

*A “New Field” for the twenty-first century? Rationale for the Hexapla Project, and a report on its progress.*

*History of Origen’s Hexapla and the non-LXX Greek versions*

The earliest work on the biblical text using the editorial tools of classical antiquity is Origen’s Hexapla, dating to the second quarter of the third century CE. There has been some dispute over its exact purpose: did Origen aim primarily at producing a scholarly, standardized Christian LXX text, at publishing a tool to enable Christians to debate with Jews using comparable texts of Scripture, or a compendium of texts for exegetical purposes?<sup>1</sup> Another point of contention is its extent: did Origen create a six-columned synoptic edition for every book of the translated LXX corpus? Or was it, at least for some books, merely a revised LXX text with marginal notes recording significant alternative renderings culled from later Jewish Greek versions? Would a text like the latter one have been linked to the “Tetrapla” (four-fold version), also mentioned in the tradition?<sup>2</sup> Related issues include what degree of authority the Hebrew text had for Origen, and whether it was included in his synopsis.<sup>3</sup> In any case, it is clear that Origen and his immediate successors Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea were responsible for collecting and

---

<sup>1</sup> S. P. Brock, “Origen’s Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament,” in *Papers Presented to the Fifth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1967* (ed. Frank L. Cross; StPtr 10 = TU 107; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1970), 215–18 (repr. in S. Jellicoe and H. M. Orlinsky [eds.], *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays, with a Prolegomenon* [New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974], 343–46). Most recently, see T. M. Law, “Origen’s Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, apologetics or exegesis?” *Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 1-21.

<sup>2</sup> See S. Sipilä, “Max Leopold Margolis and the Origenic Recension in Joshua”; L. J. Greenspoon, “A Preliminary Publication of Max Leopold Margolis’s *Andreas Masius*, together with his Discussion of Hexapla-Tetrapla,” and R. G. Jenkins, “Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question,” all in *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 16–38; 39-69; 73–87.

<sup>3</sup> Pierre Nautin’s view that there was no Hebrew column in the Hexapla (*Origène: Sa vie et son œuvre* [Paris: Beauchesne, 1977], 315) was refuted on the codicological evidence by R. G. Jenkins, “The First Column of the Hexapla: the evidence of the Milan Codex (Rahlfs 1098) and the Cairo Genizah fragment (Rahlfs 2005)” and one the basis of patristic testimony and the layout of the Greek columns by G. Norton, “Observations on the First Two Columns of the Hexapla”, both in *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments*, 103–24 (Norton) and 88–102 (Jenkins). For Origen’s attitude to the status of the Hebrew biblical text, see A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and The Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford Classical Monographs Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 4–28, and E. L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (VCS 114; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 69–85.

preserving alternative Greek versions to the LXX, almost all from Jewish sources. The results of such activity are also the main focus of modern scholars, rather than a reconstruction of the putative six (or more) columned synopsis that may never have existed in full for the entire translated corpus of LXX.

This “Hexaplaric” activity became more and more attenuated with the loss of Origen’s motivation within the context of textual issues and interfaith polemic. Critical marks (asterisks and obeli) deriving from Origen’s edition of the LXX appear in a small proportion of textual witnesses. Short readings from various non-LXX versions made their way into Christian LXX manuscripts in both the main text and margins, and into scholarly exegesis of the Old Testament by Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian Christian writers. Though these non-LXX versions were at first regarded with suspicion by Christian intellectuals such as Justin, Irenaeus, Theodoret, and Epiphanius,<sup>4</sup> Origen’s use of them in his own commentaries began a process of “domestication” of these readings in a Christian setting where they were redeployed to explicate apparent difficulties in the LXX text and even to support specifically Christian exegesis.<sup>5</sup>

Origen’s revised LXX text (whether this was contained in the Hexapla’s fifth column directly, or was a product of it<sup>6</sup>) was rendered into Syriac by Paul of Tella in

---

<sup>4</sup> A. Salvesen, “Aquila, Symmachus and the Translation of Proof-texts,” in *Die Septuaginta –Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012* (eds. W. Kraus and S. Kreuzer; WUNT 325; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 154–68. Also on this and several other issues covered by the present chapter, see the stimulating article of Olivier Munnich, “Les révisions juives de la Septante. Modalités et fonctions de leur transmission. Enjeux éditoriaux contemporains,” in *La Bible juive dans l’Antiquité* (eds. R. Gounelle and J. Joosten; HTB 9; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2014), 141–90 [141-42]. Although I do not agree with every element of his analysis, I have learned much from his fine scholarship in this meeting point of Septuagint, Jewish studies, and patristics.

<sup>5</sup> S. Morlet, “L’utilisation des révisions juives de la Septante dans la première littérature chrétienne. Philologie, exégèse et polémique,” in *La Bible juive dans l’Antiquité* (eds. R. Gounelle and J. Joosten; HTB 9; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2014), 117–140 [119-20]; Morlet believes that Origen’s *Letter to Africanus* influenced Christian scholarly interest in the later versions. See also A. Salvesen, “The “Three” in Early Christian commentary: the case of the ‘Song of the Vineyard’ (Isaiah 5:1–7),” in *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 48 (2015): 73–86.

<sup>6</sup> Various views have been expressed on this topic. A representative sample can be found in the following : B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, vol 1 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 18/1–2; Basle: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1987), vol. 1, 88–94; J. Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla” in *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments*, 3–15; O. Munnich, “Les Hexaples d’Origène à la lumière de la tradition manuscrite de la Bible grecque,” in *Origeniana Sexta: Origène et la Bible; actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum Chantilly, 30 août – 3 septembre 1993*, (eds. G. Dorival and A. Le Boulluec; BETL 118; Paris / Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 167–185, and Munnich, “Les révisions juives de la Septante,” 181–85; and also in the note above on the “Tetrapla”.

Egypt in 617/8, and the margins of books in this “Syrohexaplaric” version were adorned with readings from the non-LXX versions.<sup>7</sup> However, there is speculation concerning his Vorlage: was it the fifth column of the Hexapla, or a separate revised text by Origen, or the “Tetrapla”?<sup>8</sup> After this point in history, or even before, the synoptic Hexapla, apparently kept in the ecclesiastical library in Caesarea of Palestine, seems to disappear. The turmoil of the seventh century is probably responsible, but we have no evidence of what may have happened to it.

Reinhart Ceulemans has argued convincingly that separate texts of the “Three” (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) were not copied and did not circulate in the Church outside the Hexapla, and so Christian access to the “Three” was always directly or indirectly dependent on the Hexapla.<sup>9</sup> So apart from the folios found in the Cairo Geniza that may preserve a fifth–sixth century Jewish text of Aquila’s version of 1 Kings 20:7-17 and 2 Kings 23:12-27,<sup>10</sup> and fragments of Psalms 90–103 (both employing the Palaeo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton),<sup>11</sup> any preservation of these later Jewish Greek versions was dependent on the vagaries of Christian interest.

