A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEXAPLARIC
FRAGMENTS OF JOB 22-42

Introduction

As a result of the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla in the summer of 1994 at Oxford, a
decision was made to create a new collection and edition of all Hexaplaric fragments.¹
Frederick Field was the last scholar to compile all known fragments in the mid to late 19ᵗʰ century,² but by
1902, Henry Barclay Swete had announced that more hexaplaric materials were
“accumulating.”³ These new materials need to be included in a new collection of hexaplaric
fragments, a collection which is called “a Field for the 21ˢᵗ century.”⁴ With the publication of
two-thirds of the critical editions of the Septuagint (LXX) by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in
Göttingen, the fulfillment of a new collection of all known hexaplaric fragments is becoming
more feasible.

Project

¹ Alison Salvesen ed., Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the
Hexapla Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th-3rd August 1994 (Texte und Studien zum Antiken

² Frederick Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum

³ Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge

Sydney Jellicoe’s pessimism concerning a revised and enlarged edition of the hexaplaric fragments, which he did
not think was in the “foreseeable future.” Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1968), 129.
This project aims to produce a new critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments for Job 22-42, and it will build upon Field and upon the critical edition by Joseph Ziegler for the Göttingen Septuaginta. The new edition will also incorporate new sources which Ziegler either did not use or to which he did not have access at the time he completed his edition. Specifically the work on the hexaplaric fragments of Job will make a contribution to the field in three ways. First, it will contribute to an understanding of the complicated text history of the book of Job, including both its Greek versions and the Hebrew text. Second, it will contribute to the history of exegesis of the book of Job, both Jewish and Christian, since this edition will attempt to reconstruct the original text for both Origen’s Hexapla and the readings of the three Jewish revisers (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion). Third, it will contribute to the needs of modern scholarship for a Field for the 21st century for the entire Old Testament.

Background

Origen’s Work and Intention for the Hexapla

When reconstructing the history of the Hexapla, scholars have asked at least two significant questions concerning its origins: 1) what was the original appearance of the Hexapla with special attention given to the presence or absence of the Aristarchian signs in the fifth column, and 2) what was Origen’s original intention for constructing it.

---


7 See “Adequacy and Availability of Sources” below for the details.


9 For the relevant secondary literature see the following articles: Joachim Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla,” in Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich
The Original Composition of the Hexapla. We can only provide preliminary answers to these questions here, and we will do so in order. It is generally recognized that the Hexapla had the following six columns in this order from left to right: column 1 contained the Hebrew text, column 2 contained the Hebrew text transliterated into Greek, column 3 contained the revision of Aquila (α'), column 4 contained the revision of Symmachus (σ'), column 5 contained the LXX (ο'), and column 6 contained the revision of Theodotion (θ'). The most recent analysis of the existing fragments of the Hexapla, if the existing copies are like the

---


original, show that the Hexapla probably had forty lines per page and there was probably only one Hebrew word per line. With these parameters, one estimates that the Hexapla would have filled almost forty codices of 400 leaves (800) pages each.\footnote{See Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, \textit{Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea} (London: 2006), 104-5; n. 35. This reconstruction offers an update to Swete’s comparison of the Hexapla with Cod. Vaticanus in Swete, \textit{An Introduction...}, 74.}

Of these six columns, the fifth column appeared to have been the focus of Origen’s work. It is clear that he used an asterisk (\(*\)) to show where words had been added to the LXX (usually from one of the Three especially Theodotion) and he used a metobelus (\(<\)) to mark the end of the addition. In order to mark pluses in the LXX, which were not in the Hebrew text, he used an obelisk (\(\div\)) and metobelus.\footnote{Grafton and Williams, \textit{Christianity and the Transformation of the Book...}, 116-7. These authors conclude, “We think this [that the Hexapla had the signs and was supplemented from Theodotion] unlikely, since the fifth column marked with critical signs and supplemented from the sixth column would have been both redundant and confusing: redundant because where the Septuagint contained additional material lacking in the Hebrew and the recentiores, to leave the other five columns blank would have made the lack of a parallel to the Septuagint column abundantly clear, without the need for obeli marking the fifth column as well; confusing, because where the fifth column lacked material present in the others, to fill in the blank with the text of the sixth column would only have obscured the differences, even if the additions were marked with asterisks.”} In Proverbs a combination of asterisk and obelus would mark a transposition from the LXX.\footnote{Frederick Field, \textit{Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta} (translated by Gerard Norton and Carmen Hardin. Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), 100-104.}

