Mariachiara Fincati

The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch

Critical Editing between Septuaginta and
Hebraica Veritas in MS Ambrosianus A 147 inf.

V&R

V&R Academic

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 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 5

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Mariachiara Fincati

The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch

Critical Editing between *Septuaginta* and *Hebraica Veritas* in MS *Ambrosianus* A 147 inf.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 3 figures

Acknowledgements

This book is a translated and revised version of my PhD dissertation, defended at the Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane in Florence in March 2012.

Thanks are due to the Ambrosian Library in Milan, which allowed me to examine such a precious manuscript as the *Ambrosianus* A 147 inf., and particularly to Rev. Federico Gallo and Dr Stefano Serventi; to my professor Carlo Maria Mazzucchi, who first suggested the present investigation; to my supervisor Natalio Fernández Marcos, to Nicholas Lange, and to the members of the jury (Francesco D'Aiuto, Riccardo Maisano, and Roberto Pintaudi) who examined my PhD thesis and made helpful remarks. Finally, I am deeply indebted to my friend and colleague Dr Barbara Crostini Lappin, who revised my English text, as well as to my husband Matteo Garzetti, for his support in the editorial process.

Milan, October 2014   Mariachiara Fincati

Preface

Approaching the brilliant literary production of Hellenistic Judaism, with the translation of the Bible into Greek as its best example, I have always been intrigued by the continuation and the end of this branch of Judaism.

There is no doubt that its reception was to a great extent guaranteed and transmitted by Christians. However, I would like to know what its destiny was in the Jewish tradition, beyond the witnesses that, through Christian authors, have been transmitted to us through the Hexaplaric readings in the Greek manuscripts of the Septuaginta.

In my *Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Madrid, [2]1998) I devoted a chapter to the translations into medieval Greek and neo-Greek. However, in recent decades it has mainly been thanks to the publications of Nicholas de Lange and his team at the University of Cambridge that our knowledge in this area has increased. Through unedited sources from the *Cairo Genizah* and other archives, new evidence of the use of Greek by Byzantines Jews have been brought to light (*Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah*, Tübingen 1996, and *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions*, Tübingen 2009).

The work by Dr Mariachiara Fincati which I present to you here belongs to those same lines of investigation. She has been working for many years on the study of the Ambrosian Hexateuch of Milan, having already published an important article: "Per la storia dell'Esateuco Ambrosiano A 147 inf", *Aevum* 83 (2009) 299–339. This 5th century uncial manuscript presents some marginal corrections made by a medieval restorer (F[b]) and which apparently seemed to continue in the line of the corrections of the Septuaginta based on the Hebrew, which were started in the 2nd century by the revisions and translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

Dr Fincati has carried out an exhaustive, intelligent, and rigorous study of this Ambrosian Hexateuch. She has also successfully shown her excellent knowledge of classical and post-classical Greek, as well as of the Hebrew language and of the complicated textual history of the Septuagint. I would like to point out here the main contributions of her monograph to our knowledge of the transmission of the Greek Bible in the Byzantine Empire.

For the first time, all the marginal corrections of the Ambrosian manuscript have been examined on the basis of the original one of Milan. The examination includes a codicological and palaeographic analysis with a thorough investigation of all the pieces of information at our disposal.

For the first time all the marginal notes have been examined and compared with the Masoretic text in the context of the textual history of the Septuaginta and of the fragments of the Hexapla which are still kept. The

history of the Greek language has been taken into account, just as it appears in the ancient, medieval and Atticistic lexica. These readings have been compared with the Jewish-Greek texts from the Cairo Genizah.

There had been some partial studies (John J. Wevers, D. Fraenkel, C. Boyd-Taylor) on the relationship between these marginal notes and the Judeo-Greek text of the polyglot Pentateuch of Constantinople, but now, for the first time, a complete comparative study has been made of the F^b with the Greek text of the Pentateuch of Constantinople and also with the text of *Graeco-Venetus* of the Marcian Library of Venice (14th century). The frequent coincidences of F^b and the Greek Pentateuch of Constantinople have been confirmed and the coincidences, though not so many, of these marginal notes with the text of *Graeco-Venetus* are surprising. Both data place the readings of F^b in the Jewish tradition and confirm and show the reception of the Greek Bible in Byzantium and in the neo-Greek of the 16th century.

However, one of the most original results consists in the fact that not all those marginal notes can be reduced to corrections according to the Masoretic text, both through the Hexaplaric glosses or any other kind of approximation to the Hebrew. Nor can all the notes be reduced to stylistic improvements of the Greek in the sphere of the Christian tradition. The author of these glosses probably worked in an 11th century Christian environment in close contact with the Jewish tradition of Byzantium. He uses different sources which cannot always be identified.

In short, we have in front of us a first-hand contribution to the studies of the Septuagint and of the Byzantine Greek, as well as to the study of the languages in contact. There is evidence that the transmission of the Greek Bible has been carried out in contact with the Jewish tradition and it has also undergone other influences, both stylistic and of other kinds, from the Christian tradition.

Finally, I would like to point out that the work by Dr Fincati is a brilliant example of the best tradition of the Italian school of textual criticism in classical and biblical philology.

Natalio Fernández Marcos
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid

Table of content

Abbreviations and sigla[1]

c.	= century
col.	= column
edn	= edition
fol(s).	= folio(s)
LXX	= Septuagint
ms(s)	= manuscript(s)
MT	= Masoretic Text (according to *BHS* edition)
OG	= Old Greek
OT	= Old Testament
p(p).	= page(s)
s.v.	= *sub voce*
v.	= verse

Talmud b.	= Babylonian Talmud
Tg. Neof.	= Targum Neophyti
Tg. Onq.	= Targum Onqelos
Tg. Ps.-J.	= Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

Texts, Editions, Modern Studies Frequently Cited

(Full references are given in Bibliography).

