CHAPTER 1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON CODEX ZACYNTHIUS (D.C. PARKER)

Codex Zacynthius was first encountered by critical scholarship on sea-girt Zante in 1820, when it was presented by the Duke, Prince Antonio Comuto (1748–1833), to General Colin Macaulay (1760-1836), friend and colleague of Wellington, prisoner of Tipu Sultan and abolitionist.1 Macaulay brought the manuscript to the United Kingdom the following year and gave it to the British and Foreign Bible Society, where it was assigned the shelfmark MS 213. Both of these donations are recorded on a page stuck to the inside front cover of the manuscript, Comuto's Greek text designating the book 'a memorial of the piety of the knight, Count Antonio'.2 Tregelles gathered enough information about the two men to be able to illustrate some of the circumstances surrounding this gift. The Prince was a noted scholar with a large library, interest in religious matters and sympathy towards Britain (his island being at this time within the British Protectorate), while the General was also a well-read man and strongly supported the work of the Bible Society.³ In the year prior to Macaulay's visit, Comuto had expressed his support for the production of a translation of the lectionary into Modern Greek and attended a meeting of a Bible Committee with two British representatives who presented it with seventy copies of an edition of the New Testament produced by the London Missionary Society; Macaulay himself played an important role in the translation of the Bible into Malayalam when he was Resident of Travancore.4

_

¹ For Macaulay, see Colin Ferguson Smith, *A Life of General Colin Macaulay, Soldier, Scholar and Slavery Abolitionist.* (Birmingham: privately printed, 2019).

² Μνημὸσυνον σεβάσματος τοῦ Ἰππὲος ἀντωνίου Κόμητος 1820: the hand is somewhat shaky, consistent with Comuto's advanced age. Under this is written in pencil, perhaps by Macaulay, Il Principe Comuto, Zante. The date of Macaulay's gift of the manuscript is recorded as November 6, 1821, although it appears that there may have been an attempt in a different ink to adjust this to 1820.

³ 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. Deciphered, Transcribed, and Edited, by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL.D. (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1861), xxiii–xxv.

⁴ Tregelles, *Codex Zacynthius*, xxiv; Smith, *A Life*, 39–43.

D.C. PARKER

The research project from which this book comes has reached its completion on the two-hundredth anniversary of the manuscript's entry into the world of western scholarship, and only now is a transcription of the whole text being published. This may seem strange. It is less surprising when one considers the general lack of interest in the whole textual content of catena manuscripts. Generally, New Testament philologists have abstracted the biblical text and subsequent research has often forgotten the nature of the source.⁵ Nevertheless, it remains surprising that a whole generation was to pass before a study even of the biblical text alone of this manuscript was to appear. This transcription (which did not include the catena) by the distinguished editor Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813–75), appeared in 1861.⁶

According to Tregelles, the manuscript had been inspected in London in 1845 by Johann Martin Augustin Scholz (1794–1852) who observed that it was a palimpsest.⁷ Although Scholz contributed extensively to our knowledge of Greek New Testament manuscripts, none of the accounts of his travels in search of them or his other publications was published late enough to include any information about this foray. It appears that the first printed notice of the manuscript comes from the pen of the German orientalist Paul de Lagarde (1827–1891), who drew Tregelles' attention to the manuscript in a letter of 11 August, 1858. Tregelles cites the whole description published by Lagarde the previous year.⁸ In it Lagarde seems to indicate that he had examined the manuscript four years earlier, recognised that the undertext contained Luke but found it hard to read, and commended its further study to the appropriate person at the Bible Society. He correctly identified some of the writers excerpted, but mistakenly stated that Origen and Titus were cited anonymously. He also suggested that editors of the New Testament should study the manuscript.⁹

On 6 September, 1858 Tregelles received permission from the Bible Society to transcribe the manuscript in his own home.¹⁰ He reported that he was able to complete the transcription and return the manuscript 'after a few months'.¹¹ The publication

⁵ See D.C. Parker, An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts. (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 55–6.

⁶ See note 3.

⁷ Tregelles, *Codex Zacynthius*, ii.

⁸ The description is found in Paul De Lagarde, De Novo Testamento ad Versionem Orientalium fidem edendo Commentatio (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1857). Lagarde's research included the catena tradition in Coptic (Catenae in Evangelia Aegyptiacae quae supersunt [Göttingen: Dieterich, 1886]), as well as Titus of Bostra (Titi Bostreni quae ex opere Contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt Graece [Berlin: Hertz, 1859]; Titi Bostreni Contra Manichaeos Libri Quatuor Syriace, [Berlin: Hertz, 1859]).

