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Introduction

There are a series of recensions that have greatly influenced the textual development and the textual history of the Old Greek: the so-called kaige recension, the Hexaplaric recension and the Lucianic/Antiochene recension. In this volume we want to shed light on the latter two, even if, as one of the peer-reviewers of the manuscript wrote: this is “a notoriously difficult dual topic.”

Anneli Aejmelaeus contributes with two articles which both set the tone for the whole volume. In her first article, “Hexaplaric Recension and Hexaplaric Readings in 1 Samuel,” she not only presents what Origen’s textual interventions looked like, but also focusses on what she calls “the after-effect” of the work of Origen, in that it “opened the gates to a flood of approximations of the Greek text to the Hebrew.” Aejmelaeus analyses the earliest revisional activity undertaken by the Jewish revisers, who aligned the Old Greek to the then-current Hebrew text and whose work was used by Origen. She then focuses on Origen's statement concerning his text-critical work and, with examples, she elaborates what the process of ‘healing the text’ meant for Origen, what precisely was meant by plusses and minuses, and what sort of readings the three revisers offered. When describing the after-effect of Origen’s work, she points to non-Hexaplaric witnesses in which readings can be found which are not based on the fifth column of the Hexapla, but which are the result of a continued post-Hexaplaric process of aligning the Greek with a Hebrew text, and which are not marked with Aristarchian signs—the latter occasionally leading to doublets, even triplets!

In her second article, entitled “The Lucianic Text of 1 Samuel,” Anneli Aejmelaeus takes on the difficult topic of the Lucianic text of 1 Samuel and contributes to the “new hot debate” on the nature of the Lucianic text, which is also known as the Antiochene Text. She explains how, in two large sections of Samuel-Kings, the Lucianic text is the best witness for the Old Greek text, but that it still takes an accurate and thorough analysis to distill the Old Greek from under this text. As the Lucianic text itself is the product of a conscious editorial process and as this text was also secondarily influenced by Hexaplaric readings, it is thus of utmost importance to filter out all these editorial changes and Hexaplaric influences in order to arrive at the original Old Greek readings which were preserved. With this contribution, Aejmelaeus (again) changes the standard perspective in research. In her conclusion she notes: “… the Lucianic editors were not totally ignorant of kaige readings.” She then concludes: “it is obvious that the Lucianic editors had several manuscripts at their disposal, among them good old manuscripts and ones with kaige-type readings.” Again, she describes the process of finding “the good old basic text,” which is often “buried under Atticizing corrections or changes
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of word-order or partial additions of Hexaplaric readings. ... The only way to achieve this (= uncovering the original text, added KDT) is a full text-critical and translation-technical analysis.”

Anna Kharanauli sets out to determine the chronological sequence in which specific parts of the Bible were translated and whether or not the translations of different books have influenced each other in the process of translation or revision. In order to do so, Kharanauli has chosen the Song of Anna as a case study. Her goal is to describe the relation of the Georgian version of Anna’s song from the Psalms and 1 Samuel with their respective Greek counterparts. She also analyses how the Georgian versions relate to the Greek version of Ps 112 and the text of the book of Jeremiah. Then, she establishes how all these Georgian versions relate to each other in the Georgian Bible itself. Finally, Kharanauli offers her thoughts on the development of the Georgian translations. The in-depth analyses of the different texts demonstrates that the Georgian translation of 1 Samuel was made before the 5th century C.E. and that the Song of Anna was taken, without any changes, from that translation into the collection, which is called Odes. Kharanauli also concludes that the Georgian book of Jeremiah did not leave any traces on the Georgian text of Anna’s Song, but that the latter was influenced by the text of Psalm 112. Finally, Kharanauli indicates that the text of Odes 3 clearly influenced the scribe of the Oshki Codex of Jeremiah.

In her contribution, entitled “The L Text-Form in the Old Georgian Tradition of 1 Samuel,” Natia Mirotadze first gives a short summary of the Georgian sources of 1 Samuel, describes how these sources are grouped together according to the text they contain, and briefly characterizes these groups by highlighting their main features. She notes that all Georgian text-forms of 1 Samuel contain readings of the L text type. In the main part of her article Mirotadze analyses these readings, which are mainly additions, albeit that in some cases they manifest themselves as substitutions. Mirotadze concludes that even in those cases where the Georgian textual forms of 1 Samuel are interconnected (as they offer the same translation), there are some readings of the L text type which come from different Greek Vorlagen. The L readings are variously distributed in the Lucianic manuscripts and the variety is reflected in the Georgian versions as well, with in some cases the Georgian text even bringing more colour to the spectrum.

