

GREEK SOURCES OF THE COMPLUTENSIAN POLYGLOT

Natalio Fernández Marcos

Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. CSIC. Madrid

In the Grinfield Lectures 2003 devoted to *The Study of the Septuagint in Early Modern Europe* Prof. Scott Mandelbrote deals, among other interesting issues, with the text of the Alcalá Polyglot, the earliest printed text of the Septuagint completed the 10th July 1517. He pointed out the impact of the arrival of *Codex Alexandrinus* in England in 1627 and its use as one of the main authorities for the London Polyglot (1653–1657), whose editor, Brian Walton, was especially critical of the text of the Complutensian Polyglot and the precise age of the manuscripts on which it had been based.¹ Indeed, Walton's judgement is highly negative; he maintains that the Greek text of the Alcalá Polyglot is very far from the genuine Septuagint. It is a compilation of several different texts with Hexaplaric additions and even Greek commentaries in an attempt to relate it to the Hebrew text printed in the parallel column.² He backs up his statement with some examples taken from the first chapter of the book of Job.

Since then the vexed problem of the Greek manuscripts used by the Complutensian philologists has been dealt with by different scholars, including myself. However, I think it is worthwhile taking another look at the question in the light of new evidence which has recently been published in the context of Septuagint textual criticism.

¹ Scott Mandelbrote, 'The Grinfield Lectures 2003–2004,' *BJGS* 33 (Winter 2003–2004), 37. The *Codex Alexandrinus* was presented to King Charles I as a New Year's gift in 1627. B. Walton was the first who designated the manuscript as *Codex Alexandrinus*. On the origin of this manuscript see Scot McKendrick, 'The Codex Alexandrinus or the Danger of Being a Named Manuscript,' in *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text*, Edited by Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O'Sullivan (London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2003), 1–16.

² "Nova enim et mixta est haec Versio, partim ex Septuaginta, partim ex Origenis additamentis ex Theodotione, partim ex Aquilae, Symmachi, aliorumque Interpretum, imo & Commentatorum Graecorum verbis consarcinata, ut hoc modo textui Hebraeo per columnas aptius responderet," see B. Walton, *Prolegomena (De versionibus Graecis)* to the *Biblia Polyglotta* (London, 1657), 64. Likewise in the *Praefatio* B2, Walton deals with the new contributions of the London Polyglot and among them he mentions the publication of the Septuagint according to the Sixtine edition of 1587 and *Codex Alexandrinus* when it disagrees from *Vaticanus*, "rejecta illa Complutensium, quam secuti sunt in Regiis et Parisianis, ut omnium quae hodie extant maxime mixta et interpolata, et quae a genuina *τῶν ο'* omnium longissime distat."

It is well known that cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, in the Preface to the reader that precedes the edition of the texts, praises the Greek manuscripts sent by Pope Leo X from the Vatican Library and used for the Polyglot, as very old and pure (“vetustissima simul et emendatissima”). He mentions, in addition, other sources: a copy from a very correct manuscript belonging to the legacy of cardinal Bessarion, sent by the Venetian Senate; together with other manuscripts which were the fruit of a long and costly search for a large number of corrected codices.³

Cisneros’s statement must be interpreted in the context of the Renaissance, indulging in some rhetorical bias, and the state of Biblical studies at that time. But the basic reliability of the information transmitted cannot be put in doubt. In the 19th century, Vercellone discovered in the Vatican Library, the proceedings of an inventory of the library of Leo X which were drawn up in 1518; he had edited this inventory and described the codices lent to Spain for the preparation of the Complutensian Bible, adding that they had been returned to the library.⁴ These are *Vaticanus Graecus* 330 (= 108 of Rahlfs’s Catalogue) and *Vaticanus Graecus* 346 (= 248 of Rahlfs’s Catalogue).⁵ The first contains the Octateuch, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Paralipomena, 1–2 Ezra, Judith, Esther (Septuagint and Alpha-text) and Tobit (incomplete); and the second contains Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Wisdom, Ben Sira (with the second Prolog), 1–2 Ezra, Esther, Tobit and Judith. It must be emphasized that ms. 330 has many Hexaplaric notes and arabic glosses as well as some Greek scholia to 2 Kingdoms. Ms. 248 is full of Hexaplaric notes in the margins without any indication of the sigla to which those notes should be attributed. As we shall see below, this circumstance may explain some Complutensian singular readings at the beginning of the book of Job.