\footnotetext[12]{12}{\itshape τῶν γὰρ ὄμριβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομῷκοις διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνάδον ἐκείνας ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὀβελίσκουμεν <ως> ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κέιμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μὲ τ’ ἀπερίσκου προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ἢ ὅτι μὴ κέιμενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομῷκοις ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν, (“For when there are doubts with the Septuagint on account of the discord with the copies, we, by making a judgment from the rest of the Versions, we keep the agreement with these (f. pl. antecedent = the rest of the Versions), and we use an obelisk for some [Greek readings] <because> they are not in the Hebrew (not daring to remove any of these), but we place other readings with asterisks, in order that it might be clear that we have added the [readings] not present with the Seventy from the rest of the Versions in harmony with Hebrew,”) Origen, \textit{Commentarium in Matthaeum}, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 40 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935), XV, 14, 387-88.}

\footnotetext[13]{13}{Origen describes this process in his \textit{Commentary} on Matthew in XV, 14: τῶν γὰρ ὄμριβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομῷκοις διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνάδον ἐκείνας ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὀβελίσκουμεν <ως> ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κέιμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μὲ τ’ ἀπερίσκου προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ἢ ὅτι μὴ κέιμενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομῷκοις ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν, (“For when there are doubts with the Septuagint on account of the discord with the copies, we, by making a judgment from the rest of the Versions, we keep the agreement with these (f. pl. antecedent = the rest of the Versions), and we use an obelisk for some [Greek readings] <because> they are not in the Hebrew (not daring to remove any of these), but we place other readings with asterisks, in order that it might be clear that we have added the [readings] not present with the Seventy from the rest of the Versions in harmony with Hebrew,”) Origen, \textit{Commentarium in Matthaeum}, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 40 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935), XV, 14, 387-88.}
Although this prospectus is not the place to enter into a full discussion of the matter, the writer is convinced that the colophons and scholia in the hexaplaric manuscripts confirm that Origen did indeed apply the Aristarchian signs to the fifth column as he described in his Matthew Commentary. I depend, here, on private correspondence with Peter J. Gentry, in which he pointed me to some of the relevant colophons and scholia in both the Syro-hexapla (Syh) and Greek hexaplaric manuscripts. I cite two of his translations, the first is the colophon of Ezekiel in Codex Marchalianus, and the other is the colophon from Proverbs in Syh. The first reads as follows: “Copied from the Hexapla according to the editions and corrected from Origen’s own Tetrapla, which was corrected and annotated in his hand. I, Eusebius, added the scholia from this source. Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected.” The second reads as follows:

It was noted in the Greek book from which this book of Proverbs was translated into Syriac, after the end of them, as follows: The Proverbs were copied and collated from an accurate copy that was made and in which scholia were written in the margins by the hand of Pamphilus and Eusebius, in which were noted also these things: These things that we found were taken from the Hexapla Version of Origen and we corrected them. And again: in their own handwriting, Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected.

Gentry notes that the Syriac colophon contains punctuation which guides the reader to the proper understanding of the note. The first section of the colophon indicates that the last three sections come from a colophon in the Greek Vorlage and were translated into Syriac. The second section indicates that the Proverbs were copied exactly from the Hexapla by Pamphilus and Eusebius. The third section indicates explicitly that the things Pamphilus and Eusebius found were taken from the Hexapla Version of Origen, and the fourth part states that Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected the text.

The first of these colophons mentions a Tetrapla, which we shall discuss briefly below, but these notes clearly state that at least the texts of Ezekiel and Proverbs—including the signs—have been copied directly from Origen’s Hexapla. The burden of proof rests on the one who would show that the Aristarchian signs in these manuscripts were added at a later time or

---

that these notes somehow refer to another composition besides the Hexapla itself. Therefore, in the eye of the writer, the easiest reading of the evidence is to combine Origen’s description of his procedure with the colophons of the manuscripts, which claim to be copies of Origen’s Hexapla or related titles of the same work (e.g. Tetrapla). Therefore Origen applied the signs to the Hexapla itself according to this reading of the sources.

The question over whether Origen composed a Tetrapla either before or after the Hexapla has a long history and it is a relevant question to the present study of Job.\(^\text{17}\) The colophon of Job in the Syh reads as follows: The book of Job, the righteous, is completed according to the tradition of the Seventy: Job was taken from the old Tetrapla.\(^\text{18}\) The colophon consists of two parallel units according to the punctuation, in which the first line identifies the text as from the Septuagint, while the second line clearly states that Job was taken from the Tetrapla. The adjective “old” is curious. Perhaps, it is meant to distinguish the Seventy as the oldest column in the Tetrapla, which refers only to the four Greek Versions minus reference to the first two Hebrew columns. This colophon juxtaposes the edition of the Seventy (the third column) with the oldest edition in the Tetrapla (the Seventy). Thus the scholiast does not intend to distinguish two different compositions, Tetrapla and Hexapla, but rather he probably refers to the Septuagint of the Hexapla with a different designation, Tetrapla. Syh Job also contains very