In her contribution, Sarah Yardney, using 1 Sam 14:41, makes the case that the Greek translator of Samuel occasionally departed from his usual working method to produce creative, interpretive translations. Whereas the Masoretic text preserves the difficult phrase הָבָה תָמִים, the Septuagint attests a lengthy plus that appears to describe Saul consulting the ʾûrim wətummîm. By focusing on the lexical and syntactical elements of the Greek, Yardney attempts to solve the problem of whether the plus reflects an original text or can be credited to the translator. In her analysis, she explores the history of interpretation as visible in a wide range of ancient Jewish texts. The interpretations offered by the ancient
texts gave the translator the option to “exclude tummîm from his translation.” Yardney concludes that “the translator did not intend ὀσιότης in 1 Sam 14:41 to render ‘tummîm,’ as has been widely assumed, but rather meant it to carry its usual meaning of ‘piety’ or, more contextually, ‘blamelessness.’” She concludes that the Greek does not render תֻמים but of תמים.

With his article entitled “Is there a (Proto-)Lucianic Stratum in the Text of 1 Kings of the Old Latin Manuscript La115?” Timo Tekoniemi puts himself in the line of Julio Trebolle, Adrian Schenker, and Tuukka Kauhanen who have put the Old Latin back on the front burner of text-critical studies. Tekoniemi focuses on the (50) agreements between the Old Latin and the Lucianic text and attempts to find out which readings reflect a proto-Lucianic old text and which reflect the recensional Lucianic layer. First, he analyses the 17 cases of possible recensional Lucianic readings and then, as a sort of counter-test, he deals with the 28 clearest cases of (recensional) Lucianic readings that are not found in La115. He concludes that there are a few possibilities for very sporadic Lucianic corruptions but also that some ostensibly “Lucianic” readings might well have already been in the proto-Lucianic stratum.

As the title of his second article, “On the Verge of Textual, Literary, and Redaction Criticism: the Case of 2 Kings 17:7,” suggests, Timo Tekoniemi argues that “higher” literary and “lower” textual criticism could actually benefit from each other instead of being treated as separate methods. He precisely describes the different witnesses and their problems and proceeds to focus on 2 Kings 17:7. He analyses the text in light of the methodological discussion about the methods, by first offering a text-critical analysis and then a literary-critical assessment. Then he proceeds to offer his views on the redactional ramifications of the textual evaluation. Whereas in the past the redaction history of 2 Kings 17 was seen as a straightforward process of Fortschreibung, Tekoniemi notes that phrases and ideas of the new narratives could have led to adjusting the text of the older narratives. He describes this process as “textual zigzagging.”

In his article, “3 Kgdms 12:24a–z as Textual βάσανος for the Edition of 3–4 Kingdoms,” Pablo A. Torijano takes the reader on a tour of the ongoing work on the edition of the books of Kingdoms for the Septuaginta Unternehmen as undertaken by himself and Julio Trebolle. Using the example of 3 Kgdms 12:24a–z, he tests their methodology, illustrating the extreme complexity of the problems and offering possible solutions. Whereas in the past the text of the Antiochene tradition was not seen as a good text to reconstruct the Old Greek, new knowledge of the history of the biblical text, as gained through the Qumran biblical manuscripts, points to the necessity of critically using the Antiochene text for the reconstruction of the Old Greek. Torijano offers an excellent description of the witnesses and their problems. Then, using important variants of the alternative story in 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z, he proceeds to establish the Old Greek, identify the textual characteristics of the main textual traditions, and describe what one
can learn from this exercise for the reconstruction of the Old Greek in the rest of 3 and 4 Kingdoms, both in the Old Greek and the *kaige* sections. This analysis, however, leads him to very nuanced conclusions: not just an entire group of manuscripts needs to be taken into account, but the individuality of each manuscript. Moreover, in the Lucianic manuscripts not every reading is Lucianic, as they may also transmit pre-Lucianic and pre-Hexaplaric readings. Similarly, some isolated readings of the *kaige* manuscripts do not represent the Old Greek. And finally, one can detect Old Greek readings even in non-aligned, mixed manuscripts, albeit in a Hexaplaric location.

Andrés Piquer Otero turns his attention to the Coptic Fragments of 3 and 4 Kingdoms in his contribution entitled “Lucianic or Pre-Lucianic? The Provenance of L Readings in the Coptic Fragments of 3 and 4 Kingdoms.” Piquer Otero describes the witnesses, their complex relationship, and the process needed to reconstruct the Old Greek. He emphasizes the necessity to carefully glean information from the secondary versions and focuses in this contribution on the Sahidic Coptic texts. He proceeds to connect the fragmentary Coptic evidence of 3 and 4 Kingdoms with the Antiochene or Lucianic text, in a similar way as it is done with the evidence of the Old Latin. He concludes that the Coptic text aligns itself with the text of the B tradition. However, the analysis of the L readings as present in the Coptic text seems to point to these readings being pre-Lucianic readings. Piquer Otero also offers an explanation for these readings in the Coptic tradition.