BHK	= *Biblia Hebraica*
BHQ	= *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Deuteronomy*
BHS	= *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
Brooke/McLean	= A.E. Brooke/N. McLean's critical edition of the Greek Octateuch
Ceriani	= A.M. Ceriani, *Pentateuchi et Josue quae ex prima scriptura supersunt in cod. Ambrosiano Graeco saeculi fere 5.*
DCH	= *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*
Field	= *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, ed. F. Field (2 vols. + *Auctarium et indices*)
HRCS	= E. Hatch/H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*
Joüon	= *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*, ed. P. Joüon, transl. and rev. by T. Muraoka
LSJ	= Liddell/Scott/Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*
NETS	= *The New English Translation of the Septuagint*

---

1 According to *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*, ed. P.H. Alexander/J.F. Kutsko/J.D. Ernest/S. Decker-Lucke/D.L. Petersen (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1999), with scant divergencies.

Abbreviations and sigla

NRSV	=	*The HarperCollins Study Bible: The New Revised Standard Version*
ODB	=	*The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*
RE	=	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*
Walton	=	*Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, ed. B. Walton
Wevers	=	J. W. Wevers' critical edition of the Greek Pentateuch

Series

AB	=	Anchor Bible
ByzH	=	Byzantinisches Handbuch
CCSG	=	Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca
CCSL	=	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CSCO	=	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	=	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
GCS	=	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
HAT	=	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
MSU	=	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
PG	=	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne
PIBA	=	Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association
PL	=	Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne
SC	=	Sources Chrétiennes
SCS	=	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
TEG	=	Traditio Exegetica Graeca

Review

JQR	=	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSS	=	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
REJ	=	*Revue des Études Juives*
ZAH	=	*Zeitschrift für Althebraistik*
JTS	=	*Journal of Theological Studies*

Greek and Hebrew dictionaries (except for LSJ and *DCH*) are cited under the author's surname as in the list found in the Bibliography.

Introduction

The present study focuses on the medieval stage of an ancient manuscript of the LXX, now at the Ambrosian Library in Milan with the shelfmark *Ambrosianus* A 147 inf (*gr.* 808)[1]. The restoration the codex underwent at the end of the eleventh century went beyond the physical replacement of material lacunae: it also involved an impressive number of annotations and editorial interventions concerning the Greek text of the Bible. Before examining each of them in order to detect their purpose, I will provide a description of the codex, detailing the restoration itself and listing later sporadic annotations. A general overview of the Christian and Jewish biblical scholarship in Byzantium is then offered as background to the medieval work on the manuscript.

The manuscript

Codex *Ambrosianus* A 147 inf. is an ancient manuscript containing the first six books of the Old Greek translation of the Bible (Genesis–Joshua): hence the name of "Hexateuch".[2] Several sheets are missing at the beginning (fol. 1 starts with Gen 31:15), and at the end (fol. 213 ends with Josh 12:12).[3] It is given the siglum F in the critical editions of Cambridge and Göttingen.[4]

---

1 Ae. Martini/D. Bassi, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan: Hoepli, 1906; repr. Hildesheim/New York: Olms, 1978), 904–05.

2 The codex is sometimes named "Octateuch" in literature, since the collection of eight books was a popular format of the Byzantine Bible.

3 The manuscript consists of 215 folios, but the last two belong to a different book, namely the codex *Ambr.* D 96 sup. (*gr.* 260): see C. Pasini, "Smembramenti e restauri all'Ambrosiana: frammenti del codice C 129 inf. restituiti al codice A 180 sup.", *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* NS 35 (1998) 67–75, on p.73. A large and accurate description of the manuscript preceded the diplomatic edition of the majuscule text by A.M. Ceriani, *Pentateuchi et Josue quae ex prima scriptura supersunt in cod. Ambrosiano Graeco saeculi fere 5.* (Monumenta sacra et profana opera Collegii doctorum Ambrosianae, 3; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1864), VII–XXIII, which remains essential for knowledge of some marginal notes – today invisible – written by the first hand. I made a preliminary investigation on the codex's history in my paper "Per la storia dell'Esateuco Ambrosiano A 147 inf.", *Aevum* 83 (2009) 299–339. For the sake of convenience, however, I resume here the main codicological features of the manuscript.

4 *The Old Testament in Greek according to the text of Codex Vaticanus*, ed. A.A. Brooke/ N. McLean (4 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1906–1940, repr. 2009; henceforward Brooke/McLean); *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scien-*

The manuscript consists of thin sheets of good quality parchment, since the original ink is not visible through to the verso. The leaves are arranged in quaternions according to Gregory's law; each sheet measures mm 325 × 265. Fascicle numbers are marked in Greek letters at the beginning of each fascicle ca. mm 25 above the first text-column, and sometimes also at its end, below the third (and last) column of text. The first numbering was retraced in the Middle Ages counting two fascicles less.[5]

Today, the dimensions of the manuscript are much smaller than the original ones: this can be argued with some precision from the evidence of a protruding flap on fol. 4, which was preserved because it contained an addition by a medieval hand: the flap protrudes from the present margins ca. mm 10. As to the upper margin, some crosses desultorily traced in black ink from fol. 53v onwards often have their vertical stroke truncated (see e.g. fols. 68v, 69v, etc.); therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the sheets had broader margins at the time when the crosses were traced.[6] This fact is moreover confirmed by the long majuscule addition written in the upper margin of fol. 40v: the first line of text is partially cut off because of a later trimming of the codex. The text, arranged in three columns of 35 lines each, occupies an area mm 210 wide and mm 240 high. The ruling lines are D3 of Leroy/Sautel's repertoire.[7] Each line contains five syllables on average (about 11 or 12 letters).[8] The space between the columns is mm 22.