\(^\text{17}\) See Frederick Field, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis hexaplorum...*, 29-33, where he casts doubt on Montfaucon’s thesis that the Tetrapla was edited before the Hexapla. R.G. Jenkins, “Hexaplaric Marginalia and the Hexapla-Tetrapla Question,” 73-87, where he concludes in the first place, “The Septuagint text of the Syrohexapla of the Psalter and Job derives more or less exactly from the Tetrapla, which was an edition with a Septuagint text quite distinct from the (later) fifth column of the Hexapla, and from the edition of Eusebius and Pamphilus” (85-6). Olivier Munnich, “Les Hexaples d’Origène...”, 181-3. Munnich presents the best general treatment of the question and her conclusion is worth citing in full, “In sum, if the tradition attests to the existence of the Hexapla and the Tetrapla, our documentation does not permit us to differentiate them. It seems even hazardous to distinguish them, in the upshot of Epiphanius, by the number of their columns, for one does not know what the copyists were understanding when they used the term, “hexapla”: for the Psalms mentions the word, while it describes a synopsis of seven or eight columns; the Barb. gr. 549 cites a fragment of the synopsis in five columns and ascribes to it “Hexapla.” In certain colophons the word is manifestly a synonym of the hexaplar of the Seventy. In the end, the term sometimes possesses a technical sense, which one is not able to restore with certainty, sometimes it possesses the sense of ‘Origenic synopsis’ in general, which, thenceforth, distinguishes itself poorly from the term “tetrapla”’ (182-3). The writer thanks Laura Musick for checking over his translation of the last sentence and offering helpful feedback.

\(^\text{18}\) The writer’s translation from the Syriac.
interesting scholia in the margins, which identify asterisked readings “not placed” in the Octapla of Origen\(^{19}\) and readings which are or are not placed in the Tetrapla.\(^{20}\) The question is over whether the scholiasts understood Origen to have composed three separate works or do these titles refer to the same work, the Hexapla. An answer to this question is outside of the purview of this paper, but at present, the writer agrees with the conclusion of Munnich that there was one composition of the Hexapla of Origen, which had neither a precursor nor a subsequent form, but later copyists sometimes used the term Hexapla in a technical sense and sometimes they used the term with the sense “Origenic recension” which distinguishes itself poorly from Tetrapla.\(^{21}\)

**Origen’s Intention for the Hexapla.** Modern scholarship has proposed three reasons for why Origin constructed the Hexapla: 1) to reconstruct the original Septuagint based on the Hebrew text of his day, 2) to create an apologetic tool to aid in Christian and Jewish dialogue, and 3) for the purpose of exegesis.

The purpose of the Hexapla according to Origin’s own account and the final product was in some way text-critical.\(^{22}\) But there is reasonable debate whether Origen was ‘LXX centered’ or ‘Hebrew centered’.\(^{23}\) When the Hexapla itself is taken into consideration along with

---


\(^{20}\) See at least two references to the Tetrapla in Syh at Job 32:11, 13b-17. These are only examples and there may be more references for which to account. The first example shows a reading that is in other copies, but is not in the Tetrapla, while the second example identifies a reading in the margin as the Tetrapla and the reading in the text as according to the copies of Pamphilus and Eusebius.

\(^{21}\) See n. 17.

\(^{22}\) Origen’s intention according to his *Matthew Commentary* XV, 14 is as follows: νυνὶ δὲ δήλον ὅτι πολλῇ γέγονεν ἢ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ ρ>bhμιας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθῆρας <ἐ&iot;τε ἀπὸ ἀμελούντων> τις διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει ἢ προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιροῦντων, τὴν μὲν όν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν ἔδον διδόντων διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντων εὐρομέν ἱάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεις: (But now it is clear much difference of the copies has happened, whether from laziness of some scribes, or from the boldness of some wicked ones, <or from those who are negligent> in the restoring of what has been written, or even from those who add or take away those which seem good to themselves in the correction. Therefore we found means to heal the discord in the copies of the Old Covenant by using the rest of the versions as a criterion with God giving [grace].) Origen, *Commentarium in Matthaueum*, 387-88. See n. 13 for the rest of this citation.

\(^{23}\) For a full treatment of the issues see Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew*
this statement in the *Matthew Commentary*, Origen seems to refer to the “healing” of discrepancies within the LXX tradition using both the Hebrew and the rest of the Versions as a criterion. But however true Origen’s purpose of reconstructing the original LXX may be, one cannot reduce his entire project to this purpose, and so we move to a different intention that Origen had.

According to another statement found in his *Letter to Africanus*, Origen had an apologetic purpose for constructing the Hexapla. 24 This statement contains a purpose clause (ἵνα) in which Origen makes clear that he is comparing the Jewish Versions with the LXX (presumably) so that they are prepared for debate with the Jews and so that they will not ridicule them. 25 Yet, although there is a purpose clause in this text, one cannot reduce Origen, the man or his work, to apologetics. Thus, we turn to the latest suggestion, that the Hexapla is more exegetically focused.