Tregelles pointed this out, and also reacted firmly to observations by Lagarde concerning the use of chemical reagents in deciphering manuscripts.

¹⁰ Tregelles was then resident in Plymouth, possibly at 6 Portland Square. The house no longer stands. For his life, see the article in *DNB* by E.C. Marchant, revised by J.K. Elliott. See further the recent biography by Timothy C.F. Stunt, *The Life and Times of Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. A Forgotten Scholar* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020).

¹¹ Tregelles, Codex Zacynthius, ii.

reproduced the format of the biblical text with respect to the page and line divisions, printed in lithograph using the Alexandrian type. ¹² He also provided what he described as a 'facsimile tracing' (p. xxi) of one page of the manuscript as it is now bound. In his preface, Tregelles describes the manuscript, lists the commentators named at the top of each page of the catena, transcribes the initial *kephalaia*, provides a partial concordance between the folios of the lectionary and the undertext, and offers several comments on the manuscript and its text. It appears that he may have been abroad a good time between his completion of the transcription and its publication in 1861, in addition to a period of severe illness which he mentions in a postscript to his preface to explain why the preparation of the volume was slow: Bagsters sent the British Museum a receipt for the type on 20 May 1859, and it was not returned until 15 July 1861. ¹³

Tregelles' editions of the New Testament and the manuscript itself appear to have been the point of departure for all subsequent scholarship on its biblical text. He was responsible for assigning the manuscript the alphabetical siglum Ξ , which was adopted by Tischendorf in his editio octava critica maior of 1869. Errors in Tischendorf's citation of Codex Zacynthius in Luke 7:28 and 8:20 suggest that he took its readings from the apparatus to Tregelles' edition of Luke rather than that of the manuscript: the perpetuation of these by subsequent editors reveals their dependence on their predecessors. 14 Two decades before the appearance of Westcott and Hort's The New Testament in the Original Greek, F.J.A. Hort had been responsible for reading the proofs of Tregelles' edition of the manuscript and Codex Zacynthius is cited throughout the introduction to their edition of 1881. 15 In the same year, however, a two-page article was published by Nicholas Pocock in a weekly review entitled *The Academy*. ¹⁶ Pocock drew attention to 'as many as seven variations' between the facsimile tracing in Tregelles' edition page and the corresponding page of his transcription. Although he did not have access to the manuscript, Pocock collated the gospel text from Tregelles, noting a total of around three hundred differences between Codex Zacynthius and the Textus Receptus. Indeed, he compared the manuscript favourably to the fourth-century codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, observing that, in terms of scribal performance, 'the MS. may be said to be more correct than the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., which have many more itacisms and many more mistakes than the Codex Zacynthius', even if 'the value of this MS. is almost superseded by the publication of the Vatican, and still more by the discovery of the Sinaitic

¹² For this type, cut for Woide's facsimile edition of Codex Alexandrinus, see J.H. Bowman, 'The Codex Alexandrinus and the Alexandrian Greek Types,' *The British Library Journal* 24.2 (1998): 169–83, esp. 174–5. There were three sizes, all of which were used in Tregelles' edition. Some of the type still exists at the British Library, but it is not known whether the matrices survive.

¹³ Bowman, 'The Codex Alexandrinus,' 175.

 ¹⁴ See J.H. Greenlee, 'Some Examples of Scholarly "Agreement in Error", 'JBL 77.4 (1958): 363–4.
 ¹⁵ Tregelles, Codex Zacynthius, xx.

¹⁶ Nicholas Pocock, 'The Codex Zacynthius,' *The Academy* 19 (1881): 136–7.

