDaniel, who first introduced me to the big blue book we call Rahlfs' Septuagint, and is now (perhaps more

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

importantly) my culinary confidant. I am also indebted to Johnny Hunt, who has been my spiritual mentor and pastor for 20 years.

Two other scholars deserve separate mention. Peter Gentry first (patiently!) taught me the Septuagint in Louisville; his excitement for the Greek translation has inspired not only me, but countless other students past and present. In Oxford I was fortunate to have worked with Alison Salvesen, who was more than one could have hoped for in a doctoral supervisor, and is now as a postdoctoral mentor. She continues to provide encouragement during crises of confidence, and has always been a gentle but honest critic of some of my more embarrassing work. The Salvesen family have become some of our dearest friends in the world, and our lives have been enriched as our friendship has grown with David, Adam, and Magda.

Our own families have always been supportive. My parents, Jim and Kathy, have never doubted what their sons could achieve and are still our biggest support; my brother Jeremy and his family (Ashlee, Maddie, and Reese) have tried to help me keep my head in the real world. Rod and Ginger Leonard have also encouraged their son-in-law, even though he took their daughter overseas. Nikki B, PC, and BR never could surpass the BL, but I love them all the more for trying.

Thanks are also due to the series editors for accepting this work, as well as to the expert Silke Hartmann who patiently guided the publishable form from start to finish, and Jörg Persch who oversaw the process.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my wife Katie, my best friend for almost 10 years. I was able to finish my doctorate only because she worked the entire time, delaying her own persuits and passions so that I could pursue mine. She is the picture of selfless love, and I could not be more encouraged about the life our precious Elizabeth Rose (to whom my next book will be dedicated!) will now have because she has Katie as her mother.

Oxford, May 2011 Timothy Michael Law

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Primary Sources

Hebrew and Greek Versions

MT: Elliger, K. & Rudolph, W. (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (=BHS) (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967–77).

B: *Codex Vaticanus*, in the diplomatic edition of Brooke, A.E., McLean, N., & Thackeray, H. St. J. (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek,* 2: *The Latter Historical Books;* Part 2: *I and II Kings* (=BMT) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

Ant: Fernández Marcos, N., & Busto Saiz, J.R. (ed.), *El texto antioqueno de la Bibla griega, I: 1-2 Samuel* (TECC 50; Madrid: CSIC, 1989); and Fernández Marcos, N., & Busto Saiz, J.R. (ed.), *El texto antioqueno de la Bibla griega, II: 1-2 Reyes* (TECC 53: Madrid: CSIC, 1992).

Syriac Versions

P: Gottlieb, H. (ed.), in collaboration with E. Hammershaimb, *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version, 1-2 Kings* (II/4; Leiden: Brill, 1976).

Syh: Lagarde, P. de (ed.), *Bibliothecae Syriacae a Paulo de Lagarde collectae quae ad philologiam sacram pertinent* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892.

Armenian

Arm: Zohrapian, H. (ed.), *Astuatsashunch' Matean Hin Ew Nor Ktakarants' = Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, a facsimile reproduction of the 1805 Venetian edition with an introduction by C. Cox (Delmar: Caravan Books, 1984).

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Hexapla

Field: Field, F. (ed.), *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875).

Patristic

Eusebius, *HE* (= *Historia Ecclesiastica*): Winkelmann, F. (ed.), *Die Kirchengeschichte* (GCS 6.1-2; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999).

Eusebius, *VC* (= *Vita Constantini*): Winkelmann, F. (ed.), *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* (2nd edn; GCS, *Eusebius Werke* 1.1; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991).

Jerome, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* I-II: Weber, R. (ed.) (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969).

Jerome, *vir. ill.*(= *De Viris Illustribus*): Migne, J.P. (ed.), *De Viris Illustribus* (PL 23; Paris: Garnier Frères, 1863) 602–720.

Lucifer of Cagliari: Diercks, G.R. (ed.), *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt* (CCSL 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1978).

Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* (= *Commentary on Matthew*): Klostermann, E. (ed.), *Origenes Matthäuserklärung*, (GCS 40; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1935).

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Abbreviations and Signs

A	*Codex Alexandrinus*
B	*Codex Vaticanus*
M	*Codex Coislinianus*
V	*Codex Venetus*
Aeth	Ethiopic Version
Anon	The Anonymous Chronicle
Ant	Antiochian LXX in the edition of Fernández Marcos and Busto Sáiz
Arm	Armenian Version
Arm^{mss}	Variants in the Armenian manuscript tradition
Aug	Augustine
Barh	Barhebraeus
BMT	Brooke/McLean/Thackeray (Larger Cambridge) edition of the LXX
Bo	Boharic Version
Chr	Chrysostom
Cyp	Cyprian
Cyr	Cyril
Eus	Eusebius, *Onomasticon* (BMT: On)
Field	F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt*
Hieron	Jerome
Iren	Irenaeus
Jac	Jacob of Edessa
La	*Vetus Latina* (the Old Latin version)
Luc	Lucifer of Cagliari
LXX	Septuagint
Or	Origen
P	Peshitta
Procop	Procopius
Ra	Rahlfs' LXX
Sa	Sahidic Version
Syh	Syrohexapla
Syh^{B}	Manuscript of Syh 3 Kgdms
Syh^{ed}	Lagarde's edition of Syh 3 Kgdms

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

TJ	Targum Jonathan
Thd	Theodore of Mopsuestia
Thd-syr	Works of Theodore of Mopsuestia extant in Syriac
Tht	Theodoret
Vulg	Vulgate
α′	Aquila
γ′	"the Three" (*recentiores*)
εβρ′	"the Hebrew"
θ′	Theodotion
σ′	Symmachus
⩗	οι γ′, "the Three" (*recentiores*)
⩖	λυκιανος, the Lucianic (Antiochian) recension
⩕	Syh siglum for ο εβρ′

The layout of the apparatus is similar to that of the Göttingen LXX, but as the volume is not yet complete for 3 Kgdms, my apparatus will not be identical. Commonly used signs are:

⁀	parablepsis
※	hexaplaric asterisk
÷	hexaplaric obelus
↙	hexaplaric metobelus (reversed in Syh)

Other References

Biblical and Journal References follow as closely as possible the SBL Handbook of Style, but are in any case commonly understood.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Manuscript Groupings for 3 Kingdoms

Italics indicate those manuscripts that were not available to BMT and therefore not used in this work. These are tentative groupings determined by the editors of the Göttingen edition of 3 Kingdoms, Julio Trebolle Barrera and Pablo Torijano Morales. Certain details are subject to change prior to the publication of their edition, at which time this list here will become useful only for this study.

Uncials: (A) BMV

O: A 247

L: 19 82 93 108 127

C: 98 243 *379 731*

cI: 46 52 236 242 *313 328 530*

b: 121-509

d: 44 106 107 *125 610*

f: 56 246

o: 64-*381*

s 92 130 314 *488* 489 *762*

t: 74 120 134

x: 119 *527 799*

z: 68 *122*

mixti: 55 71 121 158 244 245 *318 342* 372 *460* 509 *707* 554

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

1
Introduction

Although it has never been subjected to a detailed analysis, the Syrohexapla (Syh) is widely believed to be a careful witness to the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, or at the very least to the hexaplaric recension of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.[1] This Syriac version not only attests the revised Greek text of Origen, but also preserves many of the hexaplaric sigla – that is, the asterisks, obeli, and metobeli – and the readings of several Greek Jewish versions that are no longer fully extant. The present book is the first to evaluate the worth of Syh as a witness to the hexaplaric materials in an entire book, here 3 Kingdoms (Kgdms), and is preliminary to the preparation of the critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments for the same book.[2]

By conducting a careful analysis of these materials (both the anonymous signed readings and those attributed to revisers, along with the copious attributed readings in the margins) it is possible to appraise the reliability of this seventh century Syriac version for recovering what is preserved of Origen's Hexapla. It is important, however, to make the distinction between Syh as a valuable witness to the Hexapla and Syh as a valuable witness *to what is preserved from the Hexapla*. Later in this book, the evidence demonstrates that there are a large number of readings that have lost the signs that may have accompanied them in the Hexapla. Nonetheless, the primary question concerns the reliability of Syh for what has endured of the hexaplaric materials.

