# Introduction

Codex Zacynthius is a palimpsest manuscript, the undertext of which contains portions of a commentary on the Gospel according to Luke in the form known as a catena. The manuscript first become known to scholarship in 1820, when it was presented by Prince Comuto to General Colin Macaulay on the island of Zakynthos (Zante), hence its name. It was donated to the British and Foreign Bible Society the following year. In 2014, following a public appeal, the manuscript was purchased by Cambridge University Library where it currently bears the shelfmark MS Additional 10062. Between 2018 and 2020, the Arts and Humanities Research Council funded the Codex Zacynthius Project, led by David Parker and Hugh Houghton at the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing (ITSEE) in the University of Birmingham, to make a thorough examination of the manuscript. This included the production of multispectral images of the codex and a complete electronic transcription of both the undertext and the overtext, published online on the Cambridge Digital Library.1

The present volume is an edition of the palimpsest undertext, along with an English translation of the catena. It draws on the material produced by the Codex Zacynthius Project for its electronic edition of the manuscript. As a printed edition was not one of the planned outputs of that project, this book has been prepared under the auspices of the European Research Council CATENA Project, led by Hugh Houghton at ITSEE between 2018 and 2023. It was felt that the permanence of a printed text, along with the presentation of the transcription and translation on facing pages, would provide a useful complement to the digital edition. In addition, the preparation of this volume has permitted the CATENA Project to undertake further investigations, building on the work of the Codex Zacynthius Project. These have included the identification of a further manuscript witness to the first portion of the catena of Codex Zacynthius (corresponding to folios IIIr-XXv), which includes the text of portions of commentary on pages which were not used for the palimpsest. The evidence from this manuscript, Codex Palatinus (Vatican City, BAV, Palatinus graecus 273)—which includes the majority of the least legible pages

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/codexzacynthius/. A full description of the Project, along with its findings, is published as H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker, ed., Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Palimpsest, Lectionary (T&S 3.21. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2020): reference should be made to this set of studies for a fuller discussion of all the matters touched on in this introduction.

of Codex Zacynthius—has been incorporated in the present transcription, as well as an update to the electronic edition initially released in January 2020.<sup>2</sup>

## The Manuscript

The date at which the original manuscript of Codex Zacynthius was produced is unclear. Based on the style of writing and form of the catena, Parker and Birdsall proposed in a 2004 article that it was copied around the year 700.3 On the basis of the complete set of information now provided by the multispectral images created for the Codex Zacynthius Project, including examples of decoration and other features (such as accentuation), Parker maintains 700 as the earliest admissible palaeographical date for the manuscript, but allows that 'anything up to the middle of the ninth century' may be considered.4 In the same study, Parker notes some changes in presentation which suggest that the manuscript was the work of several scribes despite the overall consistency of the scripts. The clearest disjunctures occur at two points: on folio XXXVIr the size of the catena section numbers reduces significantly and the *paragraphos* symbol begins to be used (see Plate 5); from folio LXXr, numbers and titles start to be written in red ink (indicated by bold text in the present edition; see Plate 7). Parker also draws attention to inconsistencies in the decoration and script of the paratextual features, suggesting that these may have been added at different points. Given the paucity of evidence for Greek majuscule script between the sixth and ninth centuries, points of comparison for Codex Zacynthius are relatively few.

The catena manuscript was palimpsested around the end of the twelfth century and overwritten with a Greek gospel lectionary following the Constantinopolitan rite (Lectionary 299 in the Gregory-Aland *Liste*). This was the work of a copyist named Neilos, who copied two other lectionaries for the monastery of Patmos while on the island of Rhodes: all three books feature marginal verses which mention the name Neilos, although these are most prominent in Codex Zacynthius. The lectionary consists of 176 folios, measuring 280 mm in height and 170–178 mm in width. Apart from folio 173, a replacement paper leaf added in the fourteenth century, all the pages of the lectionary are made up of parchment leaves from the catena manuscript: there are a total of 86 leaves and 3 half pages (folios VII, LXVIII and LXXXIX). Although the catena pages were numbered sequentially by Tregelles, using Roman numerals, they do not present a continuous text. Instead,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A full presentation of Codex Palatinus is given by Panagiotis Manafis in a forthcoming article.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> D.C. Parker and J.N. Birdsall, 'The Date of Codex Zacynthius ( $\Xi$ ): A New Proposal,' *JTS* ns 55.1 (2004), 117–131.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> D.C. Parker, 'The Undertext Writing,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 19–32, here 31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See further A.C. Myshrall, 'An Introduction to Lectionary 299,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 169–268, especially 196–202.

there are twenty-eight separate portions of the original manuscript, ranging from half-leaves to a run of ten consecutive folios.