MS.'. ¹⁷ Codex Zacynthius appeared in a short book published in 1928 giving details of four manuscripts belonging to the Bible Society, which is entirely dependent on Tregelles' published information. ¹⁸

The manuscript also featured in publications on palaeography. Following Tregelles, Gardthausen listed Codex Zacynthius without discussion as an eighth-century production in the first edition of his *Griechische Palaeographie* (1879); the longer treatment in the second edition of 1913 reproduces Tregelles' description of the hand. ¹⁹ The same date was accepted by Gregory and Scrivener in subsequent decades. ²⁰ In 1937, Hatch proposed a redating of two majuscule gospel manuscripts, Codex Zacynthius and Codex Cyprius (GA 017), placing the former in the sixth century, two centuries earlier than the date proposed by Tregelles and accepted up to that point. ²¹ This dating was adopted by Aland in the first edition of the *Kurzgefasste Liste*, in which the gospel writing in the undertext was registered with the siglum GA 040 and the lectionary overwriting as GA L299. ²²

Transcription of the catena did not follow until ninety years after that of the biblical text. On the suggestion of G.D. Kilpatrick of Queen's College, Oxford, J. Harold Greenlee (1918–2015) took research leave from his position at Asbury Theological Seminary in order to examine the manuscript as a Senior Fulbright Fellow in 1950–51. Kilpatrick had arranged that the British and Foreign Bible Society would loan the manuscript from their collection in London to Oxford's Bodleian Library for this period. Greenlee's working method was to transcribe 'with Cod. Ξ sitting on a wide window ledge of the Bodleian Library, and a magnifying glass over the text and a mirror to focus the sunlight into the glass'. ²³ The transcribers for the current project, working with high quality images combining the optimum wavelengths for the ink of the undertext, can testify to the excellent results that Greenlee achieved. Unfortunately, plans to publish the transcription, with a preface of forty pages in typescript (printed for the first time as Appendix 2 in the current volume), were abandoned. Only three short contributions saw the light of day: a

¹⁷ Pocock, 'The Codex Zacynthius,' 137.

¹⁸ R. Kilgour, Four Ancient Manuscripts in the Bible House Library (London: BFBS, 1928).

¹⁹ Viktor Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie*. First edn. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1879), 139; V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie*. *II. Die Schrift, Unterschriften und Chronologie*. Second edn. (Leipzig: Von Veit, 1913), 141.

²⁰ This is described further in Chapter 3.

²¹ 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. R.P. Casey, S. Lake, and A.K. Lake; London: Christophers, 1937), 333–8.

²² Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des neuen Testaments.* First edn. ANTF 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963). A copy of a letter from Aland to Gunther Zuntz dated 14 September 1982, kept in the file on GA 040 at the INTF in Münster, indicates his intention to revise the date of the undertext in the second edition of the *Liste*, although this appears not to have been carried through.

²³ Letter to J.N. Birdsall, dated 6 January, 1998. Greenlee also referred to '... the work I did on a window ledge of the Bodleian Library back in 1950–51, with the help of a magnifying glass, and some printed texts to help a bit ...' in a letter to J.N. Birdsall, dated 1 February, 1997.

five-page article of corrections to Tregelles' edition, which appeared in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in 1957; a two-page note in the same journal the following year observing errors in the citation of the manuscript in scholarly editions, as observed above; a ten-page article on the catena in *Biblica* two years later, entitled 'The Catena of Codex Zacynthius'. Greenlee left a copy of his typescript with Kilpatrick, however, who loaned the transcription to Joseph Reuss some three decades later for his collection of fragments from early Greek commentaries on Luke. Greenlee's own papers were eventually deposited with the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California.

Around 1995, my Birmingham colleague Neville Birdsall and I became interested in the many unanswered questions surrounding the manuscript, in particular by the unresolved discrepancy in the dates offered for the undertext. We agreed to pursue the question from two angles: I examined the palaeography of the manuscript and Birdsall considered the development of catenae.²⁷ In the course of our research, Birdsall became aware of Greenlee's work and began a correspondence with him. As a result, I was able to acquire a copy of Greenlee's transcription on a visit to Claremont in November 1997, which was of great use to Birdsall in his researches. The research bore fruit in an article which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* of 2004, proposing a date for the copying of Codex Zacynthius of around the year 700.²⁸

An overview of the history of research on catenae is provided by Birdsall's contribution to the joint article, which may be rehearsed briefly here.²⁹ At the point at which Tregelles was working, there was no research and the only modern publication that provided any illumination was John Anthony Cramer's series *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, which appeared between 1838 and 1844. Only at the very end of the nineteenth century did significant research begin to appear. An initial catalogue of catena manuscripts was assembled by Hans Lietzmann and Georg Karo.³⁰ The first investigations of Lukan catenae were by Joseph Sickenberger. His research took the form of monographs on individual commentators: Titus of Bostra, Nicetas and Cyril of

²⁴ J.H. Greenlee, 'A Corrected Collation of Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Ξ),' *JBL* 76 (1957): 237–41; J.H. Greenlee, 'Some Examples of Scholarly "Agreement in Error"; J.H. Greenlee, 'The Catena of Codex Zacynthius,' *Biblica* 40 (1959): 992–1001.

