Part 1: **Introduction**

1 Exegesis of the Gospel of Luke

1.1 The manuscript tradition

1.1.1 Previous Scholarship on catenae of Luke and towards a new classification of catenae manuscripts of Luke

The purpose of this volume is to contribute to a better understanding of the Byzantine collections of exegetical excerpts on the Gospel according of Luke, and to bring hitherto unstudied material to the attention of scholars. The edition of previously unknown or largely neglected series of comments on Luke and the examination of the relationship between them opens a new window on the understanding of the textual transmission of certain exegetical comments extracted from earlier patristic texts and on how various types of catenae on Luke relate to each other.

Recent years have seen a significant increase in the study of patristic exegesis of the New Testament, especially with regard to biblical catenae. Yet most catenae on Luke remain unpublished and detailed research on them is yet to be undertaken. In the seventeenth century, Fronto Ducaeus published the Greek text of the catena of Luke attributed to Titus of Bostra as it survived in a sole manuscript, Vatican, BAV, Ottob. gr. 113; his edition was accompanied by a Latin translation.² Soon after, a Latin translation of the catena on Luke by Nicetas of Heraclea was published by Balthasar Corderius.³ This translation is likewise based on a limited number of witnesses; Corderius relied on a transcription of Venice, Marc., gr. Z. 494 (coll. 331), ff. 3r-58v (GA 598) and a comparison of this codex with Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 71, ff. 1r-424r (GA 434), Munich, BSB, gr. 473, ff. 1v-415r (GA 426) and Munich, BSB, gr. 33, ff. 1r-397v. 4 Two centuries later, John Anthony Cramer produced a complete edition of a catena on the Gospel of Luke as part of his eight-volume edition of Greek New Testament catenae.⁵ Cramer's edition was based on two manuscripts, one in Paris (BnF, Coislin grec 23) supplemented by another in Oxford (Bodleian Library, Auctarium T. 1. 4 [Misc. 182]). Angelo Mai's edition of the compilation on Luke by Nicetas of Heraclea relies on a single witness: Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1611, ff. 1r-320v (GA 1821). This manuscript is the earliest extant witness to the catena

¹ For an overview and individual studies, see H. A. G. HOUGHTON, ed., *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition* (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2016).

² Fronto Ducaeus, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum seu scriptorum ecclesiasticorum. Tomus II* (Paris: per Sonnios fratres et Hieronymum Drovardum, 1624), 762–836.

³ Balthasar Corderius, *Catena Sexaginta quinque Graecorum Patrum in Sanctum Lukam* (Antwerp: Ex officina Plantiniana, 1628).

⁴ See Joseph Sickenberger, *Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Herakleia untersucht* (TU 22.4. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 69–71.

⁵ John Anthony Cramer, Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum Tomus II in Evangelia S. Lucae et S. Joannis (Oxford: OUP, 1844), 6–174.

of Nicetas.⁶ Mai also published the series of exegetical extracts on the Gospel of Luke by Origen and Eusebius found in catenae.⁷ At the turn of the nineteenth century Joseph Sickenberger collected and published a considerable number of excerpts from the commentaries on Luke by Titus of Bostra and Cyril of Alexandria transmitted in catena manuscripts⁸ and some eighty years later Joseph Reuss published an edition of scholia from selected authors transmitted in catenae on Luke.⁹ These editions of exegetical fragments, indispensable to the determination of the transmission history of certain patristic texts, are less helpful in studying the compilation and transmission of particular collections of excerpts. In fact, the lack of editions of complete catenae on the Gospel of Luke prevent us from being able to identify and establish the construction, circulation and reception of them in the Byzantine era. Only recently have steps begun to be taken in this direction, with the appearance in 2020 of the full transcription of the complete palimpsest undertext of Codex Zacynthius (Cambridge, University Library MS Add. 10062), probably the oldest surviving manuscript with a catena of Luke.¹⁰

A necessary precursor to editing the catenae on Luke is a full listing of witnesses and their classification. Significant steps towards this have been made since the end of the nineteenth century. Joseph Sickenberger was the first to undertake an analysis of catena manuscripts of Luke.¹¹ He published two surveys of the catena on Luke by Nicetas of Heraclea, attempting the first classification of the catena tradition on Luke.¹²

⁶ Angelo MAI, ed., Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio. Tomus IX (Rome: Collegium Urbanum, 1837), 626–722.

⁷ Angelo MAI, ed., *Bibliotheca nova Patrum. Tomus IV* (Rome: Vatican, 1847), 159ff. These scholia are reprinted in PG 13, 1801–1902 and PG 24, 529–604.

⁸ Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (TU 21.1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901) and Joseph Sickenberger, *Fragmente der Homilien des Cyrill von Alexandrien zum Lukasevangelium* (TU 34.1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909), esp. 63–108.

⁹ Joseph REUSS, Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche (TU 130. Berlin: Akademie, 1984).