The writing is a biblical majuscule belonging to the early phase of decadence (approximately the beginning of the fifth century), according to the classification by Guglielmo Cavallo.[9] The writing module is regular, measuring ca. 4 × 3 mm (width and height). At the beginning of a verse, a paragraphos is traced on the left,[10] and letters often show a slightly larger mod-

---

5   *tiarum Gottingensis editum. Pentateuchus*, ed. J. W. Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974–1991; henceforward Wevers).

5   Thus, e.g., the fascicle beginning at fol. 127r is marked as x̄γ̄ according to the medieval numbering, but it is preceded by the x̄δ̄ of the ancient numbering marked on fol. 126v: see also C. M. Mazzucchi, "Alcune vicende della tradizione di Cassio Dione in epoca bizantina", *Aevum* 53 (1979) 94–139, on p. 95, n. 8. The first fascicle number extant today is η̄ (8th) on fol. 11r: it overwrites the original ῑ (10th) of the first numbering.

6   That is, after the Middle Ages, since fol. 53 was added during the medieval restoration (see below).

7   J. H. Sautel, *Répertoire de réglures dans les manuscrits grecs sur parchemin* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).

8   This datum is approximate, because syllables can obviously consist of a varying number of letters, and especially because every biblical verse starts from a new line (with some exceptions, since the modern verse-division going back to the 16th century scholar Sante Pagnini does not always match the ancient one).

9   G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Studi e testi di papirologia 2; Firenze: Le Monnier, 1967), 73 and plate 56.

10   The *paragraphos* is normally a horizontal line traced beside the beginning of a verse. From fol. 88r on, either the right end of the line is prolonged in a oblique line that runs down from the right to the left, or this oblique line starts from the midpoint of the horizontal stroke. This variation also appears in *codex Sinaiticus* (Ceriani, *Monumenta*, XII).

ule (mm 6 × 5); they are placed in *ekthesis*, halfway out of the justification line. At the end of the lines there is no justification, and the last letter often has a smaller module than usual; passing from one line to the next, the scribe breaks up the words into whole syllables. The *scriptio continua* is sometimes broken off by a space wherever a period could be placed.

The writing is similar to that of *codex Colbertino-Sarravianus* (*Leid. Voss. gr. 4° 8*, *Paris. gr. 17*, *Petropol. gr. 3*), which also dates to the beginning of the fifth century and was produced in Egypt, according to Tischendorf.[11]

The ink is reddish-brown, whereas it is greenish in the book of Joshua (fols. 200–213): these are two different inks, the second of which has eroded the parchment. According to Ceriani, the manuscript was copied by two associated scribes, the first copying the Pentateuch, the other only the book of Joshua; the quaternions, however, must have been entirely numbered by the scribe of the Pentateuch.[12]

On the left of some columns, Egyptian *cruces monogrammaticae* are found (⳨): they occur when the biblical text contains a reference to YHWH: κ(ύριο)ς or θ(εό)ς, but also πν(εῦμ)α.[13] Ceriani ascribed them to the first hand, although such designs are actually typical in palaeo-Christian epigraphs and papyri.[14]

The place of origin of *codex Ambrosianus* could therefore be Egypt, although this cannot definitely be stated; one more piece of evidence in favour of such a hypothesis is the stichometrical numbering recorded in the margins throughout the book of Deuteronomy: the mark meaning 1000 is similar to that in Chester Beatty Papyrus II (also known as P46 in New Testament studies), an Egyptian manuscript dated approximately to the year 200 containing the Pauline epistles, at the end of the Letter to the Romans.[15]

---

11 A. F. C. Tischendorf, *Fragmenta origenianae octateuchi editionis*, in *Monumenta sacra inedita*, III (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1860), xv: see a photographic reproduction of fol. 64r in Cavallo, *Ricerche*, plate 50.

12 Ceriani, *Monumenta*, xviii.

13 See fols. 13r, col. 1, line 7–8: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θ(εὸ)ς τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ό)ς σου… (Exod 3:6); fol. 13v, col. 1, line 13: θ(εὸ)ς Ἀβραάμ… (Exod 3:15); fol. 26r, col. 1, line 8: ὁ γὰρ κ(ύριο)ς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν (Exod 16:29); fol. 34v, col. 2, line 22: in the latter passage, YHWH is the implied subject of the sentence καὶ Μωϋσῆ εἶπεν (Exod 24:1).

14 Ceriani, *Monumenta*, xix–xxi.

15 F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (16 vols.; London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933–1958), vol. 3, suppl., plate 21r; the stichometrical mark is visible on the website http://www.lib.umich.edu/reading/Paul/stichometry.html. On the peculiar marks expressing thousands (see plate 3) see K. Ohly, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* (Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 61; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1928, repr. Nendeln-Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd/Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968), 81–2, who gives a complete list of stichometrical marks employed in *codex Ambrosianus*, and V. E. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie. Die Schrift, Unterschriften und Chronologie im Altertum und im byzantinischen Mittelalter* (2 vols.; Leipzig: von Veit & Comp., ²1911–1913), 370. Ceriani suggested that the manuscript was produced within the boundaries of Greece or –at least– within those of the Constantinople Patriarchate, but he deferred to a future publication his

Some marginal readings written in a smaller module than the main text are also to be ascribed to the first hand: they testify to corrections, additions and variants. Corrections – admittedly quite scant – are carried out by erasure, or by writing a dot above each wrong letter. Variants are generally introduced by the sigla ακ, συ(μ), θε,[16] hinting to the three translators: Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

According to Ceriani, some punctuation and diacritical marks such as breathings, accents and diaeresis should be ascribed to the first hand as well, although they are not always marked; they are transcribed in his diplomatic edition of the majuscule text.

There are no peculiar abbreviations in the ancient text, besides the common ones employed for the nomina sacra (θεός, κύριος when referred to God, πατήρ, ἄνθρωπος). Καί is never abbreviated in the main text, whereas it occurs tachygraphically written in *marginalia*, together with the abbreviated ending -ται.