²⁵ Joseph Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*. TU 130 (Berlin: Akademie, 1984): see v and xv. Although Reuss cites Greenlee's published articles, nowhere does he connect him with this 'copy of the codex'.

²⁶ For an account of his career, see an obituary by his son at http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2015/03/rip-harold-greenlee.html.

²⁷ See further Chapter 3 below.

²⁸ D.C. Parker & J.N. Birdsall, 'The Date of Codex Zacynthius (Ξ): A New Proposal,' *JTS* ns 55.1 (2004), 117–131.

²⁹ See also Chapter 8 below.

³⁰ Hans Lietzmann, *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte in handschriftlicher Überlieferung* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Mohr, 1897); G. Karo and J. Lietzmann, *Catenarum graecarum catalogus* (Gottingen: Lüder Horstmann, 1902).

6 D.C. PARKER

Alexandria.³¹ This approach was continued two decades later by Max Rauer, the first to make mention of Codex Zacynthius, with studies of Peter of Laodicea and Origen's Homilies on Luke.³² Another leading figure in this period of research was Joseph Reuss. His first work offered lists of witnesses and his theories regarding the typologies of a number of catenae for each of Matthew, Mark and John.³³ Reuss later published extracts of otherwise-lost works from the catenae of Matthew, John and Luke: the last of these, as noted above, is the only previous work to make use of Greenlee's transcription.³⁴ More recently, a translation and study of the *Catena in Marcum* was published by William Lamb.³⁵ The designations of catena types in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, each beginning with C, have become the standard to identify these works and are described in detail in Chapter 8.

Further research in Birmingham has continued to explore catenae as a specific class of witness for the New Testament and to elucidate further the relationship between the different types. The establishment of a full list of New Testament catena manuscripts first became of interest to me when I observed the fact that some but not all of the manuscripts listed by Reuss had a Gregory-Aland number. On the whole, New Testament textual research had focused on the biblical text of such witnesses, ignoring their context within the catena tradition. A noteworthy exception was the work of Hans von Soden. Von Soden's categories are:

K Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on John

A Antiochene Commentaries

 C^{μ} Catenae of unknown origin on Matthew

C Catenae of unknown origin on John

 $N^{\mu,\lambda,\iota}$ Catenae of Nicetas on Matthew, Luke and John

Z Gospel Commentary by Zigabenus

Θ Gospel Commentary by Theophylact

³¹ Joseph Sickenberger, *Titus von Bostra. Studien zur dessen Lukashomilien*. TU 21.1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901); *Die Lukaskatene des Niketas von Herakleia*. TU 22.4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902); *Fragmente der Homilien des Cyrill von Alexandrien zum Lukasevangelium*. TU 34 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909). For further research on Nicetas, see note 39 below.

³² Max Rauer, *Der dem Petrus von Laodicea zugeschriebene Lukaskommentar*. MA 8/2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1920); Max Rauer, *Origenes: Werke. Neunter Band. Die Homilien zu Lukas.* Second edn. GCS 49 [35] (Berlin: Hinrichs, 1959).

³³ Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus-, und Johannes-Katenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen.* NTAbh 18.4–5 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1941).

³⁴ Joseph Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*. TU 61 (Berlin: Akademie, 1957); Joseph Reuss, *Johannes-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*. TU 89 (Berlin: Akademie, 1966); Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare*.

³⁵ William R.S. Lamb, *The Catena in Marcum: A Byzantine Anthology of Early Commentary on Mark*. TENT 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

³⁶ D.C. Parker, Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament. The Lyell Lectures, Oxford, Trinity Term 2011 (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 40–52, esp. 46.

³⁷ Hans von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. 1. Teil: Untersuchungen. 1. Abteilung: Die Textzeugen* (Berlin: Alexander Duncker, 1902), 249–89.

