The writer's examination of the palimpsest Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Ε) and the citation of variant readings from this MS for a new edition of the Greek NT1 have revealed how erroneous citations are sometimes made and passed on from scholar to scholar without being detected and corrected. It is hoped that this note will serve to bring to the attention of those interested the correct reading of Cod. Ε at these points.2

The four principal readings at the beginning of Luke 7:28 are λέγω, ἀμφότερος λέγω, λέγω γάρ, and λέγω δὲ. Tregelles' facsimile of the text of Luke of Cod. Ε reads ἀμφότερος λέγω. Tregelles' NT, however, cites Ε for λέγω, as do Tischendorf, Bover, and Alford's Greek NT (7th ed., 1874). Von Soden, Merk, and Vogels all cite various MSS supporting ἀμφότερος λέγω but do not include Ε, and by implication agree with the other editors concerning Ε. The MS of Cod. Ε actually reads ἀμφότερος λέγω twice, since the first part of vs. 28 is one of the passages in this MS which is repeated to accompany the catena.3

1 This new edition is being sponsored by the American Bible Society, the National Bible Society of Scotland, and the Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, and is being prepared by a committee of American and European scholars. A printed brochure describing the new edition is available from the Translations Dept., American Bible Society, 440 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

2 The present article deals primarily with erroneous citations from Tregelles' facsimile edition of Cod. Ε, whereas the writer's previous article, "A Corrected Collation of Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Ε)." JBL, LXXVI (Sept., 1957), 237–41, dealt with discrepancies between the facsimile volume and the MS itself.

3 For a discussion of this characteristic of the MS see pp. 237–38 of the writer's article in JBL, cited above.
In Luke 8:20 Tregelles' facsimile reads δητι. Tregelles' NT cites Ξ as omitting δητι, as does Tischendorf. Von Soden and Bover do not include Ξ among their witnesses for the inclusion of δητι. (Merk and Vogels do not deal with this variant.) The MS of Cod. Ξ reads δητι.

Two further instances are of a different nature. In Luke 7:1 Tregelles' facsimile reads τας. Tregelles' NT states that Ξ omits τας, and Tischendorf gives the same information. (Von Soden, Merk, Bover, and Vogels do not deal with this variant.) The MS of Cod. Ξ, on the other hand, has no trace of τας at all.

Similarly, in Luke 8:43 Tregelles' facsimile reads ἄρτη. Tregelles' NT reads ἄρτη Ξ, ἄρτη Ξ, Tischendorf gives the same information. Von Soden and Bover read ἄρτη Ξ. (Merk and Vogels are silent.) The MS of Cod. Ξ actually reads only ἄρτη.

What do these discrepancies reveal? In Luke 7:28 and 8:20 Tregelles read Cod. Ξ correctly and printed its text correctly, but somehow cited it erroneously in his edition of the Greek NT. The evidence indicates that Tischendorf simply copied Tregelles' citation rather than checking the facsimile, and later editors probably copied Tischendorf.

In Luke 7:1 and 8:43 Tregelles' facsimile is in error. These incorrect readings Tregelles cites (7:1 by implication) in his NT as Ξ. Very strangely he cites the correct reading for each of these as Ξ, although his facsimile gives no hint of a corrector and the MS itself shows no trace of more than one reading. Could he have misread his own notes here? Again Tischendorf apparently copied Tregelles' NT and later editors probably copied Tischendorf. There is no evidence that any editor consulted the facsimile volume directly. It is still more certain that no editor after Tregelles ever checked the actual MS of Cod. Ξ.

From these few random samples one may wonder how many other erroneous citations of important MSS have gained undeserved acceptance by simply being passed from one editor to another without being checked in the original MS.
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