Orthographical mistakes are not very frequent, but some linguistic features of the text are worth noting:
1. ἐραυνάω instead of ἐρευνάω: a later variant of the classical form.[17]
2. τέσσερα instead of τέσσαρα: the vowel lenition is widely witnessed in Hellenistic times.[18]
3. λήμψομαι instead of λήψομαι: the addition of a nasal epenthesis before ψ is common in *koiné* Greek.[19]

Although Tischendorf considered such features – which F shares with *codex Sarravianus* – as conclusively proving the Egyptian origin of the latter,[20] they are too widespread in *koiné* Greek to act as evidence for inferring a place of origin.

During the sixth or seventh century, a majuscule hand (Fᵃ in critical editions), wrote some minor textual variants. Some examples:

---

arguments for such a hypothesis; this publication should have included a complete survey of the manuscript as well as the transcription of the Byzantine marginal notes, but it never came to light. Ceriani only sent his preparatory work to Frederik Field, who drew from it for his edition of the *Hexapla* (the codex is named "VII" according to the edition by R. Holmes/J. Parson, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1798).

16 See, e. g., fol. 85v (Lev 18:21), and fol. 94r (Lev 24:19).
17 Wevers, *Genesis*, 485. See also F. Blass/A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge, University Press/Chicago: University Press, 1961), 16–17, no. 30.4, and H. St.-J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909; repr. Hildesheim/New York, 1978), 78–79: the transition from -ευ to -αυ after ρ- is attested in papyri from 22 CE onwards.
18 Blass/Debrunner, *Grammar*, 15, no. 29.1, and Wevers, *Genesis*, 484–5.
19 Thackeray, *Grammar*, 108–10 and 274: the epenthetic form was gradually abandoned from the sixth century onwards to be replaced by the Attic λήψομαι.
20 Tischendorf, *Fragmenta*, xv.

1. Deut 6:13, fol. 163v: μόνῳ is written after αὐτῷ in the statement Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις; this change is common to many other witnesses (A, V, etc.) and to the OT quotation as it appears in Matthew 4:10 and Luke 4:8.
2. Exodus 5:11 (fol. 16r), Fᵃ wrote an addition which is also found in codex *Coislinianus* 1 (siglum M) and in several minuscule manuscripts: καὶ τὴν σύνταξιν τῆς πλινθείας ἀποδώσετε; it is without parallel in MT, rather anticipating the end of v. 18, where the phrase is attested by the totality of witnesses.

Most remarkable is the long addition written in an oblique majuscule (Fᵃ) in the upper margin of fol. 40v (fig. 1). It contains some verses dealing with the breastplate of the Great Priest (Exod ^MT 28:23–28). These verses are absent in the original text of the Septuagint, but were added by Origen in his Hexaplaric edition; they are witnessed by *codex Coislinianus* (M), by codices belonging to the Origenian recension, by three groups of the Byzantine tradition (*d n t*),[21] by a group of catena manuscripts[22] and by a few other minuscule manuscripts, as well as by Syro-Hexaplaric, Armenian, Aethiopic and Arabic versions. In the Syro-Hexaplaric edition the addition, which is not framed by *metobelos*, is ascribed to Theodotion.[23]

In the upper margin of fol. 74v (Lev 12:4–13:4 ff.), a majuscule rough hand indicated in large characters the contents of the page: περι τον δυο τρυγονον. This note, written with a wide calamus and in a red-brown ink, likely points to Lev 12:6, the verse of the Law which Luke 2:24 alludes to when describing the presentation of Jesus to the Temple and the sacrifice of the two turtle-doves.[24]

The medieval restoration

The manuscript underwent major restoration at the end of the eleventh century: it had probably become barely legible because the ink had faded, and parts of the biblical text had been lost: the parchment had been torn and damaged in places and some leaves had fallen out.[25] The first two fascicles

---

21 Wevers, 41–2.
22 Siglum *C''* in Wevers' edition.
23 This confirms what can be read in Jerome: "Ubi quid minus habetur in Graeco ab Hebraica veritate, Origenes de translatione Theodotionis addidit et signum posuit asterisci, id est stellam…": Jerome, *Epistulae*, 106, 7: ed. I. Hilberg (CSEL 55), 2.252. *Metobelos* was employed in Origenian copies in order to mark the end of an addition (introduced in turn by an *asteriskos*) or of a deletion (introduced by an *obelos*).
24 Luke 2:24: καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσσοὺς περιστερῶν.
25 Fol. 1 was already lacking the upper external quadrant (Gen 31:21): in fact the restorer had to add the missed text between the lines of the ancient writing (this is more evident on the *verso*, Gen 31:27). Similarly, fol. 22r shows a cut in the first alley, four lines from the lower

probably no longer existed, or they were no longer considered part of the codex, as shown by the medieval numbering (see above, p. 14, note 5).

The original ink was retraced throughout the whole manuscript. The contrast between thick and thin strokes was completely lost in this operation. At first, accents were marked with no regard to the syllabic quantity, but their position is never wrong; then a contemporary hand corrected them, and turned some *koiné*-forms into classical usage.[26]

Added folios

On the same occasion fol. 71 (Lev 9:19–10:14) was copied, as well as a bifolium – now lost – located between the extant fols. 7 and 8 (Gen 46:6–47:16): on fol. 72 the first three letters (ΤΟΣ), belonging to the word ἀφαιρέματος, were not retraced, since the whole word was written in the added sheet; the same way, the first two lines in fol. 8 were not retraced and were even deleted with a horizontal line: since the deletion of this portion of verse is not due to a difference with the Hebrew text, one could infer that the text copied by the restorer in an added folio should reach the end of the verse, causing the elimination of the ancient text as a duplicate.