¹⁰ H.A.G. Houghton – Panagiotis Manafis – A.C. Myshrall, *The Palimpsest Catena of Codex Zacynthius: Text and Translation* (T&S 3.22. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2020). The codex is dated to the eighth century by David Parker: D.C. Parker, "The Undertext Writing", in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary* (eds. H.A.G. Houghton – D.C. Parker. T&S 3.21. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2020), 19–32. G. Parpulov suggests a date in the first half of the ninth century; Georgi R. Parpulov, *Catena Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament: A Catalogue* (T&S 3.25. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2021), 205. A dating to the middle-tenth century has been proposed by Elisabeth Goeke-Mayr – Georgios Makris, "Dating the codex Patmiacus 171: Iconoclastic remarks on the Byzantine illuminated manuscripts of the Book of Job and on the supposed origins of the Catenas in the 6th century", in *Griechisch-byzantinische Handschriftenforschung: Traditionen, Entwicklungen, neue Wege*, (eds. Christian Brockmann – Daniel Deckers – Dieter Harlfiger – Stefano Valente. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020), 437–460, esp. 454–455.

¹¹ Joseph Sickenberger, Titus von Bostra and Joseph Sickenberger, Fragmente, esp. 63–108.

¹² Joseph Sickenberger, "Aus römischen Handschriften über die Lukas Katene des Niketas," *RQ* 12 (1898): 55–84; Sickenberger, *Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Herakleia* (TU 22.4. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902). Sickenberger divided the manuscript tradition of the catena by Nicetas of Heraclea into three main clusters: Italian, Byzantine, and interpolated.

Around the same time Georg Karo and Hans Lietzmann identified six types of catenae on Luke in their *Catenarum Graecarum catalogus*, recording basic information on their;

- i) the catena edited by Cramer;
- ii) the catena attributed to Peter of Laodicea;
- iii) the catena preserved in MSS Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 20, ff. 1r–226r (GA 381) and Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1933, pp. 1–619 (GA 868) (epitomes of the catena of Nicetas);
- iv) the catena by Nicetas of Heraclea;
- v) the catena by Macarius Chrysocephalus;
- vi) the catena preserved in Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 301, ff. 36v–79v and Oxford, Bodl., Auct. E. 2. 2 (Misc. 30). 13

This catalogue supplies a brief description of the manuscripts known to the authors, along with the *incipit* and *explicit* of their scholia on Luke 8:43–46 and a list of the Church Fathers excerpted in the various catena types. Some decades later, Max Rauer refined and expanded Karo and Lietzmann's classification in his examination of the sources for Origen's *Homilies on Luke*. His classification formed the basis of the identification of seven Lukan catena types by Maurits Geerard in the first edition of the fourth volume of the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG). A few years after the appearance of this catalogue, Joseph Reuss, as noted above, published an edition of the exegetical comments transmitted in catenae on Luke. In the introduction to his edition, he distinguished the following six types in the Lukan catena tradition (A-F), too:

- 1. **type A** is heavily based on Titus of Bostra and represents the earliest catena type, going back to the sixth century. The catena, in fact, is not by Titus of Bostra himself, but contains numerous extracts from his commentary. The compiler of this catena also seems to have been responsible for the earliest forms of the catenae on Matthew (C110.1) and John (C140.1);¹⁷
- 2. **type B** is the catena assigned to Peter of Laodicea.¹⁸ This catena draws largely on the same sources as type A;
- 3. **type C** is the catena by Nicetas of Heraclea;

¹³ Georg Karo – Johannes Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum catalogus* (Nachrichten der königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. Klasse, Heft 1, 3, 5. Göttingen, 1902), 572–583.

¹⁴ Max RAUER, ed., *Origenes: Werke, Neunter Band. Die Homilien zu Lukas.* Second edn. (GCS 49; Berlin: Hinrichs, 1959).

¹⁵ Maurits GEERARD, ed., Clavis Patrum Graecorum. IV Concilia. Catenae. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980).

¹⁶ REUSS, Lukas-Kommentare, 54–297.

¹⁷ See Panagiotis Manafis, "Catenae on Luke and the Catena of Codex Zacynthius," in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary* (eds. HOUGHTON – PARKER), 137–168, esp. 139.

¹⁸ Although Reuss does not exclude the possibility that the *catena* was compiled by Peter of Laodicea, this authorship is now disputed; REUSS, *Lukas-Kommentare*, XIII; Gilles DORIVAL, "Biblical Catenae: Between Philology and History", in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition* (ed. HOUGHTON), 65–81, esp. 67. See also David Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 331.

- 4. **type D** is a catena dated prior to that of Nicetas of Heraclea. In type D, the original texts are often heavily abridged;
- **type E** is the catena transmitted in Codex Zacynthius; 5.
- **type F** is the catena contained in Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 301, ff. 36v–79v.

According to Reuss, Munich, BSB, gr. 208, ff. 235r-248v (GA 53) containing extracts on Luke 1:1–2:40 cannot be classified in any of the aforementioned types.

