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CODEX Zacynthius (Ζ, Greg. 040, Soden A1), owned by the British and Foreign Bible Society in London, is a palimpsest and fragmentary MS of Luke, accompanied by an extensive patristic commentary or catena. The upper text of the codex is the 13th century Gospel lectionary l 299.

The importance of Cod. Ζ includes the fact that it is the oldest known NT MS accompanied by a catena and is the only such MS in which both the biblical text and the catena are written in uncial letters.

All citations of the text of Luke of Cod. Ζ have of necessity been based upon the facsimile which S. P. Tregelles edited and published in 1861, following his personal examination of the MS. A few other scholars before and since Tregelles have seen the MS; but none of them collated or re-collated the text of Luke from the MS. Apparently neither Tregelles nor anyone else had made any serious attempt to read the catena during the more than a century and a quarter after the MS had been brought to London in 1821.

This neglect of Cod. Ζ was called to the writer’s attention by Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick of Oxford. As a result, I spent several months transcribing as much of the catena as I could decipher, some 30,000 words or more, and completely re-read the text of Luke, checking the text against Tregelles’ facsimile. With the advantage of having Tregelles’ edition as a starting point, and considering the factors involved in reading a palimpsest, some corrections to Tregelles’ facsimile can be offered, although the general accuracy of his work was verified.

Since the catena comprises a study in itself, the present article deals only with the text of Luke in Cod. Ζ.

Numerous passages of Luke are repeated in this MS. The catena accompanying a given passage of Luke is sometimes continued extensively on the following page; in such instances the text of Luke to which the catena refers is often repeated as well. Such repeated passages must

2 Contrary to Tregelles’ statement (op. cit., p. ii, near bottom), there are no pages
of course be collated separately for each repetition, since they may not be textually identical.

Since Tregelles failed to note some of these repetitions, the following list is given of all passages which are repeated in Cod. X, together with their precise contents:

1 2 καὶ δοῦνα ... αὐτοῦ εἰς ... (folios 3v, 4r)
1 38 καὶ ἵδα ... αὐτής (9r, 9v)
1 42 καὶ ποιεῖ ... τῶν εἰς (11v, 12r; Tregelles omits 11v)
2 21 καὶ οὖτε ... καλλίς (3 times: 19r, 19v, 20r)
2 24 ἵδα ... αὐτελθομένου (21r, 21v)
6 21 πλῆθος ... πλούσιος (36v, 36v)
6 42 δοκεῖ οὐκ εἰς τοὺς εὐδαιμονίας (60v, 40v)
6 62 νερόν ... ναπαρν (40v, 41r)
7 28 ἀμην λεγὼ μου ... οὕτως εἰσὶν (46v, 47v; Tregelles omits 46v)
7 27 καὶ ἵδα ... Φαρισαίοις (49r, 49v)
9 1 συγκαλεσάμενος ... ἔφησαν (3 times: 49v, 49v, 50v)
9 16 λαβῶν ... κατέλαβαν (52r, 52v)
9 27 λεγὼ ... θεον (65v, 66r)
9 28 εὐερετε ... προκεκυρίαν (66v, 67r)
9 66 εὐσηθεῖς ... μείζον αὐτων (70r, 70v)
10 22 παρὰ μίαν ... εἰ μὴ ὁ θεός (79v, 80r)
10 25 καὶ ἰδοὺ ... πληρονομήσω (81v, 82r)
10 34 εὐπάθειας ... εὐπάθειαν αὐτοῦ (84r, 84v)

Moreover, the MS is very fragmentary. Since Tregelles' facsimile contains some oversights, the following list of the contents of the text of Luke is given:

BEGIN WITH  END WITH

1 1 εὐερετε ... 10 τοῦ κυρίου
1 10 καὶ αποκρίθησαι ... 11 εἰπὼν αὐτοῦ
1 17 εἰπήμορον ... 11 καὶ στίξας αὐτοῦ
1 30 μὴ φοβοῦ ... 11 καὶ ἵδα αὐτοῦ
1 38 καὶ ἵδα ... 11 τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ
1 37 τοῦ δοῦνα ... 12 καὶ τίνι ἵδας αὐτῆς
2 21 καὶ οὖτε ... 12 καὶ παρακάτων αὐτοῦ
2 23 διὰ τάξεις ... 12 καὶ παρακάτων αὐτοῦ
3 6 καὶ παρ ὀρὸς ... 13 καὶ παρὰ τούτοις
3 11 καὶ ο ἐχὼν ... 13 καὶ παρὰ τούτοις
4 1 Πνεῦμα δέ ... 14 αὐτοῦ εἰς ... (folios 4v, which is folio 121v of the present binding) and give his opinion.

