

Anneli Aejmelaeus / Drew Longacre / Natia Mirotadze (eds.)

From Scribal Error to Rewriting

How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed



De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI)

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

In Co-operation with

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

Volume 12

Anneli Aejmelaeus / Drew Longacre /
Natia Miritadze (eds.)

From Scribal Error to Rewriting

*How Ancient Texts Could and
Could Not Be Changed*

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <https://dnb.de>.

© 2020, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen
All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: NEUNPLUS1, Berlin
Printed and bound: Hubert & Co. BuchPartner, Göttingen
Printed in the EU

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

Online ISSN 2197-0912
ISBN 978-3-525-52209-7

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 7 |
| <i>Part I Ancient Scribal and Editorial Practices</i> | |
| <i>Anna Kharanauli</i> | |
| Origen and Lucian in the Light of Ancient Editorial Techniques | 15 |
| <i>Amneris Roselli</i> | |
| Galen's Practice of Textual Criticism | 53 |
| <i>Julio Trebolle</i> | |
| Pre-Lucianic Readings of 3–4 Reigns in Marginal Notes of the Syrohexapla and in the Syriac Text of Jacob of Edessa | 73 |
| <i>Kristin De Troyer</i> | |
| The Scribe of the Marginal Notes of Manuscript 344 (Ra 344; BM v) | 99 |
| <i>Part II Textual History of the Hebrew Bible</i> | |
| <i>Peter J. Gentry and John D. Meade</i> | |
| MasPs ^a and the Early History of the Hebrew Psalter | 113 |
| <i>Emanuel Tov</i> | |
| The Possible Revision of Hebrew Texts According to MT | 147 |
| <i>Anneli Aejmelaeus</i> | |
| Rewriting David and Goliath? | 165 |
| <i>Drew Longacre</i> | |
| Multilinear Genealogical Networks: Expanding the Scope of Textual History | 181 |
| <i>Part III Writing and Rewriting in Translation</i> | |
| <i>Katja Kujanpää</i> | |
| Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul's Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations | 201 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Andrés Piquer Otero</i> Creative Philology and Glosses: Secondary Versions of Kingdoms and Lexical Accumulation or Mutation | 221 |
| <i>S. Peter Cowe</i> Scribe, Translator, Redactor: Writing and Rewriting Scripture in the Armenian Versions of Esther, Judith, and Tobit | 237 |
| <i>Jean-Marie Auwers</i> The Intermediate Version of the Book of Tobit in its Greek Dress | 271 |
| <i>Natia Dundua</i> What Can the Georgian Translation of the Book of Tobit Tell about G ^{III} ? | 289 |
| <i>Natia Mirotdadze</i> The Old Georgian Version of the Book of Esther—All in One | 321 |
| <i>Magda Mtchedlidze</i> A Translation, Paraphrase, or Metaphrasis? Regarding Euthymius the Hagiorite's Versions of the Orations by Gregory the Theologian | 361 |
| <i>Anna Kharanauli</i> Septuagint Text Types in the Georgian Translations | 391 |

Introduction

The present volume focuses on ancient literary cultures and the work of copyists, editors, and translators. The contributions included in it represent the work of a diverse group of senior and junior scholars from North America, Europe, Israel, and Georgia, who were gathered to an interdisciplinary symposium in Tbilisi, Georgia from 30 April–3 May 2015. On behalf of all the participants, the editors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the initiator and organizer of the symposium Professor Anna Kharanauli and her many colleagues and students for their generous hospitality and excellent organization of the symposium and its accompanying program. We would also like to thank the Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University and the Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation for making the event financially possible. The symposium was a wonderful opportunity to meet and exchange ideas between scholars and students of different backgrounds and specialties who might not regularly have other occasions to see each other, and it was a great chance to get acquainted with the country and culture of Georgia.

The papers published in this volume have been organized into three parts. The first part *Ancient Scribal and Editorial Practices* focuses on scribal and editorial techniques in Greek, Latin, and Syriac sources. In her paper “Origen and Lucian in the Light of Ancient Editorial Techniques”, **Anna Kharanauli** argues that Origen and Lucian were heirs of a conservative Alexandrian philology and explores the ramifications of that for their editorial work. She argues that the Alexandrian grammarians were not concerned with producing critical texts for popular dissemination, but rather created annotated editions and commentaries for scholarly reference. In light of this, Origen’s Hexapla should not be understood as creating a new composite Greek text in his fifth column, but merely presenting a synopsis of readings without the need for the critical signs attributed to him. The Hexapla was used by Origen and his students as a resource for creating new editions, where differences were occasionally indicated as needed with the use of the asterisk and obelus. This scenario helps explain the inconsistencies in hexaplaric texts and marginal annotations in the tradition. Kharanauli explains the work of Lucian similarly as not creating a new composite text or revision, but rather an edition with marginal annotations that only inconsistently come to be worked into the text in the tradition.

In “Galen’s Practice of Textual Criticism”, **Amneris Roselli** surveys the principles of textual criticism as utilized by Galen in light of his commentaries on Hippocrates and his recently discovered work *De indolentia*. Galen pays close attention to the quality of the text when working with stylistically difficult texts. He makes a point to seek out ancient copies and commentaries and considers the plausibility of their readings. In this process, Galen shows awareness of

many ways in which the text could be corrupted, and he was confident in his ability to reconstruct it. He tries to explain the text by the author's own words elsewhere in order to produce a medically useful text, including emendations where necessary.