Michael Law has recently written on a third purpose for Origen’s Hexapla: exegesis. The article has merit since it attempts a more holistic approach to the question of Origen’s intention, and he reports on Origen, the man, and his work. In effect, Law simply highlights Origen’s exegetical purpose, but he does not argue for this intention exclusively. Rather, he

---

*Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 4-28. The general consensus of the ‘text-critical’ purpose of the Hexapla is that Origen was ‘LXX centered’, but according to Kamesar, Dominique Barthélemy and Pierre Nautin have argued that Origen was not ‘LXX-centered’. For a representative of the ‘LXX-centered’ school see Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 102.

24 The statement is as follows: Ἀσκοῦμεν δὲ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰς παρ’ ἑκείνους, ἵνα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διαλέγομεν μὴ προφέρομεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μὴ κείμενα ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἵνα συγχρησύμεθα τοῖς φερόμενοι παρ’ ἑκείνους ἐκαί ἐν τοῖς ἑμετέροις οὐ κέπιται βιβλίοις. Τοιαύτης γὰρ ὀσφύς ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ζητῆσι παρασκευῆς, ὧν καταφρονήσουσιν, οὐδ’, ὡς ἐθος αὐτοίς, γελάσονται τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνων πιστεύοντας, ὡς τ’ ὑλὴ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα ἄγνοοντας. (We endeavor not to be ignorant even of their [Versions], so that while disputing with the Jews we might not present to them the readings not present in their copies, and so that we might make use of the things which are found in those [books], although they are not present in our books. For because our preparation with them in the disputes is such, they will not despise, nor, as is their custom, will they laugh scornfully at the believers from the Gentiles, because they do not know the true readings which are in their books).

25 See for a further defense of this view, Brock, “Origen’s Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament,” 216.
believes that the best answer to the question will take into account all three purposes, and in this answer one is closest to the truth.26

History of the Hexapla and Hexaplaric Research

The history of the Hexapla is a short one, which is probably because it was not copied in its entirety due to its immense size and the cost of materials and copying in those days.27 However, enough evidence remains to reveal that parts of the Hexapla were copied and translated and disseminated throughout Christendom. It is clear that Origen constructed it in Caesarea between 230 and 245 A.D., and that it spread widely through various means. In the Life of Constantine, Eusebius (d. c. 340 A.D.) records a letter from the Emperor, who orders him to prepare “fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures,” which were to be taken by two public carriages from Caesarea to the growing church in Constantinople.28 The bible text of Eusebius was almost certainly that of Origen’s Hexapla. Although this task seems insignificant, it is now clear that these copies provided the biblical text for the Council of Ephesus in 431, and it is also clear that the Armenian constituency at this council brought the hexaplaric text home after this council and their biblical text was revised according to it, so that now the Armenian Version in its current form reflects the hexaplaric text including the Aristarchian signs tradition.29 It is also clear that


27 Grafton and Williams, Christianity and the Transformation of the Book..., 106-7. These authors show that a copy of Virgil’s Aeneid would have cost 3,400 denarii, while a complete copy of the Hexapla would be upwards of 150,000 denarii, 75,000 for the copying and 75,000 for the luxurious copying materials. They add that the Hebrew script would have required extra expertise, and would have probably made the task more costly. Thus clearly, only the wealthy could afford this work, and these authors have shown that Origen’s patron, Ambrose, a member of the upper echelon of Roman society, would have been able to finance the Hexapla. They also put these numbers in perspective in relation to yearly salaries. Origen, as a grammarian in Alexandria, would have made a yearly salary of about 70,000 denarii according to the Price Edict. This salary would not have been enough to finance a project like the Hexapla, but the project would have been in reach for a wealthy bishop like Cornelius of Rome, who annually donated 6 million denarii in food to the poor. Therefore Origen’s patron, Ambrose, would have been able to finance the project (107).


29 Claude E. Cox, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia, Society of Biblical Literature
Bishop Paul of Tella in about 616 A.D. translated the fifth column along with the Aristarchian signs into Syriac, a work now known as the Syro-Hexapla or Syro-Hexaplar. In 638, Caesarea was conquered by the Muslims, and it is speculated that the Hexapla manuscripts were destroyed at this time or were simply forgotten. Although the complete Hexapla had a relatively short life, its impact on the text history of the Greek Bible was already pervasive by the time of Jerome (d. c. 420 A.D.). In a letter to Augustine, written c. 398 A.D., he says to him:

> And I am amazed how you do not read the books of the Seventy in their pure form, as they were published by the Seventy, but rather as emended by Origen or rather corrupted by the obeli and asterisks, and you do not follow the translation of a Christian man, especially when he (Origen) transferred these, which have been added from an edition of a man, a Jew and a blasphemer, after the Passion of Christ. Do you wish to be a true friend of the Septuagint? You should not read these [additions], which are under the asterisks; on the contrary, erase them from the chapters, so that you might show yourself to be a true patron. If you do that, you will be forced to condemn all the libraries of the churches. *For scarcely will one or another manuscript be discovered, which has not such additions.*

Clearly, Origen’s work had a wide influence on the text history of the Septuagint.

