APPENDIX 2.

CODEx ZACYNTHIUS: THE CATENA AND THE TEXT OF LUKE (J.H. GREENLEE)*

Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Z), owned by the British and Foreign Bible Society, is the older (erased) text of a palimpsest manuscript of Luke accompanied by an extensive patristic commentary or catena. The manuscript is fragmentary, with many pages missing and nothing beyond Luke 11:33.

In spite of its fragmentary form and obscure condition, Cod. Zacynthius is an important manuscript. It is apparently the oldest known New Testament manuscript accompanied by a catena and the only one in which both the Biblical text and the catena are written in uncial letters.¹

The date of Cod. Zacynthius is debated; it is assigned to either the eighth or the sixth century. Two inter-related problems, therefore, are among the factors which make a study of this manuscript desirable: 1) the date of the manuscript may have a significant bearing upon theories which have been put forth concerning the development of catenae; and 2) material in this catena may furnish clues for the more accurate dating of the manuscript. Yet although the codex was brought to London from the Greek island of Zante in 1821, forty years passed before the text of Luke from the manuscript was published, edited by S. P. Tregelles.²

---

* As noted above (p. 17), this introductory article was found by J.K. Elliott in 2019 among the papers of G.D. Kilpatrick. It is here made available for the first time as a contribution to the history of research on the manuscript and in recognition of Greenlee's significant unpublished research on Codex Zacynthius. Greenlee gave Birdsall 'my full permission to make whatever use you wish of my work', including publication, in his letter of 6 January 1998. We are grateful to Dr Megan Davies for transcribing the text; typographical errors in the original have been corrected, but apart from two internal references the text and numbered footnotes are unchanged (including references to Greenlee's own transcription). All folio numbers relate to the undertext.

¹ One such Old Testament manuscript is the ninth-century Vat. gr. 749 of Job, a page of which is reproduced in *Specimina Codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum*, ed. by Pius Franchi de' Cavalieri and Johannes Lietzmann, p. 8. The only N.T. manuscripts in which the Biblical text is in uncials and the catena is in a cursive hand may be Codd. X and 018.

² *Codex Zacynthius*. London: Bagster, 1861.

Further, although certain data supposedly relating to this catena have been used in discussions of the date of the manuscript and discussions of the development of catenae,³ the catena has apparently never been read except for the briefest extracts and one full page which was reproduced by Tregelles as the frontispiece for his volume.

It was the present writer's privilege to undertake the task of deciphering the catena of Cod. Zacynthius in the autumn of 1950, during a leave of absence from professorial duties in Asbury Theological Seminary. Approximately six months of work was involved in the task, yielding an estimated thirty thousand words from legible portions of the text. The text of Luke in the manuscript was also re-examined during this period, and a number of changes in the readings as given by Tregelles are given in Appendix I below.

The present writer is not prepared to offer final answers to the questions of the date of the manuscript or of its relation to the question of the origin of catenae.

Some tentative suggestions may be put forward, but the primary purpose of the present article is to present the data which the study had revealed. The writer hopes that these data will be useful in solving the problems of the manuscript and in shedding light upon the question of the origin and development of catenae.

The work of deciphering the catena was done entirely by sunlight. Some experimental photographs were made, using ordinary, ultra-violet, and infra-red light, and sample pages were examined directly under ultra-violet light. In all these instances the facilities available at the Bodleian Library were used. Under none of these conditions did the text prove to be appreciably more legible than when it was read by sunlight. Some pages, however, although fortunately not a large number, remain sufficiently illegible that it may prove to be worth while to have these pages subjected to further experimental photography.

The task of reading the erased catena was made considerably easier by the fact that printed texts were available for most of the passages in the catena. This does not mean, of course, that the passages in the manuscript were identical with the printed texts. There were a multitude of variants, but the agreement was sufficient to make the reading of the manuscript considerably easier. A list of printed works used is given in Appendix III below.

THE TRANSCRIPTION OF THE CATENA

There is of course no word division in the manuscript. All letters in the text are the same size except for the larger initial letters. In the accompanying printed transcription, except for making divisions and capitalizing proper nouns, an effort has been made to show in the transcription the forms—abbreviations, corrections, etc.—used in the catena.

Dots under letters indicate that the letter is only partially visible, and its identity is therefore less than certain. After the first few pages of the transcription, if a large number

³ See, for example, Georg Karo and Hans Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum Catalogus*, in *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* (Göttingen, 1902); R. Devreesse, 'Chaines Exegetiques,' in Pirot, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supp. I (1928), col. 1092 ff.; Tregelles, *op. cit.*, pp. xvi-xvii; and W. H. P. Hatch, 'A Redating of Two Important Uncial Manuscripts of the Gospels--Codex Zacynthius and Codex Cyprius,' in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake*, ed. by R. P. Casey, S. Lake, and A. K. Lake (London, 1937), pp. 333-38.

of letters are doubtful these dots are not used but the words 'obscure' or 'partially obscure' are written in the right-hand margin. The present writer's personal notes, however, have these doubtful letters specifically indicated throughout the text.

Square brackets enclose words or letters which are wholly illegible in the manuscript but which are conjectured because they are found in a printed text of the same work. These conjectures take into consideration the size of the space and the number of letters required to fill the space.

A question mark following the section number of the catena indicates that the symbol itself was obscure and therefore uncertain. A question mark following the chapter and verse reference (chapter and verse references are of course not in the original manuscript but are included here for convenience) indicates that the symbol was not definitely located in the accompanying text of Luke and the reference was therefore not certain.