Fol. 45 was also added, containing Exod 30:29–31:18 according to the LXX; it replaces the first sheet of the 13th (= ιγ̄) quaternion,[27] which used to constitute a bifolium with a lost hypothetical folio containing Exod [LXX]36:3–26 placed where the extant fol. 52 now is. In the present fol. 52 and the next 3 sheets, however, a peculiar version of the Tabernacle Account occurs, written in *Perlschrift*, following the order of the MT, which is different from the LXX in these chapters. This peculiar version, named F[h] in Wevers' critical edition, starts at Exod [MT/LXX]36:3 and stops abruptly at [MT]39:19 (= [LXX]36:26), whereas the original majuscule text today resumes on fol. 56 from [LXX]37:10 (= [MT]38:12): therefore, a number of verses overlap and are extant in a double version (both LXX and "Masoretic").[28] Nevertheless, a portion of text is missing (Exod [LXX]36:26–40 = [MT]39:19–31). The sharp interruption of the minuscule text on fol. 55v (the last words being [ἐπ]έθηκαν ἐπὶ τὰ) suggests that the ancient majuscule text used to resume from Exod [LXX]36:26 ([καὶ ἐποίησαν δύο δακτυλίους χρυσοῦς καὶ ἐπέθη-καν ἐπὶ τὰ] δύο πτερύγια ἐπ᾽ ἄκρου τοῦ λογείου…) at the time of the

---

margin: the cut reaches the second column, so that a καί in the 34th line (Exod 14:10) was rewritten by the restorer in a blank of the previous line; the same way the restorer had to operate on the *verso* (Exod 14:17). The cut also damaged an ancient note (possibly by the first copyist), which was copied between the columns by the medieval restorer.

26 Εἶπαν → εἶπον (e. g. fol. 11r: Exod 1:19; fol. 22r: Exod 14:11), λήμψομαι → λήψομαι (e. g. fol. 42r: Exod 29:12, 13, 15), ἐραυνάω → ἐρευνάω (e. g. fol. 1v: Gen 31:33, 35).

27 According to the medieval numbering.

28 Curiously enough, the original text from fol. 56r on (Exod [LXX]37:10–, [MT]38:12–) underwent retracement and annotations (particularly lexical notes), although this pericope was displayed in the added folios according to the MT sequence.

restoration, on a sheet that was subsequently lost. That is to say, Exod
$^{\text{LXX}}$36:26–37:10 at an earlier time used to be on a sheet now lost, which was
the first of the ancient 16$^{\text{th}}$ fascicle (= ιϛ, then ιδ i.e. 14$^{\text{th}}$). Fols. 52–55 con-
stitute a binion.

All the added sheets (fols. 45, 52–55, 71, 191, 211, and the external col-
umn of 201) are made of rather thick, roughly prepared parchment: in fols.
45v and 54v signs of a poorly executed scraping are evident, since the roots
of the hairs of the animal have not been removed.

On the hair side a ruling system is impressed roughly, as the vertical and
horizontal lines result oblique and irregularly spaced out.[29] The writing
does not use them consistently: sometimes it hangs from the lines, some-
times it lies on them; often it does not reach the justification lines on the
right. Its module varies, as do also the interlinear space and column width,
according to the length of the text to be copied, particularly on fols. 45, 52–
55, 191, and 211.

The majuscule writing is employed in fol. 45 and in the external column
of fol. 206 (Josh 6:23–7:1), which is now pasted on fol. 201 (missing the
external column as well) because of a faulty subsequent restoration. It is in
black ink and upright. Its module is quite regular (ca. mm 3 × 3),[30] though
protruding from the bilinear system: some letters (γ θ τ γ ψ) go over the line
of writing upward, others downward (ζ, and sometimes ι ξ ρ φ χ ψ), others
both (β, λ). There is no difference in the thickness of the horizontal and ver-
tical lines. Letters are separated from each other, except α and μ, which are
joined from the bottom with the following letter; sometimes θ π χ are also
joined together. The diphthong ου is usually made in a single stroke. The
ratio between writing and line spacing is 1:3.

A *Perlschrift* written in black ink is employed at fols. 52–55, 71, 191
(Deut 28:63–29:14) and 211 (Josh 9:33–10:37). Final and initial letters of
two adjacent words are never joined together. Ligatures are the traditional
ones.

On fols. 52–55 the ratio between writing and line spacing is 1:2, but it
increases progressively. The writing module is constant in the first three
leaves (about 2 × 2 mm), but it increases slightly on fol. 55.

In fol. 191 the ratio between writing and line spacing is 1:2 on the *recto*,
whereas it is 1:3 on the *verso*, as well as in fol. 211.

Both in majuscule and in minuscule writing, the interlinear space contains
breathings and accents, carefully written and never joined to the letters. The
circumflex mainly has an angular shape; in one case only it is widely arched, as
it contains the breathing (fol. 45r, col. 1, r. 15). Diaeresis is employed only for
the name Μωϋσῆς. Abbreviations are limited to *nomina sacra*. Traditional

---

29 This is particularly evident in fol. 191.
30 But ε and σ are often larger at the beginning of a word than in the middle; ϰ often sticks
    out downwards from the writing line, and it is placed in *ekthesis* in the last line of fol. 45r,
    col. 2.

brachygraphic marks are rarely used and only at the end of the line, where superimposed letters can also be found. Punctuation follows the ternary system of *teleia*, *mesē* and *hypostigmē* and is used regularly and consistently.

The minuscule writing of fol. 71 is similar to that of the other additions. However, modules are more uniform and the ratio between line and line spacing is constantly 1 : 3: such features make these pages tidier overall.

Abbreviations are much more frequent in fol. 211v, where even the module of the letters becomes smaller.