The second edition of the CPG volume on catenae, updated by Jacques Noret in 2018 reproduced the six main types mentioned above with additional information from Reuss: Reuss's type A comprises both C130 (which he called the *Erweiterte Grundform*) and C131 (the Vollkatene). In fact, C131 is an extended version of the catena C130, which includes extracts from fifteen named authors. In addition to Titus's Commentary on Luke, it draws extensively on Cyril of Alexandria's Homilies on Luke, Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew, and Origen's Commentary on Luke and Homilies on Luke. Reuss's type B consists of C132 (Grundform) and C133 (Erweiterte Grundform) as well as a Vollkatene. C135, the catena of Nicetas of Heraclea compiled at the beginning of the twelfth century, corresponds to Reuss's type C, while C134 is his type D. Codex Zacynthius (C137.3) is identified as type E by Reuss, while his type F is the Vienna catena (C137.1). Moreover, the revised CPG volume added four extra individual manuscripts to the two in the codices singuli section of the first edition:19

- Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 301 (C137.1)
- 2. Munich, BSB, gr. 208 (C137.2)
- 3. Codex Zacynthius (C137.3)
- 4. Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 349 (C137.4)
- 5. Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 273, ff. 1–4, 271–274 (C137.5)
- Florence, BML, Conv. soppr. 159 (C137.6)

This revised edition also refers on several occasions to Parker's initial checklist of catena manuscripts published two years earlier. 20 This had been compiled from a number of sources, including Von Soden's edition of the Greek New Testament, the Gregory-Aland Kurzgefasste Liste (see below), and studies such as that by Reuss. It indicated that the number of surviving catena manuscripts was significantly higher than had previously been thought to be the case, although it did not address the question of how catenae were to be defined and whether compilations by single editors such as Nicetas or Theophylact had the same status as earlier catenae.

¹⁹ GEERARD - NORET, Clavis Patrum Graecorum, 362-371.

²⁰ H.A.G. HOUGHTON - D.C. PARKER, "An Introduction to Greek New Testament Commentaries with a Preliminary Checklist of New Testament Catena Manuscripts", in Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition (ed. HOUGHTON), 1-35.

Georgi Parpulov's catalogue of catenae, published in 2021, added around 30 New Testament catena witnesses to those listed in the official register of Greek New Testament manuscripts since 1963, the so-called *Kurzgefasste Liste*. In Parpulov's catalogue the types listed in the CPG have been used and expanded, and included in the online version of the CPG, the *Clavis Clavium*. Based on a systematic search of library catalogues, coupled with online databases and collections of digitised images, Parpulov also offered a significant number of revisions of the CPG classification of the *codices singuli*:

- a) Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 301 should no longer be considered as a unique catena of Luke. The codex contains a series of extracts identical to that found in manuscripts identified by CPG as C132;²²
- b) Prague, Národní Knihovna České republiky, XXV B 7, Venice, BNM, Z.495 (1048), and Drame, M. Koσινίτσης, 3 (GA 1424) must also be included, according to Parpulov, in the *codices singuli* section: he assigned them the CPG numbers C137.8, 137.9, 137.10 respectively;²³
- c) Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 612 and Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1248 transmit a catena which differ from all other known CPG types; Parpulov assigned this the CPG number C137.7.²⁴

Nevertheless, my subsequent research has indicated that Prague, Národní Knihovna České republiky, XXV B 7 and two leaves bound as flyleaves in Vatican, BAV, Pal.

²¹ Kurt Aland, Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. Second edn. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994). This list assigns each manuscript a Gregory-Aland (GA) number. It does not treat catena manuscripts as a separate category, but instead they are categorized with other manuscripts according to the type of script (i.e., of their biblical text), the writing material and whether or not the text is continuous. Many of these traditional criteria are problematic for catena manuscripts in general, and those on Luke in particular. For example, the use of script to classify catena manuscripts on Luke can be misleading. Two manuscripts have the biblical text in majuscule while the surrounding commentary is in minuscule: Munich, BSB, gr. 208, ff. 235r-248v (GA 53), a parchment codex dated to the tenth century, and the eleventh-century codex Athens, EBE, 95, ff. 93v-163v (GA 1411). Prague, Národní Knihovna České republiky, XXV B 7 has the commentary in majuscule, only. There is only one manuscript in which both the biblical text and the commentary are written in majuscule script: the so-called Codex Zacynthius. In this manuscript the exegetical excerpts were copied in a majuscule script different from that of the Gospel text. The use of two different types of script in Codex Zacynthius, a more archaic and larger Alexandrian majuscule for the Gospel text and a smaller pointed majuscule for the commentary, is an argument to distinguish the biblical source from its commentary. Yet both the biblical and the commentary texts were copied at the same time and by the same scribe; see HOUGHTON - PARKER, "An Introduction", 2-4 and 28-34; Jacob Harold Greenlee, "The Catena of Codex Zacynthius," Bib 40 (1959): 992–1001; D.C. PARKER – J.N. BIRDSALL, "The Date of Codex Zacynthius (E): a New Proposal," ITS 55.1 (2004): 117-131; H.A.G. HOUGHTON, "The Layout and Structure of the Catena," in Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary (eds. HOUGHTON - PARKER), 59-96.

²² PARPULOV, Catena Manuscripts, 102.

²³ PARPULOV, Catena Manuscripts, 106–108, 206–207, 198–199.