3 Tregelles' facsimile indicates that the words ἁρπνόμενοι δὲ παρακάτων (8 19v) are repeated. This is erroneous. These words appear only once.

without a portion of the text of Luke. There are, however, one or two pages which contain no catena.

There is a possibility that this repetition includes one previous line. If so, it is probably εἶπεν πάντων τὴν δο. 1 would be happy if some qualified person would examine the MS (folio 40v, which is folio 121v of the present binding) and give his opinion.

4 Tregelles' facsimile indicates that the words ἁρπνόμενοι δὲ παρακάτων (8 19v) are repeated. This is erroneous. These words appear only once.

Three of the above beginnings and endings differ from Tregelles' facsimile:

8 20 καὶ εἰς ... 11 καὶ εἰς τῷ δόξῃ τῷ Θεῷ
8 21 καὶ εἰς ... 11 καὶ εἰς τῷ δόξῃ τῷ Θεῷ
8 22 καὶ εἰς ... 11 καὶ εἰς τῷ δόξῃ τῷ Θεῷ

A copy of the full collation of Luke in Cod. Z has been deposited with the International Critical Apparatus Project, with a notation of each point at which this collation differs from Tregelles. In order that the new information may be readily available to scholars, the following list is given of all textual points in which 'Tregelles' facsimile is incorrect. 6

The first reading in each instance below is the text of the Textus Receptus (Oxford, 1873), as reproduced at the University of Chicago Press for the International Critical Apparatus Project.

1 1 καὶ εἰς ... (Tregelles καὶ καὶ)
1 10 μοῦ / omit on 11v, with Cod. W. (Treg. omits 11v completely.)
1 11 μὲ / εἰς on 11v and 12r, with * Β Θ. (Treg. omits 11v completely, and erroneously reads μὲ on 12r.)
1 17 εἰ / εἶ / ζέ (Treg. indicates lacuna.)
1 18 εὐερετε / same (Treg. εὐερετε[π])
2 2 2 καὶ παρακάτων / καὶ παρακάτων (Treg. καὶ παρακάτων, εἰς errore)
2 26 Ναζαρέτ / same (Treg. Ναζαρέτ, εἰς errore)
3 5 παρ / same (Treg. παρ, εἰς errore)
4 11 αὐτοί / same (Treg. αὐτοί)
4 14 μὲ / μὲ / (sic)
4 22 εὐφημία / same (Treg. εὐφήμια)

1 Examination of the MS has also yielded corrections to some of the section titles and to some of the section numbers as recorded by Tregelles. I shall be glad to make these details available to anyone interested.

4 This list does not include matters which are significant paleographically but not textually — e.g., instances in which Tregelles shows -ται written out, where it is actually indicated by a symbol in the MS.
V7r' in 8 43, as given in the collation above, are the only readings at these points in the text of this MS. There remain, however, four instances (plus three others involving only nu-movable) in which Cod. Z is now seen to agree with the Textus Receptus where Tregelles’ facsimile had indicated disagreement with TR. There are fourteen instances (none involving only nu-movable) in which the MS is now seen to differ from TR where Tregelles’ facsimile had indicated agreement with TR.

These changes serve to strengthen the evidence for the Alexandrian character of this MS. The four instances in which it agrees with TR contra Tregelles are instances in which Tregelles’ reading had Alexandrian support, but three of these were supported by D and Byzantine witnesses as well. Of the fourteen instances in which the MS disagrees with TR contra Tregelles, four have no support listed in the critical editions. Of the other ten, almost all have Alexandrian support. The most frequent support comes from Cod. L, which appears with seven of the ten.

The conclusion, therefore, is that Codex Zacynthius remains a good Alexandrian witness, with some unique readings and some scribal errors. The text and catena are written in a neat and careful hand; the MS must have presented a picture of simple beauty 1200 years ago.

In at least two instances, Luke 7 1 and 8 40, Tischendorf cites what he calls Ξ, which presumably refers to a corrector of Cod. Ξ. However, neither in these instances nor in any other is there evidence of a corrector’s hand in the text of this MS. The absence of τας in 7 1 and the reading of ενθω’ in 8 40, as given in the collation above, are the only readings at these points in the MS.

A number of the corrections listed above are not significant for establishing textual affinities, since they involve such matters as errors in Tregelles’ facsimile, idiosyncrasies and unique readings of Cod. Ξ, and lacunae. There remain, however, four instances (plus three others involving only nu-movable) in which Cod. Ξ is now seen to agree with the Textus Receptus where Tregelles’ facsimile had indicated disagreement with TR.