---

<sup>7</sup> T. M. Law, *Origenes Orientalis: The Preservation of Origen’s Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Reigns* (De Septuaginta Investigationes 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 16-24, 370. See also the article on the Syrohexapla by Ignacio Carbajosa in the present volume.

<sup>8</sup> See the discussion under 3.1 of Carbajosa’s chapter on the Syrohexapla in this volume.

<sup>9</sup> Ceulemans, “Greek Christian access to the Three,” in *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis* (eds. T. M. Law and A. Salvesen; CBET 66; Leuven / Paris / Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2012), 165–91. For a similar view, see also Munnich, “Les revisions juives de la Septante,” 178–80.

<sup>10</sup> Published in F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings, according to the translation of Aquila from a MS. Formerly in the Geniza at Cairo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897); K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (CBOT 10; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1977). The assumption that it is a Jewish text has been questioned recently by E. L. Gallagher, “The Religious Provenance of the Aquila Manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 64 (2013): 283–305, who notes that at a line end the scribe supplied the (normally Christian) *nomen sacrum* KY, as observed by other scholars, the text was part of a manuscript reusing a text from John’s Gospel in Christian Palestinian Aramaic and the Hexapla Psalm 21/22 text (M. Sokoloff and J. Yahalom, “Christian Palimpsests from the Cairo Geniza,” *Revue d’histoire des textes* 8 (1978): 109–132 [111]).

There is also a fragment of Aquila Gen. 1:1–5 from Egypt that is clearly Christian since it is written on the reverse of a Christian letter (dated to the second half of the third century CE): A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (4<sup>th</sup> edn. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1923), 172–79, and see Gallagher, “Religious Provenance,” 286.

<sup>11</sup> Published by C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), pp. 51–85.

The brief inscription from Iznik/Nicea (with menorah symbol, so definitely Jewish) may also derive from Aquila’s version: A. Salvesen, “Psalm 135(136).25 in a Jewish Greek inscription from Nicea,” in *Semitic Studies in Honour of Edward Ullendorff* (ed. G.A. Khan; Leiden / Boston, 2005), 212–221.

Early editions of these readings are summarized in Michael Law's helpful article,<sup>12</sup> though he does not comment explicitly on what motivated scholars from the late sixteenth century to gather them together and present them to the public. The reason must lie with the rise of philological interest in Scripture, stimulated by both secular and religious developments in Europe, namely the Renaissance and the movements of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, leading to a desire to study the bible in its Hebrew and Greek forms, and it was certainly connected to the development of printing which disseminated the findings more widely. The names of Masius, Morinus, Nobilius, Drusius, Walton, are well known to scholars today, those of Poole and Bos less famous. But it was Bernard de Montfaucon's 1713 edition that marked "the first major attempt to produce an entire collection"<sup>13</sup> and it was an enormous influence on Frederick Field's own work, published in two volumes in 1875.

Field's especial contribution was to include not only newly discovered Greek readings, but also readings of the later versions from the Syrohexapla (thanks to the cooperation of Ceriani). These readings Field ably retroverted into Greek. Other major advances of Field's edition were his Prolegomena (the extensive introduction to the collection examining aspects of the preserved versions),<sup>14</sup> and the footnoted discussion of individual readings. The layout and typography of Field's edition are exemplary and enable both rapid consultation and browsing. More than anything, in his extensive Prolegomena and his running comments on the readings, Field displayed an unrivalled command of the material that leads one to trust his judgment.

However, even the best scholarship can become dated. Field was unable to perform the manuscript collations that would have enabled him to check his Greek sources<sup>15</sup> and so his work is mainly reliant on the Hexaplaric collections of his

---

<sup>12</sup> T. M. Law, "A History of Research on Origen's Hexapla: From Masius to the Hexapla Project," *BIOCS* 40 (2007): 30–48.

<sup>13</sup> Law, "History of Research on Origen's Hexapla", 38. Montfaucon's title for his collection was *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, deliberately imitated by Field for his own work in order to emphasise the continuity between the collections.

<sup>14</sup> For an English translation, see G. J. Norton, OP, *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. (With the collaboration of Carmen Hardin; Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 62; Paris: Gabalda, 2005).

<sup>15</sup> Law, "History of Research on Origen's Hexapla," 44.

predecessors (especially Montfaucon's), and on the LXX collations of Holmes-Parsons,<sup>16</sup> which have now been superseded by those of the Cambridge and Göttingen editions. He also wrote entirely in Latin, which even by the later nineteenth century was no longer normative practice. As Law observes, Field's presentation of the versions would have differed if he had known Barthélemy's identification of an early recensional group often resembling the version of Theodotion and preceding the revision of Aquila.<sup>17</sup>

Within a few decades of publication of Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum*, more material had been found<sup>18</sup> among the Cairo Geniza fragments, including a palimpsest of columns two to five of a seventh century copy of the Hexapla to Psalm 21 [MT 22].<sup>19</sup> Another palimpsest fragment from a copy of the Hexapla of Psalms was discovered in the Ambrosian Library in Milan in 1896 (Rahlfs 1098), though it was not fully published until 1958.<sup>20</sup> Aside from some fragmentary Syrohexaplaric texts with just a few readings from the *recentiores*,<sup>21</sup> a more significant find was the twelfth century Midyat manuscript of the Syrohexaplaric Pentateuch, which contained some Hexaplaric readings in the margins.<sup>22</sup> New editions of patristic commentaries have had much to contribute, particularly Ziegler's edition of the *Commentary on Isaiah* by Eusebius of Caesarea, which contains many readings of the "Three",<sup>23</sup> and added to the marginal readings for Isaiah chs. 1–16 in the tenth century Sinai manuscript published in 1915.<sup>24</sup> Much has been accomplished in the highly complex catena tradition, for instance Schenker's study

---

<sup>16</sup> R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford: 1798–1827).

<sup>17</sup> Law, "History of Research on Origen's Hexapla", 45.

<sup>18</sup> As noted by Sebastian P. Brock in his review of Schenker (see below), *VT* 27/3 (1977): 381–83; already in 1977 Brock includes a useful list of further Hexaplaric material not contained in Field's edition.

<sup>19</sup> Taylor-Schechter 12.182. C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 54–65. The Divine Name appears as ΠΙΠΙ. See note above on the Aquila palimpsest also found in the Geniza.

<sup>20</sup> G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae. Pars Prima. Codex Rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae O 39 sup. phototypice expressus et transcriptus* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958), and Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae. Pars Prima. "Osservazioni." Commento critico al testo dei frammenti esaplarici* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1965). See the useful description of the fragments in S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 130–33.

<sup>21</sup> E.g. W. Baars, *New Syrohexaplaric Texts, edited commented upon and compared with the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 136–45 (Deut. 32:1–43 in a manuscript of 1126).