Julio Trebolle argues in his paper "Pre-Lucianic Readings of 3–4 Reigns in Marginal Notes of the Syrohexapla and in the Syriac Text of Jacob of Edessa" that many marginal notes in the Syrohexapla and readings from Jacob of Edessa stem from a pre-Lucianic or Old Greek (OG) version of 3–4 Reigns. These readings occur in parts where the majority B text reflects the *kaige* recension, but they faithfully preserve the characteristics of the OG translation based on a different Hebrew text. Many of these readings are also paralleled in pre-Lucianic sources like Josephus, the Old Latin, and the Ethiopic. Thus, these readings provide important evidence for the reconstruction of the OG text.

Kristin De Troyer's article "The Scribe of the Marginal Notes of Manuscript 344 (Ra 344; BM v)" examines the marginal notes in Ra 344 to investigate how the scribes read and annotated the text. The main scribe of the manuscript (MS) faithfully copied a model manuscript and occasionally wrote down hexaplaric variants. At least one further scribe (MN) subsequently inserted more marginal notes based on different sources. Within these notes, De Troyer argues that the siglum o' refers to the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, which consisted of an Old Greek substratum revised and annotated by Origen, though the MN is not entirely consistent in how he references sources for his readings.

The second part *Textual History of the Hebrew Bible* focuses on scribal and editorial aspects of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible. In their article "MasPs^a and the Early History of the Hebrew Psalter", **Peter J. Gentry** and **John D. Meade** compare the Masada Psalms scroll MasPs^a to the Aleppo Codex and early Greek codices with regard to their stichometric layout. The text of MasPs^a agrees almost completely with the Aleppo Codex, and the divisions marked by blank space and line breaks in MasPs^a agree very closely with the Masoretic terminal markers (pausal forms and accents). The Aleppo Codex also employs a system of division by blank space, but this does not correspond well with meaningful semantic breaks and the pattern of MasPs^a. This suggests that the Masoretic tradition of the Psalter retained the visual concept of the stichometric layout of earlier scribal praxis, but without necessarily preserving the ancient content divisions. The divisions of MasPs^a agree more closely with the stichometric divisions evident in the Greek codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, implying a common tradition going back earlier than MasPs^a.

In "The Possible Revision of Hebrew Texts according to MT", **Emanuel Tov** argues that the correction towards the Masoretic Text so evident in the Greek tradition cannot be substantiated within the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls. Though many examples can be cited of corrections in agreement with the MT, most of these were likely corrected according to their exemplars, rather than a different

proto-MT text. This holds true for scrolls that were closely related to the MT as well as those that were quite different.

Anneli Aejmelaeus suggests in her article “Rewriting David and Goliath?” that the longer MT version of the story of David and Goliath was the result of processes of rewriting, where the story was expanded with interpretive insertions and bridges to the Torah. She sees the shepherd motif as the key to explaining the rewritten narrative, building on other references to David’s early career. This motif was especially appropriate, since it was often used metaphorically in reference to kings. By drawing from other passages in 1 Samuel and building bridges to similar motifs in the Pentateuch, the reviser rewrites the earlier story to fill narrative gaps.

In “Multilinear Genealogical Networks: Expanding the Scope of Textual History”, **Drew Longacre** concludes the section and calls for expanding the horizons of textual history beyond the limits of literary works by exploring multilinear networks of genealogically related texts. The genealogical structure of textual history can be conceptualized with series of source-recipient relationships that cross the literary boundaries of works or compositions. In this way, the scope of textual history can be expanded to include all interrelated texts and portions thereof, while at the same time allowing for literary distinctions within that structure. Longacre illustrates this perspective with examples from the book of Exodus.

The third part *Writing and Rewriting in Translation* deals with a variety of writings from the Old Testament, New Testament, Apocrypha, and Patristic texts in various languages, focusing on issues of textual and literary criticism and including a number of papers with an emphasis on Georgian translations. In her article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations”, **Katja Kujanpää** demonstrates how the Apostle Paul purposefully reworked scriptural citations in the course of making his arguments. He freely adjusted the wording of his quotations to best fit within their new literary contexts as part of his argument. In some cases Paul quoted from a text already revised towards the Hebrew, and in others Paul’s quotations subsequently influenced the textual transmission of the LXX texts he quoted. Kujanpää concludes that it was more important for Paul to highlight the significance of the cited verses than to replicate their precise wording.

In “Creative Philology and Glosses: Secondary Versions of Kingdoms and Lexical Accumulation or Mutation”, **Andrés Piquer Otero** cites numerous examples of how he sees translators and scribes in the Coptic and Arabic traditions creatively engaging with and building complex textual traditions. By examining the phenomena of doublets, onomastics, toponymy, glosses, adaptations, expansions, and eclecticism, he argues that these versions reflect creative interaction between various *Vorlagen* and the literary and philological interests of the translators. Understanding the work of these translators is important for understanding the full textual tradition.

S. Peter Cowe in his article “Scribe, Translator, Redactor: Writing and Rewriting Scripture in the Armenian Versions of Esther, Judith, and Tobit” constructs a typology of the types of creative changes made by Armenian translators in their work, surveying the evidence from the books of Esther, Judith, and Tobit. He concludes that translators occupy the middle ground between scribes and redactors, attempting to communicate the text in meaningful ways to their readers. They do this not in isolation, but in the context of interpretive traditions which influence the ways they read and reformulate the texts they translate. Cowe further argues that the translators were influenced by theological and rhetorical concerns that shaped their presentation.

