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pared to the LXX was supplemented from the alternative versions, marked with an asterisk. A plus of the LXX compared to the Hebrew was marked with an obelus. If the plus contained more than one word, the end was marked with a metabelus. In case of variations between the copies of the LXX, Origen chose the readings that matched the Hebrew most consistently, and sometimes aligned the Greek word order with the Hebrew. The Hexaplaric recension, which was distributed separately. After Origen's death, its text was progressively edited, as can be seen in Cod. Sarrafinianus-Colbertinum (G) and Cod. Marcellianus (Q). In the year 616, Paul of Tella prepared a translation into Syriac, in which readings of the alternative versions were incorporated as marginal notes. One half of this so-called Syrohexapla (CPG 1501) is presented by Cod. Ambrosianus C 313 inf. (8th cent.; facsimile by Ceriani); another codex, containing the other half, is lost.

Next to the Syrohexapla, the testimonies of the church fathers and catena MSS are the main sources for the so-called Hexaplaric readings, i.e., remnants of the Hexapla, which were collected by Frederick Field. Columnar fragments of the Hexapla to the Psalter are passed down in a marginal note (Rahlfs-MSS 113), as well as in two palimpsests (Rahlfs-MSS 1098; 2005); another fragment of the columnar arrangement is preserved for Hosea 11:1 (Rahlfs MS 86). A new edition of all the material is in preparation by “The Hexapla Project.” In the Göttingen Editio critica maior of the LXX, the first apparatus includes the Hexaplaric recension, presented as the O-group, whereas the second apparatus offers Hexaplaric readings.
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Hexateuch

The term “Hexateuch” as an alternative to the term “Pentateuch” appeared in biblical scholarship at the end of the 18th century, but it is difficult to know who invented it. Contrary to the Pentateuch, which is the Greek term for torah and refers to its five books (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy), the concept of a Hexateuch, which has no “canonical reality” adds to the Pentateuch the book of Joshua. The idea of an “Hexateuch” is much older than the use of the term in the academic discussion as shown by the so-called “old English Hexateuch,” the translation of the books of Genesis to Joshua into Old English in the 10th or 11th century. The idea of a Hexateuch in historico-critical research probably emerged on the basis of two observations. First, the narrative coherence of the books of Genesis to Joshua seems greater than that of Genesis to Deuteronomy. The patriarchal narratives emphasize the promise of the land and this promise reaches its fulfillment only in the book of Joshua. Also, the final discourse of Joshua (Josh 24), after the conquest and the distribution of the land, clearly concludes the narrative from the time of the Patriarchs to the entry into the land (von Rad). Second, there are stylistic links between the book of Joshua and the preceding books, especially Deuteronomy. In 1792, the first part of Alexander Geddes’ translation and introduction to the Bible contained the books of Genesis to Joshua. Geddes argued that the book of Joshua belongs to the Pentateuch since it stemmed from the same author and presented a necessary appendix to the rest of the narrative.

The idea of a Hexateuch was adopted in the context of the documentary hypothesis and the book of Joshua considered as containing the endings of the Yahwist and the Priestly document (sometimes also of the Elohist). The idea of a Hexateuch remained prevalent until the middle of the 20th century when Martin Noth’s theory of a Deuteronomistic History (1943) created, in fact, a Tetrateuch (Genesis–Numbers) instead of a Hexateuch, because Deuteronomy and Joshua were now regarded as the introduction to a “Deuteronomistic History.” In current Pentateuchal research, where Noth’s theory has come under attack, the idea of an original Hexateuch is revitalized by an important number of scholars.
Hezekiah (King of Judah)

1. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
   I. Kings
   II. Proverbs
   III. Jeremiah

2. Father of Amariah

In the superscription of the book of Zephaniah, the prophet is presented as the great grandson of Amariah, the son of Hezekiah (Zeph 1:1). Following Ibn Ezra, an identification with Hezekiah, the king of Judah, has often been proposed. The timeframe of five generations makes this identification possible but not necessarily plausible because Hezekiah in Zeph 1:1 is not labelled as “king.” In the HB/OT as well as in the epigraphic sources a variety of persons bear this name.

3. Ater

The list of returnees from the Babylonian exile mentions a clan of “Ater, that is of Hezekiah” (Ezra 2:16; Neh 7:21). This Hezekiah is probably not identical with Hezekiah, the king of Judah. The qualifier is added to distinguish this clan from the family of Ater who were among the gatekeepers (Ezra 2:42; Neh 7:45). In Neh 10:17 (ET 18), Ater and Hezekiah are seen as two different persons.
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Hezekiah (King of Judah)

1. King of Judah

Hezekiah was king in Jerusalem around 700 BCE. He survived an Assyrian siege and is famous for the story of the sundial; see “Hezekiah (King of Judah).”

2. Father of Amariah

In the superscription of the book of Zephaniah, the prophet is presented as the great grandson of Amariah, the son of Hezekiah (Zeph 1:1). Following Ibn Ezra, an identification with Hezekiah, the king of Judah, has often been proposed. The timeframe of five generations makes this identification possible but not necessarily plausible because Hezekiah in Zeph 1:1 is not labelled as “king.” In the HB/OT as well as in the epigraphic sources a variety of persons bear this name.
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