---

[1] Some authors still repeat the assertion that Syh was a translation of the fifth column (e.g. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 366; cf. also Gentry, "Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes", 7). This is misleading, as it implies that the Syrian bishops had access to and therefore translated directly from the Hexapla itself in the seventh century. Moreover, because they had access to the Hexapla, as this assertion assumes, they made their own marginal notations from columns 3, 4, and 6. While it cannot be proven that they did not have the Hexapla at hand, it is credulous to suggest they did, as Chapter 6 will demonstrate.

[2] I have accepted the responsibility of editing the fragments for 3–4 Kgdms because of the importance of studying the LXX textual history of these books. Unfortunately, little attention has been paid to the Three in previous research on Kgdms.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

1.1 The Hexapla and the Syrohexapla

1.1.1 The Hexapla[3]

Over the course of several centuries following the initial translation of the Septuagint (LXX) in Alexandria, various recensions and revisions of the Old Greek were completed by both Jews and Christians.[4] The complex history of these recensions and revisions of the LXX is not the focus of this present research, but the Hexapla and the three versions attributed to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are of central importance and therefore deserve mention.

Scholars have generally agreed that when in the third century Origen compiled his famous six-columned Hexapla, the Church Father placed the Hebrew in the first column; a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew in the second; Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (the Three) in the third, fourth, and sixth columns; and the LXX texts that Origen had at hand in the fifth.[5] Of great importance were the asterisks and obeli that Origen most likely placed in the fifth column.[6] Because the LXX and Hebrew texts were at variance with one another, Origen used these signs to indicate the differences between them. The asterisk was used to mark portions of the text that were added from one of the Three to fill in what was lacking in his LXX text. The obelus marked passages that were in Origen's received LXX text, but not found in the Hebrew. Origen himself describes his procedure in his *Comm. in Matt.* 15.14:

---

[3] For Origen's motivations in compiling the Hexapla, including mention of the most recent research on the Hexapla, see Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible." It should be noted that when that article was sent to press, I was unaware of the chapter on the Hexapla in Grafton/Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 86–132. With some reservations, I agree with the authors' conclusions on Origen's motivations. See also the collection of essays on the Hexapla in Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*.

[4] See the discussion, with bibliography, in Dorival/Harl/Munnich (ed.), *La Bible grecque*, 157–61; and Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 247–52.

[5] There are, of course, the problems associated with other columns known in the tradition, such as Quinta, Sexta, and Septima. For these, see Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 155–73. Other para-hexaplaric readings include those attributed to ὁ ἑβραῖος (or, τὸ ἑβραϊκόν: Hebraios), ὁ Σύρος (Suros), and τὸ σαμαρειτικόν. On these, see Field, *Origenis hexaplorum*, I:lxxi–lxxxiv, xlii–xlvi (= Norton, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena*, 83–90, 135–56); Romeny, "'Quis sit ὁ Σύρος' Revisited"; and Romeny/Gentry, "Towards a New Collection."

[6] Not all are convinced, however. Both Dines, *Septuagint,* 101; and Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 213–15, express a measure of skepticism over whether or not the signs were in the fifth column in the first place, allowing the possibility that Origen's followers added the signs later. Cf. also Schaper, "Origin and Purpose", 9; and Brock, *Recensions*, 39–43.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντος εὕρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν· τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνᾷδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσαμεν [ὡς] ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ᾖ ὅτι μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν … [7]

As a result, the scholarly Greek text of the fifth column aligned more closely with the Hebrew than did the LXX texts received by Origen. The format of laying out all of the texts in columnar order enabled Origen, and any other readers who had the fortune of seeing this work in its short life, to compare the principal Greek texts of the Old Testament and to make reference to the Hebrew if they had the skill to do so.[8] Thus, the *Hexapla* was an exegetical tool, even if textual criticism and apologetics were also useful outcomes.[9]

The *Hexapla* in its entirety was lost at some point during the next few centuries.[10] Fortunately, two of Origen's admirers, Eusebius and Pamphilus, esteemed him enough to extend the influence of their hero's work. Jerome indicates that the hexaplaric recension, created by copying the fifth column of the Hexapla, was one of the *trifaria varietas*, and was a text *quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilius vulgaverunt*.[11] Although this

---

[7] *Comm. in Mt.* 15.14. See also Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 87–94.

[8] Eusebius, and later Jerome, praised Origen's scholarship on the biblical text and claimed that because he had desired to know the original Scriptures, he even learned Hebrew. Eusebius, *HE* vi.16: τοσαύτη δὲ εἰσήγετο τῷ Ὠριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις, ὡς καὶ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα γλῶτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τάς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐμφερομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων στοιχείοις γραφὰς κτῆμα ἴδιον ποιήσασθαι; and Jerome, *vir. ill.* 54: *quis autem ignorat quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studii ut etiam Hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret*. See also Brock, "Origen's Aims"; De Lange, *Origen*, 22, 29–37, 133–5; Brock, *Recensions*, 38; and Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 204–6. De Lange (*Origen and the Jews*, 22) is probably correct: "We shall not be far from the truth if we conclude that Origen could not speak or read Hebrew, but that he was fortunate in having acquaintances who did, and who gave him such help as he demanded."

[9] See Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible."

[10] There are fragments which demonstrate that some were interested in copying the Hexapla as it was; unfortunately, only the Milan and Cairo palimpsests have been recovered.

[11] Jerome, in *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* I, 546: *Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provinciae palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilius vulgaverunt, totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate conpugnat*. There are four pieces of evidence that the fifth column was copied; these are outlined, with texts, in Gentry, "Old Greek and Later Revisors", 306–7 n. 20 (cf. also Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*, 8–9): 1) Eusebius in *VC* claimed to have made copies of the Bible for the Constantinopolitan Churches at the demand of the Emperor; 2) Colophons in several codices of the LXX mention the copying and checking of manuscripts which were produced on the basis of this Origenic text being performed by Pamphilus

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

text form never attained the status of a *textus receptus*,[12] it did rise to prominence when several other Christian communities decided to use it to translate the Old Testament into their language: this recension lies behind much, even if not all, of the Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, and Syrohexapla versions.[13]

1.1.2 The Idea of the Syrohexapla[14]

While Eusebius and Pamphilus were the first scholars responsible for preserving material from Origen's Hexapla, later followed by the Armenian version which also retained a small amount,[15] the survival of this masterpiece of erudition is ultimately due to a few 7th century Syriac bishops.

Ancient testimony maintains that Paul of Tella produced a translation derived from the fifth column of the Hexapla.[16] But how did this bishop some four centuries after the Hexapla's completion in Caesarea have access to the giant tomes in Egypt? It is possible that the Egyptian monastery

---

and his colleagues, including Eusebius; 3) Jerome's statement quoted in this note (above); and 4) a number of manuscripts which are marked by hexaplaric characteristics.

[12] Kamesar, *Jerome*, 34–5.

[13] On the Coptic, see Drescher, *Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II* and Browne, "The Sahidic Version of Kingdoms IV". Other fragments of 1-4 Kgdms have been published, a list of which is being prepared by Andrés Piquer Otero (Madrid). On the methodology of using the Sahidic Coptic (specifically on 1 Kgdms) in the textual criticism of the LXX, see E. Perttilä, "How to Read the Greek Text behind the Sahidic Coptic." On the Armenian, see the survey on 1–2 Kgdms by Cowe, "La versión armenia" (where he also addresses some of the problems in Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*), and now Law, "Armenian Version of the Song of Hannah"; specifically on the hexaplaric materials throughout Arm, see the two works by Cox: *Hexaplaric Materials* and *Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion*. Finally, mention can be made of two newer studies on the value of the Georgian and Sahidic Coptic versions. The Georgian reveals some OG readings independently of any other witness, and also preserves unique Lucianic readings: Piquer/Torijano/Trebolle Barrera, "Septuagint Versions." The authors are not convinced that the Georgian is as great a repository of hexaplaric readings as earlier studies (e.g. Birdsall, "Traces") have attempted to prove (pp. 260–1 n. 29). On the Sahidic, see Piquer Otero, "An Old Greek Reading."

[14] A more thorough history of the development of Syh can be found in Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, and more recently in Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire"; and a better description of some of the issues in the translation and transmission of Syh in Liljeström, "Observations."

[15] Again, see Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials*; and Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion*.