²⁴ PARPULOV, Catena Manuscripts, 116.

gr. 273 bear the same series of comments on Luke as Codex Zacynthius. 25 As a consequence, these two manuscripts must also be identified as C137.3 (and the sigla C137.5 and C137.8 withdrawn). Furthermore, as the edition of its excerpts in Part 2 of this volume shows, Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1225 (GA 1293) does not represent the catena type C131 as indicated in Parpulov's catalogue. The manuscript needs to be treated as another codex unicus, and I here propose to treat it as C137.11.

Parpulov's catalogue included a new set of entries in the CPG, the category C139 for catenae which were not previously included in the CPG but are attested by multiple manuscripts (and therefore not codices singuli).26 The catena C139.1 is found in four witnesses: Rome, Accademia dei Lincei e Corsiniana, 41.G.16; Athens, EBE, 2364; Jerusalem, GOP, Taphou 28; Athens, Ch. G. Sarros Collection, 1.27 Another type, assigned the number C139.2, is found in six manuscripts.

Based on the CPG, Parpulov's subsequent emendations to it, and my own observations above, the catena manuscripts on Luke may be categorised as follows²⁸:

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
C130	Moscow, ГИМ, Syn. gr. 137 and Syn. gr. 384		1r-54r	9th/2
	Florence, BML, San Marco 687		86v-115r	y. 943
	Athos, Μ. Μεγίστης Λαύρας Α 15	1080	132v-213v	10th
	Athos, Μ. Μεγίστης Λαύρας Β 113		172r-189r	10th
	Athens, Βιβλιοθήκη της Βουλής των Ελλήνων, 4	2097	198r-317r	10th
	Athens, EBE, 56	773	155r-215v	10th
	Athens, EBE, 95	1411	93v-125v	10th
	Athens, EBE, 98	1412	216v-223r	10th
	Florence, BML, Plut. 06.05/Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. G 157	832	145r-180r	10th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 188	020	142r-202v	10th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 231		99r-131r	10th

Table 1: Categorisation of Catena Manuscripts of Luke

²⁵ See Panagiotis Manafis, "A New Witness to the Catena of Codex Zacynthius", ZAC 26.3 (2022): 371-401.

²⁶ PARPULOV, Catena Manuscripts, 95-96.

²⁷ An edition of this catena is given in section 8 in this volume.

²⁸ These are: MS Rome, Bibl. Naz., S.A. Valle 100 of the sixteenth century, which on ff. 1r-118r transmits a catena of Type A according to Reuss' classification (Type A Reuss = CPG C130). Folios 119r–350v contain a series of extracts, the assembly and organization of which are assigned to Nicetas of Heraclea (Type C Reuss = CPG C135). And MS Vatican, BAV, Reg. gr. 3 which transmits the catenae C133 and C134. The first one appears to have been copied by a hand dated to the eleventh century, whereas C134 was copied in the first half of the fourteenth century.

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
71	Paris, BnF, gr. 704		140v-185v	10th
	Paris, BnF, Cosilin 71		136r-155v	10th
	Athos, Μ. Μεγίστης Λαύρας Α 113	1507	172r-189r	10th
	Patmos, Ioannu, 59		192r-235r	10th
	Rome, Bibl. Angelica, gr. 67		139v-177v	10th
	Vatican, BAV, Archivio di S. Pietro B 59		303v-332v	10th
	Vatican, BAV, Barb. gr. 562		247r-271v	10th
	Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, F° 30 (Cim.16)	033	59r-100v	10th/1
	Cambridge, Trinity College, B.VII.1		253v-295r	10th/1
	Patmos, M. Αγ. Ιωάννου του Θεολόγου, 60		312v-375v	10th/1
	Paris, BnF, gr. 201	055	191r-230r	10th/1
	Paris, BnF, gr. 701		241r-292v	10th/1
	Paris, BnF, gr. 702	2110	208r-250v	10th/1
	Venice, BNM, Cl. I,34		195r-228r	10th/1
	Venice, Marc., gr. Z. 544 (coll. 591)	215	145r-202v	10th/2
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1692		144r-177r	10th/2
	Athos, Μ. Βατοπεδίου, 662	2453	219v-253v	11th
	London, BL, Harley 5540	114	130r-217r	11th
	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. gr. 33	050	147v-214r	11th
	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D.2.17	048	72r–113v	11th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 186	300	141r-203r	11th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 703		208r-246v	11th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 206	1266	331v, 333r- 432v	11th
	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T.1.4		301r-354v	11th/1
	Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 25		43r-64v	y. 1109
	Athens, Βιβλιοθήκη της Βουλής των Ελλήνων, 1	807	138v-201v	12th
	Moscow, ГИМ, Syn. gr. 47 and РГАДА, ф. 1607, no. 3	238	2r-99v	12th
	Patmos, Ioannu, 58	1160	291r-366r	12th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1618	377	211r-266v	12th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. Ross. 211	1366	86r-127v	12th/1
	London, BL, Add. 19386	1268	128r-205v	13th
	Moscow, ГИМ, Syn. gr. 138		268r-297v	13th/2
	Florence, BML, Plut. 08.24		72r–107v	15th/2
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 384		77–127	y. 1553
	Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, O.II.23		101r-172r	16th
	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1419		73r-110v	16th
	Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana O 142 sup.		1r-70v	16th
	Munich, BSB, Gr. 83		1r-44v	16th
	Rome, BNC, S.A. Valle 100		1r-118r	16th