<sup>22</sup> A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla: a facsimile edition of a Midyat MS. discovered 1964* (CSCO 369: Subsidia 45; Louvain: Peeters, 1975).

<sup>23</sup> J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975).

<sup>24</sup> L. Lütkefmann and A. Rahlfs, *Hexaplarische Randnoten zu Isaias 1–16, aus einer Sinai-Handschrift* (MSU 1.6; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1915).

of Hexaplaric Psalm material in two catena manuscripts,<sup>25</sup> and especially Françoise Petit's extensive and groundbreaking editions of catenae to Genesis and Exodus.<sup>26</sup> Reinhart Ceulemans has identified Hexaplaric readings in the catenae to Canticles.<sup>27</sup> Natalio Fernández Marcos has listed new Hexaplaric readings in the catena tradition of 1 Kings/ 3 Kingdoms, as edited by Petit.<sup>28</sup> Claude Cox's monograph presents a number of readings of the "Three" in Armenian and Georgian manuscripts, for Joshua, Judges, 1–4 Kingdoms, 2 Chronicles, Job, Isaiah, and Ezekiel.<sup>29</sup> Jost Gippert notes the presence of material relating to the Syrohexapla of Canticles and Ecclesiastes in an Armenian palimpsest from Sinai.<sup>30</sup> The possibility of further new material preserved in Armenian has also been signalled recently.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>25</sup> A. Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke: Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (OBO 8; Universitätsverlag Freiburg and Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975).

<sup>26</sup> F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. I, Chapitres 1 à 3* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 1; Leuven: Peeters, 1991); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. II, Chapitres 4 à 11* (TEG 2; Leuven: Peeters, 1993); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. III, Chapitres 12 à 28* (TEG 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1995); *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. IV, Chapitres 29 à 50* (TEG 4; Leuven: Peeters, 1996); *La chaîne sur l'Exode. I. Fragments de Sévère d'Antioche* (TEG 9; Leuven: Peeters, 1999); *La Chaîne sur l'Exode. Édition intégrale II. Collectio Coisliniana; III. Fonds caténique ancien (Exode 1,1-15,21)* (TEG 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2000); *La chaîne sur l'Exode. Édition intégrale IV. Fonds caténique ancien (Exode 15,22 - 40,32)* (TEG 11; Leuven: Peeters, 2001).

<sup>27</sup> R. Ceulemans, "New hexaplaric data for the Book of Canticles as discovered in the Catenae," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 41-54; Ceulemans, "Unknown hexaplaric readings of Ezekiel, Isaiah and Psalms, offered by Apollinaris of Laodicea," *ZAW* 123 (2011): 406-23 (in which he points out that the catenae known in Field's time and even more recently were not subject to proper editing, leading to the neglect of Hexaplaric readings contained therein [407]); Ceulemans, "Apollinaris of Laodicea in the catenae as a source of Hexaplaric readings," *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum = Journal of Ancient Christianity* 15/3 (2011), 431-49; Ceulemans, "Nouveaux témoins manuscrits de la chaîne de Polychronios sur le cantique (CPG C 83)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104/2 (2011): 603-28; Ceulemans, "New manuscripts of the catena Trium Patrum ('B2') and of the commentaries by Theodoret of Cyrillus and the Three Fathers ('B1') on the Song of Songs," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011): 105–20.

<sup>28</sup> "New Hexaplaric Readings to the LXX 1 Kings" in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (eds. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; SupJSJ 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 391–400, using material from the edition of F. Petit, *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr: La "collectio Coisliniana" sur les derniers livres de l'Octateuque et sur les Règles: Le 'Commentaire sur les Règles' de Procope de Gaza* (TEG 13. Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

<sup>29</sup> C. E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (SBL SCS 42; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996). Some of the readings are not found in other sources.

<sup>30</sup> Gippert, "Hexaplaric Material in the Albano-Armenian Palimpsests from Mt. Sinai" in *Caucasus between East and West. Historical and Philological Studies in Honour of Zaza Aleksidze/ K'avk'asia aġmosavletsa da dasavlets šoris. Ist'oriul-pilologiuri dziebani midzġvnili Zaza Aleksidzis dabadebis 75 c'listavisadmi* (ed. Dali Čitunašvili; Xelnac'erta erovnuli cent'ri 2012. Tbilisi 2012), 202-211.

<sup>31</sup> Personal communications by colleagues at Oxford, the present and former Gulbenkian Professors of Armenian. Theo van Lint notes that the Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel by Esayi Nch'ec'i (1255?–

Some of these findings that postdated Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum fragmenta* were included in the Cambridge and Göttingen editions, which were both based on extensive manuscript collations and generally listed readings from the non-LXX versions in the second apparatus. Individual studies of Hexaplaric material for various books have been published since 1970s, and these incorporated new material.<sup>32</sup> However, all such readings should once again be brought together and edited.

*The value of the material, and the need for a modern edition*

Modern scholars appreciate the alternative renderings of Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus, and other non-LXX Greek versions transmitted by or associated with Origen's Hexapla, in a fashion not too far from that of their forebears in the patristic and early modern periods: namely, for the insights they offer into the meaning of obscure words and phrases that are not necessarily much elucidated by LXX alone. However, researchers today also value the non-LXX versions for their text-critical value. For textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the evidence from later versions sometimes reflects alternative vocalisations of individual words, and may even occasionally indicate that a small number of minor non-MT Hebrew variants were still in circulation in the second century CE.<sup>33</sup> For LXX textual criticism, tracing the influence of the "Three" and other later versions can be of some aid in reconstruction of the "Old Greek": this is essentially why Hexaplaric material of every sort is included in both the Cambridge and Göttingen

---

1338), written in 1303/4, has many references to readings of the Three. Robert L. Thomson has reported that he is working on a thirteenth century *Commentary on the Psalms* by Vardan Arewelci, "a rather lengthy work that survives in a large number of MSS and was published in Astrakhan in 1797... Vardan provides a very large number of variant readings to the biblical text, which he specifically identifies as: The Hebrew (rarely), the Syrians (rarely), the Seventy (often), Symmachus (very often) in conjunction with Aquila and Theodotion (though Symmachus appears sometimes alone)". I am grateful to Prof. van Lint and Prof. Thomson for this intriguing information.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. J. R. Busto Saiz, *La Traducción de Símaco en el Libro de los Salmos* (Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros" 22; Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, CSIC, 1978); J. González Luis, "La Versión de Símaco a los Profetas Mayores" (Tesis Doctoral, Universidad de Complutense de Madrid, 1981); A. G. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991); P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SCS 38; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).