The beginning of the catena manuscript is extant, consisting of a short preface to the catena (fol. Ir; Plate 1) and a synoptic table of chapters (folios Iv–IIv; Plate 2), in which Luke is compared with the other three gospels. The catena itself begins on folio IIIr (Plate 3), with Luke 1:1, and gives out in the commentary on Luke 11:33 on folio LXXXIXv. Houghton and Parker note that 359 of the first 545 verses of the Gospel according to Luke are present in whole or in part, and estimate that the whole gospel would have occupied around 240 folios. This total, along with the prefatory matter focusing on Luke, suggests that the original manuscript only contained this one gospel. The original size of the pages was around 350 mm high and at least 300 mm wide, making the manuscript roughly square in appearance. The loss of text in the top margin and right margin of fol. Iv indicates that the pages have been trimmed slightly (see Plate 2), but this has not affected any of the text or marginalia of the catena. Due to the tight binding of the lectionary, however, there are often one or two lines of text which are illegible in the central gutter of the manuscript.

The commentary, a compilation of extracts from early Christian writers arranged in the sequence of the biblical text, is written in the format known as a 'frame catena'. A portion of the gospel is written in the central portion of each page, while the commentary is arranged in the three outer margins, spanning the whole page above and below the biblical text and in a narrower column alongside the gospel verses. While a large biblical majuscule script is used for the gospel, the commentary is written in a smaller upright pointed majuscule (and the preface in slanting pointed majuscule). The biblical text is divided into a series of numbered portions of differing lengths. These numbers are used to connect the commentary to the corresponding verses, as described in the preface to the catena (fol. Ir). Each of these 'catena sections' has between one and five different extracts, with the numbering restarting every time the number one hundred is reached. The majority of the extracts also have an indication of their source written directly above the commentary. Ten authors are identified in this way: Cyril of Alexandria (on 83 occasions), Titus of Bostra

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> For more on the preface, which is found in numerous other catena manuscripts but may be original to the catena of Codex Zacynthius, see further H.A.G. Houghton, 'The Layout and Structure of the Catena,' *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 59–96, especially 67–8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker, 'The Gospel of Luke in the Palimpsest,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest*, 33–58; see 33.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See H.A.G. Houghton and 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. H.A.G. Houghton. T&S 3.13. Piscataway NJ: Gorgias, 2016), 1–35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Parker, 'The Undertext Writing,' 19.

(38), Origen (29), Severus of Antioch (24), Victor the Presbyter (5), John Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium and Eusebius of Caesarea (4 each), Basil of Caesarea (3) and Apollinarius (1). Thirty-two extracts are indicated as 'unattributed' (ἐξ ἀνεπιγράφου; see Plate 5), suggesting that they were taken from an earlier collection in which sources were not named. Fourteen extracts have no title or are indicated as 'Other', while sixty-nine scholia are introduced as continuations from the same source as the previous extract. It has been possible to identify the source of 329 of the 343 extant scholia, all of which are from the ten authors already mentioned by name. 10 However, only forty-three of these can be verified from the surviving direct tradition of these writers; 286 are transmitted in other published catena compilations (sometimes with different attributions), while fourteen appear not to have been published elsewhere. Certain extracts from Severus and Isidore also give the title of the work in the initial heading (e.g. Plate 4). Where the commentary extends over several pages, the gospel text in the central panel is repeated. Luke 2:21 and 9:1 are written three times for this reason. Conversely, there are two pages with no scholia (folios XXXV and LXIr), indicating that the copyist intended to provide a complete text of Luke to accompany the commentary; on other pages, one or two of the margins are left blank where there are no extracts.

As the only surviving New Testament catena manuscript in which both the commentary and the biblical text is written in majuscule script, Codex Zacynthius has long been considered to be the oldest surviving example of this genre by around two centuries. A terminus post quem for the date of the compilation is the death of Severus of Antioch, the latest author included in the catena, in 538. As Severus is referred to as 'Saint Severus' in several scholia titles (despite his condemnation for heresy), it seems probable that some time had elapsed following his death. Nevertheless, Lamb's observation that the catena shows little evidence of the mid-seventh century promotion of the doctrine of 'Monenergism' suggests that it may have been assembled before that date. Manafis notes that, despite a few shared scholia, the catena of Codex Zacynthius largely stands apart from the main traditions of Lukan catenae, as identified in the Clavis Patrum Graecorum: of the 215 catena manuscripts of Luke, this compilation is only found in two fragmentary manuscripts, Codex Zacynthius and Codex Palatinus (Vatican City, BAV, Palatinus graecus

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See Panagiotis Manafis, 'The Sources of Codex Zacynthius and their Treatment,' *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 97–120 and Appendix 2 in the present volume.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> William Lamb, 'A Question of Attribution: The Theological Significance of the Catena in Codex Zacynthius,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 121–136; see especially 133–5.