The article by Jonathan M. Robker, entitled “Hezekiah in the Antiochene Text: 2 Kings 18:20 in Ant., B, and M with Recourse to Isaiah 36–39,” compares two of the three texts that deal with King Hezekiah and his stand-off against the Assyrians. While the texts of 2 Kings and Isaiah resemble one another on the Hebrew level, the Greek versions differ in their narrative. With this topic, Robker definitively takes on one of the most well-known textual problems of 2 Kings. Robker investigates the choices made by Alfred Rahlfs, taking 2 Kings 18–20 as a test case. He first characterizes the Antiochene text of 2 Kings 18–20, then addresses some specific variants and finally offers his views on how the Antiochene text could help to reconstruct the Old Greek of Kings in this passage.

In her article, entitled “Hexaplaric Readings in the Book of Joshua,” Kristin De Troyer seeks to answer the question of how Origen went about his task in selecting readings from the three early Jewish revisers. She selected the first two chapters of the book of Joshua as a test case. Using the famous manuscript 344, she compares its marginal notes with the readings as noted in the Cambridge edition of the Old Greek of Joshua. She notes that the scribe of the manuscript developed his own system of annotations and that he or she was well aware of when to use the Aristarchian symbols. She also notes that there was some variation in the way the scribe of the marginal notes referred to “the remaining of the Early Jewish Revisers” as well as to the fifth column with its Hexaplaric notes. Then, she
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investigates readings taken from ‘the Rest’ and either marked or unmarked with an asterisk, readings from Theodotion marked with an asterisk or not, readings from either Symmachus or Aquila, readings that are marked with an asterisk in the Hexaplaric tradition, but which have not been assigned a source, readings that are Hexaplaric but were not taken over by Origen, and finally, readings marked with an obelus in the Hexaplaric tradition. De Troyer concludes that Origen was dependent for his precision on the early Jewish revisers. She also points to the fact that Origen not only took over Theodotionic readings, but also readings from ‘the Rest.’ Finally, she notes that there are some readings which look Hexaplaric, but which were not taken up in the fifth column—the latter readings may point to a very late phase in the textual development of the Hebrew text.

The last article of the volume, “The Alpha-Text of Esther and the Shadow of the Lucianic Recension,” is written by Tyler James Smith and dedicated to the problem of the nomenclature regarding the so-called Alpha-Text of Esther. From the edition of Esther by James Ussher in 1655 to the present discussion, Smith traces the names given to the second Greek text of Esther and explains the raison d’être for the different names. Befitting the topic of this volume, he elaborates on the reasons why the text was perceived as Lucianic and why this label was persistently (mis-)used. At the end of his contribution, he wonders about the overlap between the small group of manuscripts in which the second Greek text is found and that in which the Lucianic recension of the historical books can be found.

Most of the contributions to this volume originated as papers given in the Textual Criticism of Samuel–Kings Program Unit at either the SBL San Antonio, TX, 2016 meeting or the SBL Boston, MA, 2017 meeting.

The editors of the present volume are grateful to the reviewers for their constructive criticism and to the authors for their patience and willingness to improve their contributions.

Salzburg, 26 May 2020
Anneli Aejmelaeus

Hexaplaric Recension and Hexaplaric Readings in 1 Samuel

Introduction

The Hexaplaric recension is the most well-known of the Christian recensions of the Septuagint. Nevertheless, there are still many puzzles around it. I am approaching the topic from the angle of textual transmission, and in particular, from the angle of the textual transmission of one biblical book, so that I am not primarily interested in taking part in the big debates concerning the work of Origen. He was no doubt the originator of the text-historical phenomenon of the Hexaplaric recension and Hexaplaric readings that can be observed in the textual transmission, although we do not know for sure what his personal role was and how he proceeded fulfilling his task. What concerns me is the after-effect that can be observed in the textual evidence offered by the various manuscripts available to us and how to explain it.

I need not start by describing Origen's great text-critical endeavour, the Hexapla and its six columns that were meant to facilitate the comparison between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text—the sacred texts of the Church and the Synagogue in the third century C.E.—a huge, ambitious endeavour in which the three later Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) were employed to ease the access to the Hebrew text and to help Origen “heal” the text of the Septuagint.¹

Instead of putting an end to textual variation, Origen's great text-critical work eventually opened the gates to a flood of approximations of the Greek text to the Hebrew, the most commonly mentioned of these being the complementation of elements of the Hebrew text not present in the Old Greek, marking these complementations with an asterisk as well as marking plusses of the Greek text that had

no correspondence in the Hebrew text with an *obelus*, the change of word-order to conform to the Hebrew text, and the correction of proper names according to the Hebrew. Examples of these features can be seen all over the critical apparatus of any Septuagint book (that has a Hebrew *Vorlage*), as they have spread to a varying number of manuscripts.