<sup>33</sup> E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn., 2012), 141-45. See also Salvesen, "The Role of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Modern Commentaries on the Bible" in *Let Us Go Up to Zion. Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (eds. I. Provan and M. Boda (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 95-112. Munnich, "Les révisions juives," 186, believes that no Hebrew text in the early third century CE would have deviated at all from MT; however, there is evidence of minor variants not only in the ancient non-LXX Greek versions but also in the Hebrew medieval manuscript tradition.

editions, so that later strata of the tradition can be traced, since it is pertinent to disentangling OG strata from later recensions, e.g. Kaige and Lucian.<sup>34</sup>

The *recentiores* shed light on the history of philology and exegesis of Hebrew Bible among Jews at the turn of the Era up to 200 CE,<sup>35</sup> and can be compared or contrasted to early rabbinic exegesis in Hebrew and Aramaic. The intertwining of Hebrew and rabbinic knowledge with LXX and later Jewish Greek renderings found in Jerome's *iuxta Hebraeos* and his commentaries can be traced by the study of Hexaplaric remnants.<sup>36</sup> The later versions add to our knowledge of ancient translation practices, for instance the contrast between the isomorphic approach of Kaige/Theodotion and the freer one of Symmachus: these versions may even have coexisted in similar milieux. Most importantly, the versions of Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus, Quinta, Sexta, Septima, etc. remind us that not only did the LXX corpus start life as a Jewish translation used widely throughout the large Greek-speaking Diaspora and no doubt also within Palestine, but that Greek-speaking Jews continued to use Greek versions of scripture for many centuries (even in Hebrew characters).<sup>37</sup>

Patristic use of the "Three" in the commentaries of Orgien, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodoret of Cyrus, John Chrysostom, Jerome, and others,<sup>38</sup> illustrates the attitude of ecclesiastical writers to the authority of the text of Scripture in its various forms. An artefactual approach to the manuscripts bearing readings from the non-LXX versions can

---

<sup>34</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (eds. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, with B. Doyle; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 151–61; T. M. Law, "Symmachus in Antioch? The Relationship between the Antiochian Text and Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Reigns)," *Textus* 25 (2010): 29–48.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Salvesen, "Midrash in Greek? An Exploration of the Versions of Aquila and Symmachus in Exodus," in *On Stone and Scroll. Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (eds. K. Dell and J. K. Aitken; Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), 523–36.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 121–26; Colette Estin, *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions Juives antérieures* (Rome: San Girolamo, 1984); P. Jay, *L'Exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985); M. Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology. A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (VCS 90; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007).

<sup>37</sup> See the articles in eds. N. de Lange, J. Krivoruchko, and C. Boyd-Taylor, *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (TSMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr, 2009); T. M. Law and A. Salvesen, eds., *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis (Papers from the ESAJS seminars, 2010)*. (CBET 66; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2012).

<sup>38</sup> Also R. Ceulemans, "The Greek Christian afterlife of the minor versions: the possibilities of a shift in perspective," in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual criticism in honour of Florentino García Martínez* (eds. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, M. 2. BETL 224; Leuven / Paris / Dudley MA: Peeters, 2008), 101–117.

contribute to wider discussions of scribal practice and the transmission of learning in Late Antiquity.

Finally, the “Three” and other versions offer interesting lexical information, and may reflect the type of Greek education accessed by the bilingual translators in their Jewish context.<sup>39</sup>

### *The need for a new, scientific edition*

The case for a new edition of “Hexaplaric” fragments has already been made by Gerard Norton, Peter Gentry and Bas ter Haar Romeny.<sup>40</sup> I hope the above remarks have further strengthened the case for the importance of the non-LXX Greek versions that have fortunately been transmitted to us through Origen’s Hexapla and works associated with it. The following section repeats my colleagues’ arguments for an edition that builds on and improves the work of Field in a number of ways. Obviously it must include the new material discovered since 1875, often published but not easily accessible. It should also include new witnesses to readings known for some time, even to Field and his predecessors: for instance the Greek catena tradition or medieval Armenian commentaries may provide additional testimony, perhaps regarding the attribution; and if not (such later works often do not include as much information as earlier witnesses), it is still of interest to see how a reading is transmitted, often for different reasons than the source from which it is derived.

Material under the obelus or asterisk should be included, since this is not only “Hexaplaric” in the strictest sense, but is likely in many cases to have been derived from one of the “Three”, even if there is no explicit attribution in the witness.

---

<sup>39</sup> J. Lust, “A Lexicon of Symmachus’ Translation of the Psalms,” *ETL* 74 (1998): 87–92; M. van der Meer, “Ἰερησκεία, Terra Incognita, and Terra Devastata: Vocabulary and Theology of Symmachus,” in *XIV Congress IOSCS, 2010* (ed. M. K. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2013), 499–514.

<sup>40</sup> G. J. Norton, “Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 45; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 251–262; R. B. ter Haar Romeny and Peter J. Gentry, “Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 51; Atlanta, GA.: Scholars, 2001), 285–99.

Not surprisingly, Field's use of Latin should be eschewed in favour of English, as the main current medium for scholarly discussion. Manuscript numbers and other references to witnesses should conform to the norms of the Göttingen Unternehmen.

Any errors detected in Field's work should be noted and corrected: for instance, any retroversions into Greek that are proved to be unreliable,<sup>41</sup> and any readings whose source cannot be traced (e.g. inherited from Masius or others) should be marked as such.

Material transmitted in a script other than Greek or Latin should be presented in that script, rather than run the risk of confusion or misrepresentation by translating it into Latin<sup>42</sup> or English (though Field's retroversions from Syriac should be checked and retained).

A particular desideratum is an expansion of Field's use of "parahexaplaric" material – for instance the "Samaritan" material in the Pentateuch, in the light of catena finds, and comparison with "Samaritan" tendencies found in some Qumran biblical texts.<sup>43</sup> The project should also include the findings concerning versions such as "Ὁ Σύβορος".<sup>44</sup> Such material is of course not strictly hexaplaric, but it is related to the hexaplaric material in two ways: it was often transmitted alongside the later Greek versions (the "Three", Quinta, Sexta, and Septima) in both manuscripts and exegesis, and for modern scholars it provides further information on the development of the biblical text and its interpretation in antiquity.

### *The genesis of the Hexapla Project*

---

<sup>41</sup> The general (but not complete) reliability of Field's retroversions from Syriac is noted by M. Weitzman, "The Reliability of Retroversions of the Three from the Syrohexapla: A Pilot Study in Hosea," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 317–59.

<sup>42</sup> The late John Wevers privately admitted that the rule of rendering Syriac readings into Latin in the Göttingen editions was both irksome for the editor and confusing for the reader (in conversation with the present writer, at IOSCS in SBL Toronto, November 2002).

<sup>43</sup> B. J. Marsh, "Early Christian Scripture And The Samaritan Pentateuch: A Study In Hexaplaric Manuscript Activity" DPhil dissertation, Oxford, 2016, on "Samaritan" material preserved in Christian sources. Marsh demonstrates a clear distinction between the τὸ σαμ' readings (e.g. in the catenae) and the "ba-lēhūd" ("[found] only in the Samaritan version") notes in the Syrohexapla: "Typologically, the groups can be consistently distinguished in four key areas: i. codicological provenance; ii. textual nature; iii. 'Samaritan' character; and iv. discernible historical context".