As far as the copy sent by the Venetian Senate is concerned, we have no other information than the words of Cisneros in the aforementioned Preface. There is no

³ “Quod autem ad Graecam scripturam attinet: illud te non latere volumus: non vulgaria seu temere oblata exemplaria fuisse huic nostrae impressioni archetypa: sed vetustissima simul et emendatissima: quae sanctissimus Dominus noster Leo Decimus Pontifex Maximus coeptis nostris aspirans ex ipsa apostolica Bibliotheca ad nos misit: tantae integritatis: ut nisi eis plena fides adhibeatur: nulli reliqui esse videantur: quibus merito sit adhibenda. Quibus etiam adiunximus alia non pauca: quorum partem ex Bessarionis castigatissimo codice summa diligentia transcriptam Illustris Venetorum Senatus ad nos misit: partem ipsi magnis laboribus et expensis undique conquisivimus: ut copia emendatorum codicum abunde supesset,” *Prologus ad Lectorem, IIII* of the Alcalá Polyglot.

⁴ C. Vercellone, *Dissertazioni accademiche* (Rome, 1864), 409.

⁵ A. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Berlin, 1914).

testimony of the loan in the Marcian Library of Venice. Therefore, Delitzsch, in a visit to the library, examined the Greek mss. that had belonged to cardinal Bessarion in order to find out which of them could be the base of the Spanish copy. He arrived at the conclusion that ms 68 (= Gr.V) is the best candidate, the most fitting to the adjective *castigatissimus* of Cisneros's Preface. He also verified that the *Complutensis* fills the lacunae of 330 with the copy of ms. 68; he insists, however, that these two manuscripts are not the only sources.⁶ This partial copy including Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Paralipomena, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, 1–2 Ezra, Esther (according to ο' and with the Greek Supplements *pace* Rahlfs), Wisdom, Judith, Tobit, 1–3 Maccabees of ms. 68, a complete Bible⁷ including the New Testament, was preserved until the Spanish civil war (1936–1939), in the library of the Complutensian University of Madrid, as part of the ancient collection of the Colegio de San Ildefonso of Alcalá founded by Cisneros. It could be consulted by Samuel P. Tregelles, the editor of the New Testament, in 1860, and Delitzsch published in 1886 its text for the Song of Debora (Judg 5) and David's elegy (2 Sam 1:19–26) from a facsimile copy sent by the librarian Pascual de Gayangos.⁸ As to the fate of this manuscript, 442 of Rahlfs's Catalogue, and its present state of preservation a few words at the end of this paper seem adequate. The other manuscript from the same collection of Alcalá and used basically for the edition of the Psalms by the Complutensian philologists is a Psalter of the 14th/15th centuries (Number 23 of Villa-Amil's Catalogue = 1670 of Rahlfs's Catalogue).⁹

For the time being, we shall leave to one side the problem of the Greek manuscripts used for the text of the New Testament and which has still not been answered satisfactorily and also requires further study.¹⁰ But, as far as the text of the Old Testament is concerned, it is patent that Delitzsch's studies led to a positive appreciation of the Complutensian Polyglot as textual witness. This process of revaluation of the Complutensian Greek text will continue *in crescendo* up to the present time.

⁶ F. Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte* (Leipzig, 1886), 26.

⁷ The order of the books is the same as in ms. 68. However, we can only speculate on the omission in the copy of the Pentateuch, Joshua, the Prophets, Job, Psalms and Sira. The ms. has 1–3 Maccabees only like its copy.

⁸ Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 13–18.

⁹ Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 28–29.

Closely related to the problem of the manuscripts utilized by the Complutensian collaborators is the use they made of such witnesses. In other words, whether they respected the readings of the manuscripts or whether they corrected them in order to accommodate the Greek text to the Hebrew or the Vulgate printed in parallel columns. The opinion of scholars on this issue ranges from the strong negative stance represented by A. Masius, B. Walton and R. Simon to the more balanced opinions, concretely those of F. Delitzsch, P. de Lagarde and J. Ziegler, who held the Complutensian Greek text in great esteem. One thing seems clear: it is time to forget the broad generalizations and to undertake a thorough study of the individual books in order to advance towards the clarification of this vexed question. For example, the critical edition of the book of Job by J. Ziegler has indirectly contributed to shed light on the Complutensian Greek text of this book. As in the rest of the Wisdom books, the Alcalá Polyglot follows basically ms. 248 lent by Leo X. But for the first ten chapters (the first chapter of Job constituted the core of Walton's criticism!), they took the readings of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion which were in the margin of this manuscript, sometimes whole sentences, because these readings were closer to the Hebrew, I suppose. But it can be verified that in the rest of the book, chapters 11–42, only five marginal readings of ms. 248 have been introduced into the Complutensian text.¹¹ In defence of the editors it should be remembered that these Hexaplaric readings of the margins lacked the sigla with the corresponding attributions.¹² It can be deduced that, at times, the closeness to the Hebrew or to the Vulgate has been utilized as a criterion for the restoration of the Greek. Certainly it is not a sound principle according to modern textual criticism of the Septuagint, but was the kind of philology commonly practised in the Renaissance.¹³ The European humanists, just as Origen and