[16] Gwynn, "Paulus Tellensis", 266–71; Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 186–8; Sprengling/Graham, *Barhebraeus' Scholia*, 5; and Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, 247–8. The ancient sources are: Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 12,168 (Catena Patrum), Ms. Par. syr. 27 (colophon 4 Kgdms), Mōšē bar Kēphā, ca. 815–903 CE (*Comm Hexameron*; see Martin, *Introduction*, 1:101), and Barhebraeus, ca. 1226–86 CE. Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History", 178–204 provides a list of colophons from other books of Syh in which the claim is repeatedly made that the copy has been compared with the text of Eusebius and Pamphilus, which itself was a copy of the Hexapla.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

within which Paul worked had in its possession a copy of the LXX text of Eusebius and Pamphilus, complete with the Hexaplaric sigla. A letter from Catholicos Timothy I written in the early 9th century to Mar Sergius quotes from colophons which shed some light on the matter.[17] In this letter, Timothy mentions the colophons at the end of each biblical book of Syh that read, "This was written, collated and compared with the exemplar of Eusebius, Pamphilus and Origen." Timothy's letter suggests that Paul copied from the text of Eusebius and Pamphilus, which may have included the readings from the revisers. He may have indeed obtained some material from such a manuscript, but it is more likely the readings of the Three – as well as those of the more obscure Hebraios, Suros, Samareitikon, etc. – were passed along in varying consistency through the media of bible manuscripts, homilies, and other writings such as the catenae.[18]

The colophons, such as those found at the end of 3 Kgdms, 4 Kgdms, and Isaiah,[19] provide evidence that Syh was produced about nine miles outside of the city of Alexandria at the Enaton.[20] The Monophysite monastic community was founded at the Enaton when the monks of the Monastery of Peter of Iberia were expelled during the time of the Bishop Theodosius of Jerusalem in 535/6 CE and became a place at which ecclesiastical *émigrés* were given shelter during the Persian hostilities led by Khosrau II.[21] John of Ephesus recounts the aftermath of the expulsion of the convent of Peter the Iberian when the convent came to Alexandria "and there it lived

---

[17] Ms. Alqoš 169, fol. 360a–360b. See Braun, "Ein Brief", 312–13. Cf. Brock, *A Brief Outline*, 245–51; Rompay, "Past and Present Perceptions", pars. 34 and 38; Romeny, "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East", 503–10.

[18] This is plausible since in the margins of Syh one also finds quotations from commentators and other recensions. That the marginal readings in Syh probably came from other manuscript sources, notably the catena tradition, is discussed more in 5.3. See also Gentry, "Hexaplaric Materials." This is also the view of Fernández Marcos, who believes the marginal readings of Syh were from predominantly Antiochian sources (private communication). I also make this latter argument in Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire."

[19] The colophon of 3 Kgdms, Ms. Br. Lib. Add. 14,437 (fol. 122[1]) reads :

ܫܟܡ ܗܘ ܕ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܬܩܢ ܘܐܫܬܘܐ ܥܠ ܐܘܪܝܓܢܣ ܘܥܠ ܐܘܣܒܝ ܘܥܠ ܐܘܪܝܓܢܣ ܗܘ ܕ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܬܩܢ ܘܐܫܬܘܐ ܥܠ ܐܘܣܒܝ ܘܥܠ ܐܘܪܝܓܢܣ.

The final word of this colophon could be read as 'Ennatonians', or 'Antonians.' Similar comments are found in Ms. Par. syr. 27 (4 Kgdms) and in Ms. Br. Mus. Orient. 8732 (Isaiah) Cf. Mercati, "Di varie antichissime sottoscrizione", 1–48.

[20] Brooks, *John of Ephesus*, 325. Cf. Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 37. The Enaton is also spelled Ennaton, and means 'milestone', not mile.

[21] Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 36; and Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, 248. Khosrau II, known in Persian sources as خسرو پرویز ('Khosrau Parvez', 'Khosrau, the ever-victorious') was the 22nd Sasanid king of Persia, reigning from 590-628 CE. Initially favorable to Christians, to the extent that some Armenian writers believed he had converted, the Persian king later turned against them and began wars against Rome, eventually extending his campaigns to take Damascus and Jerusalem in 613 and 614. See Frye, "Political History", 164–77.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

in a place called Enaton which means 'ninth', viz. miles."[22] After Chalcedon in 451, the Syrian and Egyptian clerics bound themselves to one another in opposition to their Dyophysite opponents, and during the persecutions they united in the deserts of Egypt;[23] one account suggests that as many as 600 monasteries were present at this time.[24] The precise location of the translation work is not clear, but the Enaton was not the name of the monastery itself.[25]

The translation of Syh was commissioned and encouraged by the Patriarch of Antioch, Athanasios I Gammālā (595–631CE), who was also at the Enaton during this time.[26] Most of the available evidence confirms a date of around 616/17 CE, although some have suggested it could have begun as early as 613 CE.[27] Whether or not Paul was alone in this work is not entirely clear, but it is more than coincidence that at the time of the production of Syh the bishop Thomas Harkel was preparing his translation of the New Testament.[28] Furthermore, a Thomas is mentioned in the colophon to 4 Kgdms as the 'syncellus' of the Patriarch.[29] Antonio M. Ceriani denied that the Thomas mentioned could not have been the Bishop Thomas Harkel who was at the Enaton. Basing his rejection upon the subordinate title ܩܫܝܫܐ used in the subscription, Ceriani insisted that if it were the Bishop Thomas, the more exalted title ܐܦܣܩܦܐ would have been used.[30] John Gwynn on the other hand wrote that it must be Thomas Harkel, because Thomas would have readily served a subordinate capacity to the Patriarch since he had been in exile from his see and had perhaps lost his "Episcopal style."[31] For Gwynn, the omission of the lofty title from Thomas ' name presents no difficulty as

---

[22] Brooks, *John of Ephesus*, 325. Cf. Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 37.

[23] Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History", 179–80. Some of the most notable guests included Athanasios I Gammālā, Paul of Tella, Thomas Harkel, the convent of Peter the Iberian, and Severus of Antioch. Cf. Migne, *Leontius Byzantinus*, 1229.

[24] Cf. Evetts, *Severus of Al'Ashmunein*, 485.

[25] E.g. Baars, *New Syrohexaplaric Texts*, 1. Cf. Brooks, *John of Ephesus*, 325; Kugener, *Zacharias Scholasticus*, 14, 27, 39; and Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 14,541 (fol. 48b).

[26] Gwynn, "Paulus Tellensis", 266–7; Gwynn, "Thomas Harklensis", 1015; Kugener, *Zacharias Scholasticus*, 14.

[27] Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 36–44; Mercati, "Di varie antichissime sottoscrizione", 1–48. The Ambrosian codex also contains a colophon with the date of 617 CE at the end of Daniel and Bel the Dragon.

[28] Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 188–9; Gwynn, "Thomas Harklensis", 1014–21; Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 103–21; Evetts, *Severus of Al'Ashmunein*, 485.

[29] ܐܢ ܩܫܝܫܐ ܗܪܟܠ ܡܢ ܐܬܠܒܝܐ ܩܫܝܫܐ ܬܐܘܡܐ ܗܘ ܐܢ ܐܦܣܩܦܐ ܗܪܟܠ ܕܐܬܠܒ ܒܝܬ ܐܢܛܘܢ ܕܩܪܝ ܬܫܥ ܐܝ ܡܝܠ. See Lagarde, *Bibliothecae Syriacae*, 256, lines 32–3.

[30] Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, 1:v-vi. Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 41, also imagines this is another Thomas.