273), with a later development from a similar origin in Codex Parisinus (Paris, BnF, supplément grec 612). As would befit a catena manuscript from early in the tradition, Codex Zacynthius is largely accurate in its identification of scholia and preserves a good text of the sources quoted, albeit with frequent abbreviation and other editorial interventions. However, there are several instances on which the attribution is demonstrably incorrect (e.g. the occasions when Titus appears in place of Cyril of Alexandria). In addition, there are several minor copying errors as well as the omission of an entire phrase due to homoeoteleuton on folio LXr. These, along with indications that the copyist was adjusting the layout of the manuscript *in scribendo* (e.g. folios Vr, XIIIv, XLIIIv, LIVr, LXr) demonstrate that Codex Zacynthius is a copy of another catena manuscript. This is also shown by the incorporation of what appears to be a short scholium into the biblical text at Luke 7:31 on folio XLVIIv (οὐκέτι ἐκείνοις διελέγετο ἀλλὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς). The copying of additional marginal comments by the first hand (e.g. VIIIv, XVIIIv [Plate 4]; possibly also XXr, LXXIVr) suggests that the exemplar was also in frame catena format.

The gospel text in Codex Zacynthius is recognised as being of high quality. The manuscript is a consistently-cited witness in NA28, with the siglum  $\Xi$  (or GA 040). In the majority of variation units, it corresponds to the reconstructed editorial text of this edition, although it also transmits readings which characterise an early stage of the Byzantine text. To Overall, the closest witness to the gospel text of Codex Zacynthius is the eighth-century majuscule Codex Regius (Paris, BnF, grec 62; GA 019). The marginal gloss on folio LXIr is worthy of note: this supplies a Byzantine form of Luke 9:10, εἰς ἔρημον τόπον πόλεως καλουμένης alongside the reading of the main text, εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην. The latter is a rare form also found in P75, Codex Sinaiticus (GA 01), Codex Vaticanus (GA 03) and Codex Regius, and adopted as the editorial text in NA28.

Codex Zacynthius has two other systems of division of the text of Luke, in addition to the catena sections. One is the standard set of eighty-three Byzantine chapter divisions (*kephalaia*), accompanied by the *titloi* which summarise the content of each chapter. These are written above the biblical text or in the top margin of the relevant page (e.g. Plate 5). All eighty-three are also found in an initial list on folios Iv to IIv, where the numbers of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> See Panagiotis Manafis, 'Catenae on Luke and the Catena of Codex Zacynthius,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 137–68; for the CPG, Maurits Geerard and Jacques Noret, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. IV Concilia. Catenae. Editio aucta* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018). The catena of Codex Zacynthius is identified there as C137.3, with Codex Palatinus as C137.5; in the online *Clavis Clavium* platform, the catena of Codex Parisinus has been assigned the siglum C137.7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Scholia 186-1, 188-2, 271-2, 276-1 and 277-1; note also the overlap between Severus and Origen mentioned by Manafis, 'The Sources of Codex Zacynthius,' especially scholia 080-2 and 081-1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> See further Houghton, 'The Layout and Structure of the Catena,' 65, 68–70.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> See further Houghton and Parker, 'The Gospel of Luke in the Palimpsest,' 51.

the corresponding chapters in John, Matthew and Mark are also added (see Plate 2). Codex Zacynthius is the earliest surviving example of these *capitula parallela*, which become common in later centuries. In addition, this manuscript is the only other witness to a series of gospel divisions known as the Vatican Paragraphs from their appearance in the fourth-century Codex Vaticanus (GA 03). In Codex Zacynthius, these are added in the margins in larger script, often on both sides of the biblical text and preceded by a cross with serifs which resembles the letter *psi* in the manuscript (examples on Plates 3, 4 and 7). The offset ink on folio LXXVIv from the Vatican paragraph at the top of the opposite page suggests that these numbers were added separately at a later stage in the manuscript's production or use, without time for the ink to dry properly before the page was turned. Nevertheless, the presence of these two systems of division, in addition to the careful layout of the catena and the high quality of the biblical text, supports the characterisation of Codex Zacynthius as a manuscript produced for scholarly use.