¹⁰ See the interesting contribution of J. A. L. Lee, "Dimitrios Doukas and the Accentuation of the New Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot," *NT* 47 (2005), 250–90.

¹¹ O'Connell thinks that the different procedures in the editing of Job are due to two different editors, one of them more interventive than the other, not to tiredness of the editor after chapter 10 as Ziegler thought, see S. O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text—Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*. OBO 215 (Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 133.

¹² J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta. XI, 4 Iob* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 56–58, and Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 12: "Die Verschmelzung solcher Marginallesarten mit dem Septuagintatext war freilich unkritisch, entschuldigt sich aber dadurch, dass sie im codex nicht mit ASQ bezeichnet sind." Delitzsch insists that most of the Complutensian peculiar readings are not retroversions but rely on the witness of the manuscripts.

¹³ "Und in der That, welchem andern Kriterium hätten sie bei ihrem beschränkten handschriftlichen Apparat folgen sollen?," see Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 27.

Jerome, thought that the Greek translation had been made from the same Hebrew text transmitted by the Masoretes, a text which had been preserved unaltered throughout the centuries. They could not even glimpse the different Hebrew texts that the Qumran documents have patently brought to light and, consequently, the possibility of a different Hebrew Vorlage in the hand of the translators. Consequently, in the Preface to Pope Leo X, cardinal Cisneros points to the originals as the last criterion for authenticity in the translated texts, “ita ut librorum Veteris Testamenti synceritas ex Hebraica veritate: Novi autem ex Graecis exemplaribus examinetur.”¹⁴

But we should not think that the recourse to the original source as the arbiter of the Greek readings was used as the supreme principle or in a systematic way. In fact, this device has been detected in a few cases, while the editors try to draw the reading closest to the original Hebrew from the Greek tradition, be it in the manuscripts or in their margins. Moreover, in books like Jeremiah, the Complutensian editors are aware of the differences which exist between the Hebrew and the Greek texts, they maintain the Septuagint tradition as valid in its own right, and admonish, in the preface to this book, that the Greek text must be respected without trying to correct it towards the Hebrew, because the truth of both should be maintained.¹⁵ A surprisingly modern warning confirmed by some of the Qumran Jeremiah fragments (4QJer^{b,d}) that support the Septuagint short text edition. And on the text of Reigns O’Connell states: “The editors saw LXX as a separate entity and consequently the Greek text as requiring internal criticism. This consideration, frequently in tension with that of faithfulness to their primary source and to the Hebrew, explains the number of stylistic modifications and the overall pragmatic approach to the text.”¹⁶

It is not only the new critical editions of the Göttingen series which have helped to illuminate the Complutensian text. Further studies, especially on the books of Kingdoms and the Twelve Prophets have led to the conclusion that each book has to be

¹⁴ *Prologus*, col. 1.

¹⁵ “Haec interpretatio hieronymi est. Si quid in ea novi erit: secundum hebraeos codices exploretur. Alia est Septuaginta interpretum ecclesiis usitata. Quae quamvis nonnulli aliter habeat quam in hebraeis codicibus invenitur: tamen utraque, id est secundum septuaginta: et secundum hebraeam, apostolica autoritate firmata est: non errore neque reprehensione superiori: sed certo consilio septuaginta nonnulli aliter dixisse vel contexuisse intelliguntur. Quod ideo praemonemus ne quisquam alteram ex altera velit emendare. Quod singulorum in suo genere veritas observanda est,” from the Preface to the Book of Jeremiah.

¹⁶ O’Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 111.

submitted to a thorough analysis and the results have been nuanced according to these new studies.¹⁷ In what follows, I do not pretend to offer a global or final solution to this complex problem, but only to mention in passing a few recent and partial studies that have contributed to add to the esteem of the Complutensian Greek text among the textual critics of the Septuagint over the last sixty years.