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
,,	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, C.II.14		140v-210r	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Ottob. gr. 113		1r-48r	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Ottob. gr. 237		47r-71r	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat, gr. 547		96r-142r	16th
C131	Athens, EBE, 204	771	62v-110v	10th
	Athos, M. Μεγίστης Λαύρας, Α 16	1078	90r-146v	10th
	Paris, BNF, Coislin 195	034	241r-348r	10th/1
,	Florence, BML, Plut. 06.33	194	119r-190v	11th
	Naples, Bibl. Naz., ex Vind. 3	108	198r-314v	11th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 19	329	141r-234r	11th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 23	039	149r-208v	11th
	Paris, BNF, gr. 187	301	104r-159v	11th
	Sofia, Ivan Duichev Centre, gr. 177	1684	121r–180r	11th
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 277	2838	77r-94r	15th
	Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 334		17r-162v	16th
	Vatican, BAV, gr. 1423	373	104r-159v	16th
	Venice, BNM, Z.545 (410)		1v-140r	16th
C132	Athos, Μ. Δοχειαρίου, 7	964	103r-158v	10th
	Madrit, BNE, Res. 235	2812	138r-226v	10th
	Milan, Bibl. Ambros., A 62 inf.	1980	47r-59r	10th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 20	036	224r-355r	10th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 177	299	154v-249v	10th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 178	024	109r-186v	10th
	Patmos, M. Αγ. Ιωάννου του Θεολόγου, 177		380-418	10th
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 117		125r-190v	10th
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 301		36v-79v	10th
	Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 220	151	133r-182v	10th/1
	Athos, Μ. Παντοκράτορος, 39	1392	157r-248r	10th/2
	Oxford, Lincoln College, gr. 16	095	45r-102r	10th/2
	Alexandria, Patriarchal Library, 122	2937	95v-216v	11th
	Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2	1373	110r-190v	11th
	Athos, Μ. Βατοπεδίου, 936	1570	172r–269r	11th
	Athos, M. Ἰβήρων, 2	989	134r-205r	11th
	Budapest, Eötvös Loránd Tudomány Egyetem Könyvtára, Gr. 1	100	175r–269r	11th
	Cephalonia, M. Κηπουραίων, 2	2211	163r-239r	11th
	Cleveland, Cleveland Museum of Art, 42.152	2381	200r-322v	11th
	Cologny, Fondation Martin Bodmer, Bodmer 25	556	93r-141v	11th
	current whereabouts unknown	2436	96r-202v	11th
	Dublin, Trinity College, 31	063	219-357	11th

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
	Durham NC, Duke University, David M. Rubenstein Library, K. W. Clark Collection 60	1423	164r-268r	11th
	Florence, BML, Plut. 06.18	186	140r-210r	11th
	Florence, BML, Plut. 06.34	195	127r-203v	11th
	Jerusalem, GOP, Taphou 25	1312	128r-203v	11th
	London, BL, Add. 39592	549	112v-169v	11th
	Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M 93 sup.	353	95r-139v	11th
	Moscow, ГИМ, Syn. gr. 44	259	133r-203r	11th
	Moscow, ГИМ, Syn. gr. 46	239	3r-157v	11th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 21	037	176r-273r	11th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 22	040	157r-249r	11th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 189	019	207r-314v	11th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 191	025	122r-235r	11th
	Rhethymno, Βιβλιοθήκη Δικηγορικού Συλλόγου, 2	2994	22r-55v	11th
	Saint Petersburg, PHБ, gr. 667	2539	102r-163v	11th
	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, C.II.4	332	130r- ²⁹	11th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 358	129	176r-272r	11th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 756	137	155r, 156r- 234v	11th
	Zagora, Δημόσια Ιστορική Βιβλιοθήκη, 1	2414	93r, 110r– 169v	11th
	Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 611	746	157v-275v	11th/1
	Athos, Μ. Διονυσίου, 588	2458	140r-222v	11th/2
	Patmos, Μ. Αγ. Ιωάννου του Θεολόγου, 80	1164	132v-191r	11th/2
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 154	077	137r-214v	11th/2
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 432	391	106r-175r	y. 1055
	Saint Petersburg, PH5, Gr. 72	569	181v-268r	y. 1061
	Escorial, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio, Y.II.8	233	132r-217v	12th
	Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1300		112v-203r	12th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 709		136r-154v	12th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1445	374	86r-134v	12th
	Sinai, Μονὴ Ἁγ. Αἰκατερίνης, Gr. 193	1230	149r-242v	y. 1124
	Athens, EBE, 65	800	106r-175r	13th
	Durham NC, Duke University, David M. Rubenstein Library, K. W. Clark Collection 1	1780	61v-87r	13th
	Sinai, Μονὴ Ἁγ. Αἰκατερίνης, Gr. 303	1253	105r-183r	14th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1741		53r-89r	14th
	Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 180	222	167r-274v	14th

²⁹ According to Georgi Parpulov the manuscript suffered fire damage in 1904; PARPULOV, *Catena Manuscripts*, 41.