## The Transcription

An edition of the gospel text of the manuscript was produced by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles in 1861, using the British Museum's Alexandrian typeface to imitate the script of the manuscript. <sup>17</sup> Study of the catena, however, had to wait until 1950 when J. Harold Greenlee spent a year in Oxford at the invitation of G.D. Kilpatrick as a Senior Fulbright Fellow. In addition to three short published articles on the manuscript, including a list of corrections to Tregelles' edition, Greenlee made a transcription of the catena text based on what could be read in sunlight on a window ledge of the Bodleian Library. <sup>18</sup> Despite the provision of a lengthy introduction, Greenlee's edition was never published. <sup>19</sup> Extensive use was made of his transcription three decades later by Joseph Reuss in his collection of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> See further Houghton and Parker, 'The Gospel of Luke in the Palimpsest.' 34–7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, Codex Zacynthius (*E*). Greek Palimpsest Fragments of the Gospel of Saint Luke, Obtained in the Island of Zante, by the late General Colin Macaulay, and now in the Library of The British and Foreign Bible Society (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1861).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> J.H. Greenlee, 'A Corrected Collation of Codex Zacynthius (Cod. E),' *JBL* 76 (1957): 237–41; J.H. Greenlee, 'Some Examples of Scholarly "Agreement in Error" *JBL* 77.4 (1958): 363–4.; J.H. Greenlee, 'The Catena of Codex Zacynthius,' *Biblica* 40 (1959): 992–1001. For Greenlee's method of working, as related in his personal correspondence to J.N. Birdsall, see D.C. Parker, 'History of Research on Codex Zacynthius,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 1–8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> The introduction has now been published as J.H. Greenlee, 'Codex Zacynthius: The Catena and the Text of Luke,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 281–300.

material from commentaries on Luke only preserved in catenae, the bulk of which is constituted by Cyril of Alexandria. <sup>20</sup> The principal published edition of a catena on Luke remains that of John Anthony Cramer in 1844, relying on just two manuscripts, which provides some comparative material for Codex Zacynthius. <sup>21</sup> In addition to Cramer, Greenlee also consulted an even earlier compilation by Angelo Mai of material from Cyril of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch to fill out some of the less legible portions of the manuscript, as well as the collection of some of the *Homilies on Luke* by Titus of Bostra made by Joseph Sickenberger and the first edition of Rauer's GCS volume of the fragments from Origen's *Homilies on Luke* preserved in catenae and Jerome's Latin translation. <sup>22</sup>

The Codex Zacynthius Project was able to make use of a typescript copy of Greenlee's transcription acquired by David Parker from the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California, in 1997. Both this and Tregelles' edition of the gospel text were transcribed into electronic files by Rachel Kevern and Panagiotis Manafis while the new imaging for the project was in progress. The multispectral images were created by members of the Early Manuscripts Electronic Library team (EMEL) and the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures at the University of Hamburg in Cambridge in July 2018. Fifty-one high-resolution digital photographs were taken of each page using different wavelengths of light (from infrared to ultraviolet) as well as X-ray.<sup>23</sup> These were then combined by Roger Easton and Keith Knox in such a way as to maximise the legibility of the undertext. The most successful images, based on three particular wavelengths, were known as 'triples' and were used exclusively by the transcribers for their superior legibility.<sup>24</sup> In them, the main undertext is artificially coloured dark blue, with rubrication as mid-blue; the distraction of the overtext is reduced by the use of a light blue or cyan colour

to this.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Joseph Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (TU 130. Berlin: Akademie, 1984).
<sup>21</sup> John Anthony Cramer, *Catenarum Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum Tomus II in Evangelia S. Lucae et S. Joannis* (Oxford: OUP, 1844). His manuscripts for Luke are Paris, BnF, Coislin grec 23 (GA 39, saec. xi) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. Gr. 33 (GA 50, saec. xii).
<sup>22</sup> Angelo Mai, ed., *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum. Tomus X* (Rome: Collegium Urbanum, 1838); Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien* (TU 21.1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901); Max Rauer, *Origenes: Werke. Neunter Band. Die Homilien zu Lukas* (GCS 35. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1935: a second edition was published in 1959). Greenlee does not mention Sickenberger's later collection of material from Cyril of Alexandria (1909), and his partial transcription of scholium 279-2 on folios LXXIIr–v indicates that he did not have recourse