Early Comparison of the Septuagint with the Hebrew Text and Approximation to It

Origen was, however, not the first one to compare the Greek text with the Hebrew and to take measures accordingly. The attitude of both Jews and Christians to the traditional Septuagint was curiously ambivalent. The Septuagint was the first Bible of the Christians and was in that sense authoritative. At least among the Diaspora Jews, the Septuagint—above all the Greek Torah—was also considered to be Scripture. At the same time, the Hebrew text—the contemporary Hebrew text at hand—was considered to be a valid criterion for revisions to be made on the Greek text.

What were the factors that gave rise to such early revisional activity? Until the time of Origen, the Septuagint had already had a long history of copying, which always produces errors as we know. One even more important factor that triggered the activity of the revisers was the Hebrew text itself, as many parts of it were still under editorial activity at least until the turn of the era. The later the Hebrew text of a certain book continued to be edited, the more there were differences between the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and the Hebrew text that was used for comparison, and accordingly, the more revisional activity can be expected to have happened on the Greek text already during the pre-Hexaplaric period—as well as later.

The Books of Samuel and Kings are good examples for this. Previous generations of textual critics tended to think that—except for scribal errors—all the differences that called for revision were caused by the translators, either through

---

2 For the text-historical disaster caused by Origen, see Salvesen, “A Convergence of the Ways?”, 242–6; see also Samuel R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd edition, revised and enlarged; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), xliii: “Origen, no doubt, freed the text of the LXX from many minor faults; but in the main his work tended to obliterate the most original and distinctive features of the Version. To discover the Hebrew text used by the translators we must recover, as far as possible, the text of the Version as it left the translators’ hands; and Origen’s labours, instead of facilitating, rather impeded this process.”

erroneous or free translation or paraphrasing. In the present post-Qumran era, it has become clear to most scholars that the Vorlage time and again differed substantially from the proto-MT of the revisers as well as the later MT that we use for comparison. Nevertheless, in the historical books we do also find numerous cases in which erroneous translation was the factor that triggered revision. The two kinds of differences—those caused by the editors of the Hebrew text and by the Greek translators—do not exclude each other. In Samuel and Kings both kinds are well represented. No wonder then that these books have such an eventful textual history.

Origen’s Understanding of the Textual History of the Septuagint by His Time

As for Origen, he naturally had no idea about the development of the Hebrew text. When he compared the Septuagint manuscripts that were available to him with the Hebrew text, he took it for granted that this very same Hebrew text had been the Vorlage of the Septuagint, and he followed the principle of regarding the reading in agreement with this Hebrew text as the original wording of the Septuagint. In the case of divergences, he gathered that they must have been caused either by careless copying or by the arrogance of some copyists to change the text. It is, however, seldom considered at all that Origen had several Septuagint manuscripts and that he was troubled not only by the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts, but also by the divergences between the Greek copies. Consequently, he had a twofold task (1) to “heal” the text of the Septuagint from all corruption and (2) to clarify for those Christians who engaged in the debates with the Jews what were the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures.

In what follows, I am going to give examples for different aspects of Origen’s text-critical work and of the subsequent influence of the Hexapla. I shall start

---

4 For instance, John William Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy, SCS 39 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), xxii: “One should not automatically presuppose a different parent text when differences between the Greek and the Hebrew obtain; rather one should first seek for and pursue other explanations. It is only through such details that a picture of the attitudes, the theological prejudices, as well as of the cultural environment of these Jewish translators can emerge.” By contrast, it is often the attitudes and prejudices of the editors of the Hebrew text that emerge through the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek text.

5 See Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta, Translated and annotated by Gérard J. Norton O.P., with the collaboration of Carmen Hardin, CahRB 62 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 2005), 91–3 (Orig. xlvi-xlviii), 99–100 (Orig. li-lii), 113–5 (Orig. lx-xl).
with Origen's own statement concerning his text-critical work and then proceed by examples of the different kinds of readings encountered by Origen and at the end discuss in brief Hexaplaric influence after Origen.

Origen's Statement concerning His Text-Critical Work

In the famous passage in his Commentary on Matthew (15.14), Origen describes the procedure of comparing manuscripts and deciding between readings:

τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ διδόντος εὑρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεις· τῶν γὰρ ἀμφι-βαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν τὴν κρί-σιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων τὸ συνάδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὀβελίσαμεν (ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα (οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν), τινὰ δὲ μετ’ ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δήλον ἥ ὅτι μὴ κεί-μενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνους τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν, καὶ ὃ μὲν βουλόμενος προ(σ)ηταὶ, ὁ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον ὃ βουλέται (περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν ἢ μὴ) ποιήσῃ.