In “The Intermediate Version of the Book of Tobit in its Greek Dress”, **Jean-Marie Auwers** describes the characteristics of the Greek III version of the book of Tobit and stresses that it should be studied in its own right. He concludes that Greek III is a revision based on Greek II to make it more readable, coherent, and succinct. Thus, Greek III is intermediate in size between the short Greek I and long Greek II text-forms, but not actually a mix of the two. This creative rewriting yields a story with its own distinctive forms and emphases.

Asking “What Can the Georgian Translation of the Book of Tobit Tell about G^{III}?” **Natia Dundua** analyzes the sources for the Old Georgian translation of Tobit, concluding that it is a good witness to the complete Greek III version of the book. The Old Georgian does not consistently agree with any Greek manuscripts, but rather attests more fully to Greek III than any surviving Greek manuscripts, which preserve it only in part. Thus, the Old Georgian (often supported by the Old Latin) is an important indirect witness to the partially lost Greek III version.

In her article “The Old Georgian Version of the Book of Esther—All in One”, **Natia Mirotadze** discusses structural and compositional peculiarities of the additional (apocryphal) sections of the Book of Esther and argues that the composite nature of the Old Georgian version (GeII) of Esther reflects an aim to collect and document a wide variety of texts. The editor probably tried to maintain the smoothness of the resulting story, but in some cases chose to sacrifice the coherent character of the text in favor of completeness. Using the Septuagint as its base text, the distinctive Greek *Vorlage* of GeII regularly added texts from *L*, Gr^{La}, and a postulated additional source Gr^x wherever they differ. The result is a full inventory of all the various Greek versions of Esther, with frequent redundancies and inconsistencies.

Magda Mtchedlidze's paper “A Translation, Paraphrase, or Metaphrasis? Regarding Euthymius the Hagiorite's Versions of the Orations by Gregory the Theologian” illustrates the liberties taken by the prominent 10th–11th century Georgian scholar Euthymius the Hagiorite in his version of the Orations by Gregory the Theologian to adapt the text to communicate with his readers. He freely translated the language and metaphors into comprehensible Georgian. He also

gave interpretive translations of difficult passages in order to bring across his perceived meaning. At times, Euthymius even inserts his own creative contributions.

In “Septuagint Text Types in the Georgian Translations”, **Anna Kharanauli** surveys the relevance of Georgian translations for the textual criticism of a number of Old Testament books. She argues that the Georgian tradition of Ezekiel gives evidence that pre-Origenian variants were added in the margins of manuscripts and subsequently (inconsistently) incorporated into the main text. The Georgian text of Jeremiah is a rare witness to the *O* text, but also demonstrates that the marginal variant readings were inconsistently incorporated into this tradition, rather than being systematically included in a single hexaplaric recension. So also the Georgian texts of Isaiah and 1 Esdras, which support the manuscript family *L*, but not a Lucianic recension. Thus, the Georgian manuscript tradition provides both important evidence for early forms of the Greek text, as well as supporting evidence for the process of creating ancient *ekdoses* and the gradual infiltration of marginal readings argued for in the first paper in this volume.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to the editors of *De Septuaginta Investigationes* and the staff at Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht for their help in bringing this volume to publication, as well as to Susanna Asikainen (Th.D.) for performing the technical editing with the support of the Centre of Excellence “Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions” (University of Helsinki). It is our hope that these contributions will prove valuable both in relation to their specific concerns and to the broader question of how authoritative texts do and/or do not change.

Anneli Aejmelaeus
Drew Longacre
Natia Miritadze

Part I Ancient Scribal and Editorial Practices

Anna Kharanauli

Origen and Lucian in the Light of Ancient Editorial Techniques

Ἀμαθέστατε καὶ κακέ, ἄφες τὸν παλαιόν, μὴ μεταποιεῖ
Codex Vaticanus, 1512

The history of the Septuagint starts in *Alexandria*. This was the place where Ptolemaios Lagos brought from Athens Aristotle's pupils, the Peripatetics (Demetrius Phalereus among them) and founded professional philology. Thus, the beginning of the history of philology and the beginning of the text history of the Septuagint coincide. This is, at least, according to tradition. Even in later times, Alexandrian philology and the philology of the Septuagint never actually separated from each other; the subsequent textual history of the Septuagint has been related to the Alexandrian grammarians and Antiochean critics. Therefore, my thesis is that Hellenistic philology represents the context in which both the formation of the Septuagint and the subsequent history of its text must be considered. The present article is an attempt to generally and schematically draw upon this context.¹

* This paper was written with the support of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies and Kone foundation (2014) and with encouragement of Prof. Anneli Aejmelaesus, whom I thank for many useful suggestions. I would like to express my gratitude to Drew Longacre as well for his interesting critical questions and notes, and also to Natia Dundua, who helped me to write this article in English. I want to thank Peter Gentry, who read the paper and supported ideas expressed therein.