<sup>44</sup> See R. B. ter Haar Romeny, 'Quis Sit Ho Suros Revisited' in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 360–98, and Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress. The Use of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (TEG 6; Leuven: Peeters, 1997).

First, to recapitulate some history: the Hexapla Project emerged from a ten day seminar on Origen's Hexapla held at the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, Yarnton Manor, in 1994.<sup>45</sup> It became clear to the participants that what was needed to develop further studies would be "a Field for the twenty-first century". Progress in technology led the scholars involved to favour an electronic database of material that could be easily updated as new material was discovered, and searchable for attributions, witnesses, and lexical items.<sup>46</sup> Gerard Norton, a former student of Dominique Barthélemy, was particularly keen to forward this work. In 1995 he gave a paper on what this would be likely to involve.<sup>47</sup> Connections with, and a profound respect for, the work of the Göttingen Unternehmen meant that the Hexapla Project looked primarily to the material collected in the second apparatus of the Göttingen editions as the basis of the edition,<sup>48</sup> though as new material was discovered (e.g. from the catenae) this would be incorporated in the new Hexapla edition. Books were assigned to individuals or scholars working in pairs. Peter Gentry and Bas ter Haar Romeny, who were also participants at the Rich Seminar, collaborated on the the book of Genesis, and at a conference in 1998 they presented samples of what the electronic mark-up might look like.<sup>49</sup>

### *A report on progress*

More than twenty years since the Hexapla Project was first outline, much has been accomplished, but sadly we are still a long way from a complete "New Field". The task has proved much greater than could have been foreseen in the 1990s. The technology of databases has progressed far more rapidly than the pace of the careful research being carried out on the entries, and both the development of software and websites and also the maintenance of servers entail ongoing expenses for which it is hard to find longterm

---

<sup>45</sup> A. Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25<sup>th</sup> July–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

<sup>46</sup> H. P. Scanlin, "A new edition of *Origen's Hexapla*: How it might be done," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, 439–449; naturally much of the technology and programming suggested by Scanlin has long since been superseded.

<sup>47</sup> Norton, "Collecting Data".

<sup>48</sup> John Wevers gave the Hexapla Project his blessing and encouragement.

<sup>49</sup> Romeny and Gentry, "Towards a New Collection," 299. The current format has changed a good deal since then.

funding.<sup>50</sup> Even in the digital age, the codex form has certain advantages of permanence and ease of consultation, and Peeters Press has undertaken to publish the volumes in a hard copy edition. Recent doctoral dissertations from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven have edited and presented hexaplaric and parahexaplaric material for several books. The following are being prepared for publication: these are Numbers, Ecclesiastes, Job,<sup>51</sup> and Canticles.<sup>52</sup> The researchers responsible for this work have helped to refine the methodology and presentation of the edition. Their efforts have highlighted the sheer amount of material that exists in a wide variety of witnesses.

Other related studies have contributed to the field in recent years. The following are just a few highlights: Ceulemans' articles on the significance of patristic references to "οἱ περὶ α'/σ'" etc.;<sup>53</sup> the research, conferences and volume of papers associated with the Cambridge project "The Greek Bible in Byzantine Judaism" has examined the afterlife of Jewish Greek versions of scripture;<sup>54</sup> the doctoral thesis of Lorenzo Cuppi on doublets in Proverbs;<sup>55</sup> the very recent monograph of Mariachiara Fincati investigating the many-layered traditions in the text and marginalia of the important Hexateuch manuscript F of the Ambrosian Library.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Louisville, Kentucky) generously supported the project database in the early years.

<sup>51</sup> Kevin Burris, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 1-18." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009; Andrew H. McClurg, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 19-36." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011; Phillip S. Marshall, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2007; Nancy Woods, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: Chapters 1-21." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009; John D. Meade, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22-42." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012. Meade's revised PhD will be published imminently by Peeters Press.

<sup>52</sup> Reinhart Ceulemans, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis." Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009.

<sup>53</sup> Ceulemans, "Readings attributed to 'οἱ περὶ α' and/or σ'" by Theodoret of Cyrhus" in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 473-97; Ceulemans, "Readings attributed to 'οἱ περὶ (τὸν) Ἀκύλαν and/or (τὸν) Σύμμαχον" by Greek Christian scribes and authors (Theodoret excepted)," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 4 (2011): 73-88.

<sup>54</sup> Eds. de Lange, Krivoruchko, Boyd-Taylor, *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions*.

<sup>55</sup> L. Cuppi, "Long Doublets in the Septuagint of the Book of Proverbs with a history of the research on the Greek translations," PhD dissertation, Durham University, 2011.

<sup>56</sup> M. Fincati, *The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch: Critical Editing between Septuaginta and Hebraica Veritas in Ms. Ambrosianus A 147 inf.* (De Septuaginta Investigationes 5. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

### *Criticisms of the Hexapla Project*

In a recent article Olivier Munnich raised a number of criticisms of the Hexapla Project and its approach.<sup>57</sup> Munnich argues that the Göttingen editions' second apparatus is in effect already “a «new Field»” and therefore adequate for the purposes of studying the later Jewish Greek versions of Scripture.<sup>58</sup> He objects to Gerard Norton's 1995 statement that a Göttingen editor notes “attributions of the [Hexaplaric] material in the manuscripts, but does not comment on the authenticity of that reading”.<sup>59</sup> Munnich notes the “*appréciation soigneuse*” applied by the Göttingen editors to each attribution, with dubious or corrected attributions being marked by different brackets in the second apparatus. This is true, but Norton was referring principally to the lack of *overt discussion* of reasons for the choice of attributions and readings, a discussion that Field often supplied. Of course, the very format of the Göttingen second apparatus does not allow for this kind of discursive editorial comment. Field's edition is still used today because it supplies the element of explicit commentary that the Göttingen editions lack, even though Field's use of Latin has become a barrier to many scholars today, and the collations he used too limited to be reliable. More to the point, Field's main focus was the Hexaplaric and related readings, whereas the primary function of the second apparatus for the Göttingen Unternehmen is, quite rightly, to serve the first apparatus: it allows an understanding of certain modifications the LXX underwent during transmission<sup>60</sup> by identifying possible later contamination by Hexaplaric readings. Munnich admits this is one function of the second apparatus, but claims that the editors also attempt to establish through it both the Hexaplaric recension, and other manuscript groups: “les volumes de la «Septante» de Göttingen ont pour vocation d'éditer *toutes* les formes du «Vetus Testamentum graecum», révisions incluses”.<sup>61</sup> However, other editors (in line with Paul

---

<sup>57</sup> Munnich, “Les révisions juives,” 175–78 (section “Réflexions sur le projet d'une réédition des Hexaples de F. Field”).