For the lack of consistency in the manuscripts of the Old Testament, we have with God's help found a cure, while we use the other versions as a yardstick; what was dubious in the Septuagint on account of manuscripts lacking consistency, we judge this from the other versions, and retain what is in harmony with them. Moreover, such places that are not in the Hebrew (we did not dare to erase them completely), we mark some with an obelus. Other places we mark with an asterisk to make clear that what we added from the other versions in harmony with the Hebrew is not found in the Septuagint. Whoever wants to can accept these variants, but to whom such a thing is objectionable, he can accept or refuse as he wishes.6

While commenting on the Gospel of Matthew, Origen takes up the theme of possible textual changes in Matthew and compares with it the situation in the Old Testament, where he can solve textual problems by comparison with the Hebrew text. This is indeed the difference between the New Testament and the Septuagint in textual criticism: the Hebrew text always plays a role in the textual criticism of the Septuagint—although the matter is a bit more complicated than presupposed by Origen.

---

6 For the interpretation of Origen's Comm. Matth. 15.14 (as well as the other ancient texts on Origen's text-critical work), see Neuschäfer, Origenes als Philologe, 86–94. See also Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla,” 6–9. The Greek texts with translations are found in Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context, 204–10.
As a matter of fact, Origen does not say that he compared the diverging Greek manuscripts directly with the Hebrew text, but with the three later versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and he chose the reading that was “in harmony” (τὸ συνῄδον) with them. The Three provided an easy access to the Hebrew, which he obviously was not completely fluent with. In addition, he mentions the use of obelus to mark plusses of the Greek text, which he did not want to excise, and asterisk to mark the filling in of minuses of the Greek text in comparison with the Hebrew, which happened with the help of the Three, mainly Theodotion.

It seems obvious to me that Origen discusses in the passage at hand different kinds of variant readings, not only the quantitative differences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text of his time (the so-called plusses and minuses), although the passage has often been interpreted as referring to those only. How he speaks about the diverging copies—“the lack of consistency in the manuscripts of the Old Testament”—would be a curious way to refer to the same variants that he discusses on the following lines when he mentions the use of asterisk and obelus. Rather, the first-mentioned divergences are those between different manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Scripture of the Church, and the criterion for deciding between them was what is “in harmony” (τὸ συνῄδον) with the Hebrew text as reflected by the Three—not identical, but “in harmony.” This is not what he did with the plusses and minuses. Deciding between variants found in copies of the Septuagint is what Origen refers to as “healing” the text. The readings that resulted from the “healing” procedure were not marked in any way.

There has been a long debate about what Origen actually refers to in the quoted passage, whether he is explaining the construction of the fifth column of the Hexapla (the Septuagint column) or speaking of a recension of the Septuagint that he prepared separately from the Hexapla. As for the textual transmission

---

7 Consider the estimations by Bernhard Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, I–II, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 18/1–2 (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1987), 95: “… dass die Kenntnis des Hebräischen, über die Origenes verfügte, im Vergleich mit anderen Kirchenvätern zwar erstaunlich, an objektiven Massstäben gemessen aber begrenzt gewesen sein muss”; as well as by Alison Salvesen, “A Convergence of the Ways?”, 240, n. 22: “Origen’s own knowledge of Hebrew was very limited and depended heavily upon the renderings of the Three. His proficiency fell very far short of Jerome’s.”

8 The general assumption that Origen mainly used Theodotion (see for instance, Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 109), placed in the sixth column next to the Septuagint, to complement the text of the Septuagint is confirmed by numerous Hexaplaric readings that happen to correspond to occasionally preserved readings of Theodotion.

9 This view is supported by Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, 94. See also Salvesen, “A Convergence of the Ways?”, 240.

10 For the debate whether or not Origen used the Aristarchian signs in the fifth column of the Hexapla or in some other edition of his, see Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context,*
that was influenced by Origen's work, it does really not make much difference whether this influence was mediated through the Hexapla or another edition of the text outside of it. However, in light of the textual transmission of 1 Samuel—which is my task here—if one considers what Origen says about the differences between the Greek copies, it seems impossible that Origen could have constructed his fifth column without precisely this kind of text-critical work. How could he otherwise have decided which words to copy into his fifth column, when his manuscripts differed from each other? He could not include different readings of the Septuagint in his Hexapla. The only criterion he could possibly use was agreement with the Hebrew text, and this could easily be evaluated by the information in the Hexapla. This is how Origen tried to eliminate scribal changes as well as copying errors, but at times he also happened to eliminate the original, if one of the alternatives happened to be a pre-Hexaplaric approximation to the Hebrew text.

Let us look at some examples to see how Origen's work is reflected in the textual transmission of 1 Samuel.

11 In addition, it is difficult to ascribe the "healing" of the text and the dealing with plusses and minuses discussed in close context to different phases of text-critical work (see also Schaper, “The Origin and Purpose of the Fifth Column of the Hexapla,” 9).

