

Timothy Michael Law

# Origenes Orientalis

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

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht



# 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

Timothy Michael Law, *Origenes Orientalis*

Timothy Michael Law

# Origenes Orientalis

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

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

For Katie

τί ἐστὶ φιλία  
μία ψυχὴ δύο σώμασιν ἔνοικοῦσα

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](http://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.

## 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

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

Table of Contents	7
7.7 Prospects for Future Research .....	368
7.8 Summary .....	369
Bibliography.....	371
Index of Passages Discussed in 3 Kingdoms .....	379



## 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, Mar-ketta Liljeström, Kenneth Liljeström, Christian Seppänen, Tuukka Kauh-anen, Elina Perttilä, Jennifer Dines, Jim Aitken, Michael Graves, Adrian Schenker, Julio Treballe 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 poly-mathic 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

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 pursuits 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

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

## 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* (2<sup>nd</sup> 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).

## Abbreviations and Signs

A	<i>Codex Alexandrinus</i>
B	<i>Codex Vaticanus</i>
M	<i>Codex Coislinianus</i>
V	<i>Codex Venetus</i>
Aeth	Ethiopic Version
Anon	The Anonymous Chronicle
Ant	Antiochian LXX in the edition of Fernández Marcos and Busto Sáiz
Arm	Armenian Version
Arm <sup>mss</sup>	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, <i>Onomasticon</i> (BMT: On)
Field	F. Field, <i>Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt</i>
Hieron	Jerome
Iren	Irenaeus
Jac	Jacob of Edessa
La	<i>Vetus Latina</i> (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 <sup>B</sup>	Manuscript of Syh 3 Kgdms
Syh <sup>ed</sup>	Lagarde's edition of Syh 3 Kgdms

TJ	Targum Jonathan
Thd	Theodore of Mopsuestia
Thd-syr	Works of Theodore of Mopsuestia extant in Syriac
Tht	Theodoret
Vulg	Vulgate
α'	Aquila
Υ'	“the Three” ( <i>recentiores</i> )
εβρ'	“the Hebrew”
θ'	Theodotion
σ'	Symmachus
⋈	οι Υ', “the Three” ( <i>recentiores</i> )
Δ	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.

## 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

# 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.



## 1.1 The Hexapla and the Syrohexapla

### 1.1.1 The Hexapla<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Of great importance were the asterisks and obeli that Origen most likely placed in the fifth column.<sup>6</sup> 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:

<sup>3</sup> 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*.

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

<sup>5</sup> 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."

<sup>6</sup> 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, "Origen and Purpose", 9; and Brock, *Recensions*, 39–43.

τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντος εὐρομεν 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 συνᾶδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσσαμεν [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 ...<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the *Hexapla* was an exegetical tool, even if textual criticism and apologetics were also useful outcomes.<sup>9</sup>

The *Hexapla* in its entirety was lost at some point during the next few centuries.<sup>10</sup> 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 Pamphilus vulgaverunt*.<sup>11</sup> Although this

<sup>7</sup> *Comm. in Mt.* 15.14. See also Neuschäfer, *Origenes*, 87–94.

<sup>8</sup> 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 Ὁριγένει τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπρηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις, ὡς καὶ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα γλωτταν ἐκμαθεῖν τὰς τε παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐμφορομένας πρωτοτύπους αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων στοιχείους γραφὰς κτήμα 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."

<sup>9</sup> See Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible."

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Jerome, in *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* 1, 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 Pamphilus 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

text form never attained the status of a *textus receptus*,<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

### 1.1.2 The Idea of the Syrohexapla<sup>14</sup>

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,<sup>15</sup> the survival of this masterpiece of erudition is ultimately due to a few 7<sup>th</sup> century Syriac bishops.

Ancient testimony maintains that Paul of Tella produced a translation derived from the fifth column of the Hexapla.<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> Kamesar, *Jerome*, 34–5.

<sup>13</sup> 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. Pertilä, "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."

<sup>14</sup> 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."

<sup>15</sup> Again, see Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials*; and Cox, *Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion*.

<sup>16</sup> 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.





it would have been a customary expression of humility from the Syrians.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the Bishop and the Patriarch had close relations dating back to their time at the Monastery of Qennešrē.<sup>33</sup> 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).<sup>34</sup> 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.”<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup>

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.<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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

<sup>32</sup> Gwynn, *Remnants*, 2:72.