In the present transcription, when it was necessary to use a second page for the catena of one page of the manuscript, the page number was repeated, in parentheses, with 'cont.' written below the number. Since the Greek typewriter had no 'r' and 'v,' '4' signifies '4 recto' and '4a' signifies '4 verso.'

The catena sections often do not end at the bottom of a page in the manuscript. If a passage at the top of a page of the manuscript does not begin with a capital letter and has no title line, that passage is continued from the preceding page. If it is a continuation from the preceding *extant* page, the continuation has been indicated on both pages of the transcription. With few exceptions, if a page does not end with the symbol (:-) that passage is continued on the next page (either extant or missing).

PALAEOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS⁴

Tregelles's facsimile volume and introductory material are very helpful and worthwhile. It should be observed, however, that the text as printed by Tregelles does not exactly reproduce the letters of Cod. Zacynthius, since he merely used the 'Alexandrian types' owned by the British Museum.⁵ These letters give a fairly good idea of the neatness and appearance of the text of Luke in the manuscript, although they are smaller than the text of Luke in Cod. Zacynthius, and the letters of Cod. Zacynthius are actually neater in form. There are also certain specific differences from Tregelles's volume in the form of some letters, including *upsilon*, *lambda*, *xi*, the numerical letter *stigma*, and *upsilon* as occasionally written over *omicron* at the end of a line. The form of these letters is in general more even and rounded than the facsimile volume indicates. As a frontispiece to his volume, Tregelles reproduced by hand-tracing one complete page of the manuscript,

⁴ The following observations apply in general to the text of Luke as well as to the catena, except where reference to the catena is specific.

⁵ Tregelles, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

giving both Lucan text and catena. The above-mentioned letters are given there in their proper form. Even this page does not, however, adequately illustrate the neatness and beauty of the manuscript itself, as Tregelles himself points out,⁶ since he merely traced the page in its present and rather distorted form.

The original size of the parchment pages of Cod. Zacynthius was evidently approximately 11 by 14 inches. Eighty-nine leaves, including three half-leaves, remain. It probably is not possible to determine how many pages were in a quire, since the sheets have all been cut along the original binding and separated, with some pages missing. The pages were almost certainly placed with like sides facing each other, as was customary; this furnishes one clue for determining the points at which original pages are now missing.

There seems to be little reason to doubt that the manuscript originally contained none of the New Testament except Luke: the introduction clearly stood at the beginning of this Gospel, the list of sections are those of Luke with a table listing parallel sections in other Gospels, and there are no pages from any Gospel other than Luke.

There is very little ornamentation on the pages, and the letters are relatively plain. The ink is a rusty brown as the manuscript now stands, except for some headings and section numbers of bright red.

There are five kinds of letters in the manuscript, all uncials:

- 1) The text of Luke is written in round letters 5 mm. in height.
- 2) The text of the catena is in letters 2.5 mm. in height and very compressed laterally.
- 3) Section numbers found within the lines of the text of Luke, and the section numbers and titles for the catena, are all approximately the same height as those of the text of the catena but are round instead of being laterally compressed. On some obscure pages section headings in the catena might easily have been overlooked if they had not been in letters thus differing from those of the catena itself. Occasionally the scribe apparently forgot and wrote a section number in the laterally compressed letters instead of the rounded form.⁷

- 4) The introduction (1r.) is written in a more sloping and seemingly less careful style, in letters slightly larger than those of the catena and not laterally compressed.

- 5) Paragraphs of Luke and sections of the catena are generally introduced by an initial letter 7 or 8 mm. in height.

Accents, breathings, and other diacritical marks are not regularly used in the manuscript.⁸ Initial *upsilon* and *iota* do, however, often have breathings indicated by the angular breathing (ϝ) and the two dots (ϙ) respectively, but sometimes with the usage reversed.⁹ Within words, the same symbols over these letters indicate diaeresis. The angular breathings, (ϝ) and (ϙ), are also infrequently found on other initial vowels. In the text of Luke these marks with *upsilon* and *iota* are less frequent than in the catena, and the

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxi, xxiii.

⁷ E. g., on 5r. (not indicated in the transcription).

⁸ Details of the usage may be observed from the present transcription, in which the usage of the manuscript has been carefully followed.

⁹ E. g., 54v. ff.

angular breathings over the letters seem to be limited to perhaps no more than a half dozen examples, including a rough breathing over *omicron* in Luke 11:2 (86v.) and a smooth breathing over *alpha* in Luke 10:25 (81v.). An apostrophe is occasionally found in Luke and in the catena.

Accents, too, are not regularly used either in the text of Luke or in the catena, as Tregelles points out.¹⁰ Dating the manuscript, however, requires a consideration of the entire manuscript; and the absence of breathings and accents is not so complete as to permit the manuscript to be dated prior to the period when such marks were used. The present writer recalls no certain instance of an accent in the text of Luke; but in the catena there are occasional brief portions in which breathings and accents are used rather freely: e.g., 18v. (line 1), 70, and a few other passages. Accents and breathings, moreover, are used freely in the introduction to the catena (1r.) and to some extent in the three marginal notes of the manuscript referred to below. It therefore appears possible that Cod. Zacynthius was written when breathings and accents were commonly used, but that the scribe of this manuscript had an exemplar from an older period; and although he chose to copy his exemplar as exactly as possible he occasionally fell into his more customary habit of using breathings and accents. In this connection, the blank space on 18r., line 23, may be due to a similar blank or defect at this point in the exemplar.

Punctuation, too, is limited in variety. A single point, placed at varying heights above the line and answering approximately to the upper point of a semicolon, is common in the catena and is more common in the text of Luke than Tregelles's facsimile indicates. Single points placed *on* the line like a period are rare. Commas and colons are occasionally found in the catena, less often in the text of Luke.