12 The manuscripts available for the First Book of Samuel, with their tentative groupings, are the following (with those only partially preserved in parentheses): B A V (M) (842) (845) (846) (867); O = 247-376; L = 19-82-93-108-127; Cl = 98-(243)-379-731; ClII = 46-52-236-242-313-328-530; a = 119-527-799; b = 121-509; d = 44-68-74-106-107-120-122-125-134-(370)-610; f = 56-246; s = 64-92-130-314-381-488-489-(762); 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 (342) 460 554 707. As for the group sigla, O stands for the Hexaplaric, L for the Lucianic, C for Catena manuscripts. See Offizielles Verzeichnis der Rahls-Sigeln, Stand: Dezember 2012, ed. Septuaginta-Unternehmen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (https://rep.adw-go.de/handle/11858/00-001S-0000-0022-A30C-8).
Hexaplaric Recension and Hexaplaric Readings in 1 Samuel

“Healing the Text”

Qualitative Variants

One of my most important discoveries in the textual history of 1 Samuel is that the early pre-Hexaplaric revisional activity, known as *kaige*-revision, has left its marks not only in the so-called *kaige*-sections in Samuel–Kings but also in what was believed to be non-*kaige*-sections, and this insight has important repercussions on my understanding of the work of Origen. These *kaige*-type readings are found sporadically in 1 Samuel and especially in the B text represented by Codex Vaticanus (B) and its satellites 121-509 (= b; Aeth), and these readings are followed by a small number of witnesses, most prominent among them the manuscripts that Alfred Rahlfs already recognized as Hexaplaric, namely Codex Alexandrinus (A) and the minuscules 247-376 (= O; Arm). These manuscripts are the closest we come to the fifth column of the Hexapla—or should we say: the Septuagint text “healed” by Origen.

Several scholars have made the observation that Origen’s basic Septuagint text was close to Vaticanus. I would like to modify this statement by saying that the B text was represented among the various manuscripts used by Origen: he

---


15 Bo Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta*, Studia Theologica Lundensia 22 (Lund: Gleerup, 1963), aims at defining the Hexaplaric text in 1 Samuel, but does not recognize this source of qualitative variants in Origen’s text (esp. p. 46–53); the main problem in his study is that he regards B practically as the original text of the Septuagint to which he compares all other manuscripts.

followed it in significant readings but could also decide against it. The B text is an
Alexandrian text-type, and it is thus natural to think that it was known to Origen.
Of course, this presupposes that the text-type is older than the manuscripts that
represent it. If it was developed in Alexandria during the late 2nd century C.E.,
when the Christian school of Alexandria rose to fame, this explains how it was
available to Origen.17

My first example of a qualitative variant adopted by Origen into his Septuagint
is from 1 Samuel 30:18. When chasing after the Amalekites, David had to divide
his troops and leave 200 men behind. Now in v. 21, he is returning to those 200.

1 Sam 30:21

The Hebrew text refers to these men as those “who were too exhausted to follow
David,” using the rare verb פגר pi. ‘to be exhausted/faint,’ which occurs only here
and earlier in v. 10 of the same chapter. The translator obviously did not know the
word and translated “who were left behind.”19

This is one of those cases where the B text offers an early approximation (ἐκλύ-
θέντας), using the passive voice of ἐκλύω with the meaning ‘to be faint,’ which is
clearly closer to the meaning of the Hebrew verb. This reading is found in two
groups of witnesses: the B text (B b) and the Hexaplaric text (A O), presumably

17 The B text seems to have been the earliest Christian recension of the biblical text; see my
article “Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing,” in The Text of
the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot,
ed. by Andrés Piquer Otero & Pablo Torijano Morales, Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1 (Leiden/Boston:
Brill, 2016), 160–79 (esp. 175).

18 The following examples will be given according to the critical text of the forthcoming
edition, whereas readings of Rahlfs’s edition are marked by Ra. The information given on
the readings represented by various Greek manuscripts includes just what is essential for the dis-
cussion in this paper. For the sake of clarity, minor variants as well as daughter versions and Pa-
tristic quotations have been excluded. As usual, the list of manuscripts for the majority reading
is not given in the apparatus but can be derived from the list of all witnesses by deducting the
manuscripts representing variant readings. See for instance the following footnote.

19 The critical text follows the reading ὑπολειφθέντας represented in the majority of wit-
nesses: V M 93 CI CII a d–370 fs 29 55 71 158 245 318 342 460 554 707.
the text of Origen’s fifth column.\textsuperscript{20} This is also the reading found in Rahlfs’s edition, because he based his text mainly on B and A. However, if this were the original reading, it would be impossible to explain where the majority reading or the Lucianic variant came from.

Luckily enough, we know in this case also the readings of the Three who all go different ways. Aquila uses the verb πτωματίζω pass. ‘to fall’ or ‘to be ready to fall’ (often used in reference to epilepsy!), formulating a relative clause as in the Hebrew. Symmachus and Theodotion have a participle like the Old Greek, the former using the verb ἀτονέω ‘to be exhausted,’ ‘to be too weak (to do something),’ and the latter ἄποναρκάω ‘to be quite torpid.’