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> The raw images have been made available on the University of Birmingham Institutional Research Archive, at <a href="https://edata.bham.ac.uk/428">https://edata.bham.ac.uk/428</a> (DOI: 10.25500/eData.bham.00000428).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> A fuller description of the process is given in H.A.G. Houghton, 'The Codex Zacynthius Project,' in *Codex Zacynthius: Catena, Lectionary, Palimpsest* (ed. Houghton and Parker), 9–18 (especially 10-13), as well as a YouTube video: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XxXb8qBYgPQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XxXb8qBYgPQ</a>.

for black ink and purple for red ink. Seven of these images are included in the section of plates in the current volume, and the full series is available in high resolution online in the electronic edition in the Cambridge Digital Library.<sup>25</sup>

Once the imaging was completed (including the joining of the two pages which made up each folio of the original), the files of Tregelles and Greenlee were revised on the basis of the new images. Greenlee's transcription was unlineated, so Manafis added full details of layout during his comparison of the typescript and the manuscript. Differences from Tregelles' edition, along with Greenlee's published corrections, were mentioned as notes in the transcription. Given the increased legibility of the catena on the new images, changes to Greenlee's unpublished transcription were not recorded, although it was noted when this was used to supply text no longer visible: Greenlee was sometimes able to see further into the gutter than possible on the new photographs. Manafis also applied his research on other catenae, as well as printed editions, to confirm difficult readings. The related catena in Codex Parisinus was particularly helpful in this regard during the production of the initial transcription.<sup>26</sup>

The completed transcription of the catena went through multiple iterations of revision. The basic text file was used by Houghton as the basis for the first version of the English translation, during which unexpected or problematic readings were reviewed (see below). The file was also converted into XML for the purpose of archiving, and from that into HTML for presentation in the Cambridge Digital Library. An online rendering of each HTML page using a cascading stylesheet (CSS) developed by Catherine Smith was proofread against the images by Amy Myshrall, with any changes to the transcription also made in the XML file. During Houghton's final revision of the translation, which included cross-checking with published scholia collections and the updating of the references to printed editions, the transcription was again revisited. Towards the end of this process, Manafis identified Codex Palatinus as a second witness to the first eighteen folios of the catena and revised the transcription of this section. This remarkable discovery enabled the full reconstruction of the text of Codex Zacynthius on some of the most poorlypreserved pages of the manuscript, including unpublished scholia on folios VIIIv, XVr and XXr. A transcription of the seven pages missing from Codex Zacynthius but present in Codex Palatinus will be published separately in a forthcoming article by Manafis.

The multispectral images enabled the present editors to adjudicate when Tregelles and Greenlee differed in their account of the gospel text.<sup>27</sup> Almost all of Greenlee's corrections were confirmed, with the exception of Luke 7:33 ( $\alpha\rho\tau\sigma^{-}$ ) and 10:21 ( $\sigma\sigma$ ) where

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-10062-UNDERTEXT/1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> For a comparison of these two catenae, see Manafis, 'Catenae on Luke and the Catena of Codex Zacynthius,' 154–8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> For a list of these, see Greenlee, 'A Corrected Collation.'

Tregelles' readings were upheld. On two occasions, the editors preferred a different reading to both predecessors, reading estyl at Luke 6:36 and samapyths at Luke 10:33. The transcription makes eleven further corrections to Tregelles which were not noted by Greenlee, along with several more minor alterations involving the disposition of marginal numbers or the division of words across lines. The full list of these is as follows:<sup>28</sup>

```
1:6
        ενωπιον ] εναντιον
1:22
        εωρακεν ] εορακεν
2:36
        aννης ] aννας (in the titlos)
5:27
       του ] τον (in the titlos)
        αυτη δε ] εκεινη
7:21
8:30
        οτι: no erasure
8:46
       εξελθουσαν ] εξεληλυθυιαν
9:3
        μητε δυο ] μηδε δυο
10:1
        ετερους ] ετερου
10:1
        ημελλεν ] εμελλεν
10:33 κατ αυτον ] κατ.εν.<sup>29</sup>
```

As the catena has not previously been printed, differences between this and other editions of the same scholia are not noted consistently, although a few are mentioned when they result in a text different to that underlying a published translation. Reuss cites Codex Zacynthius frequently and accurately in his collection of material from Cyril of Alexandria, based on Greenlee's typescript, although there are three further extracts from Cyril identified by the project which do not appear in Reuss (scholia 171-2, 198-1 and 329-1), and those in Reuss' third sequence of material attributed to Cyril are only given as an *incipit* and *explicit*. The manuscript is not cited in Rauer's edition of Origen's fragments on Luke, while a complete edition of Titus of Bostra and a modern revision of Mai's compilation of Severus of Antioch are *desiderata* to which it is hoped that the present edition may contribute.