[31] Gwynn, "Thomas Harklensis", 1015. Cf. Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, 7:234, 237, 249; Bugati, *Daniel*, xxiv; Gwynn, *Remnants*, 2:72.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

it would have been a customary expression of humility from the Syrians.[32] Moreover, the Bishop and the Patriarch had close relations dating back to their time at the Monastery of Qennešrē.[33] Though Gwynn's first suggestion seems contrived – that Thomas had lost his style – one might be persuaded by his suggestion that Thomas was displaying humility towards his Patriarch. Additionally, the two versions, Syh and the Harklean, were completed at the same time (ca 615–17 CE) and share an identical translation philosophy (the Harklean even marking passages with asterisk, obelus, and metobelus).[34] Without context, one might imagine Arthur Vööbus was describing Syh in the following comments: "It is strange how little respect is shown in this version for Syriac idiom and linguistic taste"; "A completely slavish adaptation to the Greek"; " … servility to the Greek text"; and, " … [a] servile and scholarly version."[35] Though one may not be able to decide if this was Bishop Thomas, or another Thomas, who helped in some way in the production of Syh, the consistency of technique throughout the entire translation makes one reasonably certain that, at the very least, one person (Paul) must have been the final editor.[36]

But why was such a translation even considered necessary? Was it simply scholarly fetish? The Peshitta had already been in use in the Church, and not having suffered the same number of revisions as did the LXX, it must have been revered by most of the Church. Nonetheless, a translation was commissioned that paid little attention to Syriac idiom. Sebastian P. Brock's view of the philhellenism in some quarters of the Syrian Church is certainly part of the answer.[37] For Brock and Robert Hiebert, both Syh and the Harklean stood at the end of a continuum in which the Syriac Bibles moved from a dependence upon the Hebrew text to an obsessive reliance upon the Greek.[38] In the middle of the spectrum on which the Peshitta was at one extreme and the seventh century translations at the other stood the version allegedly sponsored by Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbūg (ca 440–523). Bas ter Haar Romeny argued that the translation of Syh was perhaps the result of an increasing need to represent accurately the Greek text of the commentators when they were translated into Syriac. Romeny notes that the

---

[32] Gwynn, *Remnants*, 2:72.

[33] Cf. Abbeloos/Lamy, *Gregorii Barhebraei*, 1:259, 262; Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 42.

[34] Note their presentation side by side in Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 12, 139; cf. Gwynn, "Paulus Tellensis", 267; Gwynn, *Remnants*, 1:xxxii-xli; Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 119.

[35] These are his comments on the Harklean in *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 118-–21.

[36] Vööbus, *Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla*, 43–4. As the tradition has mostly referred to Paul, throughout this study I will refer to the translator of Syh in the singular, though I am inclined to believe there was more than one hand involved in the project.

[37] Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation."

[38] Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation"; Brock, *Bible in the Syriac Tradition*; Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History", 180–1.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

first references to the Greek Bible in Syriac literature can be dated most likely to the fifth century, when the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia were being translated into Syriac.[39] Because these early translations of the commentaries depart from the Peshitta quite regularly, there must have been a palpable need for a consistent method of rendering the Greek.[40] There were a sufficient number of Syrians who had the ability to perform such translations, not least because of the influence of Qennešrē. Of the monastery, Vööbus writes:

> Il monastero di Q. si trasformò in un centro molto importante di vita ascetica nella Chiesa monofisita…Esso deve inoltre la sua celebrità all'essere divenuto un focolaio di vita intellettuale. Il fondatore diede infatti alla sua istituzione un grande impulso, rendendolo *un centro di studi greci e siriaci* per molti secoli.[41]

Fluent bilingualism was surely characteristic of many Syriac scholars of the seventh century, but without a version to reflect precisely their Greek sources, the translators were required to resort to *ad hoc* renderings. With this activity of translating Greek texts, and the problems of consistency associated with *ad hoc* translations, a full version of the Bible was needed. Thus, these new versions, both Syh and the Harklean New Testament, were probably conceived more for pragmatic ends than simply for a love of all things Greek.[42]

1.1.3 The Character of the Translation

The translator of Syh displays a literalness that nearly jeopardises its status as a Syriac version of the Old Testament.[43] Paul has forced his Semitic mother tongue to submit to the rules of an Indo-European language whose structure was markedly different[44] In his study of the grammar of Syh, Thomas Skat Rørdam observed that when read as a piece of Syriac literature, this version is "inter deterrima, quae protulerunt literae Syriacae." When read for the purpose for which it was created, however, as a representation of the text of the LXX, no other version surpasses its value.[45] The similarity of this translation to the Greek translation of the Hebrew produced by Aquila is conspicuous, since in many ways the injustice commit-

[39] Romeny, "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East", 504.
[40] Romeny, "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East", 507.
[41] Vööbus, "Qennešrīn" (emphasis mine).
[42] I provide a brief overview of all of the Syriac versions in Law, "Syriac translations."
[43] This must be part of the reason for the scant attention given to the version by modern scholars, a disregard that it surprising especially as it was a version used in the Church.
[44] Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, 3.
[45] Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, 3.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

ted against Syriac idiom is strikingly similar to Aquila's subjugation of the Greek. Aquila had treated the Greek only as a means to the Hebrew; Paul, the Syriac as a surrogate for the Greek. In Syh, one finds several grammatical peculiarities, among which are the excessive use of the possessive pronoun ܕܝܠ, composite forms used in verbal morphology, and the use of ܩܕ with the perfect.[46] Yet one should not speak about the linguistic value of Syh only in negative terms, for this translator was impressively skilled. For example, in Syh one finds an awareness of Greek nuance and appropriate lexical choices when the Greek word in question has more than one meaning.[47] Nonetheless, there are still no exhaustive studies of the language and translation technique of Syh and, as a result, most assessments are based upon general impressions gained from a casual reading the text. Only a few books have been studied, and until more of them become the subject of intense investigation one cannot begin to approach anything resembling the statistical certainty found in some translation technique studies of the LXX.[48]

There is only space here for two observations on the style of the translation. First, the technique probably reveals the esteem in which Paul and the Syrian Church from the beginning of the seventh century held the LXX. This appreciation of the Greek version persuaded Leo Haefeli radically to assert that Syh was created to replace the Peshitta text in the churches: "Sie ist aus dem Griechischen hergestellt und für die gottesdienstliche Verwendung der melkitischen (palästinischen) Kirche bestimmt."[49] Though Haefeli's conclusion is overreaching, it is true that Syh became more than a work of biblical scholarship after it was completed. The influence of Syh was considerable, spreading throughout Syrian Christianity from the West to the East. As studies on Išoʿ bar Nun and Theodore bar Koni have shown, however, one must be particularly careful when evaluating readings in the lectionaries and other writings: a reading that looks like Syh does not always mean it is Syh.[50] Nonetheless, that this Syriac version came to be admired and used in the Syriac Church is without question.

Second, on a text-historical level Syh is a valuable witness to the textual history of the Greek Bible. In addition to being a witness to the Old Greek

---

[46] See Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*.
[47] Verwijs, "The Hexapla Project and the Main Text of the Syro–Hexapla (Syh) of Amos 1–2."
[48] "Some", because not all of the uses of the statistics have been sufficiently rigorous. For a judicious discussion of the use of statistics, see Aejmelaeus, "What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique", 205–22.
[49] Haefeli, *Peschitta*, 3.
[50] Scher, *Theodore bar Koni*; Molenberg, *Interpreter Interpreted*. Cf. Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, 59.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

(OG) text of Daniel,[51] Syh enables us to get a glimpse of the state of the LXX text in the seventh century. I have questioned elsewhere the extent to which the translator of Syh depended upon the hexaplaric recension,[52] but the translation technique of the Syriac version allows us cautiously to retrovert the readings into the Greek of its putative *Vorlage*.[53] Perhaps even more importantly, Syh is indispensable for the recovery of readings marked in the Hexapla, as well as several lost Greek Jewish versions that also became known to the Christian world through their inclusion in the Hexapla. As this study will show later for 3 Kgdms, in other books as well Syh contains far more evidence of the hexaplaric materials than any Greek manuscript available.[54] Although I have elsewhere urged more methodological rigor before assuming the hexaplaric recension alone is Syh's *Vorlage*,[55] Rahlfs is for the most part still correct: "Syr ist gewöhnlich unser zuverlässigster Zeuge für den hexaplarischen G-Text."[56] To that one should add that Syh is almost always "unser zuverlässigster Zeuge" to the readings of the Three.

This study investigates the degree to which Syh preserves the hexaplaric materials of 3 Kgdms. Current scholarly opinion on the whole of Syh is decidedly in favour of assessing this version's reliability in a positive light. Nonetheless, perceptions gained from these unsystematic readings must be tested by exhaustive analyses like the one attempted here.

1.2 The Present Study

1.2.1 Research in the Modern Period Relevant to the Present Study

In the modern period, the first scholar to take advantage of the value of Syh for the Greek textual history was Frederick Field.[57] When Field compiled his edition of hexaplaric remains, he was able to do something his predecessors would have only dreamed of doing: Field used Syh.[58] Rather than rely-

---

[51] See McLay, *OG and Th Versions of Daniel*; and Kamesar, *Jerome,* 7. Theodotion's translation became the standard text of Daniel, but Syh preserves the original version.
[52] Law, "La version syro–hexaplaire."
[53] Retroversion in itself is notoriously problematic, but less so when the text from which the retroversion is produced is of such a character as Syh. Cf. Weitzman, "Reliability of Retroversions."
[54] In 3 Kgdms, for example, only six other witnesses (one of them the Armenian version) preserve asterisks, and only one witness preserves obeli.
[55] Law, "La version syro–hexaplaire."
[56] Rahlfs, S*eptuaginta–Studien*, 226.
[57] Field , *Origenis hexaplorum*.
[58] See the history of research on the Hexapla in Law, "History of Research."