The F^b version of the second Tabernacle Account

The text on fols. 52–55 contains a peculiar version of the second Tabernacle Account which has no parallel elsewhere. This section of Exodus (chapters 36–39) reports the construction of the Tabernacle by the Israelites according to the instructions given to Moses by YHWH (Exod 25–30: 1st Tabernacle Account). The LXX translation, which is itself puzzling (the version of the 1st Tabernacle Account appears to be the work of an Alexandrian author, while the 2nd one seems to have been translated in a Palestinian milieu, as the different orientation of YHWH's dwelling shows),[31] departs notably from the MT: the execution of YHWH's orders is reported more concisely than in the MT, where divine instructions match exactly their implementation by the people. The difference is probably due to the fact that the LXX reveals a Hebrew text in its previous stage of writing than the Masoretic one.[32] Origen addressed the problem by working out a peculiar version of the 2nd Tabernacle Account[33] on the basis of the *Hexapla*; it is handed down

---

31 For a synthetic survey of the conflicting theories concerning the relationship between the two accounts of the Tabernacle, see M. L. Wade, *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), 4–9. According to J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 117–46, the second tabernacle account (Exod B: Exod 35–40) is the work of a different translator from that of Exod A (Exod 25–31). As P. M. Bogaert had pointed out ("L'orientation du parvis du sanctuaire dans la version grecque de l'Éxode [Ex., 27,9– 13 LXX]", *L'Antiquité Classique* 50 [1981] 79–85), the translator of Exod A rendered the Hebrew phrase לפאת־ים ("towards the sea", i.e. westward from a Palestinian point of view) as κατὰ θάλασσαν (Exod 27:12), which means northward from an Alexandrian point of view; consequently, קדם ("in front of", i.e. East) was understood as South and rendered as πρὸς νότον, and so on; differently, the translator of Exod B understood לפאת־ים from a Palestinian point of view: he rendered it as πρὸς θάλασσαν, but its opposite cardinal point לפאת־קדמה became πρὸς ἀνατολάς ("eastward").

32 A. Aejmelaeus, *Septuagintal Translation Techniques – a Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account*, in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 107–21; repr. from *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (Manchester 1990)*, eds. G. J. Brooke/B. Lindars (SCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 381–402.

33 D. Fraenkel, "Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35–40", D. Fraenkel/U. Quast/J. W. Wevers (ed.), *Studien zur Septuaginta* (FS R. Hanhart; MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1990) 140–86.

by some manuscripts belonging to the Origenian recension (the *codex Sarravianus*, some minuscule manuscripts, Aethiopic, Armenian, and Syro-Hexaplaric versions). The version appearing in fols. 52–55 of the *codex Ambrosianus* also tends to translate the 2nd Tabernacle Account of the MT, but its numerous divergences from the Origenian version prevent us from considering the former as drawn from the latter. An examination of this peculiar translation will be displayed after the analysis of the medieval notes to the book of Exodus.

Glosses and variant readings

During the eleventh-century restoration, the biblical text was provided with a great number of glosses of various type, the focus of the present study; they sometimes even replace the original text, which is either cancelled or scraped off. In most cases, the ancient text was deleted *after* the process of retracing the letters within the same restoration-project. It can thus be imagined that a revision by a careful scholar followed a general and careless restoration of the ink only aimed at saving the ancient writing together with some glosses or variants already written by the medieval hand. Since it is impossible to distinguish different hands in the medieval restoration, the author(s)[34] of both restoration and editorial work on the text is named "the restorer" or F^b.[35]

In order to introduce a variant reading, various marks are employed in the ms: ꜱ and ~ are mostly common for variants or a glosses,[36] while ↗ or ↘ usually introduce additions. The ink of the glosses now appears reddish-brown or black (the same as that used in the general retracement); sometimes the black ink covers, either partially or entirely, a note written in red-brown ink, and it did not always overwrite it exactly.[37] It seems that the codex was used for a study on the biblical text, and possibly a revision of the Old Greek translation, enacted by drawing notes from different sources. The fact that annotations were erased, or only partially retraced, or even retraced and deleted again, testifies to repeated changes of mind on the part of the annotator(s) F^b. In some cases the Hexaplaric notes themselves added by the first copyist were retraced or even used to replace the LXX text.

---

34 It is impossible to state whether the work on the Hexateuch was carried out by an individual scholar or by an équipe.

35 Brooke/McLean and Wevers named F^b all minuscule hands who wrote notes on the codex. In the present study, however, F^b indicates only the medieval hand(s) of the restorer(s); the same siglum is also used for deletions, although these are recorded as F^c in Wevers' apparatus (as far as *Genesis*, *Leviticus*, and *Numeri* are concerned), and as F$^{b?}$ in Brooke/McLean's apparatus.

36 The marks ꜱ and ~ are used indifferently, although the second occurs more frequently before lexical glosses.

37 The best example can be seen in Exod 16:31 (fol. 26r).

Three exegetical observations – two of them surely taken from Catena manuscripts – were copied in the margins of the *Ambrosianus* at fols. 29r and 39v:[38] since they deal with Christological issues, they prove that the milieu of the restoration was Christian. This is not obvious, if one considers that deletions and additions by the medieval restorer generally aim to adjust the Greek translation of the biblical text to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which is close to the Masoretic Text;[39] such an attitude testifies to a strong interest in the *Hebraica Veritas*, which appears quite unusual in the Byzantine milieu, where the value of the LXX as an inspired translation had been sanctioned for a long time.