<sup>58</sup> “un tel outil de travail existe déjà”: “Les révisions juives,” 178.

<sup>59</sup> Norton, “Collecting data for a new edition,” 253.

<sup>60</sup> My thanks go to Reinhart Ceulemans for clarifying this particular point.

<sup>61</sup> “Les révisions juives,” 187. However, as Ceulemans has noted (in private correspondence), the Unternehmen's choice of the singular form “Vetus Testamentum graecum” implies that the work of the Göttingen project has historically focused only on the reconstruction of the LXX, and in fact the second apparatus did not originally feature in the original vision of the Unternehmen, but was introduced in 1939 by Ziegler for his edition of LXX Isaiah (see J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*

de Lagarde, “father” of the Unternehmen) might well regard the editing of “all” forms of the LXX (including the Hexaplaric and parahexaplaric material) as a useful by-product in the editorial process rather than its principal goal. Certainly some entries in the Göttingen second apparatus cannot be easily used for study of the *recentiores*. To give just one instance, for Exod 1:19 and 21 Wevers and Quast provide very full information on the preserved Hexaplaric readings: every recorded variant from the tradition is present, but it is difficult for a reader unfamiliar with the nature of the different avenues of transmission to discern the most original form of each reading, due to the visual complexity of those entries.

Another of Munnich’s criticisms is the recommendation at an early stage of the Hexapla Project to give the Hebrew text of the lemma as consonants only, in case Origen’s Hebrew text or the Vorlage of the *recentior* differed from MT.<sup>62</sup> Munnich strongly doubts that there was any deviation from MT at this date (second/third century CE). However, there was no written vocalization for the Hebrew text at this date, and it would have been impossible to establish a single authoritative reading tradition covering every word of the text, in every Jewish community in that period. Thus is it unsurprising to find that even in the Pentateuch a reading from the “Three” occasionally suggests a minor difference in consonants<sup>63</sup> or a vocalization other than the one familiar to us. It is common today to regard “MT” as equivalent to the Aleppo Codex, or Leningradensis, or even BHS/BHQ: but obviously this was not the sort of text Origen or the “Three” had in front of them.<sup>64</sup>

Having said that, in practice the editions of the books produced as dissertations in research for the Hexapla Project do give the Hebrew lemmata with vocalization. This is of course anachronistic since as just stated, the *recentiores* and Origen did not have texts with *niqqud*. However, it is intended mainly as an aid to the modern reader consulting the

---

*auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. XIV. Isaias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939], 5).*

<sup>62</sup> Norton, “Collecting Data,” 254; Romeny and Gentry, “Towards a New Collection,” 292.

<sup>63</sup> E.g. Symmachus at Gen 3:17 ἐν τῇ ἐργασίᾳ σου for בעבורך, where, like LXX (ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου), his Vorlage apparently read *daleth*, not *resh* as in MT (Aquila, and Theodotion = MT). See also Symmachus and τὸ σαμ’ who both appear to follow the Samaritan Pentateuch’s עֲוֹנוֹת instead of MT עֲוֹנוֹת in Exod 32:18.

<sup>64</sup> See also Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., 9-11, 33-39, on the presence of small corruptions and misreadings in Hebrew biblical texts even into the medieval period, as shown by the work of Kennicott and de Rossi in their collations of variant readings in Hebrew biblical manuscripts.

entries, by giving the meaning of the Hebrew as understood by the Masoretes. The Notes section of the Hexapla Project entry then allows the editor to comment on any apparent difference between the Hebrew Vorlage and MT, as reflected in the lemma of the *recentior*.

The present writer is unlikely to be the only member of the Hexapla Project who is frequently contacted by other scholars, students, and educated members of the public who wish to be able to access an up-to-date collection and edition of the Hexaplaric material, and who find the presentation in the Göttingen and Cambridge second apparatus insufficient for their particular purposes. The interests of these researchers and students include the evidence of Jewish versions and their characteristics across the corpus of Jewish translated Scriptures, and their adoption by Christian writers; they also cover lexicographical research (though bible software can do some basic searches across the Göttingen volumes). The Göttingen Hexaplaric apparatus also lacks cross-referencing to other uses of similar words, and discussion of the particular choice in its context. So although this apparatus provides extremely helpful and reliable data which would otherwise be almost impossible for researchers to access, the form in which it is given is not designed for the type of study I have outlined earlier in this chapter – simply because that was never the aim of the Unternehmen's presentation of the Hexaplaric information. Moreover, for the book in which scholars have shown most interest, namely the Psalter, the existing Göttingen edition has no Hexaplaric apparatus at all.<sup>65</sup> The sheer amount and complexity of this material would have made its inclusion impossible at the time,<sup>66</sup> and although the collation of manuscripts (including the rich catena tradition, and the Milan and Cairo palimpsests) for the long-hoped-for new edition has been completed, the withdrawal of funding from the Unternehmen has delayed the new edition for an indefinite period.

Munnich is right to call attention to the issue of what has been transmitted, by whom, and for what purposes, and to stress that it is necessary to produce a hierarchy of

---

<sup>65</sup> K. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 313, n.9.

<sup>66</sup> Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis auctoritate. X. Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1<sup>st</sup> edn. 1931). See Jellicoe, *Septuagint and Modern Study*, 297–98, and also A. Pietersma, “The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (AAKWG; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 13.

witnesses and sources, as the Göttingen edition does.<sup>67</sup> He expresses the concern that the Hexapla Project's presentation may lead to a levelling of the various sources and witnesses. However, his comments refer mainly to outlines of the project published two decades ago, at a very early stage of the Project. Certainly John Meade's work on Job chs. 22–42 takes into full account the process of transmission in both the witnesses apparatuses and the notes to each entry, as well as the general observations at the beginning of the volume. The publication of this and other volumes will facilitate further study of the complex Christian transmission of the Hexaplaric and parahexaplaric material.

### *Difficulties faced in the Hexapla Project*

In fact the need both to respect, and thus to represent to an extent, the complexity of material is one of the reasons for the slow progress of the Hexapla Project. The doctoral research has produced hefty, carefully checked dissertation volumes, and there follows a similarly lengthy process of preparation for publication as hard copy, because of the need for accuracy, and the use of four non-Roman fonts (Hebrew, Greek, Armenian and Syriac) for presenting the non-Greek and non-Latin material.

Yet this very complexity may endanger ease of consultation for any reader not already steeped in the material and its transmission. One solution may be to have a separate *editio minor* (perhaps on a website) to cover the readings of the main non-LXX versions for those who look for a quick and reliable and easy reference, including a Hebrew/Greek: Greek/Hebrew concordance.