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

ing solely upon the Greek tradition, Field integrated into his edition the material from this rich source. The fortuitous discovery of the Syh manuscripts that were brought to Milan and published by Ceriani in the *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus* provided Field with the one component that would set his work apart the most from his predecessors. Nonetheless, Field's objective was simply to present all of the hexaplaric materials and not to analyse critically the value of Syh. Therefore, while I refer to Field throughout this entire study,[59] his is not in any way similar to what I attempt here. The most valuable contribution of Field's work for the present study, however, and one part that I rely upon especially in Chapter 5, is his retroversions from Syriac to Greek.

Almost two decades after the publication of Field's work, Siegfried Silberstein considered the differences between *Codex Vaticanus* (B) and *Codex Alexandrinus* (A) in 3 Kgdms.[60] In the two parts to this study Silberstein used Syh as a witness to the hexaplaric recension and, by comparing this text with the two codices, he determined that A, but not B, was a witness to the recension of Origen. Silberstein's research was an important examination of the Greek textual history, but since he used Syh only to illuminate the Greek tradition, he provided little that would impact this study.

Alfred Rahlfs also used Syh in his celebrated studies on Kgdms in 1904 and 1911.[61] This was the first comprehensive treatment of the text-historical difficulties in Kgdms to appear in the 20th century. Rahlfs' study remains impressive, even though it must be remembered that he had no knowledge whatever of καίγε, of Qumran, nor of the advances in the literary-critical study of these books. As a product of its time, however, it is unequaled. One interesting finding for Rahlfs was the 10 cases in 4 Kgdms (1:3, 6; 3:4; 6:8; 7:2; 9:5; 10:19; 15:11; 18:20; and 19:29) where Lucianic readings were quoted anonymously in the margins of Syh. In 3 Kgdms, Rahlfs identified three (3:25; 22:10 and 17),[62] to which I have added four more (1:8; 2:4, 16; and 6:4).[63] This is not the focus of the present study here, but is worth mentioning briefly since the question of Lucianic influence on the translators of Syh is, in my mind, still open.[64] Rahlfs' comments on the textual history will be mentioned as I encounter specific problems, but they are not central to the argument.

---

[59] Because Field is used so frequently in this study, I cite the page number from volume 1 in brackets in the main text, and not in footnotes.
[60] Silberstein, "Über den Ursprung der im Codex Alexandrinus und Vaticanus."
[61] These were collected and reprinted in one volume in 1965 in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*.
[62] See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 391–2.
[63] These anonymous marginal readings have not been fully analysed in 3 Kgdms as it would have required us to go beyond the scope of this thesis.
[64] Cf. Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire."

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

In 1952, John W. Wevers wrote on the value of B as a witness to the OG. His main thesis was that B had suffered from hexaplaric influence even though B was "usually considered to be the best witness to a pre Origenian text for the Books of Kings … "[65] Some of Wevers' comments are still helpful, but the main premises have become obsolete after D. Barthélemy's discoveries in the following decade.[66] Wevers accredited many of the readings in B to hexaplaric influence; but since most of Wevers' examples come from 4 Kgdms, we now know that his interpretation of the data is the result of a pre-καίγε view of the text. At this time in the early 1950s, Wevers knew of only one type of recensional activity and therefore thought that most of the divergences from the OG were due to the Hexapla. After Barthélemy, one is able to recognise Wevers' examples as indications of the καίγε revision, and it comes as no surprise that his samples are mostly taken from the καίγε-influenced B of 4 Kgdms.[67] Nonetheless, since Wevers' methodology required the use of Syh to indicate hexaplaric activity, his work is mentioned at the relevant points in this study.

The research that is most similar to the present one is Charles T. Fritsch's article in 1953 entitled, "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs."[68] Fritsch's focus was on the doublet material in the LXX Proverbs and he used Syh and the sign tradition of this version to determine their origin. He examined three categories of readings: "I. Examples with the Origenian signs correctly noted in SH [Syh]; II. Examples with the Origenian signs incorrectly noted in SH; III. Examples which have no signs in SH."[69] There are several respects in which the present study is similar to that of Fritsch. First, the book I have focused on rivals the book of Proverbs in the difficulties posed by a comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts. Secondly, I also examine the readings in roughly the same categories as those set up by Fritsch. However, it will become clear that the present study is much more exhaustive than his, and my sections further divided to account for the different types of readings that come out of each category. Finally, Fritsch did not separately treat the attributed readings as I do here.

---

[65] Wevers, "Textual History", 178.

[66] All of the issues related to the most recent research on 3–4 Kgdms is discussed in Law, "3–4 Kgdms." Another study appears in Law, "How Not to Use 3 Reigns." Still, readers hardly do better than reading the history of research in Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie*, 5–117.

[67] Read in the light of Barthélemy (Barthélemy, *Devanciers*), Wevers' conclusion concerning the hexaplaric influence on B is almost humourous: "It ought also to be observed that the text of B for III Kgs. is much less influenced by the Hexaplaric text than for IV Kgs…In other words, Hexaplaric influence in III. [*sic*] Kgs is apparently but a negligible factor, whereas in IV Kgs. it is certainly an influence with which one must reckon" (p. 189).

[68] Fritsch, "Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs."

[69] Fritsch, "Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs," 171.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Another study comparable to the present project is Hiebert's published doctoral thesis on the Syrohexaplaric Psalter.[70] In this volume, Hiebert used the text from Ceriani's *Codex Ambrosianus* to produce a diplomatic edition of the Syh Psalter attributed to Paul of Tella. Additionally, Hiebert added a critical apparatus displaying the findings from his collations of nine other Syh Psalter manuscripts. In chapter 3 of his study, Hiebert examines the extent to which hexaplaric influence may be observed in the Psalter attributed to Paul of Tella.[71] In his *Septuaginta-Studien*, Rahlfs had determined that the text of Syh Psalter was not a very reliable witness to the fifth column of Origen's *Hexapla*,[72] but since he had not investigated the question thoroughly, Hiebert sought to establish the validity of Rahlfs' charge.[73] Hiebert studied not only the marked asterisked and obelised readings in Syh Psalter as Rahlfs had done, but also the unmarked readings that showed a different relationship to the Greek and Hebrew texts. This is an important improvement upon Rahlfs because of the likelihood of the hexaplaric signs dropping out in the transmission of the Greek, Armenian, and Syriac witnesses. As I mention in Chapter 6 of my work, it is a very difficult analysis and the critic must be careful not to attribute to the Hexapla every reading that contains an approximation of some sort. Furthermore, in 3 Kgdms the problem is also complicated by the *enchevêtrement* of textual and literary history that makes the discovery of the OG even more formidable.[74]

Two more studies should be mentioned here since they have had a profound influence on the present work. S.P. Brock completed a doctoral dissertation in the University of Oxford on the recensions of 1 Samuel.[75] Since this monograph is mostly concerned with the Greek manuscript tradition, it is noted here not because of its value for a study of Syh, which in any case is hardly extant in 1 Kgdms, but because Brock's perspicacity regarding the

---

[70] Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*. Hiebert also made significant claims regarding the relationship of the Lucianic LXX to the Syh Psalter; I discuss his work in greater detail in Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire." See also Hiebert, "Syriac Biblical Textual History"; and Hiebert, "The Place of the Syriac Versions."

[71] Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, 179–234.

[72] Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 228–32.

[73] Hiebert, *"Syrohexaplaric" Psalter*, 2. Hiebert concluded (232–3) that Rahlfs' impression was correct after all: Paul of Tella's Psalter was not the most faithful witness to Origen's recension.

[74] The phrase "enchevêtrement entre l'histoire textuelle et l'histoire littéraire" was used by Père Dominique Barthélemy in Barthélemy, "L'enchevêtrement."