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
,	Athos, Μ. Δοχειαρίου, 76	978	183r-308v	y. 1360/61
	Athos, Μ. Βατοπεδίου, 247	1535	170r-255v	16th
	Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, AF XIV.15	1814	233r-363r	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Reg. gr. 5	885	227r-367v	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1090	861	188r-356r	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1767		130r-143v	16th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 2348	2480	1r-92r	16th
C133	Paris BnF, Suppl. gr. 1076	754	206r-339v	10th/2
	Athos, Μ. Βατοπεδίου, 248	1437	1r-160v	11th
	Moscow, SHM, Син. гр. 41	237	118r-205v	11th
	Vatican, BAV, Reg. gr. 3	884	1r-9v, 16r- 111v	11th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 757	138	155r-267r	11th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 758	139	2r-84v	11th
	Venice, BNM, Z.27 (341)	210	166r-240v	11th
	Venice, BNM, Z.28	357	4r-136r	11th
	Bologna, Biblioteca Comunale dell'Archiginnasio, A 3	2482	85v–129r	14th
C134	Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 20	381	1r-2v, 9r- 226r	12th/1
	Vatican, BAV, Reg. gr. 3	884	10r-15, 112r-119v	14th/1
C135	Athos, Μ. Βατοπεδίου, 530	2187	1r-585v	12th
	Athos, M. Ἰβήρων, 1439		1r-8v	12th
	Athos, M. Ίβήρων, 371 and Athens, EBE, Taphu 466	1016	1r–409r, 409r–410r	12th
	Florence, BML, Conv. soppr. 176	362	1r-314v	12th
	Rome, Bibl. Angelica, gr. 100	846	1r-343r	12th
	Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 71	434	1r-424r	12th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1642	1822	1r-295r	12th/1
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1611	1821	1r-320v	1116-17
	Munich, BSB, gr. 473	426	1v-415r	14th
	Paris, BnF, Coislin 201	1264	3r-605v	14th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 2573	2593	1r-289v	14th
	Venice, BNM, Z.494	598	3r-58v	14th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 208	313	1r-460v	14 th –15th
	Vatican, BAV, Ottob. Gr. 100	879	2r-105r	15th
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 759	859	1r-261v	15th
	Milan, Bibl. Ambros., O 245 sup.		19r-20r	16th
	Paris, BnF, gr. 193		144r-172r	16th
	Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 715	853	3r-319v	16th
	Rome, BNC, S.A. Valle 100		119r-350v	16th

Catena type	Shelfmark	GA	Luke folios	Century
	Perpignan, Bibliothèque municipale, 13	2980	1-548	y. 1552
	Munich, BSB, gr. 33		1r-397v	y. 1553
	Athos, M. Ἰβήρων, 371	1016bis	410r-626r	y. 1576
C137.2	Munich, BSB, gr. 208	053	235r-248v	10th
C137.3	Cambridge, Univ. Lib, MS Add. 10062	040	3r-89v	9th/1
	Prague, Národní Knihovna České republiky XXV B 7	1422	188r-292r	10th/1
	Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 273		1r-2v, 271r- 274v, 3r-4v	12th
C137.4	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 349	127	183r-292r	11th/2
C137.6	Florence, BML, Conv. soppr. 159	200	104r-167r	11th
C137.7	Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 612	747	188r-296v	y. 1163/4
	Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1248	2111	12r-23v	13th
C137.9	Venice, BNM, Z.495 (1048)	599	373r-434v	15th/2
C137.10	Drama, M. Κοσινίτσης, 3	1424	85r-130r	12th
C137.11	Paris, BnF, Suppl. gr. 1225	1293	131r-218v	10th
C139.1	Jerusalem, GOP, Taphou 28	1313	102v-165r	10th
	Athens, EBE, 2364	809	152r-228r	10th/2
C139.2	Rome, Acc. dei Lincei, Corsin. 41.G.16 Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, W 139	591 2604	58r-v, 69r-v, 72r-75v, 46r-v, 76r-79v, 97r-v, 80r-82v, 52r-v, 101r-v, 82r-84v, 54r-v, 85r-v, 60r-v, 47r-v, 70r-v, 59r-v, 87r-v, 62r-v 115r-174v 180v, 182r-277	10th/2 12th 11th
			277r	
	Paris, BnF, gr. 230	012	295, 297–461	11th
	Athens, Βιβλιοθήκη Σπύρου Λοβέρδου, 63	2637	170r-279v	11 th /1
	Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1229	143	130r-211v	11th/2
	Athos, Μ. Αγ. Παντελεήμονος, 217 Athos, Μ. Διονυσίου, 80	951	125r–247r 177v, 179r– 274r	13th y. 1316/7

1.1.2 Layout in catenae manuscripts of Luke

It is common knowledge that two types of layouts dominate the catena manuscripts of the New Testament.³⁰ Most of the catenae on Luke copied before the end of the eleventh century are frame catenae. The alternating catena became popular in Lukan tradition from the twelfth century onwards but is also attested earlier: the earliest surviving alternating catena on Luke comes from the ninth century (Moscow, GIM, Sinod. gr. 384, ff. 1r-54r) and twenty-six other alternating catena manuscripts on Luke were copied in the tenth century.31