In a study devoted to the Twelve Prophets, I pointed out that every publication of a new witness had contributed to reduce the number of singular readings of the Alcalá Polyglot, readings too often attributed to arbitrary corrections of the editors.¹⁸ The main problem of the Complutensian Greek text of the Twelve, “die noch unerledigte Frage” in Delitzsch’s words¹⁹, found a partial answer in Ziegler’s study. He demonstrated that a good number of readings of the Complutensian Polyglot considered to be unique were shared by *Codex Washingtonianus* (W) of the 3rd century AD but only published in 1927²⁰, the marginal readings of ms. 86, the Coptic versions and, especially, the Old Latin. However, he ended his article with ambiguous conclusions: on the one hand he recognizes that the Complutensis transmits very ancient readings which are lacking in the known manuscripts; the editors had at their disposal “eine Vorlage, die ganz altertümliche Lesarten überlieferte, die heute in den uns bekannten Handschriften fehlen.”²¹ On the other hand, he mentions frequent retroversions from the Latin into the Greek without deciding whether these interventions had been made by the editors or were taken from Greek manuscripts already influenced by Latin readings. Another eminent scholar of Septuagint studies, John W. Wevers, was not satisfied with Ziegler’s

¹⁷ See N. Fernández Marcos, 'El texto griego de la Biblia Políglota Complutense,' in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, *Biblia y Humanismo. Textos, talentos y controversias del siglo XVI español*, (Madrid: FUE, 1997), 221-24.

¹⁸ “Todo nuevo testimonio, como se demostró con motivo de la publicación del *Codex Washingtonianus* (W) en 1927, ha contribuido a reducir el número de lecturas exclusivas de la Complutense, muchas de las cuales se atribuían hasta entonces a correcciones arbitrarias de los editores,” see N. Fernández Marcos, 'El texto griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas,' *Sefarad* 39 (1979), 6. And the same could be said of the publication of the Dodekapropheton Scroll from Nahal Hever.

¹⁹ Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 53.

²⁰ See *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* von Alfred Rahlfs. *Bd. I, 1 Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 387-89.

²¹ J. Ziegler, 'Der griechische Dodekapropheton-Text der Complutenser Polyglotte,' *Bib* 25 (1944), 309.

solution, and he states in a critical review that the Complutensian text of Dodekapropheton continues to be an interesting enigma.²²

With the publication of the critical editions of the Greek Pentateuch in the Göttingen series it has been confirmed that the Complutensian editors had ms. 108, sent from Rome, as their main source for volume 1. However, they also had recourse to other manuscripts.

Moreover, further studies have shown that somewhere after Exod 15 and before Exod 25 the primary source changes to a manuscript of the f-group of Wevers edition.²³ Scholars have not been aware of this change of primary source. Therefore the Göttingen editions misrepresent Compl because they attempt to present Compl on the basis of 108.²⁴ This verification supports Cisneros's statement when he alluded, in the preface to the reader, to other manuscripts he had purchased with much effort and large sums of money. In the second volume a significant unevenness in editorial approach can be appreciated. In Joshua there is a change of primary source from a ms. of the f-group which is no longer known (not ms. 56 as Margolis thought!) to the 108 again at the end of the book.²⁵ Therefore, it is at least surprising that another prominent scholar, M. L. Margolis, in an unedited study on the Complutensian text of Joshua, recently published by L. Greenspoon, expresses a very critical judgement towards the editors of the Alcalá polyglot. He attributes to retroversion of the editors from the Latin into 'Spanish Greek' all the readings that do not agree with mss 108 or 56 of Rahlfs's catalogue, even when the reading can be found in other known Greek manuscripts.²⁶ His argument cannot be sustained in the light of recent research. As O'Connell states: "There is only the slightest trace of what Margolis termed 'Spanish Greek' – Greek resulting from editorial

²² "Der Text bleibt ein interessantes Rätsel ... Die Compl. Polyglotte enthält auch eine Reihe von nirgendwo bezeugten Sonderlesarten ... Es fragt sich, ob nicht der Text von einer anderen griech. Übersetzung beeinflusst sein könnte; denn absichtliche Revision, wie sie Ziegler vermutet, ohne die Zugrundelegung irgendwelcher Hss. ist auch keine zufriedenstellende Lösung," see J. W. Wevers, 'Septuaginta Forschungen,' *TR u 22* (1954), 105.

²³ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 19 and 35: "The first volume of Compl is edited with considerable care and fidelity to all the texts involved."