There are further types for the other parts of the New Testament. Codex Zacynthius is included within von Soden's schema, where it received the siglum A^1 . As part of the European Research Council-funded COMPAUL project (2011–16), I produced a checklist of New Testament catena manuscripts which featured no fewer than one hundred items not registered in the *Kurzgefasste Liste*. The award of subsequent funding by the European Research Council in the form of the CATENA project (2018–23) has permitted the refinement of this list as part of the process of producing a comprehensive catalogue. In addition, a series of doctoral projects at the University of Birmingham has investigated different aspects of the catena tradition, often including extensive transcriptions of unpublished material. ³⁹

The impetus for further research on Codex Zacynthius was due to a change in ownership. Since 1984 the Bible Society's library had been housed in Cambridge University Library. In 2013 the decision was taken by the Bible Society to sell some of its holdings, including this manuscript. A campaign was launched by the University Library, under the patronage of Archbishop Rowan Williams, Master of Magdalene College, to keep the manuscript in Cambridge. Donations were made by individuals and organisations, including the National Heritage Memorial Fund, and after an extension of six months to the initial deadline set by the Bible Society, in 2014 the University Library raised the required £1.1 million to purchase the manuscript. This sum was used by the Bible Society towards the building of a Centre in North Wales called Mary Jones World. After its successful fund-raising, the Library was anxious to develop understanding and access to Codex Zacynthius, which on its accession had been assigned a new shelfmark: MS Additional 10062. The development of multispectral imaging, a non-invasive means of recovering the original text of palimpsest manuscripts, also meant that the time was ripe for a reinvestigation of the undertext.

Discussions were held between members of Cambridge University Library, biblical scholars at Cambridge (including Lamb) and the directors of ITSEE at the University of Birmingham (Parker and Houghton). As a result of these, work on Codex Zacynthius was incorporated into several applications for projects funded by research councils. The most extensive of these was a proposal submitted in January 2017 to the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) for a complete electronic edition of the

³⁸ 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; see especially 28–35.

³⁹ This includes Michael A. Clark, 'The catena of Nicetas of Heraclea and its Johannine text', unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2016 [https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/6424/]; Theodora Panella, 'The Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Galatians', unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2018 [https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/8666/] and work currently in progress by Coppola on Photius, Marcon on the Pseudo-Oecumenian Catena on Romans, and Scieri on the Catena on Acts.

8 D.C. PARKER

manuscript, both the overtext and undertext, following the production of a new set of digital multispectral images. This project would also include the first-ever English translation of the catena, a set of studies of the manuscript and its contents, and an exhibition in Cambridge. The application was able to build on the existing partnership between ITSEE and the University Library, who had collaborated on a full-text electronic transcription of the bilingual New Testament manuscript Codex Bezae, published online in the Cambridge University Digital Library in 2012, as well as the Mingana-Lewis Qur'anic palimpsest. Ben Outhwaite, Head of the Genizah Research Unit in Cambridge, had arranged for images of test pages from Codex Zacynthius to be taken using advanced techniques, with impressive results. The reviewers of the application were unanimously positive, and in July 2017 the AHRC announced funding of £303,165 for the Codex Zacynthius Project to be led by Parker and Houghton at ITSEE in Birmingham from 1 February 2018 for 24 months.

The chief result of this project is that at last the full text of this document, the oldest New Testament manuscript to contain a catena, will be published two centuries after it was first presented to a representative of a British organisation. Along with this has come the opportunity to acquire a deeper understanding and to ask fresh questions of the manuscript. We have not only established a text of the catena which goes beyond the remarkable achievements of Greenlee and provides material not included by Reuss, but we have confirmed the significance of the palimpsest for the text of the Gospel according to Luke by the restoration of further ancient readings and opened a new window onto Byzantine manuscript production with a thorough examination of Lectionary 299, including the identification of its copyist and his comments on his work. The Codex Zacynthius Project will thus feed into the ongoing work of the CATENA Project and the *Editio Critica Maior* of Luke, as well as making an important step towards a fuller investigation of the text and structure of New Testament lectionaries and supplying extensive material for future study.

⁴⁰ The edition of Codex Bezae is online at http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/2167/ and http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/2167/ and https://epapers.bham.ac.uk/1664/. For the Mingana-Lewis Qur'anic palimpsest, see https://epapers.bham.ac.uk/1664/. For the Mingana-Lewis Collections-blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?p=12005 and Alba Fedeli, 'The Digitization Project of the Qur'anic Palimpsest, MS Cambridge University Library Or. 1287, and the Verification of the Mingana-Lewis Edition: Where is Salām?' *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 2.1 (2011): 100–17.