Table 2 presents the layout of surviving catena manuscripts of Luke. Out of the 184 witnesses, 98 manuscripts represent an alternating catena and 86 manuscripts a frame catena. The table shows that the frame catena layout is predominant in the eleventh century. From the twelfth century onwards, most extant manuscripts transmit an alternating catena.

century	frame catena	alternating catena
VIII/IX	1	0
IX	0	1
X	22	26
XI	51	10
XII	4	20
XIII	4	2
XIV	2	10
XV	0	5
XVI	2	24
	86	98

Table 2: Layout of Catena Manuscripts of Luke

This table does not allow us to draw conclusions about the original layout of catenae on Luke. Dorival suggested that the frame catena layout was preceded by a layout in two columns: one for the biblical verses and one for the exegesis.32 Other scholars have suggested that the frame catena layout originated in commentaries in which a set of

³⁰ HOUGHTON - PARKER, "An Introduction", 8-10. In Sautel's terminology, these types are the "commentaire à agencement autonome" and the "glose à agencement subordonnée": Jacques-Hubert SAUTEL, "Essai de terminologie de la mise en page des manuscrits à commentaire," Gazette du livre mediéval 35 (1999), (17-31), esp. 18-19.

³¹ GA 33; GA 1412; GA 832; GA 1980; Paris, BnF, gr. 701; Rome, Angel., gr. 67; Vatican, BAV, Arch. Cap. S. Pietro B. 59; Florence, Laur., S. Marco 687; GA 2110; Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 117; Cambridge, Trinity Coll., B.07.01 (178); Patmos, Ioannu 59; Paris, BnF, gr. 704.

³² DORIVAL, "Biblical Catenae", 76–77.

marginal comments had been added to a biblical exemplar.³³ The latter possibility is attractive but difficult to prove, given the paucity of evidence for catenae in the earliest period. Overall, there is a sense that frame catenae are older for it seems easier for a catenist to turn these into alternating catenae than vice versa.

The oldest extant catena manuscript of Luke, the so-called Codex Zacynthius (C137.3), probably copied in the ninth century, transmits a frame catena although the date of its composition is unclear.³⁴ C130, which Reuss identifies as the oldest type of catena, and C131, which is an expansion of this catena, are highly likely to originate in the same original compilation produced in the sixth century.³⁵ The textual comparison of Codex Zacynthius and C130 and C131 shows that the former does not rely on the latter two types. Yet textual affinities point to a common source for a number of exegetical extracts included in them.³⁶ Fifty-five manuscripts of type C130 are identified in Parpulov's catalogue. The oldest extant witness of this type is an alternating catena dated to the ninth century (Moscow, GIM, Sinod. gr. 384).³⁷ Yet eight codices of this type dated between the tenth and the eleventh century transmit a frame catena, 38 whereas twentyfive further manuscripts of the same period preserve the comments of C130 in the alternating catena layout.³⁹ C131 which, as noted, is an extended version of C130, is less widely attested than C130, with only fourteen manuscripts. 40 The majority of these – ten manuscripts from between the tenth and the eleventh century – bear a frame catena on Luke. 41 The alternating catena layout for C131 appears much later: one fifteenth-century and two sixteenth-century manuscripts. 42 The same holds true for the dominant layout of type C132, the best attested catena, appearing in 63 of the 184 witnesses. The oldest extant witnesses are twelve manuscripts dated to the 10th century. Four have an

³³ HOUGHTON, "The Layout and Structure", 59–96. On the layout of Latin commentaries see: H.A.G. HOUGHTON, "The Layout of Early Latin Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and their Oldest Manuscripts," in *Studia Patristica XCI. Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Patristics Conference* (ed. Markus VINZENT; Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2017), 71–112.

³⁴ The other extant representatives of this catena – the twelfth-century Vatican, BAV, Pal. gr. 273 and the tenth-century GA 1422 preserve the scholia in the frame catena layout, too.

³⁵ REUSS, Lukas-Kommentare, XI.

³⁶ Panagiotis Manafis, "Catenae on Luke", 147–153.

³⁷ This codex is after Codex Zacynthius the oldest catena manuscript of Luke.

³⁸ The frame catena layout is found in: GA 1080; GA 2097; GA 020; GA 050; GA 215; GA 300; GA 773; GA 048.

³⁹ The alternating catena layout is found in: GA 055; GA 1411; GA 1412; Cambridge, Trinity College, B.VII.1; Rome, Bibl. Angelica, gr. 67; Paris, BnF, Cosilin 71; Paris, BnF, gr. 231; Paris, BNF, gr. 704; Paris, BnF, gr. 701; Florence, BML, San Marco 687; Patmos, Ioannu, 59; Patmos, Ioannu, 60; GA 033; GA 832; GA 2110; Paris, BnF, gr. 703; Vatican, BAV, Archivio di S. Pietro B 59; Vatican, BAV, Barb. gr. 562; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T.1.4; GA 2453; Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 1692; GA 1266; GA 1507; GA 1980.

⁴⁰ Reuss, Lukas-Kommentare, XII.