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

<sup>34</sup> 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.

<sup>35</sup> These are his comments on the Harklean in *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 118–21.

<sup>36</sup> 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.

<sup>37</sup> Brock, “From Antagonism to Assimilation.”

<sup>38</sup> Brock, “From Antagonism to Assimilation”; Brock, *Bible in the Syriac Tradition*; Hiebert, “Syriac Biblical Textual History”, 180–1.

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.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup>

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.<sup>42</sup>

### 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.<sup>43</sup> Paul has forced his Semitic mother tongue to submit to the rules of an Indo-European language whose structure was markedly different<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup> The similarity of this translation to the Greek translation of the Hebrew produced by Aquila is conspicuous, since in many ways the injustice commit-

<sup>39</sup> Romeny, “Biblical Studies in the Church of the East”, 504.

<sup>40</sup> Romeny, “Biblical Studies in the Church of the East”, 507.

<sup>41</sup> Vööbus, “Qennešrīn” (emphasis mine).

<sup>42</sup> I provide a brief overview of all of the Syriac versions in Law, “Syriac translations.”

<sup>43</sup> This must be part of the reason for the scant attention given to the version by modern scholars, a disregard that is surprising especially as it was a version used in the Church.

<sup>44</sup> Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, 3.

<sup>45</sup> Rørdam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth*, 3.

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 ܐܢܝ, composite forms used in verbal morphology, and the use of ܐܢܝ with the perfect.<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup>

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."<sup>49</sup> 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 Išo' 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.<sup>50</sup> 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

<sup>46</sup> See Hiebert, "Syrohexaplaric" *Psalter*.

<sup>47</sup> Verwijs, "The Hexapla Project and the Main Text of the Syro-Hexapla (Syh) of Amos 1–2."

<sup>48</sup> "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.

<sup>49</sup> Haefeli, *Peschitta*, 3.

<sup>50</sup> Scher, *Theodore bar Koni*; Molenberg, *Interpreter Interpreted*. Cf. Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, 59.



(OG) text of Daniel,<sup>51</sup> 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,<sup>52</sup> but the translation technique of the Syriac version allows us cautiously to retrovert the readings into the Greek of its putative *Vorlage*.<sup>53</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup> Although I have elsewhere urged more methodological rigor before assuming the hexaplaric recension alone is Syh's *Vorlage*,<sup>55</sup> Rahlfs is for the most part still correct: "Syr ist gewöhnlich unser zuverlässigster Zeuge für den hexaplarischen G-Text."<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup> Rather than rely-

<sup>51</sup> 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.

<sup>52</sup> Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire."

<sup>53</sup> 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."

<sup>54</sup> In 3 Kgdms, for example, only six other witnesses (one of them the Armenian version) preserve asterisks, and only one witness preserves obeli.

<sup>55</sup> Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire."

<sup>56</sup> Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 226.

<sup>57</sup> Field, *Origenis hexaplorum*.

<sup>58</sup> See the history of research on the Hexapla in Law, "History of Research."

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,<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> This was the first comprehensive treatment of the text-historical difficulties in Kgdms to appear in the 20<sup>th</sup> 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 unequalled. 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),<sup>62</sup> to which I have added four more (1:8; 2:4, 16; and 6:4).<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> Rahlfs' comments on the textual history will be mentioned as I encounter specific problems, but they are not central to the argument.

<sup>59</sup> 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.

<sup>60</sup> Silberstein, "Über den Ursprung der im Codex Alexandrinus und Vaticanus."

<sup>61</sup> These were collected and reprinted in one volume in 1965 in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*.

<sup>62</sup> See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 391–2.

<sup>63</sup> 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.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Law, "La version syro-hexaplaire."

# Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

De Septuaginta Investigationes | Vol. 2

The Syrohexapla is widely believed to be a faithful witness to the Hexapla of Origen. This volume prepares the way for a new critical edition of these hexaplaric fragments of 3 Kingdoms, and offers new impulses for Septuagint research. Ultimately, this material brings the reader closer to appreciating religious interactions between Jews and Christians in the Graeco-Roman and Late Antique periods, their understandings of the nature of Scripture, and the methods they used to make the Divine Word understandable.

## **The Author**

Dr. Timothy Michael Law is a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow at the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford.

ISBN 978-3-525-53405-2



9 783525 534052

[www.v-r.de](http://www.v-r.de)