Other annotations

After the restoration (maybe in the 12th/13th century), a cursive hand added several "contents-title"; here the complete list is given:
– Lev 14:1ff. (upper margin of f. 77v): ἐνταῦθ(α) τὴν ἰατρίαν (*pro* ἰατρείαν) τοῦ λεπροῦ· μαθεῖν ως ὁ Κ(ύριο)ς τῇ δι᾽αὐτοῦ ἁγίᾳ φωνῇ ἡρμήνε‹υ›σεν.[40]
– Lev 15:1ff. (upper margin of f. 80v): ἐνταῦθ(α) περὶ ἀνδρὸς ἢ (*pro* εἴ) ἐστὶν ῥύσις ἐκ τοῦ σομ(α)τ(ος) (*pro* σώματος) αὐτ(οῦ), ἐστίν ἀκάθαρτ(ος) ὡς ἡ παροῦσα βί(βλος) λέ(γει).
– Deut 15:21 (lower margin of f. 173v): περὶ καθαρῶν ζώων καὶ ἀκαθάρτων.
– Deut 16:3 (lower margin of f. 175r): ἐστὶν τὸ ἄζυμον ἄρτος κακώσεως.
– Josh 12 (lower margin of f. 213v): αἱ βασιλεῖαι ἃς παρέλαβεν Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Ναυὶ.
There are also some reading-instructions:
– ἄρξαι, 'start!', (also shortened: ἄρξ): fol. 58r, col. 2, line 24, Exod LXX39:14;[41] fol. 118v, col. 3, line 1, Num 11:24; etc.[42]);

---

38 See further, observations to Exod 19:16 and 33:19. I have already reported them in M. Fincati, "Some Remarks on the Codex Ambrosianus", in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010* (SCS 59; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013) 425–34, on p. 427, nn. 8 and 9.

39 The term "Masoretic Text" (MT) is used here with the usual sense of "Tiberian Masoretic Text" (cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, ³2012], 24). The Hebrew text implied in some emendations by the medieval restorer is sometimes different from that of the *codex Petropolitanus* B19ᴬ, the most ancient complete text of the Hebrew Bible (year 1009), which is the basis for modern editions of the *Biblia Hebraica* (BH) from the third one (Stuttgart, 1929–1937) onwards: Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 351.

40 This sheet can be seen in plate 56 of Cavallo, *Ricerche*.

41 According to Wevers' edition; Exod 39:13 in *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. A. Rahlfs, 2ⁿᵈ edn by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

42 ἀρχ(ή) appears in fol. 202v (Josh 3:7) beside the mark ↙ , which also occurs elsewhere:

– ὑπ(ό)β(ηθι), 'go on (reading) a little below!' (if this is the correct reading of υπβ – πβ being written above υ –): fol. 118v, col. 1, line 6, around Num 11:18);
– the sequence of oblique strokes on the left of a canticle in Num 21:27–30 (fols. 132v–133r).

Possibly from a later time:
– σημείωσαι, 'note!', written in a vertical line on the left of the text in fols. 12v (Exod 3:2), 23v (Exod 15:8, 10, 11), 26r (Exod 16:28), 34v (Exod 24:1), 97v (Lev 26:27), etc.
– ζήτει, 'seek!', written between the columns: fol. 66v, col. 3, lines 22–24 (Lev $^{\text{LXX}}$6:38, $^{\text{MT}}$7:8); fol. 67v, col. 3, line 9 (Lev $^{\text{LXX}}$7:21, $^{\text{MT}}$7:31).

In the upper margin of fol. 70r a cryptographic note appears:

νηπθνς⳨λω, ηε⳨λξλνθυλω, θξθ⳨ψολω.

It must be deciphered through the key of ψῆφοι ὑφελμοί[43] as

νικανδρος, ιερομοναχος, αμαρτωλος.

The writing seems to date back to the 12th–13th century, but it is impossible to determine its time precisely, given the absence of ligatures; moreover, the *ductus* seems to be hesitant, especially with regard to some letters such as λ and ω. In the list of Greek copyists by M. Vogel and V. Gardthausen the name Νίκανδρος occurs seven times, but never with the title of ἱερομόναχος.[44] Excluding those scribes I ruled out through palaeographical comparisons,[45] the following are worth retaining as possibilities: a Νίκανδρος μοναχός of the monastery of St. Clement in Ochrid (12th c.); a Νίκανδρος subscribing the Tetraevangelion Burdett Coutts III, 4 (13th c.); a Νίκανδρος ἁμαρτωλὸς μοναχός of the Lavra Athanasiou on Mount Athos (16th c.). Three more ἱερομόναχοι known to us are Νίκανδρος ἱερομόναχος subscribing ms *Vat. gr.* 799 (11th c.),[46] and a Νίκανδρος ἱερομόναχος owner of the manuscript Weimar, Zentralbibliothek der deutschen Klassik Q 79a, a Psalter dating to 1293.[47] Finally, a ἱερομόναχος κῦρ Νίκανδρος is mentioned in a document dated 1324.[48]

---

fol. 24r, col. 3, line 13 (Exod 15:22); fol. 28v, col. 3, line 8 (Exod 19:10); fol. 29r, col. 3, line 16 (Exod 19:21); fol. 30v, col. 1, line 9 (Exod 20:25); etc.

43 C.M. Mazzucchi, "*Ambrosianus* C 122 inf. Il codice e il suo autore", *Aevum* 78 (2004) 411–40, on p. 417.

44 M. Vogel/V. E. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 33; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1909, repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966), 335.

45 Fincati, "Per la storia dell'Esateuco Ambrosiano", 334.

46 *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, III, *Codices 604–866*, ed. R. Devreesse (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1950), 327.

47 K. Treu, "Griechische Handschriften in Weimar", *Philologus* 117 (1973) 113–23, on pp. 118–19.

48 H. Hunger/O. Kresten, *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel* (3 vols.; Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981–) 1.432.

In the 13th–14 th centuries, an unknown hand sketched an odd pattern on fol. 54r, and wrote in the lower margin of the sheet something like the beginning of a letter:

ἐντϊμωτ(α)τ(ε)· φρονιμωτ(α)τ(ε)· πάσης ἀξίας τιμῆς καὶ μεγάλης σιγησεως τὴν ἀξίαν τϊμὴν καὶ χαιρετϊσμὸν κωμίζωμεν τὴν εὐγένεϊαν

The sketch is similar to a sword with spiral decoration, its hilt lying in the middle of the lower margin and its blade in the space between the two columns.