[75] Brock, *Recensions*. Brock's thesis was completed in 1966, but it was 30 years before it was published in 1996, due finally to the persistence of Bruno Chiesa. Earlier, in 1963, Bo Johnson had studied the Hexaplaric recension in 1 Samuel (Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*). Brock's study eclipsed Johnson's in several respects. First, Brock included Origen's quotations as a source for the fifth column. Second, Brock studied the asterisked material that had been made available by the publication of ms. 731, a manuscript Johnson could have studied himself, but did not. Finally, Johnson's study was an approach that, in Brock's words, "inevitably treated variants in an over mechanical way" (172–3).

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

textual history and his answers to text-critical problems is an example of the soundest scholarship. Brock's ability to unravel such complicated material is the reason why his thesis has remained in use forty years after its completion and why, after all of the advances in the study on the textual history of the historical books, it remains relevant. Brock is referred to throughout this book at those points where his insights have helped me to evaluate Syh.

Brock's student D.G. Deboys likewise investigated the textual history of 4 Kgdms in an M.Litt. thesis in the same university in 1981.[76] In some ways, Deboys' study is even more apposite to the present work since his research was based on the textual history of 4 Kgdms. This student was as interested as his supervisor was in the hexaplaric recension, and he made the appealing suggestion that Origen's *Vorlage* was more likely to have been witnessed by ms. 245 (BMT = v) than, as is often assumed, B.[77] This particular judgment of Deboys' is supported with evidence, but as B in 4 Kgdms has been subjected in its entirety to the καίγε revision, his conclusion is more likely relevant for that book than for 3 Kgdms where καίγε is only manifest in parts. Nonetheless, even though it was not possible to take up a similar investigation, I have noticed throughout 3 Kgdms that 245 shows up in a number of cases as a potential witness to the *Vorlage* of Origen.[78]

This discussion of the modern literature demonstrates that Syh 3 Kgdms – and Syh as a whole – has been neglected for too long. The interest in Syh has mostly remained in the domain of LXX scholarship, but because of its acceptance in the Church during the 7th century, Syriac scholars ought to turn their attention more to the investigation of this peculiar and important version. Even among LXX scholars, however, the version has been ignored, in part perhaps due to the linguistic barriers faced by those with no knowledge of Syriac, but also because scholars wrongly assume its only value is in its character as a literal translation of the LXX. But if Syh is to be used properly, it must firstly be understood; and if it is to be understood properly, it must be analysed meticulously. There are at least two ways this should be done. The text of Syh should be studied in relation to the Greek textual tradition so that its *Vorlage* may be known with more certainty.[79] No attempt has ever been made to treat Syh as a translation of a *Vorlage* in the same way that the LXX has been evaluated as a translation of the Hebrew.

---

[76] Deboys, *Greek Text of 2 Kings*. The thesis is unpublished, but was provided to me by Alison Salvesen.

[77] Deboys, *Greek Text of 2 Kings*, 26–31.

[78] On the other hand, a number of cases in Chapter 3 show that it could not have been. Cf. 2:24, 46; 18:41; 19:5; and 21:1 (all in 3.1). *Codex Venetus* (V) is often another potential witness to Origen's *Vorlage*.

[79] This is the plea I make in the conclusion of Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire', which has received more support in the recent review of R. Ceulemans, "Compte rendu."

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

Until this is done, judgments about the *Vorlage* of Syh are only generalisations. Secondly, the reliability of Syh in the preservation of the hexaplaric materials must be determined. This study aims to respond to the second challenge.

1.2.2 The Scope of the Present Study

This inquiry covers all of Syh 3 Kgdms, but I have restricted myself to evaluating only the hexaplaric materials. By "hexaplaric materials", I refer to the asterisked and obelised readings, and the readings attributed to the revisers.

As already mentioned above, a scrupulous effort to determine more precisely the *Vorlage* of Syh would be welcome, but this unfortunately cannot be done here. Neither was it possible to undertake an analysis of all of the marginal readings in Syh, and I focused instead on those that were indicative of hexaplaric activity. There are important aspects of these readings that will need to be discussed, but this will have to be taken up in another study in the near future.

Regarding the Greek textual history, it was tempting to engage in the debate over the interrelationships between the OG, the recensions and revisions, and the Hebrew textual history, including the differences between the Old Hebrew (OH) and MT.[80] This is a vital area of research that is only just now beginning to attract the attention it deserves after several decades of significant advances by Zippora Talshir, Adrian Schenker, Julio Trebolle Barrera, Percy S.F. van Keulen, and now Philippe Hugo.[81] Where possible, I commented on particular points that helped to explain the problem presented by the evidence of Syh, but for the most part I was forced to resist the temptation to participate in the conversation; Chapter 6 required more direct engagement in this debate than any other chapter. Thus, I will state only briefly the position assumed in this book, but I note here that since it is not the intention of the present work to argue for solutions to the problems found in the Greek text, only at certain places do I offer comments on these questions, and even these are by no means exhaustive.

The OG of 3 Kgdms is a very literal translation of the Old Hebrew (OH), a stage of the Hebrew text predating MT. The nature of the relation-

---

[80] I use the term Old Hebrew after Trebolle Barrera (see "From the Old Latin" and "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew"), to refer to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, which is in my view the precursor to MT.

[81] The most extensive, and finest, discussion (with bibliography) of the recent history of research is in Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie*, 5–117. Two of the authors in particular, Trebolle Barrera and Schenker, boast a massive bibliography on the debate.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

ship between the OH and MT is less certain, but the latter was likely a theological revision of the former. This revision, however, did not take place to such an extent that the entire book was rewritten: in most places, the MT is the same as the putative OH. Instead, this theological revision seems to have been applied to very specific portions of the book (e.g. the narratives of Solomon's wives, Solomon's building, Elijah, etc.). For this reason, one should not assume that every divergence between the OG and MT is the result of theological modification; instead, one should first proceed through the proper steps of textual criticism and translation technique analysis to determine which divergences are due to scribal carelessness, or to the stylistic concerns of the translator. While B often provides us with the best avenue to the OG, it is wrong to assume simplistically that B = OG. There are a number of textual errors within B, some of which are noted in Chapter 6. Therefore, the recovery of the OG requires much more than clinging to a favored witness.[82] When the OG is determined, however, the large-scale differences between the OG and MT are such that there are only three options for explaining them: either 1) the OG translator excersised an editorial liberty in his work; 2) a Greek reviser enacted the radical reshaping of the text; or 3) or that MT is not the *Vorlage* of the OG. The latter is the view taken here.[83]

I did not include in this analysis other hexaplaric activity such as transpositions and qualitative changes, both of which were modifications possibly made in the Hexapla.[84] These are irrelevant here since I chose to restrict the study to the use of the signs, which are employed almost exclusively for quantitative divergences. I do, however, mention the few cases when I encounter these possible uses of the signs (6:27[26 B] in 2.1; 18:46 in 4.1; 20:35 in 4.5; and 21:29 in 4.6). I also avoided scrutinising Origen's quotations to determine his later use of the hexaplaric text. Rahlfs' endeavor in the early 20th century is the only study to have done that.[85] An important aspect of the research on the hexaplaric recension though it is, I was once

---

[82] See the recent discussion of this issue in Law/Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks."

[83] My views are most like those of Trebolle Barrera, Schenker, and Hugo, whose works are mentioned elsewhere, and in the bibliography. Again, as I mentioned just above, Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie*, 5–117 is the best survey of the history of research to date, part of which includes a discussion of the use of the LXX in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible (See also my review of this book in Law, "Review of P. Hugo"). See also the introduction to 1–2 Kgdms in Hugo, "1–2 Kgdms." The first study of the translation technique of the non-καίγε portion of 3 Kgdms has recently appeared (Turkanik, *Of Kings and Reigns*). Turkanik argues that most of the translational differences are the result of the translator's choice, and do not reveal a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, following in the tradition of Wevers. Turkanik's work is, in my opinion, unconvincing. See my more extensive discussion of this book in Law, "How Not to Use 3 Reigns."

[84] See, for example, Brock, *Recensions*, 124–9; and Deboys, *2 Kings*, 103.

[85] Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 63–103. Cf. Brock, *Recensions*, 77–121, for the quotations of 1 Kgdms.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

more required to keep the focus on Syh as a witness to the materials from the Hexapla, which is not the same as the text history of the recension.