²⁴ For instance, "the editor or editors of Leviticus may not be accused of constructing the text. There is some slight stylistic modification but otherwise all the readings in the Greek column are attested in the two mss. at the editors' disposition," see O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 28. Even the most recent edition by U. Quast, *Septuaginta. IV, 3 Ruth* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 14, states: "Compl. wird notiert, wenn ihre Lesart von 108 abweicht."

²⁵ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 75.

²⁶ L. Greenspoon, 'Max L. Margolis on the Complutensian Text of Joshua,' *BIOSCS* 12 (1979), 43–56.

retroversions. ... The misplaced identification [of ms 56] leads him [Margolis] to see much more editorial activity in Compl than there actually was and to identify certain readings as 'Spanish Greek' when in fact they were to be found in what may be termed the f-type source. The term 'Spanish Greek' is unfortunate because it leads to overgeneralization in the evaluation of Compl readings which are not found elsewhere."²⁷

In a perspicuous study D. Barthélemy called the attention of scholars to a singular phenomenon of the Greek Ezekiel: the close connection between the *Complutensis* and the most ancient witness of this book, Papyrus 967, in the description of the temple. Pap 967 belongs to the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century AD. In this part of the book (Ez 40:42–46:24) there are 215 readings of the papyrus which are not backed up in the manuscripts of Ziegler's apparatus. Interestingly, 130 of these readings agree exactly with the text of the Complutensian Polyglot. It would have been difficult to give credit to the antiquity of these Complutensian singular readings had they not been confirmed by the discovery and publication of new witnesses such as Pap 967. Barthélemy is convinced that the editors of the Alcalá Polyglot had a manuscript at their disposal, albeit fragmentary, which has now disappeared but which belonged to a textual family clearly different from that of *codex Vaticanus* that embraces more or less the rest of the textual tradition. He recalls the high esteem of Lagarde towards the Complutensian text, laments that the Alcalá Polyglot had not been collated in the first volumes of the Göttingen series, and concludes: "La *Complutensis* se confirme donc, de plus en plus clairement, comme un témoin textuel de haute valeur, quoique énigmatique; et Robert Hanhart a eu parfaitement raison de lui faire place, à partir de 1960, dans la Septante de Göttingen."²⁸

Finally in his edition of 2 Ezra R. Hanhart is more cautious with regard to the singular text of the *Complutensis*. As a result of Barthélemy's article, it would be necessary, he says, to submit to a new analysis those readings in agreement with the Masoretic text and which are lacking in the Lucianic recension represented by ms.108.

²⁷ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 75 and 78, and O'Connell continues: "Although there are retroversions and errors in Compl, they are not as frequent as Margolis maintains; they are to be attributed more to the characteristics of the source mss than to editorial intervention or negligence."

²⁸ D. Barthélemy, 'Les relations de la Complutensis avec le papyrus 967 pour Ez 40,42 à 46,24,' in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J. W. Wevers, eds, *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstag*. MSU 20 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 261. For more details see D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3. Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*. OBO 50/3 (Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), CXXV–CXLIV.

Hanhart concludes that no sure conclusion can be reached regarding the use of manuscripts which are now lost or the reconstruction of the text by the editors. Notwithstanding, he observes that the eclectic use of mss. has led the editors to choose the reading of 108 which is closer to the MT, as can be proven in the utilization of the Lucianic doublets, taking the part of the doublet which is closer to the Hebrew.²⁹

Another intriguing connection between the Complutensis and the extant manuscripts was found when editing the critical edition of Exodus. It has been analyzed by the editor J. W. Wevers and a research scholar of the Septuagint–Unternehmen, D. Fraenkel, in separate contributions. In the Ambrosian library of Milan there is an important uncial manuscript of the 5th century AD. (S. P. 51, former A.147 inf.), F according to Rahlfs's Catalogue.³⁰ In the Middle Ages (12th century) this codex had been systematically corrected in cursive script by a corrector in an attempt to bring the text closer to the Hebrew (F^b in Wevers's edition). A later corrector has completed the omissions of the manuscript using a *Vorlage* that is in an order and textual form closer to the Hebrew than the Greek Exodus. This current text of the later corrector or *suppletor* is called F^h in Wevers's edition. Interestingly enough, the text of this medieval Jewish corrector agrees with the Septuagint column of the Complutensian Polyglot. As a matter of fact F^h and Complutensis agree with the Hexaplaric witnesses in the outline and distribution of the text but not in the textual form of the completed text, where both witnesses go their own way against the Hexaplaric recension. One conclusion can be drawn: that both witnesses follow a common textual tradition. From the ancient printed editions only the Complutensian offers a text similar to that of F^h in this part of Exodus. It means that the editor knew either the F manuscript itself with its medieval corrections or the Jewish tradition on which these corrections are based.³¹ The Brooke–McLean edition published, in an Appendix to Exodus, this text for Ex 36:8–39:43 (according to

²⁹ R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta. Vol. VIII/2 Esdrae Liber II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 25.