The goal of the transcription was to record the entire undertext of the manuscript, consisting of biblical text, commentary and paratextual features such as numbers or titles. The format was reproduced as closely as possible, with an indication of the placing of the titles and marginal numbers. Punctuation was included, comprising capital letters (with an approximate indication of their relative size), blank space, marks such as the *teleia* (full-stop) *ano teleia* (mid point) and high point, symbols at the end of scholia or titles, and the *diple* used to indicate quotations. Many of the punctuation dots, however, are likely to be obscured by the overwriting, while extraneous ink or other material may have resulted in some false positives on the multispectral images: a maximalist policy was adopted in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> This list is reproduced from Houghton and Parker, 'The Gospel of Luke in the Palimpsest,' 45–6, where the new reading at Luke 1:6 is discussed in detail.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> The available space in the manuscript is not sufficient for Tregelles' reading: while the opening characters are visible, the rest of the reading is very unclear.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare*, 54–297.

recording of such cases. The orthography of the manuscript was maintained, along with all abbreviations (including the nomina sacra and the use of supralinear nu), accents, breathings and diaereses where these appear in the text. Where corrections were identified, including adjustments made by the first hand in scribendo, the initial reading was also transcribed. If text was no longer legible, the project team offered a reconstruction based on the sources described above and indicated it accordingly: if no clear parallel could be found, the approximate number of missing characters was noted. Overlines were included where these were used to mark abbreviations and numerals, but no attempt has been made to reproduce decorative lines and dots above titles or the flourishes below certain numerals, such as the Vatican Paragraphs. Decorated initials were noted in footnotes.<sup>31</sup> The different series of paratextual features and numbers were tagged in the electronic transcription, enabling details to be displayed in mouseover boxes; these were also used to give the full form of abbreviations, information about corrections and the identification of the source of each scholium. Biblical verse numbers were supplied in order to assist with navigation. The uncial font GFS Decker was adopted to facilitate comparison of the transcription with the manuscript, although the file consists of standard Unicode characters. The full transcription is available on the University of Birmingham Institutional Research Archive (UBIRA) in two XML files, one for the biblical text (including the kephalaia) and one for the catena; these were combined to produce the Greek text in the electronic edition and the present volume.32

#### The Translation

The translation is intended to render the manuscript and its catena accessible to readers with little or no Greek. An approach has therefore been adopted of being as literal as possible while conforming to English usage. As mentioned above, Houghton created a first draft of the English version directly from the initial transcription, overwriting the Greek in that file: this included attempting to make the English correspond to the original lineation and rendering corrections and supplied text in addition to paratextual features such as titles and numbers. This procedure, however, resulted in several idiosyncracies such as nonsense readings where the manuscript (or, indeed, the transcription) was in error or ambiguous. For example, in scholium 176-1, Codex Zacynthius reads ouv ('accordingly') rather than ou ('not'), giving entirely the opposite sense to that intended; in the second line of scholium 050-1 on folio XIIv where the overline on the *nomen sacrum* is hard to make out,  $\theta \overline{u} \tau \eta \nu$  ('the [nature] of God') was originally transcribed as  $\theta u \tau \eta \nu$  ('sacrifice'); in scholium 270-1, the presence of the diaeresis in  $\pi \rho o \sigma \bar{u} \sigma \nu \nu$  ('they approach') makes it look as if the copyist intended this as two words,  $\pi \rho o \sigma \bar{u} \sigma \nu \nu$  ('towards healing'). While this method of translating resulted in a thorough re-examination of the transcription, as described

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> See further the list of decorations given in Parker, 'The Undertext Writing', where many are illustrated.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> The initial files are at <a href="https://edata.bham.ac.uk/429">https://edata.bham.ac.uk/429</a>, with a revised version matching the present edition at <a href="https://edata.bham.ac.uk/496">https://edata.bham.ac.uk/496</a>.

above, it was felt that the end result attempted to convey too much incidental detail from the transcription (such as the use of *nomina sacra*) and risked misleading its users by reproducing the errors of the manuscript.