⁴¹ GA 108; GA 329; GA 034; GA 039; GA 194; GA 1684; GA 301; GA 771; GA 1078; London, British Library, Harley 5540 (114).

⁴² Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 334; Venice, BNM, Z.545 (410); GA 1980; GA 2838.

alternating catena, 43 whereas eight have a frame catena. 44 The catena of type C133 is, in fact, an expanded version of C132. The oldest surviving manuscript of this type, Paris BnF, Suppl. gr. 1076, ff. 206r–339v (GA 754), which is dated to the second half of the tenth century, contains a frame catena of Luke. Four further manuscripts of C133, dated to the eleventh century, also transmit the comments in the frame catena layout. 45 In C134, most of the passages come from Cyril's commentary on Luke, along with the same principal authors found in C131.46 C134 is present in a total of three manuscripts: the twelfth-century GA 381 with a frame catena, and the fourteenth-century GA 884 and the seventeenth-century GA 868, a copy of GA 381, both in alternating format. The catena of Nicetas of Heraclea, C135, is transmitted by twenty-two manuscripts dated from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. All contain the C135 form in the alternating catena layout.⁴⁷ As for the manuscripts preserving a unique catena of Luke, the representatives of C137.2 (GA 053, saec. x) and C137.9 (GA 599, saec. xv) have the scholia in the alternating catena layout, whereas the representatives of C137.4 (GA 127, saec. xi), C137.6 (GA 200, saec. xi), C137.7 (GA 747 and 2111, saec. xii and xiii), C137.10 (GA 1424, saec. x)⁴⁸ and C137.11 (GA 1293, saec. x) transmit the comments in the frame catena layout. Finally, the newly identified catena C139.1 is attested in four manuscripts: all of them have the exegetical extracts in the frame catena layout.49

It can thus be seen that the catena tradition of the Gospel according of Luke has a remarkable variety in both the exegetical comments accompanying the biblical text and the format in which these comments are transmitted. Collections of exegetical excerpts are not merely attempts to organize knowledge, but they also attribute authority to this particular type of knowledge. Future research on whether theological motivation can be detected behind choices regarding layout or the presence of certain paratextual features in collections of exegetical comments (e.g., the identification of the patristic source or the use of symbols connecting the biblical text with the comments) is required. Yet it seems that such collections of excerpts do not only affirm the importance of citations from authoritative patristic figures, but they also attest to the value of accurate copies - in terms of layout and contents - of series of excerpts composed by certain authoritative compilers. It is noteworthy that series of exegetical excerpts attributed to Nicetas of Heraclea and Theophylact, the eleventh-century archbishop of Bulgaria, display a

⁴³ Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 117; Patmos, Ioannu, 177; Vienna, ÖNB, Theol. gr. 301.

⁴⁴ GA 024; GA 299; GA 2812; GA 036; GA 095; GA 964; GA 1392; GA 151.

⁴⁵ GA 237; GA 139; GA 210; GA 1437.

⁴⁶ C134 contains a small number of extracts which are not found in any other catena of Luke, such as a comment by Modestus of Jerusalem on Luke 24:40 and a passage on Luke 6:1 attributed to Caesarius.

⁴⁷ GA 313; GA 362; GA 426; GA 434; GA 846; GA 853; GA 859; Athos, M. Τβήρων, 371 and GA 1016; GA 1016; GA 1264; GA 2593; GA 1821; GA 1822; GA 2187; GA 598; GA 2980; Munich, BSB, gr. 33; GA 879; Paris, BnF, gr. 193; Milan, Bibl. Ambros., O 245 sup.; Rome, BNC, S.A. Valle 100.

⁴⁸ It is worth noting that the commentary in GA 1424 was copied 200 years after the biblical text.

⁴⁹ GA 591; GA 809; GA 2517; GA 1313.

lesser degree of variety in terms of layout and paratextual features. For the other catena types of Luke, it would be tempting to assume that choices regarding the exegetical passages included in a catena, as well as the layout, the identification of source texts, and the division of the biblical verses and comments signify local traditions rather than the idiosyncrasies of copyists. This calls for an investigation of the relationship of the manuscripts of each catena type along with the place where they were copied (where this can be determined). The present study and presentation of previously unknown catenae of Luke aims to pave the way for such future research on this cluster of commentaries.

In what follows, the manuscripts transmitting a unique catena of Luke are examined in terms of content and structure. In Part 2 their comments on Luke are edited for the first time. This volume includes the following manuscripts: Munich, BSB, gr. 208; Vatican, BAV, Vat. gr. 349; Florence, BML, conv. soppr. 159; Paris, BnF, suppl. gr. 1225. The two newly suggested manuscripts for the group of *codices singuli* of Luke (Venice, BNM, Z.495 [1048] and Drama, M. Koσινίτσης, 3) merit a separate study and are therefore not included in the present volume. Yet the four manuscripts of C139.1 (Rome, Accademia dei Lincei e Corsiniana, 41.G.16; Athens, EBE, 2364; Jerusalem, GOP, Taphou 28; Athens, Ch. G. Sarros Collection, 1) are presented here. The text of the catena type C139.1 is edited in Part 2 of this volume as well.