Sections of the catena are apparently intended to end with the symbol (:), rarely with a colon (:); and the absence of such a symbol at the bottom of a page indicates that the section is continued on the next page.

Quotations from scripture in the catena are often indicated by a symbol (>) in the left margin of each line containing the quotation, beginning with the line in which the quotation is introduced. This symbol is also used in the text of Luke to indicate the O.T. quotation in Luke 3:5–6 and 4:18–19.¹¹ On 23v., this symbol is twice found written double, and on 37v. it is several times written as (4). Often no symbol at all is used to indicate quotations.

When *nu* is the final letter in a line, it is often omitted and indicated by the familiar horizontal line above and slightly to the right of the preceding letter.¹² In the present transcription this abbreviation has been retained where it occurs in the manuscript, although these occurrences do not necessarily fall at the end of the line in the present transcription. In Luke 6:27 (37r.), *νμων* is abbreviated by omitting the final letter and writing *omega* over *mu*. (There is no line over the *omega* to stand for *nu*, *contra* Tregelles.) The only other use of a symbol is the form *ϣ*, which stands for *και* at the end of a line.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. ii, xvii.

¹¹ Tregelles failed to include these symbols in the former.

¹² Tregelles's edition is slightly inaccurate in showing this line directly *above* the preceding letter.

When the letters *ov* fall at the end of a line, the *upsilon* is sometimes written directly above the *omicron*, but not as a single ligature as Tregelles's facsimile indicates.

The common *nomina sacra* are found in the manuscript, and their use is almost completely confined to their special sense—e.g., $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ is rarely used except in reference to God. Exceptions include $\overline{\pi\nu\iota\kappa\eta}$ (54v., 84v.) and $\overline{\sigma\rho\iota\alpha}$ (88v.). Words normally indicated by *nomina sacra* are sometimes written fully—e.g., $\text{I}\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\nu$, 72v.

In section headings, suspensions are frequently used in the names and titles of the writers. These suspensions may be indicated by a period or by an oblique line after the last letter written, or by writing the last two or three letters of the suspension one above the other. These suspensions have been retained in the transcription (see 3r., 19r.). On 3v., and from 40v, Origen is generally designated in the titles by the symbol Φ .

There are occasional scribal errors in this as in any manuscript, but not enough to affect the generally excellent character of the manuscript. On 14r. 'Origen' is spelled with initial *omicron* instead of *omega*. Other such slips, including the omission of horizontal lines over an abbreviation or with section numbers, may be observed in the transcription, in which these errors have purposely been retained. There are also occasional scribal errors in the text of Luke, doubtless including the use of $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ for $\kappa\alpha\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$ in Luke 6:42 (40r.) and an extra *iota* in $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ in Luke 6:49 (42v.), neither of which was observed by Tregelles.¹³

Beginning at 71v., red ink is used for section titles and numbers, but it is not always used thereafter. The title of the gospel on 3r. is also in red ink.

While it is difficult to visualize fully the original appearance of the manuscript, because of its present condition, it is evident that it was a manuscript of simple and dignified beauty.

CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING THE CATENA

Since Cod. Ξ is the oldest known N.T. manuscript with a catena, it deserves special consideration for any light it may shed upon the history and development of catena.

Although the present writer is not prepared to draw final conclusions on this subject, Cod. Zacynthius may point to a need of re-examining some theories which have been advanced concerning their origin and development.¹⁴ It is to be hoped that the transcription of this catena will prove to be of some assistance in further study.

Tregelles in his volume gives a list of the writers and the titles for the catena of Codex Zacynthius as he found them while reading the Gospel text of the manuscript.¹⁵ He states that he is listing names found 'at the head of the pages,'¹⁶ seemingly assuming that all sections began at the top of a page. This assumption is, of course, quite incorrect, as may be seen from the transcription; for one section may cover two or more pages, and in other instances one page may have as many as five separate sections. Nor is there the slightest apparent concern to have the sections begin at the top of a page or to end at the bottom of a page; a section may extend only one or two lines onto the next page, or a new section may

¹³ Since there is no difference between medial and final *sigma* in uncial letters, any confusion of these forms in the transcription should be considered as typographical errors in the transcription.

¹⁴ See, e.g., R. Devreesse, *op. cit.*

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. iii-vii.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. iii.

begin one or two lines from the bottom of a page. The facsimile page which serves as a frontispiece for Tregelles's volume is therefore quite untypical, since it shows a page in which the catena section begins at the top and ends at the bottom of the page.

Throughout the Gospel text, in the margin and within the lines of the text, there are found section numbers which refer to the accompanying catena. These sections are numbered consecutively from 1 through 100 (α' – ρ') then begin again with 1. The numbering begins with 1 at the beginning of the Gospel, begins the second time at Luke 7:31 (?), and again at Luke 10:34. The last legible section number is 28, at Luke 11:30. The catena often repeats a number two or more times, as it is given for each writer's comment on the passage. When the amount of catena is small the portion of Gospel text on a page is usually correspondingly large, and vice versa. In a few instances the comments on a passage are so extensive that the same Gospel portion is repeated on the next page; Luke 2:21, for example, is given three times, on 19r., 19v., and 20r. There are two pages which contain the Lucan text but no catena, 30v. and 61r.; but there are no pages occupied entirely by catena with no Lucan text (except 7v., the top half of which is missing and probably contained the text of Luke for this page.)

If two passages from the same writer are quoted on the same Gospel passage, the section number is not given again, and the second passage is headed *και μετ ολιγα, και παλιν* or something similar. If the same writer is quoted on two successive gospel passages, the second has the new section number and the heading reads *του αυτου*, sometimes followed by the writer's name.