Following feedback from William Lamb, who kindly read the whole draft, the translation was then revised on the basis of printed Greek texts and English translations, where these could be identified, in order to take account of the wider tradition of the catena sources. Mai's edition of Severus of Antioch, for example, showed that in scholium 268-3 the addressee is being urged to adopt 'a childlike and youthful condition' (παιδικήν τινα καὶ νεαρὰν ἔξιν) rather than 'to take in marriage a slave girl and young woman' (παιδίσκην τινα καὶ νεαρὰν ἔξειν)! Lamb drew attention to Payne-Smith's translation of the Syriac text of Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on Luke: this proved to be sufficiently literal to enable it to be used for comparison with the Greek original.<sup>33</sup> In fact, when the Syriac manuscripts are not extant Payne Smith translates items from Mai's collection of Greek catena fragments, indicating this by a small marginal note. The preservation of many homilies complete in Syriac, however, offers a fascinating insight into the process of excerption and abbreviation by the compiler of the catena. On occasion, it even clarifies anomalies such as the unexpected conclusion of scholium 296-2 (a μέν-clause with no corresponding δέ) or the symbol in the middle of scholium 328-1. Lienhard's translation of Origen's Homilies on Luke, including many of the catena fragments collected in Rauer's edition, provided a control for much of the material from Origen in Codex Zacynthius insofar as it corresponded to Rauer's text.<sup>34</sup> As with the homilies of Cyril, a translation by Brooks from the Syriac of selected letters of Severus of Antioch offered parallels for two of the scholia.<sup>35</sup> No translation could be found, however, for the other extracts from Severus and the scholia from Titus of Bostra. New Testament quotations in the scholia were taken from the NRSV if their text matched that of NA28, and adjusted accordingly if it did not; Old Testament quotations were translated directly from Greek as they are based on the LXX rather than the Hebrew text of modern Bibles.

The translation of the verses from the Gospel of Luke in the middle of each page followed a similar procedure to that of the catena. The Greek text of the transcription file

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Robert Payne Smith, *The Gospel According to S. Luke by S. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. Now first translated into English from an Ancient Syriac Version* (2 vols. Oxford: OUP, 1859).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Joseph T. Lienhard, *Origen: Homilies on Luke, Fragments on Luke* (Fathers of the Church 94. Washington DC: Catholic University of America, 1996).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Scholia 082-1 and 259:3: see E.W. Brooks, ed. and trans., *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts*. (Patrologia Orientalis 12 and 14. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1919–20). Indeed, before Manafis' identification of Codex Palatinus, attempts were made to reconstruct the illegible Greek text on fol. XXr from Brooks' translation. Although there are four extracts from letters from Severus to Anastasia the Deacon in Brooks' collection, none of these features scholia 204-1 or 204-4.

was replaced with that of the NRSV by Robert Ferro, a pupil from King Edward's School, Birmingham during a work experience placement at ITSEE. When Codex Zacynthius departed from NA28 (or the text underlying the NRSV), the translation was altered to reflect this. Despite repeated attempts by the project to contact the copyright holder of the NRSV to gain approval for the use of their version in this way, no response was forthcoming. For this reason, the translation of the continuous biblical text has not been reproduced in the printed volume. It is hoped that the reference given at the top of each opening and the quotation of verses in the commentary provide sufficient indication of the text under consideration: it may also be borne in mind that the original context from which these scholia were taken did not necessarily include the text of the Gospel. Electronic files of the translation, matching those of the transcription, are also available on the University of Birmingham Institutional Research Archive. <sup>36</sup>

As has already beem mentioned, the translation tends towards a literal rendering of the Greek text in order to assist users in matching it with the text of the manuscript. Some of the connective particles have been omitted and minor emendations have been made when these make better sense and are supported by other witnesses to the same scholia. Punctuation and capitalisation have been supplied in accordance with English usage. Traditional renderings have normally been maintained, such as 'virgin' for παρθένος, 'handmaid' for δούλη, and 'type' for τύπος. An attempt has been made at consistency in translating key theological terms such as ἐνέργεια ('[divine] activity'), οἰκονομία ('dispensation', 'purpose'), οὐσία ('substance'), μονογενής ('only-begotten') οτ ὑπόστασις ('state of being'). The rendering of Ἰουδαίοι always poses a problem in the contemporary world: after some consideration, the choice was made to preserve the traditional rendering of 'Jews', as this is how it would have been understood by the original exegetes. In the case of two common phrases, a literal translation has been replaced with the customary English form: where the Greek reads 'the kingdom of the heavens' this has been translated with a singular, while the instances throughout the catena of 'the God and Father' have been rendered as 'God the Father'. Although infelicities and inaccuracies undoubtedly remain, it is hoped that the translation achieves its goal of enabling a wider public to appreciate this fascinating manuscript and undertake further study.