1 Recently, in the study of the Hebrew or the Greek Bible a special emphasis has been placed on the phenomenon of the Alexandrian library. However, special attention is paid to historical and exegetical parallels and is not (or is less) concerned with the relationship between Alexandrian Philology and the Septuagint—its creation as well as its subsequent text history. See M.R. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); M.R. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 16; Leiden: Brill, 2012); N.L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2000); S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003); J. Wyrick, *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 49; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Alexandrian Philology and the Work of a Grammarian²

Five generations of philologists worked in the Library of Alexandria to edit and interpret the texts of the poets and prosaists. They called themselves “grammarians”. According to the definition of grammar by Dionysius Thrax:³

Γραμματικὴ ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. Μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσωδίαν, δεύτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικoὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν καὶ ἰστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὗρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμὸς, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὲ καλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.⁴

We are aware of the criteria applied by grammarians during the criticism of poetical productions (κρίσις ποιημάτων): **ἀνάγνωσις**—reading aloud—is the first requirement. Here Dionysius means mainly reading according to the rules of prosody which apart from the intonational-tonic modulation of the voice also meant other things such as the division of words, considering diacritical signs and reading various poetic meters. Thus, ἀνάγνωσις is related to the understanding of the text, which is also embodied in the stem (γνώσις) of this term.

2 Selected Bibliography: R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1954); E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968); R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); H. Erbse, “Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben”, *Hermes* 87 (1959) 275–303; H. Hunger/O. Stegmüller/H. Erbse, *Die Textüberlieferung der antiken Literatur und der Bibel* (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1975); E. Pöhlmann, *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur* (1 vol.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994); K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 16; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977); B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, H. 18; 1–2 vol.; Basel: Reinhardt, 1987); S. Matthaios/F. Montanari (ed.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011). Of course, the history of the philology—and particularly the textual criticism—from the Hellenistic period to the Late Antiquity is very nuanced and complex, so the picture that I aim to propose here is simplified to a certain extent.

3 Dionysios Thrax (ca. 170 – ca. 90 B.C.E.), one of latest grammarians who worked in the Alexandrian Library, studied in Alexandria in the school of Aristarchus of Samothrace. The definition of grammar in his *Τέχνη Γραμματική* as well as its subsequent comments determined the development of philology throughout the Middle Ages and was applied for the editing and hermeneutics of both pagan and Christian texts.

4 G. Uhlig (ed.), *Dionysii Thracis, Ars Grammatica: qualem exemplaria vetustissima exhibent subscriptis discrepantiis et testimoniis* (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1883 [reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1979]), 5–6; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 268–72.

According to the commentators of Dionysius, the terms ἐξήγησις, εὐρέσις, ἀπόδοσις all mean the study of the language (γλῶσσων καὶ ἱστοριῶν, ἐτυμολογίας and ἀναλογία) and style (ποιητικὸς τρόπος) of the text, the ultimate goal of which is literary criticism—interpretation of literary works (κρίσις ποιημάτων). So the grammarian, philologist or critic (as the Pergamonian philologists referred to themselves) was both textual and literary critic. Literary criticism, i.e. finding out the divinely inspired writer's⁵ οἰκονομία (*plan, arrangement*) or προνοῖα (*foreknowledge, foresight*), is practically, first of all, related to the establishment of the author's text.⁶ And the establishment of the author's text, in turn, is a task, which could be “accomplished not only through internal and linguistic analysis, but also through an extensive collection and collation of authoritative manuscripts”⁷

Several terms such as ἔκδοσις, σημεία, ὑπομνήματα, διόρθωσις were connected with the process of working with text. The term ἔκδοσις (Latin *editio*, German *Ausgabe*) meant the edition of the text.⁸ These editions were either anonymous or named after their authors (e.g. πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως),⁹ being more or less accepted and wide-spread (e.g. κοινὰ ἐκδόσεις). However, an ἔκδοσις of the Alexandrians did not include just the text. According to recent studies, an ἔκδοσις is a copy of a text, with critical signs (σημεία), and marginal and interlinear annotations (ὑπομνήματα).¹⁰ There were also other concepts related to ἔκδοσις: προέκδοσις (preliminary or “previous edition”)¹¹

5 “Apotheosis of Homer” (British Museum in London), a marble stela made in Alexandria, is a symbol of the approach towards the poet in Alexandria. For other examples, see F. Pontani, “Only God Knows the Correct Reading!” The Role of Homer, the Quran and the Bible in the Rise of Philology and Grammar”, in M.R. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* 43–86, on pp. 54–5 and pp. 65–7.

6 About the growing interest towards the author's text, see Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 106–10. The concept of οἰκονομία in Scholia on Homer see Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, II, 396, notes 234–6.

7 Pontani, “Only God Knows the Correct Reading!”, 45.

8 It is known that ἔκδοσις had existed even before Alexandria, e.g. ἐκδόσεις κατὰ πόλεις, ἐκδόσεις κατ' ἄνδρα, ἢ κατ' Ἀντίμαχον.

9 The same grammarian could be the author of several *ekdoseis* of the same text.

10 F. Montanari, “Alexandrian Homeric Philology: The Form of the *Ekdosis* and the *Variae Lectiones*”, in M. Reichel/A. Rengakos (ed.), *Epea Pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002) 119–40; F. Montanari, “Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text: Alexandrian *Ekdoseis* and Papyri”, in F. Montanari/L. Pagani (ed.), *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship* (TCSV 9; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011) 1–15; Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode*, 18. Due to such intricate structure it is no wonder that in different contexts this term may imply only its particular element(s)—e.g. text or/and correction or/and interpretation, cf. Erbse, “Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben”, 291; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 216–17.