The history of hexaplaric research begins in 1578, when would be Pope Sixtus V, Felice Peretti, urged Gregory XIII to prepare a new edition of the Greek Bible. When Peretti became Pope, this project flourished under the leadership of Carafa. He also added new editors to this team, and one of them was named Petrus Morinus, who was the editor responsible for the hexaplaric readings placed in the apparatus after each chapter. The edition known as *Vetus*

---

30 *et miror, quomodo septuaginta interpretum libros legas non puros, ut ab eis editi sunt, sed ab Origenem emendatos siue corruptos per obelos et asteriscos et Christiani hominis interpretatiunculam non sequaris, praeertim cum ea, quae addita sunt, ex hominis Iudaei atque blasphemati post passionem Christi editionem translaterit. uis amator esse uerus septuaginta interpretum? non legas ea, quae sub asteriscis sunt, immo rade de uoluminibus, ut ueterum te fautorem probes. quod si feceris, omnes ecclesiariarum bibliothecas condemmare cogeris. uix enim unus aut alter inuenietur liber, qui ista non habeat.* Jerome, Epistle 112 to Augustine, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 55, ed. Isidorus Hilberg, (Vindobonae: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 389.

Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta appeared in 1587, but it would be surpassed by the Latin translation known as the Vetus Testamentum secundum LXX Latine in 1588. In this edition, Flaminius Nobilius included many of the readings from the recentiores from Morinus, but he also supplemented these notes with his own. In 1622, Johannes Drusius completed the first commentary on the hexaplaric fragments in Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. This edition included two introductory notes, one introduced the identities of the recentiores, while the other introduced the works of Quinta and Sexta. According to Law, Drusius added to the material, which had been handed down to him, and he translated the readings into Latin and then added his commentary.  

In 1657, Brian Walton’s London Polyglot (the Biblia Sacra Polyglotta) included Nobilius’s hexaplaric readings, but it is clear that Walton supplemented this earlier collection by drawing on the collection of Drusius. Walton both added material and corrected errors he found in the previous collections. After Walton, Matthew Poole (Synopsis Criticorum, 1669) and Lambertus Bos (Vetus Testamentum ex versione septuaginta interpretum, 1709) both published works which included hexaplaric fragments. 

In 1713, Bernard de Montfaucon published what has been called “the watershed” of hexaplaric studies since this edition was the first definitive collection of hexaplaric fragments, Orgenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt. This work was the standard of Hexapla scholarship for 150 years, until another collection of fragments was undertaken by Frederick Field in 1863 and was published in 1875. Field brought Hexapla scholarship to a higher level in the following ways: 1) he used Monfaucon’s earlier edition, which served as his base text, 2) he provided an extended prolegomena which addressed subjects such as the Three and an analysis of Sexta and Septima, 3) he discusses the obscure subjects of Ἑβραῖος, Σύρος, and Σαμαρειτικῶν, and 4) perhaps his greatest innovation, he not only used the Syh, but he provided retroversions of the

---


34 See n. 2.
Syriac into Greek, which he indicated with a smaller type print in his edition lest they be confused with actual Greek lemmas.  

As was mentioned earlier, Swete in 1902 announced that hexaplaric sources had accumulated since Field’s edition. This edition collected evidence from five quarters: 1) Greek manuscripts which contained the o’ text, with some containing the Aristarchian signs, 2) other LXX mss. containing marginal notes, 3) manuscripts containing the Syro-hexapla including the Aristarchian signs and marginal notes, 4) catena manuscripts with attributions to one of the Three, and 5) citations from the Church Fathers. However, new evidence has come to light since Field’s edition. In 1896, G. Mercati discovered fragments of the Hexapla from Psalms in palimpsest 0.39.  

In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published a manuscript, which had portions of Aquila’s translation of 1 and 2 Kings. Finally, in 1900, C. Taylor published hexaplaric fragments of Psalms 22 (LXX 21) from the Cairo Genizah fragments. Significantly these discoveries have confirmed the arrangement of the Hexapla as passed down to us via patristic testimony, since these were actual fragments of copies of the Hexapla, not preserved in other sources. In addition to these fragments, Swete lists the collections of Pitra, E. Klostermann, and G. Morin. With all of this evidence mounting, Jellicoe states about sixty-five years later that a new collection of

35 Field had access to the pre-published edition of Ceriani’s Syro-Hexapla, which is now known as A. M. Ceriani ed., Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus. Monumenta sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).
37 F. C. Burkitt, Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).
38 C. Taylor, Hebrew-Greek Cairo Geniza Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection including a fragment of the twenty-second Psalm, according to Origen’s Hexapla (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).
39 Pitra, Analecta sacra spicilegio solesmensi parata, iii (Venice, 1883).
41 G. Morin, Anecdota Maredsolana iii, I (Mareds, 1895).
hexaplaric fragments will not be published in the foreseeable future.\textsuperscript{42}