The title *αγιος* is applied regularly to John, Basil, Cyril, and Titus, and sometimes to Severus. Because of the 'pattern' of selections used, *αγιος* is thus found in the first title of the catena ('The Holy John, Bishop of Constantinople,' 3r.) and not again until 15v. ('The Holy Titus, Bishop of Bostra'), the first reference to Titus. Within these first pages the most frequently occurring writers and titles are Origen, Severus, Eusebius (Eusebius is quoted only within the first fifteen pages), and the anonymous passages (*εξ ανεπιγραφου*). With folio 15 or 16 a change in 'type' seems to occur, Titus and Cyril being quoted for the first time. From this point on, these two writers become the most frequently quoted.

Ordinarily only the name, or the name and title, of a writer is given at the beginning of a section of the catena. In three of the four quotations from Isidore, however, and in every observable quotation from Severus, the work from which the quotation is made is named as well.

Tregelles's list of occurrences of each ecclesiastical writer is very incomplete. By a coincidence, however, he found all the writers of the catena except one, Apollinarius, who is quoted only once (53v.). The full list of writers and their occurrences follows, in the order of their first mention, together with the number of these occurrences within pp. 3–15. For purposes of comparison, the totals given by Tregelles are also given.

Writer	Occurrences	Included in pp.3–15	Tregelles's List
Chrysostom	5	1	4
Origen	33	16	9
'Anonymous'	42	28	
Severus	27	9	5
Victor	8	5	2
Isidore	4	2	1
Eusebius	6	6	1
Titus	45	1	19
Cyril	93	0	38
Basil	3	0	3
Apollinarius	1	0	0

There are also four passages listed as *αλλως* or *αλλος* and six which seem to have no title, plus numerous passages the beginning and title of which are on a missing page.

In most instances the printed text corresponding to a given passage in the catena is found in the works of the writer named in the title of the passage of the catena. 'Anonymous' passages of the catena, however, are often found in the printed works of Origen, Cyril, and others. Occasionally, too, there is a definite disagreement between the catena and the printed text concerning authorship, as on 10r., where the catena attributes three brief passages on Luke 1:38 to Eusebius, and three passages on Luke 2:34, 35, 38 attributed to Basil, all of which are found in the printed works of Origen.

Since Severus was declared a heretic, it may seem strange that he is sometimes designated 'Saint'; and the fact that he is so designated regularly (with one exception) in the second half of the existing portions of the catena and not at all in the first half may seem stranger still.¹⁷ Severus is usually designated 'Archbishop of Antioch,' although a few times merely 'of Antioch' and sometimes without any such title.

Tregelles is apparently mistaken, however, in assuming that these references to Severus *necessarily* indicate an acceptance of his heretical views.¹⁸ The author of the introduction to the catena (1r.) tells the reader that the catena is taken from many works of orthodox fathers but includes also some quotations from 'rejected exegetes' and heretics. These latter quotations he justifies by appealing to Cyril of Alexandria, whom he quotes as having said in his epistle to Eulogias that 'it is not necessary to avoid everything which the heretics say, for they confess many things which we also confess.'

Tregelles raises the possibility,¹⁹ and Hatch advances it as a definite theory,²⁰ that there are several instances where the name of Severus was erased soon after the manuscript

¹⁷ Tregelles seems to imply, pp. iv, xvi, that Severus was always designated 'Saint' in the manuscript. This is erroneous, but it is true that he is so designated in all but one instance where his name appears at the top of pages, the source of Tregelles's information.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. xvi.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. xvii.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 336–37.

was written as distinct from the much later time when the entire manuscript was erased. This, they point out, suggests that Cod. Zacynthius was written during the lifetime of Severus, who died in 540, but before the edict of Justinian in 536 which ordered his writings to be burned; and that the owner of the manuscript erased the name of Severus soon after the edict was issued in order to protect himself and the manuscript.

The present writer, however, was unable to conclude that the erasures referred to are anything more than a part of the erasure of the entire manuscript after several centuries of use. Moreover, Severus is quoted twenty-two additional times which Tregelles and Hatch did not find, and he is designated 'the Holy Severus' in a large number of these instances. An examination of these examples makes it virtually certain that there was no such consistent attempt to erase the name of Severus at an early date.

Aside from the question of the erasure of the name of Severus, the fact that the catena is so well-developed is in itself almost necessarily fatal to the theory of a sixth century date for the manuscript, especially a date before 536 as suggested by Tregelles and Hatch.

That the catena of Cod. Zacynthius is a copy of a well-developed form can hardly be questioned. The introduction is stylized, similar examples being known in other manuscripts.²¹ The ἐξ ἀνεπιγραφῆς passages, with no church writer's name to give them individual authority, certainly must have been copied into this manuscript with the authority of previous quotation. Even the way in which the catena fits in with the portions of Luke on the pages suggests that the catena was not compiled especially for this manuscript.

Even on the unlikely hypothesis that the catena of Cod. Zacynthius was an original compilation for this manuscript, the proposed early date for the manuscript presupposes that the writings of Severus and Victor had become so well-known and popular as to be placed into a catena within five to twenty years after they were written, and that they were so used along with and on a parallel with church writers whose works had been recognized for from one to three centuries.

Since Victor was apparently still writing after Severus had died, the date of his writings quoted in Cod. Zacynthius should be determined, if possible. Apart from the criticism made above, the theory of the early date would immediately collapse if it should be found that any of the quotations from Victor are from a work written after 536AD.

TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

The fact that the text of the catena of Cod. Zacynthius has been largely recovered is due to the fact that most of the material in it is found in printed texts of catenae and in printed texts of the works of the writers quoted. This means that this catena, in its extant portions, contains no large amount of otherwise unknown material. Some passages and parts of others have not been found in a printed text, and these may or may not prove to be new material. The catena is nevertheless textually significant, since it contains a considerable number of variants from the printed texts with which it has been compared. In addition

---

²¹ See the following section ('Textual Considerations').

to variations of words and phrases, the catena has often been found to contain material which was not in the printed text, this additional material sometimes being in the midst of the passage. One such passage (84v., Luke 10:34–35) is a denunciation by Severus of the allegorical interpretation of ‘Manes, and before him Marcion, those most godless men,’ of the two coins which the Good Samaritan gave to the innkeeper, an interpretation in accordance with their own heretical views.

The text of the catena has some peculiarities of spelling, but apparently none which would mark it as of inferior quality. The scribe frequently writes ι for ει (e.g., φιλομεν, 27r.), and often ει for ε (e.g., απειθανον, 70r.). On 17r., Jerusalem is spelled Εροσολυμα.

It may also be that when the Lucan passage under comment is quoted in the catena, its text in the catena may vary from the text of Luke in the manuscript; e.g., 31v., ει μη εις ο θεος (Lucan text, ει μη μονος ο θεος); and 40v., δενδρον αγαθον (Lucan text, δενδρον καλον).

The text of the catena is evidently related to the text given by Cramer.²² A remarkably close similarity, however, is found in the text of the apparently unpublished catena on Luke in Cod. 747 (Suppl. Gr. 612, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), a cursive manuscript of the four Gospels with a cursive catena, dated 1164 AD. While the latter catena is not identical throughout with that of Cod. Zacynthius, the extent of similarity clearly indicates a definite relationship between them. In a number of instances, including the passage from Severus on Luke 10:34–35 mentioned above, Cod. 747 includes a passage found in Cod. Zacynthius of which no printed text was found by the present writer. One of the two pages in Cod. Zacynthius containing no catena is 61r., Luke 9:7–11; and Cod. 747 is also without a catena on this passage. The extent of this close relationship may be observed by noting the references cited for the various sections of the catena in the present transcription. A further detailed comparison of the catena of Cod. 747 with that of Cod. Zacynthius seems to be a desideratum.

The introduction to the catena (1r.) is evidently complete, not merely part of an introduction as Tregelles suggests,²³ although it does begin with the conjunction δε. The handwriting of this page has been described above.²⁴ The introduction is apparently basically the same as examples II and III given by M. Faulhaber.²⁵ It is also similar to the introduction to the catena of the four Gospels given by Cramer.²⁶

CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING THE TEXT OF LUKE

It was thought advisable to re-read the Lucan text of Cod. Zacynthius in addition to transcribing the catena, checking the text of Luke against Tregelles's edition. The present writer, aided by having the results of Tregelles's work as a starting point as well as by having read thousands of words of the accompanying catena, and perhaps by having younger eyes, was able to make a number of corrections and additions of textual importance, a much

²² J.A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, Tomus II, Oxford, Univ. Press, 1844.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. ii.

²⁴ See the section *Palaeographical Considerations*.

²⁵ *Die Propheten-Catenen nach Römischen Handschriften. Biblische Studien*, IV. Band, 3 Heft (1899), pp. 192–196.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, Tomus I.

larger number of palaeographical significance, and various others affecting only the format of the text.

Tregelles's volume for some reason fails to include the Lucan text as found on 11v., 46v., and 67v. (In addition, the Lucan text of 7v. was apparently on the missing upper half of the folio.) The text of the first two of these is repeated on the next page, so no text was lost by these omissions; but 67v. contains Luke 9:29, which is not given by Tregelles at all. On 57r., Tregelles does not give the first line of Lucan text, the first six words of Luke 8:43.

The only certain instance where the text of Luke has been supplemented by an alternate reading in the margin is on 61r., one of the two pages without a catena. That this alternate reading was overlooked by Tregelles will occasion no surprise to anyone who attempts to locate and read it even now. This marginal reading, in laterally compressed letters like those of the catena rather than those of the Lucan text, occurs in Luke 9:10. A curved line over the first word answers to a similar line over the first word in the main text for which this reading is an alternate: the text reads 'into a city called'; while the marginal reading is the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, 'into a desert place of a city called.'

Another marginal note is found on 8v., but the nature of this note is uncertain. It is found in the right margin and reads approximately *τι δώσει αυτο αρμοσσει τη οικονομια* and might be an additional comment on Luke 1:32 or a comment upon or an addition to the quotation from Severus in the catena. The only other such note is a variant reading for a clause in the catena itself.²⁷

Some rather surprising errors of Tregelles's edition were revealed by the present study, although the tedious nature of the work he was required to do calls for generous allowance for such errors. He sometimes overlooked section numbers, referring to the catena, which were written within the Lucan text and in the margins. His text sometimes includes words or letters which are not in the manuscript; as for example a title for the Gospel section 13, 'Concerning the Paralytic' (31r., preceding Luke 5:17), of which the present writer found no trace in spite of the closest scrutiny of the page. On 42v., Tregelles gives *εις τας* as the last two words on the page (Luke 7:1) but *τας* is not found in the manuscript. On 85v. he gives *συναντιλαβε* as the last word (Luke 10:4), whereas the form is actually *συναντιλαβεται*.

Tregelles occasionally found that a letter or part of a word was illegible for some reason and properly omitted it from his edition. The present writer has supplied some of these missing letters. This was not done by mere conjecture, although in most instances the letters could easily be so supplied. Where a letter has been supplied it has been done by being able to read enough of the letter to make its identity reasonably certain.²⁸

There are other errors which may have arisen between Tregelles's notes and the finished publication. A complete list of corrections may be seen in the present writer's copy of Tregelles's volume; in Appendix I of the present study only textual corrections and others of significance are given.