It is important to note the varied character of each LXX book's profile of preserved Hexaplaric and parahexaplaric readings. This is already clear from the work of Field and in the Göttingen and Cambridge editions, and is further reflected in the research on the Hexapla Project. This variety is principally due to the following interrelated factors (though there are others as well):

a) The OG translations often vary considerably in style and form from each other. To give a handful of examples: there are books such as Deuteronomy which, though translated early on, have a LXX translation quantitatively matched to a Hebrew Vorlage

---

<sup>67</sup> "Les révisions juives," pp. 185-86; 187-88.

not dissimilar to the MT; it is probably because the late translation of Ruth is so close to a proto-MT form that there are few readings found for the “Three”; while Job’s OG version is much less isomorphic, tends to summarize two line parallels in a single line, and so is supplemented already by “Theodotion” readings marked with asterisks by Origen — yet Job also attracted alternative renderings of its difficult vocabulary by Aquila and Symmachus. Canticles is another late translation, but once again, its hapax legomena were reinterpreted by the *recentiores*. The very different ordering of chapters in books such as Jeremiah and Exodus, as well as their “minuses” in comparison with MT, led Origen to reconfigure his LXX text along the lines of the Hebrew of his day, and to supply the “missing” words and phrases from other versions closer to the current Hebrew text, also marking this material with asterisks.

b) Crucially, virtually everything preserved of Hexaplaric and parahexaplaric material comes through Christian transmission, as noted earlier in this chapter and stressed by both Munnich and Ceulemans. Therefore, it represents a selection for Christian exegetical purposes. It is not surprising, then, that we have many more readings from non-LXX versions recorded in the tradition for Genesis, Psalms and Isaiah than for books less popular in Christian tradition such as Leviticus.

c) Parahexaplaric material, principally the extra, harmonising “Samaritan’ readings in the Pentateuch books, is noted in some Greek manuscripts, but preserved mainly in the margins of the Syrohexapla and often incorporated directly into the version of Jacob of Edessa for Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Thus it is likely that individual volumes will appear more varied in the “New Field” than they seemed to be in Field’s original work. This is not due so much to different editorial preferences but to the need of editors to reflect the different types of material at their disposal, much of which has appeared since Field produced his magnum opus.

## Bibliography

- W. Baars, *New Syrohexaplaric Texts, edited commented upon and compared with the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).
- S. P. Brock, "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament," in *Papers Presented to the Fifth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1967* (ed. Frank L. Cross; StPtr 10 = TU 107; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1970), 215–18 (repr. in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations: Selected Essays, with a Prolegomenon* [eds. S. Jellicoe and H. M. Orlinsky; New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974], 343–46).
- S. P. Brock, Review of Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke*, VT 27/3 (1977): 381-83.
- F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings, according to the translation of Aquila from a MS. formerly in the Geniza at Cairo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).
- K. Burris, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 1-18." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.
- J. R. Busto Saiz, *La Traducción de Símaco en el Libro de los Salmos* (Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros", 22; Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, CSIC, 1978).
- R. Ceulemans, "New hexaplaric data for the Book of Canticles as discovered in the Catenae," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 41-54.
- R. Ceulemans, "The Greek Christian afterlife of the minor versions: the possibilities of a shift in perspective," in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in honour of Florentino García Martínez* (eds. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL 224; Leuven / Paris / Dudley MA: Peeters, 2008), pp. 101–117.
- R. Ceulemans, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis." Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009.
- R. Ceulemans, "Unknown hexaplaric readings of Ezekiel, Isaiah and Psalms, offered by Apollinaris of Laodicea," ZAW 123 (2011): 406-23.
- R. Ceulemans, "Apollinaris of Laodicea in the catenae as a source of Hexaplaric readings," *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum = Journal of Ancient Christianity* 15/3 (2011): 431–49.
- R. Ceulemans, "Nouveaux témoins manuscrits de la chaîne de Polychronios sur le cantique (CPG C 83)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104/2 (2011): 603–28.
- R. Ceulemans, "New manuscripts of the catena Trium Patrum ('B2') and of the commentaries by Theodoret of Cyrrihus and the Three Fathers ('B1') on the Song of Songs," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011): 105–120.
- R. Ceulemans, "Readings attributed to 'οἱ περὶ α' and/or σ' by Theodoret of Cyrrihus'" in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 473–97.
- R. Ceulemans, "Readings attributed to 'οἱ περὶ (τὸν) Ἀκύλαν and/or (τὸν) Σύμμαχον' by Greek Christian scribes and authors (Theodoret excepted)," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 4 (2011): 73–88.

- R. Ceulemans, "Greek Christian access to the Three," in *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis* (eds. T. M. Law and A. Salvesen; CBET 66. Leuven / Paris / Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2012), 165–91.
- C. E. Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (SBL SCS 42. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996).
- A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (4<sup>th</sup> edn. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1923).
- C. Estin, *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures* (Rome: San Girolamo, 1984).
- J. Gippert, "Hexaplaric Material in the Albano-Armenian Palimpsests from Mt. Sinai," in *Caucasus between East and West. Historical and Philological Studies in Honour of Zaza Aleksidze/ K'avk'asia aġmosavletsa da dasavlets šoris. Ist'oriul-pilologiuri dziebani midzġvnili Zaza Aleksidzis dabadebis 75 c'listavisadmi* (ed. Dali Čitunašvili; Xelnac'erta erovnuli cent'ri 2012. Tbilisi 2012), 202–211.
- N. Fernández Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (eds. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, with B. Doyle; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 151–61.
- N. Fernández Marcos, "New Hexaplaric Readings to the LXX 1 Kings," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 391–400.
- M. Fincati, *The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch: Critical Editing between Septuaginta and Hebraica Veritas in Ms. Ambrosianus A 147 inf.* (De Septuaginta Investigationes 5. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).
- E. L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (VCS 114. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012).
- E. L. Gallagher, "The Religious Provenance of the Aquila Manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 64 (2013): 283-305.
- P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 38; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).
- J. González Luis, 'La Versión de Símaco a los Profetas Mayores' (Tesis Doctoral, Universidad de Complutense de Madrid, 1981).
- M. Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology. A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (VCS 90; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007).
- L. J. Greenspoon, 'A Preliminary Publication of Max Leopold Margolis's *Andreas Masius*, together with his Discussion of Hexapla-Tetrapla', in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 39–69.
- R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford: 1798–1827).
- K. Hyvärinen, *Die Überetzung von Aquila* (CBOT 10; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1977).
- P. Jay, *L'Exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe* (Paris: Études Augustinennes, 1985).