³⁰ *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften. Bd. I,1 Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel, 229–31. As indicated in an ancient inscription of the bind folium, it was imported from Macedonia (*ex Macedonia Corcyram advecta*) and bought by cardinal Borromaeus for the Ambrosian Library.

³¹ See J. W. Wevers, *Septuaginta. II.1 Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 7–8; D. Fraenkel, 'Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Ex 35-40*,' in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J. W. Wevers, eds, *Studien zur Septuaginta*, 144–45 and 174–84. In fact, several of these corrections also agree with the translation into modern Greek published in 1547 in Hebrew script as a

the Hebrew = pp. 408–436 of Wevers’ edition), taking the text of ms. G of the Hexaplaric recension as the basis. F^h was included in the apparatus, but under the symbol of F^b. According to Wevers, this Second Tabernacle Account of F^h is a revised text also based on the Greek Exodus and not a new rendering of the Masoretic Text. It is a revision based on the Hebrew, not unlike that of Origen’s Hexapla, but with many more corrections towards MT. On several occasions, both the Complutensis and F^h, support the same variant, moreover the same sentence.³² I conclude with Wevers’s words: “Close scrutiny reveals that Compl’s support is stronger for the base text than for the readings which constitute revisions towards MT. This must mean that one of the sources of Compl must have shared in its stemmata a parent text which also lay in the textual ancestry of F^h. That source is not one of the extant identified sources of Compl for the Pentateuch, viz. ms 108 and some of the f mss, but one no longer extant.”³³

Although most of these marginal glosses are anonymous, in the notes to Gen 47:31 and Exod 16:31 the readings of F^b are attributed to τo; ijoud' (= τo; ijoudaikovn). In fact, these readings follow the tradition of the ancient Jewish versions, particularly Aquila (cf. Exod 6:3; 15:1,11; Num 23:19; 24:4; 25:6), and very often agree with the lexicon of the Greek column in the Istanbul Pentateuch (1547).³⁴

Some comments to this chain of evidence seem appropriate. First of all, it is recognized that the Complutensian collaborators made use of other sources no longer extant beside those commonly accepted for the Pentateuch, ms. 108 and one of the f-group.³⁵ These conclusions confirm the statement of cardinal Cisneros in the preface to the reader “ut copia emendatorum codicum abunde supesset.” Secondly, the base text

column of the Istanbul Polyglot Pentateuch, see N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*. 2nd edition revised and augmented (Madrid: CSIC, 1998), 183–89.

³² See J. W. Wevers, *Septuaginta. II, 1 Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 408–11.

³³ J. W. Wevers, 'A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus,' in R. Gryson, ed., *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag. Band I* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 48. O’Connell recognizes that “there is a relationship between F^h and Compl only in the texts where the main text fails. Compl borrows from F^h and not vice versa,” see O’Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 53, n. 48. There is significant unevenness in the editing of the Second Tabernacle Account. Like Fraenkel, O’Connell accepts that it is a product of the hellenists of Alcalá, but he admits in this narrative the influence of the Vulgate to the shape of the Greek column, see O’Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 72–73.

³⁴ Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas*, 182–83, and N. Fernández Marcos, 'El Pentateuco griego de Constantinopla,' *Erytheia* 6 (1985), 198–99. Of the 488 readings that F^b preserves in the book of Exodus, it shares 100 with the Istanbul Pentateuch, see Wevers, *Septuaginta. II, 1 Exodus*, 43–44.

