

6. All this painstaking work upon the text of the O. T. has had a powerful influence upon the Christian Church, and particularly so, subsequent to the foundation of the Christian School in Alexandria. The Christian additions were now removed from the text of the Bible. Our oldest Greek Manuscripts, B, S, and A, had already dispensed with the addition of ἀπὸ ζύλου to Ps. XCV. 10, an addition which is still preserved only in the Coptic and Latin transmissions.¹

But, above all, Origen, the greatest scholar of the Alexandrian School, had devoted himself to the most intensive study imaginable of the O. T. text. In his famous and voluminous work, the Hexapla, which he produced in Palestine about the 4th decade of the 3rd century A. D.,² he placed side by side in 6 parallel columns the original O. T. in Hebrew characters, and in Greek transcription, together with the 4 Greek translations. It is clear from the very arrangement of the Hexapla that to him, being a scholar, not the LXX, but the original text was ultimately the primary authority, for he put the original text first, and then had next to it the translations of Aquila and of Symmachus, since they furnished the most accurate renderings of the original text. The LXX followed next, and then Theodotion as a revised version of it. The same method is discernible in the way in which Origen adapted the LXX to bring it into line with the original text. In order to indicate matter in the LXX, which did not appear in the original text, he employed obelisks (—, †, ÷), symbols that were used in textual criticism by the Alexandrian Philologists, and especially in dealing with Homer, in order to brand a passage as spurious. Origen also made use of the obelisk in this same sense, for he declares in his commentary on Matthew (*Opera ed. Delarue III 672*) that he has marked with an obelisk those words which were not in the Hebrew, since "*he did not dare to erase them entirely*". This is an obvious indication that he would have expunged them completely, had he been willing to be absolutely consistent.³ Conversely, Origen, as he himself says in the same passage, added

¹ See my *Septuaginta-Studien 2* (1907), p. 160.

² Cf. *ibid. 1* (1904), p. 71, where I have specified as the date of the composition of the Hexapla on Kings the period between about 235 and 240 A. D.

³ See my *Septuaginta-Studien 1* (1904), p. 75. *Ibid. pp. 73f.* Here I have shown that, despite this statement of his, Origen repeatedly drew the logical conclusion and entirely deleted that which was superfluous in the LXX.