Presuming that our information on the Three is correct, it seems clear that the variant ἐκλυθέντας was not adopted by Origen from the Three but rather from one of the Septuagint manuscripts that he was using, more precisely, an early exemplar of the B text. He must have known also the Old Greek reading, but comparison with the Three led him to choose ἐκλυθέντας which is “in harmony”—although not identical!—with the different equivalents found in the Three and thus also in harmony with the Hebrew text.\textsuperscript{21}

It is interesting to compare the other case with the same difficult Hebrew word in v. 10, where the weariness of the men was mentioned first.

\begin{verbatim}
1 Sam 30:10
יִהְיוּ כְּפָרָה אֶת־אַשֶּׁר [טּוֹבֶר ַכַּן] פִּגְר֔וּ וַיַּעַמְדוּ מָאתַ֣יִם אֲשֶׁ֣ר ὑπέστησαν δὲ διακόσιοι ἄνδρες οἵτινες ἐκάθισαν πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Βοσόρ.
Marginal readings: οἵτινες ἐκάθισαν ] α′ οἳ ἠτόνησαν σ′ ἠδυνάτησαν θ′ ἀπενάρκησαν παρελθεῖν 243-731(s nom) | υπέστησαν (false index!) | α′ ἠτόνησαν τοῦ διαβῆναι θ′ ἀπενάρκησαν παρελθεῖν 554(s nom) | ἐκάθισαν | ἐνάρκησαν Μ\textsuperscript{118}(s nom) |
\end{verbatim}

The translator made another contextual guess, this time using the false rendering ἐκάθισαν “they stayed,” and interpreting the infinitive construction מֵעֲבֹ֖ר אֶת־נַ֥חַל הַבְּשֽׂוֹר as the prepositional phrase מֵעֲבֹ֖ר אַשֶּׁר מֶֽעֲבֹ֖ר ‘beyond,’ thus rephrasing the Hebrew “too exhausted to cross the brook” as “stayed on the other side of the brook.” The story does not suffer much from this contextual guess, but in fact, it is a false rendering.

Again, the renderings of the Three are preserved in a few different notes, Aquila using this time the verb ἀτονέω ‘to be exhausted,’ ‘to be too weak (to do

\textsuperscript{20} Brock, \textit{The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel}, 170, is sceptical about the nature of the manuscripts A 247–376, concluding that they are related to the B text but not based on the fifth column of the Hexapla.

\textsuperscript{21} The hypothetical possibility of pre-Origenic approximations among the texts used by Origen—however, without concrete evidence—has been suggested by a few scholars: Soisalon-Soininen, \textit{Der Charakter der asterisierten Zusätze}, 29, 190; Brock, \textit{The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel}, 172; Neuschäfer, \textit{Origenes als Philologe}, 99.
something), Symmachus ἀδυνατέω ‘to lack strength,’ and Theodotion consistently using ἀποναρκάω ‘to be quite torpid.’ At the beginning of the marginal note of the catena manuscripts 243–731, the relative pronoun is mentioned just once, and similarly at the end, the infinitive παρελθεῖν ‘to cross’ correcting the second element, whereas τοῦ διαβῆναι is found in another note for Aquila (554).

How did Origen react to this case? Curiously enough, there is no revisional variant preserved for ἐκάθισαν in the manuscripts available to us. Origen probably did not have any variants to choose between in the manuscripts available to him and he obviously retained the Old Greek ἐκάθισαν. In the Hexapla, he had the renderings of the Three that agree with the Hebrew text, but because of the unanimity of his Septuagint manuscripts, there was nothing “to be healed” in the text of the Church this time.  

Word Order

Adjusting the word order to the Hebrew text is another one of Origen’s “healing” actions. Examples of this kind are numerous.

1 Sam 30:19

The passage lists the prisoners and the booty returned from the Amalekites. The relative order of “from the booty” and “to sons and daughters” is different in the two texts. Both orders are in a way logical, and it is difficult to decide which one should be considered more original.  

The change according to the Hebrew text occurs only in the Hexaplaric manuscripts (A O). The change of order was probably a practical necessity when compiling the Hexapla. Otherwise, it would have been difficult to place the Greek words into the column opposite to the Hebrew
text. Examples of this kind suggest that A O are the manuscripts that best of all transmit the text of the fifth column.

In another example, the change of word order already happened in the B text, which is followed by the Hexaplaric text and just a few other manuscripts.

1 Sam 30:13

לְֽמִי־אַ֔תָּה וְאֵ֥י מִזֶּ֖ה אָ֑תָּה
Πόθεν εἶ, καὶ τίνος εἶ σύ;
Πόθεν εἶ et τίνος εἶ σύ tr B A O a b 64-381 460 Ra = MT

Here we can see the same pattern as above: from diverging readings Origen chose the one in harmony with the Hebrew text. The corrected word order was found in the B text and spread from there to a few further manuscripts. Again, A O seem to witness the text of the fifth column.