1.2.3 The Editions of Syh and the Manuscript of 3 Kingdoms

1.2.3.1 History of Editions of Syh

A brief remark on the history of editions of Syh should be made here before I discuss the manuscript of 3 Kgdms. The original Syh composed by Paul of Tella has not survived, though copies of most of the Old Testament books have been discovered. The Ambrosian Library at Milan has in its collection a copy that was made from the original Syrohexapla, but of the supposed two-volume edition, only the second is extant. The Codex came into the possession of the library in 1767 when it was moved from the monastery of S. Mary Deipara in the desert of Skete, Egypt to the Ambrosian library.[86] The library published small samples in the following years, and as early as 1787 Matthias Norberg edited the text of Jeremiah and Ezekiel from this codex.[87] The next year Gaetano Bugati published the book of Daniel, and in 1820 the Psalter appeared posthumously.[88] Heinrich Middeldorpf's edition contained 4 Kgdms from the Paris manuscript (mentioned below), along with Proverbs, the Twelve Minor Prophets, Job, Canticles, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes from the Ambrosian Syrohexapla.[89] Ceriani's *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, published in seven volumes from 1861–71, contained fragments of the Pentateuch, and also Isaiah, Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and Lamentations from *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus*.[90]

The greatest advance came in 1874 when Ceriani published the entire *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus* in photolithographic images.[91] This was the first attempt to publish the entire codex with the quality this new technology afforded; thus, Ceriani's edition superseded the previous partial reproductions of the manuscript. The codex contains most of the poetic and prophetic sections of the Old Testament, with the books in the order: Psalms (including Psalm 151), Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wis-

---

[86] A summary of this history is found in Field's "Appendix II ad cap. VII" in his *Prolegomena*, 1:lxvii–xix (= Norton, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena* , 127–30). See the more recent treatments in Pasini, "Per la storia della siro–eseplare ambrosiana" and "La siro–eseplare dell'Ambrosiana."
[87] Norberg, *Codex Syriaco–hexaplaris*.
[88] Bugati, *Daniel* and *Psalmi*.
[89] Middeldorpf, *Codex Syriaco–Hexaplaris*.
[90] Ceriani, *Codex Syro–hexaplaris Ambrosianus*.
[91] Ceriani, *Codex Syro–hexaplaris Ambrosianus*.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

dom, Sirach, the Twelve Minor Prophets, Jeremiah (with Baruch, Threni [Lamentations], and the Epistle of Jeremiah), Daniel (with Susanna and Bel the Dragon), Ezekiel, and Isaiah. The latter book has also been published by Vööbus from a manuscript discovered in Jerusalem.[92]

Another cache of manuscripts from the Syrian monastery of S. Mary Deipara is in the British Library.[93] This collection comprises parts of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and 3 Kgdms. From this collection, Rørdam published the texts of Judges and Ruth from 1859–61.[94] In the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris the whole of 4 Kgdms is extant in Ms. Par. Syr. 27. Until Vööbus' discovery of the Midyat Ms. in 1964,[95] the Pentateuch had only been preserved in fragments; Exodus was the only book preserved in whole.[96] However, with his discovery and its subsequent publication, most of the Pentateuch of Syh is now accessible. This means that a full manuscript of Syh is missing only for 1–2 Kgdms (1–2 Sam), I-II Paralipomena, Ezra, and Nehemiah, though selections from these missing books have been published and discussed by Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, Willem Baars, Gwynn, and Charles C. Torrey.[97]

---

[92] Vööbus, "Qennešrīn."

[93] Formerly named the Nitrian collection, William Cureton, the Assistant Keeper of the Manuscripts of the British Museum, studied these manuscripts from 1848 until his death in 1864. A new edition of this work has recently been published by Gorgias Press: Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*. Recently, this collection was moved from the British Museum to the new British Library.

[94] Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth* .

[95] The Midyat Ms. is missing parts. The Genesis text begins at 32.9; Leviticus ends at 26.46a; Numbers doesn't begin until 1.3b; and Deuteronomy ends at 32.25. The manuscript is published in Vööbus, *Pentateuch*.

[96] Vööbus, *Pentateuch*, 24–6. Exodus has also been preserved in Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 12,134; cf. Wright, *Catalogue*, 1:29–30.

[97] Goshen-Gottstein, "Eine Cambridger Syrohexaplahandschrift" and "Neue Syrohexaplafragmente." His sources were Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 14,485 and 14,486, both dating to 824 CE; cf. Wright, *Catalogue*, 1:146–52; Baars, *New Syrohexaplaric Texts*, 104–28 (Baars' sources were Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 14,485-14,486-14,487 [824 CE], and 17,195 [ca 10th cent.]; Ms. Baghdad, Libr. of the Chald. Patr., 211 [1126 CE], and 1112 [12th cent. with a 15th cent. Supplement]; Ms. Rome, Vat. Libr., Borg. Sir. 113; and Ms. Mardin Orth. 47); Gwynn, *Remnants*, part 1, xvi–xviii and 5–25 (Most of Gwynn's selections were found in Andreas Masius' *Syrorum Peculium*, and from a Catena, Br. Mus. Add. 12,168. This catenist recorded Syh readings from 1-2 Paralipomena, I-II Ezra, and Daniel. His I Ezra is the Greek I Esdras, an apocryphal work, while his II Ezra is Nehemiah. Thus, he left out the Hebrew canonical book of Ezra); Torrey, *Ezra Studies*; see now the insightful study by Liljeström, "Looking for Fragments."

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

1.2.3.2 Details of the Manuscript

The manuscript of 3 Kgdms is Br. Lib. Add. Ms. 14,437 (vellum, 78f., 10 1/8" x 6 1/2", I col. 21-28l.), dated to the 8th century.[98] The first folio (52^1) of 3 Kgdms has the title ܕܡܬܪܓܡ ܫܠܝܫܝ ܕܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܡܠ̈ܟܐ ܕܟܬܒ̈ܐ, "The Third Book of Kgdms According to the Septuagint." A shortened title, ܫܠܝܫܝ ܕܡܠ̈ܟܐ, is repeated at the top of almost every tenth folio at 54^2, 64^2, 74^2, 104^2, and 114^2. There is only one lacuna, but a fairly large one from 7:15–8:61a.

The hand is consistent throughout, with only slight variation in some of the marginal notes that may have been copied by another scribe.[99] There are signs which I will refer to as "continuation signs" that have been added to indicate that a signed reading (sub ⁜ or sub ÷) extends beyond the first line and continues on the line where the continuation sign is placed in the right hand margin. Since these were added inconsistently, the metobelus determines the end of the reading, not the presence or absence of the continuation sign. They are not present in readings at 6:24–5; 9:3, 19; 11:7; 12:10; 14:31; 15:5–6; and 16:8. In several other cases they are used, but not on every line of a multi-line reading: 3:22; 6:18; 11:24–5; 16:29; and 22:47–50. Recognition of the function of these signs is important since on several occasions Lagarde's edition (Syh[ed]) and/or the Cambridge Septuagint (BMT) have misread the purpose of the sign and have therefore written misleading notes in their apparatuses.

There are also indices to indicate marginal readings used *passim*, but in many cases the index is in the text with no accompanying marginal reading. The latter are indicated in Syh[ed] by a raised numeral 0 (e.g., ܡܡܠ^0). It is possible these indicate that the marginal notes were the responsibility of another scribe who only haphazardly added the readings. For attributed marginal readings, the scribe placed the indices at the wrong points in the text at 1:2, 11; 2:18; 10:17; 11:5; 14:27; 16:16; 19:21; 20(21 B):5, and 30;[100] but there were no indices placed for readings at 10:17; 15:12; 20:27; and 22:18.

There are 10 different forms of the index used by the scribe(s), and the obelus is used on several ocassions for the same purpose.[101] The asterisk and metobelus are fairly consistently marked throughout. The asterisk appears as an *x* with dots filled in the four spaces between the ends. The metobelus

---

[98] Cf. Baars, *New Syrohexaplaric Texts*, 9.

[99] E.g. in fols. 113^1 and 113^2 the *he* is written in the *serta* script, even though the rest of the note is in the same *estrangela* as the main text.

[100] On the last reading, at 20(21):30, the index which appears in v. 29 has faded ink, as if a deletion were attempted.