²⁷ See 18v., Severus on Luke 2:15.

²⁸ See, e.g., at Luke 1:77–78.

On 1v., 2r., and 2v. there is a list of section titles for Luke together with a list of parallel passages in the other Gospels. This list, since it includes the remaining part of the Gospel of which the text is now missing, makes it clear that the manuscript did originally include the entire Gospel of Luke. These pages were also re-examined and some corrections were made, mostly of minor significance. The only material correction made was in section κ (1v., bottom line), which Tregelles gives as *περι των αποσταλεντων παρα Ιωαννου*, but which actually reads *περι των αποσταλμενων υπο Ιωαννου*. On 44v., where this title appears in the Gospel text, Tregelles gives it in the same form as before, but it actually reads *πε. των αποσταλεντων υπο Ιωαννου*.

The text type of Luke in Cod. Zacynthius is Alexandrian, related to Codd. BL etc., although it has some unique readings. Included among these is the variant in Luke 7:31 given in Appendix I below. Tregelles raises the question (p. iv) as to whether 'the oldest Manuscripts with Catenae or Scholia (and those of three successive centuries) are monuments of the older text.' This question may be extended to include Cod. 747, since its catena has such a close relationship to Cod. Zacynthius. The present writer does not know of a complete collation of Cod. 747, but two of his students, Mr. Harry Wulfcamp and Mr. John Pearsall, have collated the manuscript for Luke. A cursory examination of a small portion of this collation, comparing it with Cod. Zacynthius, seems to suggest that Cod. 747 is primarily Byzantine but agrees with Zacynthius against the Textus Receptus in a number of points. A further study of the relationship between these two manuscripts is desirable.

CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING THE MANUSCRIPT AS A PALIMPSEST

The later text of Cod. Zacynthius is a Gospel lectionary, Greg. 299 (Scrivener 200),²⁹ commonly dated as of the thirteenth century. Some centuries after Cod. Zacynthius was written it became worn and fell into disuse, and was subsequently erased. Pages too damaged for further use were discarded; the remaining pages were cut in half where they were folded in the original binding. Consequently, the original text is fragmentary in the present volume, with occasional pages missing throughout and nothing extant beyond Luke 11:33. Except for two half-leaves, the pages of the present volume are made up entirely of pages from Cod. Zacynthius.³⁰ Since there is no practice of beginning sections of the catena at the top of a page, there are many incomplete sections in the catena as it now exists, with either the first or the last part missing.

The pages of the manuscript in its present form are half as large as the original codex. It was probably further trimmed slightly after being bound. Four sheets form a quire in the present volume. The lower right-hand corner of folio 43r. is dog-eared and escaped being trimmed, and probably shows the size of the page before it was trimmed. At the top of folio 24 a hole has been worn through the parchment. This evidently took place while the manuscript was in its original form, because a hole is worn through folio 25 as well although the two are separated in the present binding.

²⁹ Hatch, (*op. cit.*, p.333) refers to it as Cod. 229, apparently a typographical error.

³⁰ Hatch, (*loc. cit.*,) erroneously states that there are ninety additional leaves in the present volume, apparently failing to observe that one page of Cod. Zacynthius made two pages of the present volume, whose pages are only half as large.

There is of course no relationship between the pagination of the later text and that of the earlier writing. In copying the Lucan text of the earlier writing Tregelles numbered the pages in Roman numerals in the order of the earlier text (without of course, allowing for missing pages) and printed in his volume³¹ a helpful index locating these pages with reference to the pages in the present binding.

Tregelles suggests³² that when a manuscript was erased for reuse the original writing was completely obliterated, and that if the original writing in a palimpsest is now legible it is due to oxidation over the centuries of the iron in the ink which had remained impregnated in the parchment. This, he says, is true in the case of black ink (containing iron), while red ink does not become legible again after having been erased. He recognizes that in this respect the red ink of Cod. Zacynthius is an exception; for the red titles used on a number of pages of this manuscript are sometimes the most legible part of a page, and the ink is in general quite brilliant. At the top of the page, indeed, it may be observed that the red ink from the title has faded onto the opposite page. In fact, the very brilliance of the red ink suggests the improbability that it was ever erased so completely as to be less legible than it is at present, but on the other hand raises the question as to whether a scribe would have been willing to use the pages for the later text with the former writing so clearly in evidence. It may be remotely possible that an ink was used in these portions of such composition that its oxidation would produce the brilliant red of Cod. Zacynthius; this could be determined by chemical analysis of a micro-sample of the ink. Yet it seems more probable that the scribe simply did not demand complete erasure of the former writing. As would be expected, the original writing is generally more legible on the smoother flesh sides of the parchment than on the hair sides. For anyone who may have the opportunity to examine the manuscript, folio 23v., the top half of which forms the verso of page 125 in the present binding, is one of the more legible pages.

There are three ways in which it may be determined where a page of the original manuscript is missing. First, a page or more is obviously missing if the text of Luke is not continuous. Second, where a section of the catena was continued from one page to another, as was often the case, if either the first or the last portion of the catena section is missing, it indicates that a page is missing. In view of the fact that sometimes the Lucan portion was printed on more than one page, a page may be missing from the manuscript even where nothing is missing from the Lucan text.³³ Finally, since the regular custom of placing parchment sheets hair side to hair side and flesh side to flesh side was followed in this manuscript, it is possible to determine when one page (or an odd number of pages) is missing by observing this sequence. A combination of these three methods is fairly certain to locate every instance of missing pages.³⁴

---

³¹ *Op. cit* p. xii.