A new edition of the hexaplaric fragments of Job is now within reach due to the publication of \textit{Job Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis} in 1982 by Joseph Ziegler. In this edition, Ziegler has provided the reader with two apparatuses, the first deals primarily with the variants from the Old Greek text above it (although this edition of Job contains an ecclesiastical text complete with asterisks not the Old Greek \textit{per se}), while the second apparatus lists the evidence fragment by fragment from the Three. In the first apparatus, Ziegler did provide evidence from Origen’s fifth column or the \textit{O} text, and he signals to the reader with a down arrow where readings from the second apparatus have influenced readings in the first apparatus. Thus Ziegler has provided us with the most complete collection of the evidence of the \textit{o’} text and of the Three (although see below under “Adequacy and Accessibility of Resources”).

Therefore, in accordance with the desire of the Rich Seminar in 1994 for producing a new Field, the Hexapla Institute was formed, under the auspices of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and in partnership with The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oxford University and Leiden University. The Hexapla Institute’s purpose is as follows: “to publish a new critical edition of the fragments of Origen’s Hexapla, an endeavor which might be described as, ‘A Field for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century’ to be available in a print edition and as an online database.”\textsuperscript{43} This dissertation will be another step toward attaining this goal.

\textbf{Relevance for Research}

The primary relevance of this research is to provide a new critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for the second half of Job, which evaluates and adjudicates between the

\textsuperscript{42} Jellicoe, \textit{The Septuagint and Modern Study}, 129.

\textsuperscript{43} See the Hexapla Institute website at: www.hexapla.org.
readings and posits an original text and organizes the variants in an apparatus underneath. Although Ziegler’s edition contains most of the hexaplaric materials in his edition, as mentioned above, these materials are not presented in a very convenient way nor do they constitute a critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments. The Göttingen editions are critical editions of the LXX, and do not have as their goal the establishing of the text of the original Hexapla. Thus they spread the hexaplaric material between the two apparatuses, which suits their purposes, but not the purposes of hexaplaric scholarship. Thus this new edition will combine this evidence (and additional evidence) into one apparatus. In addition, the second apparatus does not differentiate between sources (e.g. catenae, manuscripts, marginal notes), and thus levels the authority of the different sources. The new edition will avoid these pitfalls.44

Second, this project will contribute to clarifying the text history of the LXX. Norton says, “The Hexapla assembled the most important Greek texts of the first two centuries A.D. This was the most important period for the development and stabilization of the Greek and Hebrew texts, and now that our knowledge of the period has been enriched by the discoveries at Qumran and in the Judean desert, the hexaplaric material can be reexamined profitably.”45 Thus once the text of the Hexapla has been clarified, this text may add more clarity to the text histories of the Hebrew Bible and Septuagint.

Third, once the hexaplaric editions have been published, it is possible to create a database from which an index and lexicon based on these materials can be written. The goal of an on-line database fully searchable using different criteria will be a real benefit to scholars.

Fourth, a complete lexicon of the hexaplaric materials may aid in the task of New Testament lexicography, for many words in the NT do not occur in the LXX, and rare words in


the NT may be found or be best represented in the hexaplaric fragments.46

Fifth, the Hexapla influenced the Church Fathers as shown by their references to hexaplaric readings. Thus it cannot be ruled out that the Hexapla may have influenced the theology of the Church Fathers even if indirectly.

Finally, a catalog of the readings of the Three will probably aid in the study of rabbinic exegesis from the Second Temple period. The Three stand in the unique place of being the only Jewish Greek sources of exegesis of the Hebrew Bible as they sought to revise the LXX according to the Hebrew text.

**Adequacy and Accessibility of Sources**

The primary resource for this project is the Göttingen critical edition by Joseph Ziegler, specifically the first and second apparatuses.47 Subsequent to this edition Ziegler also published *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob.*48 Further works have been published since Ziegler’s critical edition. The Hagedorn edition of hexaplaric fragments, *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*, published in 1991 contains additional materials unavailable to Ziegler in his critical edition.49 The Hagedorns have also recollated catena manuscripts of Job and provided extensive stemmata for the catena tradition and their four volume edition is available through the library of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary so that the catena materials may be checked systematically.50 Since the publications of both Ziegler

---


47 Joseph Ziegler, ed. *Iob, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, vol. 11.4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).