followed in the Second Tabernacle Account of Exodus, forms part of a Jewish tradition connected with the ancient Jewish versions of the Bible, especially Aquila, and which is also present in the Greek column of the Jewish Istanbul Pentateuch of 1547. We lack the proof for the actual link used by the Complutensian editors. But all the traces lead to the conclusion that the contacts of cardinal Cisneros with these manuscripts from North Italy, corrected by Jewish hands, was not only possible but quite plausible. The migration of Greek manuscripts from Constantinople to Italy even before 1453 is well attested.³⁶ The main collection of the Marcian Library in Venice came from the legacy of cardinal Bessarion. Cultural contacts between Spain and Venice, Milan, Rome and other cities of Italy were frequent in the 15th–16th centuries. Some of the Complutensian collaborators such as Alfonso de Zamora or Pablo Coronel were ‘conversos’ who had access to Hebrew manuscripts and Jewish exegetical traditions. Moreover, Demetrio Ducas, the Cretan, was called by Cisneros to collaborate in the edition of the Greek text of the Complutensis when he was in Italy working on the publication of Greek texts for Aldus Manuzius in Venice.³⁷ Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (also known as Pinciano and Comendador griego), the other collaborator in the edition of the Greek text was twice in Italy (probably in Bologna before and after 1499), where he purchased several Greek manuscripts.³⁸ Nebrija itself had studied ten years in Italy.

The philological criteria of the Renaissance for the edition of translated texts were well established in the Preface of the Complutensian Polyglot: when the witnesses disagree the truth relies on the originals: the Hebrew text for the Old Testament and the Greek text for the New. It is not surprising that, given these criteria of textual criticism, the Complutensian philologists gave priority to the manuscripts and readings which supported the Masoretic Text. To this aim they sometimes preferred even the marginal readings, whether they belonged to the Hexapla as in the ten first chapters of Job or to

³⁵ The following mss. belong to this group in the Pentateuch: 53 56 129 246 and 664.

³⁶ J. Signes Codoñer, '*Translatio studiorum*: la emigración bizantina a Europa Occidental en las décadas finales del Imperio (1353–1453),' in P. Bádenas de la Peña and I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *Constantinopla 1453. Mitos y realidades*. Nueva Roma 19 (Madrid: CSIC, 2003), 189-246. In relation with the Concile of Florence (1438/39) Signes ('*Translatio studiorum*,' 232) states: "Muchos eruditos griegos trajeron desde Bizancio manuscritos de autores antiguos que difundieron entre sus colegas humanistas, presentes en las sesiones conciliares."

³⁷ J. López Rueda, *Helénistas españoles del siglo XVI* (Madrid: CSIC, 1973), 20.

para-Hexaplaric notes and texts as in the late part of Exodus. As Delitzsch stated, which other criterium could they have followed at the time? They thought that the ancient Greek translators had before them the same *textus receptus* which had remained unaltered since the time of the translation.

The last study of the Complutensian Greek text by S. O'Connell reveals that one can hardly speak of one text of the Alcalá polyglot: "The Greek column is an eclectic text constructed by a number of editors who worked semi-independently."³⁹ These editors apply different procedures. They usually follow a main manuscript as the base which they correct with readings of another manuscript. But the manuscript chosen as the base may change from book to book, from one part of the Bible to another. This may explain in some way the enigma of the Complutensis.

O'Connell slightly modifies Fraenkel's conclusions on Exodus 35–40. The Greek column bears traces of two hands, one non-interventive and the other quite interventive. The incorporation of marginal glosses is a significant feature of the Complutensian text, but there is no convincing evidence of spontaneous retroversion from MT or Vulgate. The editor made an effort to find textual sources for all the readings in the Second Tabernacle Account.⁴⁰

Concerning the work of the hellenists of Alcalá in the second volume O'Connell concludes that they "executed their task with noteworthy seriousness: the evaluation of their work must strive to avoid facile and simplistic solutions."⁴¹

As far as Ezekiel is concerned Barthélemy's conclusions are confirmed. The sounding of other chapters shows that there is a relationship, albeit hidden, with Pap 967 for some passages where 967 is still extant. There is an increase of unique Complutensian readings in the first ten chapters of Ezekiel, a section for which 967 is not extant. These

³⁸ J. Signes Codoñer, C. Codoñer Merino and A. Domingo Malvadi, *Biblioteca y epistolario de Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (El Pinciano). Una aproximación al humanismo español del siglo XVI*. Nueva Roma 14 (Madrid: CSIC, 2001), 7-12.

³⁹ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 166. However, the number of editors should not be exaggerated. We know only three or at most four editors for the Greek column: Demetrio Ducas, Hernán Núñez (or Pinciano, disciple of Nebrija) and López de Zúñiga. Perhaps they were helped by Juan de Vergara.

⁴⁰ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 37–73.