11 Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 141–2.

and ἐπέκδοσις (the “re-issued recension”, “a revised text drawn up ... by a pupil ... from material left by the master”).¹²

A system of critical signs called **σημεῖα**¹³ apparently had existed even before Alexandria. Zenodotus applied this system in the most simple and easily understandable way: the only sign he used was *obelus*, which marked a suspicious text, and it did not require any further explanation. With later philologists critical signs not only increased in number but also became ambiguous, providing no information to an ordinary reader without the help of the commentaries.¹⁴ In Aristarchus’s case this circumstance—the ambiguity of signs—allows Pfeiffer to assume that “marginal sigla in Aristarchus’s ἐκδόσεις were the link to his ὑπομνήματα.”¹⁵

The commentaries—**ὑπομνήματα**¹⁶—apparently represented brief notes, similar to the modern *apparatus criticus*. They consisted of: 1. σημεῖον, 2. the reading under question, i.e. *lemma*¹⁷ and 3. its alternative reading(s) (the preferred reading—διόρθωσις—of a grammarian among them) with brief¹⁸ or large explanatory notes dealing with the problems of the author’s language, style and especially vocabulary, as well as the value of the manuscripts and their paleographic features. It is assumed¹⁹ that in the case of scrolls ὑπομνήματα were included in separate volumes, while in the case of codices ὑπομνήματα were placed in the margins of the texts. Therefore, ὑπομνήματα and the text with σημεῖα are meant to exist simultaneously; one cannot be understood without the other.

Based on ancient witnesses Montanari describes the whole process of the preparation of an *ekdosis* as follows:

12 Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 217; see also Montanari, “Alexandrian Homeric Philology”, 126–7.

13 See M. Stein, “Kritische Zeichen”, *RAC* 22 (2008) 133–63; F. Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs: Critical Semeia from Zenodotus to Origen”, in M.R. Niehoff (ed.), *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* 87–112.

14 For instance, an asterisk as denoting a repeated line (*versus iterati*) already in Aristarchus’s case required a comment to indicate the place with the same line and to specify where it was more appropriate (Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 178). Apart from this, in the works of later philologists an asterisk had various meanings, namely, the beginning or the end of a verse in Lyric, or a change in meter; an asterisk was also applied at the end of a paragraph, etc, see Stein, “Kritische Zeichen”; Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*, 74, 87.

15 Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 218. Visualisation of this idea see Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs”, 94.

16 See Erbse, “Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben”, 278–86; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 29, 161, 175, 212–33; Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 112–24; Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs”, 92–96.

17 For methods of distinguishing the lemma from the commentaries and the accuracy of the use of σημεῖα see Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 114–16.

18 E.g.: ‘μή σε’, ἀλλὰ ‘μή τι’ αἱ Ἀριστάρχου καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι σχεδὸν πᾶσαι διορθώσεις (Schol. A 522), see Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 216.

19 See esp. Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs”, 92–4.

A philologist chose, according to his own preferences, an exemplar that he considered suitable as a basis for his work. When he rejected the text, he noted in the place in question the preferred reading in the free spaces or between the lines. His own text resulted from the original text chosen together with the changes suggested and contained in the paratext created... This copy, bearing the traces of the work of *diorthosis*, resulted materially in the philologist's own *ekdosis* of Homer. This was his own personal copy, it bore his name for purposes of identification and contained the fruit of his work and insights; *ekdosis* in that it was *ekdotheisa*, i.e. available for consultation by scholars, poets and intellectuals.²⁰

The entire process could be described even in more detail. Generally, the need for an *ekdosis* is determined by differences between different sources—*diaphony*—both in oral and written tradition. The inventory of diaphony, first of all, implied collecting the available and/or important sources—simple copies of the text and the manuscripts (*ἀντίγραφα / ἀπόγραφα / μετάγραφον*) of both the previous *ἐκδόσεις* and *ὑπομνήματα*. The copies were classified according to their city of origin, the editor, or their age and quality.²¹ The next phase of the preparation of *ekdosis* was an evaluation of the available manuscripts and choosing of the basic text among them. Afterwards, the collected and selected sources were collated: texts of manuscripts or textual data scattered in *ὑπομνήματα* were compared with each other.²²

As a result of collation the textual variants were identified. Oral or written tradition of *ὑπομνήματα* allowed the grammarians of every subsequent generation not only to identify the textual variant, but also to find out (or at least suppose) the reason why a particular variant had been formed. The analysis of variants used to commence by defining a type of variant, i.e. defining whether there were unintentional errors or intentional interventions in the text.

The collation of sources leads to **διόρθωσις**. *Διόρθωσις* can be the result of proof-reading (checking and correcting a scribe's work)²³ as well as philologists' "own conjectures" or corrections "from better readings in other manuscripts."²⁴ The procedure of dealing with readings considered doubtful, unauthentic, or secondary was called *ἄθετεῖν*. It did not mean erasing a questionable reading automatically.²⁵ Such a doubtful reading remained in the text but was marked by a critical sign (*obelus*) and could be supplied with a commentary.

20 Montanari, "Correcting a Copy", 2–3.

21 Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 110.

22 Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 93–6; Erbse, "Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben", 287–8.

23 Montanari, "Alexandrian Homeric Philology", 122.

24 See for example Pfeiffer about Zenodotus, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 110.

25 Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode*, 6–19 and 25–30; Montanari, "Alexandrian Homeric Philology", 122.

A main difference between the grammarians was whether one should adopt εὐλαβεία ('caution, reverence')²⁶ or τόλμη τῆς διορθώσεως ('audacity of conjectural criticism'). In the history of textology, a tendency developed in favor of the former.²⁷ Since as early as Aristophanes of *Byzantium's time* (ca 265–190 or 258–180 B.C.E.), μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν ('do not add or remove anything')²⁸ was at least the theoretical working principle. Semantic or stylistic correction of the text was not aimed at, either in Hellenistic (at least since Aristarchus) or in Roman and Late Byzantine philology.