- S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- R. G. Jenkins, "Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 73–87.
- R. G. Jenkins, "The First Column of the Hexapla: the evidence of the Milan Codex (Rahlfs 1098) and the Cairo Genizah fragment (Rahlfs 2005)," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 88–102.
- K. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).
- A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- N. R. M. de Lange, J. Krivoruchko, and C. Boyd-Taylor, eds., *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (TSMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- T. M. Law, "A History of Research on Origen's Hexapla: From *Masius* to the *Hexapla Project*," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007): 30–48.
- T. M. Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, apologetics or exegesis?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 1–21.
- T. M. Law, "Symmachus in Antioch? The Relationship between the Antiochian Text and Symmachus in 1 Kings (3 Reigns)" *Textus* 25 (2010): 29–48.
- T. M. Law, *Origenes Orientalis: The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Reigns* (De Septuaginta Investigationes, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- T. M. Law and A. Salvesen, eds., *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis (Papers from the ESAJS seminars, 2010)* (CBET 66; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2012).
- L. Lütkemann and A. Rahlfs, *Hexaplarische Randnoten zu Isaias 1–16, aus einer Sinai-Handschrift* (MSU 1.6; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1915).
- J. Lust, "A Lexicon of Symmachus' Translation of the Psalms," *ETL* 74 (1998): 87–92.
- B. J. Marsh, "Early Christian Scripture And The Samaritan Pentateuch: A Study In Hexaplaric Manuscript Activity," DPhil dissertation, Oxford, 2016.
- P. S. Marshall, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Ecclesiastes." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2007.
- A.H. McClurg, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Numbers 19–36." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011.
- J. D. Meade, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22–42." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.

- M. van der Meer, “Ἰερουσαλήμ, Terra Incognita, and Terra Devastata: Vocabulary and Theology of Symmachus,” in *XIV Congress IOSCS, 2010* (ed. M. K. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2013), 499-514.
- G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae. Pars Prima. Codex Rescriptus Bybliothecae Ambrosianae O 39 sup. phototypice expressus et transcriptus* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958).
- G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae. Pars Prima. “Osservazioni.” Commento critico al testo dei frammenti esaplari* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1965).
- S. Morlet, “L’utilisation des révisions juives de la Septante dans la première littérature chrétienne. Philologie, exégèse et polémique,” in *La Bible juive dans l’Antiquité* (eds. R. Gounelle and J. Joosten; HTB 9; Éditions du Zébre; Prahins, 2014), 117–40.
- O. Munnich, “Les Hexaples d’Origène à la lumière de la tradition manuscrite de la Bible grecque,” in *Origeniana Sexta: Origène et la Bible; actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum Chantilly, 30 août – 3 septembre 1993* (eds. G. Dorival and A. Le Boulluec; BETL 118. Paris / Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 167–85.
- O. Munnich, “Les révisions juives de la Septante. Modalités et fonctions de leur transmission. Enjeux éditoriaux contemporains,” in *La Bible juive dans l’Antiquité* (eds. R. Gounelle and J. Joosten; HTB 9; Éditions du Zébre; Prahins, 2014), 141–90.
- P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son œuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977).
- B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, vol. 1 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 18/1–2; Basle: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1987), vol. 1.
- G. J. Norton, “Collecting Data for a New Edition of the Fragments of the Hexapla,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 45; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 251–62.
- G. J. Norton, “Observations on the First Two Columns of the Hexapla,” in *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 103–24.
- G. J. Norton, OP, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. (With the collaboration of Carmen Hardin; Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 62. Paris: Gabalda, 2005).
- F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. I, Chapitres 1 à 3* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 1; Leuven: Peeters, 1991).
- F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. II, Chapitres 4 à 11* (TEG 2; Leuven: Peeters, 1993).
- F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. III, Chapitres 12 à 28* (TEG 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1995).
- F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Edition intégrale. IV, Chapitres 29 à 50* (TEG 4; Leuven: Peeters, 1996).
- F. Petit, *La chaîne sur l’Exode. I. Fragments de Sévère d’Antioche*. (TEG 9; Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
- F. Petit, *La Chaîne sur l’Exode. Édition intégrale II. Collectio Coisliniana; III. Fonds caténique ancien (Exode 1,1-15,21)* (TEG 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2000).

- F. Petit, *La chaîne sur l'Exode. Édition intégrale IV. Fonds caténique ancien (Exode 15,22 - 40,32)* (TEG 11; Leuven: Peeters, 2001).
- F. Petit, *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr: La 'collectio Coisliniana' sur les derniers livres de l'Octateuque et sur les Règnes: Le 'Commentaire sur les Règnes' de Procope de Gaza* (TEG 13; Leuven: Peeters, 2003).
- A. Pietersma, "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (AAKWG; MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 12–32.
- A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Societatis Scientiarum Gottingensis auctoriatet. X. Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1<sup>st</sup> edn. 1931).
- R. B. ter Haar Romeny and Peter J. Gentry, "Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Material for the Book of Genesis," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SCS 51; Atlanta, GA.: Scholars, 2001), 285-99.
- R. B. ter Haar Romeny, "Quis Sit Ho Suros Revisited," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 360–98.
- R. B. ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress. The Use of Greek, Hebrew and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (TEG 6; Leuven: Peeters, 1997).
- A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991).
- A. Salvesen, ed., *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- A. Salvesen, "Psalm 135(136).25 in a Jewish Greek inscription from Nicea," in *Semitic Studies in Honour of Edward Ullendorff* (ed. G.A. Khan; Leiden / Boston, 2005), 212–221.
- A. Salvesen, "Midrash in Greek? An Exploration of the Versions of Aquila and Symmachus in Exodus," in *On Stone and Scroll. Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (eds. K. Dell and J. K. Aitken; Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), pp. 523-536.
- A. Salvesen, "The Role of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Modern Commentaries on the Bible" in *Let Us Go Up to Zion. Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, (eds. I. Provan and Mark Boda; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 95-112.
- A. Salvesen, "Aquila, Symmachus and the Translation of Proof-texts," in *Die Septuaginta –Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012* (eds. W. Kraus and S. Kreuzer; WUNT 325; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 154–68.
- A. Salvesen, "The 'Three' in Early Christian commentary: the case of the 'Song of the Vineyard' (Isaiah 5:1–7)" in *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (2015), 73–86.
- H. P. Scanlin, "A new edition of *Origen's Hexapla*: How it might be done," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 439–49.

- J. Schaper, "The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 3-15.
- A. Schenker, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke: Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (OBO 8; Universitätsverlag Freiburg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975).
- S. Sipilä, "Max Leopold Margolis and the Origenic Recension in Joshua," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 16–38.
- M. Sokoloff and J. Yahalom, "Christian Palimpsests from the Cairo Geniza," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 8 (1978): 109–32.
- C. Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).
- E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. (3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
- A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla: a facsimile edition of a Midyat MS. discovered 1964* (CSCO 369: Subsidia 45; Louvain: Peeters, 1975).
- M. Weitzman, "The Reliability of Retroversions of the Three from the Syrohexapla: A Pilot Study in Hosea," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (ed. A. Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 317–59.
- N. Woods, "A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: Chapters 1-21." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.
- J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. XIV. Isaias*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939]
- J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975).