⁴¹ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 103.

unique readings are to be attributed more to the characteristics of the lost primary source than to the interventions of a particular editor.⁴²

If we pay attention to the shape of the text it must be said that the Vulgate was used as a guide in establishing the text. Vulgate does not always influence the Complutensian text, but it is a constant factor in the editing. The Masoretic text is of lesser influence. It is significant in longer texts that it is Vulgate which acts as a guide in interpreting the Hebrew. In Ezekiel, a very clear influence of Jerome's commentary is evidenced in the final chapters. O'Connell concludes his important monograph with the following assertions: "It is possible to distinguish contrasting techniques and tendencies throughout the Greek column: in the degree of Vg use; in the use or non-use of MT; in the incorporation of marginal glosses; in the use of Jerome's commentary; in the style of combining source mss and in differing stylistic and orthographic criteria. It must, however, be stated that the stylistic modification is quite restrained. There is no question of the editors changing to have a more elegant text. Their modification is aimed at restoring what had become corrupt or was lost. They were people of their time and Compl testifies to their expertise within their time.

The practical effect of this is to show the editorial activity of the Complutensian Hellenists in a much calmer light, especially that the amount of borrowing from the secondary source is comparatively limited as is the number of readings attributable to spontaneous editorial intervention."⁴³

Behind all the efforts of the editors lies the most important component of all: the manuscripts which the editors used. It is the manuscripts which give the fundamental colour to the Greek column. It is still valid to maintain that the text critical value of this text lies in the value of its sources.

As we have shown above, for the first volume, the Pentateuch, and the second, Joshua–2 Chronicles, the main sources of the Greek column were ms 108 and a second manuscript of the f–group. But for Judges and the following books, the editors had at their disposal a third manuscript, a partial copy of ms. 68 sent to Alcalá by the Venetian

⁴² O'Connell. *From Most Ancient Sources*, 163: "The most significant result of the investigation of Ezek 42c was that many of the unique Compl readings, rather than being supposed retroversions were in fact pre-Hexaplaric readings of very high quality... The specific Compl readings show that the editor had access to a ms no longer extant."

⁴³ O'Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 168.

Senate. It is the ms. 116–Z–36 (22 of Villa–Amil, 442 of Rahlfs).⁴⁴ A printed text of this manuscript for Judges 5, Debora’s song, and 2 Samuel 1:19–26, David’s elegy over Saul and Jonathan, was published by Delitzsch according to a copy sent by Pascual de Gayangos, the librarian of the Madrid University.⁴⁵ O’Connell describes the use of this manuscript made by the Complutensian philologists with the following words: “However, with the appearance of ms 442 for Judges, the editors had available to them, a ms which was much closer to ms 108. The sudden switch to ms 442 then becomes more understandable: in Judges the close relationship between mss 108 and 442, while not members of the same ms group, offered the editors a more stable path in establishing the Greek column and provided a sense of security as to where the LXX lay.”⁴⁶

My interest for this manuscript goes back to my postgraduate studies at the Complutensian University of Madrid. A document signed by the director of the Complutensian Library of 5th June 1973 informed that ms 22 (= 442) with other Hebrew and Latin Bibles were not accessible to the researchers since they had to be restored. My interest increased when in the Göttingen edition of 1 Ezra, in the description of the available manuscripts R. Hanhart stated on 442: “Die Hs. ist laut Mitteilung der Bibliothek vom 24.10.1969 im spanischen Bürgerkrieg verbrannt.”⁴⁷

My joy was still greater when I could verify two years ago that ms. 22 was not completely lost but only damaged, that it had been partially restored, even digitized, and that I could have in my hands the extant folios and fragments of the presumed burnt manuscript. In a separate publication I have made known and described the contents and remnants of the restored manuscript.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ J. Villa–Amil y Castro, *Catálogo de los mss. Existentes en la Biblioteca del noviciado de la Universidad Central (procedentes de la antigua de Alcalá). Parte I: Códices*, Madrid, 1878, 5–6.

⁴⁵ Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien*, 13–17.

⁴⁶ O’Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 86. Actually, in Judges ms. 108 belongs to the Hexaplaric group and ms. 442 to the group MNhyb₂ of Brooke–McLean, although ms. 442 was not collated by Brooke–McLean.

⁴⁷ R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta. Vol. VIII/1 Esdrae Liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 14. Information repeated in the specialists’ publications until now, see U. Quast, *Septuaginta IV, 3 Ruth*, 10, and O’Connell, *From Most Ancient Sources*, 82: “While the ms has been rendered unreadable by the ravages of the Spanish Civil War ...”

⁴⁸ N. Fernández Marcos, “Un manuscrito complutense redivivo: Ms. griego 442 = Villa–Amil 22,” *Sefarad* 65 (2005), 65–83.