To sum up, according to the recent studies an *ekdosis* was a unique manuscript of a grammarian, containing the text and scholia written on free spaces (margins and between lines). Those variant readings that were commented on in scholia were taken from manuscripts against which an original manuscript was collated. *Ekdosis* was a tool for literary criticism and was intended for scholars (for the grammarian himself as well as for his pupils), unlike the so-called *vulgata* which was meant for public use.²⁹ An exact copy of this *ekdosis* might have never been made, but it may have been used as working material for the production of a manuscript, which would have been adapted in accordance with various needs of scholars or ordinary readers.³⁰ The reworking of the original form of *ekdosis*, its extension or reduction, as it seems, was accomplished by the pupils of the author of an *ekdosis*. Afterwards, the original itself—the *ekdosis*—would become useless and, therefore, disappear.³¹

Are the 'Recensions' of the Septuagint 'Ekdoseis'?

Such philological activities are the background against which the Septuagint translation was carried out and against which its textual history developed. It

26 For example, Didymus blames Aristarchus for his excessive caution (περισσῆς εὐλαβείας) against an incorrect reading attested in numerous manuscripts (Schol A I 222), see Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, II, 394, n. 225.

27 "That the result of his [i.e., an Alexandrian grammarian's] work was a completely new exemplar, containing his own text, i.e. the entire work re-written according to the way he believed was appropriate and right, is not a widely held view today" (Montanari, "Alexandrian Homeric Philology", 120).

28 See C. Schäublin, "Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν", *MH* 31 (1974) 144–9.

29 See Turner, *Greek Papyri*, 94–6, 112–13, 118; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 215; Erbse, "Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben", 303.

30 In his article Montanari clearly shows how *ekdosis* is being transformed and, first of all, how comments disappear from Aristarchus's selected variants in scholia (i.e. the comment is lost and only the selected variant is left). See F. Montanari, "The Fragments of Hellenistic Scholarship", in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) 273–88.

31 E.g. the *ekdosis* by Zenodotus was not available for Aristarchus himself.

is interesting that the sources reflecting on the creation of the Septuagint—Letter of Aristeas, Josephus, Philo—assess the whole translation-process from the perspective of Alexandrian philology,³² but now I will skip these parallels, as well as the parallels between Alexandrian philology and the ongoing activity in the Judean milieu, that were aimed not only at the Hebrew text, but also at the correction of the Septuagint and creation of new Greek translations. Instead, I will try to figure out how the textual history of the Septuagint developed in the Christian Church and present this history in the light of ancient editorial technique.

As far as we know, the first text-critical approach to the Scriptures is attested in the second half of the 2nd century C.E. According to Eusebius,³³ several persons worked on the text of the Scriptures. They were Christians fascinated by the philosophy of the Greeks—Theodotus the Tanner and his followers. Eusebius mentions some characteristics of their activities: the members of the circle had

32 See Sylvie Honigman: “The depiction of the origins of the LXX in Book of Aristeas is deeply influenced by both the practice and the ideology of Homeric scholarship in the royal library” (Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, 119). This influence is evidenced by concepts and terms used in the sources describing the process and evaluation of the translation, such as ἀνάγνωσις (see above p. 16 and A. Van der Kooij, “Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter: Ein Beitrag zur Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Original und Übersetzung”, in A. Aejmelaeus/U. Quast [ed.], *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Töchterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* [MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000] 366–79, on p. 374); διασάφησις (*explanation, interpretation*): ἐτρέποντο πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου διασάφησιν (Pelletier, A. [ed.], *Lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate* [Sources chrétiennes 89; Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1962], 305); ἀντιβολή (collation): σύμφωνά ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς (*Lettre d’Aristée*, 302). The principle of the translators is expressed by the known formula: οὐτε προσθεῖναι τις οὐδὲν, οὐτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν, οὐτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν (Niese, B. [ed.], *Flavii Iosephi Opera 5, De Iudaeorum vetustate, sive contra Apionem libri 2* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1889], 1, 42); μήτ’ ἀφελεῖν τι μήτε προσθεῖναι ἢ μεταθεῖναι δυναμένους (Colson F.H. [ed.], *Philo, De Vita Mosis, I-II* [LCL 289, vol. 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, London: William Heinemann, 1984], II, 6, 34). This formula was used not only in regard to translators but also regarding those ones who would make any changes in the text in future: ἐκέλευσαν διαρᾶσθαι ... εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφῶν τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν (*Lettre d’Aristée*, 311). For more about this formula in Aristeas, Philo, Josephus, see W.C. Van Unnik, “De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτ’ ἀφελεῖν dans l’histoire du canon”, *Vigilae Christianae* 3 (1949), 16–18. The concept of the divine inspiration underlined in relation to the seventy translators is also familiar to the Alexandrian philologist. The focus on the authenticity of the Hebrew manuscript that was employed as the *Vorlage* for translation is an especially interesting parallel with the Alexandrian philology as well.