An undated *Mandelrosette* (diameter mm 33) is drawn in black ink in the upper margin of fol. 109r.

In the lower margin of fol. 191v there is a large ownership note written in grey ink with a broad-head calamus: φΐλιππ(ος) ὁ τοῦ παυπάντου (see fig. 2). The writing module is ca. mm 11. The name Φίλιππος is abbreviated; the genitive τοῦ Παυπάντου is written in only two strokes, as if the scribe wanted to imitate the imperial *monokondylia* in order to give importance to the family name (as Paupantos seems to be).[49] This name Παύπαντος/Παυπάντης is not otherwise known as a family name or as a toponym. The most similar name to Paupantos is the name of a scribe from Trebizond living in the second half of 14th cent., Γεώργιος Ποπανθόπουλος.[50] It has to be observed, however, that a very similar surname, Popandonov, is still attested today in Macedonia.[51]

An unskilled hand performed some writing tests, using a thin-head calamus and black ink: the incipit of Num 32:34 is copied (καὶ ὠκοδόμησαν οἱ υἱ-) at the end of the first column on fol. 148v. Moreover, on fol. 201v the same hand copied the last five lines of the first column (added during the medieval restoration) in the blank below the text (Josh 7:1), and then wrote

αποκαληψης τοῦ αωΐνου του θελογος···το κυ ημῶν [....] εν αρχη ην ο λογως κε λογος [...]γο ην πορς τὸν θεον κε θς ην ο λογος παντα δηαυτου εγετο κε χορης η

Notwithstanding the mention of the ἀποκάλυψις, the text is the incipit of the Gospel according to John. The inexpert writing makes the dating of this hand difficult: the hand was possibly trying to imitate the *ductus* of its *antigraphon.* It must certainly be later than the medieval restoration.

A cursive hand possibly from the 16th century wrote some pericope-titles beginning from fol. 119r (Num 11:33);[52] it employed a narrow-pointed cala-

---

49 The family name can be added in genitive to a proper name: see, e. g., Γεώργιος ἱερεὺς ὁ τοῦ Γρηγοροπούλου in Vogel/Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber*, 72.

50 E. Trapp, *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (12 fascicles; Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1976–1994), 10.52, no. 23552.

51 See, e. g., Epaminonda Popandonov, Macedonian poet and director of the National University Library St. Kliment Ohridski in Skopje from 1948 to 1951 (http://www.vbm.mk/ History.htm, consulted on the 3rd of September 2014).

52 E.g. fol. 119r, beside Num 11:33: περὶ τῆς πατάξεως ἣν ἐπάταξε κ(ύριο)ς τοὺς φεύγοντας τὴν ὀρτιγομήτραν (*sic*). The same hand wrote an end note in fol. 199v at the end of the book of Deuteronomy: τέλος τῆς μωσαϊκῆς πεντατεύχου· τῆς καὶ νομίμου

mus with brown ink. The same hand pointed out the beginning of verses by little crosses, although without consistency and especially when some annotations of its own appear. It also inserted insignificant changes throughout the biblical text (fol. 134v, Num 22:30: the syllable -χι of ουχι, which was written by the first copyist at the beginning of line 12 in the second column, was rewritten on the previous line in order to avoid splitting the word), it cancelled unnecessary ephelkystic ν, but also deleted with oblique strokes some previous notes (a note written by the medieval scholar: fol. 176v, Deut 17:8; the above-mentioned cursive notes to Deuteronomy and Joshua).

Byzantine biblical philology

Through the Catena literature, and generally through the works of the Fathers of the Church, Byzantine biblical exegesis was well aware of discrepancies between the LXX[53] and the Hebrew text.[54] Nevertheless, the value of the LXX as Holy Writ was not commonly brought into question in Greek Christianity. A comparison of the Hebrew Bible with the current LXX had been at an early date carried out by Origen (183/85–253/4) through the *Hexapla,* with the primary purpose of providing Christians with an appropriate tool for disputes with the Jews.[55] The synoptic exposition of the Hebrew text and its Greek transliteration, beside the versions by Aquila, Symmachus, the LXX and Theodotion, had allowed a revision of the Greek text on the basis of the current Jewish Bible, i.e. the proto-Masoretic text;[56] this revision, known as Origenian or Hexaplaric recension, had been published by Pamphilus (second half of the 3rd c.–309) and Eusebius (265–340), its best witness being the above mentioned *codex Sarravia-nus;*[57] however, it had not stopped the prevalence of the Old Greek. In

---

καλουμένης. The notes added by this hand are sometimes recorded by Wevers' edition, and are put consistently under the siglum F[b] since they are written in minuscule.

53 Although the name LXX properly refers to the Greek translation of the sole Pentateuch, it was used already in early Christianity to mean the Greek translation of the whole Old Testament: E. L. Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory. Canon, Language, Text* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 114; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 174.

54 Discrepancies were due to the pluriformity of the Hebrew text itself, which gained stability only at the end of the first century CE: Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 174–5. This consonantal text is known as 'Proto-Masoretic'; it was transmitted with high fidelity up to the time of the vocalization by the Masoretes (from 8th–9th century: Tov, *Textual criticism*, 34).

55 Origen, *Epistula ad Africanum*, § 9, ed. de Lange (SC 302; Paris: Cerf, 1983), 534. For an overall view of Origen's *Hexapla* see N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000 [Spanish original 1998²]), 204–22.

56 A sheet of a copy of the *Hexapla* from the fifth century survived and was found in the Cairo Genizah at the end of the 19th c.: Ch. Taylor, *Hebrew Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsest from the Taylor- Schechter Collection* (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), plates I-II.

57 F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum*, I, xcix-ci. A Syrian translation of the Hexaplaric version,