#### Conventions

The conventions adopted in the printed Greek text are relatively few in number, and reflect the transcription process as described above. Visible text and punctuation is printed in normal type, along with diacritical marks when these occur in the manuscript. Bold face is used for rubrication. Text which has been reconstructed where the original is illegible or parchment has been lost is enclosed in square brackets; where it has not been possible to supply a reconstruction, the approximate number of missing characters is indicated by a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> https://edata.bham.ac.uk/431 (DOI: 10.25500/eData.bham.00000431).

series of dots within square brackets.<sup>37</sup> Thanks to the transmission in other catenae of parallels for most scholia, it has been possible to reconstruct text with a high degree of confidence and to identify as visible letters which are only partially preserved in Codex Zacynthius. On a few occasions, however, characters are marked as unclear by means of an underdot (e.g. the bottom line of folio XXr). Punctuation is rendered by the unicode character closest in appearance. Lines to mark numerals and *nomina sacra* are indicated by a combining overline on each character, although it should be noted that these and underdots are occasionally displaced due to inconsistencies between fonts. Abbreviations (apart from numerals, *nomina sacra* and supralinear *nu*) are expanded in parentheses. The greater flexibility offered by the printed presentation means that the location and relative size of marginal numbers and capital letters has been adjusted to reflect better the actual page. In addition, the disposition of the text on alternate pages enables readers to view a complete opening by looking down from above on either side of the intervening page of translation.

The text on each page represents the final reading that can be made out in the undertext. There appear to be very few corrections, although, as Parker notes, some of the paratextual material may have been added at different points.<sup>38</sup> Where a correction has been identified, details of the earlier reading are provided in a footnote. Some corrections were clearly made by the first hand *in scribendo*, as shown by the letter spacing, and these are indicated as such in the note. Others appear also to have been made at an early stage, but the corrector hand has not been specified: it is not clear how reliably the pseudocolouring of the multispectral images reflects the colour of the original ink (apart from the distinction between black and red) and the letter forms are very similar throughout. Details of the identification of the source of each extract are provided in a footnote which follows the scholium title in the manuscript or, where there is no title, is placed at the beginning of the extract.

While layout and some paratextual features have been retained in the translation presented as part of the electronic edition, in this printed volume the presentation has been standardised. This permits the inclusion below of editorial observations on both the Greek text and the translation in the form of footnotes. These notes refer to the entire opening: although they are numbered sequentially, not all references are present on both pages as some may refer only to the Greek text or the English rendering. Each scholium in the translation begins with the unique identifier assigned by the Codex Zacynthius project. These are based on the 'catena sections' in the manuscript (see above): the first three numbers correspond to the section numbers in sequence, while the suffix indicates the place of the extract within that section. Thus the scholium from Apollinarius at the bottom of folio LIIIv is assigned the number 221-3: it is preceded by the number κA (21) in the third set of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Full stops have never been reconstructed: every dot within square brackets indicates a missing character.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> Parker, 'The Undertext Writing', 30–1.

one hundred, hence 221, and it is the third scholium which appears in this section, hence the suffix 3. Occasionally, the examination of source texts revealed that what is presented as a single scholium in the manuscript combines multiple fragments: in these cases, the scholium has been subdivided by appending a and b to the number (e.g. both scholia on fol. IIIv).<sup>39</sup> A full list of scholia is given in Appendix 2, including details of printed sources. The translation gives the heading of each extract as it appears in Codex Zacynthius in italics, even when this appears to be inaccurate. Biblical quotations are identified in the English text even when these are not marked in the manuscript: verse numbering follows NA28 and the Septuagint of Rahlfs-Hanhart, the principal difference from modern translations being in the numbering of the Psalms. For Synoptic parallels, the passage in NA28 closest to the form of the quotation has been chosen, with a preference for Luke where readings are otherwise identical. A full list of quotations is given in the Index of Biblical Passages. The titles of the biblical *kephalaia* are also translated in footnotes. Every scholium ends with the *bedera* symbol regardless of the practice in the manuscript.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> For more details on the system of identifying the scholia, see Houghton, 'The Layout and Structure of the Catena', 63.