Proper Names

Proper names are an area where Origen seems to have proceeded fairly independently, as far as spelling is concerned. Differences in the spelling of less well-known names are extremely numerous in the manuscripts. Below are a few examples.

Ziklag is a fairly well-known place-name, but there is still variation even within one manuscript and in one verse with several occurrences of the name.

1 Sam 30:1 Σικελάγ (three times in the verse)

Σικελάγ 1] σικελάτ 242 245; σικελάκ V 318; σικελά 71; σικέλαν 158; σεκέλαγ CII 242 530 s 488 55; σεκέλαγ 488; σεκέλακ 460 Ra; σκειλά 509; κειλά B L 19 108 121 f; κειλά 19 554 mg; κειλά 108; κειλά 342 |

Σικέλαγ 2] σικελάτ 245; σικελάκ V 318 342; σικελά 71; σικέλαγ 68-122; σκειλάγ 158; σκειλά 19; σεκέλαγ M 55; σεκέλαγ L 19 108 CII 242 530 121 s 55; σεκέλακ B 509 Ra; κελά 460; 3 CII 242 121 68-120-122 s 488 71 245 707 |

Σικελάγ 3] σικελάκ V 318 342; σικελά 376; σκιαλάγ 158; σεκέλαγ L 488 55; σεκελάκ B 509 460 Ra |

In the first case, there is also a major variant: the B text and the Lucianic text (followed by f [= 56-246]) refer to another town. It is a complicated case involving

24 See Field’s Prolegomena, lxi (trans. 114).
25 It deserves to be noted that the personal pronoun of the second person singular is not repeated as it is in the Hebrew text, although the word-order is corrected.
26 See Field’s Prolegomena, lx-lxi (trans. 113–114).
other variants, but this time Origen does not follow the B text because it is not in harmony with the Hebrew text. In all three cases, the form in the lemma that accords with the Hebrew name is found in the Hexaplaric manuscripts A and 247 (with minor differences in 376) and the majority of manuscripts. In the case of Ziklag, Origen in fact seems to have restored the original form of the name in the Septuagint.

Later in the same chapter, we can see variation in two less well-known names. The Hexaplaric manuscripts (A and O [= 247-376]) are the only ones that come even close to the Hebrew names, witnessing to Origen’s “healing” procedure, whereas the manuscripts of the B text show different forms of a totally different name. The original form of the first name in the Septuagint is either due to a different Vorlage or a misreading by the translator.

Plusses and Minuses

Plusses of the Septuagint

Let us take an example of the plusses of the Septuagint. In the first chapter of 1 Samuel, the Greek text of Hannah’s story contains several details that are not present in the Hebrew text.

At 1 Sam 1:13, the MT does not contain the sentence “and the Lord heard her,” which is part of the Old Greek, but was omitted by the B text, followed by the Hexaplaric manuscripts A O and five other minuscules. Consequently, it is not present in the edition of Rahlfs. This omission is a feature of the early revision, made according to the proto-MT, which had possibly deleted the sentence out of ideological reasons. Origen must have encountered the sentence in some of his manuscripts—it is preserved until today in about fifty mss—but since there was a divergence between the Septuagint manuscripts, Origen used the Three as the criterion and omitted the sentence. According to his reasoning, it could not be considered as part of the Old Greek. If the manuscripts had been unanimous, the sentence would have stayed in place under an obelus.

It is interesting to compare two other cases in the same chapter in which the MT omits some details of the story.

1 Sam 1:9

καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰάννα ... καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ Ἰλί ... om καὶ 2 — Κυρίου Compl = MT | κατέστη| ανέστη 19-108; ἐστὶ Ο 244 | 

1 Sam 1:14

καὶ πορεύου τὸν οἶνόν σου ἐπελεῦ έκ προσώπου Κυρίου om καὶ — Κυρίου Compl = MT | πορεύου | απελθε L d 68 122 554; ἀποστα 245 | ἐκ απο 245 | προσώπου | του τοπου 126 68-122 | Κυρίου | + του θυ V |

The omission of these sentences is found in none of the early witnesses, but only in the Complutensian polyglot, which reveals several such independent, late approximations to the MT. There are some scribal errors and minor variants in the wording, but these sentences were clearly considered to belong to the Septuagint. According to his report, Origen used to mark such cases with an obelus, but none are preserved in these cases. Later copyists could interpret an obelus as a sign for suspect details in the text, and thus as a permission to delete, but even where an obelus is preserved, omission is rare. The above-mentioned sentences were certainly seen to be essential for the story. However, it is impossible to judge whether these cases ever contained an obelus.

The different ways of dealing with the plusses of the Septuagint show that Origen did not compare the Greek text just with the Hebrew (or the Three reflecting it). If there were differences between the Greek manuscripts, he chose what was

30 Of the five manuscripts (f = 56-246; 55 245 ΤΟΥ ΘΥ 707) some follow the B text, others might have suffered a haplography; 707 transmits the sentence in the margin.