[101] The sign at 3:8 (·⁝·) may not be an index, but its purpose is unclear.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

is generally a diagonal line, descending from left to right; at the bottom, there is a perpendicular base. The obelus is not so straightforward, but instead has three basic forms. The first is a horizontal line with one dot above and one below (÷). The second is a horizontal line with one dot below (⁻), which Field called a hypolemniscus. The last line that is only rarely used is a horizontal line with no dots (—), which Field calls a lemniscus. There seems to be no reason to suspect they differed at all in purpose, but if they did, the meaning is unclear just as it was to Field.[102]

In his attempt to insert the hexaplaric signs in the most precise manner, the scribe sometimes ignores the constraints of Syriac by separating the *waw* and other particles from the following word: 2:31; 10:7; 15:4 (preposition ܠ), 29, 30; 16:13; 17:17; and 21(20 B):19 (preposition ܒ). In most cases, however, he does not: 2:22; 3:21; 9:3 (preposition ܠ), 9 (relative ܕ); 10:29; 13:4; 15:23 (relative ܕ); 16:13 (relative ܕ); 17:6; 20(21 B):1, 7, 11; 22:6 2x (1x: preposition ܠ), 38, and 53 (relative ܕ).[103] Syh^{ed} is inconsistent in offering correctives to these: at times Lagarde separated the constituents when the manuscript has not, and at others he left the reading as he found it. In this, Field is more trustworthy.

Finally, there is only one example of an erroneous attribution in the margin related to 1:1: Syh^{mg} reads ܐܡܪ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, and has ܪ between the two lines. The ܪ was probably added later: there is no room between the lines, and this statement "the sickness of David" is not a translation but probably a section heading. Therefore, this reading is not included as an Aquila reading. Syh^{ed} and Field (p. 592) both fail to mention the *alaph*.

1.2.4 Methodology

To ensure precision, I have not relied entirely upon the edition of Lagarde (Syh^{ed}) but have instead checked every case from Syh^{ed} against the microfilm of the manuscript obtained from the British Library. As I have already mentioned above, throughout this work I note those places where Syh^{ed} is inconsistent in modifying what is in the ms. (Syh^{B}). Sometimes Lagarde moves the signs to indicate what he presumes was the intended reading, while other times he does not. These are mostly noted in Chapter 4. There, I find a number of instances where Lagarde does not change the signs where either Field did, or I suggest they both should have: 3:26; 4:3; 6:1, 6(11 B); 13:22; 17:14; 18:43; 20(21 B):12, 33; 21(20 B):20–1; 22:4 and 5. Changes

[102] Field, 1:lviii-lx (= Norton, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena*, 109–13). In this work, I refer to all of the signs as obeli, unless a distinction is necessary.
[103] All of these cases are noted as they appear in the study.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

are made by Lagarde, however, in 4:13; 11:17; 12:27; 14:3; 16:11–12; 17:21; 19:2; 20(21 B):7, 22, 42; and 22:7. It is admirable that in almost every case where even Syh[ed] missteps, Field was correct all along. Lagarde also made several other minor mistakes: at 3:15 he marks the text with an obelus, but the sign is only an index; at 3:26 the manuscript has —, not ⁻; at 6:34 it is Aquila, not Hebraios in the marginal reading; at 18:30 the reading has ⁻ at the beginning and ÷ as a continuation mark, but Syh[ed] has ÷ for all; and at 19:2 the reading has ÷ at the beginning and ⁻ as a continuation mark, but Syh[ed] has ⁻ for all. However, such few slips should be forgiven and Lagarde's work judged as very meticulous for the most part.

1.2.4.1 Presentation of Textual Data

Several points are necessary regarding how I present the textual evidence for each reading with a series of texts followed by an apparatus.[104]

1. The text of Syh is taken from the edition of Lagarde. When the edition deviates from the manuscript and it is important to draw the contrast, the former is Syh[ed] and the latter Syh[B].

2. The Hebrew text is MT, taken from the edition of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). There were no readings in this study that suggested Origen had a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT. On the contrary, the passages in which the OG follows the OH and the hexaplaric tradition follows MT demonstrate that the Hebrew text of the Hexapla had the profile of MT. If there are small-scale divergences between MT and Origen's Hebrew text, they will likely be found when the hexaplaric recension is studied in full.

3. The Greek lemma in each example is taken from the diplomatic edition of *Codex Vaticanus* (B) in BMT, but in the sections of 3 Kgdms where B has been subjected to the καίγε revision (1:1–2:12; 22), I have given the lemma from B and Ant.[105] Because *Vaticanus* has been influenced extensively by the καίγε revision in those places, the Antiochian text provides a good point of comparison since it has escaped καίγε.[106] This is not to

[104] The information on all of the editions is listed in the bibliography.
[105] Ant in this case is the Madrid critical edition of the Antiochian (Lucianic) recension.
[106] Though see Aejmelaeus, "Lost in Reconstruction?" where she discusses the imprudence of assuming the καίγε revision is restricted only to those sections traditionally associated with the revision. See also her more recent study in which she further demonstrates the appropriate meth-

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

suggest that the Antiochian text is precisely the OG in these sections, but that, in the absence of a critical edition for 3 Kgdms, it does at least represent a recension in which many OG renderings are found since it was not subjected the same revision as was B.[107]

4. In several readings, I have listed both B and *O* readings[108] (e.g., 9:9, 15–25; 11:3, and 24–5) since in these sections the material has been rearranged to such an extent that I thought it was necessary to give both.

5. The following are details on the apparatus I present with each reading:

   a. The apparatus used for each reading contains as much information as I considered necessary to give the clearest picture of the textual history. If more data is desired, readers should consult BMT for the latest collations available to the reading public.

   b. The data for each apparatus has been collected from BMT, and the format (e.g., the use of signs such as : and | in the grouping of readings) has been followed, with several modifications and improvements.

      1) The most obvious departure from BMT is that I have chosen to use the Göttingen system for citing the manuscript numbers rather than the letter system of the Cambridge LXX. While many readers still know the manuscripts by the letters in BMT, the Göttingen LXX is the latest scientific edition and will therefore be decisive in the coming years. The Patristic sources and versions are also listed according to their Göttingen symbols, but their readings have been taken from BMT; moreover, for the exact writing to which the citation refers, readers should consult the BMT apparatus *ad locum*. Though I do have access to newer editions of some of these writings than those used by BMT, their readings are mostly supplementary evidence for the material here; since they do not take away anything from my argument, they were not collated again.

---

odology for assessing the recensions and revisions of Kgdms, and continues her criticisms of the careless classification of καίγε: Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake." The most recent examination of the methodological issues is Law/Kauhanen, "Methodological Remarks."

[107] See Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie*, 29–54.

[108] *O* is the hexaplaric recension in 3 Kgdms and is a group made up of *Codex Alexandrinus* and 247 (BMT: x).

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053

2) Readers unfamiliar with the Göttingen system should note that manuscripts are not listed in numerical order as BMT listed manuscripts in alphabetical order. Instead, the Göttingen editors have the duty of assigning each manuscript to a group and of categorising the groups from most important to least important. A list of the groups recently organised by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Pablo Torijano Morales, the editors of the Göttingen 3 Kgdms has been included.[109]

3) While the Göttingen numbers have been used, I am unfortunately hindered by the fact that the work in Madrid is still in progress; therefore, the collations upon which this thesis rests are those of the inferior BMT. Nonetheless, wherever I use 'rell', these readings have been confirmed by the help of P. Torijano Morales, who checked every one of these examples with the collations to which he has access as an editor of the Göttingen edition. It should go without saying that the end result is mine, and if there are any inaccuracies, they are charged to me. To ease any possible confusion, in the *Manuscript Groupings* I have listed those manuscripts not available to BMT, and thus not included in my presentation, in italics.

4) Nonetheless, some improvements to BMT can be made because of newer editions that have been published since.

a) The most significant is the edition of the Antiochian LXX (Ant) already mentioned. For their edition, N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz undertook a new collation of the manuscripts known most familiarly as boc_2e_2 (19-82-93-108-127 = *L*). I have used this edition to check BMT's information on *L* to ensure accuracy since this is a major witness to the OG. The listing of the hexaplaric signs in the Madrid edition is also significantly superior to the information in BMT.

b) Other than the colophons of Syh manuscripts themselves, Barhebraeus (Barh) informs us that Paul of Tella was the one responsible for the Syriac translation of the LXX[110] and he was for some time the only resource for readings from Syh in books that were

[109] Julio Trebolle Barrera, Andrés Piquer Otero, and Pablo Torijano Morales have been especially helpful in a continual collaboration on 3 Kgdms.
[110] Cf. Sprengling/Graham, *Barhebraeus' Scholia*, 5.

© 2011, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783525534052 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647534053