³² *Op. cit* p. xxii–xxiii.

³³ E.g., following p. 46 and p. 82.

³⁴ See Appendix II.

CONCLUSION CONCERNING THE DATE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The present writer is not prepared to draw a final conclusion as to the date of Cod. Zacynthius. Nevertheless, it would be an obvious anachronism to assign to the manuscript a date earlier than is permissible for any of the characteristics shown in the manuscript, either in the catena or in the Lucan text. It is out of the question, therefore, to assign to it a date earlier than the time at which laterally compressed letters came into usage, even though the Lucan text and section headings are in the supposedly earlier rounded letters. Neither may it be assigned to a date earlier than the use of the sloping, informal style of letters found in the introduction to the catena; for the introduction is certainly a part of the original manuscript and was probably written by the same scribe. Further, the free use of accents and breathings in the introduction and the occasional passages in which accents are freely used in the catena require that the manuscript be assigned to a date no earlier than this usage permits, even though they are found only rarely in the manuscript.

It is the present writer's belief, therefore, that this manuscript itself may be from a somewhat later date than a first inspection of its appearance and style of writing might indicate. Since the hypothesis for assigning a sixth century date to Cod. Zacynthius on the basis of a very early erasure of the name of Severus is apparently mistaken, there seems to be no reason for rejecting whatever date is indicated by the latest palaeographical features found in the manuscript. If it is true that these features, particularly the sloping hand of the introduction and the well-developed system of accents and breathings, are assumed by palaeographers to be no earlier than the eighth century, it would follow that no date earlier than this should be assigned to Cod. Zacynthius. Such a date would allow time for the sixth-century writings of Severus and Victor to become well-known enough to have excerpts included in catenae of established forms. It is to be hoped that a small fragment from the manuscript may be submitted to the radioactive carbon test for further evidence concerning the date of its origin.

Making some allowances for the human factor, therefore, Cod. Zacynthius is apparently to be dated no earlier than the latter part of the seventh century and probably no later than the latter part of the eighth century.

Even so, this manuscript establishes the existence of well-developed catenae, presumably in a set form, at the time when the manuscript was written. If this manuscript is a careful copy of an appreciably earlier manuscript, as was tentatively suggested above, the existence of the catena-form at a correspondingly earlier date would be concluded.

Acknowledgments

The writer is indebted to many people in the present study of Cod. Zacynthius. The research was carried on under the terms of a Fulbright grant from the United States Department of State. The officers of administration of Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky, granted the writer a leave of absence for research during the school year 1950–51. The Rev. Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick, of the Queen's College, Oxford, suggested the present study as a contribution to the International Critical Apparatus Project and offered many helpful suggestions during the course of the work. The British and Foreign Bible Society kindly loaned Cod. Zacynthius to the Bodleian Library of Oxford for the

writer's use there. The librarian and members of staff of the Bodleian Library extended many courtesies. The work—and the writer's eyes—are indebted to Mr. J. A. Spranger for the loan of an efficient and convenient type of reading glass. Miss E. Bickersteth made a valuable contribution to the study with her suggestion that the catena of Cod. 747, which she had inspected in Paris, might prove to be related to the catena of Cod. Zacynthius. M. Charles Astruc, Librarian of Manuscripts, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, was most helpful in verifying certain passages in the unpublished Cod. 747. The Bibliothèque Nationale permitted the writer to obtain a microfilm of Luke of Cod. 747 for use in the investigation. The Rev. Henri de Riedmatten gave the writer many valuable suggestions, particularly in material relating to catenae. Prof. Ruth Fess, of Asbury College, by the loan of her Greek typewriter made it possible for the writer to type the transcription of the catena.

Appendix I. Collation listing the more significant corrections made in the readings of Codex Zacynthius as given in Tregelles's facsimile

(Abbreviations are generally indicated only when Tregelles gives an abbreviation which is actually a fully-written word in the manuscript, or when he gives a fully-written word which is actually an abbreviation in the manuscript.)

First the reading of the Textus Receptus is given, then the correct reading of Cod. Zacynthius. At the right, in parentheses, is given the reading of Tregelles's facsimile.

1:2	αυτοπται και] same εωρακεν] εορακεν	(αυτοπται και και) (εωρακεν)
1:36	υιον] υιον	(<u>υν</u>)
1:43	entire verse] given twice, 11v., 12r.	(11v. omitted)
	κυριου μου] <u>κν</u> 11v. ; <u>κν</u> μου, 12r.	(<u>κν</u> , μου, 12r.; verse omitted, 11v.)
	προς με] προς εμε, 11v., 12r.	(προς με, 12r.; verse omitted, 11v.)
1:77	εν αφεσει] same	([ ] αφεσει)
1:78	επεσκεψατο same	(επεσκεψατ[ ])
2:2	Κυρηνιου] κυρινιου	(κυριιιου)
Title preceding 2:36		
	ms.: δ̄ περι Αννας της προφητιδος	(δ̄ περι Αννης της προφητιδος)
2:39	Ναζαρετ] same	Ναζαρεθ
3:5	παν ορος] same	(πλν ορος)
4:11	αρουσι] same	(αρουσιν)
4:32	εξουσια] same	(εξο[ ]σια
4:33	και εν τη] same	([ ]αι εν τη)
4:35	εξηλθεν	(εξηλθ[ ])
4:36	πνευμασι] same (?)	(πνευμασιν)
Title preceding 5:17		
	ms.: nothing	(<u>ιγ</u> περι του παραλυτικου)
Title preceding 5:24		
	ms.: ιδ̄ περι Λευιν τον τελωνην	(ιδ̄ περι Λευει του τελωνην)
6:22	μισησωσιν] μισησουσιν	(μισησωσιν)
6:34	δανειζουσιν] δανιζουσιν	(δανειζουσιν)
6:42	καρφος] καρπος	(καρφος)
6:49	εστιν] εστιν	(εστιν)
7:1	τας ακοας] ακοας	(τας ακοας)
Title preceding 7:16		
	ms.: πε. των αποσταλεντων υπο Ιωαννου	(π. των αποσταλεντων παρα Ιωαννου)