33 K. Lake (ed.), *Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History, Books I–V* (LCL 153; London: William Heinemann, New York: G.P. Putnam, 1926), (HE) 5.28.16–18, on p. 522; E. Schwartz (ed.), *Eusebius, Kirchengeschichte* (GCS 9/1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903). See A. Grafton/M. Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008), 190–1; B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 150–1.

produced their own *antigrapha*, which were copied and multiplied by their pupils; the *antigrapha* of the same editor at various times differed from each other; the *antigrapha* were a result of *diorthosis*—a corrected text based on the editors' own considerations (τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δοκοῦντα). Traces of such *ekdoseis* do not appear in the extant Septuagint manuscripts. Despite this, this information is still very interesting in order to conceptualise the text-history of the Septuagint. Firstly, it reflects the procedure of correcting the text within one circle of scholars and the possibility of a variety of such corrections. Secondly, it clearly indicates the reason why such corrections were unacceptable for the church and particularly for Eusebius, the pupil of the Alexandrian philologist Origen. The reason is the type of correction—conjecture, i.e. *emendatio ope ingenii*.

A watershed in the text history of the Septuagint as the Christian Old Testament text is Origen's Hexapla.³⁴ This phase of Christian textual criticism lasted approximately one century starting with Origen (d. 254 C.E.) and being completed probably with the Constantinian Pandect Bibles (ca 330 C.E.). Jerome's information still remains the only (though vague) landmark for characterisation of the early Christian phase of the Septuagint's text history:

Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus uulgauerunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria uarietate conpugnat.³⁵

This is the well-known passage based on which text critics of the Septuagint look for the text forms related to Origen, Lucian and Hesychios, forms which are typologically similar to each other. Today, all these forms are called 'recensions', the term that means an intentional change of the text according to some principle. But is it feasible to call such textual forms of the Scripture a 'recension' if we consider biblical philology in the 3rd–4th centuries to be the continuation of Alexandrian philology? Another question is: Were those textual forms that had been discussed by Jerome really typologically homogeneous? Let us examine the much-discussed problems from a new perspective and try to deal with the *trifaria varietas* within the context of Alexandrian philology.

34 However, papyrus Ra 967, which seems to have been copied in Christian circles, supposedly in Alexandria, in the late 2nd or early 3rd century, already has traces of philological work, manifested in the influence of the Masoretic text type; see I. E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions* (VTSup 150; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 257–61.

35 *Praefatio in Paralipomena*, see D. De Bruyne (ed.), *Prefaces to the Latin Bible* (Introductions by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Thomas O'Loughlin; Studia Traditionis Theologiae 19; Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), 30.

As generally recognised, in relation to Origen, Lucian and Hesychius *trifaria varietas* can be understood as: 1. the exemplars which contain the texts accomplished by Origen, Lucian and Hesychios themselves; or 2. the exemplars based on the *ekdoseis* of the texts of Origen, Lucian and Hesychius which were created by their pupils; or 3. the exemplars containing the texts, which represent even a later stage of the text history, a mixture of the text-forms over a long time of textual transmission.

According to Jerome's letter 106 to Sunnia and Fretela, at his time the text-form, which by Origen, Eusebius and all other commentators was called *koine*, was widespread in Constantinople and Antioch and was attributed to Lucian.³⁶ As for the text related to Origen, in one case he says that it is the *Septuagint*, which he has found in the Hexaplaric codices (*ἑξάπλοῖς codicibus*),³⁷ and in the other case (*Praefatio in Paralipomena*) that the codices, which were widespread in Palestine, were produced by Origen and edited by Eusebius and Pamphilus.³⁸

In letter 106 Jerome characterises in more detail the following two textual types of the Septuagint: *Κοινή* and *Septuaginta* represent one and the same text, however the first is an older edition that has been corrupted in the transmission process, while the other is included in the Hexapla and represents the translation by the seventy translators in its pure and immaculate form that could be found among the manuscripts of erudites.³⁹

Likewise, Jerome discusses the corrupt vs. pure Septuagint in letter 112 to Augustine. Here he contrasts, on the one hand, the emended or, better, corrupted editions of Origen with asterisks and obeli and, on the other hand, the 'Septuagint'. He writes that it is already at his time impossible to find the authentic edition of the seventy translators among the manuscripts used in the Church and

36 "... aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae tractatores κοινήν (/κοινά)—id est communem—appellant atque uulgatam et a plerisque nunc Λουκιάνειος dicitur". I. Hilberg (ed.), *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae. Pars II; Epistulae LXXI–CXX* (CSEL 55; Vienna/Leipzig: Tempsky/Freytag, 1912), 248.

37 "Aliam Septuaginta interpretum, quae et in ἑξάπλοῖς codicibus repperitur" (*Ep.* 106,2; CSEL 55, 248). About the Septuagint in the Hexaplaric codices, "ἑξάπλοῖς codices", see O. Munnich, "Les Hexaples d'Origène à la lumière de la tradition manuscrite de la Bible Grecque", in G. Dorival/A. Le Boulluec (ed.), *Origeniana Sexta: Origen et la Bible. Actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum, Chantilly, 1993* (Leuven: Peeters, 1995) 167–85, on pp. 174–5.