49 Ursula Hagedorn and Dieter Hagedorn, eds., *Nachlese zu den Fragmenten der jüngeren griechischen Übersetzer des Buches Hiob*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 1 (Philologisch-Historische Klasse, no. 10 1991). The collation book to this work has been made available through Peter J. Gentry.
and the Hagedorns, MS 161 has become available through the Peter J. Gentry, and its readings will be checked systematically for this new collection. In addition to MS 161, MS 555 will be checked systematically, since Ziegler did not have access to this manuscript as he prepared his edition. Field had access to this manuscript, Codex Regius 2434 and called it “Regii duo” in his edition, but his readings need to be checked against the manuscript, which the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen has made available to me. Since the publication of Ziegler’s edition, two new critical editions of relevant patristic commentaries have appeared and are both available through the library.  

Other Patristic sources can be checked through Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca (CCSG) and Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina (CCSL). Biblia Patristica, volumes 1-7 and Supplement is a cumulative index of citations in the Church Fathers, which can be used to check citations. The Syro-hexapla edition used is that of Ceriani.  

In addition to these resources, our knowledge of the Armenian tradition of Job has been greatly amplified since the work of Ziegler through the labors of Claude Cox, and his works are available in the library.

Methodology


52 A. M. Ceriani, ed. Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolitographice editus, Monumenta sacra et profana, 7 (Milan: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874.)

The Aim of the Project

The aim of this project is not to reconstruct a critical edition of the Hexapla in its columnar order, as beneficial as that type of project might be. As romantic as this aim would be, Norton has already shown that such an edition is not practical, since we do not know how the whole Hexapla, word by word, was arranged. Certainty of the exact arrangement for each biblical book eludes us at this time, but even if we were privy to this information, we would still not know the exact arrangement of each word in each line of the Hexapla as originally constructed. 54

Therefore, the goal of this project is more manageable: to create a critical edition of hexaplaric fragments for Job 22-42. Ter Haar Romeny and Gentry outline three types of materials that are considered to be hexaplaric, which will be the criteria for this dissertation. The first type is strictly hexaplaric and includes the asterisks and obeli and any other scholia, which indicates pluses or minuses relative to the Hebrew text of that time. The second type comprises materials which are considered hexaplaric because Origen incorporated them into it. These materials include readings from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which existed before the composition of the Hexapla and have come down in other sources besides the Hexapla. The Hebrew text in Greek letters is also considered hexaplaric according to this criterion. The third type is hexaplaric material by association and is as follows: ὁ Σύρος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκὸν or ὁ Ἑβραῖος, and τὸ Σαμαρειτικὸν. These works are not hexaplaric in themselves but they have traditionally been collected with hexaplaric materials. 55

Compiling and Presenting Information


55 Ibid., 287.
This project will follow the methodology outlined by ter Haar Romeny and Gentry in their article on collecting hexaplaric materials for Genesis, and the few changes which the Hexapla Project has made since that article appeared.  

**Choices between Readings.** Ziegler’s objective for his second apparatus was simply to list the hexaplaric evidence, and at times the witnesses would be in conflict. This project’s method will align with Field and attempt to reconstruct the original text based on the available evidence. At times this reading will be different than Field because of the new state of the evidence.  

**References to secondary literature and other remarks.** At times editorial notes will refer to secondary literature to clarify or defend the choices made. This practice carries on the custom of Field and will constitute a separate apparatus in this new edition.  

**Latin and Oriental Sources.** For non-Greek sources, in the tradition of Field, I will give the original reading and also provide a retroversion into Greek, if no equivalent Greek witness is available. In places where a non-Greek reading differs from the Greek text due to translation technique and not a different Vorlage or where a retroversion cannot be confidently supplied, a Latin translation will be supplied.  

**Variant Readings from Editions.** I will supply variant readings from modern critical editions of patristic sources, and include all the instances where an author cites the same passage.  

---

56 Ibid., 289-94.  
57 Ibid., 290-1.
Readings from earlier collections that can no longer be checked. At times the Göttingen editor used “Field,” but this project attempts to replace these attributions with Field’s original sources, and wherever I can list the source, it will be cited and Field’s name will not be. In some cases it is not possible to go beyond the indication “Montef,” “Combef,” or “Nobil.” “Montef” refers to readings given by Montfaucon with no other indication; “Combef” refers to readings found by Montfaucon in schedis Combefisionis; and “Nobil” refers to readings given by Nobilius with no further information about his source.

Other hexaplaric material. Pluses and minuses indicated by asterisks and obeli, commentaries, and marginal notes in manuscripts, which were not recorded in either of Ziegler’s apparatuses, will be included in this new collection. In some cases, texts, which were not marked with asterisks, even when they should have received one, will be marked with an asterisk in angle brackets. In cases of transposition of words or phrases that indicate hexaplaric influence, “non tr” will be used to indicate not transposition in relation to the Hebrew but in relation to the LXX.

The text tradition of the LXX has many unattributed sources (sine nomine), which are likely hexaplaric, since they have been included with other hexaplaric readings. In cases where an attribution can reasonably be determined, the attribution is placed in angle brackets. Where no attribution is possible, a question mark is placed in angle brackets, and these readings will be placed in an appendix.