7:21	εχαρισατο το βλεπειν] same	εχαρισατο βλεπειν
7:25	ημφιεσμενον] ημφιεσμενον (?)	(ημφιεσμενον)
7:31	ειπε δε ο κυριος] ουκετι εχεινοις διελεγετο αλλα τοις μαθηταις	ουχετι εκεινοις ελεγετο αλλα τοις μαθηταις
7:41	πεντηχοντα] πεντιχοντα	(πεντηχοντα)
8:28	υιε] υιε	υε
8:29	απο του ανθρωπου] απ αυτου	(απο του ανου)
8:43	και γυνη ουσα εν ρυσει αιματος] same	(omitted)
8:43	υπ ουδενος] same	(απ ουδενος)
8:45	αρνουμενων δε παντων] same, 48r.	(same twice, 47v., 48r.)
	συνεχουσι] συνεχουσιν	(συννεχουσιν)
9:3	εχειν] εχετε	(εχειν)
9:10	εις τοπον ερημον πολεως καλουμενης] εις πολιν καλουμενην – mg., εις ερημον τοπον πολεως καλουμενης	(text same, mg. reading omitted)
9:25	απολεσας η ζημ.] απολεσας ζημ.	(απολεσας η ζημ.)
9:26	γαρ αν] γαρ εαν	(γαρ αν)
	ο υιος του ανθρωπου] ο υιος του ανου	(ο υς του ανου)
9:29	και εγενετο εν τω προσευχεσθαι αυτον το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ετερον] και εγενετο εν τω αυτον προσευχεσθαι το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ετερον	(omitted)
9:32	ειδον] ειδαν	(ειδον)
9:58	εχουσι] same	εχουσιν
Title preceding 9:61		
	ms.: λδ περι των αναδειχθεντων ο >	(λδ των ανα δειχθεντων ο)
9:62	Ιησους] ις	(ιησους)
10:1	ετερους] ετερου	(ετερους)
10:21	εξομολ. σοι] εξομολ. σε	(εξομολ. σοι)
10:30	κατεβαινεν] κατεβαινον	(κατεβαινον)
10:33	Σαμαρειτης] Σαμαριτης	(Σαμαρειτης)
	κατ αυτον] καταν	(κατ αυτον)
10:34	ελαιον] same	(ελεον)
10:40	συναντιλαβηται] same	(συναντιλαβη)
11:27	επαρασα] επαρας	(επαρασα)

Appendix II: List of Pages Missing from Codex Zacynthius

Determined by missing portion of Luke (A), missing portion of a catena section (B), or wrong sequence of hair sides and flesh sides of vellum sheets (C).

Following	3(?)		B	
“	5	A		
“	6	A	B	
“	7	A		
“	8	A	B	C
“	14	A	B	
“	18	A	B	C
“	20	A	B(?)	C
“	22	A		
“	23	A	B	C
“	25	A		
“	26	A	B	
“	28	A		
“	30	A	B	C
“	34	A	B	C
“	43	A		C
“	46		B	
“	49	A	B(?)	C
“	50	A	B	C
“	54	A	B	C
“	56	A	B	
“	58	A		C
“	67	Top half of 68 and 68v. missing. Hence portions of Luke and of catena are missing between 67v. and 68r. and between 68r. and 68v.		
“	68	A	B	C
“	75(?)		B(?)	
“	78	A	B	C
“	82		B	C
“	85	A		C
“	86	A	B	
“	87	A	B(?)	C
“	88	Top half of 89 missing, including portions of Luke and catena on 89r. and 89v.		
“	89	No pages beyond 89.		

Appendix III: List of printed texts cited in the transcription of the catena

The following is a list of printed texts to which reference is made in the transcription on the catena of Cod. Zacynthius. Abbreviations preceding each title is the abbreviation by which each is identified in the transcription. References are ad. loc. unless otherwise indicated.

- (Cramer) J. A. Cramer, ed.: *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*. Oxford, University Press, 1844. Tomus I, Matthew and Mark. Tomus II, Luke and John.
- (Mai) Angelus Maius (curante): *Classicorum Auctorum e Vaticanis Codicibus Editorum*, Tomus X, *S. Cyrilli Alexandrini Commentarius in Lucae Evangelium. Item aliorum patrum fragmenta*. Tomus IX, *Scholia minora in evangelia Lucae et Iohannis*. Romae, typis Collegii Urbani, 1838.
- (Texte) Joseph Sickenberger, ed.: *Titus von Bostra, Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien*. Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolph Harnack, edd.: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*. Neue Folge, VI. Band (1901), Heft I.
- (Faulhaber) M. Faulhaber, ed.: *Die Propheten-Catenen nach Römischen Handschriften. Biblische Studien*, IV. Band, 3 Heft (1899). (Introduction to catena only.)
- (Migne) Jacques Paul Migne, ed.: *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. Cyril, vol. 72. Chrysostom, vol. 57, Isidore, vol. 78. Eusebius, vol. 24. Basil, vol. 32.
- (GCS) *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Origenes: Werke*, IX. Band, Max Rauer, ed. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs (1930).
- (Ms.) Codex Gr. Suppl. 612 (Gregory Cod. 747), Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Dated 1164 AD.