38 See above, *Praef. in Par.*, in D. De Bruyne (ed.), *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, 30.

39 "Κοινή autem ista, hoc est Communis, editio ipsa est quae et Septuaginta. Sed hoc interest inter utramque, quod κοινή pro locis et temporibus et pro uoluntate scriptorum, uetus corrupta editio est. Ea autem, quae habetur in ἑξάπλοῖς et quam nos uertimus, ipsa est, quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata Septuaginta Interpretum translatio reseruatur" (*Ep.* 106,2, CSEL 55, 249).

that these manuscripts are full of the additions borrowed from another translation made by a Jewish man, Theodotion.⁴⁰

In the same sources Jerome clarifies the essence of two editions related to Origen. The first is the Hexapla. In *Praefatio in Paralipomena* he provides a description of this edition: In his work Origen composed (*conposuit*) manuscripts (*exemplaria*) of four editions (i.e. Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) writing a single word on a separate row. As Jerome notes, in such editions, a different variant of any edition is clearly visible in comparison with the homogeneity of the rest. The other type of edition related to Origen represents rather a mixed text. The edition by Theodotion has been mixed into the edition of the Septuagint and pluses and minuses are marked by obelus and asterisk.⁴¹ Such treatment of a text is regarded by Jerome as audacity and thus, seemingly, he

40 From this letter one can assume that Jerome knew the meaning of the signs and that for him the authentic Septuagint is the one which lacks the asterisked passages: “Quod autem in aliis quaeris epistulis, cur prior mea in libris canonicis interpretatio asteriscos habeat et uirgulas praenotatas et postea aliam translationem absque his signis ediderim. ... Illa enim interpretatio septuaginta interpretum est et, ubicumque uirgulae, id est obeli, sunt, significatur, quod Septuaginta plus dixerint, quam habetur in Hebraeo, ubi autem asterisci, id est stellae praelucentes, ex Theodotionis editione ab Origene additum est. ... Et miror, quomodo septuaginta interpretum libros legas non puros, ut ab eis editi sunt, sed ab Origene emendatos siue corruptos per obelos et asteriscos et Christiani hominis interpretatiunculam non sequaris, praesertim cum ea, quae addita sunt, ex hominis Iudaei atque blasphemi post passionem Christi editione transtulerit. 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 ecclesiarum bibliothecas condemnare cogaris. Uix enim unus aut alter inuenietur liber, qui ista non habeat” (*Ep.* 112,19, CSEL 55, 389). Jerome’s assessment of the New Testament text which has been related to Lucian and Hesychios is also notable. Here too, his attitude towards amendments made by Lucian and Hesychios is sharply negative: “Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum adserit peruersa contentio, quibus utique nec in Ueteri instrumento post LXX interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Nouo profuit emendasse, cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt” (*Praefatio in Evangelio*, in D. De Bruyne (ed.), *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, 154).

41 He mentions such an edition in his other writings too, e.g. in *Ep.* 112 (see above, n. 40), in *Praefatio in Pentateuchum*: “Origenis me studium prouocavit, qui editioni antiquae translationem Theodotionis miscuit, asterisco et obelo, id est stella et ueru (*uirgula*), opus omne distinguens, dum aut inlucescere facit quae minus ante fuerant aut superflua quaeque iugulat et confodit” (Bruyne [ed.], *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, 7); in *Praefatio in Job*: “Quasi non ... omnia ueteris instrumenti uolumina Origenes obelis asteriscisque distinxerit, quos uel additos uel de Theodotione sumptos, translationi antiquae inseruit, probans defuisse quod additum est” (Bruyne [ed.], *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, 38); and in *In Isaiam*, I,2,22, where he considers Aquila and not Theodotion as an author of added texts marked by asterisk: “Hoc praetermisere LXX, et in graecis exemplaribus ab Origene sub asteriscis de editione Aquilae additum est” (CSEL 73, 39,2-4).

highlights an activity that looked extraordinary in comparison with the traditional philological work.⁴²

Thus, Jerome juxtaposes the editions: I. according to their localization (the texts widespread in different geographical areas); II. according to their attribution (1. the edition of the seventy translators—the *koine* or *vulgar*—which in his time was related already to Lucian, and 2. two editions of Origen—the Hexapla and the mixed texts); and III. according to their authenticity (pure Septuagint and Septuagint mixed with translations of Theodotion and Aquila). Hence, it seems to me that Jerome means different forms of the text edition: 1. the traditional one (vulgar text); 2. the Hexapla; 3. the text that is the part of the Hexapla—presumably the text of its fifth column (in relation to Origen);⁴³ and 4. the mixed text equipped with asterisks and obeli.

In short, what we get from Jerome's witnesses is that the manuscripts of his time contained texts of various traditions, in almost none of which was the Septuagint preserved authentically. We also learn that the main differences of the text of the Septuagint are related to those influences, which we call Hexaplaric. Therefore, the witnesses of Jerome confirm what we already know from the surviving early manuscripts and fragments of the Septuagint—the diversity of the textual forms containing Hexaplaric material.

Origen's *Ekdosis*

What was the reason for such change of the Septuagint, the inspired text? Barthélemy notes, "Jamais non plus personne n'exerça sur l'histoire de son texte [i.e. Greek Bible] une influence aussi décisive, ni aussi catastrophique." Usually citations of Barthélemy end here, and the main responsibility for the textual variety of the Septuagint turns out to be Origen's. But actually Barthélemy continues, "Et pourtant Origène était un érudit d'une honnête scrupuleuse, animé d'un profond sens de la tradition."⁴⁴

What does Origen's "sens de la tradition" mean? And why are the changes to the text and his "sens de la tradition" incompatible with each other?

42 "Et certe Origenes non solum exemplaria (exempla//exapla) composuit quattuor editionum, e regione singula uerba describens, ut unus dissentiens, statim ceteris inter se consentientibus arguatur, sed, quod maioris audaciae est, in editione Septuaginta Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus fuerint, et uirgulis, quae ex superfluo uidebantur adposita" (*In Par*, in Bruyne (ed.), *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, 30).

43 "Septuaginta" must be designated the 5th, Septuagint, o' column. See Munnich, "Les Hexaples d'Origène", 175.

44 D. Barthélemy, "Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament", in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 203–17, on p. 203.