The Project Format

Each reading or entry contains the following elements, which are prescribed by the Hexapla editorial board.
**Hebrew and Greek texts.** The Hebrew lemma is given first followed by Ziegler’s text of the LXX and this text will be labeled LXX. The Hebrew Text is the consonantal Masoretic text (MT) of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and is labeled HT.\(^{58}\) This text is the base text of the edition, and if Origen’s Hebrew text appears to be different, these observations will be noted in the apparatus. Verse references follow the LXX system, and where the Hebrew is different, the Hebrew reference is provided second in square brackets.

**Readings with attributions.** After the LXX reading, the related hexaplaric readings are given. When there are textual variants, a preferred text is given, and variants and explanation are supplied underneath in an apparatus. Any lemma that has been derived by retroversion alone is indicated by a smaller font and explained in the final apparatus.

**Witness apparatuses.** The first apparatus contains the primary hexaplaric witnesses (Wit I). Primary witnesses come mainly from the readings in the second apparatus of Ziegler’s edition or the additional evidence in the Nachlese. The second apparatus for this project contains secondary witnesses (Wit 2). These are manuscripts of the text of the LXX, which have been corrupted by hexaplaric readings and they are principally found in Ziegler’s first apparatus. If all witnesses contain the entire lemma, then the witnesses are simply listed. Otherwise, the sources which contain the longer lemma will be listed first and marked clearly as “lemma” and the shorter or incomplete variants will be preceded by the portion of the full lemma they contain.

The third apparatus presents variants to the attribution (Attr). First, variant attributions from the lemma are listed followed by their sources. Second, where an attribution is omitted, this is indicated by the Latin *sine nomine* “without name” followed by the manuscripts that omit

the attribution.

The fourth apparatus presents the variants to the readings (Var). The lemma in question is listed to the left of the right bracket (]) and the variants and their sources are listed to the right and, in the case of multiple variants, are separated by vertical lines (]). The format of presenting variants follows the Göttingen editions (variants, transpositions [tr], omissions [om, >], additions [pr, +]).

The fifth apparatus lists all non-Greek sources (NonGr). Although the final form of the Hexapla project will include all known non-Greek sources (in particular the Coptic tradition of Job), this project will cover the original texts of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Armenian, and Latin sources. All non-Greek sources listed in Ziegler will be listed in the Witness apparatuses, but only the texts of the aforementioned languages will be included in this dissertation.

The sixth apparatus contains any relevant notes on the entire entry (Notes). Comments on the previous five apparatuses may be supplied, or on matters such as translation technique or usage of particular translators. This apparatus will contain references to any relevant secondary literature. This goal of this apparatus is to explain the given lemma and its place in the text tradition of Job.

The following sample is taken from Job 5:12a and demonstrates the use of all six apparatuses.

**Job 5 12a**

| HT | נספִּים (מַהָּשָׁבְתָהּ הַעֲרָמִים) |
| LXX | διαλλάσσοντα (βουλάς πανούργων, ) |
| σ´ | διαλύσει |

\[WitI: \quad \downarrow C \ (\text{= 250 257 [Olymps]} \ 3005) \ \downarrow cI \ ^{139} 260 643 732 \ \downarrow cII \ (\text{Olymp}) \ 161` \downarrow 252 505 560 \text{ Syh}\]
Notes: Symmachus’s translation technique for the Hebrew participle is generally rendered by a Greek participle form, but it may also be translated using finite verbs and –σις nouns (Busto Saiz, 140-143). Mss 3005, unavailable to Ziegler, and 740 are witnesses to the omission of the sigma in the lemma, perhaps both have inadvertently committed the same error. The participle form in 257 cII is secondary, harmonizing the verb form of the three revisers to participles. In 138, the reading is combined as follows: α’ ἀκυροῦντα διασκεδάζει διαλύει (Kollationen, 35; Young, 157, 31).

Explanation of entry. The parentheses in the HT and LXX lines show the context of the reading in question, while the text not in parentheses is the text under consideration. The first apparatus shows that ↓C (= 250 257 [OlympX] 3005) ↓cI 139 260 643 732 ↓cII (Olymp) 161 ↓252 505 560 Syh all contain the lemma. The down arrow (↓) before a manuscript number or grouping indicates that more information is given in the apparatuses below. The second apparatus reports that the reading in 575 has been influenced by a part of the hexaplaric tradition per Ziegler’s first apparatus. The third apparatus shows that the attribution in 505 is uncertain (inc) and that the attribution is omitted in 138-559. The fourth apparatus shows that C (= 3005) 740 have διαλυει instead of the lemma, that 252 is incertum after διαλη, and that C (= 257[Olympx]) cII have διαλυοντα instead of the lemma. The fifth apparatus supplies the Syriac reading from the margin of the Syro-hexapla complete with attribution to Symmachus. The sixth apparatus provides the editor’s comments on the textual problem and adds any other information from the sources (primary and secondary) relevant to this problem.
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